VOLUME XXII JANUARY & JULY 1987 NUMBER (1-2)

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

[HUMANITIES]

UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB
LAHORE

VOLUME XXII JANUARY & JULY 1987 NUMBER (1-2)

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

[HUMANITIES]

UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB
LAHORE

Printed by Javed Iqbal Bhatti at the
Punjab University Press, Lahore
D-161—P.U.P.—500—1-3-89

UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB
LAHORE

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr. Khwaja Imtiaz Ali, Professor & Chairman, Department of English, Bahauddin Zakria University, Multan.
2. Mr. Munir Ahmed Qazi, Kuwait.
3. Dr. Nasim Riaz Butt, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Punjab University, Lahore.
4. Prof. Arshad Syed Karim, Department of Political Science, Karachi University, Karachi.
5. Dr. Zahir J. Khattak, Department of English, Islamia University, Bahawalpur.

RUSKIN AND REVIEWERS OF *MODERN PAINTERS III*

K. I. Al

The third volume of Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, published in 1856, is very crucial in the development of his views on art. The ten years interlude between the writing of the second and third volumes, during which he probed the allied field of architecture with characteristic enthusiasm and determination, graduated him from boyhood to maturity. As we read the third volume we get the impression that we have crossed blind alleys and narrow paths and entered upon open spaces and wide highways. The volume was sub-titled 'Of Many Things' and it is truly so. The author now eschews system, which he had so studiously adopted in his investigations of the first two volumes, and decides to arrange his chapters 'with a view to convenient reference, rather than to any careful division of subjects', a style which could be more congenial to his discursive, rambling way of expression. He brings teasing, awkward questions to a head, gives a more explicit rendering of them, explains the apparent inconsistency of his uplifting Turner and the pre-Raphaelites simultaneously, divides the history of landscape into three recognizable periods and arbitrarily selects three poets, who, in his opinion, are truly representative of those ages. One could also discern in the volume vague anticipations of Ruskin's subsequent shift to social and economic criticism.

As in the criticism of the first two volumes, the reviewers of the third volume of *Modern Painters*, despite finding fault with most of Ruskin's artistic assertions, could not help praising the general character of the volume and the great abilities of the author. The favourable reviewers laid greater stress on the distinctive talents of the author while not blinding their eyes to some of his obvious defects and the hostile reviewers

emphasized the evil effects of his writings while acknowledging here and there some of their very glittering beauties. The reviewers like the *Weekly Despatch* and the *Non-Conformist*, mainly pointed out the finer qualities of the author. The others touched on his more varied characteristics. The *Critic* regarded the author as "one of the notable men of England." His gifts of originality, honesty and eloquence had lent him a higher status than the other art critics. His books were bold, valuable and entertaining, "full of gorgeous descriptions, and earnest glances into the moral world, alternating or intermingled with dauntless and well-supported attacks on many received authorities and established reputations."[1] The views of 'the Oxford Graduate' showed 'the frank and healthful nobility of the original man' and they were bound to have a lasting effect on the artistic world. The *Leader* felt that a writer who had brought long and arduous study, literary ability of the highest order, earnestness, courage, and extraordinary originality of view to the service of criticism on Art in this country certainly deserved the respect and admiration of his readers. They had found a new happiness in their field-walks for the future and were grateful to the author for his 'valuable teaching and hearty encouragement'. The *Idler* was conscious that we owed many benefits to the pen of this magnificent writer. The reviewer could not think of any other class of writers who had "faced the facts of nature and of the mind with such steadiness, or so well discriminated the qualities which alone can give pictorial merit."[2] The author had given us illuminating conception of the distinction between *language* and *expression* and driven home to us the point that the best executed picture may be the worst one if it did not convey ideas of the higher order. It required a courage of the intellect to see that these were essential and cardinal truths. The author was not afraid to say what he saw and he said it "with a courage which no rebuff could daunt, an acuteness which no sophistry could elude, and a style which could have made interesting a subject far less attractive."[3] The book was distinguished by suggestive and profound thought and possessed that "rare sincerity and love of

truth which never desert the author in his most perverse assersions, and his wildest flights of fancy."[4]

George Butler, the critic of the *Saturday Review*, recognized Ruskin's claim to the attention of the readers because he had given away ten years of his life to the task of establishing the principles of art with the purpose of teaching them to others. It was good that in this volume he had eschewed systems and followed only the inclinations of his natural instincts which sometimes led him to unnecessary digressions. The temper of his mind required such digressions and one was happy to "turn aside with him to listen to a discussion on poetry, or on the social state and national destiny of England—feeling sure that our guide will come back to the path and be himself again—than require him to put a constraint on the free and genial current of his thoughts, whether they glide through smooth meadows, or advance with irregular bounds among opposing rocks and wave-worn stones."[5]

The *Economist* remarked that the volume would be "hailed with interest and curiosity, if not with submissive attention by the art world of England."[6] The author possessed 'a clear and penetrating mind' which sometimes shattered the confidence of his readers in his soundness because they could not believe that there existed so much beauty in an object which he discussed and which they themselves could not discover on their own. The reviewer recognized that the author was "undeniably practical in his fundamental ideas, full of the deepest reverence for all that appears to him beautiful and holy, and, though, owning to very strong preferences, founding these preferences on reason, and fully admitting the good that exists elsewhere, even in the work of these his adversaries."[7]

The British Quarterly Review observed that Ruskin's previous two volumes, though bitterly attacked by some critics, did not fail in their aim and checked the virulent attackes on Turner, who, "already sinking into death must have felt cheered in his desolate home by the eloquent advocacy of that young champion who flung himself so chivalrously

between him and his cowardly assailants and so willingly received the thrusts that were aimed at the gifted old man."[8] The reviewer commened Ruskin's fine taste and sound principles even when his conclusions could not always be accepted. To the critic of the *Electic Review*, the author combined in his person "some of the highest qualities of the literary man and the artist,"[9] which had left an indelible impression on the art-literature of the day and had already "effected a revolution in the popular estimate of modern, as compared with ancient landscape painters."[10] The reviewer placed him in the first rank of modern writers on the theory of fine Arts and felt impelled to accept his convictions which were expressed with such boldness and sincerity. The critic also realized that the energy and power of his style, his evident love for nature, his wonderous faculty of word-painting still further heighten the charm, and increase the influence of his writings."[11] This was also evidenced by the fact that his works, though condemned and ridiculed by a large number of writers, were still zealously sought after and read.

George Eliot, writing in the *Westminister Review*, recorded that every one who loved nature or poetry or had anything to do with literature and philosophy or the story of human progress would find something valuable in the volume and would be irrepressibly attracted to the author. George Eliot felt that the excellence of a writer did not depend upon his freedom from faults but on the positive merits he possessed, "the variety of thought he contributes and suggests, the amount of gladdening and energizing emotions he excites."[12] It carried no significance that Ruskin under-valued this writer or painter and overestimated that other one, gave a just argument here and a false one there, was a little absurd here and very arrogant there. What was really important was that he taught 'truth of infinite value' and taught it in such a way that the people would listen. To George Eliot, the truth that Ruskin taught was 'realism'. This meant that "all truth and beauty are to be attained by a humble and faithful study of nature, and not by substituting vague forms, bred by imagination on the mists of feeling, in place of definite substantial reality."[13] She felt

convinced that if we fully accepted this doctrine it would reshape our lives and anyone who preached it in any one sphere of human activity, as Ruskin did with his inimitable pen, must be regarded a prophet for his generation. Mere teaching of truth was not enough; it had to be done in a way which seduced men's attention and sympathy. It needed a concordant voice which could arouse the audience and take charge of their souls. Ruskin proudly possessed that voice and "whatever error he may mix with his truth, he will make more converts to that truth than less-erring advocates who are hoarse and feeble."[14] The *Spectator*, reminiscing over the origin of the work, recalled how the first volume had come "crying like a trumpet among sleepers when even the name of the author was unknown,"[15] and every body eagerly sought to know who this 'Oxford Graduate' was. The reviewer regarded this volume as "one of the fullest, ablest and one of the most arduous in its range of inquiry, which Mr. Ruskin has written."[16] It was also "one of the most impregnable in its broad principles' whenever a more positive test than individual opinion can be brought to bear upon the matter."[17]

For Sir John Skelton, the reviewer of *Fraser's Magazine*, Ruskin was like "an English Institution, like the House of Lords or the National Gallery."[18] *Modern Painters* had effected a revolution in the people's views on aesthetics. Before this book appeared what men knew about art was a vague feeling that the earth was green, the sea blue, the clouds generally of a dirty white, Claude the prince of colourists and Turner the mystery of abomination. One could also recollect the kind of paintings that adorned the walls of art galleries before Ruskin's great work exposed their absurdities. They consisted of "classical catastrophies, 'conveniently antique, involuntarily modern' ; nymphs meagerly draped, blue with cold, ashamed of their nudity ; stiff, angular gentlemen with a wonderful depth of ideal vacuuity in their faces"[19] about which Dr. Johnson said, "such an excess of stupidity, Sir is not in nature." There were also paintings of "the hanging gardens of Babylon, and the architectural elevations of the Queen of Sheba's palace; trees and vegetables

grown in the grass as we buy them in covent-garden, and tempestuous representations of the ocean studied from the effects of the washing-tub or the tea-kettle."[20] Skelton felt that if the author had achieved nothing except clearing this rubbish away, he would have deserved the gratitude of all true connoisseurs of art.

In a review highly charged with emotion, contributed to the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*, William Morris and Burne-Jones, talking of the author, said that he would speak better and worthier things about nature than any one who did before. He would "tell you more credible tidings about God and man than you are likely to meet with in many a long day's journey."[21] The reviewers believed that any one whom God had endowed "truthfulness, veneration and earnestness, will come from the diligent reading of this book with a spirit of deep solemnity upon him."[22] An ignoramus about art, after the perusal of this book would "feel his heart warmer, his sympathy wider, his knowledge deeper, his thoughts purer."[23] As artist would emerge from this 'fiery trial of truth' "with some fancies quickened, some doubts directed, some aspirations ennobled, some emotions deepened and confirmed."[24] The reviewers were conscious that the author had devoted ten years in the centre of his life to the arduous task of "rendering tardy justice to the memory of a great Englishman, dead and wronged."[25] Ruskin had always spoken with truth and earnestness, had valued noble passions and had waged a crusade against falsehood and in defence of righteousness. His writings had opened up new worlds of sympathies and desires for many who might never have the privilege of thanking him and saying, "You made us happy." This, the reviewers reckoned was Ruskin's wordly crown and compensation. There was no shame in speaking feelingly of him. The reviewers were confident that God could not let the author's noble work die without advantage or profit.

But a majority of these favourable reviewers were impartial enough to point out the defects in Ruskin's writings. According to the critic of

the *Leader*, the author was too much inclined to seeing things in great detail and finding too many veiled meanings in the picture or poem he was examining. He had an indubitable confidence in the correctness of his theory even in exceptional circumstances, which led him at times to substitute 'sophistry for reasoning' and to make his comparison 'all on oneside' as the Irish say. *The Idler* did not like the fact that the present volume had come "as a sort of *hors d'aeuvre* a corollary to the others, rather than as a distinct and integral portion of the system."[26] The *Economists* argued that a painter could be willing to discard his old ideas and methods of work and adjust himself to the changing taste of the time if the process was completed gradually and imperceptibly. But if he was made to look like a fool and it was proved to him that his productions were 'ridiculous inanities' this was bound to arouse his anger and force him to hit back.

The *Eclectric Review* also pointed out some 'dangerous errors'. The reviewer felt that the author over-emphasized the influence of the Fine Arts on the well-being, culture and progress of the human race. He considered every wrong opinion and false method of practice in Art, "as a sin to be sternly reprobated, rather than as a mistake to be pointed out and corrected."[27] Again it was absurd on the part of the author to place Turner, the master of 'aspects' on an equal footing with Bacon, the master of 'essences' while knowing very well that the one represented things as they appeared and the other knew them as they were. He forgot that the Fine Arts were 'merely the offspring of man's intense love of the beautiful, but not essential to his existence or prosperity, and although they may indicate the tendencies of an age, as the vane does the direction of the wind, they are yet incapable of determing its character, or fixing its destinies."[28] Ruskin also fell into another error. He attached too much importance to the influence of religious feeling in art, and, at the same time, did not appreciate the true nature of that feeling. For him a painter was great in proportion to the extent of the religious feeling he expressed in his art, whatever may be his merits or

deficiencies otherwise. He preferred Angelieo to Raphael, Arcagna to Michael Angelo, Giotto to Titian and Holman Hunt to all of them. Many old Spanish painters had this devout religious sentiment to the highest degree; they started every new work by prayer, fasting and the Eucharist but even Ruskin would not compare their work to that of the buoyant and courtly Valesquez who only painted princes and grandees. It is true that the Puritans nad Scottish Govenanters had this feeling but they 'hated, despised and destroyed Atr'. The reviewer appreciated the value, of the religious sentiment for the artist but did not imagine that the mere presence of that feeling justified or excused technical weaknesses. Moreover great technical excellence and d ep religious feeling had no essential connection.

A charge on which more reviewers agreed was the author's inconsistency. The writer in the *Eclectic Review* said that despite his magnificent gifts, the author of *Modern Painters* was a 'strange mixture of inconsistencies and peculiarities'. He taught others to be meek and humble but himself was most authoritative in his views and did not brook opposition. He was the greatest destroyer of images and yet worshipped idols. Claude showed him no beauty but a medieval griffin could throw him into bursts of delight. He considered Domenichino and the Carracci as 'art weeds' but a Madonna by Giotto or Angelieo were to him the best examples of great art. He had no respect for many of the lofty names in modern painting and stigmatized the works of Stanfield, Roberts, Creswick, Cope, Herbert, Maclise as 'feeble, 'flimsy' 'imperfact', 'coarse', 'vulgar', 'out of drawing', 'tame and dead in colouring', while he classed those of Turner, Millais, Hunt and Lewis as 'ineffably right' and 'infinitely beautiful'.

The *Critic* too, was not satisfied with the way in which Ruskin set forth his views or conclusions. They gave to the reviewer the impression of being incoherent as if "instead of harminizing opposites, the writer was contenting himself with putting together contradictions, with a

comment of honesty and frankness which he takes for granted must ensure the needful unity of effect."[29]

Sir John Skelton of *Fraser's Magazine* also found many points of inconsistency in the author and attributed it to 'the incompleteness of the man.' Skelton felt that no author of our day was "more justly liable to severely hostile criticism."[30] There were many examples of the contradictory character of the author. As already pointed out by the *Eclectic Review*, he preached others the "admirable lessons of self-restraint and humility" and yet was himself "the most arragant and dogmatic of all men."[31] He was a logician who proved on one page what he ridiculed in the next. As a keen student of metaphysics, he did not possess that seriousness and accuracy which was the hallmark of a sound philosophical education. As an author he could write the 'most lame and tawdry English' and also "as noble passages of clear and forceful eloquence as any in English literature."[32] As a philanthropist he was sometime aroused by 'the widest sympathies' and sometimes was hampered by 'the most arbitrary and wayward bigotries'. Again at times Ruskin showed a miserable lack of judgement and discretion while at other time he enforced "wise and sagacious counsels with the rarest power of argument and illustration."[33] It was difficult to describe such an enigmatic personality. Skelton felt that the problem with the author was that he took a part of the truth and held it for the whole. He was able to see "certain facts with admirable clearness and neglects the rest which do not appeal so immediately to his peculiar organization, but which nevertheless require to be accurately estimated in the construction of any impartial and philosophical system."[34] One extenuating factor for Ruskin was that he was a practical reformer and like all such zealous people he felt bitterly and passionately but did not argue accurately. Perhaps if he had not felt so strongly he would have reasoned more unerringly but then he would not have acted with the sincerity and enthusiasm required for bringing about practical reform. Ruskin had got hold of the truth which was necessary for the furtherance of his object, just as Luther got hold of what was

necessary for his. They may not be perfect in their separate ways but this suited the effective fulfilment of their life work.

Some other reviewers also explained, from their point of view, the background of Ruskin's so-called inconsistency. To the *Spectator* what hindered the author in his acceptance by a large mass of his readers, was not his 'crotchettiness' or intolerance but 'conspicuous and judicial impartiality'.

As Skelton of *Fraser's Magazine* also said above, Ruskin's loves and hates were strong because they were true and spontaneous. He often spoke "in the most tranchant terms of some men and work, according to the immediate purpose which he has in view, but what there is to be said per contra may also be looked for confidently in its proper place."[35] Angelieo and Tintoret, Turner and Gainsborough, Raphael and Mulready, the Parthenon and the Lombardic Churches, Wordsworth and Engene Sue could receive his admiration and condemnation according to the point of view from which he was looking at them. Careless readers took this as Ruskin's inconsistency. We all know that he worships Turner and condemns Claude but there are certain aspects of painting in which he has declared Claude superior to Turner. This could not be inconsistency. It would be inconsistency only if the painter was praised at one place for what he was condemned at another. Ruskin was unprejudiced and impartial and one could safely say for him what Emerson said of Plato that he was a man who could see both sides of a question. The reviewer thought that the author could be called 'crotchety' only in the sense of 'acuteness'. He possessed the intellectual penetration to look far deeper into the nature of things and could read meanings in the smallest details of fine works, either of art or literature. This gave the readers the notion that the meanings existed only in 'Ruskin's subtility and not in the work itself.' For example he did not have serious data to base his judgement on the Greek and medieval feeling for landscape. But he acted on the conviction that anything emanating from a great man must have been done with the greatest seriousness and must bear the imprint of his personality. As

Ruskin himself said, much of what he stated was 'reasoned opinion only and not demonstrable argaument' and it should be taken as such.

George Butler, writing in the *Saturday Review*, believed that Ruskin had involved himself 'in sundry self-contradictions'. This was the only ground on which he could agree with "the small fry of critics who ineffectually conspire to write down the most earnest and single-minded writer on art that has appeared within our memory."[36] At the same time Butler felt that one could not be entirely consistent without "superhuman judgement, or else a persistency in error which is often joined to very inferior abilities."[37] We all, in our youth, had formed fragmentary and unreal ideas about particular subjects and we should be wise enough to admit that. Similarly minor inconsistencies in Ruskin's writings were inconsequential and should not be taken seriously. They did not "hinder a traveller from getting safely to the end of his journey or from pointing out to others the right road."[38]

Perhaps Sir John Skelton, in the second review of the volume published in *Fraser's Magazine* in June 1857 under the heading "What are the functions of the Artist?" provided the final word to the charge of Ruskin's inconsistency. He felt that it was quite the time 'this red-tape cant' were abandoned. No man who did not choose to 'stand stock-still' could remain consistent. As long as there was life, there will be progress. A consistent man could have no belief in change or advancement; he should die or be buried atonce. Skelton was happy that the author had been held guilty of this grave offence and believed that, in discussing the mysteries of art, if the latter had not been inconsistent again and again, "he would long ago have settled down into consistent and ossified error."[39] One of the most interesting feature of *Modern Painters* for Skelton was "the evidence each successive volume supplies of the author's intellectual growth."[40] Ruskin had 'positive inconsistencies' but they had been much exaggerated by narrow-minded critics. Skelton felt confident to say that the volumes of *Modern Painters* contained 'a sound and intellegible theory of Art'.

Among the hostile reviewers, the *Art Journal* made a summary dismissal of the author. The reviewer felt that Ruskin had learnt nothing during the ten years since he wrote his last volume. Although he had had stopped trifling with sell-known names and reputations, it appeared that the gruelling of the years had not disciplined or chastened him. His upholding of Turner had added nothing to the reputation of the painter, neither his depreciation of the Old Masters had detracted anything from them. If Ruskin had known something of art, he could have been dangerous but, as it was, he was only ridiculous. The reviewer thought that there was little relevant material in his three volumes and it would have been less provocative if, with the help of some more knowledgeable person, he could squeeze down the entire stuff into one volume of three hundred or odd pages. The reviewer divided Ruskin's criticisms into two extremities, violent and unreasonable censure and extravagent and groundless praise. The author remained "continually in the suburbs, but never within the province of Art."[41] The book talked of every thing except painting. There were disquisitions in it on poetry, music, botany, geology, anything under the sun but when the writer felt himself warming into Art, he adverts to the leaf of the flower in his button-hole or we may go and gather limpets on the sea-shore."[42] The reviewer concluded that the work was "an overdone and excessively ill-designed frame with a blank canvass."[43] His parting advice to the author was that if he wished that his little knowledge of Art was treated with respect and consideration he should stop reviling the Old Masters who were absolutely secure in their hallowed domains even if he continued to disparage them for a hundred years.

Lord Coleridge, in an unsympathetic review in the *Guardian*, started by paying glowing tributes to Ruskin's first volume which he regarded his best and which contained more truth "more beauty, more just and noble thinking, more healthy instinct, and far less extravagence and eccentricity, than any of those which have succeeded it."[44] But he felt that Ruskin's later writings had more of 'effected bombast and irregulated judgement'

and it was only very exceptional that one could see "the pure feeling, the refined expression and comparatively modest opinions and sentences which charmed us so much in his earlier compositions."[45] Lord Coleridge admitted that Ruskin was a man of admirable natural instincts but he had no 'great reasoning power.' His vanity had made him overbearing and he spoke with an authoritative air even on subjects with which he was not sufficiently acquainted. His arguments were often meaningless in logic and freakish in manner. Lord Coleridge acknowledged that Ruskin had given eloquent descriptions of the beauties of the earth and the sky and had brought art within the serious study of serious men. But he was now only wasting his energies and aspolling his reputation. Lord Coleridge looked at the volume 'with a feeling of regretful indignation' because he had sadly found that with 'clever thoughts and striking truths' were "mingled up a quantity of inaccurate and fallacious assertions, weak reasoning, and at the conclusion, something which reads like raving madness."[46]

The critic of the *Athenaeum* also felt that the third volume did not register any improvement upon the previous two volumes. Even ten years of severe training had remained infructuous in the case of the author. He had rather grown "more reckless in assertion, less select in illustration, more audacious in conclusion."[47] His early successes had gone to his head and he was now less sober than ever. His writings could now attract only uneducated fanatics and serious, cultured students would "increasingly regard them as taking rank only among the curiosities of humour,— sometimes quaint high-soaring, brilliant, — but false as regards principles."[48] Ruskin, as a half-thinker was only spreading false knowledge. The reviewer had a feeling that a silver age for the author's authority was already setting in and this was evidenced by the tone of his preface which showed a 'mixture of arrogance and of depreciation.'

Lady Eastlake, writing in the *Quarterly Review*, first probed into the reasons which had made Ruskin's works so popular. She admitted that he was a 'positive and confident thinker' on a subject which had

attracted the attention of a large section of the English reading public. Young and unsophisticated readers were apt to follow the direction of any one who could introduce a thought and lay down principles on a subject which they themselves felt deeply but lacked the power to reason about. Moreover new and strange beliefs in any subject were always a fashion and this attracted the largest number of popular supporters. Ruskin's 'apocryphal' views had remained generally unanswered because the lover of art, like all true lovers, was 'a shy and sensitive' person who could admit his passion but would not act or fight for the cause. Again it was believed that to combat Ruskin effectively, something of the Ruskin was also needed. Lady Eastlake, however, felt otherwise. She wanted to fight the author not with the weapons which he had chosen 'from the mental armoury', but with the ones that he had left. Armed with these, even the most ordinary enemy could hold his own against him.

Lady Eastlake imagined that Ruskin displayed in his writings what was generally regarded as a serious defect of the age – brilliant intellectual talents but no great moral qualities. He had a powerful mind but not one single great moral quality in its application; rather he appeared "so far more destitute than others, like himself, more intellectually than morally gifted men, of these higher aims as not even to recognize the necessity for feigning them."[49] Lady Eastlake found in Ruskin's writings "all the qualities of premature old age—its coldness callousness, and contraction"[50] and, contrary to the opinion expressed by the critic of *Frasers' Magazine*, she felt that there was 'no development apparent' in all that the author had written. Even in his first volume, which was ably written, it was not his youth which had made him so presumptuous and his whimsical contradictions were not the result of or "conflict between the arrogance and timidity of a juvenile reasoner — between the high spirit and tender mouth of the young courser in the race of thought,"[51] they rather stemmed from 'a cold and hardened habit' which could not be affected by temporary enthusiasm or natural generosity. He was guilty of an unfeeling heart rather than hasty judgement when he assailed the sacred names in the

past and challenged the sensitive ones in the present. Lady Eastlake went on to make the extravagant charge that, in his later works, Ruskin had displayed "a blind rhodomontade of reasoning and a reckless virulence of language almost unparalleled in the annals of literature."[52]

H. F. Chorley, writing in the *Edinburgh Review*, also started with a recognition of some of Ruskin's very conspicuous merits. No English writer on art was more naturally gifted than him. With his 'warmth of admiration' he could arouse interest in any subject on which he dwelt. He possessed an incisive imagination which could "sieze what is subtile in intention and to comprehend what is noble in design."[53] He also wielded a pen which was facile, gifted and eloquent. He was conscious of the precise relationship between art and society. He had laboured very hard, travelled far and wide in pursuit of his chosen subject, had seen all the well-known art-repositories of Europe and had made a large personal collection. He had also very sharp perceptions and was not devoid of taste. But the reviewer pointed out that all these rare attrtibutes seemed to have fallen flat on the author and seldom would vanity "so overweening in stature, so unblushing in front, so magisterial in language (have) risen up between a writer and his public."[54] He considered the volume as "the worst book of a bad series of books, mischivious to art, mischivious to literature, but mischivious above all to those young and eager minds, animated by the love of art and of literature, which may mistake this declamatory trash for substantial or stimulating food."[55] Chorley felt sorry that his positive qualities were "perverted and destroyed by the entire absence of masculine judgement, by the failure of the logical faculty, and by a strange propensity to mistake the illusions of his fancy or his own vanity for the laws of reality and the principles of truth."[56]

Blackwood's Magazine, perhaps, gave a more reasonable assessment of Ruskin's work. J.B. Atkinson, the reviewer, felt that the present volume confirmed the author's 'well-earned reputation as a critic, a dogmatist, and an honest sophist'', and as such was "well-calculated to instruct the

wise, alarm the timid and mislead the weak."[57] Explaining this epigrammatical remark Atkinson pointed out that the work instructed by "carrying the mind upwards and onwards towards the contemplation of the highest truth that can concern art or humanity."[58] It astonished by "the dogmatism of its assertions, the fearlessness of its denunciations, the paradox of its truths, the originality of its errors."[59] It misled by "an eloquence, spacious, impetuous, and ornate; by an elaboration of florid word-painting, rendering all thoughts, whether right or wrong, all topics, lofty or mean, alike decorative and seductive."[60] It again misled by "an earnest truth-seeking, uniformly sustained amidst fallacies however self-destructive, and, finally, by the present at all times, even when encompassed by error, of earnest conviction and undoubted honesty of purpose."[61]

Atkinson could spot out in the volume many beauties and extravagancies. As an example of the former he quoted the passage from the chapter of the True ideal : thirdly 'Grotesque' in which the author expressed the opinion that if a really great painter faithfully followed such masters of the spiritual world as Dante and Spenser, there would be 'no limit to the splendour of thought which painting might express' and which the reviewer considered a vision for a picture good to serve as a set-off to 'Achilles cutting a pork Chop' and 'St. Peter swimming Ashore'. There were, however, more examples of the author's extravagance. As an instance of hollow rhetoric was "the sublime rhapsody of five continuous pages devoted to the glory of 'grass'."[62] One could also cite, in the same connection, his pontifical denunciations of the modern age, its science and its literature. After his war against certain British artists, he had now carried it "into the camp of living authors, making an unwarrantable onslaught upon the phalanx of greeat minds who lead the van of our present civilization."[63]

Atkinson, in his long and able disquisition on the volume, tried to render justice both to Ruskin and to the reading public. He acknowledged the study originality of the author's genius and the precious knowledge

he had acquired of his subject but he also warned the public against his 'dogmatic paradoxes and his tempting fallacies'. People looked at Ruskin as a teacher in varying degrees of appreciation. For many he was like a fixed star in the heavens, rather the central pole-star in the firmament. Some finding it difficult to turn round his axis, being not sure of his own wayward motions, only compared him to a comet. Still others, unable to comprehend his strange and freakish movements, placed him among meteors and falling stars. Again there were some who were more despaired of his arbitrary and unpredictable actions and considered him no "better than a will-o'-the wisp phantom, alluring the ignorant, and misleading the benighted traveller"[64] for his part, the reviewer believed that the author fulfilled all these various functions. He was the sun to brighten up earth and sky and also, sometimes, not in his real elements, and serving inglorious causes, he became "for a season but the candle in a dark lantern."[65] Atkinson only wished that the author knew when to put it prudently under a bushel.

But more interesting and wholesome criticism came from the *National Review*, which in a long article on Ruskin's works and two other recently published books on art, pointed out the erroneous and malicious approach of these hostile reviewers, especially the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*. The writer emphasized that Ruskin's teaching was 'preeminently the teaching of scholars' and his art-criticism so far as it concerned the particular schools, masters and pictures, was not an important part of it. Ruskin's greatest power lay in his role of a guide to nature. He had, for fourteen years, tried to unravel its mysterious face and provide meaning and law to its protean reality and this he had done "with a zeal that has been vouchsafed to few, a knowledge rarely equalled, an eloquence seldom surpassed and an industry that has never faltered."[66] Ruskin had handed over the student to the inward vastness of the outside world and enjoined him to "read reverently therein, and copy faithfully and submissively from the living emblazonments of its fair and various pages."[67]

But the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*, in their unusually piquant criticism which one had hoped, had disappeared from serious periodical literature had missed this important aspect Ruskin's work. They had chosen to hit Ruskin's weak points 'as an unsound theoriser about art and an untrust-worthy critic of pictures' and had made no attempts to evaluate him as a guide to nature. It is true that Ruskin exposes himself to easy attacks for his extravagant praise of some painters and savage abuse of others. But this is because, solely concentrating on his immediate subject he disregards any effort to reconcile his various assertions which read separately, seem to contradict each other. The *Edinburgh Review* had tried to bring together such apparent contradictions with a strong garnish of abuse'. The *Quarterly* article, although written by a more knowledgeable hand, had tried to judge Ruskin as a theorist about art and there was no reference to his achievement as a teacher of the glories of nature. The reviewer's plea is that if any one likes to do justice to Ruskin, he must judge him, "not as a propounder of a theory of art, but as an advocate of particular discipline for the artist."[68] One would find that even when his imperfect theorising, unmannerly judgement and unreliable picture-criticism had been exposed and condemned, one could still discern in him "the man whose books have awakened more thought, stimulated more study, and inspired more earnestness in landscape artists and lovers of landscape art than those of any man who has ever written in the English language."[69] These reviewers had entered the field not to judge but to abuse and their articles appeared to be "the latest workings of that old leaven of conventionalism which, in the early days of the same periodicals, gave sourness to Gifford's savage condemnation of Keats, and fermented in Jeffrey's contemptuous criticism of Wordsworth.[70] The reviewer protested, in the name of his profession, against the spirit which had inspired such criticism. It unveiled in these writers the same offensive faults with which they had stigmatized the author-malignity, unfairness, irreverence, and impertinence.

Looking at the broad spectrum of the criticism of the third volume,

one is not struck by any significant change in the reviewers' estimate of Ruskin's work since the publication of the second volume in 1846. There were again diverging opinions of the value of his art literature. He was both eulogized and condemned. The appreciation ranged from the highly impassioned and sentimental review from Burne-Jones and William Morris in the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*, to the equally highly trenchant and unforgiving comments made on the volume by Lady Eastlake in the *Quarterly Review*. The meeting ground, on the two sides, was perhaps reached by *Erasers' Magazine* and *Blackwood's Magazine*, both of which themselves, made a learned contribution to the subject and, in their discussion, lost sight of neither the beauties nor the faults of the author. It was clear that the present volume was the most perspicuous of the three published so far and contained Ruskin's latest and well-considered views on all the awkward questions which had raised their head since he emerged as a champion of Turner thirteen years ago. He had learnt much during this period and, although it had brought no intrinsic change in his fundamental thesis of the moral basis of art, his wide European travels and thorough search of the kindred field of architecture had engendered serious doubts in his mind whether art could help man in the higher contemplation of beauty before his other and more immediately related problems were resolved effectively.

One can however, form some idea, from these views, of the extent of Ruskin's popularity at the time of the publication of this volume. As we have seen the volume was widely noticed. There were twenty-two reviews of it in England alone, almost all of which appeared in the course of the year. While some of the minor journals which had reviewed the first and second volumes did not offer any comment on the third one, thirteen new periodical entered the gallery of *Modern Painters* critics for the first time. These included such serious and respected magazines as the *Leader*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Critic*, the *Economist* and the *Idler* on the favourable side and the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*, against him, the latter two of which made use of the opportunity to rebut

the dangerous views of the author before they got a stronger hold of the people's imagination. R. H. Wilenski, in his book on Ruskin, has tried to prove that, contrary to popular belief, Ruskin was not accepted as an Art-Dictator of England in the 1850s and that the established artists and architects showed scant regard for him. Prof. J. D. Jump, in his very illuminating eassay,[71] has successfully contradicted this view by taking the evidence of the three principal weeklies of the time, the *Spectator*, the *Athenaeum* and the *Saturday Review*. We can produce a few more representative comments to show that Ruskin wielded considerable influence on the minds of the artists and literary men. The *Eclectic Review* admitted that "the impress of (the author's) mind had been indelibly stamped upon the Art-literature of the day, and he has already, in part, effected a revolution in the popular taste . . . ."[72]

Fraser's shuddered to remember "what sort of notions we held on art ere we read *Modern Painters*."[73] Even the new adverse reviewers felt impelled to enter the battle because they were scared of the popularity of the author and the wide circulation of his 'vicious' views about art. The *Quarterly Review* started the long essay "with many reasons for the popularity of Mr. Ruskin's works."[74] The *Edinburgh Review* tried 'to inquire what right he had' to use impertinent language against artists of proven fame and standing and listed the various qualifications which had emboldened him to speak with such masterly authority on matters of taste. It was true that all of his prolific views on art could not be admitted without misgivings but no one could seriously deny that he had expressed himself with sincerity, courage and truthfulness and in a language forceful, ebullient and eloquent. He was, indisputably, a writer to be reckoned with.

FOOT NOTES

1. *Critic*, XV, February 15, 1856, p. 88.
2. *Idler*, May, 1856, pp. 230-31.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
5. *Saturday Review*, February 23, 1856, p. 321.
6. *Economist*, March 1, 1856, p. 226.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 227
8. *British Quarterly Review*, XXIII, April 1, 1856, p. 442.
9. *Eclectic Review*, XI, June, 1856. p. 545.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Westminster Review*, LXV, April 1, 1856, p. 626.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*, p. 627.
15. *Spectator*, (Supplement), February 2, 1856, p. 145.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Eraser's Magazine*, June, 1857, p. 619.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Oxford and Cambridge Maganzine*, April, 1856, p. 216.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Idler*, May, 1856, p. 231.
27. *Eclectic Review*, June, 1856, p. 546.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Critic*, February 15, 1856, p. 90.
30. *Fraser's Magazine*, June, 1856, p. 648.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Spectator*, February 2, 1856, p. 145.
36. *Saturday Review*, February 23, 1856, p. 321.
37. *Ibid.*

38. *Ibid.*
39. *Fraser's Magazine*, June, 1857, p. 619.
40. *Ibid.* pp. 619-20.
41. *Art Journal*, April, 1856, p. 113.
42. *Ibid*.
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Guardian*, March 5, 1856, p. 183.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Athenaeum*, January 26, 1856, p. 97.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Quarterly Review*, March, 1856, p 386.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, p. 387.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Edinburg Review*, April 1856, p. 537.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*, p. 557.
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Blackwood's Magazine*, November, 1856, p.503.
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Ibid.*
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, p. 526.
63. *Ibid.*
64 *Ibid.*, p. 527.
65. *Ibid.*
66. *National Review*, July, 1856, p. 83.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
69. *Ibid.*
70. *Ibid.*
71. J.D. Jump, "Ruskin's Reputation in the 1859s : the evidence of the three principal Weeklies," *PMLA*, June 1948, pp. 678-685.
72. *Eclectic Review*, June, 1856, p. 545.
73. *Fraser's Magazine*, June, 1857, p. 619.
74. *Quarterly Review*, March, 1856, p. 384.

EVIL AND MACHIAVELLIANISM IN MARLOWE'S PLAYS

by

DR. MUNIR AHMAD QAZI

In order to understand or evaluate any aspect of Marlowe's plays, it is necessary to know something of Marlowe himself, and of the time in which he lived. We must be familiar with ideas, then current, of science, psychology, history, morals, religion, theological controversy, astrology and literature for Marlowe is, above all others, the most typical artistic product of the Elizabethan era, the most glorious period of the English Renaissance.

Sixteenth century London, centre of many Elizabethan theatres, was the city of contradictions. On the one hand, it was a busy commercial centre of home and foreign trade, its citizens enjoying all sorts of imported fasions from Italy and France ; on the other hand, it was a sight of duels and street brawls, cony-catching and swindling. Offenders were punished by hanging or disembowelling while beheading was reserved for noblemen. Later, their skulls were fixed to stakes and then displayed to the public. Dr. Edward Thompson, in his recent monograph on Sir Walter Raleigh, remarks:

> The Elizabethan world of fact was one that the imagination dare not confront. The mob, like the mob evereywhere else, was fed with cruelty like any Roman one, with traitors flung alive on the quartering block and occasional Socinians or Anabaptists burnt (to show Philip of Spain that the English monarch was still a Defender of the Faith) in great horror, crying and roaring ! London streets abounded in beggary, in suffering, in swashbuckling. And not in England only, in every land—

warfare, plottings, executions, poisonings abounded, to an extent that renders moral judgments an absurdity.

Similarly, the Elizabethan theatre reflected the age and its vitality. It served as a meeting place even at the risk of losing one's money or even his life. The playgoers or groundlings demanded plays with ingenious devices from Italian novels. They preferred jigging and clownage, violence and intrigue, the fall of princes and the burning of witches and religious heretics.

The Elizabethans and especially the groundlings (those who paid their penny for standing room) attended the theatre because they truly enjoyed it. They were stimulated by the language and the intricate plots. Also, they were willing to welcome new themes of classical inspiration such as the Senecan machinery used by Kyd in his *The Spanish Tragedy* where there are two suicides, five murders, two judicial executions. Its main character bites out his tongue, stabs his enemy and then pierces his own heart.

As a result of their enthusiasm, literary influences combined with the spirit of the age to produce the tragedies. The play-wrights borrowed freely from popular sources such as folk traditions, street ballads, Moralities and Mysteries.

Marlowe, more than any other English writer of any age, symbolizes the youth of his time ; its hot-bloodedness, its brutal and unscrupulous gasping after the good things of life, its lust after knowledge and power. In this, he responded to the new-born imperialism of his countrymen, to their belief that there was no greatness to which England might not attain. Marlowe was a man of Renaissance as Nicoll has stated :

> His main conception of serious drama—Renaissance virtue battling on to success and the falling unconquered before fate—is at the root of all the great seventeenth century tragic activity; only Shakespeare made his figures more human and stressed more the fatal flaw in the greatness of their characters.[1]

Since the audience or playgoers demanded certain conventions (i.e., current, Medieval, Renaissance) in the structure of an Elizabethan play, I think, the job of a dramatist was to include the desired ingredients in the play in order to be a successful or popular dramatist. Thus, Marlowe was an Elizabethan with the advantages and limitations of his time, and accusing Marlowe of being Machiavelli's disciple, as Green in the "Groatsworth of Wit" blamed him, was at least, in part, inspired by envy and spite.

It is true that, in some respects, Marlowe was intoxicated with Machiavellianism, since its influence is apparent in *The Jew of Malta*, where Machiavelli himself is brought on the stage to speak the Prologue :

> Machiavel. Albeit the world thinks Machiavel is dead.
> Yet was his soul but flown beyond the Alps,
> And now the Guise is dead, is come from France,
> To view this land, and frolic with his friends.
> To some perhaps my name is odious,
> But such as love me guard me from their tongues ;
> And let them know that I am Machiavel,
> And weigh not men, and therefore not men's words.[2]

Here, the hero, Barabas, is specifically stated to be a reincarnation of the Italian Statesman, Machiavelli, who regarded virtue as a mixture of cunningness and intrigue. According to Harvey, when Marlowe was at Benet College in 1579, Machiavelli was the authority on political philosophy at Cambridge and thus his ideas had a profound impact on Marlowe.

Machiavelli's book *The Prince* was not seriously studied in historical perspective. Its striking maxims, often perverted by being torn from their contexts, were quoted and made to justify all sorts of crimes as 'Realpolitik'. The author of *The Prince* was regarded as the fiend incarnate. The terms used to describe him "would seem", says Macaulay, "to impart that he was the tempter, the evil principle, the discoverer of ambition and revenge, the original inventor of perjury, and that, before

the publication of his fatal 'Prince', there had never been a hypocrite, a tyrant, or a traitor, a simulated virture, or a convenient crime."[3]

But as to the content of Machiavelli's maxims or *The Prince* which is merely a summing up of regular Renaissance ideals of conduct, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, contrary to the above remarks, gives us the following account :

> .... those maxims were purely theoretical abstractions of an art itself not always based on moral scruples, least of all in Machiavelli's time ; but their bold, lapidary style made it easy to detach them from their context and to ignore the purpose that had inspired and the needs that had conditioned them ... he was judged a cold and cynical man, a sneerer at religion and virtues; but, in fact, there is hardly a page of his writings and certainly no action of his life that does not show him to be a passionate, generous, ardent, and basically religious.[4]

Marlowe, a hot-tempered child of Renaissance, keeping the both above-mentioned views in his mind, rebelled against the accepted moral and religious attitude of the time and chose those parts of Machiavelli's maxims which suited his purpose. The perverted maxims of Machiavelli follow thus :

EPIGRAMMA IN EFFIGIEM MACHIAVELLI

Machiavellus ipse loquitur

Machiavelli, speaking in person, says in substance :

> Let no one think to govern who does not know my rules, nor think he has gained wisdom who does not know them well. My talk is only of kingdoms and sceptres, of camps and wars. In my hand I bear a sword and my tongue is sprinkled with a thousand poisons. My motto is and always has been : "Ambition; either Caesar or nothing." Milk is food for babes, I feed on blood. Blood is nothing, torture is nothing; let lowly minds perish. I alone have wisdom, I live, and triumph by myself. Fraud is my greatest virtue; the next is force. I know no other gods.[5]

This must have produced a powerful effect upon the Elizabethans, in general, since they did not study *The Prince* thoroughly and, thus, were unable to understand the message of Machiavelli. Anything 'bad' they heard or saw was attributed to Machiavelli who also inspired Marlowe to produce his Machiavellian heroes, as Meyer says :

> Marlowe had studied Machiavelli with a vengeance : and it may be stated as an absolute certainty, that had the 'Principle' never been written, his three great heroes would not have been drawn with such gigantic strokes.[6]

Thus, these maxims sharpened Marlowe's own ideas and encouraged him to express them under the pretext of Machiavelli by deliberately exaggerating their immorality. In other words, Marlowe uses Machiavelli as a shield while trying to find an outlet for his boundless individualism. Hence Marlowe distorts Machiavelli's doctrines and personality by blending evil and pseudo-Machiavellism with Satanism. By portraying men for whom moral barriers did not exist, Marlowe opened up infinite possibilities to the dramatist. Men struggling passionately after antagonistic aims could now be brought face to face; and the ups and downs, the hopes and fears, the shrinkings and the darings of the struggle and the characters of the combatants, could be placed in swift, dazzling and heart-shaking succession visibly before the eyes of the spectators. The gist of his drama lies in the struggle of a brave human soul against forces which in the end prove too great for it. 'His heroes', as Harry Levin in 'The Overreacher' has remarked, "make their fortunes by exercising virtures which conventional morality might well regard as vices. For the most part, they are self-made men; and, to the extent that they can disregard the cannons of good and evil, they are supermen."

Thus, alongwith the elements of Renaissance, Marlowe included the questioning of orthodox creeds as F. S. Boas has observed :

> The central problem of Marlowe's work and career lies in his exceptional union of two almost conflicting Renaissance elements. There was in him the soaring aspiration after power and knowledge and beauty in their ideal and absolute forms. Side by side with this there was the critical, analytic impulse which led to the questioning of orthodox creeds and standards of conduct.[7]

Marlowe's three earlier and more typical plays are all dominated by a single 'aspiring mind', in comparison with which the other characters are as naught. His heroes adopt different methods in order to reach their ends. His plays might well be termed a trilogy of Lust's Dominion. 'Tamburlaine' exemplifies the lust for boundless conquest and seeks his success through physical force; 'Faustus' the lust for boundless knowledge through abjuring the Scripture and witchcraft; 'The Jew of Malta' the lust for boundless wealth, and the other characters, including Barabas again, "the Duke of Guise, Mortimer have recourse to ruse and dissimulation, to what was known as 'policy', that is to say to Machiavellism."[8] The theme of each is the operation of the energy and will-power of a single man under the dominion of a superhuman passion. Marlowe's common self-made men are of insatiable will and they must assert themselves to rise to the top at whatever cost to themselves and to society.

Marlowe's play *The Jew of Malta* coloured by the Senecan revenge theme and the teachings of Machiavelli, is derived from the popular tradition of farce. Barabas, the rich Jew of Malta, is a villain who for his selfish ends deliberately violates standards of morality set by the society. At the beginning of the play, we hear in his soliloquy that he hates the Christians :

> Rather had I a Jew be hated thus
> Than pitied in a Christian poverty.
>
> (*I, i*)

Then, before his goods have been confiscated, there is a satiric tone :

> Bar. Half of my substance is a city's wealth.
> Governor, it was not got so easily ;
> Nor will I part so slightly there withal.
>
> Fern. Sir, half is the penalty of our decree,
> Either pay that, or we will seize on all.

and later Barabas says :

> Bar. Will you then steal my goods?
> Is theft the ground of your religion ?

Subsequently this satire is heightened :

> Fern. Excess of wealth is cause of covetousness :
> And covetousness, O, 'tis a monstrous sin.
>
> Bar. Ay, but theft is worse : tush ! take not from me then,
> For that is theft! and if you rob me thus.
> I must be forced to steal and compass more.
>
> (*I, ii*)

After his goods have been confiscated, he decides to retrieve his property and chastise the injustice of Ferneze by taking revenge and declaring war against his prosecutors :

> No, Barabas is born to better chance,
> And framed of finer mould than common men,
> That measure naught but by the present time.
> A reaching thought will search his deepest wits,
> And cast with cunning for the time to come :
> For evils are apt to happen everyday.———
>
> (*I, ii*)

Thus he utters contemptuous words against them as 'slaves' and 'villains' (in the same speech) who consider him 'a senseless lump of clay'.

Barabas, later, recovers his former wealth by inducing his daughter, Abigail, to feign a religious vocation. We hear Barabas' outburst against the 'swine-eating Christians as he is still planning to avenge the harm done to him by the Governor :

I am not of the tribe of Levi, I,
That can so soon forget an injury.
We jews can fawn like spanields when we please :
And when we grin we bite, yet are our looks,
As innocent and harmless as a lamb's.
I learned in Florence how to kiss my hand,
Heave up my shoulders when they call me dog,
And duck as low as any barefoot friar ;
Hoping to see them starve upon a stall,
Or else be gathered for in our synagogue,
That, when the offering-basin comes to me,
Even for charity I may spit into't.

(*II, iii*)

With the entry of Ithamore, a Turkish slave bought by Barabas in the Maltese slave-market, the figure of the jew further degenerates. He has his Turkish villain disciple with him whom he gives the following evil Machiavellian instructions :

First be thou void of these affections,
Compassion, love, vain hope, and heartless fear,
Be mov'd at nothing, see thou pity none,
But to thyself smile when the Christians moan.

(*II, iii*)

And when Ithamore appreciates his advice by saying : "O brave ! master, I worship your nose for this.", he further tells :

As for myself, I walk abroad o'nights
And kill sick people groaning under walls ;
Sometimes I go about and poison wells ;

And now and then, to cherish Christian thieves,
I am content to lose some of my crowns,
That I may, walking in my gallery,
See 'em go pinioned along by my door.

(*II, iii*)

Then Ithamore mentions his experiences :

Faith, master,
In setting Christians villages on fire,
Chaining of eunuchs, binding galley-slaves.

(*II, iii*)

and they both rejoice :

....we are villains both :
Both circumcised, we hate Christians both.

(*II, iii*)

Here we begin to feel that Barabas' retaliation has more than revenge in it. The revenger becomes a villain. He uses his daughter as a decoy, forges the document which lead Ferneze's son Lodowick and the other suiter to fight a duel and kill each other. From this point onwards Barabas becomes like Kyd's Lorenzo, the ivillain and the author of the crime which drives Hieronimo to revenge, is a true Machiavellian. Lorenzo, is an egotist :

I had no father, I am like no father,
I have no brothers, I am like no brothers,
And this word 'Love' which graybeards term divine,
Be resident-in/men like one another,
But not in me : I am myself alone.

(*I, i*)

and so is Barabas : "Ego mihimet sum semper proximus
(For so I live perish may all the world !)"

Like Lorenzo, Barabas is guileful, cruel, faithless, remorseless and murderous. His victims of the past have not all been Christians. He has been wicked on invalids, orphans and helpless persons too. His ill-will applies equally to Christians, Turks and even his fellow jews :

> These silly men mistake the matter clean.
> To him deceiving the Christians is justified :
> It's no sin to deceive a Christian.
> And dissembling is another characteristic of him :
>
> She has confess's, and we are both undone,
> My bosom inmate ! But I must dissemble."

And

> As good dissemble that thou never means't
> As first mean truth, and then dissemble it.

He acts under the control of devil :

> Why, the devil invented a challenge,
> My master writ it, and I carried it.
>
> (*III*, 162)

Finally, he dies cursing his enemies as do the majority of Machiavellian villains :

> Damn'd Christian dogs, and Turkish infidels !
> But now begins the extremity of heat
> To pinch me with intolerable pangs :
> Die, life! fly, soul ! tongue, curse they fill, and die !
>
> (*V. vi*)

Marlowe has used the word 'policy' thirteen times[9] in the play, which shows that not only Barabas but also other characters in the play are governed by slyness and villainy. As a matter of fact, the whole structure of the play is influenced by Machiavelli as is shown by R.W. Van Fossen:

> In his dealings with the lovers, with the Friars, with Ithamore, with the Turks, with Ferneze, with Bellamira and Pilia-Borza, even with Abigail, Barabas is governed by politic considerations. But the focusing of interest on Barabas must not be allowed to obscure the fact that almost everyone else in the play operates on much the same basis : the Turks have intentionally allowed the tribute to pile up in arrears; Ferneze perpetrates the perfectly fraudulent tax arrangement on the three Jews and, even more unfairly, on Barabas; the Maltese decide to defy the Turks but make no pretense of returning the Jews' money to them; del Bosco is at least partially motivated by his wish to sell slaves; one Friar attempts to outdo the other in cleverness as well as in greed; Bellamira and Pilia-Borza play Ithamore for the fool; Ferneze arranges the grand climax, deceiving the Turks and Barabas together. Except for Ithamore—and Marlowe must surely have been smiling to himself—the Turks show up much better, on the whole, than either the Jews or the Christians.[10]

Barabas quotes Machiavellian maxims by the score; he admires treachery and hypocrisy, never forgets a wrong, uses poison and causes twelve fatalities. He starts his tragic career out of hatred and revenge, pursues his plot by guile but oversteps all bounds of justice and even Machiavelli and reason in the cruelty of his deeds, and is finally taken in his own toils and destroyed.[11] The play in its extravagance and sensational intrigue surpasses *The Spanish Tragedy* of Kyd and *Titus Andronicus* of Shakespeare.

Marlowe, in *The Jew of Malta*, uses Machiavelli's doctrines with the poetic splendour of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Here the jew Barabas reacts bitterly against hypocrisy and is, at least, honest as contrasted with the dishonesty of the Christians who adopt the disguised way of worshipping Mammon but calling him God. Thus, Marlowe, in *The Jew of Malta*, is not a defender of Jews but he is an attacker of Christians. He sympathises with Barabas only to prove his point.

Marlowe makes a more direct use of his Machiavellian doctrines of prowess in *Tamburlaine* than in *The Jew of Malta* or *The Massacre at Paris* where he is concerned with the realm of policy. In *The Jew of Malta*.[12] Marlowe belongs to the camp of Huguenot Gentillet (Machiavelli's French opponent) and draws on both Machiavelli and on Gentillet, using the typical Huguenot irony, whereas in *Tamburlaine* since the dramatist wanted to glorify an Eastern Emperor, Machiavelli's *The Prince* offered him the perfect guidebook. According to Maxims of Machiavelli, a prince should adopt two ways to achieve power :

> A prince ought to follow the nature of the lyon and of the Foxe, yet not of the one without the other.
>
> (*The Prince, III.*)

Thus the prince should possess both the courage of the lion and the cunning of the fox. Early in the play, Tamburlaine the Great, Mycetes, the King of Persia, compares Tamburlaine to a fox while speaking to Meander :

> Meander, thou, my faithful counsellor,
> Declare the cause of my conceived grief,
> Which is, God knows, about that Tamburlaine,
> That, like a fox in midst of harvest time,
> Doth prey upon my flocks of passengers ;
>
> (*I, i*)

And later in the same scene he is likened to a lion by Techelles :

> As princely lions, when they rouse themselves,
> Stretching their paws, and threatening herds of beasts,
> So in his armour looketh Tamburlaine.

Tamburlaine's policies further parallel Machiavelli's advice mentioned in *The Prince* (Chapter 19) in order to avoid hatred. According to Machiavelli a prince must avoid those things which will make him hated and despised such as depriving his citizens of their property and insulting

their women. He should strive to make his actions display his magnanimity, seriousness, and fortitude, for a prince of such reputation will not be easily attacked. A prince should not antagonize the nobility; but he should, at the same time, satisfy the masses. He should continually contrive great matters, so as never to give his followers leisure to rest and thus plot against him. We notice that Tamburlaine adopts the same policy. He mentions the heroic deeds before facing Theridamas :

> Keep all you standings, and stir not a foote,
> My selfe will bide the danger of the brunt.
>
> (346 – 47)

He keeps on motivating his men by mentioning new projects. We further read in Machiavelli that a prince should entertain the people with feasts. We see that Tamburlaine, along with his men, celebrates during the siege of Damascus. Machiavelli stresses that a prince must have 'virtue' (from the Latin 'virtus') meaning courage, efficacy, talent, strength, ability, and above all intelligence. Thus, a politician must adapt himself to the various circumstances and the various individuals he encounters. He must sometimes caress, sometimes hurt; sometimes forgive, sometimes punish; sometimes benefit, sometimes suppress. Fortune is the arbiter of one half of human actions, the other half is directed by the will of men. Fortune and Virtue alternate in Machiavelli's theory. Virtue should organize defense against fortune because fortune asserts her power when no dike restrains her. Marlowe follows these doctrines as after the battle with Bajazet in Part II, he liberally shares the spoil with his men. Tamburlaine is grotesquely cruel :

> I long to see thee back return from thence,
> That I may view these milk-white steeds of mine
> All loaden with the heads of killed men,
> And from their knees even to their hoofs below
> Besmear'd with blood that makes a dainty show.
>
> (*I, i*)

But at the same time, he is notably humane toward Zenocrate. He makes a magnanimous speech before slaughtering the virgins of Damascus. He jests with his enemies . . . Mycetes :

Tamb : (to Mycetes about the crown)
You will not sell it, will you?

And

Tamb : Here; take it for a while : I lend it thee,

. . . . the Truk in the cage and the chariot-drawing kings :

Here Tamburlaine follows Machiavelli's concept of 'virtue' and 'fortune' by declaring :

Virtue solely is the sum of glorie
And fashions men with true nobility.

(1970-71)

And he boasts :

I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains,
And with my hand turn fortune's wheel about.

(370)

In the beginning of the play, 'Fortune', says R.W. Battenhouse, "gives Cosroe the occasion to rise to power. Menaphon says to him :

Fortune gives you opportunity
To gaine the tytle of a Conquerour
By curing of this maimed Empire.

(132-34)

Cosroe seizes his fortune; but then his rise soon comes to ruin because he lacks the might and courage of Machiavellian Virtue. Tamburlaine, aided by Fortune, has also Virtue."[13]

As for the Machiavellian qualities of being courageous and fearless. Tamburlaine instructs his sons to bear "A mind couragious and invincible". He kills his own son.

Since Machiavelli believed that any means of strengthening the state were acceptable, including violence, murder, deception and treachery as can be found in his famous maxim :

> A prince ought not to feare to be perjured, to deceive, and dissemble; for the deceiver alwaies finds some that are fit to be deceived.

The same maxim is equally practised by most of Marlowe's characters. Thus, in Marlowe's plays not only the heroes but also their opponents violate the principles or standards of morality. "In the Second Part", says Harry Levin, "he (Tamburlaine) is opposed by the Christians, who league against him with the Turkish armies. With some misgiving the King of Hungary is convinced by his generals that 'necessary pollycy' (2832) dispenses those who profess the true religion from honoring the oaths they have sworn to infidels."[14] The Christians in *The Jew of Malta* are also consistently satirized in the last part of the play for their 'close hypocrisy". Ferneze, breaks his word with Selim as has Sigismund done with Orcaves to cover his treachery and such are the deeds of Barabas who proudly boasts :

This is the life we Jews are used to lead;
And reason too, for Christians do the like.

(*V, iii.* 115-16)

The Faust legend goes back to the myths of the ancient world ; and the conception which lies at the root of it—man's abuse of supernatural powers acquired by him——are found in the story of Prometheus and in the Book of Job. With the coming of Christianity we begin definitely to hear of men abjuring Christ and selling their souls to the devil for a limited period of supernatural power and thus were regarded as the conscious agents of the Evil One. Doctor Faustus, an actual personage, was one of them.

Dr. Faustus aspires to unlawful knowledge because it is an instrument of power. He is the embodiment of a single superhuman passion (i.e., love of knowledge) which leads him into such desperate and unholy courses that it may well be called lust. Under its dominion Faustus relinquishes the honourable studies of philosophy, medicine, law and divinity, dismissing them as childish toys.

He is :

> Yearning in desire
> To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
> Beyond the utmost bound of human thought.

And this longing leads him to seek refuge in the 'black art' or necromancy in order to have the knowledge of a god ; and to acheive this knowledge he sells his soul to the devil. He blasphemes the Trinity, while making his first attempt to conjure, and since blasphemy is a deadly sin, the Evil Powers hasten to try their powers upon the souls of blasphemers:

> That was the cause, but yet per accident ;
> For, when we hear one rack the name of God,
> Abjure the scripture and his saviour Christ,
> We fly in hope to get his glorious soul.

Thus, we see that evil is hovering over Faustus from the very beginning of the play, he abjures the scripture and says farewell to Divinity :

> "Divinitie adieu"
>
> and "Divinity is basest of the three" (*I, i.*)
> "Metaphisickes of Magicians"

He replaces the Scripture with 'Negromantike books' (*I*, 76-78), and intends to be a god : "A sound magician is a demi-god". (*I.* 90).

After signing the pact, Faustus becomes a semi-devil and therefore human standards are no longer expected. His evil bargain leads him

towards riches and lust. Tamburlaine, since he was uneducated, was satisfied with the earthly crown whereas Faustus, a learned man, aspires more :

> All things that move between the quiet poles
> Shall be at my command : . . . . . .
> (*I. i*)

He forgot that the power he was acquiring so presumptuously fell far short of the 'Omnipotence' of which he had dreamed. Upon Faustus' insistence to know about the nature of hell, Mephistophilis reveals that it is not a place, but a condition or state of being. Any place where God is not, is hell :

> Why this is hell, nor am I out of it :
> Think'st thou that I, that saw the face of God,
> And tasted the eternal joys of Heaven,
> Am not tormented with ten thousand hells,
> In being depriv'd of everlasting bliss ?
> (*I. iv*)

In (*vi*) when he questions him about astronomy, Mephostophilis tells him nothing about it. And when in the same scene he asks "Who made the world?" Mephostophilis is reluctant to acknowledge the Creator. There were several warnings as to the congealing of his blood "Homofuge", "display of the Seven Deadly Sins", "the fall of Lucifer" :

> Meph : Unhappy spirits that fell with Lucifer,
> Conspir'd against our God with Lucifer,
> And are for ever damn'd with Lucifer.
> (*I. iv*)

Faustus asks for a wife and he gets a whore. But he being an 'evil spirit' neglects these warnings. He is impatient, arrogant, headstrong and blind as Hazlett has commented :

> This character (Faustus) may be considered as a personification of the pride of will and eagerness of curiosity, sublimed beyond

> the reach of fear and remorse. He is devoured by a tormenting desire to enlarge his knowledge to the utmost bounds of nature and art and to extend his power with his knolwedge.

Faustus, a he-devil, lacks faith in God's mercy and is driven towards despair :

> Damn't art thou, Faustus, damn'd ;
> despair and die !
>
> (*XVIII*, 56)

By scene (*xix*) Faustus has entirely lost hope. The old man's intervention and assurance that God's mercy is still available, prevents Faustus from stabbing himself and when he repents, Mephostophilis intervenes and says :

> Revolt, or I'll in piecemeal tear thy flesh.
>
> (*V,i.*)

Here Faustus confirms his vow to Lucifer. As a last favour he is given Helen of Troy for his paramour. He commits the sin of demonalatry which is also an evil action. Then the striking of a clock warns him that he "has but one bare hour to live", and in a paroxysm of terror he implores Christ to save him with but a drop of His blood; he cries on mountains and hills to fall on him and hide him from "the heavy wrath of God."

In vain he beseeches that God will "impose some end to my incessant pain." In vain he prays that his soul may be "dissolved in Elements" ; devils enter, and amid the growling of thunder and the flashing of lightening they carry him off to eternal damnation. Thomas describes Faustus' death in the following manner :

> The students lay near up to the hall, wherein Dr. Faustus lay, and they heard a mighty noise and hissing, as if the hall-door flew open, wherein Dr. Faustus was : then he began to cry for help, saying, 'Murther, Murther'; but it was with half voice and very hollow ; shortly after they had heard him no more. But when it was day, the students that had taken no rest that night, arose and went into the hall in which they left Dr. Faustus, where notwithstanding, they found not Faustus, but all the hall sprinkled with blood, the brain cleaving to the wall, for the devil had beaten him from one wall against another in one corner lay his eyes, in another his teeth—fearful and pitiful sight to be hold ! Then began the students to wail and weep for his body—they found his body lying on the horse-dung, most monstrously torn, and fearful to behold, for his head, and all his joints were dashed to pieces . . .[15]

Whereas Marlowe shows the evil consequences of Faustus' spiritual sin of bartering his soul to the powers of evil, he has in Edward II, suggested that the absolutism of the king is based not upon the Divine Power but upon human power.

Machiavelli condemns the policy pursued by feudal nobility and especially of the papacy. The current myth, during the regin of Henry and Queen Elizabeth, developed that the prince was a semi-divine as G. B. Harrison says :

> He was God's direct and immediate representation on earth. Queen Elizabeth in one of her proclamations declared : 'Forasmuch as it is manifestly seen to all the world how it hath pleased Almighty God of His Most Singular favour to have taken this Our Realm into His Special Protection these many years even from the beginning of our reign .... with special preservation of Our Own Person as next under His Almightiness, Supreme Governor of the Same.[16]

But Marlowe, under the influence of Machiavelli's doctrine, calls the general Elizabethan doctrine to question without the least regard for tradition or prevailing opinion :

"The truth is that the theory of sovereignty underlying Edward II is the same as that of Tamburlaine in which the unquestioned absolutism of the king is based not upon divine appointment but upon human power, and in which the king is not controlled by any responsibility to a God who will destroy him if he neglects his duties to his people, but only the limits of the king's own ability to maintain his power in spite of any opposition."[17] Machiavelli believed that rulers can be very successful if they consider all circumstances and are flexible enough to alter a policy to conform with a particular situation because both noble and common 'rabble' (plebs) are potent political force and may shake the foundations of a state no matter how absolute a ruler may be. Thus, Machiavelli insists that a prince should respect the nobles, and should not make himself hated by the people. He must rule justly. Edward II, does not follow the rules of Machiavelli and thus fails. Michel Poirier has summed up the play's content thus : "It is the story of a feudal monarch who attempts to govern as an absolute monarch and fails."[18]

Until the fourth Act Mortimer is like the other lords but soon after Edward is defeated, we come to know about his evil intentions. He is a Machiavellian villain and takes the queen as his mistress. They are evil persons who intend to do evil things. The Queen is a weak and vicious woman. She is a fine dissembler and keeps her 'fine dissembling' before them all :

> I rue my lord's ill-fortune ; but alas !
> Care of my country called me to this war.
>
> (*IV. v.* 73)
>
> Alas, poor soul, would I could ease his grief !
>
> (*V.ii.* 27)
>
> Wither goes this letter ? to my lord the king ?
> Commend me humbly to his majesty,
> And tell him that I labour all in vain
> To ease his grief, and work his liberty ;
> And bear him this as witness of my love. (Gives a ring)
>
> (*V.ii.* 68-72)

> Shall I not mourn for any beloved lord,
> And with the rest accompany him to his grave ?
>
> (*V. vi.* 87-88)

Thus she keeps up appearances right until the end of the play and proves to be a she-Machiavel as F.P. Wilson remarks :

> Isabel plays she-Machiavel to Mortimer's Machiavel. Cruel as well as unfaithful, she has nothing to learn in the art of turning and dissembling. In public she is full of concern for the state of the country and the king's misfortunes, of thanks to 'the God of kings' and 'heaven's great architect' ; in private there is no villainy of Mortimer's which she does not aid and abet.[19]

Mortimer is the real Machiavellian villain :

> Fear'd am I more than loved.

As one of the maxims attributed to Machiavelli was, that "it is better for a prince to be feared than loved." Another maxim was that "A man is happy so long as Fortune agreeth unto his nature and humour", and it is Mortimer and Mortimer alone who calls upon Fortune. At the height of his power he boasts that he makes Fortune's wheel turn as he pleases, and quotes from Ovid the line "Major sum quam cui possit fortuna nocere."[20]

Furthermore, in the tradition of Machiavellian villainy, he hires Lightborn, a professional wicked murderer, to kill the King in a cruel and shameful way, who declares his past experience thus :

> You shall not need to give instructions ;
> 'Tis not the first time I have killed a man
> I learned in Naples how to poison flowers ;[21]
> To strangle with a lawn thrust down the throat ;
> To pierce the windpipe with a needle's point ;
> Or whilst one is asleep, to take a quill
> And blow a little powder in his ears :

Or open his mouth and pour quicksilver down.
And yet I have a braver way than these.

(*V. vi*)

The evil 'braver way' must have been too strong even for the Elizabethans as Harry Levin describes the scene :

> The horrendous details are decently obscured both in the dialogue and in the business; but legend was painfully explicit in specifying how a red-hot spit had been plunged into Edward's intestines. The sight of the instrument would have been enough to rasie an excruciating shudder in the audience ; and subtler minds may have perceived, as does William Empson, an ironic parody of Edward's voice. It is when he beholds the frown of Lightborn that Edward knows the worst ;
>
> "I see my tragedie written in thy browes."
>
> (2522)

Charles Lamb said that this death scene moved pity and terror beyond any scene ancient and modern with which he was acquainted.

No matter how cruel, evil, vicious and Macheiavellian Marlowe's heroes are, they are all destroyed at the end and thus are taught a lesson that on the one hand evil never prospers and on the other they are mortal and that the real power over life and death lies beyond human reach. Tamburlaine, the great conqueror who had an uncontrolable aspiration for beauty, knowledge and power over life and death, at the time of his death realizes the fatal contradiction of his life saying, "For Tamburlaine, the Scourge of God, must die !"

Faustus' ambition to acquire infinite knowledge and to be omnipotent, at the cost of abjuring God, Christ and the Scriptures (Divinitie, adieu) is also misleading and he, too, at the end realizes that his intellectual pride

and insolence are negative and thus responsible for dragging him away from God and His eternal bliss :

My God, my God, look not so fierce on me !
Adders and serpents, let me breathe a while
Ugly hell, gape not ! come not Lucifer !
I'll burn my books !———Ah, Mephistophilis !

Barabas, in *The Jew of Malta*, a cold-blooded villain hero and the very incarnation of devil, too, is destroyed by his own evil designs when he falls into the boiling cauldron, prepared for the Turkish chiefs. And, thus, is overthrown by those who were more cunning villains than himself.

But in *Edward II*, according to I. Keith, "Marlowe seems to have outgrown his admiration for Machiavelli. Gaveston, Spenser, Baldock all begin their relations with Edward with a touch of 'pollicie', and all end by standing by him to their deaths. Here for once Marlowe admits the power of love to conquer the itch for self-aggrandisement : the affection inspired by the weak and halpless king in every case destroys either Machiavellian or the Machiavellianism.

FOOT NOTES

1. Allardyce Nicoll, *British Drama*, London : George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd.

2. Havelock Ellis, "The Prologue" *Christopher Marlowe*, New York : Hill & Wang, 1956.

3. Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays.*

4. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. II., p. 230.

5. Xaipe vel Gabrielis Harvij Gratulationum Valdensium Libri, London, 1578.

6. Edward Meyer, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama.*

7. Boas F.S., *Christopher Marlowe*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1940

8. Poirier Michel, *Christopher Marlowe*, London, 1951.

9. Babb Howard S., *Policy in Marlowe's 'The Jew of Malta'.*

10. Van Fossen R.W., *The Jew of Malta.*

11. I. Keith, *Early Elizabethan Drama.*

12. As Meyer holds, that Barabas is "drawn from popular prejudice based on Gentillet and not from Marlowe's own study." (Eduard W. Mayer, Machiavellis Geschishtsauffassung und sein begriff Virtu Munich, 1912

13. Battenhouse R.W., *Marlowe's Tamburlaine : A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy*, Nashville, 1941.

14. Levin Harry, *Christopher Marlowe : The Overreacher*, London: Faber & Faber Ltd. 1953.

15. Thomas, *Early English Prose Romance.*

16. Harrison G.B., *Introduction Shakespeare.*

17. Bluestone Max and Norman Rabkin, *Shakespeare's Contemporaries.*

18. Poirier Michel, *Christopher Marlowe*, London, 1951.

19. Wilson F.P., *Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare*, Oxford University Press, 1953.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Lightborn's 'I learned in Naples how to poison flower', is akin to Barabas' use of poisoned flowers (*IV. vi.* 35-43) and to the use of scented gloves in 'The Massacre at Paris' for poisoning the Queen Mother of Navarre.

"STRUCTURE IN THE *MACBETH* FILMS"

by

NASIM RIAZ BUTT

Drama, in exacting its stern demands, leaves no room for any structural laxity. Shakespeare, being aware of it, took special care of structural organization of *Macbeth* and made it the most actable of his plays. The play has been acted on stage several times, but neither the powerful and many-dimentional character of Macbeth could be satisfactorily delineated nor the profound vision of evil in the play could be entirely captured. The screen, with its tremendous advantages over the stage, has explored the vast possibilities of capturing the subtlety and comprehensiveness of human nature. It met with paramount success. But in case of the larger than-life plays, as *Macbeth* is one, the camera could not entirely encompass the imagination of the poet. The film-makers of *Macbeth* did different experiments on the plotting of its action: they pictured the play in accordance with Shakespeare's arrangement of the episodes, made certain changes to fit the play in their scheme of work, altogether changed the action of the play or the atmosphere therein, or recreated the play. But never could it possibly match even a portion of what Shakespeare created for total understanding.

More than any other play, the structural organization of *Macbeth* betrays an intricate working of Shakespeare's genius for poetry, acting, and direction put together. This scheme of action, if it is disturbed or mishandled, would not project the vision which it is meant to. The film-makers find it difficult to portray the inmost sentiment of *Macbeth* which is described through its poetry. However, if the poet Shakespeare cannot be translated into the filmic medium, the dramatist can be. And although it is impossible to separate the poet from the dramatist, an

attempt can be made to translate the most of Shakespeare, taking film as a singular medium of expression, and thus plotting the action of the play accordingly. The contention of this paper, therefore, is that the demands of the filmic medium being peculiar and different from the stage, a film-maker ought to change the play liberally to fit it in his own scheme of work, or he should recreate the play to the satisfaction of his own demands. Otherwise the play would remain defiant to any attempt of filming it.

Of all the film versions of *Macbeth*, the B. B. C. version is certainly the most truly faithful to Shakespeare's text. There is, of course, some cutting of the text but that does not anyway disturb Shakespeare's ordering of the episodes and action. The film does not include the porter's account of what drink provokes and unprovokes (II. iii. 26-42), the Hecate scene, which is a suspected interpolation anyway, the speech of the First Witch after the parade of the eight Kings in the Macbeth/Witches second meeting, some of the dialogues between Lady Macduff and her Son (IV. ii. 30 - 37, 41-58) the account of miraculous works of the English king (IV. iii.139-159), the entry of Malcolm and Siward where they are informed about the probable immediate fall of Dunsinane (IV.vii. 24) and the dialogues between Rosse and Siward where they speak about the noble death of young Siward. This would certainly be cumbersome to go, line by line, comparing any film version of *Macbeth* to Shakespeare's text, but in case of the B. B. C. version, one can have a complete, word to word comparison with the play. The film is simply a visual narration of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. It provides, however, a major contrast to those film versions—Kurosewa's, Welles's, and Polanski's—which dare take insolent liberties with Shakespeare's text and structural organization.

Next to the B. B. C. version of *Macbeth*, Schaffer's is the closest to the play. It does not either make any structural changes. But whereas the B.B.C. version does not at all exploit the possibilities of filmic medium of expression, Schaffer uses some filmic technique to his advantage, or perhaps to his disadvantage : many of the dialogues are omitted, some

scenes are condensed, some dialogues are interchanged, some characters are given longer or shorter roles ; notwithstanding, the action is organized as it is in Shakespeare.

Some changes are made with perhaps no specific purpose in mind. For example, Macbeth, in Schaffer's film, meets Duncan at Inverness after seeing his wife; whereas in the play, he meets him at an open place outside Dunsinane before meeting Lady Macbeth. Such alterations may cause slightly different effect upon an audience, but not so significant an effect as to bring about any real change. Other changes introduced by Schaffer are more significant : Shakespeare's Macbeth, for his second meeting with the Witches, goes out in search of them to know "By the worst means the worst." (III.iv.134) Schaffer rather chooses to picture this confrontation as a dream. Thus, he does not show Macbeth as a frustrated man looking for the Witches, but rather as a helplessly entraped victim in the hands of the demonic agents. It considerably lightens the burden of his crime. Also the murder of Macduff's family and the destruction of his castle is shown in Macbeth's double vision. This technique fails to actualize the action therein, by which the film suffers especially from the deficiency of not showing the tragic death of Macduff's son. It should have not been simply passed over.

These changes, however, are not specifically in the structural scheme of *Macbeth* but, rather, are the outcome of the faulty cinematic technique. The film, in fact, does not look for a change. It only shifts an emphasis which probably should have not been shifted, because it does not anyway help in spelling out the themes of the play; it rather obscures them.

R. R. Elliott is of the opinion that there is sufficient evidence in the play that would legitimately plead for a theological structure of the play. In his *Dramatic Providence in Macbeth*, he presents the sinful soul of Macbeth in a theological fabric. His argument is that we always wait anxiously to watch for repentance on Macbeth's part, and that the

"Christian self-esteem would have rendered Macbeth what deity and nature designed him to be."[1] A comparatively recent article "Theological and Non-Theological Structure in Tragedy" by Roland Mushot Frye explores the possibilities of interpretting *Macbeth* as possessing a theological structure. Frye sets forth the view that the tragedy of *Macbeth* does not fit into theological pattern because the internal battle of Macbeth is not related to God ; the framework of his struggle is mainly personal and political; and he is not concerned with salvation and damnation.[2]

Orsen Welles, however, in his film, attempts to fit *Macbeth* into a Christian theological fabric. Welles understands the play in Christianity vs Paganism context and plots the action of his film accordingly. He even introduces a new character, a priest, to fit him in his themetic scheme. So we get, as Roger Manvell says, "a Wellesian superstructure imposed upon the play, which is then to conform to his new themetic device."[3] Macbeth's act of murder, in Welles's scheme, is an invasion on the order of Christian civilization. The tragedy of Welles's *Macbeth*, however, does not quite come off as a Christian tragedy, because the primitive setting of the film and the introductory announcement that the cross is newly arrived here against the barbaric paganism makes us see the pagan powers incarnated in the Macbeths. The Macbeths are realized out of the Christian domain working against the religious forces, who ultimately dominate life in Scotland.

Welles is liberal in cutting the play, in rearranging the scenes, and in interchanging the dialogues amongst the characters. He squeezes the action of *Macbeth* to questionable consequences. Macduff's character is one of the glaring examples, which got a drastic change in Walles's scheme of filming *Macbeth*. In Shakespeare, when Macduff reveals Duncans' murder, nobody is sure who has done it. Some of them more strongly suspect Macbeth, but they do not let him know their minds. Instead, Banquo says, "Let us meet/And question this most bloody piece of work/ To know it further." (II. iii. 125-127). Also it is after Macbeth's second meeting with the witches that we know, with Macbeth, that Macduff has

fled to England. His visit to England is to seek English help under the aegis of Malcolm. Thus, Shakespeare makes Macbeth believe that the witches have "harp'd my [his] fear aright." (IV. i. 74) Welles, however, shows Macduff leave Macbeth's castle for England, with Malcolm, right after the discovery of Duncan's murder. They leave as if they are protesting against the murder, the blame for which rests on Macbeth. The question arises that if Macduff is so sure of himself that the murder obviously is done by Macbeth and not by Malcolm, as one might suspect, why does he run away? He should have stood with those who wanted to "question this most bloody piece of work." (II. iii. 126) Also, he should have thought of his wife and children. There seems to be no logical explanation of his flight to England except that he was afraid of Macbeth's murderous intentions. This sort of Macduff is neither envisaged by Shakespeare nor is sustained by Welles in his film.

Banquo's soliloquy, "Thou hast it now, King, Cawdor, Glamis, all . . . and, I fear, / Thou play'dst most foully for't ; yet It was said, It should not stand in your posterity . . . " tells that Banquo, who knows Macbeth in a special context, understands that Macbeth played foully to secure the throne. It also tells on Banquo's aspirations to see his children as kings as the Weird Sisters prophesied. Welles, however, shows Banquo speaking this soliloquy to Macbeth. And Macbeth sensing danger in it tries to make a deal with Banquo :

Macbeth : If you shall cleave to my consent, when 'tis. It shall
make honour for you.
Banquo : So I lose none
In seeking to augment it . . . .
I shall be counceled.
(II. i. 25-27)

But Macbeth being not sincere in counselling Banquo plans his murder. In Shakespeare, Banquo is murdered mainly because Macbeth would not let the throne pass on to his [Banquo's] posterity; in Welles's film he is murdered mainly because Macbeth wants to get rid of the most

potential evidence to his murdering of the King. The stress of the whole structural movement in this part of the film is on Macbeth's fear that Banquo knows too much and demands too much. Banquo is a constant reminder to him of his foul play, and a potential threat to his power and honour.

Welles makes Macbeth believe that Banquo has grown defiant. When Macbeth appears as king for the first time, he tries to shout Banquo down with a reddened face, yelling, "fail not our feast", (III. i. 27) and a cynical taunt returns after a little suggestive pause, "My Lord, I will not." (III. i. 28). Welles particularly makes an audience hear the recurring sound of Banquo's answers to Macbeth which make Macbeth sick as well as thoughtful. Shakespeare's reason for Banquo's murder that his issues must not inherit kingship becomes secondary in Welles's *Macbeth*.

Welles plots the action of his *Macbeth* so radically different from Shakespear's play that the film gets altogether a new look. It suffers mainly from the on-rushing action which distorts the episodes and the themes of the play. His own remarks on his film point out the lack of time which caused him to make *Macbeth* as an ordinary film :

> *Macbeth* was made in 23 days, including one day of retakes. People who know anything at all about the business of making a film will realize that this is more than fast. My purpose in making *Macbeth* was not to make a great film, though I was making what might be a good film. . . . "[4]

Welles puts Shakespeare's dialogues, characters, episodes, and scenes at his own command, and rearranges them, twists them, and changes them, rather unhesitatingly ; nevertheless, he could not come up with 'a good film.' Kurusawa, a Japanese filmmaker, on the other hand, recreates Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in his *Throne of Blood* and comes up with a 'great film.' He changes the play to fit it in his own fifteenth-century traditions. He knows that such blood-letting, as in *Macbeth*, has been in Japan during the period of Civil Wars, and that inspires him to change the

socio-political scene from Scotland to Japan. He completely changes the dialogues and the names of the characters, totally eliminates the poetry of *Macbeth*, and cuts and adds up the scenes and characters according to his needs. Avoiding all those scenes in *Macbeth* which could have not been transformed into his own traditional perspective, Kurusawa gives us quite a new *Macbeth*, a *Macbeth* visualized in Japanese historical context, yet, paradoxically, quite in line with Shakespeare's play.

Kurusawa does not start the film with the witches of *Macbeth*. He rather establishes an intense and fatalistic atmosphere by fixing his camera on the spiderlike Cobweb Castle, a castle which has bloody past. And then the Cobweb Forest, a labyrinthine puzzle, in which the horsemen ride swiftly but do not find their way out; one of them is shown beating a door, the others struggle to get out of the trap. Washizu (Macbeth) and Miki (Banquo) are also in the trap. Washizu strikes an arrow and a mocking laughter returns from the thick wood. Here the supernatural is introduced; a strange, ghostly, sexless witch spins and chants, "Washizu will be Lord of Cobweb Castle, and Miki's sons rulers after him." This is a sound and appropriate setting for the *Macbeth* action. But as Roger Manvell remarks that *Throne of Blood* "is a transmutation, a distillation of the *Macbeth* theme, not an adaptation;"[5] the film demands an entity of its own, quite independent of *Macbeth*. The rearrangement of action in this part of the film, however, does not bring about essential changes in the structural organization of *Macbeth*.

The Shakespearian scheme of antithetical structure and the theme of the reversal of values is judiciously incorported in *Throne of Blood*. Kurusawa shows Asaji (Lady Macbeth) continuing her demonic pressure on Washizu, even after Tsuzuki's (Duncan's) murder to get rid of Miki (Bonquo) whom she thinks a constant danger. Washizu defends Miki's loyalty and believes that according to the prophecy his sons must inherit the throne because he himself has no children. Here Asaji announces her pregnancy which 'spurs' (I. vii. 25) Washizu's 'intent' (I. vii. 26), and the 'vaulting

ambition' (I. vii. 27), once again becomes the reason to get Miki murdered. But, quite against their hopes, after Miki's murder, the child is born dead. The device is excellent. Very intelligently, indeed, Kurusawa changes the story of *Macbeth* to his own ends. The structural movement contains stringent irony, quite Shakespearian in thematic intention, yet not quite Shakespearian. Kurusawa provides an understandable and workable reason for Washizu to murder Miki. It is, I think, an improvement on Shakespeare's story.

Another conspicuous change which Kurusawa brings about in *Throne of Blood* is that the thematic movement is not from order to disorder and finally to the restoration of order, as it is in *Macbeth*. He lets us know that evil is perpetual ; it is a matter of past, present, and future. Asaji persuades Washizu to kill he Lord because the Lord himself killed his Master to become the Lord. She makes it quite simple : "Kill and take possession of Cobweb Castle." In Manvell's words, "it is a case of warrior against a warrior."[6] Asaji councels Washizu to kill Tsuzuki in the room already stained with blood. And Tsuzuki also decides to sleep in the same blood-stained room. The blood is being washed off the walls and floor of the room in order to shed new blood. This is a ritual meant to offer a sacrifice to the room. This is entirely fatalistic. Asaji tells Washizu, "the stage is set for you", as if she knows that the murder is ordained by he gods. This part of the scheme of action n the film suggests continuity of murders.

But A.L. Mambrano's view that in the end, the death of Washizu also suggests the continuity of violence and murders is hard to reconcile to. Her argument is that "Washizu's soldiers who rose to power as his followers have betrayed their trust and lost their honour by executing him as the most expedient means to save themselves."[7] But conversely, Washizu's death by his own warriors, one may explain, means that the burden of his murder is borne by everybody. He is shown impaled by so many arrows. It is no more "a case of warrior against a warrior." Washizu must be a victim of the vicious circle, because he killed his Master to become the

Lord of Cobweb Castle, as the tradition happened to be. But now the tradition of murder is over. This time the restoration of order is to new ends, the ends which disqualify a murderer to become the Lord.

The film, however, ends with the same chant with which it started; the same foggy atmosphere and the same wailing kind of music; "Life is like a flower that wilts. All men are mortal; there is lust and mortal greed. They must accept the judgment which spares neither sinner nor saint. They will vanish into nothingness." The announcement denies the way Washizu died—Impaled by the arrows of his own warriors. The new order of bearing the burden of Washizu's death by everybody may come but would be frustrated by fate. It says that the human efforts to end the murderous cycle would not be honoured. The ritual will continuously be demanded. In the words of Hisai Niki, a Japanese scholar, "a new order may come, but as in ancient times, sings the chorus at the end of the film, the same thing will happen again. The film begins in chaos, and ends in chaos, too. The fatalistic end of the film is not restorative, which Shakespeare envisaged in *Macbeth*, but is one of a continuous evil cycle.[8]

The last in my discussion is Polanski's [and tynan's.] *Macbeth* which has received a flood of both appreciation and criticism because of its being controversial and interesting. The film has always been put into Shakespearian context. A tough and to an extent literal comparison with Shakespeare's text made it liable to severe cricicism; and a 'broader' point of view, which allowed liberal sanctions to the film, caused a wave of appreciation. The movie, in fact, is not a recreation, as Kurusawa's *throne of blood* would be, but rather, in every sense, an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Mecbeth*. Hence, a comparison with Shakespeare's *Macbeth* has its legitimate grounds : wherever the action is misplaced, the character is overplayed or subdued, or the theme is distorted, it becomes critic's concern to notice it.

There are certain changes which tell on the subject of the movie, on the characters in it, or on its scheme of action. For example, Rosse's

role gets a decisive shape of a traitor, the murderers of Banquo are pushed in the same ditch/room where the baited bears are thrown; and Lady Macbeth reads the well-saved letter, after everything comes to a chaotic fall, as if she has been deceived by the wording therein. This is not exactly from Shakespeare, but so appropriately fits in the thematic scheme of *Macbeth* that it enhances the effect of the film upon an audience. At the same time, it does not anyway detract from the play. It also helps to establish the antithetical pattern of the film, which Polanski seems to have in mind. In the Macduff/Macbeth fight, at the end of the play, however, Macbeth puts his sword under Macduff's chin but lets him go because, he says, his "soul is too much charged/With blood of thine already." (V. viii 5-6). Such a melodrama certainly does not help maintain the tragic effect or the epic standard of *Macbeth*. It gives a sense of the trifle absurd.

Another thing conspicuously noticeable in Polanski's *Macbeth* is Duncan's murder. Polanski shows Macbeth murdering Duncan when he is awake. At first Duncan is shown asleep. Macbeth takes the converlet off the sleeping Duncan. The camera simultaneously shows Duncan's breathing naked chest and Macbeth's reluctance to kill him. Hesitatingly, he puts the dagger on the beat of Duncan's heart. The camera takes a close up of Duncan's chest again and shows the upheavel with a forked nose of the dagger mildly thrust into the sphere of heart. Another closeup shows Macbeth's face twitched and fearfully thoughtful still reluctant. The camera moves back and forth, and finally is fixed on Duncan's face who wakes up and sees Macbeth standing over him like an angel of death. And then the murder becomes inevitable; it must be committed. This psychological treat of the whole scene is indeed excellent. Shakespeare, however, does it differently. He makes Macbeth murder Duncan while he is asleep. And thereafter he [Macbeth] bewails that in murdering Duncan in sleep, he, in fact, has murdered sleep itself. Polanski's Macbeth also speaks the same dialogues but the words suffer from lack of validity.

The obvious criticism which everybody shares with David I. Grossvogel is that it is "more in faithfulness to himself than to Shakespeare that Polanski devises an extra ending for his *Macbeth*. Grossvogel refers here to what should be called the most grievious deviation from Shakespeare's play : Donalbain's character which changes the structural and thematic scheme of *Macbeth*.[9] In Shakespeare, Donalbain is a negligible character. Polanski also gives him a minor role in his film, but significantly different. His Donalbain limps, which is emblematic of the fatalistic nature of his moral weakness. In an earlier scene where Duncan declares his eldest son, Malcolm, the Prince of Cumberland, the camera moves rapidly showing the two faces of Macbeth and Donalbain noticeably resenting upon the announcement. Donalbain is marked as ambitious and vicious as Macbeth. At the end of the film, when Macbeth is killed and Malcolm is hailed as the king of Scotland, Donalbain is shown riding to the witches, dismounting at their den, and searching for them. It speaks for an unending succession of evil designs, dark schemes, and heinous murders. Polanski, like Kurusawa, ends his film with a vicious circle. As long as ambition is nourished in the bosoms of the mortals, the evil would stay immortal. Shakespeare's scheme of restoration of goodness through an ordered and blessed rule of a noble king, and his belief in the inherent goodness of man, is not agreed upon by Polanski and Kurusawa.

Scholarly opinion directs our attention to the juxtaposing of the natural and creative life-forces with the unnatural and destructive death forces in *Macbeth*. The structural scheme is realized in the poetic imagination and the dramatic action of the play, which makes *Macbeth* particularly a play of symbols and images. The main themes of the play are inherent in its imagistic patterns. Hence, it is not the external structure but rather the essential action which particularly matters in transforming *Macbeth* into filmic medium. We need to exploit all the techniques and potentialities of filmic medium to attain the fuller vision of *Macbeth* through film. A half-hearted, literal transformation of *Macbeth* into a film would not project even a portion of the profound vision of evil in the play.[10]

FOOT NOTES

1. G.R. Elliott, *Dramatic Providence in Macbeth*, Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton UniversityPress, 1958, p. 231.
2. R.M. Frye, "Theological and Non-Theological Structure in Tragedy," *Shakespeare Studies*, 1968, Vol. IV, p. 132.
3. Roger Manvell, *Shakespeare and the Film*, New York : Praeger, 1972, p. 56.
4. Francis Novel, "Interview with Welles," *Sight and Sound*, December, 1950, p. 316.
5. Manvell, op cit., p. 56.
6. *Ibid.* p. 60.
7. A.L. Membrano, "Review", *Sight and Sound*, Decen.ber, 1950, p. 124.
8. Hisai Niki, *Film Literature*, Vol. I, 1973, p. 7.
9. David I. Grossvogel, "Macbeth", *Film Review*, p. 27.
10. L.C. Knights, *Some Shakespearean Themes*, London : Chatto & Windus, 1959, p. 120., G.W. Knight, *The Imperial Theme* London: Metheun & Co., Ltd., 1951, p. 153. Also Knights, *The Wheel of Fire* (1949), p. 158. Kenneth Muir, "Image and Symbol in Macbeth," *Shakespeare Survey* (1966), Vol. XIX pp. 45-55. G.I. Duthie, "Antithesis in Macbeth," *Shakespeare Survey* (1966), Vol. XIX, pp. 25-34. Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare and the Reason*, New York : The Humanities Press, 1965, p. 124. They all variously believe with G.W. Knight that "In a final judgement the whole play may be write down as a wrestling of destruction and creation."

PEOPLE'S CHINA : THE SECOND WAVE OF REVOLUTION

by
ARSHAD SYED KARIM

Mao Zedong's death in 1976 closed one chapter of modern Chinese history, and opened another post -- Mao era. The rise of China in the second half of the twentieth century is a miracle. In such a short period China awakened from its sleep to shake the world under the authoritative leadership of Mao. His departure from the world became a turning point in Chinese way of life determining the change to change. Mao succeeded in changing Chinese society with a revolutionary storm and armed liberation movement, whereas his successors led the Chinese to yet another change with a quiet revolution. How Mao's China changed after his death and to what direction, are significant questions one carries in his mind. To analyse the fact a twofold study follows : (*i*) Moa's legacy; and (*ii*) his successor leadership and its role.

I

There is an old Chinese saying: "For a thousand miles journey one has to begin with the single step." Twentieth century China was to be modernized with this heartful desire and the first single step was taken by Mao Zedong when he led the nation to a newer independent China in 1949 under the banner of Communism. The Communist ideology was based upon the principle of Marxism-Lenonism. Maoism gave the disheartened, frustrated, disunited, backward, unemployed, depressed Chinese a new and a greater hope to modernize themselves and change through the road to violent revolution. Mao secured authority by way of peasant movement[1] and for that reason he was regarded as the leader of the proletariat. Therefore, he sought for revolutionary bases in the rural areas. He viewed that the imperialist and reactionary

forces were strongly entrenched in the urban centres, so the best way to compete with them could be to avoid confrontation in the cities, especially when his revolutionary forces were still weaker. It was necessary, therefore, to "build the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political economic and cultural revolutionary bastions, so that they can fight the fierce enemy who utilises the cities to attack the rural districts."[2] To Mao, the existing Chinese conditions could be appropriate for the revolutionary rural base areas gradually to win the cities leading to an overall victory for the revolution. Furthermore, "the unevenness of China's economic development (a localized agrarian rather than a unified capitalist economy) ; the immensity of China's territory, which gave the revolutionary forces sufficient room to maneuver in, the disunity inside China's ruling group— all these conditions enabled the Chinese revolution first to triumph in the rural areas and then to complete the protracted, arduous task of winning a national victory."[3]

Alongwith Mao's concept of the rural revolutionary bases due to existing conditions in China, there were historical conditions as well for the formulation of his strategy. In history, the Chinese experienced many peasant wars, particularly in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.[4] These attempts generally failed because the rebels attacked and retreated as they lacked the strong bases. Mao learned much from these failures, and considered the significance of rural bases in his revolutionary strategy to attack the enemies.

Mao's discussion from orthodox Marxism lay in his faith in military power and its use in the process of revolution. His famous saying indicated that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Whoever wants to seize political power of the state and to maintain it must have a strong army. And, the world can be remolded only with the gun."[5] To him, such power could grow only in the rural base areas. For the protection of these and to expand them further he advocated the extensive use of guerrilla warriors particularly at the initial stage.

Mao in his concept of political system laid the foundation of New Democracy which ultimately became the Chinese political structure with the formation of his government in 1949. It differed from the Soviet pattern. Mao established an empire of the largest number of people in the world, as the Chinese population was one-third of the world's. His source of power was man-power. In his New Democracy he did not look for proletarian dictatorship, nor believed in a democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants, as was suggested by Stalin in 1926 and adopted by the Chinese Communists in 1930-1934.[6] For him, New Democracy was a "democratic republic under the joint dictatorship of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people led by the proletariat."[7] He followed a joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes such as the proletariat, the peasantry, the intelligentsia and the petty bourgeoisie.[8] With the total victory of the Communists, he added the class of national bourgeoisie also, but did not allow them participation in government. This addition constituted a departure of Maoism from orthodox communism. His concept of New Democracy was based on two stages. The first was to change the semi-colonial and semi-feudal society into a democratic society. The second was to push revolution further by building up a socialist society. He emphasized that there must be a consecutive continuity in these two stages without any intervention of bourgeoisie' dictatorship.

In his political strategy, Mao presented a novel idea of contradiction where he spoke of the role of antagonism. To him, some contradictions were open antagonism, and others were not.[9] He explained that "an antagonistic contradiction is one between the revolutionaries (who represent the people) and the enemies of the people, while a non-antagonistic contradiction may exist among the people."[10]

The launching of the Cultural Revolution (in 1966) was typical of Mao's ideal to rule the country with a firm hand. Many causes were attributed to such action. The failure of the Great Leap Forward (in 1958), the peasants discontent with the people's commune, the Sino-Soviet

ideological conflict, and the increasing isolation of China in world affairs rose the opposition against Mao's policies. The rise of opposition and anxiety to continue his branch of Communism after his death, Mao felt it necessary to carry on the political purge and take up the task of extensive cultural transformation. For the purpose, he organized the Chinese Youth into the paramilitary Red Guards who could carry out the task of Cultural Revolution. His Cultural Revolution was (*i*) to struggle against and overthrow those persons in authority who were taking the capitalist road, (*ii*) to criticise and repudiate the reactionary bourgeois and the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and (*iii*) to transform education, literature, and art and all other parts of the superstructure that did not harmonize well with the socialist economic base.[11]

In the 1960's it was a general belief of Mao's supporters that the bourgeoisie though deprived of political and economic power, still wielded cultural power in the areas of ideas, customs, and habits which they used to capture the minds of the masses.[12] Therefore, it was necessary to create an art that could serve and protect the interests of the Maoist Communistic order. The main target of the Cultural Revolution thus was the handful of party persons in authority who were taking the capitalist road. The contradiction between these persons, according to Mao, was an antagonistic one and therefore, these bourgeoisie had to be "completely refuted, discredited and overthrown, and their power seized by the Red Guards."[13] This way Mao asserted the mass line strategy through Cultural Revolution, as he often said that "the people, and the people alone, are the motivating force in the making of world history" and that "the masses have a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism."[14] Interestingly enough, during the Cultural Revolution period, Mao did not use peasants and workers to carry out his struggle.[15] He believed that struggle is life and that contradictions continue to exist in a socialist society. He held that "the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will continue to be

long and tortuous and at times will even become very acute."[16] It is correctly remarked that "in launching the Cultural Revolution in the evening of his life, he is in fact reaffirming his belief that a person's life may end, but that class struggle must go on."[17] Such task of the continuity of revolution was taken up by Mao's successors after he departed from the world.

II

The process of change is meaningful in the study of development and modernization. A change may occur mainly through two ways : evolutionary and revolutionary. Evolutionary process of change takes its roots in slow, steady and liberal manners, to rejuvenate the society by bringing out change through peaceful or quiet methods. Such a process leads to permanency in the changed system, or at least it has a longer changing life for development. Revolutionary process of change, on the other hand, has a fast, dynamic and violent means to modernize the society. In a very short span of time, it endeavours to change the entire pattern of socio-political and economic institutions. Changes emerge out of such a revolution, but it carries a temporary nature and the system is left ripe to enter yet another change with any pretext.

China in her history often found herself in termoil with reference to his policies and people. Such uncertainty in politics has been probably due to the process of change she generally adopted. In less than a century (i.e. from 1911-1978) she witnessed three important revolutionary changes from liberal (1911) to violent (1949) to silent (1978). The last approach (1978) has been a quiet one and therefore, it may possibly be of longer life than the two earlier ones. The leaderships of Sunyat Sen and Chiang Ki-Shek to Mao Zedong determined altogether new socio-political and economic orders; and after Mao's death yet a newer change appeared under the influence of Deng Xiaoping. In other words, China in this century has passed through three main hands ; the Nationalists ; the Communists; and the Modernists. The first two became the victims of

personality cult and stronghold of one man ideological furor. The third one has taken a road towards development and change with a broader outlook and not only considering the Chinese inside-wall conditions, but the Chinese existing conditions in and out of Chinese boundaries. It is working under the influence of an ideology yet carrying its policies with liberal, moderate and considerate outlook.

Mao's ideological furor terminated into the outbreak of his Cultural Revolution which attempted to revive the heroic and inspiring times of pure Communist spirit and Mao's glory. The revolution was "cultural not only in the sense of attacking writers and intellectuals, but in seeking to make a new people without pride and greed, spartan creatures without interest in personal pleasures or vanity."[18] Mao was worshiped to the extent that meetings were opened with a Mao-reading and prayer for his long life For a time no books but Mao's works were printed.[19] Even theaters in China were showing the six similar Maoist-revolutionary operas, which were made into the only six movies.[20] But Mao's attempt to recapture past success failed. He and his close aides, including his wife, could not govern the country without a political apparatus that at one time ruled less than half of China.[21] It became necessary to seek help from the army and that was how the People's Liberation Army was invited to govern the country. Through them Mao suppressed the Red Guards as a political force, considering them bourgeois.[22] This way the first phase of the Cultural Revolution ended in 1969. The principal losers were the veteran civilian administrators whom Mao considered agents of revisionism. The main winners were military officers and their superior Lin Piao, who was named Mao's heir-apparent.

From 1969 to the death of Mao Zedong (in 1976) there had been almost a constant struggle over the legacy of the Cultural Revolution. Radical leaders like Lin Biao and Jiang Qing advocated policies of reducing or at least limiting the inequalities in Chinese society through political means. Moderate leaders like Zhou Enlai believed that some

appeals to material interest were necessary to spur production and tried gradually to introduce changes along those lines. Zhou also sought the rehabilitation of experienced administrators, which the radicals resisted. Ultimately, an irreconcilable conflict developed between Lin and Mao. Mao's doubt about his defense minister (Lin Biao) began to grow soon after Lin was officially named heir-appearant in 1969. Mao believed that Lin was conspiring to sew up his succession to the chairmanship, had gone too far in declining the image of Mao's cult; was blocking the revival of the Party apparatus; and was wrong in opposing Mao's desire to tilt toward the United States in foreign policy. Zhou Enlai sided with Mao on all these issues. Lin was accused of having plotted a coup d'etat and the assassination of Mao. He supposedly died in a plane crash in Mongolia in September 1971 in a futile escape attempt.

In early 1972, Zhou Enlai fell seriously ill. Mao was also too old to live longer. At this juncture, the moderates started search for their leader particularly for their cause. They turned their eyes toward Deng Xiaoping, who had supervised the Party's day-to-day work in the decade before the Cultural Revolution and had helped pull China out of the post-Great Leap Forward period. He also had strong ties with most military leaders who were not associated with Lin Biao. Thus Deng was rehabilitated in early 1973, and became the member of Politburo. In 1975 he secured major post in the government, Party, and military, and was also put in charge of the day-to-day work of the Central Committee. This was the time when in Fourth National People's Congress (1975) Zhou Enlai enunciated the policy goal of the 'Four Modernizations' (agriculture, industry, science and technology, and national defense) which Deng himself had particularly accorded and desired.

The year 1976 became a culminating point in modern Chinese history. In this year both Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai died and left China in a political vacuum. Pages of history witness that stability of a nation, particularly filled with leaders of personality cult and personal charisma,

shattered when it departed from the world. It happened with China also. There appeared a political chaos and race for power conflict within the political arena. The loss of Mao's charisma with his death was not a simple event to fill the gap. Mao was too demanding in his approach, especially during his last days and particularly, when his image was used by his close associates. There already developed a crisis of power sharing even when he was alive. The two forces of the radicals and the moderates had started pulling the rope for the tug-of-war. Under such circumstances, the ultimate authority goes to a less powerful and less important political man. Thus there appeared a Maoist, Hua Goufeng to head the government and the Party. Hua united with Deng to purge their opponents. They arrested a number of radical leaders around the country, including the principal figures Jiang Qing (Mao's widow), Yao Wenyuan (a polemicist from Shanghai whose November 1965 article was the first blast of the Cultural Revolution), Wang Hongwen (a former factory worker from Shanghai), and Zhang Chunqiao (a prominent theoretician from Shanghai). They were quickly dubbed the 'Gang of Four'. The Gang of Four were considered as capitalist-roaders and criminals although they had been Mao's closest associates in his last decade and were members of his Politburo. Their sins, follies and clique became the principal issues in Chinese politics. They were denounced everywhere as source of troubles, and kindengarten children recited their crimes.[23]

In the midst of widespread rejoicing over the arrest of the radicals, the leadership revived the policy goal of the Four Modernizations. Even then China was still in trouble. The central leadership, in the eve of purges and death, was deeply divided over policies of the future. On the one side, the neo-Maoist (Hua Guofeng) sought to preserve much of Mao's legacy. His group was willing to allow the Four Modernizations in economic policy, but they resisted efforts to liberalize social policy and tamper with Maoist ideology. On the other side was the Modernists (led by purged vice-chairman, Den Xiaoping) who believed that the Cultural Revolution had been a disaster for China economically,

politically, culturally, and socially. They held Mao responsible for it and regarded Mao's dogma as a serious obstacle to progress. They desired economic growth even with the help of foreign technologies, if necessary, an emphasis on experties rather than politicals loyalty in education and science and a broad relaxation in cultural and social policy.

For a year since Mao's death (1976), Deng was politically in weak position. His supporters campaigned for his reinstatement provoking neo-Maoists who were overwhelmingly criticising Deng. However, Deng officially returned to his post in mid 1977. In the national congress of the CCP in the new Central Committee, a number of former radicals were removed and a number of veteran leaders were reinstated. Hence, the new Politburo was equally balanced between victims and beneficiaries of the Cultural Revolution.

Deng's return brought priority to the development strategy, He called for rapid expansion of heavy industry, to be aided by a revived science establishment allowed to do basic research, and an educational system that sought the most academically talented and taught skills suited to economic modernization. Foreign trade policies, particularly those concerning the importance of advance technology, were liberalized. Significant changes in university enrollment qualifications were announced : high school graduates would no longer have to spend two to three years working before applying to college, as has been the case during the past seven years.[24] Finally in 1978 Deng Xiaoping took over the office of the Chairman of the CCP. Hua's influence diminished and Deng's influential role was finally established. With this China entered a new phase of change and development. Mao's image receded to haziness and the new leadership showed a more pragmatic and constructive role in the socio-economic development of post-Mao China.

Deng Xiaoping was born in 1904 in a landlord family. He lived in France with Zhou Enlai for a number of years during 1920's. That's how he remained a close and trustworthy associate of Zhou. When Deng

returned to China, he joined Mao's great Long March. In 1950's he rose to power under Zhou by holding office of vice-premier and secretary-general of the Central Committee. His relations with Mao generally remained strange and as a victim of the Cultural Revolution he was retired to menial labour. Zhou again brought him back in 1973 and Deng became 'de facto' chief of the government after the death of Zhou in January 1976 until he was removed in April the same year. In a year and a half, he again celebrated his rehabilitation in July 1977 when he returned to his post and also became the member the Politburo. It was only in next two years that he asserted his influence and established himself as the main leader of China in 1979.

With the opening of Deng era in China a remarkable change took place in the Chinese daily life. He changed the neo-Maoist slogan 'Seek truth from facts' to 'Practice is the sole criterion of truth'. He restored the stage play which was banned by the former leadership. Newspaper editors were encouraged to give a new life to journalism.[25] Many artists and writers who were sent to rural areas returned to their professions.[26] The radicals had banished love stories, non-political folk music and etcetra. These were allowed and welcomed by lifting the ban. Many Chinese classics and foreign books were published. Western artists and classics were again welcomed. Chaplin movies were shown. Universities started studies on history, law, religion, philosophy and economics, which were stopped in 1966. Beauty parlours were opened in major cities and sale of cosmetics allowed in stores. American jeans and Cocacola were available in the shops. Chinese students on science and technology were sent to the western world for higher education. Not only that, changes appeared in the spellings of names of leaders like Mao Tse-tung and Chou Enlai are spelled now Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. The names of different cities were changed. Peking became Beijing. In short, China socially looked towards a diverted road from that of Mao's time.

China after Mao turned from "modernization by revolutionism to

modernization by technology and production."[27] The great goal of the new era became the Four Modernization through which Chinese desire to make China a leading industrial country by the end of this century. Managers and technicians were not to be asked what they believed, but what they could do. Wages were raised and bonuses were offered for performance.

Scientists emerged as heroes in present changing China. The Party looked towards them for the strength and progress of the country. In the first all-China scientific conference (1978) Deng delivered the message that "we can't demand that scientists and technicians . . . study a lot of political and theoretical books, participate in numerous social activities, and attend many meetings that are not related to their work. . . . As along as they are not against the Party and against socialism, we should, in line with the Party's policy of uniting with, educating, and remoulding the intellectuals, bring out their specialized abilities, respect their labour, and take an interest in their progress, giving them a warm helping hand."[28]

The encouragement of studies in science also depoliticized the value of education by strengthening it. Students were asked to study and learn useful knowledge as "knowledge became the recognized production factor." A revolutionary change appeared in the field of education from primary to secondary and higher levels. The old educational scheme was replaced by more dynamic and pragmatic education plan which put greatest emphasis on education for the sake of knowledge and its use in productivity, prosperity and progress of the society.

Modernization and development were to achieve through technological help from the advanced industrial countries which China undertook eagerly and enthusiastically. Consequently, foreign trade increased rapidly especially, with Japan and France. China luxury hotels were planned to be built in the country. Scientific exchange programmes were introduced and Chinese students were sent abroad for higher studies. They started

learning French, German and English and took Japan as example of modernization resulting in intense relations between the two countries.

On the political side, the government looked towards regularizing and slightly opening up the political system. A new constitutional change was adopted in 1978 which made a deeper blow to human rights than the Mao's era. The People's Political Consultative Conference which was convened in 1978 after 1964 was represented by intellectuals, non-Communist parties, and other groups. There appeared a less secrecy in Party and State activities. Law codes were adopted with rules against arbitrary arrest and detention. Study of Law was given so much importance that a large numer of students enrolled for law-education.

The change appeared in China's post-Mao era is significant in many ways. It has emerged through an evolutionary process under a silent revolution. The excitement and enthusiasm for development remain in present Chinese mind as a formidable task for the society. But they are aware of their historical past and revolutionary rapid change-system which had brought if not misery then termoil, and put China on the road of criticism, internally as well as externally. China under Mao had a new hope of uniting the nation under an ideological banner, and under Deng it looks toward the world competition of modernization and development. Realization of scientific achievements, value of education, significance of human rights, partly freedom of life and thoughts, importance to law, and exchange participation in search of modernization and development are some of the many which have been adopted by the present decision-makers. They tend to modernize China with a much broader approach after undraping the iron-curtain unlike Mao and have entered a new phase of development and change. In short, China after Mao has much changed in ideology, philosophy of life, economic activity, social values and educational ambitions. Her broader look now may lead her to modernization and development with the change in a faster and rapid way which a nation desires in this space age.

Deng is in his 80's now. He is too old to live longer. His old age has not carried the characteristics of Mao and his aides. Deng has wisely invited the participation of the Chinese Yough who see China in his era as a prosperous China and much awaited prosperity for their future with technological advancement and liberalized socio-political system. The support of younger generation may gain more confidence in present Chinese leaderships for modernization and development. One can see that Maoist China after Mao has changed, but the present change may last longer with the participating enthusiasm of the younger generation.

Yet, there are other points worth mentioning. The present government came in power through a reform coup, and its leadership differed with Mao's in many respects. Mao never left China and was a victim of localization. Whereas Deng received orientation in France during his youth which led him to broadmindedness and value of outer worldy life. Mao believed in mass movement basically based on rural population. He faced Lin Biao on this issue when Lin advocated the movement through urban labour. Deng supported the movement from both bases, rural as well as urban. He emphasised technological growth and wider education in social, natural and applied sciences for the entire population. Mao trained his followers in his own language, Chinese, keeping them away from foreign languages and thus made modern Chinese localized. Deng looked for wider vision with the use of foreign languages and desired to train the Youth in French, German and English languages. Curiously enough, both used Youth : Mao for his Red Guards, to be brainwashed with the use of arms leading them to narrowness ; Deng with liberal education, to be brainwashed with higher knowledge of world vision leading them to broadness. The purpose of the life of the Youth for Mao was self-sacrifice for the state only, whereas for Deng the sacrifice was for both, state and society (personal and general). Therefore, Mao remained orthodox, limited, static, ; on the other hand, Deng is liberal, wider, dynamic and pragmatic.

FOOT NOTES

1. Benjamine L. Schwartz, *Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 119.

2. Chester C. Tan, *Chinese Political Thought in the Twentieth Century*, New York, David & Charles Ltd., 1972, p. 349.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Arshad Syed Karim, *A Study in Political System : The People's Republic of China*, Lahore : Progressive Publishers, 1971, pp. 16-17.

5. Benjamine L. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

6. Arshad Syed Karim, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

7. Benjamine L. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

8. Lucian W. Pye, *China : An Introduction*, Boston : Little, Brown, 1972, p. 186.

9. George Sabine and Thomas Thorson, *A History of Political Theory*, Hinsdale, Ill. : Dryden Press, 1973, p. 787. Also see details in Benjamine L. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, pp. 359-64.

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning the Great Proletriat Revolution in China*, Peking Foreign Language Press, 1966-67, I, p. 25.

12. Chester C. Tan, *op. cit.*, p. 351.

13. "A Great Historic Document"—Editorial of the *Red Flag*, May 18, 1967 in *Survey of China Mainland Press*, No. 3943, p. 3.

14. *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, Peking, : Foreign Language Press, 1966, pp.118,121.

15. Chester Tan holds that in the latter part of 1968, because of widespread chaos caused by the unruly Red Grards, Mao Tse-tung began to reply on the workers, organized as 'propaganda teams', to stablize the situation.

16. Mao Tse-tung, *Four Essays on Philosophy*, p. 115.

17. Chester C. Tan, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

18. Robert Wesson, *Modern Governments*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ. : Printice -Hall Inc., 1981, . 376.

19. Edgar Snow, *The Long Revolution*, New York : Vintage Books, 1971, p. 25.

20. Robert Wesson, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

21. Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 776.

22. William Hinton, *Hundred Day War : The Cultural Revolution of Tsinghua University*, New York : Monthly Review Press, 1972, p. 68.

23. Robert Wesson, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

24. Fredric M. Kaplan and Julian M. Sobin *Encyclopaedia of China Today*, New York : Euracia Press Inc., 1982, p. 77.

25. Robert Wesson, *op. cit*, p. 380.

26. Harrison Salisbury, "Now it's China's Cultural Thaw', *The New York Times Magazine*, New York : December 4, 1977, p. 49.

27. Robert Wesson, *op. cit.*, p. 381

28. *The Wall Street Journal*, March 30, 1978, p. 14.

Journal of Research (Humanities) Vol. XXII, No. 1-2

FORSTER'S AND WOOLF'S ANTI-IMPERIALISM : THEIR WOMEN PROTAGONISTS

by

Dr. ZAHIR J. KHATTAK

E. M. Forster ond Virginia Woolf have contributed significantly to the novel form but their visions are even more revolutionary. Their stance of anti-mperialism has been occassionally questioned, especially by the writers of the ex-colonies.[1] Still, by and large they are regarded as the opponents of the empire. The discussions are, however, commonly conducted around the overt social and political themes in the novels. They often neglect the fact that both Forster and Woolf have time and again embodied their visions in women protagonists and that the culture expounded by these women counters imperialism in more fundamental ways than the obvious study of their novels social political or historical aspects can suggest.

Both Forster and Woolf were associated with the Bloomsbury group and their writing reflect some of the characteristics of that group which by implications are subversive to the establishment. Their novels are shot through with sentiments and images that are deeply as well as subtly opposed to imperialism. Both of them were attracted to ways of life that could be termed feminine as against the masculine mode of life that has traditionally led to imperialism. This view is supported by the fact that their successful novels invariably present a woman or women who carry the positive values the authors would like to see prevail in the world. Other novelists, such as James Joyec, George Eliot or Jane Austen for that matter, had also employed women as central characters.[2] But their reasons for doing so were different. Forster and Woolf employ women not to represent women's rights or their peculiar difficulties—though that might be a part of it, especially in Woolf's case [3]—but to advocate a

culture in which the values of women should be dominant for women as well as men or in other words, for humanity at large.

The typical spokesman of the British imperialism, in the realm of literature, was Rudyard Kipling.[4] As the expansion of the Empire required certain qualities like physical courage, cold efficiency, self-discipline and the power to discipline others, Kipling's heroes are the paragons of these virtues. Such characteristics would usually be associated with men, as they are considered masculine attributes. (Modern feminists views about these things are a later development). But Forster's and Woolf's interest in the esthetic values of the Bloomsbury group—in alliance with their anti-imperialism—made them invest their sympathies in women characters since the themes of beauty, charm, feelings and personal relations embodied themselves more easily in women characters than in the men of Imperial Britain.

E. M. Forster took up the values of personal relations and friendship as against those of good administration and empire-building.[5] He gradually arrived at the conclusion that the need of the empire to train people in discipline and group loyalty had incapacitated its men to form any good personal relations. The emotional life of men was dried up. So, he felt that if the emotional and spiritual life of the individual was to revive, he had to cultivate values that were traditionally ascribed to women. He wrote *Howards End* to demonstrate some such formula. In the preceding novels, where *Angels Fear to Tread*, the *Longest Journey* and *A Room with a view*, in the words of Lionel Trilling, the formulations and the solutions have been just, but they have not been worked out against sufficient resistance.[6] The novels suggest that naturalism is preferrable to authority and society. But the indication is more in the manner of a parable rather than the mode of fiction Forster's perfects in *Howards End* and later in *A Passage to India*. In *Howards End* Forster "develops to their full the themes and attitudes of the early books and throws back upon them a new and enhancing light."[7] The overt theme of the novel

is 'to connect' the open, liberal and emotional life of the Schlegels with the more efficient and property-minded life of the Wilcoxes.[8] But the way Margaret is conceived and presented in the novel in contradistinction to the Wilcoxes it becomes increasingly difficult to approve of the Wilcoxes. She gets an overwhelming preference.

The Schlegel sisters stand for a way of life that has nothing to do with empire-building: they are more human and are concerned about their personal relations with people around them. Their lives are devoted to art, music and literature. On the other hand, the Wilcoxes stand for business and administration; and Forster associates them with class differences and snobbery. They are wealthy, physically strong and very efficient in the management of their material interests. But compared with the Schlegel sisters they are not interesting at all. The different ways in which Margaret from the Schlegels' side and Charles from the Wilcoxes' side react to the news of love between Helen and Paul is symptomatic of the outlook of the two families.

For Margaret if they are in love that is sufficient to evoke her approval : "I have it in Helen's writing that she and a man are in love. There is no question to ask as long as she keeps to that."[9] She does not believe in class differences and therefore is not concerned to know the family background of the man with whom her sister, Helen, is in love. She says :

> If Helen had written the same to me about a shop-assistant or a penniless clerk . . . . or if she had wanted to marry the man who calls for Carter Patterson, I should have said the same. (p. 10).

Her only consideration is the presence of love between the two people and "All the rest isn't worth a straw." That Forster approves of her attitude is made clear by his authorial comments that follow :

> Away she hurried, not beautiful, not supremely brilliant, but filled with something that took the place of both qualities—

something best described as a profound vivacity, a continual and sincere response to all that she encountered in her path through life.

Charles's reaction to the news is quite to the contrary. When Mrs. Munt, informs him of it (in an absurdly comic and blundering way) he explodes and calls his brother : "The idiot, the idiot, the little fool !" He tells Mrs. Munt that "the thing (their marriage) is impossible, and must be stopped." (p. 20) This is followed by the author's comment that Charles "flung decency aside" and that in him "a vein of coarseness was latent." (p. 21) When he reaches home he is about to make an ugly scene with Paul in the presence of Helen but Mrs. Wilcox's graceful intervention saves them from a crude quarrel.

Margaret and Helen do not care for property and material possessions : they are interested in feelings. The lives of these two sisters are lively and vivacious whereas the Wilcox's lives are cold, calculating and dry. Forster indicated that the tough-masculine characteristics of the Wilcoxes also complemented towards a successful life and, therefore, intended the novel to suggest that the Schlegels's life and all that it signifies in the novel needed connection with it. However, as the prevailing social atmosphere in England was too much dominated by the masculine qualities of the Wilcoxes type he emphasized the feminine qualities to bring about a balance.

In the novel the house, Howards End, can be taken, as Trilling suggests, as a symbol for England, and the problem as who should inherit it might be equated with the question as who shall inherit England.[10] The fact that Charles is sentenced to three years' imprisonment and that Henry is made dependent on Margaret suggests the subordination of the Wilcoxes' values—not a connection on equal footing—and that England should belong to the Schlegels.

In *A Passage to India*, though on the literal level Mrs. Moore dies half way through the novel, her spiritual presence remains ubiquitous to th end. It is she who shapes the future events, in the sense that Adela renounces her charge against Aziz when she remembers Mrs. Moore in the courtroom; and later on the advice of Fielding to Aziz in his turn drops the idea of prosecuting Adela for damages for her (Mrs. Moore's) memory. In the last section of the novel the rupture in fielding and Aziz's relation is mended (partially) because Fielding has married Stella, the daughter of Mrs. Moore. Aziz warms up to Ralph because he is Mrs. Moore's son and takes him on the boat to "do this one act of homage to Mrs. Moore."[11] We also learn that it is Adela who gave the money to Ralph to visit India.

Aziz finally admits Adela's courage and writes a friendly letter and, more significantly, tells her: "For my own part, I shall henceforth connect you with the name that is very sacred in my heart, namely, Mrs. Moore." (p. 320).

Mrs. Moore as representative of universal love is closer to Hinduism (in Forster's conception of Hinduism) and therefore the final triumph of Professor Godbole's religion is hers too. It is interesting to note that Professor Godbole, in his transcendental moments remembers her :

> Thus Godbole, though she was not important to him, remembered an old woman he had met in Chandrapore days. Chance brought her into his mind while it was in this heated state. He did not select her, she happend to occur among the throng of soliciting images; a tiny splinter and he impelled her by his spiritual force to that place where completeness can be found. (p. 286)

The wasp which Mrs. Moore addresses as "Pretty dear" at the begining of the novel also occurs to Professor Godbole: "he remembered a wasp.... He loved the wasp equally, he impelled it likewise...." (p.286)

So, if Margaret provided a linkage to the people around her through her liberal attitude of love and understanding Mrs. Moore makes her presence felt almost on a mystical level.

Virginia Woolf's preoccupation with women is equally pervasive and to the same effect : the values she upholds are anti-imperialist in their implications. Though she might be ambivalent, at times, towards imperialism as an institution, she is nevertheless, severely sabotaging the ways and out-look of life that went into its creation. The British Empire was built by people who believed in a hierarchical—and more significantly, patriarchical—society, and a Christian morality. But Woolf questions the patriarchical structure of society and, moreover, emphasises beauty at the expense of morality. She places esthetic beauty and pleasure higher than any other consideration.

In *To The Lighthouse* she presents her views very forcefully. But before it, a brief discussion of one or two novels that preceded it will be helpful. In *The Voyage Out*, Helen is central to the book and she is concerned with personal relations. She educates Rachal and encourages her to love and marry Hewet. The eccentric *St. Hirst* gravitates towards her. Helen's beautiful presence is felt throughout the novel : Woolf's admiration is lavished on her, so to speak.

In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Clarissa is the woman around whom all the other characters are arranged. Her husband, Mr. Dalloway, the politician, has to pay tribute to her. Peter Walsh, who has served in India, also pays homage to her beauty and charm. And what does Clarissa do ? She is only interested in people as individuals and is busy in organizing private dinner parties (this would have been a triviality for George Eliot but not for Woolf). It is also important to note that the religious Miss Kilman is hostile to Clarissa. Woolf is suggesting that Miss Kilman has suffered social injustice and so has turned religious and now, mistaking her real target of attack, runs down what is hostility to Christianity : She brings it in to vent hatred against it even at places where one would least expect it.

In *To The Lighthouse* the issues in which Woolf was interested become crystallized, as it were. Mr. Ramsay's cold and scientific approach to life is severely criticized. He is called a tyrant and a brute. He is associated with images that remind one of his coldness, harshness and dryness. For example he is likened to a "beak of brass."[12] His son wants to hit him with a poker or cut him with a dagger. In his love of truth and facts he is insensitive to the feelings of people. He ruthlessly disappoints James, his son, about any possibility of their going to the lighthouse the next morning. Of course there is charm which surfaces fully only when he becomes responsive to the feeling of his son and daughter in the boat which takes them to the lighthouse. In such a role he is clearly following the footsteps of Mrs. Ramsay.

As opposed to her husband, Mrs. Ramsay spreads her charm all around. She is, like Clarissa in *Mrs. Dolloway*, consistently associated with birds and trees. She is a life sustaining force. Because of her personal magic and her family life, all sorts of artists are attracted towards her. Woolf might have intended this portrait as a criticism of the self effecting Mrs. Stephen, her mother, or Venessa, her sister (as some critics maintain).[12] But the acutal reading experience is far from that—it is the opposite. Woolf invests Mrs. Ramsay with so much beauty and majesty that her way of life becomes the message of the book. Mr. Ramsay is a famous intellectual and a well known scholar in the academic world but when one gets closer to the Ramsay's family Woolf suggests, one realizes, that it is Mrs. Ramsay who is almost indispensable not only to Mr. Ramsay and their children but also to all the people around the family.

One of the remarkable features of *To The Light house* is the way it accomplishes its theme through a consistent pattern of imagery. Besides the birds and tree imagery, the other recurring image used in association with Mrs. Ramsay is that of a queen. When she is coming down to the dining room she is described in the following rhapsodaic terms :

> And, like some queen who, finding her people gathered in the hall, looks down upon them, and descends among them, and acknowledges their tribute silently, and accepts their devotion and their prostration before her. . . . (p. 124)

Charles Tansley, observing Mrs. Ramsay standing by the picture of Queen Victoria, describes her in terms of a Greek goddess. He rhapsodizes : "With stars in her eyes and veils in her hair, with cyclamen and wild violets . . . . with the stars in her eyes and the wind in her hair. . . ." (p. 25)

Mrs. Ramsay's power is immense ; she just wills people into a relationship and that becomes effective—she makes others want what she wants :

> She was irresistible. Always she got her own way in the end. Lily thought. Now she had brought this off—Paul and Minta, one might suppose, were engaged. Mr. Bankes was dining here. She put a spell on them all, by wishing, so simple, so directly . . . . p. 125)

Mr. Ramsay does not have Mrs. Ramsay's kind of power ; he is sterile and uncreative. He is archaic in his style—he is a Victorian remnant in the Edwardian age. His patriarchical style is replaced by the playful attitude of Mrs. Ramsay ; the seriousness gives way to a slightly humorous and more easy-going way of life.

So, the elevation of Mrs. Ramsay at the cost of the fact-interested and adventurous Mr. Ramsay would be equivalent to admiration of precisely those elements which would be in sharp contrast to Kiplinguesque values.

Virginia Woolf was a conscious feminist, and therefore, it might be objected that it was because of her feminism that she focussed her

attention on women characters and that this had nothing to do with imperialism. The objection is valid in one sense. But what I have been suggesting is that whatever the most important reason for writing in the way she does, her completed works are undeniably anti-imperialist. The themes of her novels as presented through women are not those which would favour imperialism; the culture that resides in her novels would not produce empire-builders. One can, however, go further and point out that there are mumerous instances where her criticism of imperialism is more direct. For instan e. Septimus goes crazy because of the experiences of war, in *Mrs. Dolloway*. In the same novel Peter Walsh returns from India like a hollow shell to get a new core of life from *Mrs. Dolloway*. In *To The Lighthouse* the death of Andrew and other young men is reported as if coming from a universal doom : "A shell exploded twenty or thirty young men were blown up, in France, among them Andrew Ramsay, whose death, mercifully, was instantaneous." (p. 201).

Virginia Woolf's preference for women can be explained in terms of her interest in women's liberation. But why did Forster give such prominence to women characters—with almost mystical dimension—in his novels ? One answer could be that he was deeply attached to his uneducated mother and that the women characters like Mrs. Wilcox and Mrs. Moore are his homage to her. But that is not really so very important.

Of real significance is the fact that Forster was, consciously at times and unconsiously at others, reacting to the culture of imperialism in the most fundamental way—he was advocating a thorough change of culture with a swing from the masculine values to the feminine values, so to speak. He thinks that the values of love, friendship and fine sentiments, not too much straining after facts—as the feminine way of looking at life the people's only hope to carry them through the ethoes of imperialism.

The imaginative response of both writers, E. M. Forster and Virginia Woolf, as bodied forth in women protagonists in their novels was more damaging to imperialism because they were advocating a culture which would directly run counter to the one that had produced the vast British Empire.

FOOT NOTES

1. Nirad C. Chaudhri "Passage to and From India", *Encounter*, II (June 1954) typifies critics who question Forster's anti-imperialism and John Beer in *The Achievement of E. M. Forster*, (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1962) represents those who consider him an anti-imperialist.
2. J.K. Johnstone, *The Bloomsbury Group : A study of E. M. Forster, Lytton strachey, Virginia Woolf, and Their Circle*, New York, 1964.
3. *Three Guineas*, (London : Hogarth Press, 1986).
4. Martin Green, *The Dreams of Adventure, the Deeds of Empire*, (London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), p. 264.
5. Ibid., p. 264.
6. Lionel Trilling, *E. M. Forster*, (Oxford : Oxford University Press 1982), p. 8.
7. Ibid., p. 85.
8. Malcolm Bradbury, (ed), E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, (London : Macmillan, 1973), p. 120.
9. E. M. Forster, *Howards End*, (New York : Vintage Books, 1921), p. 10. All subsequent references to this novel are from this edition and will appear in parentheses inside the paper.
10. Trilling, *Forster*, p. 88.
11. E. M. Forster, *A Passage to India*, (Harcourt Brace Jorarovich, 1924), p. 313. All subsequent references to this novel are from this edition and will appear in parentheses inside the paper.
12. Virginia Woolf, *To The Lighthouse*, (London : Everyman Library, 1938, reprinted 1978), p. 43. All subsequent references to this novel are from this edition and will appear in parentheses inside the paper.
13. M. C. Bradebrook, "Introduction", *To The Lighthouse*, (London : Everyman Library, 1938, reprinted 1978), p. vii-viii.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Journal of Research (*Humanities*) is published twice a year, in January and July.

SUBSCRIPTION

Pakistan.

Single Issue	Rs. 15.00	Postage included
Annual (two issues)	Rs. 25.00	

Foreign Countries

Single Issue	$ 5.00	Postage included
Annual (two issues)	$ 10.00	

All correspondence should be addressed to Muhammad Ismail Bhatti, Secretary, Editorial Board, *Journal of Research* (*Humanities*), Department of English Language & Literature, University of the Punjab, Lahore (Pakistan).

CONTENTS