LITERATURE IN ENGLISH
1914 TO THE PRESENT

Code No. EN1004-I

M. A. English (Previous)
Semester-I

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
MAHARSHI DAYANAND UNIVERSITY, ROHTAK
(A State University established under Haryana Act No. XXV of 1975)
NAAC 'A+' Grade Accredited University

Maharshi Dayanand University
ROHTAK – 124 001

Contents

Unit-I	**D. H. LAWRENCE** Sons and Lovers	**1**
Unit-II	**T. S. ELIOT** The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock The Waste Land	**39**
Unit-III	**ARTHUR MILLER** Price	**97**
Unit-IV	**JOHN OSBORNE** Look Back in Anger	**144**

D.H. LAWRENCE

Sons and Lovers

Unit-I
D.H. Lawrance: Sons and Lovers

Biographical Sketch (1885-1930)

David Herbert Lawrence was the son of an illiterate coal miner, John Arthur Lawrence and a genteel schoolteacher, Lydia Beardsall, in Eastwood, Nottinghamshire. Lawrence, the fourth child of his mismatched parents was especially close to his mother. From early years he was plagued with tuberculosis which growing acute in his forties eventually killed him. He began work with clerical jobs and in 1908 he qualified as a teacher from Nottingham University College. After four years of teaching he eloped with Frieda to Italy and were later married in 1914. Later, after the First World War, he traveled all over the world including Australia, Mexico, New Mexico and Europe. He found immense comfort and harmony in the plains and mountains and offered a refuge from the decadence of life that was taking place in Europe. His health steadily worsened and he died in 1930.

The Age

It is impossible for any writer to remain untouched by the social, political, intellectual and cultural environment of his age. Every writer depicts the characteristics of his age as he generally transcribes life. In order to understand well the writings of an author, knowledge of the times in which he lived is indispensable. Hence, we shall analyze the social and the literary background that influenced the works of D.H. Lawrence

According to William J. Long: "The long and progressive reign of Queen Victoria came to a climax in the Diamond Jubilee Year (1897), a time of peace and plenty when British Empire seemed to be at the summit of its power and security". However, the two important factors that influence the social life and literary sphere at this period of time were imperialism that lead to the two world wars and the wave of social unrest as a result of decline in religious faith and social or moral values. War happened to be the main motive force for social and cultural changes in this period, the moral order began to decay rapidly and a sense of alienation prevailed among the general public.

The situation is very aptly described by Lawrence: "It was in 1915 the old world ended. In the winter of 1915-16 the spirit of the Old London collapsed; the city, in some way, perished, perished from being the heart of the world, and became a vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears and horrors. The integrity of London collapsed and the genuine debasement began, the unspeakable baseness of the press and the public voice, the reign of that bloated ignominy, "John Bull'…The well-bred, really cultured classes were on the whole passive resisters. They shirked their duty. It is the business of people who really knew better to fight tooth and nail to keep up a standard, to hold control of authority."

The rapid growth of industrialization in England in the Victorian age marked the shift of England to an industrial country from an agricultural country thus, forwarding a rapid change in the social life of the people. By the end of the nineteenth century there was a total change towards urbanization with a breakdown of the agricultural way of life. The simultaneous coming up of industrialization and urbanization brought with it many problems. The industrial towns grew haphazardly and congestedly, these congested places often lacked the basic amenities of lives reducing the living standards of people to almost inhuman condition. There was a marked rise in vice and crime and a gradual decline in the standards of spiritual and ethical values.

There arose a mad race for acquisition of wealth and this became the ultimate aim of a gentleman's life. All human relationships came to be regarded in terms of money. The evil effects of industrialization are remarkably

reflected in the works of the 20th century novelists like Ruskin and Carlyle severely condemned the commercialization of this age. Certain spiritual values seemed to be vanishing with gradual decline of the rural way of life and urban societies led to the establishment of material values in life. The new age, however was not without its possible aspects, like there came into being a welfare state—the state was now responsible for education, health and well being of the individual. However, writers continued to think f the agricultural life as the ideal form of life and nostalgically referred to it in their works.

As a result of all these changes, there started a period of uncertainty and moral perplexity. The blind faith in social belief and tradition was given up with rational and scientific questioning. However, the Victorian writer in spit of this questioning was never critical of the very fundamentals of the social and moral order. For example Dickens, though a critical writer criticizes only a few basic evils inherent in their social system. On the other hand he has an acceptance of their way of life and takes pride in it. The beginning of the twentieth century introduces to us writers like Shaw, Wells and Glasworthy who were highly critical of the existing social, economic and moral system.

The different critical attitude of the writers, which tend to be contradictory, has led to confusion on the part of the common man. R.A. Scott-James writes: "the twentieth century has, for its characteristic, to put everything in every sphere of life, to the question, and secondly, in the light of this reception, to reform, to reconstruct, to accept the new and attempt to mould it by conscious, purposeful effort." With the spirit of interrogation came the questioning of the male authority and assertion of the liberation of women. With the end of the war came complete decline in the supremacy of the male authority. People instead of submissively following their leaders became suspicious of manifestations. Their subordinates and juniors, who now did not hesitate to revolt against them, no longer accepted the incompetence of those in authority.

Among other changes, the most important change was the enhancement of the position of women. Women were no longer confined to the four walls of the house but had a significant role to play in the family and the society. The movement of women's liberation got a strong impetus with the spread of education and a tendency towards democratization. There was now a general allowance and encouragement for the women to go in for higher education and their right to vote was vehemently advocated. The tenets of Christianity were no longer accepted unquestioningly. Contemporary religious scholars and philosophers like Max Muller shattered the concept of the supremacy of Christianity. The theory of evolution of Charles Darwin threatened the very basis of the Christian faith. Hence, the complacency of the Victorians was shed off and there was a gradual loss of faith in God and religion.

With weakening of religious faith under the influence if science and rationalism, public issues could no longer be moulded with religious controversies. There arose a keen interest in the study of nature of man in philosophy and metaphysics. The assessment of human behaviour was greatly revolutionized with the psychological theories propounded by Freud followed by Jung and Bergson. Freud declared man to be a biological phenomenon, a creature of instincts and impulses. Freud laid emphasis on the powers of the unconscious to affect the conduct of man. Now more emphasis began to be assigned to the study of the unconscious. The normal were also recognized to be neurotic and abnormal to a certain extent. It was established by Feud and his followers that neurosis and other signs of abnormality are a result of repressed sex instincts. His theory of Oedipus complex was strongly propounded and thoroughly exploited by the twentieth century writers (like D.H. Lawrence). It became established that man's intellectual communications are actually the rationalizations of his emotional needs. Emphasis began to be placed on feeling and intuition rather than intellect, which had all through been regarded as a means of true and real understanding.

The psychological theories of Freud and his followers were not only confined to the literary field, but imparted a considerable influence on the private and family relationships. The theory of Oedipus complex led to the interpretation of various relationships in its terms. It was now believed that mothers could naturally be jealous of their daughters or daughters-in-law. Sons were supposed to have greater attachment for their mothers

rather than their fathers. The daughters were bound to be more attached to their fathers. All such relationships were pervaded with sexual undertones. For instance, T.S. Eliot interpreted *Hamlet* in terms of Oedipus complex. All abnormal human conduct occurs from repressed sex instincts. It was believed that the behaviour of a man was a direct outcome of his early development as a child. The old authoritarian pattern of family relationships broke up.

The questioning of authority and with dismantling of traditional patterns of human relationships, there was an environment of tensions and frustrations. The age became pervaded with the temper of anti-heroism. Various factors including unemployment and economic depression added to the hardship of life. The sense of security unlike the Victorian age was lost because of the shaking foundation of the social and political order and beside the forces of labour legislation, democratization and dissemination of scientific ideas added to the deteriorating situation. The evolution of strong durable convictions that form the basis of emotional stability was not allowed because of the rapid scientific advancement. Man lost faith in God and became rootless and this rootlessness brought its own problems and frustrations and thus, it led to severe anxiety which became the most important characteristic of this age.

In the literary sphere there was a rapid decline in the literature that was produced because of the commercialization of the printing press. The cheap literature catered to the needs of the general public and they were abundant in vulgarity and brutality. The themes of popular literature were no longer touching upon human relationships but had taken over to violence, crime and mediocre love stories. One could say that this age was noticeably an age of popularization and commercialization. Even the serious literature, in order to survive, had to adapt itself to this new world that lacked ethical values and principles. Psychological theories of Freud and other made symbolism quite significant in presenting the literary work and also the stream of consciousness evolved as a very considerable literary technique. "In a world of increasing socialization, standardization and uniformity, the aim was to stress uniqueness, the purely personal, in experience, in one of the mechanical rationality, to assert other modes through which human beings can express themselves, to see life as a series of emotional intensities involving a logic different from that of the rational world and capturable only in dissociated images of stream of consciousness musings." In addition, realism became major part of literature instead of an inclination towards pastoralism and romanticism. Usually avoided facts about life now found place in the modern literature, for instance, war slums and camps, prostitution and other realities were incorporated along with heavy doze of cynicism and satire. Along with traditional forms of literature—novel, drama and poetry—a great amount of literary criticism was produced during this age. The works of art were interpreted through sciences like psychology, anthropology, semantics, linguistics, etc. Many schools of criticism, (for example The New Critics, The Marxist, The Moralists, The Psychological school, The Impressionists, The Formalists, Archetypal Criticism, The Historical Criticism), contributed to this field,

Fiction of the 20th century

The foremost feature of modern writing, perhaps, could be that things not very often begin when and where they are expected or supposed to begin. Indeed the very concepts of beginning and ending become debatable, as Lawrence writes: " In the beginning—there never was any beginning". In fact, James Joyce's Finnegans Wake actually ends in a peculiar manner—the opening sentence being the completion of the final one, the final sentence hence once again turning the reader back to the beginning of the work.

Rise of the Novel: there has perhaps never been so radical a change in any branch of literature, as that which came over the English Novel in the first half of this century. Not only has it mirrored the change in the external world, like every art medium, but it has also developed internally. The English Novel right from its beginning, has been monopoly of the English Bourgeoisie, and so dealt mainly with the social and economic culture of the age. The traditional novelists took their stable society for granted. They never questioned its beliefs or values, and tread their characters in relation to the society. What is more important is the fact of that these novelists were assured that their readers shared all their views, shared the basic assumption of the sanctity of social

institutions, family, church etc, and necessity to conform to the rules of such institution. This opinion and approach to novel writing reached its peak in Victorian England.

Yet towards the end of the 19th Century, disillusions with bourgeois complacency and commercialism crept in, and this was a major external force in the rise of what we call 'the modern' novel. Ironically enough, it began with the Victorians themselves. George Eliot and Emily Bronte questioned the basic of an individual's links and society. Tennyson began to doubt the linear progress of his and his contemporaries' works. This generated interest in discovering new themes and new ways of expressing them and gradually the break with the past was achieved. Of course, there was now startling jump from one type of novel to the other. The subject matter became increasingly critical of Victorian materialism, sex was no longer a taboo, but still the tradition was not completely done away with. One cannot deny the presence of Victorian elements in the early works of all the major modern writers. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers is in main-stream of typical Victorian fiction, despite his candid views on sexuality. This is particularly true of Forster and Huxley, who, one feels have never managed to make a complete break with traditional novelists. Affinities in both technique and theme have been studied between Lawrence and Hardy, Conrad and Dickens, Woolf and Sterne. Yet all these novelists—Lawrence, Virginia Woolf, Conrad and Joyce—were steadily making trime and paving the way for the modern novel.

At the same time, the hold of society over the individual was loosening. Man was emerging as an individual in his own right and not merely a member of society. Church, family and schools (all institutions) were no longer the prime concern of the indiduals. The writers of this period could no longer take it for granted that their impression held good for others, For society, which formed the basis of beliefs shared by the reader and writer, was no longer the major motivating force. It is this breakdown of what David Daiches calls a 'public sense of significance' (the shared belief of the writer and reader of what is significant in human experience), that forced sensitive artists to discover new ways of expressing new themes and feelings.

This breakdown was the result not only of social and economic cause as the Industrial Revolution, but also related to remarkable discovery made in psychology and other areas. One such discovery was Henry Bergson's concept of *Law duree*. Bergson asserts that clock time is artificial, and that 'mental' time is the only natural time. Time, he said, is a continuous, heterogeneous flow, which cannot be characterized by separate moments. According to this theory then a novel of linear progress, which moved from situation to situation in a fixed chronological statement, was not a 'real' rendering of human experience. Therefore, a new kind of narrative developed to capture the reality, the essence of human experience—since it emphasized fluctuating time, which constantly moved backward and forward. In such a narrative structure there is no tension between the past, the present and the future, because a character can proceed from one to another as often as he wants to. One of the first novelists to use this technique was Marcel Proust. His work influenced every major twentieth century English novelist as is evident from such works as, *Nostromo*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, *To the Lighthouse, Ulysses, a Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and more.

Together with this new concept of time was the changing concept of human consciousness influenced by the work of Freud and other psychologists. The fact emphasized in this concept was the "multiplicity of consciousness". That is to say, an individual's consciousness is the sum total of all that he has ever experienced and his cultural affinities with the members of his race. So, actually the past does not exist separately. What we term the 'past' exist along with the present determining every response of ours. So a novelist who seeks to project the total view of his characters, has to effectively communicate the simultaneity of the characters' different levels of consciousness. Since the traditional novelist had not been faced with such a problem, the modern novelist had to evolve an appropriate technique. This resulted in the stream of consciousness technique.

These then are the three major forces that resulted in the growth of the modern novel. They also influenced the major theme of the modern literature—the theme of an "individual's loneliness". Since all beliefs in religion, family and other institutions were completely shattered; the modern writer was a completely isolated

figure. No longer could he depend on the stability of the conventions, he had to forge completely new relationships based on a different set of values. Since most modern novelists have undergone this experience personally, it forms the keynote of their major works. Thus, we have Lawrence and Joyce re-living their own experiences through the characters of their novels. In their works and in those of other major novelists, "loneliness is seen as the necessary condition of man" (David Daiches). Yet their main preoccupation is not this isolation, but to find a way through which harmony can be achieved. A way through which a modern man cut adrift, can achieve satisfying relationships.

Each novelist views this problem in his own way, for instance, Lawrence believed that the solution lay in love which recognized the mystical core of otherness in the beloved. Therefore, we see towards the end of the century, the concept of what was significant in human experience changed under the influence of psychology and related fields of knowledge. No longer was a man's exterior personality or his behaviour in society considered important. Stress was now laid on his internal make up; the working of his mind, his responses to a world that was essentially hostile and his search for an identity in this world. The modern novel is the result of the novelists' effects to deal with such problems, to define them and suggest a possible solution.

Techniques used in the modern novel

As it has already been discussed the modern novel emerged in altogether a different kind of environment with diverse changes in its themes and techniques, there by defining the very concept of the novel.

Stream of Consciousness: it a psychological term that refers to a literary technique in the twentieth century and gained immense popularity within the genre of the modern novel. Leon Edel writes that "between 1913 and 1915 was born the modern psychological novel—what we have come to call in English letters the stream of consciousness novel". Robert Humphery defines stream of consciousness fiction as the type, "in which the basic emphasis is placed on the exploration of the free speech levels of consciousness for the purpose, primarily of revealing the "psychic being of characters". The use of this technique is coincidental with the turning inward process of the English novel; it is a technique to document authentically the mental process or to capture "the atmosphere of the mind". Many writers find this technique highly realistic and facilitating greater truthfulness in the presentation of the character. It is important to note that stream of consciousness is not the same as the "point of view". The latter aims at analyzing the character from various perspectives or angles. Neither can stream of consciousness technique be equated with impressionism because the object under consideration is static. The origin of the term lies with the psychologist, William James, who believed that an individual's consciousness is continuous but constantly changing: "Consciousness does not appear to itself chopped up bits. Such words as 'chain' and 'train' do not describe it fitly as it presents itself in the first instance. It is nothing that is pointed; rather it flows. A river or a stream is metaphor by which it is most naturally described. On talking about it hereafter, let us call it the stream of thought or consciousness, or subjective life." In other words, one understands from the above explanation that the consciousness of a person is always in a flux and the task of the novelist is to arrest this flux.

There are certain techniques used in the presentation of stream of consciousness:

Interior monologue: Robert Humphrey defines this technique as "the method used in fiction for representing the psychic content and processes of character, partly or entirely just as these processes exist at various levels of the conscious control before they are formulated for deliberate speech". This is not the same as dramatic monologue, for the latter is the verbalized form of the contents of consciousness. In the direct interior monologue technique, the consciousness of the character is rendered with minimum interference from the author. There are no guidelines or authorial comment, and the actual lecture, the very essence of the character's consciousness is reported. This is done by the character himself. The classic example is the last forty five pages of James Joyce's Ulysses—the detailed wanderings of the consciousness of Molly Bloom. In these pages the author disappears entirely. The monologue is in the first person and keeps no rule of grammar. The incoherence is emphasized by a total lack of punctuation and the indistinct limitations of time and space. Nor is the monologue

directed to either the reader or any character. Leopold Bloom, the only other character in the scene is asleep. What we have here is a perfect example of the direct monologue technique, represented by the un-inhabited flow of Molly's consciousness. Joyce has gone a step futher, by using a variation of this direct interior monologue technique, in trying to depict dream consciousness in Finnegans Wake.

Where as direct monologue, the author rarely intrudes, in ''**indirect interior monologue**'', the continuous presence of the author is implied. So instead of the narration proceeding in the person indirect monologue, the second or third person is used. This naturally lenda more coherence and unity to the subject matter. For, while the consciousness of the character is rendered directly, the author is always at hand to guide the reader through it. All the same that basic quality of interior monologue-the direct presentation of a character's consciousness is retained. Virginia Woolf's novels are based mainly on this technique, particularly, Mrs. Dalloway and To the Lighthouse. Edward Dujardin was however the first novelist to use this technique of interior monologue in his novel Les Lauriers Sont Coupes (1881).

There are certain techniques (uniquely twentieth century) used by nearly all stream of consciousness writers, which Humphery terms '**cinematic' devices**. As the very name implies these are borrowed from the cinema. One of these devices is the **time and space montage**. Montage, as Humphery explains is essentially a technique to show different views of a single subject. This forms an important aspect of stream of consciousness fiction, for in depicting the consciousness of a character, the novelist has to break all barriers of time and space. This technique works in two ways. One is that in which the character remains fixed in space and his consciousness moves freely intermingling the past, present and future. This has been freely used by Virginia Woolf and there are many instances of it in To the Lighthouse.

The second method of montage is that in which the time element is fixed and the spatial element changes. This is known as space montage. For example of this in literature, the famous ""Wandering Rocks" episode in Ulysses. This technique is also known as 'multiple-view, for at a given time, the consciousness of several characters can be described-their individual responses to the same stimulus'

Aspects that Characterize the Modern Experimental Novel

Purpose of the Novel: Before twentieth century the novelists were primarily concerned with the creation of memorable characters. The experimental novel asks instead "What is the experience of living?" The focus, unlike the previous writers, was not so much on the social and economic pressures that dictate the occurrences of one's life. In fact, the emphasis is laid on the critical reappraisal. For instance, Henry James intentionally made the characters of his novel financially self-sufficient so that the economic demands do not become an over riding factor in the novel. The novel, therefore, no longer remains as a mere source of entertainment and pastime.

Withering away of the external plot: the readers of 20th century novel would usually complain that not much happened in the novels. The novelists in this age were more concerned about the inner life of the characters rather than highlighting the outside or the external events of one's life. The conflict therefore, moved to the warring elements within the character. As M.H. Abrams writes: "Since 1920s, a number of writers of prose fiction and drama have deliberately designed their works to frustrate the expectations that the reader or auditor has formed by habituation to traditional plots."

Absence of the Hero: the experimental novel has discarded the concept of heroism and the reader would seldom find a truly likable character. In the earlier novels the hero and the villain were obvious but now the no character is all good or all bad rather they have shades of grey.

Complexity: Seeking to portray not so much what people do or say as what they actually are, the experimental novelist finds none of the old ethical simplicity but discovers a vast and chaotic world within even the outwardly mundane character. Change and alteration produce within a personality a ceaseless fluidity that destroys the old rigidity of character and reveals disturbing contradictions and complexities.

Irrationality: Increasingly, the experimental novel in exploring the inner life, has found that man does not act from reason, as earlier novels assumed, but rather is motivated by deep unconscious sources of primordial origin.

Modern novelists can be divided into those who continue within a broad tradition of realism and those who experiment far more with the form of the novel. Writers like John Glasworthy, Arnold Bennett, Graham Greene, Iris Murdoch, Doris Lessing, Earnest Hemingway are essentially realists. They are less intrusive than 19th century realists, presenting a credible picture in which we are not particularly aware of the narrator's presence. They deal with social, personal and ethical problems and offer us an entertaining, but at the same time, an instructive look at how people cope with life in the 20th century.

The outstanding novelist within the tradition is D.H. Lawrence whose novels conform to the usual model of presenting characters at odds with the society, but Lawrence goes much further than the other writers in a romantic quest for an alternative way of life. Lawrence's writing is committed to exploring fresh areas of experience, and writes in an emotional style that suits his subject matter, never forgetting that his characters are bound by demands of ordinary existence. The most striking feature of the 20th century novel is the extraordinary degree of formal experiment and innovation. This begins with the works of Joseph Conrad and Henry James. The reasons for such testing and originality were the disappearance of shared values and beliefs. A new awareness of individual psychology came into existence. It was realized that each individual has a unique perception of the world and life, thus calling for more emphasis on the mind of the individual.

Important writers of this age

Thomas Hardy: He was not only the last of the great Victorians but also the forerunner of the modern novel. Hardy's writings show human beings facing up to the assaults of a destructive power. He accepted the theory of evolution and as a result had little hope left for individuals. He was always trying to depict human condition in general rather than narrating a story of a particular individual's life. Through his serious fiction Hardy presented his view of life that was quite different from his contemporaries like Tennyson and Browning. He is very often called a pessimist as is at the end of *The Mayor of Casterbridge*: "happiness was but the occasional episode in the general drama of pain".

Hardy's preoccupation with his "philosophy of life is seen in the way in which he pierces into his novels to point an accusing finger at destiny or to take the side of his protagonists, and in the very often use of coincidence of accidents which he looks for to his case. Too often his plots center upon a sequence of accidents which have the most grim consequences, and, therefore, while he rarely fails to inspire in his readers his own deep pity for the sufferings of his characters, he frequently fails to attain the highest tragic levels. Allied with this use of coincidence are a fondness for the fantastic or unusual and a weakness for the melodramatic. Yet he handles striking situations with great firmness of touch and a telling realism, and all his best novels contain individual scenes, which are unforgettable.

The characters of his novels are mostly ordinary men and women not forming a part of the higher strata of the society. The individuality of some is sacrificed to Hardy's view of life' but while he is, by more modern standards, not really deep in his psychological analysis, characters like Jude and Sue, Tess, Henchard, and Eustacia Vye show considerable intricacy of interpretation. Such figures as Gabriel Oak (*Far from the Madding Crowd*) and Diggory Venn (*The Return of the Native*) are finely realized, country types blending with the countryside to which they belong, while the minor rustics, who are briefly sketched but readily visualized, are a frequent source of pithy humour, and act as a chorus commenting on the actions of the chief protagonists.

Hardy's boyhood was spent mainly in the country, and he had an acute and sensitive observation of natural phenomena: "Without overwhelming you with his intimate knowledge of natural phenomena, he can make you feel, by his delicate and multifold allusiveness, the significance of country's life". As a unifying influence in his novels, the Wessex scene, which he immortalized, is second only to his philosophy. But nature provides more than just a background and many times it takes the role of a protagonist in the story, an unfeeling impersonal

force exerting its influence upon the life of the characters. Interestingly, his understanding and perception of nature gives the reader inkling into his view about men and women.

Henry James: Born in New York, Henry James was educated in America and Europe. He became a prolific writer with novels, short stories, travel sketches, literary criticism, autobiography and was also a friend of the New England group of writers—among them were James Russell Lowell, H.W. Longfellow and William Dean Howells. A study of James is important for the analysis of the modern novel for the reason that he was the first to view it as an artistic form. To him novel was primarily an art form to be judged solely by artistic canons, concerned, not with moral purpose, but with the objective and impartial presentation of the reality of life. In this picture there is no place for the extravagance of romance or the distortions of sentimentality. He was not much concerned with the external or with detailed and elaborate study of the subtlest shades of human reactions to the situations which he conceived. Moreover, his work shows the steady evolution of technique to replace the outworn convention. He saw unlimited possibilities of artistic achievement for the novelist: "the advantage, the luxury as well as the torment and responsibility of the novelist, is that there is no limit to what he may attempt as an executant—no limit to his possible experiments, efforts, discoveries, successes."

The key to James's choice of subject is to be found in his own life. An American fascinated by the charm of an older civilization, he finds a great many of his themes in the impact of one type of society upon the product of another, in the study of the processes of adjustment and their effect upon the development of an individual character. An intellectual and a member of an intellectual family, James through out his novels portrays life of the people such as himself. He is concerned with the man as a social being, not with the deeper relations of man with his God. There is not much of elemental passion in his novels because the chosen field is a sophisticated, intellectual society, except in so far as they are shown under the influence of mind. Identifying the good with the beautiful, he regards taste, artistic sensibility, and individual integrity as the prime virtues. On the other hand he sees ugliness and meanness of spirit as the great evils. James is often concerned In the development of a character as apart of the social group. He is absolutely not interested in the poor or in the unintelligent. His characters and figures are usually sensitive, refined, sophisticated, controlling impulse by reason, and endowed with faculty for acute self-analysis. They are capable of viewing their own motives and reactions with a remarkable detachment and an equal degree of subtlety.

Joseph Conrad: He was a sailor and an adventurer and his works reflect this character of the author. He presents situations that cannot be really explained through the conventional and accepted notions: "the world of significance that he creates is far removed from the Victorian worlds of public significance and this is what makes him the first important modern novelist in English". His method of writing a novel is best found in his preface to *The Nigger of Narcissus*—"My task which I am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word, to make you hear, to make you feel—it is before all, to make you see". The characters of Conrad's novels did not convey just a single point of view but a variety of them. His technique of writing novels involved shifts of time as well as double narrator scheme. His novel *Heart of Darkness* is an excellent example of this.

Lawrence's Fiction

Lawrence's theory of novel takes, unswervingly, from his notion of man and his relationship to the universe. Lawrence ardently believed that man was not an isolated being rather he was well integrated within the cosmos. "There is in his novels a furious struggle between those who live, or more appropriately, seek to live in their soul and those who translate a mental concept of life into the process of living. The novel for him seeks to establish the perennial, man-universe relationship. This essential quality is, as Lawrence calls it, the fourth dimension, like a myth the Lawrentian type of novel present these truths about the man-universe relationship that are above the limiting boundaries of time and circumstance. The human plane of the novel thus is a paradigm of the mythical plane because the interaction of character and action repeats the mythical aspect of experience. The mythopoetic vision express itself in a rhythmical movement of the prose".

It will be useful to learn what a great literary figure like T.S. Eliot has to say about Lawrence: "he was an impatient and impulsive man (or so I imagine him to have been; for, like the author of this book I never knew him). He was a man of fitful and profound insights, rather than of ratiocinative powers; and therefore he was an impatient man; he expressed some of the insights in the form least likely to make them acceptable to most of his contemporaries, and sometimes in a form which almost willfully encouraged misunderstanding… wrong he often was (I think) from ignorance, prejudice, or, drawing the wrong conclusion in his conscious mind from the insights which came to him from below consciousness: it will take time to dissociate the superficial error from the fundamental truth. To me, also, he seems often to write badly; but to be writer who had to write often badly in order to write sometimes well."

Lawrence did not believe in following the conventions of his time and his work is thus regarded as a revolt against the values and ideals of the nineteenth century. "Lawrence, in that ultimate spark of spontaneity, the essential untouchable naivety at the centre of all true human beings, rejects both the false 'individuality' of the liberal tradition and the increasing socialization of his times. His triumph was to see them as joint manifestations of the same basic outlook, involving the evaluation of the ego or spurious self the conscious entity with which every individual is saddled'—the conceptualizing self, not the unified sensibility. In essence too this was his case against the positive assault. In reaction against the abstraction of the intellect, the failure of reason to capture adequately the sheer flux and flow of experience, there has been a counter assertion of the need to convey emotional immediacy, a grasping after the moment, a subjective insistence on the force of inner feeling."

During the reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901), England was going through a difficult phase. As a result of industrialization, life had become very mechanical and the vibrancy and vivacity had given way to artificiality and uniformity. Moreover, the society was compartmentalized into classes and these class barriers curtailed the growth of relationships between people. Above all, the state religion, Christianity, was turning cold with its restraints and prohibitions. Individuals were feeling suffocated as simple passions were repressed and the natural course of things were always interfered and arbitrated. Lawrence was in opposition to all these things and tried to rebel against the standards dictated by the social authorities, especially those dealing with personal lives of individuals. As a result, we find Lawrence's inclination towards the psyche of a person, which has control over the behaviour and to some extent on the character of an individual. But Lawrence did not concern himself with the regular feelings and commotions experienced by an individual; rather his aim was to open the doors to the restricted areas of the human psyche and sexual experience was one of those areas that were forbidden from being openly discussed.

An essential feature of his fiction is that the central character is always proceeding from a partial or mechanical existence into organic wholeness. Lawrence used the novel as a carrier of his own interpretation of life, very much concerned with the basic problems of human existence and relationships among human beings. Therefore, the relationship between man and woman and their sexual conflict became a major part of his study. Lawrence had once declared: "I can write what I feel strongly about; and, that at present, is the relation between men and women. After all, it is the problem of today. The establishment of new relations, or the adjustment of the old ones, between men and women…". For Lawrence complete happiness in life is not possible unless sexual harmony is attained. Modernity for Lawrence meant free and frank treatment of sex and his attitude towards life was deeply rooted in sexual mysticism. It is not just a physical process meant for only pleasure or reproduction but is capable of much more as a critic has commented: "To him [Lawrence]…sexual experience was a door to new realms of consciousness, and initiation into divine mysteries, the mysteries of the other world that is close behind us." He tried to highlight the contrast between the modern mechanized world and the natural living.

He was quite inclined towards the study of the development of one's individuality but this study was not based merely on the intellectual abilities of an individual but also on the impulses and senses that play a significant role in shaping the personality of a person. Apparently, Lawrence's themes are concerned about the passions and instincts of the heart rather than the working of the mind. As F.R. Leavis puts it: "Life is fulfilled in the

individual or nowhere; but without a true marital relation, which is creative in more than the sense of producing children, there can be no fulfillment; that is the burden of Lawrence's art". He allotted a superior position to the impulses and believed that intellect is responsible for annihilation of life's excitement and destroys the liveliness. In his own words: "Life and action take rise actually at the great centres of dynamic consciousness". He fully agreed with modern psychologists who argued that there are layers of consciousness—the conscious, the subconscious and the unconscious—and Lawrence felt that if one lapses back into the unconscious self "only then will you act straight from the dark sources of life, outwards, which is creative life".

Lawrence ardently believed in the presence of "dark mystery" of life and he saw all living forms instilled with it. Lawrence was, in fact, of the opinion that the "dark mystery" could not be known through intellect. Moreover, natural and untamed ideas are cannot be accessible through intellect but may be known through the instincts and intuitions. He had once written to Katherine Mansfield: "We must grow from our deepest underground roots, out of the unconscious, not from the conscious concepts which we falsely call ourselves". For reasons like this Lawrence and his writings have often been criticized and condemned for being immoral and obscene by many but on the other hand F. R. Leavis defend him against such charges and E.M. Forster regards him as "the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation".

From a literary point of view also Lawrence can be looked upon as a radical in the sense that he did not constrict his writing to the pre-laid rules or models. He questioned the traditional methods of novel writing: "he felt that the novel could become more personal and less objective if he saw the possibility that language could describe in detail the personal experiences of emotion and passion as it were from the inside". Lawrence was to a great extent influenced by Thomas Hardy. Hardy's novels are usually set against natural background which play an important role in the development of action instead of being just a background for the story. In case of Lawrence also the imagery is significant to bring out the essence of the scene and enhance the emotions and sentiments of the characters. For Lawrence a novel was a religious art in which he could speak of and to the whole man.

An autobiographical note runs through most of Lawrece's novel. As Middleton Murry believes: "Lawrence was a tortured soul for full forty-five years of his life, and his writings are an expression of his inner suffering, frustration and emotional complexes. They are all in the nature of personal revelations, some more, some less, but the autobiographical note runs through them all"; another commentator feels that "the most striking feature of Lawrence's characters is the resemblance they bear to their creator". Lawrence's writings seem quite impulsive and natural and he reader feels that the writings are the result of author's inner compulsion coming out with all the force.

Lawrence with his protests against "idealization" and his assertion of the poetry of "the immediate present" which has "no perfection, no consummation, nothing finished" questions, thus: "The ideal—what is the ideal? A figment. An abstraction…It is a figment of before and after. It is a crystallized aspiration, or a crystallized remembrance: crystallized, set, finished. It is a thing set apart, in the great storehouse of eternity, the storehouse of finished things." (Preface to Poems)

The reason for all the misery and turmoil, for Lawrence, was the fact that human beings were becoming more and more dependent on reason rather than their impulses and emotions. The so-called modern age was emphasizing on the intellectualization of life and discarding the spontaneous and instinctive response to life. Lawrence had written to his friend Ernest Collings: "My own religion is the belief in blood, the flesh as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But whatever blood feels and says is always true. The intellect is only bit and bridle. What do I care about knowledge? All I want is to answer to my blood, direct, without fribbling intervention of mind, on moral or what not." Also, with industrialization, there was an overwhelming change in the attitude of people. The society had shifted to a materialistic approach towards life and detachment from emotional sentiments resulted in killing of natural instincts.

Lawrence's philosophy can be defined in the following words: "throughout his career he had been anti-materialistic, since materialism for him blunts sensibility, he is for shearing away the relics of dead faiths, of philosophies that

clog the free play of the impulses and he rejects Christianity and Platonism with equal scorn". One way of seeking escape from this materialism was living among nature and thus he traveled to places like Italy, Australia and Mexico. Lawrence was filled with horror at the growing materialism and selfishness, the increasing ugliness, sordidness and meanness, consequent upon the rapid industrialization of the country. Lawrence is nostalgic for the bright sensory life that town civilization is steadily destroying and like a neo-romantic craves for contact with the earth.

David Daiches, commenting on Lawrence's philosophy of life, feels: "he soon came to feel the deadness of modern industrial civilization with the mechanizing of personality, the corruption of the will, and the dominance of sterile intellect over the authentic inward passions of men, which he saw as the inevitable accompaniment of modern life. But he has no patience with political or social panaceas. Sometimes he talked as a wild anarchist asserting that everything must be pulled down or blown up so that a new start might be made. But the vision conveyed by his characteristic novels is not political in any way, even in a destructive anarchist way. He is concerned always with human relationships, with the relation of the self to other selves, with the possibilities of fulfillment of personality, and with exposing all the dead formulas—about romantic love, about friendship, about marriage, about the good life which can cause so much deadness of frustration or distortion in the life of the individual. There is nearly always a strong autobiographical element in his novels; he never attempts, as Joyce does (and Joyce uses autobiography too, but in a wholly different way), to construct a self-contained world outside himself and his readers with its own structure and its own *livableness*. He projects his novels from the very centre of his own passionate experience so that they act out, sometimes tentatively, sometimes fiercely, sometimes desperately, his own deepest insights and forms of awareness, and the lyric and the dramatic modes interpenetrate each other." On the other hand Aldous Huxley sums up his philosophy in the following words: "Lawrence could never forget, as most of us almost continuously forget the dark presence of the "otherness" that lies beyond the boundaries of man's conscious mind. This special sensibility was accompanied by a prodigious power of rendering the immediately experienced others in terms of literary art".

Principal Works

Novels: The White Peacock (1911), The Trespasser (1912), Sons and Lovers (1913), The Rainbow (1915), Women in Love (1920), The Lost Girl (1920), Aaron's Rod (1922) Kangaroo (1923), The Boy in the Bush (1924), The Plumed Serpent (1926), Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928), The Virgin and The Gypsy (1930).

Poems: Love Poems and Others (1913), Amores (1916), Look! We Have Come Through (1917), New Poems (1918), Bay (1919), Tortoises (1921), Birds, Beasts and Flowers (1923), Pansies (1929), Nettles (1930), Last Poems (1932), Fire and Other Poems (1940).

Short Stories: The Prussian Officer and Other Stories (1914), England, My England (1922), The Ladybird (1923), St. Mawr, together with the Princess (1925), The Woman Who Rode Away (1928), Love Among the Haystacks (1930), The Lovely Lady and Other Stories (1933), A Modern Lover (1934).

Essays: Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious (1921), Fantasia of the Unconscious (1922), Studies in Classic American Literature (1923), Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine (1925), Phoenix (1936).

Plays: The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd (1914), Touch and Go (1920), David (1926), A Collier's Friday Night (1934).

Travel Sketches: Twilight in Italy (19160, Sea and Sardinia (1921), Mornings in Mexico (1927), Eiruscan places (1932).

Bildungsroman

"Bildung" is a German word that means "formation" or "shaping" and "Roman" in German language means a "novel". Thus, Bildungsroman is a novel that describes the youthful development of the protagonist who normally attempts to integrate his/her experience by the end of the novel. It is a novel which tends to draw more directly and heavily on the writer's memory of his/her own life than do most other forms of fiction. With

this goes the tendency for the author and narrator to identify more closely with the protagonist of the novel than is usually the case. Such a genre has both the feeling of authenticity associated with an autobiographical work and the integrity and detachment of the fictional writer. Within the tradition of "Bildungsromam" there is the further genre of "Kiinstlerroman". In German Kiinstler means an "artist". Therefore, "Kiinstlerroman" is a novel that shows the development of an artist. Paul's description of the kind of painting he aspires to directs the reader to the kind of writing Lawrence is attempting to write. Paul claims to be painting not "the stiffness of the shape" but "the shimmeriness" which is "the real living" and "which is inside really". For Lawrence the self is:

a thing of kisses and strife

a lit-up shaft of rain

a calling column of blood

a rose tree bronzey with thorns

a mixture of yea and nay

a rainbow of love and hate

a wind that blows back and forth

a creature of beautiful peace, like a river

and a creature of conflict, like a cataract."

(Death is not Evil, Evil is Mechanical)

Summary

The novel opens with the description of mines and related activities. The cottages of the miners formed the village of Bestwood. The industrialization had just begun with coal and iron fields at Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire being discovered. Within the new set-up there are two residential units—the Squares and the Bottoms. Initially Mrs. Morel was not interested to move into the Bottoms, but when she got an end house with an extra strip of garden, she moved in. Mrs. Gertrude Morel had a refined taste and an intellectual background. She is a mother of two children—William and Annie—and is expecting her third baby. A wife of a miner, she is now disappointed and dejected with her life. She had met her husband at a Christmas party and taken to like him for the mere reason that she found him different from others. It was not very long before love and affection begins to diminish from their conjugal relationship. Frequent quarrels and clashes disrupt the peace of the family life. Two unhappy episodes accelerate the widening of the gap between husband and wife. The first is the clipping of William's hair by Morel and then one night Morel comes home drunk and a very violent quarrel ensues. Thus, the antagonism between the two opposites—husband and wife—goes on increasing. As the sons grow, first William and then Paul, they replace the husband in Mrs. Morel's life. She continues to have arguments with her husband, some of which have painful results: on separate occasions, she is locked out of the house and hit in the head with a drawer. Estranged from her husband, Mrs. Morel takes comfort in her children, especially her sons.

Paul, the third child and the second son, is born and Mrs. Morel's affections begin to transfer from the eldest son to Paul and a special bond seems to develop between Paul and his mother. Meanwhile Morel falls ill which brings which results in some peaceful period in the house and makes Mrs. Morel a little tolerant towards her husband. Another baby, named Arthur is born as a result of this cordial period. However, as the children grow old, Morel is reduced to a non-entity in the house and with time feels alienated. The children grow up hating their father and Paul goes to the extent of praying for his father's death. William moves to London and Paul becomes the centre of his mother's love and attention.

Mrs. Morel, over the years, gets very possessive about her sons. She cannot tolerate any other woman in their lives. The sons also, on the other hand, feel uncomfortable in making new relations especially with girls and are

not able to come to terms with their growing sexual instincts. William, however, manages to free himself from this mother-son bond when he is engaged to Lily. He brings her home on Christmas to introduce her to his family. On another visit, without Lily, he seems completely worn out and sad. He even harps about the theme of death and wonders if lily would ever visit his grave. Unfortunately, on returning back to London, William falls seriously ill and never recovers. The family is completely shattered with William's death and then Paul also fails ill but to Mrs. Morel's consolation, gets better. After William's death and Paul's recovery from serious illness, Mrs. Morel's "life now rooted itself in Paul". From that point on, Paul becomes the focus of her life, and the two seem to live for each other.

With the arrival of Miriam the novel enters into new complexities. Paul falls in love with Miriam Leivers, who lives on a farm not too far from the Morel family. They carry on a very intimate, but purely platonic, relationship for many years. The suppression or denial of physical pleasure results in tension and conflict, not only between the couple but also inside them individually. Also, Paul is unable to free himself from the strong mother-pull. And the mother never leaves an opportunity to convey her dislike for Miriam and her disapproval of any kind of relationship that Paul might be thinking of developing with Miriam. The burning of bread incident reveals a couple of facts. First, Paul feels passionately for Miriam and is aware that Miriam has similar feelings for him, yet their love cannot culminate. Something is always holding them back.

Mrs. Morel is very annoyed over the burnt bread and blames Miriam for it and is angry with Paul for neglecting her. Paul consoles and reassures his mother about his devotion for her. Furthermore, he asserts that he did not really love Miriam and that nothing can distract his attention from his mother and his home. Mrs. Morel, in return, "kissed him a long fervent kiss". Finally, Paul is sure that he feels very strongly for his mother and thus, decides to break off with Miriam. They come to the conclusion that perhaps they did not love each other enough to get married. However, within himself Paul was going through feeling of turmoil and utter confusion. He still had mixed feelings for Miriam that were very difficult to resolve.

Paul meets Clara Dawes, a suffragette who is separated from her husband, through Miriam. Paul is straight away attracted towards Clara and wants to get closer to her. Meanwhile, Annie is married to Leonard and Arthur returns from army. With Annie gone and Arthur being no better than an outside visitor, it is Paul who is left to be the only companion to Mrs. Morel. However, Paul cannot get rid of the restlessness and the dilemma. On one hand he wants to go back to Miriam while on the other he is drawn strongly towards Clara.

As a painter Paul managed to receive some acclamation and Mrs. Morel is very pleased with her son's success. Paul begins to socialize and meet new people but is never at peace with himself. He, once, goes to Clara's place and comes to know about her poor condition. He manages to get a job for her at Jordan's but Clara is not welcomed by some of the old employees. The girls at the work place celebrate Paul's birthday but do not involve Clara in the celebrations. Later, when the secret is disclosed, Clara makes up by sending a volume of verse to Paul. As he becomes closer with Clara and they begin to discuss their relationships. When Paul complaints about Miriam's attitude towards him, Clara does not hesitate to declare that Miriam had always desired him and not any kind of union of soul. She tells him that he should consider consummating their love and he returns to Miriam to see how she feels. Paul and Miriam sleep together and are briefly happy, but shortly afterward Paul decides that he does not want to marry Miriam, and so he breaks off with her. She still feels that his soul belongs to her, and, in part agrees reluctantly. Even physical consummation is not able to bring the long desired fulfillment. He realizes that he loves his mother most, however.

After breaking off his relationship with Miriam, Paul begins to spend more time with Clara and they begin an extremely passionate affair. Their relationship seems to be free from any sense of guilt or mental reservation; rather there is a sense of freedom and a feeling of delight. However, in spite of the intensity in their relationship, there is something missing. Clara painfully realized it: "together they had received the baptism of life, each through the other; but now their missions were separate. Where he wanted to go she could not come with him. They would have to part sooner or later". Clara seems to prefer Baxter to Paul and does not want to divorce her husband and so Paul and Clara can never be married. Paul's mother falls ill and he devotes much of his

time to caring for her. Paul could not bear to see her mother in so much pain and suffering more and more each day.

At last, Paul decided with his sister Annie to give an over dose of morphine to Mrs. Morel and release her from the pangs and miseries of life. When she finally dies, he is broken-hearted and feels lonely. He senses a kind of vacuum in his life after the support system, his mother, is no more. Everything around him seems to have lost its meaning, it seemed different and unreal, and he moved around aimlessly. Nature also did not have a soothing effect on his mind. He felt a little comfortable only in the darkness of night. One evening he unexpectedly meets Miriam and spends some time with her. He does not react to the news of Miriam's employment, which irritates her a little. Miriam is shocked to find Paul wasting his life. She is so overwhelmed with love and sympathy that she plainly proposes marriage. She felt that only by becoming his wife could she do something to help him. She confesses that she is always thinking about Paul. On this Paul replies, "I know you do. But – you love me so much, you want to put me in your pocket. And I should die there smothered". Miriam falls back with utter pain and frustration. This was the end of their relationship. Miriam was ready to sacrifice herself for their relationship but Paul was not ready for this.

While going back to town, Paul takes note of the country beyond the town and the dark night enveloping the surroundings. He thinks about his mother and feels her presence in his soul. It was time for him to make the choice between darkness and light and finally "turning sharply, he walked towards the city's gold phosphorescence…He would not take that direction, to the darkness, to follow her. He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly".

Aims and Structure (Sons and Lovers)

Henry James, writing of Hawthorne's novel *The Scarlet Letter*, said:

"It is simpler and more complete than his other novels; it achieves more perfectly what it attempts, and it has about it that charm, very hard to express, which we find in artist's work the first time he has touched his highest mark—as sort of straightness and naturalness of execution, an unconsciousness of his public, and freshness of interest in his theme."

The same can be commented in case of Lawrence as well. His first two novels, The Trespasse (1912) and The White Peacock (1911) are quite assuring but slight. Lawrence himself in a letter refers to them disapprovingly as "a florid prose poem [and] a decorated idyll". The opulence and embellishment is replaced in *Sons and Lovers* by "a flexible and economical style, and the implied triviality gives rise to a subject of compelling interest and importance. The openness of the writer makes it easier for the reader to distinguish and counter "the stimulating tenseness that comes from Lawrence's obvious feeling of excitement and self-discovery of the progress from boyhood to manhood". Lawrence, unmistakably, is intensely involved in the situation he is dealing with; the exhilaration conveyed by the novel is that which accompanies the recollection in later years of the significant and formative era of one's life.

Sons and Lovers can be viewed as an endeavour to "reconstruct the stages of a movement into understanding and maturity that was still close enough to Lawrence to be remembered passionately, but distant enough to be recorded with objectivity". Lawrence chooses to explore and survey very natural experiences in one's period of life. Topics deal with growth, love in various forms, ever changing ideals resulting in conflicts within the personality, coming out of the secured cocoon of family into the outside world, being aware of one's sexuality and so on and so forth. However, it cannot be denied that the complexity of these experiences is dealt with an approach that is direct but does not, by any chance, over simplifies things. There is a well-defined story that is told in more or less a chronological progression. It is interesting to note that the events and activities are very common but at the same time they are not essentially universal. However the feelings and thoughts that are the result of such experiences can be comprehended even if they have not been experienced in particular by all. Lawrence is only narrating the events and leaving it for the story to speak for itself. Analyses of feeling

and motive rise naturally from recorded events that are presented fairly and squarely for the reader to contemplate and assess for himself/herself.

The characters of *Sons and Lovers* are real people with personal characteristics and are directly related to observable realities of everyday life. They are not abstractions designed to illustrate a theme, or embody an ideal, or enunciate a theory. The novel seems to give an impression that Lawrence has observed humanity as it is and not as it ought to be or as he would like it to be. These accurately observed people are placed in a world that is equally firmly based on a meticulous and often loving perception of the social customs, the habits and the day to day economic realities of the working class, given with such an eye for detail serves to reveal a wealth of unconscious assumptions and beliefs. In fact, if the novel had nothing else to offer, it would still be invaluable to the social historian as an authentic picture of working class life at the beginning of this century. "All this is done in a style that is generally simple, direct and precise, refreshingly free from the over-insistent rhythms of the later work and from words intended to carry a special meaning and portentous significance."

It would be a grave error on the part of the reader to interpret Lawrence's intentions as an attempt towards creation of characters that are either highly likable or highly detestable. Rather his intention is to create "recognizable human beings". it is very important to perceive the characters not as individuals within themselves but in relation to one another. It would appear that the comment made by Mrs. Moore in E.M. Forster's *Passage to India* that "though people are important, the relations between them are not" would not get the approval of Lawrence who believed that the importance of various events is based on the "developing patterns of intertwined lives". This is all the more emphasized in his novels, *The Rainbow* and *Women In Love* where the relations play a very significant role. At the same time, considering the construction of Morel in the first chapter of *Sons and Lovers*, one would realize the paradoxical nature of Lawrence's stance.

However, the focus of Lawrence's writing has predominantly been on the ways in which individuals counter and act in response to one another. In fact, much of his best work is found when he is describing emotions, impulses, reactions and responses or even physical sensations in all their complexities that arise as a result of interaction or mere contact with people. "It is not only that he traces the obvious effects and consequences of such meetings of personalities, showing how a new awareness of life, a new period of growth may follow from a chance meeting or how a life may be made painful by the consequences of a powerful but short lived emotion. This he certainly does, but this is the commonplace activity of any novelist interested at all in the interactions of human beings, the usual subject matter of the majority of novels. This is as it were a part of the iceberg that shows above the water, impressive in itself, but a very small part of the whole; it is the most obvious manifestation of an interest and a process that are much more subtle and penetrate much more deeply into the source of human individuality and behaviour.

Lawrence's great strength, the power that distinguishes him from any other novelist, lies in his capacity to perceive and convey the essential consciousness of each other that exists between two people or a group of people. This consciousness is not always at the level of intellectual awareness and recognition; he is dealing with the stage of awareness that comes before verbal formulation is possible, before it is possible to say to oneself 'That person is here, I am aware of him, he disturbs me', or a stage further, 'I dislike that person' or 'That person is attractive'. Lawrence is more concerned with the instinctive movements of sympathy or revulsion that make ultimately make possible such statements, and particularly those occasions on which sympathy and revulsion are simultaneous and co-existent—as witness the relationship between Paul and Miriam. Such feelings or instincts are the basis not only of attitudes that in a more advanced stage of their development can be recognized as love or hatred or indifference, that can be expressed in words, rationalized and put into neat categories, but of all human awareness of other human beings, and consequently of all human endings of old relationships. This simple scheme is perfectly adequate; the subtleties of *Sons and Lovers* are not in sophisticated organization or a concern with art for art's sake. The unity of the novel is organic in that it records developing lives and people in contact with each other moving from a beginning to the end."

Both thematically and structurally Mrs. Morel is the nucleus of the narrative. This reason for this is very clearly explained by the analysis of *Sons and Lovers*, which Lawrence made in a letter to Edward Garnett, dated November 14, 1912:

A woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class and has no satisfaction in her own life. She has had a passion for her husband, so the children are born of passions, and have heaps of vitality. But as her sons grow, she selects them as lovers—first the eldest, then the second. The sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother—urged on and on. But when they come to manhood, they can't love because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them…As soon as the young men come into contact with women there is a split. William gives his sex to a fribble, and his mother holds his soul. But the split kills him because he doesn't know where he is. The next son gets a woman who fights for his soul—fights his mother. The son loves the mother—all the sons hate and are jealous of their father. The battle goes on between the mother and the girl with the son as object. The mother gradually proves the stronger, because of the tie of blood. The son decides to leave his soul in his mother's possession and, like his elder brother, go for passion. He gets passion. Then the split begins to tell again. But, most unconsciously, the mother realizes what the matter is and begins to die. The son casts off his mistress, attends to his mother dying. He is left in the end naked of everything, with a drift towards death.

It is a great tragedy and I tell you that I have written a great book. It's the tragedy of—thousands of young men in England…"

The statement shows the emphasis that Lawrence lays on Mrs. Morel. Apparently, the mother is the "strongest motive force' in the novel, and the other characters are viewed in relation to her. This is made clear from by a very simple fact about the structure of the novel. She and only she is involved in all the relationships dealt with: she is the factor common to all of them.

The novel deals, first of all, with the coming together of Mrs. Morel and her husband. The period of passion and happiness is so brief and is so rapidly replaced by strife and bitterness that the readers tend to overlook the fact that this is the first love affair of the novel, that it is the study of reverse side of love. The state of affairs between the Morels is the basis on which other relationships rest; it dictates their course, and developments that follow are the inevitable consequence of Mrs. Morel's deprivation, disappointment and frustration. Then follows what is best described by the title heading of the third chapter: "The Casting Off of Morel and Taking on of William". "The title assumes the central importance for Mrs. Morel; she removes her attention from her husband and transfers it to her son; she is the agent, the one who acts, and the others are to a certain extent her satellites, important mainly as they relate to her." The love relationship between Mrs. Morel and William does not leave much of an impact on the reader for various reasons and the removal of William to London being one of them. Nevertheless, the theme of maternal possessiveness is reiterated in the next section of the novel. In the relationship with William a concurrent theme, that of mother's hostility towards her son's lover, emerges.

With the death of William, the novel pierces through more intricate and complex sequences. Initially there is a sort of "tranquil mutual love between Mrs. Morel and Paul. This section provides a stirring account of the independence of "an isolated mother and a son who by temperament and circumstances cannot bring himself to play a full part in the outside life of his contemporaries". However this seemingly blissful state of affairs do not last for a very long time, for as Paul grows up he "enters into a strange and ambiguous relationship with Miriam".

The intricacies are further generated with the arrival of Miriam and a period of struggle begins. This is the beginning of a relationship that is not initiated by Mrs. Morel and where the hold and the influence of the mother is threatened. Interestingly, the structure of the novel seems to follow the pattern of life itself: "the son grows up and begins first to seek and then assert emotional independence; the mother resents, and struggle ensues." This struggle is tripartite—there is interlocking tension between Mrs. Morel and Paul, Mrs. Morel and Miriam and between Miriam and Paul. The reader realizes that each character is engaged in more than

one but connected struggle and also, Mrs. Morel is not only concerned with Paul and Miriam as individuals but also as a couple. "It is in the description and the working out of these battles of will and personality that we see Lawrence at his sensitive and intelligent best, as we shall see, at times his grasp weakens, but on the whole the complexities are handled with an assured certainty that keeps all the various developments in continuous play."

This section of the novel can be regarded as the most imperative part not in with regard to the development of the novel but also vital for formulating an impression on the readers. At the same time one cannot come to conclusions ad this is only a part of the novel and one of the component of the entire pattern. Thus, to have a balanced view it will not be correct to concentrate any more on this section than is required or asked for. The process of Paul's growth continues with the coming of Clara. It is important to note that Mrs. Morel does not feel all that threatened by Paul's relationship with Clara as she does in case of Miriam. Probably, she thinks that Paul is only physically flirting with Clara that will not last for a very long time and also Clara on the other hand does not seem to be trying to possess Paul. Thus, Mrs. Morel is not afraid of losing Paul. The relationship between Paul and Miriam falls off and due to Mrs. Morel's illness Paul returns back to his mother. This can also be seen as a victory for Mrs. Morel as the son comes back to her. However, the novel ends with Paul "agonizingly free of all entanglements, entering on his own life for the first time alone"

The novel thus deals with; "The relationships themselves, their effect on the participants, the depiction of victories and defeats incidental to the process of growing up, the emergence of a mature man through passion and anguish". But these premises or themes cannot be viewed in isolation. Whether it is analysis of relationships or the description of setting, all are significant in providing a meaning to and understanding of the novel. The picturesque backdrop, including the home, the mine and the village or as small unit as a pub, contributes to the drama of life and has an essential and decisive role in the shaping of the characters and their individual personalities.

On the structure of *Sons and Lovers*, Seymour Betsky writes:" *Sons and Lovers* moves along a structural pattern determined by the nature of its human relationships. A Wave-rhythm distinguishes, in beat and counterbeat the major involvements of the characters: those of Walter and Gertrude Morel, Paul and his mother, Paul and Miriam, and Paul and Clara. In each of these relationships, separate episodes focus—in dramatically enacted dialogue, description, and action—aspects of each character-inter-connection. Each event is a successive wave and, the movement of the relationship is the full tide which is its consummation. After that consummation there are wave like returns to the achieved tension in that relationship, but now each wave shows a diminishing strength and intensity.

The reader of *Sons and Lovers* soon comes to anticipate the rhythmic returns and finds himself attuned to the Lawrence mode. He doesn't ask for the conventional climactic d3evelopment." Also, comments from Dorothy Van Ghent on the structure of the novel would be helpful in its understanding: "…it is clear that the book is organized not merely on a chronological plan showing the habits and vicissitudes of a Nottinghamshire miner 's family, that it has a structure rigorously controlled by an idea: an idea of an organic disturbance in the relationships of men and women—a disturbance of sexual polarities that is first seen in the disaffection of mother and father, then in the mother's attempt to substitute her sons for her husband, finally in the sons' unsuccessful struggle to establish natural manhood.

Lawrence's development of the idea has certain major implications: it implies that his characters have transgressed against the natural life-directed condition of the human animal against the elementary biological rhythm he shares with the rest of biological nature; and it implies that his offence against life has been brought about failure to respect the complete and terminal individuality of persons by a twisted desire to 'possess' other persons as the mother tries to possess her husband, then her sons, and as Miriam tries to 'possess' Paul. Lawrence saw this offence as a disease of modern life in all its manifestations, from sexual relationships to those broad social and political relationships that have changed people from individuals to anonymous economic properties or to military units or to ideological autonomies."

Autobiographical Elements in the Novel

> "Lawrence was always an autobiographical writer, and aspects of his personality, his beliefs and his experience in life appear in most of his novels, often more directly and with less modification than is common in imaginative fiction." Graham Hough, in *The Dark Sun*, says: "Sons and Lovers is a catharsis achieved by re-living an actual experience—re-living it over and over again". There can be no doubts that the novel is not only a record of Lawrence's early life but it is also believed that the writing of that record was exceedingly important to Lawrence as an individual and thus makes the novel much more than just another accomplishment in his literary career.

Sons and Lovers is set in close replica of Lawrence's native village of Eastwood. The minutely described Bestwood can be seen as the realistic presentation of the place where the author has been brought up. The member's of the Morel family and the situation that exists in the family is also mirrors Lawrence's own life at home. Lawrence's parents never enjoyed a very happy married life and its strains had an adverse effect on his own development. Quite similar to his mother, Lydia Lawrence, Gertrude in the novel is attracted towards Mr. Morel (Arthur Lawrence in case of Lawrence's mother) initially but the charm began to dwindle away very soon. Moreover, in case of both the woman, Lawrence's mother and his novel's Mrs. Morel, dissatisfaction from marriage resulted in transference of affection from husband to sons.

Lawrence born on September 11, 1885 in Eastwood, Nottinghamshire, began his education in 1891 from Board School to Nottingham High School and finally teacher's training at Nottingham University College. Paul of the novel bears a close resemblance with Lawrence. The author, just like the character that he creates, was a weak and sickly boy. Both were affected by the disharmony in the relationship of their parents and as a result became quite introvert and depressed souls. In 1901 began his friendship with Jesse Chambers, which bears the origin of the "Mirriam" of *Sons and Lovers*. It is believed that the parts of the novel related to Paul-Miriam love affair were written and revised under the direction of Jessie Chambers. Lawrence had a love relationship with Jessie but their affair failed to reach a satisfactory point of culmination, just like that of Paul and Miriam. Regarding the character of Clara, critics feel that it does not have its origin in any single but more than one women from Lawrence's personal life.

It is believed that Lawrence himself was a victim of Oedipus complex as his mother Lydia had a very strong hold him and in return Lawrence had an extraordinarily close relationship, more like that of a lover, with his mother. Lawrence himself confessed to Jessie Chambers: "I've loved her like a lover that's why I could never love you". Similarly, in *Sons and Lovers*, Mrs. Morel happens to be the central force in Paul's life. Paul cannot break free from his mother in order to establish some sort of normal relationship with any other woman in his life.

Class Consciousness

The issues of class-consciousness seem to be reflected to quite an extent in the *Sons and Lovers*. Lawrence appears to be offering a foretaste of the social structure prevailing during the early twentieth century in Britain. It has been noted that as the Victorian era came to an end the mothers, especially those belonging to the working class, aspired for higher standards of living and aimed towards higher achievements, both culturally and socially. Also, it was found to be a common practice among mothers to hold their sons close to themselves and inculcate the same notions, values and aspirations. "The expectations of mothers in Lawrence's days were tempered with a sense of realism, but secretly harbored a desire for he success and happiness of all their offspring. But men were trapped in late Victorian society, frequently by their mothers who unwittingly failed to let go, sometimes by societal constraints and, in spite of educational reform, were constantly struggling to improve their lot, yet generally failed to do so."

In context of this background Paul, as many critics agree, is restrained by his mother's prevailing dominance but her influence seems to be ambivalent to an extent. On one hand she wants her son to rise in life and at the

same time does not allow him to be completely on his own. Along with a yearning for economic progress she does not completely disapproves of his desire to pursue a simple living by staying local. Thus, it is important to note that "this ambivalence, mirrored in other relationships throughout the novel, seems to pervade Lawrencean thinking and, defined in terms of social stratification, sets up a predominant dialectic throughout the work, leading to a combination of aspiration, passion, constraint and self-destruction. This progression is almost roller coaster like, as the protagonist hurtles toward a destiny the reader begins to glimpse, but is unable to stop. The inevitability of Paul's dialectic make-up almost seems to flow naturally into the novel, because the attentive reader readily perceives the introspective musings and the idle speculations which typify Paul's thinking."

The emotional impulses that characterize Paul's personality also have some basis in social aspirations as his life's adolescence was dominated by an authoritative father and an ambitious mother. The dialectical aspect of Paul's character "toward growth, yet destruction, and toward eroticism, yet nihilism, cross the barrier from the purely psychological to the socio-economic as the novel unfolds". During the early nineteenth century England there was a wave of Marxism and egalitarian theories had begun to attract the minds of many people. Lawrence is not trying to endorse the Marxist values through the novel but is trying to reflect the ideological dilemma that the people faced during that period. Lawrence does not clinch to pure Marxist philosophy as a does allot the superior position to Paul whereby he is able to make employment available for lower-class people as well. Lawrence seems to be suggesting some sort of hopefulness and at the same time questioning the system of distribution of money in the society. The novel thus deals with issues of class structure, the way class restrictions are imposed and confronted and how they influence the psyche of the individuals.

Setting

The Countryside and Nature: "Lawrence was very much a village boy although his village was industrial rather than agricultural and throughout his life he kept the intense awareness of natural objects that was fostered in his childhood by the woods and fields that came within a stone's throw of the house in Eastwood where he was born. His background and the background of *Sons and Lovers* must not be imagined in terms of the vast built up areas of the Northern industrial conurbations; in his childhood and youth, the period of the novel, town and country jostled each other shoulder to shoulder. As Lawrence writes in the very first chapter of the novel: "From Nuttall, high up on the sandstone among the woods, the railway ran, past the ruined priory of the Carthusians and past Robin Hood's Well, down to Spinney Park then on to Minton, a large mine among corn-fields; from Minton across the farm-lands of the valleyside to Bunker's Hill, branching off there, and running north to Beggarlee and Selby, that looks over at Crich and the hills of Derbyshire; six mines like black studs on the countryside, linked by a loop of fine chain, the railway." (Chapter 1)

The countryside is virtually acts as a contrast to the darkness of the burrows of the coalmines that lie underneath. The account of this in the novel is almost secondary and it is not referred to openly and directly, but the reader is all the time reminded of the proximity of and to the world of nature. The people are not entirely detached or removed away from the natural order, rather there is always, although not very explicit, bond with nature. They are living a synthetic life within a mechanized system and there seems to be a repudiation of nature altogether, but there is some kind of closeness with nature that is shared by all.

Thus it is very natural for certain important scenes of the novel to take place in natural surroundings, for instance it can be country walks or farms. Lawrence, in fact, makes use of such junctures to "convey moments of revelation in his characters". Lawrence had the ability to emphasize the emotional turmoil through the associated background. Nature would help to provide the character with an insight into his/her own thoughts. Mrs. Morel is often comforted by some undefined energy that the nature possess: "She went into the front garden, feeling too heavy to take herself out, yet unable to stay indoors. The heat suffocated her. And looking ahead the prospect of her life made her feel as if she were buried alive. The front garden was a small square with a privet hedge. There she stood trying to soothe herself with the scent of flowers and the fading beautiful evening" (Chapter 1).

Another of Lawrence's description in Chapter 2 needs attention: "The sun was going down. Every open evening, the hills of Derbyshire were blazed over with red sunset. Mrs. Morel watched the sun sink from the glistening sky, leaving a soft flower-blue overhead… The mountain-ash berries across the field stood fierily out from the dark leaves, for a moment. A few shocks of corn in a corner of the fallow stood up as if alive; she imagined them bowing, perhaps her son would be a Joseph… With Mrs. Morel it was one of those still moments when the small frets vanish, and the beauty of things stands out, and she had the peace and strength to see herself." Not only do these passages demonstrate the observant eye of an artist like Lawrence that captures the minute details of the surroundings but it also shows how the backdrop is so skillfully used to convey the emotions and mood of the character, Mrs. Morel in this particular case.

It has been very truly commented about Lawrence's writing that "it is purely functional writing and its function is within the novel". Perhaps, Lawrence is so well informed about and cherishes a special kind of intimacy with nature that he instinctively uses natural objects to describe human emotions. In the novel he particularly uses flowers and plants to bring to light complex characters like that of Miriam: "The cheeks of the flowers were greenish with cold. But still some had burst, and their gold ruffled and glowed. Miriam went on her knees before one cluster, took a wild-looking daffodil between her hands, turned up its face of gold to her, and bowed down, caressing it with her mouth and cheeks and brow" (Chapter 9). A better understanding of Miriam's personality and temperament can be attained through this visualized action rather than a formal analysis.

The use of flora and plant life, through out the novel, is suggestive of the power of life. Lawrence has taken them as metaphors of vivacity and spontaneity, images of life itself. Thus, when the naturalness around is compared to the relationship between Paul and Miriam, the sterility of this human liaison is highlighted although it has been equally a part of nature. Moreover, Miriam's attitude to the flowers, one of strong, worshipful adoration, mirrors her feelings towards Paul, too idealistic and over-spiritualized.

These observations establish the fact that Lawrence uses the natural surroundings and the countryside in two different ways: "first to particularize the special circumstances of Bestwood and secondly, as a source of imagery and near symbolism that can best convey extremely delicate and intangible emotions and attitudes."

The Village and Mine: Lawrence does not provide any formal description of the village and it is left to the reader to grasp the physical properties and appearances and so forth from the many comments that are made in the course of the novel. Just as the existence of a village does not stand outside the lives of its inhabitants, the reader also comes to take it for granted. The focus of the author is not on the external presence of the village as we see in the case of nature. Rather, Lawrence perceives village as a community. "Strangely enough the countryside is most important in defining the village. The constant reminders of the near presence of the countryside gradually give the impression of Bestwood as an island, to some extent cut off, and most certainly self-contained. This creation of a sense of unity in isolation is factual reporting; even today, despite the ubiquity of the motor-car, mining villages tend to be exclusive communities whose members, friends and enemies alike, belong to one another; the village is an extension of the family."

The fine description of this cluster of village people makes the reader acknowledge not only his social accuracy but also sense that he intends to make the community something more than merely a background for his narrative. It becomes significant in the placing of his characters. Morel fits into it while Mrs. Morel does not. Morel belongs to the place as is depicted by scenes at work or pub, going on jaunts with his friends and sharing their habits and so on. He seems to blend naturally and quite easily with his surroundings, whereas Mrs. Morel never feels at home. She is we are told, "not anxious to move into the Bottoms; even when she does get there, she is set apart: "Having an end house, she enjoyed a kind of aristocracy among the other women of the "between" houses" (chapter 1). Mrs. Morel's superiority and her awareness of it is best shown in a trivial incident. Mrs. Morel is "having a word" with her neighbour; a short conversation follows about Hose, the agent who collects the stockings that that the housewives have seamed at home. Hose arrives: "Hose was

coming along, ringing his bell. Women were waiting at the yard-ends with their seamed stockings hanging over their arms. The man, a common fellow made jokes with them, tried to swindle them, and bullied them. Mrs. Morel went up her yard disdainfully" (chapter 2). Two functions are being carried out here simultaneously: First, the reader is acquainted with one of the many facets of community life and secondly, the reader is informed about Mrs. Morel's attitude towards this life, which is undoubtedly that of superiority.

Lawrence is more concerned and curious about human life and experience rather than being interested in physical appearance of the surroundings. This is to be seen in Lawrence's handling of the pub that happens to be an important place in the life of the Morels. The building and its rooms or even the furniture is barely touched upon, but its importance to the men and especially to Morel, is presented in a couple of scenes. The first is when early in the novel he comes in after 'waiting' all day at the 'Moon and the Stars', and described his day, mainly the conversation centred on a coconut (chapter 1): "This is very far removed from stage dialect; Lawrence with his accurate ear for language and his close acquaintance with the common tongue of north Nottinghamshire, captures the rhythm and cadence of uneducated and lively speech, achieving an authenticity that takes us into the heart of working class talk and thought". Another incident demonstrates the social function of the pub in the community, and quite precisely reveals Morel. The incident takes place after a quarrel between him and Mrs. Morel when he has thrown a table drawer at her and is resentful and feels guilty. More than words could ever describe the character of Morel; his action speaks all about his personality. Lawrence's writing is commendable for such dramatic economy of high order.

Numerous incidents in the novel—the chapel, shopping, market, etc.—firmly base the actions and activities of the characters in actuality with immense authenticity and from these substantial insights of daily life, not very obvious facts about the economic life of the working class begin to surface. "Through out the first half of the novel there is a constant awareness of money, and there is a deeply sympathetic depiction of the unremitting pressure of near poverty, and of the planning and small economies made necessary by a small and uncertain income." Lawrence seems to be very ardently engaged in the depiction of the feelings and thoughts and apprehensions of a working class man. The result is quite realistic because Lawrence is writing, based on his instincts and experience, from inside. The details are meticulous: " If he earned forty shilling to pay his debts" (chapter 1). These figures remind the readers that Morels could have been comfortably placed; coal getters were among the aristocracy of labour; we discover from Robert Tressell's The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists, for example, that at this time skilled painters and decorators were earning barely a pound a week. Mrs. Morel, thus, has a genuine and real grievance against her husband apart from emotional aversion. From another perspective, the reader is made to sympathize with the poor housewife's condition.

Economics bring together two of the predominant issues in this precisely recorded background: the mine and the home. The mine dictates the village life as it happens to be the economic basis for the existence of the village people. Moreover, its physical presence is persistently felt: the winding gear at the pit-head, the lives of miners walking to and from work, the whistle, the trucks, the mine offices, though not described ostentatiously but very convincingly show the influence of mine on the lives of the characters. Morel's tales about mine episodes adds a lot of veracity to the idea of mine being central to the village life. In addition to this, mine has its place in the home as well: Morel getting his 'snap' ready, laying out his singlet, having his back scrubbed, drying himself and changing his clothes in front of the fire. Incidents, though trivial, enable the reader to peep into the daily life of the Morels and realize the extent to which mine infiltrates into the domestic life.

There can be no doubts about the fact that mine is central to the life of the family in general but it is only Morel who actually goes down the mine. There is a large and significant part of his life that is inaccessible to his family. While he is relaxing with his mates or is at the pub, he is very distant and secluded from his family. He withdraws into a world of his own which although "shapes their lives but is impenetrable to them, and which they cannot, even if they wanted to, share". The novel does not emphasize on this feature of "separateness" but it is very much there. For Morel the idea of home and family is not the same as for Mrs. Morel, and they seem to have different perceptions of life itself. For Mrs. Morel mine is only a means to an end; she is rather

astonished to know that Morel is a miner: " 'And you are a miner?' she exclaimed in surprise. 'Yes. I went down when I was ten.' She looked at him in wondering dismay."(Chapter 1) But for Morel, mine is much more than just a source of food and shelter for the family. One may regard this as a cause of alienation of Morel from the family or as a factor that emphasizes this alienation. With time mine begins to lose its importance for the family but remains centre of Morel's life. The sons look elsewhere for their livelihood, William to London, Paul to Nottingham, Arthur to the army and Annie gets married. As Paul starts earning, Mrs. Morel is no longer solely dependent on Mr. Morel's income and thus the mine becomes less important. As is mine important and part of Morel, the work that Paul takes up to earn his living is not essentially a part of Paul or his life.

The Home and the Home Life: The mine and community are very important in the development of the novel. And, to quite an extent, they also seem to have influenced the home life of the characters. There are two main aspects to these: the physical actuality of the house and the normal daily domestic economy on one hand, and on the other the kind of life that is led there. The relationship between Morel and his wife are largely expressed in terms of their home life, the way in which they live and get on together, and it is impossible to talk of the home without talking of the relationship.

"There is a vivid description of the appearance of the Morel's home, impressionistic rather than photographic; it is not until fairly late in the novel that we are given anything like a literal description of the interior, and even here the effect sought is one of coziness rather than detailed description." Home and domesticity had always been very important for Lawrence and therefore happens to be noticeably present in the novel. For Paul also, a home with its comforts and simplicity is vital for existence. Even amidst strife and during difficult times home with its homeliness has a very calming effect for Paul. It offers not only comfort but becomes a refuge and a kind of safe haven for Paul. There is a desperate need for this security that the home provides and thus no longer remains merely as a vignette of domestic life.

The home is not only seen in still pictures as a stagnant object or is never referred to as a mere building/house but always as a place of activity. The things are going on and happening in this place and it is not deprived of life. There are descriptions of the daily routine of domestic life with such revealing detail that authenticity is assured. There is a kind of genuineness and realism about the account of the household affairs that are carried out by the characters. Paul blanching almonds, Mrs. Morel ironing, Paul baking bread, and letting it burn in his preoccupation with Miriam, all these show a home as a place where things happen; they give the impression not of a dead setting but a living environment; they are completely accurate in tone and convincingly strike the note of a real home.

The home is of course the scene of special occasions of various kinds. The description of Christmas preparations before William's first return home brings to mind Dickens's skilled art of portraiture. Imbedded with comic element, Lawrence uses his observation powers are able to show very accurately the working class manners and other social traits through the scene. Later, the preparations for the reception of William's coffin are described with equal rightness and solemnity. There are still many more scenes that bring out different shades of life lived in a house by a working class family ranging from tense and tortured moments to some happy and cheerful flashes: "These doings and occasions, happy and sad alike, are the stuff of domestic life, and Lawrence carefully shows the ordinariness in the life of Morels; this is no demonic family set apart from the general run of humanity by monstrous and gigantic passions; the Morels home is no Wuthering Heights; but the ordinariness is valuable in stressing those elements in the life of the family that differentiate it fromothers and make it distinctive."

Another important thing to note is that it is only at home that Morel is shown drunk. In other words, the novelist wants to show how his drunkenness affects the domestic and the family life while at the pub Morel is shown very briefly. It can be said that Morel's drunkenness is of two types. On one hand it is used to construct scenes of violence and anger between Morel and his wife, thereby highlighting the existing tension and strife between the couple. On the other hand, it shows the feelings that arise as a consequence. It gives rise to a

sense of uncertainty and a feeling of wretchedness. At the same time there is a constant fear about the future of the children and the adverse affect it has on them and, furthermore, it brings an extended misery for everyone in the family. Thus, the home is more than just a background for Lawrence's narrative. It, in fact, plays an important role in bringing out the suppressed feelings and impulses in the family members.

Gradually, Mrs. Morel's love and adoration for her husband depreciates with each quarrel and every outburst. The clashes of personalities resulting in quarrels are depicted with lot of dramatic vim and vigor. "Lawrence perfectly catches the vocabulary and rhythms of embittered speech designed solely to hurt; they are powerful presentations of viciousness, of blind unthinking antagonism; the reader is made to realize that they are the eruptions of passions that for most of time lie dormant and repressed, only to break out on provocation with destruction and irresistible violence." The initial quarrels have only Morel and his wife as participants. In the first chapter of the novel we find the couple shouting at one another

Symbolism:

There is an extensive use of symbols in the novel but it, in no way, hampers the development of the plot or the flow of action. The symbols are so well knitted that it is difficult to regard them as something outside the structure. With regard to symbolism Jung remarks: "A symbol is alive in so far as it is pregnant with meaning…" and that symbol "is the expression of a thing not to be characterized in any other better way". According to M.H. Abrams "The modern period, in the decades after world war I, was a notable era of symbolism in literature. Many of the major writers of the period exploit symbols which are in part drawn from religious and esoteric traditions and in part from their own invention. Some of the works of the age are symbolist in their settings, their agents, and their actions, as well as in the objects they refer to."

One of the major symbols in the novel is that of flowers. Mrs. Morel seems to have a special relationship with them. They are not only offered to her by her son, Paul, but also have a very soothing and calming effect. Apart from the usual symbolism of innocence, beauty and freshness they also show the varying attitudes of three individuals—Paul, Miriam and Clara—in the scene when the three are walking in the open field. While Paul seems to have a very spontaneous respond toward them, Miriam seems to drive life out of them though she picks them quite lovingly and on the other hand Clara does not pick them at all. Then there is the swing at Willey Farm is symbolic of the ambivalence that Paul experiences with regard to his feelings for Miriam. Just as the swing moves to and fro, Paul is all the time oscillating between the feelings of love to that of hate. It also symbolizes the transitory nature of the two extreme feelings. Moreover, the dilemma within Paul is highlighted. When Miriam is not able to achieve the same height as Paul does on the swing, it shows the incompatibility between them.

The Concept of Oedipus Complex: Freud's theory of the Oedipal Complex takes its name from the title character of Sophecles' *Oedipus*. In this legendary Greek drama, Oedipus comes to kill his father and marry his mother. The Oedipus/Electra complex is the foundation for many of Freud's theories. He argued that every child was faced with the task of mastering the id's urges for the incestual relations of the Oedipal Complex, and that a failure to master the tendencies resulted in a basis for neurosis.

In a letter to Wilhelm Fliess, Freud explains how he developed the concept of the Oedipus complex: "Being entirely honest with oneself is a good exercise. Only one idea of general value has occurred to me. I have found love of the mother and jealousy of the father in my own case too, and now believe it to be general phenomena of early childhood, even if it does not always occur so early as in children who have been made hysterics…If that is the case, the gripping power of Oedipus Rex in spite of all the rational objections to the inexorable fate that the story presupposes, becomes intelligible and, one can understand why later fate dramas were such failures. Our feeling rise against any arbitrary individual fate…but the Greek myth seizes on a compulsion which everyone recognizes because he has felt traces of it in himself. Every member of the audience was once a budding Oedipus in fantasy, and this dream fulfillment played out in reality causes everyone to recoil in horror, with the full measure of repression which separates his fantasy from his parent state."

As explained by Arthur Asa Berger: For Freud, the Oedipus complex is the central or nuclear core of neurosis, and how we resolve our Oedipus complexes effect the way we develop and whether we are relatively normal or become neurotic. And, as we have seen, it affects the way our children develop also.

Freud argued that the Oedipus complex is found in everyone because it is natural and not environmental. There is a divergence of opinion among anthropologists as to whether this is correct, but there is evidence that seems to suggest it is and that the Oedipus complex is found everywhere. (there is also an inverse or negative Oedipus complex, which involves fantasies of incest with the parent of the same sex and murderous wishes towards the parent of the opposite sex.)

The Oedipus complex is normally resolved or mastered; in little boys. This is done through the agency of castration anxiety (the fear that the father will castrate the boy) and in little girls through penis envy (the fantasy girls have that they have lost their penises). Castration, anxiety, so the theory goes, leads boys to identify with their fathers' masculinity and to renounce their love for their mothers. This masculinity is then channeled into love outside of the confines of the family and toward other women. Penis envy leads girls to reidentify with their mothers and turn to males (other than their fathers) to obtain babies, and, indirectly, their lost 'penises'.

The female equivalent of Oedipus complex is often called the Electra complex, after the myth of Electra, daughter of Agamemnon. Electra induced her brother Orestes to kill their mother and her new husband, in retribution for their having killed Agamemnon. Electra refused to marry and brooded over the death of her father

Many are of the opinion that Oedipus complex is at the heart of all literature: "for a literary work to have a strong, or, even more, a lasting appeal, its plot must arouse and gratify some important aspect of the unconscious oedipal wishes of the members of its audience". Furthermore it is suggested that Oedipus complex is "the cornerstone of all culture as we know it". In other words "it informs our expressive works, both tragic and comic. It helps us work through out the unconscious problems and conflicts, both as individuals and as collectivities; as such, it plays a much more profound role in our lives than we may possibly imagine".

Not only Lawrence but also the age itself was swayed by the theories of Freud and Oedipus complex was a major one. However, it cannot be assumed that this theory determined the composition of *Sons and Lovers*. If one believes that Lawrence was trying to present his personal experiences in the novel then it can be concluded that he was a victim of this complex. His mother, Lydia, had a great influence and a strong on him and he had once confessed to Jessie Chambers, the girl he loved: "I loved my mother-like a lover and that is why I could never love you". Graham Hough (*The Dark Sun: A Study of D.H. Lawrence*) asserts the psychological importance of *Sons and Lovers* and claims it to be 'the first Freudian novel in English". The Freudianism is not only explored through the life of the main character in the novel but it also hints at the "Oedipus imbroglio" of the author. Harold Massingham wrote in a review published in the *Daily Chronicle*: "We suspect that Paul is a projection of the writer's own personality".

Characters and Relationships: In this chapter we shall be considering the various relationships and interrelationships that make up the main part of SL. It will not be often necessary to give character sketches because Lawrence does not work that way, and it will not be possible to deal with situations in as neat and orderly fashion as the sub heading might rather deceptively indicate. For example it is obviously impossible to talk of Mr. And Mrs. Morel without talking of their children; it is even more impossible to talk about Miriam and Paul without talking about Mrs. Morel. But the sub – headings will at least serve to indicate the main lines of emphasis.

MOREL AND MRS. MOREL: When the reader is first introduced to Mrs. Morel, she has been married for eight years; she is seen immediately as housewife and mother. In the scene at the wakes, there is the first slight statement of the Principle theme of the novel, the attachment between the mother and the sons. Williams, a child of about seven years old, has won two eggcups from a stall. He is pleased with them, and shows them

to his mother. ' She knew he wanted them for her. ' Lawrence goes on to describe briefly the little boy's pride in his mother, and in his possessiveness of her: He would not leave her. All the time he stuck close to her, bustling with a small boy's pride of her. (chapter1). The note that resounds through the novel is here struck gently and unobtrusively. When the children have gone to bed, Mrs. Morel, alone, reflects on her life: Mrs. Morel was alone, but she was used to it. Her son and her little girl slept up stairs; so, it seemed, her home was there behind her, fixed and stable. But she felt wretched with the coming child. The world seemed a dreary place, where nothing else would happen for her—at least until William grew up. But for herself, nothing but this dreary endurance—till the children grew up. And the children! She could not afford to have this third. She did not want it. The father was serving beer in a public house, swilling himself drunk. She despised him, and was tied to him. This coming child was too much for her. If it were not for William and Annie, she was sick of it, the struggle with poverty and ugliness and meanness. She went into the front garden, feeling too heavy to take herself out, yet unable to stay indoors. The heat suffocated her. And looking ahead, the prospect of her life made her feel as if she were buried alive" (Chapter1).

Thus we are introduced to the central figure of the Morel, a woman depressed and tired, no longer loving her husband, and sustained only by her children. Then follows a retrospective account of her early life, and what emerges from it is her superiority, both personal, and, by decent at least, social: 'She came of good old burger family.' A measure of 'forgiveness' is indicated, too, though of Nottingham stock, she had spent her child hood and youth in the south, and had been educated there. Lawrence establishes from the beginning those qualities of temperament and make it unlikely that, she being as she is, her marriage cab be a success with the sort of man she married; this is hinted at by the mention of the young man whom she had known at Sheerness and (She still had the Bible that John field had given her) who we gather would have been suitable.

Mr. Morel who attracted her into marriage is introduced in the course of this reminiscence; and throughout the emphasis is on his simple abundant vitality. A list of the words and phrases used to describe him is revealing: well set up, erect and very smart, vigorous, ruddy, red mist mouth, rich ringing laugh, color and animation, ready, pleasant, non – intellectual, warm, natural, joyous, exaltation, glamour, the flower of his body, the dusky golden softness of this man's sensuous flame of life. These all occur in the course of a page and a half and speak for themselves; (Chapter1 pg 10) they show us the spontaneous, instinctive and simple sensuous man who appeals to his antithesis: "She was a Puritan, like her father, high-minded and stern" (Chapter1 pg11). This fundamental sensuous attractiveness is a real and in some ways lasting influence on the relationship between them. It is left for Paul to comment on it late in the novel: Yes; but my mother got real joy and satisfaction …lasts three months (chapter12).

Though Paul's subsequent attempts to define this kind of passion are not realize what is meant; there must be an experience of passion and fulfillment which however brief it may have been, can illuminate a whole life, a moment or period of complete and spontaneous union that can never be forgotten, where existence serves as a bond between those who shared it even when the passion itself is long dead. And this experience Morel and Mrs. Morel had; brief through the statement of their short married happiness, it is enough. It should be set against the innumerable statement of Mrs. Morel's contempt for her husband, the vivid description of the hatred between them, and the reiterated theme of Mrs. Morel's economic dependence on the Morel ' for the children's sake.' The economic reason and the passionate reason can assimilate, just as a sense of union can co – exist with, just as a sense of union can co – exist with hatred and contempt. Lawrence, dealing with the emotions, is aware of their complexity, and refuses to simplify into terms of black and white, right and wrong, happy and miserable; antitheses can co – exist.

When we first see the Morel, however, the period of disillusionment had lasted years, and a fifth of the novel is largely given to tracing the last stages of spiritual intimacy between them. We are shown the various crucial moments; Mrs. Morel's discovery of her husband's deceitfulness about money is the first; the second and crucial one is the cutting of the year old Williams's hair – an event trivial enough, one which is earlier and lesser novels could have been an excuse for vintage domestic sentimentality; here it here it becomes really important:

"But she knew and Morel knew, that that act had caused something momentous to take place in her soul. She remembered the scene all her life, as one in which she had suffered the most intensely. This act of masculine clumsiness was the spear through the side of her love for Morel" (Chapter1). This is worthy of close attention, and the details must be noted carefully. The reference in the metaphor is of course to the crucifixion. Mrs. Morel's love for her husband is the implied Christ of the image; but Christ's side was pierced only after his death.

The cutting of William's hair is the act that proves the death of that first love; after this – that is, for practically the whole novel – Mrs. Morel has ceased to love her husband vitally: "Before, while she had striven against him bitterly, she had fretted after him, as if he had gone astray from her. Now she ceased to fret for his love: he was and outsider to her. This made life much more bearable" (Chapter1). But Mrs. Morel cannot lapse in to the easy going indifference that could have made their lives so much more tolerable, and which would have been so welcome to Morel: "Nevertheless, she still continued to strive with him. She still had her high moral sense inherited from generations of Puritans. It was now a religious instinct, and she was almost a fanatic with him, because she loved him, or had loved him. If he sinned, she tortured him. If he drank, and lied, was often a poltroon, sometimes a knave, she wielded the lash unmercifully" (Chapter1).

At this stage, it is Possible to feel some sympathy for Morel, and it is even possible that Lawrence feels some. But, basically his approval and sympathy lie with Mrs. Morel, His mother – figure; she is an expression of his even Puritanism. In the scenes that follow the casting off of Morel, there is very little sympathy, and Morel is presented, reasonably enough, in a bad light, since his actions are disgusting. Besides being an account of the transference of Mrs. Morel's love from her husband to her son, the first quarter of the novel is also an account of the degeneration of Morel, and of Mrs. Morel's bitter triumph in the middle of misery. "The pity was, that she was too much his opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be she destroyed him. She injured and hurt and scared herself, but she lost none of her worth. She also had the children" (Chapter1).

In this objective summary of the situation, the responsibility for Morel's decline is ascribed unequivocally to Mrs. Morel, even though the provocation comes from Morel. But in the presentation of Morel's process of degeneration, Lawrence seems to be intellectually aware I\of the pathos of his gradually diminishing vitality, but does not seem to be moved by it: he is much more moved to indignation and sympathy by the misery it causes to Mrs. Morel (who he has said is responsible) and her children. This withdrawal of comparison is particularly interesting when we consider the sympathy by which he treats Paul's struggle to resist being eaten up by his mother, and when we consider lawrence's own bitterly expressed resentment of possessive love as it appears in Birkin's attitude in *Women In Love*. Morel loses most, but quite simply Lawrence does not seem to care; Morel only matters to Lawrence in so far as he affects Mrs. Morel and the children. However this does not prevent Lawrence from recording the process accurately and sensitively. There is a direct statement; after the incident in which Morel locks his wife out of doors, Lawrence comments: "After such a scene as the last, Walter Morel was for some days abashed and ashamed, but he soon regained his old bullying indifference. Yet there was a slight shrinking, a diminishing in his assurance. Physically even, he shrank, and his fine full presence waned. He never grew in the least stout, so that, as he sank from his erect, assertive bearing, his physique seemed to contract along with hid pride and moral strength" (Chapter2).

He is seen as increasingly empty, and increasingly futile in action; there is a shaming anticlimax of his blustering departure from the house with his little blue bundle and his ignominious return the same evening, on which there is this comment: As Mrs. Morel saw him slink… because she had loved him (chapter2). It is shortly after this that her love for him finally dies. In his illness 'she never quite wanted him to die…wanted him for herself' (chapter3) but the the birth of Paul asserts itself and brings about the final change and Mrs. Morel realizes the direction in which her feelings are set: Now with the birth …she scarcely desired him (chapter3). And with this with enunciation comes on measure of indifference; Morel has last to heart her; from this time on her concern is with the children, and Morel's behaviour is only important to her if it affects the children. The effect

on Morel's inner life is disastrous, even though, after his return to strength he goes on very much as before, working, drinking and bullying his family. But, as far as his personal life is concerned, he is a beaten man: His life was casting him off…to their children (chapter3).

He has ceased to be of any account in the life of his family, and when this is remembered, his violence inside the home, and his search elsewhere for comfort and consultation can be seen as empty gestures of assertiveness, attempts to impose his presence on these withdrawn people of his flesh as a reality. These pathetic attempts make his children hate him, as they fear him and are made uncomfortable by him; in this section of the novel we see him and his relationship with his wife through the children's eyes, not through Mrs. Morel's – he is no longer important to her: Paul hated his father so…and nasty temper (chapter4).

This is a figure very far removed from the young man of super abundant life and charm and vitality that we saw at the beginning of the novel, and at least part of the change is done to a change in Lawrence's attitude: his sympathy for Morel diminishes as the novel progresses, until here we have something that is very near caricature. Lawrence's involvement of Paul's feeling is clearly shown in the use of the word 'soiled' of Morel's patches of grey – it is an emotional weighting. Lawrence at this stage does not seem to see anything pathetic in this situation, indeed, Morel is stated to be where and what he is by an act of his oven will, as a consequence of his oven choice: He was an outsider. He had denied the god in him (chapter4). There is no recognition of the fact that it takes two to make an incompatibility, no sense of regret at the prevention and near extinction of a personality. Lawrence is too deeply committed to the mother and children. This is one of the occasions when we are most acutely aware of Lawrence's personal employment with the characters of the novel, when we remember that Walter Morel is Lawrence's vision of his father , and Paul his vision of himself. Dramatically, this bias has its compensations: it certainly gives urgency and intense feeling to the scenes in which Morel is behaving intolerably, but its presence must be acknowledged if we are to see the novel clearly.

By the time William is entering early manhood, and Paul is a boy, the relationship between Morel and his wife has reached its final static stage. Mrs. Morel is by now largely indifferent to her husband; he became less and less important in the home and more ineffectual, lapsing in to mare " an ugly irritant". Not only in Mrs. Morel l8ife but also in the novel he is replaced by his sons, and in the second half of the sons and lovers he seldom makes an appearance of any importance.

It has been dealt at some length with this relationship partly because it is only easy to take it for granted, and partly because of his dual complexity; first the complexity of the relationship itself, the study of incompatible people moving form passion through hatred to in difference; and secondly, the complexity of Lawrence attitude towards Morel; he starts off with some measure of sympathy for him , and some objective realization of the intractability of Mrs. Morel ; these disappear as the story moves into the more conscious period of Paul's child hood; that is , as turns to the part that Lawrence himself can more vividly remember experiencing. It well illustrates the very special place of this novel in Lawrence work and life: it is at once of personal record and an objective work of art.

MRS. MOREL AND HER SONS: Mr. Morel is discarded off as a dominant factor fairly early in the novel, and Mrs. Morel "turns for love and life" to her children. The first relationship with William is not as powerful as it could probably have been or as Lawrence might have wanted it to be. It is the coming of Paul that is responsible for the impetuous end of her love for her husband; it is Paul who is symbolically baptized with her blood. William is to be seen as a temporary substitution. Mrs. Morel turns to him first because he is older; he is nearer to a manhood; she saw him as a man, young full of vigour, making the world glow again for her" (chapter 3). In him she see the chance of fulfilling all those aspirations—social, intellectual, and emotional—that her marriage with Morel had crushed. William, unlike his father is clever, ambitious, and intelligent and he has the intellectual qualities of his mother: he can enter the outside world from which she has been excluded by her unsuitable marriage. He begins to move in social circles nearer to those of his mother's youth.

As he enters this world inaccessible to his parents there is inevitably tension between him and his mother on one side and his father on the other. In a scene such as has been enacted in countless working class homes, Morel voices the resentment and antagonism that exist alongside his pride in his son. In an argument about William 's choice of a job, Morel suggests the pit, but Mrs. Morel is strictly against it and says that it is not good enough for him. More important is the first development of tension between Mrs. Morel and William. His modest social climbing takes them to dances, of which the puritan of Mrs. Morel disapproves, and brings him into contact with girls, of whom she disapproves even more strongly. Lawrence very effectively catches Mrs. Morels forbidding antagonism and these girls painful embarrassment. The incident is trivial, as are the affairs; but it shows Mrs. Morel's protective possessiveness, and the direction in which Williams downfall is to lie; he has a predilection for, in Lawrence's word, "fribbles" – pretty, feckless, shallow girls his departure to London is mingled pain and pleasure to Mr. Morel's; "she loved him so much! - …as well out of her heart" (chapter3). She not only misses him but worries for him as well, fears that his susceptibility will lead him to make a choice, as in the event it dose. His removal to London accelerates a process that had already begun: Mrs. Morel had already begun to turn to Paul for comfort. When William was kept more form whom by his work in Nottingham, and this moment is intensified; but at this stage we are told "William occupied her chiefly…not so passionate as with her eldest" (chapter4).

However, William's first visit home on Christmas brings the family together and a. and to reanimate it for the time being: "Home was home, and they loved it with a passion of love, whatever the suffering had been" (chapter 4) and we are told again that Mrs. Morel still "loved him passionately" but this is the last time that such a feeling is conveyed for William. On his next Christmas visit Williams 'arrived with a lady, but no presents', The mother, in spite of her reservations and dislike, is kind and hospitable towards the girl, who is hopelessly feather – headed, but Williams is quite unsettled and insecure. When he brings the girl home again, he is all the more disturbed and unhappy. He is shown as feeling himself committed to the girl, yet not loving her, capable even of detesting her, and despising her. There is one sentence that perhaps reveals the true reason: "Lily could understanding nothing …he hate his betrothed (chapter6). Lilly, in fact, is not his mother and the intimacy that is between him and his mother is not to be found with her and he hates her for it. He is at first attracted to her by her prettiness, her gaiety, and what he sees as her lively social life, but these proves insufficient: what ever gives, it is not in the pattern that has been established by his mother as the one necessary for his personality. He has chosen lightly and wrongly, on an ultimate basis of appetite, and cannot escape and the situation is draining him of life. Mrs. Morel is sensible and kind, but seeing him heading for a marriage of incompatibles, and seeing him suffering she suffers too "her heart was heavy as it had never been…it was her hope that was struck (chapter6). She sees her son destroying him self and part of her self in her hopes of him: he, in whom she had hoped to lived and to achieve by deputy what she had never had in person, is moving towards a union as certain of failure as her own turned out to be. His depth, in tolerably painful as it to her, is only as it was a realization of her fears.

Shortly after William's death the final stage of Mrs. Morel's final shift of her central love to Paul takes place. Mrs. Morel, since the funeral, has withdrawn from life and begins to lose the will to live. But Paul falls ill: his mother lies in bed with him. He wakes, feeling him that he is dying: "I s'll die mother! He cried …oh my son, my son " (chapter6). The mother's words are those, which she uttered repeatedly at Williams funeral; now she applies to her living son; she comes back in to the world of life, and at last Paul has completely taken of his brother who had already taken the father's place in the mother's heart. The relationship between Paul and his mother runs through the whole novel; it has various stages and various degrees of intensity and stress; all other relationship are brought in to contact with it. Not only is it most exhaustively treated and the most feeling rendered of the relationships, but it is also the central expression of the theme of sons and lovers; every thing is ultimately referred to it.

The study of William and his mother is presented to a large extent in terms of direct statement – the reader is told that GM loved her elder son; the study of Mrs. Morel and Paul is presented dramatically and on a large

scale. From the very beginning we are shown the development the love and its manifestations, and are also shown the circumstances outside it that contribute in making it all the more strong. Its fluctuations are noted and demonstrated; it is always seen as a living thing, kept constant by the fixity of Mrs. Morel's emotional dedication to it, and wavering only because of the inevitable changes caused by Paul's growing up, and the consequent diffusion of his interest and affections. The course that it takes is one from the unquestioning intimacy of his boy hood and early adolescence through the period of trouble and problems that is caused by Miriam to the realization by Paul of his mother's central and dominant position in his life, ending only with her death.

It is very obvious that Lawrence is more concerned with the relationship rather than the individual is clear picture of Gertrude Morel here, a firm inflexible little woman, suffering and embittered, but indomitable and determined to achieve a personal life of fulfilled emotion; we see her as a woman passionately determined not to be beaten down by life. But Paul as an individual seldom emerges with any definite clarity. We are told from time to time what he looks like (chapter5. He was not a very good debater and the reader is told about his interests – his painting, his intellectuals questioning, and his life at work. Yet, comparatively slight as the formal description is of him and his personality is, we became acutely and intimately aware of him. This comes about by reason of the very subtle way in which Lawrence takes us inside Paul; we are made to share his receptiveness; we feel the impact of events and people as they come into his consciousness. And Paul is most usually seen in a state of response to the personalities and doings of others, of his mother, of Miriam, of Clara, of Banter Dawes.

In a sense it is true to say that Paul is a hero of the novel, in that it is mainly to him that things happen, and we experience them with him. This is not to say that we are invited to identify naively with him, as we are invited to identify with James Bond; Lawrence in giving Paul's experiences, generally has given us enough to see the whole picture, and this evaluates and places Paul's reactions, thereby qualifying ours. A good example of this is to be seen in Lawrence's treatment of Paul's intense experiences of passion; everything is centred on Paul's awareness of it; it is described subjectively, not objectively; but we are also made aware of the other person's reactions; we know more than Paul, though at the time we can see through his eyes. In these cases Lawrence achieves a singular fusion of author, character and reader. This, of course, has its dangers; sometimes we feel that we are being forced to endorse the judgment, which we cannot accept, but this is rare.

Although Paul is so much at the centre, and so much the register of other people and events, and though we are shown so much of his mind, he is not presented as a thoroughgoing introspective; this is precisely because he is concerned so much more with other people and his reactions to them than he is with the details of his personality. Paul, in fact—and this is one of the great strengths of the novel—is for most of time in state of ignorance and bewilderment about himself; in capturing this confusion, Lawrence has captured the very essence of adolescence and early manhood. He seldom tries to explain the inexplicable; after all, it can be argued that the novelist's talk is to present the problems, not to give the answers. So Paul emerges as a sensitive and intelligent boy and young man, immensely responsive to the world and people round him, confused and uncertain, often unhappy, but determined like his mother to live, though, unlike her, he does not consciously expect happiness.

It will be useful to look in some detail at the way in which the relationship between these two is presented. Descriptions of affectionate companionships begin very early in the novel; there is the trip to Nottingham to get him his job; the mother's uninhibited eagerness and the boy's embarrassment at it are delightfully caught, and the simple completeness of their happiness is summed up: "He had spent a perfect afternoon… and tired (chapter5)

Also, the description of their first visit to the Leiver's farm shows well Lawrence's technique of presenting the incident in simple, straightforward prose, and then clinching the meaning with an unobtrusive statement: Here is a bit of new mown hay…she was perfectly happy" (chapter6). It is worthy to note that Lawrence here, in a situation of great emotional delicacy, manages to avoid any suggestion of the sentimentality it would be so

easy to fall into, the occasion has been put before the reader with too much authority, and the comment is too austere in expression to allow any falsity of feeling to creep in.

These occasions show the activity of the relationship at its most free and happy, the spontaneous expressions of the intense fundamental love that is dealt within the period of the strife and unhappiness that follows the idyllic untroubled phase. They are reinforced by occasions of even more explicit significance; the following passage is one of the few occasions on which Lawrence actually states the importance of this quiet communion to both mother and son. "He was studying for his painting…they almost ignored" (chapter7).

The first sign of a flaming of this happy companionship comes only three pages later, when Paul is late home after spending an evening with Miriam. We are first told directly of the mother's uneasiness. "Always when he went with Miriam…he could not understand" (chp7 pg185)—a statement whose accuracy as a fact of domestic life will no doubt strike many readers but the real force of the incident lies to a much greater intent in the splendid reporting of Mrs. Morel's conversation with Paul. Her antipathy for Miriam, her unwillingness and lack of enthusiasm to admit the reality of Paul's growing up, the antagonism between mother and son, are dramatically before the reader—the more direct comment that has gone before is amply documented and justified. Mrs. Morel's conscious reason for her anxiety has been stated. She could feel Paul being drawn away—she said to herself (chapter7) but the simpler and deeper possessiveness, something not entirely dissimilar from what she fears in Miriam, comes out in the action put before the reader. Equally clearly emerges the fact that this strife is not likely to destroy the love between mother and son at the end of the incident. "Then he went slowly to bed…she was hurt" (chapter7). There are further incidents of a similar kind one, that takes place during the holidays at Marblethorpe, is important because it shows Miriam so plainly as an intruder into the happy intimacy between mother and son. Again, he is rather late; again, there is acid exchange between them. "And she took no further notice of him…she put the blame on Miriam" (chapter7).

Besides showing Gertrude's antagonism to Miriam, it gains force when one remembers the close intimacy shown in the passages quoted earlier. When Paul was at home working at his painting; the intrusion and the resultant discord are shown. It will be noticed that there is no question of right or wrong in this matter; Lawrence merely states the facts as they are and though, as the incidents multiply, we can see that his sympathies are pretty clearly with the mother, yet at this stage of the novel there is no undue writing; the pitiful ness of Miriam's character is honestly realized.

Matters reach a crisis when Paul returns from taking Miriam to her home after having burnt the bread; it is this incident that shows the subject of the next chapter—The Defeat Of Miriam—to be inevitable. In the course of a bitter agreement Paul stressed the community of ideas and interests that he shares with Miriam and cannot share with his mother. Mrs. Morel resents his saying so, just as she resents the truth of the statement and Paul blundered into a further stupid truthfulness: "You'r old mother, and we are young…wrong thing" (chapter8). His mother is deeply hurt, and Paul is shocked into realization. Then follows the most revealing passage: "he had taken off his collar…without knowing he gently stroked her face" (chapter8). This is in many ways a fundamental passage. Technically, it shows Lawrence's mastery of the impassioned scene of strong and complex emotions: the mother's desperate fear of losing her son, her sense of a frustrated life, the intensity of her love, the son's misery and his equally strong love for his mother, the complete absorption in feeling and emotion are all conveyed with a straightforward directness that commands ascents.

But besides this, it establishes two vitally important elements in the theme of the novel; we see now that Mrs. Morel realizes a similar intensity of possessive emotion in Miriam: she realizes that she and Miriam are fighting for the same thing, the possession of Paul's soul; and it establishes her rare supremacy in Paul; when he is put under pressure, his choice, he realizes, is already made; he must return to his mother. All this is expressed quite deliberately in terms of erotic love (his mouth was on her throat", "long fervent kiss") and Gertrude's explicitly says: "I have never had a husband—not really". This stresses the intensity of the link between mother and son, and shows its completeness; it has within itself a capacity for passion that is generally associated with the

relationship between man and wife, or lovers. Indeed, significance of title, Sons and Lovers becomes obvious; there is a way in which the sons are seen as lovers. Though so much of this is expressed in terms of the senses. The total effect is not one of sensuality; the senses and the language of the senses, are used to express a much more complex spiritual position. The completeness of mutual passion between mother and son explains why Mrs. Morel must oppose Miriam, who is seeking the same thing; why she is different to Clara, from whom Paul's soul is safe; why Paul can never love another woman completely while his mother lives—he is too far committed already. Here, as at all key points of the novel, Lawrence's dramatic power and economy are obvious; there is nothing superfluous and nothing wanting, and a vital development has taken place. Paul's complex emotions and his ultimate submission to his mother are summed up at the end of the chapter: "he pressed his face into his pillow in a fury of misery…It was the bitter piece of resignation' (chapter8).

Gertrude Morel's triumph is about an ordinary possessiveness, though that is there. It is recognition of a fundamental mutual need. This central fact of Paul's essential commitment to his mother is established surprisingly early: the above scene takes place exactly half way through the novel. For the rest of the novel both the relationships between Paul and his mother and the relationship between Miriam and Clara must be seen with this acceptance in mind. Of course, the study of the relationship between Paul and his mother does not end here; there is much to come that makes them increasingly solid figures; but the crisis has been passed, and the main course of Paul is already set.

The rest of the relationship between Paul and his mother is concerned first with Mrs. Morel's concern for his son in his love affairs and then with his concern for her in her illness. Although now "he had come back to his mother" (chp9 pg 253) and although Mrs. Morel can say with security "in him was established her life now' (chapter9). There are other demands made on him, first by Miriam, then by Clara. These continue to upset Mrs. Morel and make her suffer, not because she is uncertain of her son's love, but because she is afraid for him. Paul is shown at this stage as in a "state of restless fretting". Unable to break finally with Miriam, and unconsciousness of the strong pull of Clara; her mother in anguish sees this state as dangerous to him: " Mrs. Morel felt as if…which is a form of slow suicide" (chapter10).

Paul, Miriam and Clara: "The relationship between Paul and Miriam is in many ways the most difficult in the novel, partly because of the psychological and emotional complexities in it, and partly because of Lawrence's varying and subtle attitude. With the other relationship he seems to have a clear pattern in mind from the beginning, so that in spite of the changes and developments, the dominant point of view remains basically the same. But in this case Lawrence's sympathy and emphasis fluctuates, moving between Paul, Miriam and Mrs. Morel in such a way as to leave a measure of uncertainty. This effect is artistically valuable; it expresses the confusion of Paul, and the confusion of Lawrence himself, and adds a great deal to the authenticity and immediacy of the account; it is to some extent a reliving of a difficult part of his past by Lawrence, and comes over directly to the reader. By a purist, it might be seen as a weakness in the art of the novel, but most certainly it strengthens the dramatic impact and furthers the humanity."

From the very beginning of the relationship, before Mrs. Morel's hostility is aroused, and before Paul is deeply involved, it is clear that there are going to be difficulties. Many of these lie in the personality and temperament of Miriam herself. When she is first introduced, when she is 'about fourteen' Lawrence is concerned to establish her coyness; her brothers call her 'mardy-kid' and her feeding of the hen states without undue emphasis characteristics which persist through the novel. She finally forces herself to offer grain in her hand to the hen: "At last Miriam let herself…rather pathetic' (chapter6). Fear, pain and grief are to form a large part of Miriam's association with Paul, and, as is foreshadowed here, so much of it comes from her own over-refined sensibilities, her readiness to be hurt. Her timorousness, it is later suggested in a vivid incident, is closely linked with her inability to submit herself to the moment and take a risk. Paul has been swinging: "He was swinging through the air, every bit of him swinging, like a bird that swoops for joy of movement". Miriam reluctantly takes her place on the awing: "She felt the accuracy with which he caught her…hot wave of fear" (chapter7). When she is left to herself, she sways gently, safely, 'scarcely moving'. It is not merely fear: "She

could never lose herself, so, nor could her brothers". Swinging is symbolic of the capacity for instinctive living: Paul can give himself up to the moment, spontaneously; Miriam, though she recognizes this power in Paul, and warms to it, cannot naturally act in the same way. The difference of temperament is fundamental, and much of the difficulty of the relationship is caused by this deep dissimilarity.

This is brought out in the overture to the relationship; when it properly gets underway, in the chapter Lad-And-Girl-Love, other characteristics are emphasized. We are told of her romantic nature, her mysticism, of her treasuring religion inside her', of her passion for learning, and of her piqued idealization of Paul, who 'scarcely observed her'. It is relevant to her latter attitude that after Paul's illness (she is now 16) she rejoices in his weakness—"then she would be stronger than he. Then she could love him" (chapter7). In her way she wants to be dominant; it is not Mrs. Morel's way, but there are points of contact. And yet with the desire for dominance goes a shrinking hesitancy, and what Lawrence describes as 'proud humility'; she at once retires, and wishes to assert mastery.

Very early in the course of their acquaintance, characteristic that is to be most important in their life together is introduced. Paul has already noticed the very in which Mrs. Leivers 'exalted every thing to the plane of religious trust; "Miriam resembles her mother in this, many of her early meeting with Paul are concerned with establishing this quality of intensity. Paul starts to teach algebra. He is not a good teacher: He was quick and hasty…he questioned her more, then got not…afraid, apologetic, ashamed. (chapter7).

Irritation with Miriam is an important ingredient in Paul's attitude towards her, irritation that hurts her and makes her cringe. In her earnestness, she makes the learning of algebra more important than it is, and brings to it a disproportionate emotional intensity. Learning is desperately important to Miriam, and she approaches it with a kind of religious fervour, as she approaches everything, yet her fervour, instead of giving her confines and certainty makes her hesitant, unsure and anguished. She makes complex what with happier dispositions is simple, and imposes her complexity on Paul: "Because of the intensity…went with Edgar (chapter7). It is plain that such a relationship can seldom be easy and untroubled; Miriam's very nature demands too much.

Miriam's intensity rises to its peak in her attitude before flowers. Lawrence splendidly suggests the repressed passion behind her spirituality, which is indeed a sublimation of passion. She takes Paul to look at wild rose bush: "they were going to have a communion together—something…holy (chp7 pg 183-184). They stand before the bush which is made to seem a living power—"Point after point the steady roses shone…in their souls". They are united in their response to it, but Paul cannot go the whole way with her; Paul looked into Miriam's eyes…he turned aside as if pained" (chapter7). One need not feel gross and insensitive if one recognizes the fact that, to say the least, such intensity is difficult to with it; it makes easy spontaneity difficult and hazardous, and Lawrence clearly shows the demand it makes on Paul's sensibility. Miriam translates everything into terms of the spiritual, and Paul feels himself, half-reluctantly, half-willingly drawn into it. Significantly, it is just after this incident that Gertrude Morel says of Miriam, she is one of those who will want to suck a man's soul out till he has none of his own left, and though we see Mrs. Morel's possessiveness we must admit there is a considerable justification for her feeling and Miriam's own possessiveness is clearly stated: "he had not seem to belong…would she feel alive again' (chapter7).

By this time, the bond between them is love, love, however, that they will not acknowledge: "He thought himself too same for such sentimentality and she thought herself too lofty." Besides that, there is the important factor of Miriam's attitude towards sexuality. It would be wrong to call her prudish, and certainly we see her capacity for passion, but the passion is etherealized. Miriam is inhibited by her spiritual delicacy: 'but, perhaps because of the continual business of birth…it could never be mentioned that the mare was in the foal" (chapter7). And Miriam, in her bewildered purity, at first prays: "O Lord, let me not love Paul Morel. Keep me from loving him, if I might not to love him" (chapyer7). Inevitably, Paul feels the pull of sensuality, and in dealing with these early stirrings, Lawrence shows his deepest understanding of adolescence. When Paul and Miriam stand among the sand hills gazing at an enormous yellow moon, Paul is tormented: "she was slightly afraid…but

somehow she ignored them" (chapter7). The situation is created and then explicitly commented on, the state described as complex, but the analysis is perfectly clear: "he did not know himself what was the matter…he was too shrinking and sensitive to give it" (chapter7). Miriam's attitude is not a simple one; it is clear tha5t she is not merely chaste because to be chaste is the right and the moral thing. In her own way, she is intensely aware of him physically: "she loved him absorbedly…she never realized the male he was" (chapter8). The growing tension between them is admirably and surprisingly briefly stated; a few incidents are enough to establish it completely. It is made unmistakably obvious that all the inhibitions are not on Miriam's side; and that as complex as she is, he is even more so. She is not merely passive: "she seem to want him, and he resisted … she wanted to draw all of him into her" (chapter8). And immediately afterwards Paul says: "if only you could want me…then its my fault", he said (chapter8). These passages demonstrate the lovers' difficulty splendidly: attraction and something near to revolution, desire and inhibition, love and hatred, the sensual and the spiritual, are all confirmed and struggling together; neither of the lovers knows what is the matter. And for Paul there is the added complications of his mother all the time: 'And why did he hate Miriam, and feel so cruel towards her, at the thought of his mother? …easily hated her" (chapter8).

This happens just before the scene quoted and commented as above, in which Paul realize primary love for his mother; the one that follows after the realization, and illustrates the increasing bitterness and anger. In a crucial scene in the chapter, "Defeat of Miriam", all the incompatibilities flare out, and the situation is made as clear as it can ever be. All Paul's irritation, all his thwarted passion are expressed in savage resentments: "why must you always be fondling things,", he said irritably … jolted off these sayings like sparks from electricity (chapter9). It should not need Lawrence's comment to make us realize that this is not an entirely just view of Miriam; it is partial one, seen in anger and frustration, and a hidden consciousness of failure on his part in Paul. Shortly afterwards, he first suggests that they should "breakoff": "I can only give friendship…let us have done" (chapter9)

Here, Paul recognizes his own share in failure of the relationship, and here I will reiterate what I suggested before. Though Paul is partly Lawrence, and though we see largely through Paul's eyes, we also see Paul; he cannot understand himself and his situation, but we can; we are shown enough of the situation as a whole to enable us to make our own judgement. Indeed, at this moment in the novel, it is not measure of Lawrence's involvement with Paul that is remarkable, but it is the coexistence of involvement with fine crucial detachment, it is undoubtedly a rare achievement.

Paul moves from this to his firmest statement of his own incapacity to love. Miriam has said that she cannot understand his attitude towards he: "I know,", he cried, 'you never will! You will never believe that I can't-can't physically, anymore than I can fly up like a skylark-, "what?" she murmured. Now she dreaded. "Love you" (chapter9). Miriam will not believe it: she knew he loved her and both now and later. Miriam continues to love and to hope. This is the moment she recognizes fully that besides fighting Paul, she is fighting his mother: "What have they been saying at home? … she knew it was" (chapter9).

Immediately afterwards we are shown, he had come back to his mother. Stated badly like that it sounds as if Lawrence were working mechanically to a rigid formula, but the development is by no means coldly schematic. The richness and authority of creation of Paul's relationship with his mother, display of the difference in his feelings and attitudes when he is with his mother from these with Miriam, the subtlety of the interplay of the two contending pulls on Paul, make this an organic development: it grows naturally out of a complex of feelings, situations and personalities.

Though Paul has gone back to his mother, the struggle in Paul and between his mother and Miriam are not over; rather, even though the ultimate decision has been taken, they are intensified. Miriam goes on fighting for Paul's love, and Paul, who is shown to have a real need for Miriam's companionship, unsatisfactory though, it is drift back to her. He can neither take her nor leave her alone. He still needs her. "She alone helped him towards realization…could not do without her" (chapter9). She is necessary to his intellectual life and to his

growing up, but the sexual barrier remains, now acutely self-conscious. When he comes to the verse…scotch in his running with her (chapter9). It is at this time of frustration that Clara really enters Paul's life, and the situation is complicated further. When he meets her at the farm, she is described in terms of the physical and sensuous: Clara sat in a cool parlour reading…muslin at the top her hand" (chapter9).

Since we largely see Clara through Paul's eyes, we are made amply aware of her sexual appeal to him; and because we also see her partly through Lawrence's eyes, we are aware that she is drawn to him. They have points in common. In the scene in which Paul and Clara compete in jumping over a haycock. We are made aware that Clara has same gift of surrendering herself to sensation and the moment that Paul showed in the much earlier scene of the swing; both have the same capacity for instinctive living, however it may have been repressed and thwarted by circumstances. Here, as he breaks again with Miriam and the novel comes to the end of the first phase of Paul's love-affair (chapter9). It is marked by an intensification of his sexuality: The sex-instinct that Miriam had refined…concentration in the breast (chapter9). It is not simply a turning from one woman to another; both are in his consciousness: "Sooner or later he would have to ask…he allowed her right" (chapter9).

His intimacy with Clara grows gradually; for a time he sees little of Miriam, and more and more of Clara. When she comes to Jordan"s at his invitation, they are thrown even more together, and Lawrence traces very delicately the growing involvement; he shows their physical awareness of each other and the defensive sexual hostility that accompanies such awareness. The situation is not realized as intimately, as much from inside as the relationship with Miriam; it does seem more to be there in order to confirm preconceived thesis, but it is amply adequate for its purpose; Clara's little attractiveness is enough conveyed for us to accept it as a fact. Again, Paul does not realize the true state of his feelings towards Clara. At the time when the nature of Clara's appeal to Paul is clear to Gertrude Morel and to the reader, 'Paul can still feel: but she was a married woman…it was only a friendship between man and woman" (chapter10). At this point, Lawrence makes one of his clearest definitions of Paul's state: "Sex had become so complicated…yet he did not positively desire her" (chapter10).

Because Paul, preoccupied with sex as he is, has not yet completely focused his desires on a particular woman, it is possible for him to return to Miriam, in spite of the attraction to Clara. Clara has in a way herself encouraged him; she has told him that "Miriam does not want any of your soul communion. That's your own imagination. She wants you"(chapter10). He goes back this time with fully aroused passions, and still finds himself inhibited from any direct approach to Miriam by the 'eternal maidenhood' about her. Paul's return to Miriam causes bitter suffering to his mother. She has not been in the centre of the picture for some time as Paul is absorbed by interests other than her so is the reader but now she comes back. In a passage whose significance is often missed, because the main stress for the time being lies on Paul, we are told of her grief and her feeling of defeat. "She sees Paul as losing warmth and joy in the course of his struggle with Miriam: she realizes he is determined to go to her. Now, for the first time, she cannot fight back. Mrs. Morel was tired…she was in the way" (chapter11). The decision now lies with Paul; his mother no longer has will or power to act.

Paul makes an effort to break the barrier of physical reticence between him and Miriam; he tries to bring sexuality to life between them, so that their union, so close in many ways, can be complete. But Miriam cannot respond; to do so would be alien to her, a violation of her own special integrity. Her timorousness, her inability to yield herself spontaneously to sensation, feeling and passion, come more painfully than ever between them: "He courted her now like a lover… deliberate reflective creature" (chapter11).

They do however achieve physical consummation, but it remains merely physical, it doesn't bring about the union that both Paul and Miriam desire. It has seemed to Paul that only Miriam's physical withdrawal stood between them; he finds that possessing her body makes no essential difference: "They lay as if she had given herself up to sacrifice…But he wanted somehow to cry" (chapter11). They have a week of passionate lovemaking

and the situation is made quite clear. When Paul takes Miriam physically, he had to do so selfishly—he had always almost willfully, to put her out of count; when they are spiritually together, Paul's desire has to be laid aside. The spiritual and the physical sides of their love never fuse together; for Miriam the physical act of love is a voluntary sacrifice of herself. Between them, the physical union gives nothing more than itself; for Miriam it is not even a gratification.

Both feel a sense of failure. Paul realizes that the act he had set so much store on as a means of achieving fulfillment and unity is paradoxically the means of driving them apart: "Gradually, he ceased to ask her to have him…it would never be a success between them" (chapter11). This is really the end for them. Paul has had Miriam's body, but he has not had her; her spiritual virginity, that has proved to be the barrier, remains. But Miriam is not wholly to blame. In their last meeting as lovers, Miriam, in a scene of great pain and bitterness, says: "It has always been you fighting me off…always the same" (chapter11).

Paul, in despair, feels that their whole relationship has been a sham; Miriam is 'full of bitterness' and for those who believe that Lawrence wholly and blindly committed to Paul, it is useful to look at Miriam's angry assessment of " his littleness, his meanness, and his folly' we, the readers, knew better than either of them that the relationship was more than a sham, that there is more to PAUL than bitterness, meanness and folly. Their situation is a sad one; but we can see that it is inevitable. They are not 'star-crowd. Lovers; they are crossed by their characters, temperaments 'and circumstances.

They go their separate ways, Miriam in patient hope (she remained alone with herself, waiting of Paul's return), Paul to seek fulfillment in Clara. The treatment of the relationship between Paul and Clara is different in tone from that of Paul and Miriam. It is not so minutely seen from the inside, and, vivid as it is, and perfectly adequate to fulfill Lawrence's intentions, it is not so intensely felt; it is reported, and convincingly reported, rather than experienced. The relationship is in itself simpler, and I do not propose to deal with it in such close detail.

It is for Paul, something in the way of an exercise or experiment in passion. This is not to say that Paul's feeling is cold-blooded lust a simple search for gratification, but the reader certainly gets the impression that there is an element of will in it. Paul is deliberately searching for the fulfillment in passion that failed to find with Miriam. That is in love with Clara is made clear enough; Paul's impatience through the long Sunday as he wants for Monday when he will see her again is well done; Clara's physical vitality is thoroughly realized; and we feel Paul's acute awareness of it.

They achieve a simple happiness together at first; both are uninhibited with each other; both are willing to surrender to the moment; both have a capacity for happiness. Ultimately, Paul finds his fulfillment: But then Clara was not there for him, only a women, warm, something he loved and almost worshiped, there is the dark…the wheel of stars (chapter13). Their passion is seen to be instinctive and living and natural-it is included in the natural order of the world, the grass, the peetwit, the stars. It is a revelation to them, a profound experience: They could let themselves be carried by life (chapter13). Although, they could see this, Clara is not satisfied: something great was there…but she could not keep the moment (chapter13). She feels that she has not fully got Paul, that there is some part of him with held. Not deliberately, but, unattainable because of his very nature. Just as Miriam could not naturally give herself physically, Paul cannot (naturally) give himself spiritually. But their passion and their desire for each other continue, and very soon, Clara recognizes the true state of affaire: She knew she never fully had him…realize what it was" (chapter3). She feels surer of her estranged husband than she does of Paul. Paul and she have benefited each other, she feels; a necessary function has been performed: Together they had received the baptism of life…but now their missions were separate (chapter13). She realizes that they will part, and realizes too that they both want a permanent relationship; she knows that they cannot give that to each other.

As time goes on, even the passion begins to fail, and they begin to move from the realm of love to these of lust: Their loving grew more mechanical…some feeling of satisfaction (chapter13). At this stage, it bring to a head

all Paul's inner dissatisfaction with himself and his life. He becomes inaccessible to Clara and even to his mother. He is in this precarious state when he hears of his mother's tumor, and the process of dissolution is accelerated. It is virtually the end of his relationship with Clara; he still sees her and she can give him some relief from his anguish, but there is no vital link between them, and return to Banter Dawes as it were serves formally to mark the end of the relationship. The relationship has given Paul something; he has come near his fulfillment in passion; but he cannot give himself, and it has ended as the relationship with Miriam did, in failure. And clearly this time, the deficiency is with Paul.

THE LAST PHASE: Many of the important revelations of the relationship of Paul and Clara were made in the course of analysis, often by Clara; now, the novel turns reverts to the more dramatic techniques of the earlier section, the characters are shown in action. Mrs. Morel comes back with Paul into the focus of attention; her illness and suffering are splendidly realized, and again we must admire Lawrence's creative tact in his avoidance of sentimentality and any kind of over-statement; the reality of intolerable suffering is expressed by the heroic stoicism of Mrs. Morel: Her mouth gradually shut hard in a line…tearing from her.

The narrative from the first statement of Mrs. Morel's illness to her death is very compelling. The death itself is vividly realized but it is particularly important because of the immense irony that it exemplifies. We have by now realized for once and all that Paul's life is centred on his mother; yet he hastens her death; in love for her, he gives her an overdose of morphine; he is an agent in killing what he loved most. Paul at his mother's death is very near his own: "His mother had really supported his life…faced the world together". But in spite of what Lawrence said in his letter to Edward Garnett, Paul is not defeated completely: "He did not want to die…he would go on alone" He carries on mechanically and lifelessly, in anguish and puzzlement, but still he carries on; his mother's endurance lives in him. Clara finally goes back to her husband and Paul is alone: 'Always alone, his soul oscillated, first on the side of death then on the side of life, doggedly". When Miriam appears again he offers to marry her but she realizes that, as always he is unable to offer his fuller self. Miriam achieves heroic dignity in her final acceptance of defeat: "she was not to have him, …self-sacrifice". The path of the whole relationship is summed up and concentrated in this refusal; each desperately wants the other to act, to give; they need each other; but neither can act or give wholly. Nothing in the novel more clearly shows the inevitability of their failure to come together: "He felt, in leaving her… by denying his own."

Critical Comments on D.H. Lawrence

Virginia Woolf: "His [Lawrence] reputation, which was that of a prophet, the exponent of some mystical theory of sex, the devotee of cryptic terms, the inventor of new terminology which made free use of such words as solar plexus and the like, was not attractive; to follow submissively in his tracks seemed an unthinkable aberration; and as chance would have it, the few pieces of his writing that issued from behind this dark cloud of reputation seemed unable to rouse any sharp curiosity or to dispel the lurid phantom…One of the curious qualities of *Sons and Lovers* is that one feels an unrest, a little quiver and shimmer in his page, as if it were composed of separate gleaming objects, by no means content to stand still and be looked at. There is a scene of course; a character; yes, and people related to each other by a net of sensations; but these are not there—as in Proust—for themselves…The world of *Sons and Lovers* is perpetually in process of cohesion and dissolution. The magnet that tries to draw together the different particles of which the beautiful and vigorous world of Nottingham is made is the incandescent body, this beauty glowing in the flesh, this intense and burning light. Hence whatever we are shown seems to have a moment of its own. Nothing rests secure to be looked at. All is being sucked away by some dissatisfaction, some superior beauty, or desire, or possibility. The book therefore excites, irritates, moves, changes, seems full of stir and unrest and desire for something withheld, like the body of the hero. The whole world—it is a proof of the writer's remarkable strength—is broken and tossed by the magnet of the young man who cannot bring the separate parts into a unity which will satisfy him."

An anonymous critic writes in *The Bookman*, August 1913: "…The book has naturally a place in a list which includes such authors as John Galsworthy, Cunninghame Graham and Charles Doughty, to name only three of

the many who have enriched the literature of today with work which is, in some sense, esoteric…It has nothing of urbanity and no trace of the humorous and faintly contemptuous patronage which is common—and probably rather difficult to avoid—in novels dealing with a particular piece of country and class of people. Its descriptions and interpretations are convincing as experience is convincing; Mr. Lawrence is on his own ground and presents it with an assured intimacy of knowledge that never fails or blurs…it is a novel of outstanding quality, singular in many respects and in none more so than in the author's constancy to his artistic purpose, which never suffers him to see his people in a dramatic or spectacular light or on a level higher or lower than his own. The fact that they exist suffices him without calling them names, whether good or bad, his business is to show them, dispassionately and accurately. He writes with a nervous pliancy which is a joy to read."

Questions for better understanding of the novel

1. Show with reference to *Sons and Lovers* that Lawrence sees human relationships essentially in terms of conflict.
2. Does the value of *Sons and Lovers* depend wholly or mainly on the validity of the Oedipus complex? Is it possible to make a case for the novel even on the assumption that the theory is false?
3. The clash of his parents in him gets reflected in Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*. Examine the novel from this perspective.
4. How far would it be appropriate to dub the novel 'a success for making the psychological selves of the characters but an outgrowth of their sociological selves"
5. Has *Sons and Lovers* any real unity as a novel, or is it at least two separate novels co-existing uneasily in a single book? Give reasons in support of your answers.
6. Is Mrs. Morel the most important woman to Paul throughout the novel, or are there moments at which his relationships with Miriam or Clara take precedence? If so, what is the significance of these moments? Why does he always come back to his mother in the end?
7. What goes wrong between Paul and Miriam? Is it just that she cannot compete with his love for his mother, or is there some other problem?

T.S. ELIOT

The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock

The Waste Land

Unit-II
T.S. Eliot

SECTION I: CRITICISM ON ELIOT

1. The Age of T.S. Eliot

The 20th century is such a complex and problematic age that it cannot be represented by a single voice or character. We can hardly call it the Age of Science, for even physics is today on the verge of metaphysics, nor will it suffice to designate it as the Age of Anxiety, for that really tells nothing. Neither it is humanistic, nor classical, nor scientific, nor romantic, nor one of the compromise. We cannot simply sum up the age by a single charming epithet, as in case with the previous eras, e.g. the Age of Chaucer, the Age of Milton, the Age of Dryden, the Age of Pope, the Age of Wordsworth, and so on and so forth. The 20th century is a peculiar mass that entraps us with tempting baits heartlessly; it is a baffling mass of currents and cross-currents. The moment we set out to discover it, it becomes a mirage. Instead of unfolding itself to us, it rather engulfs us. It seems that the 20th century has brought all the distinct threads trailing through centuries together and tied them in a knot. It would be a miracle indeed if someone were born to voice the concern of the age in all its manifestations. But the miracle has already happened in the form of T.S. Eliot !

Surrounded by a hostile world, Eliot's many-sided genius became impatient to formulate new devices of speech and rhythm in English poetry. When he began writing verses, the Georgian poetry was in progress. By and by the poets had forgotten their avowed aims and had begun doing the same as the romantic Decadents, against whom they had risen in revolt erstwhile.

To understand the greatness of T.S. Eliot, it is worthwhile to throw light on the Georgian school of poetry, since it is school against which he stood firmly and contributed something concrete to the growth of English poetry.

The Georgian school of poets published five volume of *Georgian Poetry* between 1912 and 1922 from the Poetry Bookshop of Harold Monro. In these volumes appeared the poems of R. Brooke, E.Blunden, W.H.Davies, Walter de la Mare, L.A bercrombie, Gordon Bottomley, John Drinkwater, J.E. Flecker, John Freeman, W.W. Gibson, Ralph Hodgson, Edward Shanks, Sir John Squire, Alfred Noyes, G.K. Chesterton, Masefield and Hilaire Bellock. These poets had their recognisable features, but they were alike in the rejection of the Decadent ideals of art and literature. They cultivated such qualities as reality, simplicity, love of natural beauty, and adherence to the main traditions of English poetry in form and technique. With the passage of time, they turned away from real life and, like the Romantics, sought shelter in "old, unhappy, far-off things" and in "battles long ago".[1] And hence their revolt against the decadents proved to be no more than a re-statement of 'what had already been said perfectly'. They wrote for the popular taste, and their "exoteric" poetry tended to be "flat and thin, or shallow and shadowless….. an evasion like the phrase, 'Not at Home'."[2] This is the reason that led the Sitwells, Roy Campbell and others to attack their poetic practice.

T.E. Hulme (1883-1917) led the reaction against the Georgian poetry. Through his impressive lectures and five short poems, Hulme stressed that poetry should solely confine itself to the world perceived by the senses, and to the presentation of its themes in a succession of concise, clearly visualized, concrete images, accurate in detail and precise in significance. He also stressed the employment of *vers libre* with its unlimited freedom of expression and its rhythms approaching those of everyday speech. Hilda Doolittle and Ezra Pound offered their unstinted support to Hulme, and they combinedly launched an attack on the Georgian poetry and brought into being the literary movement, known as Imagism. In 1914 appeared *The Egoist* and *Des Imagistes.* The

Imagist poets went on with their job with a missionary zeal, and succeeded in producing the three collections of poems under the title *Some Imagist Poets* (1915-1917) and the final *Imagist Anthology* (1930). Although the Imagist movement grew weak by the desertion of its certain members and by the obsession of its practitioners to follow the sequence of very exact and concise images. But the movement was in full swing after the first Great War, and exerted profound influence upon Eliot and Richard Alidington. Eliot could never shake off its impact and it ensured to him the use of concrete images.

When Eliot came from the New England to Europe, the condition of English poetry was not very bright; American poetry was defunct; and French poetry began to draw inspiration from Symbolism, which influenced writers like Arthur Symons and W.B. Yeats in its wake.

Two eminent poets of Eliot's time were Yeats and Ezra Pound. But whereas the early Yeats was devoted whole-heartedly to 'the stuff of dreams' and to the Irish questions, and Pound to his idiosyncracies about art and politics, Eliot alone showed in poetry the "complex intensities of concern about soul and body"[3]. In case with the first two poets, in many other respects great and powerful as they were, "the moral, religious and anthropological preoccupations"[4] are absent. Yeats could be a realist and an over-all metaphysical seer only towards the close of his career. Moreover, the best utterance of Yeats philosophy is *A Vision* (1925 and 1937), which is in itself an obscure work of prose, not of poetry. But Eliot's best religious and philosophical work, as far as I can think, is *Four Quartets*, a unique flower of the poet's genius: "The complete consort dancing together."[5] And Pound stands nowhere in the context, since his "main concern has always been art: he is, in the most serious sense of the word, an aesthete.[6] Despite Eliot's proclaimed gratefulness to Pound, who was his "technical adviser" [7] and to whom he dedicated *The Waste Land*, "the influence of Mr. Pound that can be observed from outside is secondary to Mr. Eliot's."[8] Thus it can be safely asserted that Eliot is the truest poet of his time, only next to none.

Being conscious of the 'failings' of the Georgians, Eliot set about to introduce "new ways of thought, new modes of approach, new patterns of expression, new rhythms and new cadeneess".[9] And Eliot succeeded wonderfully in his job as a poet for that simple reason that he had the humility to admit the great ineluctable value of tradition. That indeed is the indelible mark of true genius. The true genius does not invent or discover so much as he creates or transmutes the borrowed material. In Shakespeare's hands the material drawn from other sources 'suffered a sea-change.'

Eliot wanted to evolve and practise certain standards; he was a traditionalist through and through. He longed to imbibe in his works the best of the European tradition, of which the British was a part. "Although a poet of the English language, Eliot is, first and foremost, an European poet. "[10] And it is this 'Europeanism, the awareness of belonging to a tradition broader than that of his language that distinguishes him from many of his English-language contemporaries. He went to Christianity to satisfy the longing for European tradition and culture, since Christianity was "the most effective measure against the corruption of totalitarianism" and could "save the modern man from being completely atomized and going adrift".[11]

Correlated to this traditionalism is Eliot's concept of art. His most remarkable contribution to modern literature is the 'impersonal theory of poetry' *Tradition and the Individual* Talent is a very good essay in which Eliot says that the poem and the poem are two separate things. He elucidates the matter by examining "the relation of the poem to the past" and then "the relation of the poem to its author".[12] He thinks that the past is never dead; it lives in the present. The poet should draw his model and ideas from the past to shape the future. He takes much from the stored wisdom of the ancients and gives comparatively less to the tradition. And in this usual barter system, he has to annihilate himself greatly, or to undergo the process of 'a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality.' Personality, therefore, finds no room in his theory of poetry. In this respect he is very different from the romantic conception of art, and his declaration in 1928 that he was "classicist in literature, Anglo-Catholic in religion, royalist in politics"[13] is fully vindicated. Thus we see that Eliot was not only an innovator in poetry but also in criticism. His multipronged gen us heralded the drawn of a new era in the field of English poetic drama too. As Eliot thought, certain emotions and feelings visit us only in

moments of inaction, the moments frequently symbolized in Eliot's work by a scene in a rose-garden or apple orchard. These can only be expressed in the language of poetry. But at the same time the contact with the ordinary, everyday world must be organically related to each other. They should look as 'integral products of an act of imagination.'

And Eliot, beyond doubt, was "an integral poet",[14] who had been searching for a form of poetry as well as for a form of life. He could make the search easy by means of symbols and images, which synthesised his disparate experiences, and which came up to fill in the gap created by the absence of connections and transitions. But if " he omits the grammatical signs of connection and order, he preserves the psychological or poetic signs."[15] Eliot's employment of 'broken images', his abrupt transitions from one thought to another, his wit-flashes, his over-implication, his allusiveness, his elliptical style that are so evident in his works are all indicative of his permanent concern to convey 'the genuine whole of tangled feelings'.

Some critics have charged Eliot of being obscure and elliptical in his poetry, particularly so in *The Waste Land* and *Four Quartets*. Though the charge may not be rejected totally, the age itself we are living in is such. Eliot did not believe in producing work haphazardly; he worked with diligence and artistry. In his reaction against the preceding poetry, he chose the way of esotericism. And in one of his memorable essays[16] he has tried to clarify his stand in the matter:

"We can only say that it appears likely that poets in our civilisation, as it exists at present, must be difficult. Our civilisation comprehends great variety and complexity, and this variety and complexity, playing upon a refined sensibility, must produce various and complex results. The poet must become more and more comprehensive, more allusive, more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning."

Eliot was fully convinced of "the uselessness of wide appeal to an audience incapable of full appreciation."[17] He was also fully convinced of the demands of our civilisation being infinitely much more complex than in any previous era. As art is the reflection of the spirit of the age, it requires the resurrection of the lost and the development of new artistic devices. Esotericism, as opposed to exotericism of the Georgian poetry, was at once "a discipline for the easier desires of the artist and of the audience" and "a necessary result of the conditions in which the poet's sensibility had to operate."[18] The esoteric poet aims at "cultivating all the possibilities of words as a medium"[19], and "when the speech of one sense is insufficient to convey (the) entire meaning, (using) the language of another".[20] Esotericism therefore, as cultivated by Eliot, was a call of the 20th century to create new devices essential to the expression of entirely new conditions.

Paul Elmer More labeled Eliot as a 'lyric prophet of chaos'. When he attributed this epithet to him, he simply meant that Eliot had dealt with 'the confusion of life' in his poetry. In 1922, a new star became lord of the ascendant. Eliot's The Waste Land was hailed by the literary world as a landmark in English poetry comparable to the *Lyrical Ballads.* The poem was written under the shadow of postwar horror and despair. *The Waste Land*, in method as well as in mood, is a continuation of *Gerontion*; it is in genre the same as *The Hollow Men* which is the next to follow it. This poem has surpassed even Laforgue in technique and symbolic expression. Eliot has now " developed a new technique, at once laconic, quick, and precise, for representing the transmutations of thought, the interplay of perception and reflection."[21]

Most of the 'modernist' trends of poetry – the new psychology, anthropology, symbolism, and metaphysics – meet in the work of T.S. Eliot and contribute most to its surprising success. The years 1919-1929 were "a confused" and "a barren decade"[22] but not for Eliot. The poet is loved and liked today so much due to his flourishing at a time when there was felt a vacuum in English poetry. Critics like Yvor Winters should have done well to themselves and to the literary world at large by greeting the 'ascendant' star instead of labeling him as one who 'surrenders his form to his subject', and thereby becomes chaotic. Who can say that Eliot is chaotic, simply because he 'holds a mirror to Nature' as a true social reporter and reformer? Who can deny the fact that he has done considerable service to English poetry by bringing it back to life? Perhaps Mr. Hugh Kenner has dispensed justice to him by ascribing him the quality to be "the invisible poet in an age of systematic

literary scrutiny"[23] Mr. William Empson is also quite judicious in his evaluation of Eliot as ' a very penetrating influence, perhaps not unlike an east wind'.

For good poetry Mr. Pound has laid down that it should ensure the blending of three aspects together: (1) Melopoeia, (2) Imagism, and finally (3) Lagopoeia. Some of these three is found in all good poetry, as in Eliot's too. Such poetry "must resolve the distinctive characteristics of its own time – which are temporary – into universality."[24] For Eliot, the past or tradition is the best form of universality. But this past or tradition does not imply the insular outlook of 'Europeanism'. It transcends the limitations of space and time. Eliot is a 'universal' poet of the first rank. He is not 'the great minor poet of 20th century' as David Daiches characterised him in his Delhi Seminar address. One must bear in mind that Eliot's universality is a progression of the concept of 'Europeanism' and not a retrogression. It highlights his readiness to accept 'the best that is known and thought' in the world. Octavio paz has expressed this idea in the following memorable manner:

"Eliot is universal in the sense in which all great poetry, from the funeral chants of the pygmies to the Hai-ku of the Japanese, is the common heritage of all men; and he is universal also because of his influence in world literature of our time, comparable to that of Klee in painting or that of Sxtravinsky in music: an influence which differs from others because it is a critical influence."[25]

As a true 'universal' poet, Eliot included, at least, six foreign languages in *The Waste Land alone*. He would be remembered as a scholar who was sincerely devoted to the betterment of English poetry by plumbing new depths and exploring new horizons. In the words of Pinto: 'He has given it (English Poetry) a new intellectual dignity, new forms arising out of a sincerity and a new spiritual depth. Like Dryden after the Restoration and Wordsworth at the end of the eighteenth century he has also given it a new policy'. And this is a very balanced judgement of Eliot indeed.

1. Wordsworth, 'The Solitary Reaper'. *Fifteen poets*
2. Edith Sitwell, *Aspects of Modern Poetry,* p.73.
3. F.R. Leavis, *New Bearings In English Poetry*, P. 140
4. *Ibid*., p.140
5. 'Little Gidding', *Four Quatets*. *Complete Poems*, p.
6. F.R. Leavis, *New Bearings In English Poetry*, p.140.
7. G.S. Fraser, *Ezra Pound*, p.1.
8. F.R. Leavis, *New Bearings In English Poetry*, p.134.
9. *The P.G.E.A. Magazine* , Allahabad University , Allahabad (1964-65),p.20.
10. Octavio Paz, 'Inaugural Address', *Papers and Proceedings of a Seminar* (1965), p.2
11. *Papers and Proceedings of a Seminar*, p. 97.
12. 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', *The Sacred Wood* p. 51.
13. See the Preface to For *Lancelot Andrewes, p.7*
14. K.Smidt, *Poetry and Belief in the Work of T.S. Eliot ,* p. 114.
15. George Williamson, *A Reader's Guide to T.S. Eliot*, p.14.
16. 'The Metaphysical Poets' in *Selected Essays*, p.289.
17. D.E.S. Maxwell, *The Poetry of T.S. Eliot,* p. 15
18. *Ibid*, p. 15.
19. Edith Sitwell, *Poetry and Criticism,* p.23.
20. *Ibid*, p. 18.
21. Edmund Wilson, *Axel's Castle,* p.92.

22. Grierson and Smith, *A Critical History Of English Poetry*, p.513.
23. See Hugh Kenner's *The Invisible Poet*: T.S. Eliot, p.ix.
24. D.E.S. Maxwell, *The poetry of T.S. Eliot*, p.13.
25. Octavio Paz, 'inaugural address", *Papers and Proceedings of a Seminar*, p.2.

2. T.S. Eliot's Life and Works

T.S. Eliot has become been a name of high fame in English poetry since the early twenties. He had governed the age in which he lived with an unchallengeable authority. The 20th century, as it is known to all, is quite complex and diversified in nature. It cannot be signalized by a single voice or authority. Still T.S. Eliot may be regarded as its best representative in English literature, perhaps more so than any other literary figure. Amongst the post-war poets, playwrights and critics, who have enjoyed honour and prestige, Eliot stands out as a towering personality. It is he alone who could face and relish the life of stark and harsh realities. He never liked to sit in an ivory tower by shutting his eyes to the intricate and baffling problems confronting the human race of his time. He rather came forward as one of ourselves and to presented a first –hand report on the formidable issues of the age.

As a poet, Eliot drew upon many different sources to gather his material. He was deeply influenced by certain glorious personalities of the past and of the contemporary scene. Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Ben Jonson, Arnold, etc. in general, and Donne and the Metaphysicals in particular contributed their shares in shaping Eliot's mind. Of the foreign impact upon him, mention may be made of the French Symbolists, especially Laforgue and Gautier, of the German philosophers, such as Hegel, Meinong and Bradley, and of the Indian religions and philosophies. By embracing influences so wide and diverse in nature, Eliot greatly increased his knowledge and enriched his sensibility. This also accounts for his being a universal poet. Eliot was a versatile genius, a highly talented man and an immortal soul. Eliot's universality is to be interpreted in the sense in which all great poetry, from the funeral chants of the pigmies to the Hai –ku of the Japanese, is the common heritage of all man; Eliot's appeal was not limited to the English speaking people or to the European tradition; he is rather a universal poet. And this necessarily presupposes that he is an English poet or an European poet.

In this context it is proper to say that Eliot was aware of a vastly rich tradition, which was not merely English or European, but had a wider application. He derives, for example, not only from "the best that is known and thought" in the Bible, or Christian theology, but also from Buddhism and Hinduism and many more religions. It is in this sense that Eliot's outlook is said to be catholic, not insular, not national, but international, nor peculiar to one tribe or people but to all tribes and peoples. For him creeds and castes do not matter; he is only concerned with the best. This also explains another stand taken by him, that of a classicist in literature. He held Aristotle's authority supreme, because he had a critical mind *par excellence.* Eliot is also a critic of the Aristotelian line. Correlated to this is his historic statement in 1928 that he was 'an Anglo – Catholic in religion' and 'a royalist in politics'. No doubt, Eliot's mind was wholly absorbed with Christianity, its burning problems, its reformative zeal; his poetry, tends to enact an attitude towards life, and this attitude is that of a devout Christian and spiritual fighter.

By 'royalist in politics' Eliot might have meant a conservative who does not believe in sudden and violent revolutions, like the one which the French enacted in 1789 against the monarchy. Eliot was a humanitarian beyond scruples, but it does not mean that he should be violent and aggressive to root out the stumbling blocks in the way. They are rather to be overcome with sympathy, which at once implies the sympathy of a critical mind. His manifesto of being a 'royalist' does not offer him an advantage of escape from the social and human responsibilities, which necessitates involving into action rather than fleeing into a solitary resort.

T.S. Eliot was born in 1888 in St. Louis, Missouri (U.S.A). His family was of Devonshire origin, which was traditionally interested in trade and commerce and academic studies. He was an undergraduate at Harvard during 1906 –1909. Here he came under the influence of the Symbolists and Laforgue. During 1909-10 he was

a graduate student at Harvard and completed his early poems, including *'Portrait of a Lady'* and began *'Prufrock'*. In the years 1910 and 1911 he went to France (Sorbonne in Paris) and Germany. He spent a year at Oxford reading Greek philosophy. Again he was back to Harvard University as a graduate student. It is then that he started work on the philosophy of Francis Herbert Bradley, whose *Appearance and Reality* influenced him much. During 1914 –15 he resumed his study in Germany which was cut off by the First World War. He took his residence at Oxford, and worked on some short satiric poems. *'Prufrock'* was published in Chicago in June 1915. His marriage to Vivian Haigh - Wood took place in July 1915.

After a brief experience of teaching at Highgate School, Eliot entered business in 1916.He also completed his Bradley thesis in that year . Then he spent eight years as an employee of Lloyd's Bank. He took up various reviewing and editorial assignments. During 1917-20 he wrote many poems in quatrains after the French fashion. '*Gerontion*' deserves special mention in this connection. *Prufrock' and Other Observations* appeared in press in June 1917.He was an assistant editor of *The Egoist* (1917-19).He also published a collection of Poems and *The Sacred Wood* in 1920.

Eliot was the London correspondent for *The Deal* during 1921-22 and *La-Nouvelle Revue Trancaise* during 1922-23. In October 1923 began his career as an editor of *'The Criterion'*. His epoch -making poem, *The Waste Land,* appeared in public in 1922. It is a much discussed poem with five movements. In it the poet has displayed the fears, doubts and distrust of the post war generation. It won for him the *Dial* award. In 1925 appeared his *Poems* 1909-1925, which included *'The Hollow Men'* written in the spirit of *The Waste land.*

During 1926-27 came out his satiric pieces '*Fragment of a Prologue',* and *'Fragment of an Agon'*. In 1927 Eliot declared himself to be an Anglo-Catholic in religion and assumed British citizenship. *'Ariel Poems'* were published between 1927 and 1930. *'Ash Wednesday',* the most difficult poem in six sections, appeared in 1930, before which he had written an essay on Dante (1929). The fragmentary *'Coriolan'* was out in 1931. The year 1932 saw the publication of *Selected Essays* in which were included most of the essays already published in *The Sacred Wood'* (1920).Thereafter *The Use of Poetry and The Use of Criticism (1933)* and *After Strange Gods*(1934) were produced which contain some of the highly qualified critical opinions of the poet-critic on the theory and practice of poetry.

The year 1934 witnessed a substantial change in the attitude of the poet. He had now sided with the poetic drama, which he renovated and energized during the later years of his life. Eliot's first work in this direction was *The Rock*(1934). Since then a spate of publications flooded the dramatic field. *Murder in the Cathedral* appeared in 1935. *Poems:*1909-1935, including '*Burnt Norton'* was produced then. *The Family Reunion* in 1939 was a stage- failure, but the dramatist remained unshaken. During the years 1940-42 appeared '*East Coker'*, '*The Dry Salvages'* and '*Little Gidding'*. These three and '*Burnt Norton'* were combined together to form *Four Quartets* (1943).

The year 1947 brought a catastrophe for Eliot : the death of his first wife after long illness. In 1948 he wrote *'Notes towards the Definition of Culture*. By now he had been honoured by his fellow poets, writers, literary associations and clubs on so many occasions. Among the many literary honours bestowed upon him, mention may be made of : Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry at Harvard(1932-33),President, Classical Association, Nobel Prize for Literature(1948), and Order of Merit(1948).At different times he had received honorary degrees from no less than twelve Universities in Europe and America.

Eliot wrote *The Cocktail Party* in 1950,*The Confidential Clerk* in 1955 and *The Elder Statesman* in 1959. After '*Four Quartets,* poetry was almost untouched by him, though poetic element was indisputably retained in his all dramas mentioned above. Earlier in 1957,Eliot had married Valerie Fletcher, his second wife, and had published *On Poetry and Poets*. Eliot's hectic literary life came to an end on January 4,1965, and the news of his death was received in the world with a sense of deep loss and sorrow.

Needless to say that with the passing away of T.S. Eliot an age of Masters of English literature has closed its chapter, at least for the time being. But he will ever be remembered by us; he who gave us *'Whispers of*

Immortality' while alive, will return invisibly to us to console, exhort, and guide the 'erring humanity'. He would be ever remembered as one of the illustrious sons of the Muse who have secured a permanent place on the Parnassus. He is to be remembered as one who has enriched and enhanced the scope of English poetry. "He has given it (English poetry) a new intellectual dignity, new forms arising out of a new sincerity and a new spiritual depth. Like Dryden after the Restoration and Wordsworth at the end of the eighteenth century he has also given it a new policy. More than any other poet he has saved it 'from becoming a mere pastime of the scholarly section of the upper middle class, like Latin poetry in the days of Claudiun and Ausonius.'

3. Themes in Eliot's Poetry

Eliot is a representative poet of the twentieth century and hence he has voiced forcefully the moral and spiritual degradation of modern man, the loss of human values, and the prevalence of chaos, confusion and tension in the human world. His poetry is an expression of the age in which he lived. It does not take a recourse to the past or the medieval age. It tries to feel the pulse of man and articulates his problems and tensions in a touching way.

A critic has rightly pointed out that Eliot's early poetry is the poetry of suffering and tension. As we know, he began his poetic career with "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock", and this poem brings to the fore the dilemma and the pangs of a middle aged man in the presence of beautiful movement. The question that haunts him incessantly is: 'Do I dare disturb the universe?' Similarly, the poem "Portrait of a Lady", highlights the same kind of dilemma and sense of futility in the life a lady advancing in years: 'I shall sit here, serving tea to friends.' Infact, all the protagonists of Eliot - Prufrock, the lady, Gerontion, Mr. Apollinax, Tiresias, etc. – are great sufferers in the drama of life.

In his early poetry, Eliot portrays persons and scenes full of disillusionment, repulsion and horror. His awareness of 'the universe panorama of futility and anarchy' in the human world is quite acute and intense. The imagery of the poems prior to *The Waste Land* is modern, urban, even cosmopolitan, and invariably tends to emphasize the boredom and sterility of modern urban life. The teduim of life, even the meaninglessness of existence, may be marked in the following extract from "Rhapsody on a Windy Night":

So the hand of the child, automatic,

Slipped out and pocketed a toy that was summering along the quay.

I could see nothing behind that child's eye.

Here we have a glimpse of the utter emptiness and the lack of fulfilment in the child life. A grown–up man's or woman's life is no better in any way. The life of the middle–aged lady is painted as a follows:

And I must borrow every changing shape
To find expression… dance, dance
Life a dancing bear,
Cry life a parrot, chatter like an ape.
Let us take the air, in a tobacco trance –

Clearly, her life is meaningless and no better than that of an animal. Prufrock is also faced with 'the overwhelming question' of seeking meaning in life. Gerontion, an old man, is also preoccupied with a sense of loss and nostalgia, of failure and frustration:

Here I am, an old man in a dry month,

Being read to by a boy, waiting for rain.

The 'sign' of Christ given in the poem is not taken by man.

With "Gerontion" onwards, Eliot's poems deal with the depths of human depravity. In these poems, animal images become frequent, emphasizing thereby the bestiality and depravity of man. There is Princess Volupine, whose name suggests both a devouring wolf ('vulpene') and a voluptuary; there is Bleistein, like some creature

from a primeval swamp; there is Sweeney, the 'Apeneck', who is 'clawing' at the pillow slip', while a cosmopolitan woman associated with him is –

Rachel nee Rabinovitch
Tears at the grapes with murderous paws.

In "Whispers of Immortality" Grishkin is seen in a drawing soon, distilling a rank 'feline smell'.

The Waste Land (1922) employs the theme of 'the divitalization of human civilization' and 'the destabilization of human society'. Critics like F.R. Leavis and Paul Elmer More think that the poem begins with a description of a cruel season and a dead land, and that it ends on a chaotic note. But these critics have not been able to grasp the full implication of the Sanskrit words proper – 'Da Da Da and 'Shantih Shantih Shantih'. The poem is highly suggestive of the loss of spirituality in the modern world; that is why London is called an 'unreal city' and the London Bridge is depicted as 'falling down'. The poem has a mythical structure. The Fisher King of the Grail legend suffers from a mysterious sickness, as a result of which the land he rules over terms into a waste land and suffers from infertility. This infertiliy can be healed and removed by the Deliverer. The subject matter concerns the entire humanity, though the focus is on modern London. The overall mood of the poet is one of despair not of exhilaration over the prospective dawn of a better future (as hinted at towards the close of the poem).

"The Hollow Men" continues the mood and ironic vision of *The Waste Land* The poem is replete with sardonic tone and pessimism. The hollow men are the empty or stuffed men, with no bright hope. The poet's vision comes out vividly in the following lines:

This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.

Up to "The Hollow Men" the note of suffering and pessimism is predominant, but after this poem the Christian hope returns to the poet. The Ariel Poems definitely mark the break, and the dark vision of the poet fields place to a brighter vision –

The Ariel poems consist of "Journey of the Magi", "A Song for Simeon", "Animula", and "Marina". These poems make use of the religious theme connected with the life of Christ. The magi travel a long arduoes way to see the infant Christ. The narrator, who is one of the magi, is sure that he has seen the saviour. In "A Song for Simeon", Simeon also has the impression of having seen the Saviour, but he feels that he is not to be redeemed. "Animula" is somewhat some and gloomy in outlook; it paints a process of degeneration – from innocence to irresolution and selfishness and then to death. This poem asserts that the new life after death is the gift of Christ. The poet is acutely conscious of time here. The fourth of the Ariel Poems, "Marima", is based on the reunion of Pericles with his daughter (as celebrated by Shakespeare in his famous play), and subtly shows the graceful life leading to solvation through the intervention of Christ.

Thus, we have noticed that Eliot's poetry written since 1927 breathes in a fresh air of religious certainty and spiritual discipline. The poem "Ash Wednesday" (1930) is precisely steeped in spiritual atmosphere of self – abnegation. The earlier atmosphere of chaos and confusion, doubt and distrust, has now disappeared. By this time, the poet has achieved a new religion (Anglo–Chatholicism) and a new hope for the salvation of man.

Four Quartets (1943), which is a bunch of four poems – "Burnt Norton", "East Coker", "The Dry Salvages", and "Little Gidding" – is the acme of religious meditation and eventual salvation. The poem combines in its texture the deep reflections on time and Eternity, word and word, speech and Silence, attachment and detachment, love human and love divine etc. It achieves 'a contemplative depth' that English' poetry has hardly ever witnessed.

Eliot has also written some poems on the political theme. His "Coriolan" consisting of "Triumphal March" and "Difficulties of a Statesman" is of this nature. The two fragments have surprised many of Eliot's readers, as they deviate from the mainstream of his poetry of the two fragments, the first one exalts the hero of the

triumphal march at the expense of the admiring crowds. The second one mocks at the very democratic system. Eliot had announced in 1927 that he was a royalist in politics', and hence his anti – democratic stance should be taken as deliberate and purposive.

The themes mentioned above are all related to human life. Eliot is also a poet of Nature, though his treatment of Nature is neither Wordsworthian nor Shelleyan. To him, nature is the bare phenomenon of the human world, as it was to Pope in the eighteenth century. Man is the supreme consideration in Eliot's scheme of things. Eliot describes natural beauties in relation to urban surroundings rather than to rural countryside. He is concerned with the civilized rather than with the wild aspects of natural beauties. No doubt, he is a poet of towns and cities and of crowds to be seen there. Nature is to him nothing more than a scenery, a mere phenomenon, an object for sensual and concrete imagery – an evening 'spread out against the sky' and an afternoon 'grey and smoky'. Nature is neither or spiritual, nor ethical, nor metaphysical entity. She lacks any order or plan, which she had in store for the great Hardy. Nature contains no 'healing balm' for Eliot; neither does she have a plan or design for man's development. She is no longer a shelter or solace for the afflicted mind, as he was controlled by the rational man. This idea is clearly ventilated in the following lines of "The Dry Salvages" *(four quartets)* :

I do not know much about Gods, but I think that the river
Is a strong brown God – sullen, untamed and intractable
Patient to some degree….
The problem once solved, the brown God is almost forgotten
By the dwellers in the cities – ever….

Thus, Nature is harnessed to serve the utilitarian ends of man. In fact, Eliot was so much preoccupied with the problems of life death, of man's moral and spiritual degradation, of the intersection of tirelessness with time, of God and the Universe, that he had hardly any time to get interested in natural descriptions, in some of his poems, Eliot uses the garden – scene (or, simply the garden) to symbolize the moment/place of illumination. According to a scholar, "A formal garden is an admirable symbol for man's attempt to impose a pattern on his experience and to discipline nature".[1] Eliot's treatment of nature is quite in keeping with his classical leanings.

4. Eliot's Contribution to English Poetry

As a poet, Eliot belongs to the Classical tradition. He has nothing to do with the Romantic excesses and 'purple patches'. A classicist remains crystal clear and controlled in his expression, and his guiding force is reason. He exalts the head over the heart, objectivity over subjectivity, reason over emotion. He owes allegiance to an external authority, like that of Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Homer, Virgil, or the three great tragedians of Greek literature, whereas a Romantic listens to his own 'inner voice'. No one can make such a threadbare distinction between 'classicism' and 'Romanticism' as R.A. Scott – James has done in his brilliant book, *The Making of Literature:*

Form, outward form, is the first distinctive element in classicism, and on this beauty of outward appearance, with its attributes of symmetry, balance, order, proportion, reserve, it takes its stand. And as contrasted with this the romantic tends to emphasize the spirit which lies behind form – not the formless but the freedom which is not content with any but the freedom which is not content with any one form, but experiments, and expresses itself now in this, now in that way, as the spirit dictates. The first tends always to emphasize the "this – worldliness" of the beauty that we know; the second, its "other – worldliness"…. The one seeks always a mean; the other an extremity. Repose satisfies the Classic; adventure attracts the Romantic. The one appeals to tradition; the other demands the novel. On the one side we may range the virtues and defects which go with the nations of fitness, propriety, measure, restraint, conservatism, authority, calm, experience, comeliness; on

[1] See T.S. Eliot : A Study of His Writings by Several Hands, ed. B. Rajan, p.62.

the other, those which are suggested by excitement, energy, restlessness, spirituality, curiosity, troublessness, progress, liberty, experiment, provocativeness.[1]

This long passage has been quoted here to acquaint the readers with the salient features of 'Classicism' (the school is which Eliot belongs) as contradistinct from 'Romanticism". And as we know, Eliot has publicly announced that he is a "classicist in literature".[2] So, when we come to examine Eliot's contributions to English poetry we have to keep in mind his artistic qualities as a classicist. First of all, Eliot remains a traditionalist throughout his literacy career. As a creative writer, he follows the tradition of Sir Philip Sidney, Ben Jonson, John Milton, John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Samuel Johnson, Matthew Arnold, etc., but as a sound critic he does not spare his co-travellers for their faults. Milton, Pope and Arnold have been criticized by him for their respective weaknesses.

Eliot as a traditionalist or classicist accepts an always existing background, the function of which is to provide incidental symbolism to a poem. Pope in his *The Rape of the Lock* had designed the poem within the framework of a classical epic, using its accepted norms and symbols. It is in this acceptance that Pope is a new – classicist, and it is in the rejection of this that Shelley is not a classicist in his *Frometheus unfound Alastor* and *Mab queen*. Eliot, like Pope, accepts the valve of traditional literature as his poetic world. In his monumental poem, *The Waste Land* (1922), Eliot blends European tradition with Eastern though to provide a necessary background to the interpretation of contemporary human prediesment. The basic symbolism in this poem is derived from the Grail legend, and in the last Section he employs the Journey symbol, which is well within the Christian fold.

Eliot regards 'tradition' as a substitute for the classical mythology to provide a background full of symbolism in his poetry. His sense of tradition allows due recognition of the illustrious past (which lives in the present). It intesifies the feeling of the artist, shapes the content of the poem, retains the quality of suggestiveness in it. It also "attempts to eliminate excessive blurring of the object, which tended to result from Romantic usage".[3] It does not require the Romantic atmosphere of mystery as found in Shelley's *Alastor*. Eliot's essays, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919), is of far – reaching significance in propounding his views of 'tradition'.

In order to fully understand Eliot's concept of Classicism, we are tempted to go to the scholarly doctoral dissertation titled *T.S. Eliot: The Dialectical Structure of His Theory of Poetry* by Fei – Pai – Lee. This sound scholar summarizes Eliot's classicism under three heads: Personality, Tradition and Orthodoxy. According to him, personality though extinct in a classical work takes the shape of individuality and enlivens it in a considerable measure. This idea is made so clear by Eliot in his famous essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent'. Tradition or the sense of history should not suppress the individual talent, but should encourage it to flourish. What Eliot wants is that personality should not be allowed to intrude too much into a work of art, and that the poet is no more than a medium of expression. He thinks that the poet must remain objective, not subjective, working as a medium rather than an experience. If he concentrates on his own personality, he will be doing the same as a Romantic does. This will inevitably shift our attention from the poetry to the poet. Eliot warms us against this kind of poetic practice. He enunciates his 'impersonal theory of poetry', which forcefully lays down that the poet and the poem are two separate things. According to him, 'the more perfect an artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates; The impressions and experiences which are important for a man may find no place in his poetry, and *vice versa.* If this premise is accepted, there will be left very little of purely personal experience in a poem. As contrasted to the definition of poetry as given by Wordsworth – that 'Poetry is a spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings, recollected in tranquillity', etc. Eliot offers his own definition: 'Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality…. The emotion of art is impersonal; Poetry has its life 'in the poem and not in the history of the poet'.

Evidently, Eliot is not interested in the personal history of the poet. Like W.B. Yeaots, Eliot lays on the inner integrity of the personality. It is this to the work of a poet. It is due to this integrity that Eliot regards Dr. Johnson's *The Vanity of Human Wishes,* Goldsmith's *The Deserted Village,* and George Herbert's *The*

Temple as the testimony of their greatness. In Eliot's view, Shakespeare, Herbert and Herrick are 'major' poets for the same reason.

As regards Tradition (about which we have already spoken earlier), it provides room for originality (what Eliot calls 'the individual talent'). Tradition is susceptible to 'petrifaction' if it is static and incapable of assimilation. It is threatened with dissolution if the new developments are odd and eccentric. It admits 'experimentation' to bring to it freedom of expression. It offers us 'the historical sense' or the sense of 'the garden mean' in the past. The historical sense is an instrument for self discovery, for "it is an instrument for the discovery of the whole."[4]

Fei – Pai Lu thinks that orthodoxy is a part of 'the social sanction' which consist of two parts, the second being Tradition. Eliot has made this sort of bifurcation in his *After Strange Gods* (1934). Orthodoxy is contrasted to Tradition. The forever is the formulated system of common beliefs, while the latter is equated with communal habits and feelings. Orthodoxy calls for 'the exercise of all our conscious intelligence', but tradition remains largely 'unconscious' and represents the blood kinship of 'the same people luring in the same place'. Eliot points out in his sociological studies *The Idea Of A Christian Society* (193) and *Notes towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) – that religion, culture and society are the main considerations of Orthodoxy.

Society is a 'spiritual community', not the congregation of crowd. Culture is 'the incarnation of religion', not ' a flurry of uncoordinated activities'. Ordered society and common culture are essential conditions for the production of classics, which, for the most part, depend upon the vitality of religion. So, church and religion in a society contribute a lot to the shaping of culture.

After the Augustans, wit had almost disappeared from the poetic world. Credit goes to Eliot to have revived it again. He blends in it the Augustan wit (such as Pope used it in his verse) with the Metaphysical wit (such as Donne and Crowley used it in their poetry). Eliot does not simply aim at evoking wit or provoking amusement in his poetry. Instead, he explores the serious through the ludicrous, or he makes use of levity to intensity the grim and the gloomy. This artistic device he has learnt from the Metaphysical poets. Shakespeare has also employed this device in his tragedies; for example, the grave – digging scene in *Hamlet* and the porter scene in *Macbeth.* Eliot uses wit for 'resolution' or 'integrity' in his poetry. Wit is useful for brevity and clarity in expression and for promoting 'ironic vision'. Wit is usually associated with irony and satire, and the Augustans have amply displayed it in their verse.

Eliot has paid utmost attention to verbal precision, which demands a conscious choice of words and phrases and a thoughtful construction of sentences. The verbal precision needs the utmost care in making use of words the placing of words flawlessly. Eliot has hinted at it in the following lines:

(Where every word is at home,
Taking its place to support the others,
The word neither diffident nor ostentations,
An easy commerce of the old and the new,
The common word exact without vulgarity,
The formal word precise but not pedantic,
The complete consort dancing together)
Every phrase and every sentence is an end and a beginning,
Every poem an epitaph.

("Little Gidding," Four Quartets).

The poet's emphasis here is on verbal precision, which must not give the impression of stiffness or inaccuracy. Eliot's search for precision and accuracy makes room for clarity and propriety in poetry.

We have already pointed out that in Eliot's concept of poetry – which is the classical concept – the poet is a mere medium of expression. Eliot has also given his views about the role of 'emotion' and the role of 'thought' in the poetic process.

Eliot emphasises the role of emotion in poetry. But how should it be expressed? It cannot be simply transmitted from the mind of the poet is the mind of the reader. It has to turn itself into something concrete – the picture of a person, place or thing – in order to convey effectively the same emotion in the reader. And the picture of a person, place or thing into which emotion is thus bodied forth becomes its 'objective correlative' or 'external equivalent'. Eliot makes use of the phrase 'objective correlative' in his famous essay, "Hamlet and His problems" (contained in *The Sacred Wood,* 1920). Eliot clarifies how emotion can be best expressed in poetry. He remarks: 'The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an 'objective correlative'; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that emotion such that even the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience are given, the emotion immediately evoked'. In Eliot's view, Shakespeare was though a consummate artist in his plays, he failed in finding as 'objective correlative' to express the tortuous emotions of Hamlet. Eliot thinks that shakespeare has superbly succeeded conveying the raging malady in Lady Macbeth's mind by making her repeat the past actions in the sleep - walking scene in *Macbeth*.

Critics like Eliseo and Vincent Buckley have found fault with Eliot's theory of 'objective correlative' for expressing emotion in poetry. They point out that Eliot devises the formula of 'objective correlative' to avoid a direct utterance of emotion, but he complicates the issue by praising Dante for his view of life and Shakespeare for his 'emotional maturity'. These critics hold the view that it is erroneous to think that Eliot has a distrust for poetry based on emotion; for instance, Eliot holds Shakespeare superior to Ben Jonson due to the former's 'susceptibility to a greater range of emotion, and emotion deeper an obscurer'.

What Eliot is concerned with is the expression of emotion in an objective way. He is opposed to the direct expression of emotion, and hence he propounds the theory of 'objective correlative'. He is concerned with art – emotion, not with raw emotion that bursts forth spontaneously.

Eliot also gives his mind to the question of the role of 'thought' in poetry. The poet confronts a thought in the same way as we confront a man; he accepts or rejects it to build his artifice, to suit his poetic purpose. What comes to us is the semblance of thought, not thought at first hand, but the result of his conscious selection or rejection. According to Eliot, the poet to thinks is merely the poet who can express 'the emotional equivalent of thought'. Thus, what Eliot means by thought is its 'emotional equivalent'. Like 'significant emotion' serving the poetic purpose, 'significant thought' (or 'art – thought') is the objective of Eliot as a poet. If a distinction could be drawn between 'imaginal thinking' and 'conceptual thinking,' we can say that the former is the prerogative of a poet while the latter is that of a philosopher or scientist. In imaginal thinking the poet 'nothing affirmeth, and, therefore, never lieth'. The poet articulates his ideas in a state of illumined consciousness.

Further, Eliot maintains that a synchronization of emotion and thought effects the poetic sensibility. In his well-known essay, "The Metaphysical Poets", Eliot is seized with this matter. In this essay, he speaks of 'the dissociation of sensibility' as well as of 'the unification of sensibility'. By the latter phrase Eliot means "a direct sensuous apprehension of thought, or a recreation of thought into feeling".[5] When 'the unification of sensibility' is found, as in the poetry of Chapman and Donne, the result is good poetry. Then, thought is transformed into feeling to steal its way into the reader's heart. It is the union of thought and feeling that constitutes poetic sensibility. But when the poet's thought and is unable to transform itself into feeling, the result is 'the dissociation of sensibility' – a rupture between thought and feeling – and hence bad poetry. For good poetry, it is essential that thought must issue forth as sensation. According to Eliot, the Victorian poets Tennyson and Browning do not pass this test, as 'they think, but they do not feel their thought as immediately as the odour of a rose'. Th poet's function is not to versify ideas but to convert them into sensations.

As Eliot conceives sensibility, it is the faculty that enables a poet to respond to diverse experiences in a unified manner. In its function, it is close to Coleridge's concept of 'Secondary Imagination', which also gives form to the shrubby undergrowthof experiences in life. The noted critic, F.W. Bateson, subjects Eliot's concept of sensibility to a strict scrutiny. Bateson opines that that Eliot's concept of sensibility is a synonym for sensation, and if it is so how can it contain the element of thought? Bateson sees a paradox in Eliot's concept of sensibility.

It would be, perhaps, in pace to draw a distinction between 'sensibility' and 'imagination'. For one thing, the faculty which shapes experience is sensibility, not imagination. Eliot's sensibility is a unifying faculty for disparate experiences. For Cloridge, imagination is a reconciling agent aiming at 'recreation' after dissolving, diffusing and dissipating the material at hand. Imagination does not allow a place to memory that plays a vital role in Eliot's poetry. Eliot speaks of 'mixing memory and desire' in the beginning of *The Waste Land*.

Eliot's poetic technique is consonant with the spirit of his time. Like the time itself, his technique is bare and stark, direct and unadorned. Eliot was highly impressed by the technical discoveries of John Donne. He thought that Donne's great achievement lay in his ability to convey ' his genuine whole of tangled feelings'. Like Donne and his school of poets, Eliot aimed at the 'alliance of levity and seriousness.' The use of irregular rhyme which was to Eliot's taste, was actually inspired by Donne. Eliot largely used free verse in his practice, instead of conventional metric verse, his versification is essentially 'a disturbance of the conventional'. His technique is, for the most part, allusive and suggestive. This sort of technique suits a poet of scholarly temperament. One can easily understand it when one keeps mind the vast number of allusions and references used by Eliot in *The Waste Land.* No fewer than 35 authors and six foreign languages have been alluded to or used by him in this difficult poem. Such a technique lends obscurity and complexity to the poem. According to Eliot, this kind of technique suits the temper of the age. In his brilliant essay on the Metaphysical poets, Eliot remarks that 'Our civilization comprehends great variety and complexity', and he tailors his technique to catch up this 'great variety and complexity of the modern age. The employment of apt images and suggestive symbols by Eliot in his poetry consolidates his technique to a great extent. Eliot had learnt a good deal from the French Symbolists, and shaped his symbolistic and allusive technique under their irresistible influence.

To conclude, Eliot's contributions to English poetry are quite substantial and abiding. Among his recognisable contributions are his classical and traditional stance, his impersonal theory of poetry, his formulations of the role of emotion and thought in poetry, his concept of sensibility, his insistence on the use of correct diction and verbal precision, and his bold application of *vers libre* and allusive and symbolistic technique. For all these contributions, he will ever he remembered by lovers of English poetry.

References

1. R.A. Scott – James, *The Making of Literature,* Indian rpt. (New Delhi : Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1978), p.167.
2. T.S. Eliot, "Preface" *For Lancelot Andrewes* (London: Faber & Faber, 1927),p.7.
3. D.E.S. Maxwell, *The Poetry of T.S. Eliot* (London : Routledge& keganpaul, 1961), p.41.
4. Fei – Pai Lu, T.S.Eliot: *The Dialectical Structure Of His Poetry ,* p. 82.
5. T.S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," *Selected Essays* (London : Faber & Faber, 1932), p.288.

SECTION II: CRITICAL NOTES ON "THE LOVE SONG"

1. Composition of "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prurock"

This dramatic monologue was composed sometime during 1914 – 1915, that is about the year when the first World War broke out. The time of the composition is significant, for there is relevance between the theme of the poem and the general psychological and spiritual climate of Europe in those days.

The poem was submitted to Ezra Pound for his suggestion and approval in October 1914. Pound wrote to Harriet Monroe, the editor of *Poetry*, which was considered at the time to be an *avant garde* poetry magazine, publishing mainly the work of the Imagists, as follows:

'Here is the Eliot poem. The most interesting contribution I have had from an American.

P.S. Hope you'll get it soon'.

Monroe probably failed to get at the meaning of the poem, and in his typically Georgian manner suggested that the poem should be made plain and easy for the general poetry – reading audience. Pound wrote back to Monroe :

'Your objection to the Eliot is the climax No, most emphatically I will not ask Eliot to write down to any audience whatsoever……'

In another letter he tried to explain to Monroe the central meaning of the poem:

"Mr. Prufrock' does not 'go off at the end.' It is a portrait of failure, or of a character which fails, and it would be false art to make it end on a note of triumph…… A portrait satire on futility can't end by turning that quintessence of futility, Mr. P, into a reformed character breathing out fire and ozone…….. I assure you it is better, 'more unique,' than the other poems of Eliot which I have seen. Also that he is quite intelligent (an adjective which is seldom in my mouth)……'

The poem was published eventually in *Poetry* for June, 1915, as an end – piece of the issue. It was in June 1917 that the Egoist Ltd. published this poem along with a few others in a volume entitled *Prufrock and Other Observations*.

2. Title of the Poem

First of all, what catches the attention is the name J. Alfred Prufrock. ' Prufrock' may be said to have been derived from Eliot's unconscious memory of the name of a furniture wholesale firm in St. Louis, Missouri, where he was born and bred. But 'J. Alfred' is the poet's own invention of a fatuous – sounding prefix.

Maybe, it was the pattern of sound in 'J. Alfred Prufrock' suggesting inanity that appealed to Eliot. The addition of 'Love Song' is full of implications and stirs the whole gamut of feelings associated with the theme of love – poetry since Spenser.

Thus, an irony already lurks in the title, an irony emanating from the collocation of 'Love Song' and 'J.Alfred Prufrock'. This irony deepens further when we proceed to read the poem and find that the poem could be anything but a 'Love Song'. The irony which may appear facile in the title turns into a complex one as the poem proceeds.

3. Sources of the Poem

The epigraph indicates Prufrock's resemblance to Guido da Montefeltro, one of the characters in Dante's *Inferno*. Montefeltro meets Dante and asks him about happenings in Italy, and Dante narrates all that he knows. On being asked, Montefeltro confesses his sin, of which he is ashamed, and hence he is living in hell. Like Montefeltro, Prufrock is living in a hellish world for his sins. Professor Grover Smith points out that Prufrock's sin is his passivity.

It has been suggested that the story and character of Prufrock were derived from Henry James's story, *Craphy Cornelia,* written in 1909. The story revolves round one middle – aged man, White Mason. He once visits a young – looking woman, Mrs. Worthington, with an intention to propose marriage. He makes several efforts to propose but each time some psychological complex hinders the words which he should have uttered. He also realises suddenly the gap between his own age and hers and deviates into meaningless conversation. It is possible, as Dr. Grover Smith suggests, that some of the descriptive details as well as its theme and narrative derive from James's short – stories. But whatever the initial source, Eliot has transmitted the entire material into his own poem.

It is also possible that Eliot might have got the initial inspiration from one of Laforgue's *Sunday* poems which begins:

'To give myself to an "I love you" ! I was all set,
When I realised, with some regret,
That I didn't really have myself in hand as yet.'

and develops the themes of indecision, hesitation, postponement, etc. The theme of inability to 'take the first step' is developed further and more elaborately in another poem, "Solo by Moonlight"' by Laforgue. There is a similarity between Laforgue's "Ennui" and Prufrock's sterlity of will. Certain lines in Laforgue seem to contain the original of the echoes to be found in Eliot's "Love Song". Take these lines for example :

'Ah my sterile heart !
I've behaved badly from the start.'

And these:

'And I pass by and leave them,
And lie down facing the sky.
The road turns……..
No one waits for me, I'm going to no one home.
I've only the friendship of hotel rooms.'

Apart from these positive sources, there is one which may be called negative: Andrew Marvell. "The Love Song" has a similarity with Marvell's Coy Mistress" in that this, too, is, according to the title, a poem about love. But it is, in reality, a total antithesis of Marvell's poem in that it is not a poem urging the beloved to vital love but one in which the lover flinches from even proposing love to his beloved.

4. The Character of Prufrock

Prufrock's consciousness forms the core of the poem. His consciousness impresses us as a representative consciousness of our time. 'We suspect', as Joseph Margolis says,' he is Everyman', and thus his malaise comes to be seen as the affiction of everyman in the contemporary society.

But for all that, Prufrock is not an abstract character: he is concretely realised, the product of a felt experience, so much so that many have been inclined to identify Prufrock with Eliot. No doubt, Prufrock is Eliot in a way, for after all he is the latter's creation after his own image. But, at the same time, it must be understood that Prufrock is a person like Pound's Mauberely. As we proceed with the poem, he gradually emerges as a distinct character in his own right revealing a multi-dimensional nature.

Prufrock is a man in his own forties, or rather dressed as a man in the forties. The lines which suggest this are:

Time to turn back and descend the stair,
With a bald spot in the middle of my hair__
(They all say :'How his hair is growing thin !')
My morning coat, my collar mounting firmly to the chin,
My necktie rich and modest, but asserted by a simple pin……

The growing baldness suggests the middle-age and the carefully planned dress is designed to conceal the middle-age, though, at the same time, he knows such an effort will be worthless. The parenthetical line,' they will say……', suggests Prufrock's fear and anxiety but Prufrock is not an hypocrite. He is not trying or posing to be young. He wishes he could behave as a young man, but he knows he cannot. He knows that it is worthless: the memory of youthful days gives him no pleasure at all. He would not be young again, for it will be the repetition of the same cheerless, routine, meaningless relationships with the women. The lines which suggests this boredom of Purfrock's experience with women are to be found in the three stanzas beginning with:

'For I have known them all already……..' It is clear that Prufrock is an extremely sensitive, rather hypersensitive person, given to reflecting, silently debating within himself implications of this or that action, this or that word. He is highly cultured and widely read in literature and fine aris, as in obvious from the mention of Michelangelo, Lazarus, Hamlet, and so on.

The melody which has afflicted him is not frustration or anger; he is rather bored with life. Hence he considers no action, not even so much as making his proposal of love, worth anything. He has had experiences of action, and they have bred only boredom. So he flinches from the occasion which will require him to act: that is to make a choice and say it to the women.

Prufrock's melody is not physical, but deeply psychological, or spiritual, like Baudelaire's and Laforgue's 'emui' characterized by total lack of will – power and sterility of emotion. Prufrock is hypersensitive both intellectually and emotionally, but the intellectual hypersensitivity has sapped all life out of emotion. Dr. Grover Smith calls him a defeated 'idealist'.

5. A Critical Appreciation of the Poem

" The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" is a monologue, and as such it owes a good deal to Robert Browning. It has 'you' and 'I' in the very first line. Although it is not needed to assume the presence of a second person and explicate its relationship to Prufrock in order to understand the meaning of the poem, the 'you' is significant in ascribing the character of a monologue to it. For one thing, the 'you' never speaks in the poem ; it is the 'I' who does all the speaking from the beginning of the end. That is why the term 'dramatic monologue's may, strictly speaking, be inappropriate for the poem. In a dramatic monologue, the presence of the other character or characters is always felt: one character is speaking to the other, even though the latter may be silent. In this poem, Prufrock is more speaking to himself than to anyone else. It would, therefore, be more appropriate to call the poem on 'interior' monologue' than a 'dramatic monologue'. Prufrock's consciousness is the focal point here.

The poem consists of a number of sections put together in a manner which looks forward to *The Waste Land.* Sections are rearranged, lines put in, others taken out; and yet the poem does not suffer, for its coherence depends on consistency of feeling, not on a fixed sequence of idea or event.

The poem would appear as Eliot's first attempt to explore the nature of the spiritual state of the contemporary man. This is the germinal theme which is developed and presented in a pattern of opposites. In the words of Joseph Margolis, "And its themes, which are remarkably diverse, are offered in contrary pairs: youth and old age, work and idleness, spiritual life and death, commitment and loneliness, pride and disgust in the self, sincerity and hypocrisy, interest and boredom." These 'contrary pairs are not stated clearly; nor is one thing of a pair set in apparent conflict with the other. On the surface level, the entire poem deals with one set of themes associated with the spiritual sickness of Prufrock. Whether he flinches from asking 'the over whelming question' or escapes into his own fantasy of fog or the party of his own self, he is a man who has totally lost his will to party of his own self, he is a man who has totally lost his will to action, is symbolic of his spiritual sickness. Each image, each picture – fantasy, reiterates with sharper precision, this theme of Prufrock's sterility. Eliot has not described how or why has Prufrock become spiritually sterile, though there are some hints to suggest that the roof of his malaise is his being over – intellectualized and hypersensitive to things of emotional life. He is given to analyzing too deeply the pros and cons of his actions and others' reactions. Very subtly he analyses his own self.

Eliot's diagnosis of the contemporary human personality bears a slender resemblance to D.H. Lawrence's. For Lawrence too believed that the real evil of the contemporary mechanized, commercialized, society was the morbid growth of intellect which had sapped the vitality out of man–woman, and through it, man–world, relationship. And, in part, both Lawrence and Eliot up to this extent derive from Henry James's analysis of man – woman relationship as delineated in his novels.

And though the themes of Eliot poem are not immediately related to the First World War, the outbreak of war did lend an urgency to the poem. Prufrock personified or symbolised a state of mind in which a war could break out. It is significant to note that whenever Prufrock escapes from the monotony and boredom of the human company into fantasy, his mind conjures up scenes or symbols of death or death like situations. The evening is like a patient etherised for a serious operation struggling between life and death. The nights are restless, the

restaurants are cheap where acts of violence are common. The cat itself is associated with ferocity and destruction. Prufrock imagines himself 'sprawling on a pin' and 'wriggling on the wall'. He compares or contrasts himself to John the Baptist, Lazarus and Prince Hamlet, who were involved in violent or tragic deaths. Only in the last few lines, his fantasy brings into play the sea image which is symbolic of life, and yet the last line brings in the image of death __ 'and we drown' . It is evident the Prufrock is fascinated by the idea of death, and this is because he is irretrievably bored by the contemporary life. In such a morbid spiritual state, war may even be welcome, war which brings death home.

The poem is rich in literary allusions. Michelangelo, for instance, stirs up the rich image of the mediaeval passionate love of God and man, the image of an artist who turned his sufferings into material of great art. But the women talking of him do not properly understand his value as an artist, and they are chattering about him as though he were a detective film hero. The other significant allusions in the poem are : John the Baptist,Lazarus, and Hamlet.These allusions tend to highlight certain inherent characterstics of the protagonist.

The drama of the poem is presented through soliloquy, the action being limited to the interplay of impressions, including memories, in Prufrock's mind (See Prof. Grover Smith, p. 16). A rather curious device complicates his reverie. By a distinction between 'I' and 'you', he differentiates between his thinking, sensitive character and his outward self. Prufrock is seen addressing, as if looking into a mirror, his whole public personality. His motive seems to repudiate the inert self, which can't act, and to assert his will. The ego alone 'goes' anywhere, even in fantasy, but it can't survive the disgrace of personality, and at the end of the poem it is 'we' who drown. The personal has become the general.

It is not so much the far-fetchedness of the objects of comparison but their opposition, contrariness, to one another that creates the dramatic tension and communicates the point sharply and precisely.

In fact, each image follows the same pattern. In the oft-quoted image : 'I have measured out my life with coffee spoons;' the first part is serious,noble and poetically grand, 'I have measured out my life,' but the other part, 'with coffee spoons' demolishes all the anticipation the first part raised. One would say, 'with coffee spoons' is Eliot's or Prufrock's way of ridiculing of the seriousness of the first part. It is again the same structure in another oft-quoted image :

I grow old.....I grow old.....
I shall wear the bottoms of my trousers rolled.

One common function of all these images is to trivialise whatever is romantic, serious, noble, grandious and conventionally attractive. And, therefore, the images are wholly functional, because they are integrated with the nature of the themes dealt with.

Trivialisation is the general feature of all the contemporary culture, trivialisation of all values, faiths and beliefs, trivialisation of love, passion, sex, art and human relationship. Each image trivialises something considered to be grand and noble valuable.

What remain to be considered is the diction of the poem, for apart from its imagery, much of the novelty of the poem in 1915 or 1917 was seen to lie in the strange use of words and phrases. It was the language of actual everyday conversation which Eliot has used so boldly in the poem. The Georgian poets too, it is true, had tried to use the real speaking language in their poems. Important contribution in this direction were made by Rupert Brooke, Seigfried Sarseon and Wilfred Owen. But their efforts were limited to using a word here and a phrase there, while by and large the language remained conventionally poetic both in the choice of idioms and rhythm. Eliot's revolutionizing contributions lay not in using part or snatches but the whole of the contemporary idioms and speech – rhythm.

It may be noticed clearly that the language of the poem is bare of any rhetorical features and devoid of any complicated structures. The words in general are most common, though the objects juxtaposed may be far – fetched. There can hardly be more commonplace language than:

In the room the women come and go
Talking of Michelangelo.

But the effect it exerts is stronger, deeper and at the same time more intimate than any rhetorical or conventionally poetic language is capable of. The complexity of Eliot's does not lie in the language he uses but in the complexity of his feeling the endeavors to communicate. "Prufrock" is a poem of a feeling of a mood, and all the words and phrases and images are used to create, strengthen and deepen the prevailing feeling or mood. Certain key words are repeated, certain phrases recur, so do certain images. Reception is a feature of everyday conversation, and so repetition very closely approximates the speech rhythm. Take the following lines, for example:

And indeed there will be time
For the yellow smoke that slides along the street
Rubbing its back upon the window panes;
There will be time, there will be time
To prepare a face to meet the faces that you meet;
There will be time to murder and create
And time for all the works and days of hand.
That lift and drop a question on your plate,
Time for you and time for me,
And time yet for a hundred indecision's,
Before the taking of a toast and tea.

But Eliot exploits the repetition of certain words for his own purpose; he repeats the key – words which suggest the central feeling or mood of the poem. Here 'time' is the key-word, as it is the key-word in the whole poem, and it is always the future time, and postponement of any action in the present time.

Thus, though these are repetitions and elements of verbosity in the poem, each word and each phrase has a precise function to perform. As Hugh Kenner says: 'Every phrase seems composed as though the destiny of the author's soul depended upon it. Yet it is unprofitable not to consider the phrases as arrangements of words before considering them as anything else. Like the thousand little gestures that constitute good manners, their meaning is contained in themselves alone-Eliot is the most verbal of the eminent poets: more verbal than Swinburne. If he has carried verbalism for beyond the extirpation of jarring consonants, it is because of his intimate understanding of what language can do……' In Swinburne, language is and end in itself; in Eliot it is a means to an end. His verbalism evokes and contributes to the feeling, the mood ; it is an instrument of evocation, suggestion and implication. It is a deliberately created verbalism in which each word has significance beyond itself, and each phrase a resonance beyond itself.

Generally, metaphor and symbol replace direct statement in Eliot. In "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" we have what comes to be a familiar compound, observation, memory, and reflection, in which observation becomes symbol. The doctrine of the objective correlative means not only that the subjective is projected into the objective, or by means of it, but that it is expressed in other means – metaphor; objects become symbols, and personal feeling is set apart from the poet. Connection through imagery is characteristic of Eliot, who is likely to exploit a kind of imagery, not to use it at random. A particular kind of imagery becomes the expression of a particular kind of feeling, not only in the same poem but in different poems. Recurrent imagery may not only reiterate a theme, but provide a base for variations, or development; its recurrence usually is accompanied by a deeper plumbing or a richer exploration of its significance. For some of these uses witness in "The Love Song" the sea imagery, hair imagery, sartorial imagery, that of polite versus crude society, that of bare sensitivity versus the protective shell, images of relaxation or concentration of effort or will, and finally the heroic parallels which both magnify and mock the overwhelming question.

Such a method of indirection is appropriate to a character who never really faces his inner conflict or his frustrated self, and hence is capable of a direct expression of it, to say nothing of a solution. Here the most revealing lines in the poem are:

Is it perform from a dress
That makes me so digress?

But the observation 'downed with light brown hair' is no digression from the arms or from Prufrock's problem. This is why the epigraph, with its conditioned response, provides an important clue to the intention of the poem; and the title shifts its context significantly. The title suggests the question for this song of indirection, made such by repression. The mock-heroic tone is not merely in the author's treatment or in his character's conception of the problem, but finally even in Prufrock's evasion of himself.

This kind of imagery is more than usually dependant upon arrangement. But the order of parts will reveal an implicit method in an Eliot poem that is essential to its meaning. There is such a method in "The Love Song" ; it is begun by 'Let us go' and ended with and we drown'. The going is developed and dramatized even by verb tenses, the time element. The 'drown' submerges again what has emerged in the 'going' – which is never directly said – and concludes the imagery of his submerged life. To this arrangement the author helps the reader in other ways. His punctuation, for example, is functional, not conventional. Verse, too, is a kind of punctuation, as Eliot has remarked, and he comes to rely upon it more and more as a poet. In the present poem, the phrasal separation in the short lines may be studied, and the effective chimes of the mock – heroic rhyme.

All verse – even nonsense verse is not quite free – depends upon an order and organization capable of being followed and understood ; requires an implicit, if not an explicit, logic – connections which can be discovered in the terms of the poem. If the words of a poem have syntax, they make sense, have a logic. Otherwise the poet has no control over his material except that exerted by meter. Only an ordered context can control the range of meaning set off by the single word ; and relevance to this context must be the guide for any reader in determining the range of meaning or the logic involved. William Empson's Seven Types of Ambiguity is a misleading book in that it explores possible meanings without proper regard to their limitations by the context.

Lastly, why is the poem called a 'Love Song'? In truth, the theme of love is so much subdued in it that it is difficult to say whether it is at all about love, and whether there is any evidence in it of the presence of Prufrock's beloved. The phrase 'you and I' has been variously interpreted. Eliot himself is reported to have stated that 'you' is 'some friend or companion of the male sex.' If so, then how to justify the title of 'Love Song'? If it is suggested that love is not the theme of the poem, then why call it 'Love Song'? But 'Love' is certainly the underlying theme of it. Only if is a fruitless, sterile yearning for love, not the vital positive passion for love. There is nothing in the poem to suggest either that relationship between 'you and I' is anything like Homosexual, but it can't be ruled out as absurd in the light of Eliot's own remarks and the suggestion of frigidity, languor, and boredom in 'I's' attitude to 'you'. And yet, the suggestion does not seem to posses an acceptable validity. Prof. George Williamson explains 'I and you' in psychoanalytical terms.

6. Annotations of the Poem

The epigraph is taken from Dante's *Inferno,* Canto XXVII, lines 61-66. Its English rendering goes thus: "if I believed my answer might be heard by anyone who could return to the world, this flame would leap no more. But since no one ever, returned alive from these depths, as far as I know, then I answer without fear of infamy," It emphasises the lack of communication from which Prufrock also suffers. In the Inferno, the flame of Guido is asked to identify himself, and he replies in the words of, the epigraph.

You and I — Obviously, 'I' suggests the speaker (in a dramatic monologue we have usually one), and 'you' suggest a lady, as the title indicates, but the epigraph hints at ' a scene out of the world.

When the evening is.....the sky — it is evening, tea – time as we shall see later on. The line also suggests a sick world.

Like a patient etherised.....table — Here we have startling modern imagery. The speaker sees the evening in the aspect of etherization, and the metaphor of etherization suggests the desire for inactivity to the point of enforced release from pain, 'etherised' means 'put under ether/anaesthetic.

Let us go, through certain..... Retreats— After we learn the time of going, we learn the way of going, 'retreats' means retiring corners or refuges.

Of restless nights..... with syster-shells — It suggests 'a surprising way, through a cheap section of town'; 'sawdust restaurants' means, 'restaurants made of fine wood fragments', and 'oyster' is a kind of fish.

Streets that follow.....overwhelming question — The way looks as dismal as a tedious argument smacking of a treacherous purpose, and leads to an 'over – whelming question'. In the words of George Williamson, "The streets suggest the character of the question at their end as well as the nature of the urge which takes this route'. There is an abrupt break after the mention of the question, suggesting an emotional block on the part of the speaker.

Oh, do not ask — The speaker refuses here to identify the 'over – whelming question.' Implicitly, it is his emotional urge which he conceals, and which belongs to the 'you'.

Let us go.....our visit — After suppressing the real urge, the speaker diverts the attention by pointing out another object or purpose of going in, - i.e. 'our visit'.

In the room.....talking of Michelangel — Where are they to pay the 'visit'? To the room, where women come and go and gossip about Michelangelo, a man of violent personality, an artist of epic grandeur, and a typical figure of the great creative period of the Renaissance. The slumness of the town is associated with the triviality of the conversation of women.

The yellow fog that rubs its back.....window – panes — With this line we find more of the twilight atmosphere, - the smoke and fog settling down. Here we have the image of the fog as cat, suggesting 'desire which end in inertia'. It the cat-image suggests sex, it also suggests the greater desire of inactivity.

The yellow smoke.....of the evening — The yellow smoke, like the gathering fog, stole its way from the window – panes to the corners of the room, and the evening slipped in.

muzzle – snout (mouth and nose) of an animal, the image being that of a cat.

Lingered upon the pools.....in drains — By and by, the fog or smoke expanded its reign and moved on even to the pools without water.

Let fall upon its back..... from chimneys — The twilight world now deepened into the dark world.

Soot – black powdery substance.

Slipped by ..... and fell asleep. — The image of the fog-cat continues. The fog or smoke, slipping by the row of houses ('terrace'), leapt up suddenly, and seeing that is was a pleasant October night, sleepily lapped the house. The speaker or Prufrock can't think of Nature except in terms of a cat rubbing its back and muzzle upon the window – panes, licking the dirty drain – water, allowing the chimney – soot to settle on its body, and finally falling asleep. On the one hand, Prufrock finds an escape from human company by thinking of the fog or smoke, on the other he discovers, to his discontent, that the world he wishes to escape into is the world of feline behaviors.

And indeed there.....the window –panes— This is the beginning of a fresh section (line 23-24). Prufrock decides to postpone taking interest in natural scenery, such as that the yellow fog or smoke.

Window – panes – window glasses.

There will be time..... faces that you meet — Here the motif of appearance and reality appears. It is clear that Prufrock prepares a mask for the world in order to lay a plot of momentous effect or to make small-talk over a tea cup. His thought now turns to the members (women) of the salon party.

There will be time..... create — It is now time for Prufrock to kill his natural self and create a concocted one.

And time for all the works..... on your plate — This is the time for toast and tea and dishes; morsels are lifted and dropped on the plate, suggesting that the party is now in full swing.

'drop a question on your plate' indicates the hesitation of Prufrock in entering into a conversation with the people in the drawing-room (for that is the scene) or even with his companion. The 'over-whelming question' of the first paragraph has returned to the speaker with a renewed tension and anxiety.

Time for you and..... me — Prufrock hopes to find time for the two, you and me, before the toast begins.

And time yet for ..... Toast and tea— Before the actual event (celebration or feast) starts, there will be time for a number of indecision's, dreams and revision of previous decisions.

Vision – dreams.

Revisions – rethinkings on previous decisions.

In the room the women..... Michelangelo — Inside the room women keep on talking of Michelangelo, the great sculptor.

And indeed there will be time..... 'Do I dare?' — The time motif returns here. Prufrock is now taken into fear of the mocking and hostile eyes of the world that will avidly note all defects and failings (lines 37-38). This section increases the tension of the speaker by raising the question of daring

Time to turn back..... Of my hair — Prufrock's " terrified self-consciousness" (Grover Smith, p. 18) is exposed in these lines. He is thinking of turning back from the room and going down the stair, with all his weakness of the unromantic middle-age. He is afraid of his baldness.

'a bald spot' – indicates the old age.

[They will say..... thin!] — The thinness of hair is a sign of old age, and those present in the room will point out to each other the thinness of Prufrock's hair.

My morning coat..... A simple pin— Here one notices the mock-heroic touch in the speaker's ' collar mounting firmly' and the 'assertion' of his simple pin. He is also conscious of his morning coat and necktie 'rich and modest'. The suggestion here seems to be that even his dress does not allow him to introduces himself to the women in the room.

[They will say..... Legs are thin!'] — Like his baldness the thinness of this arms and legs makes Prufrock a misfit in the company.

Do I dare..... The universe? — His fear has now mounted to the image of daring to 'disturb the universe.' He cannot do so.

In a minute..... Will reverse — The wavering nature of Prufrock is obvious here. In a minute he might make some important decisions and revised ideas which will be reversed in the next minute.

For I have known them..... all — In this section and in the next two (lines 49-69), Prufrock tries to explain as to why he dares not disturb the universe. In this line, he asserts that the presents company of women does not at all enthuse him because he is already familiar with them.

Have known the evenings.....afternoons — He is quite familiar not only with the women present there but also with what they do at different periods of the day.

I have measured out.....coffee spoons — Prufrock is disgusted with his tired and trivial life.

I know the voices dying..... a farther room — He knows about the voices gradually dying out with a highly vocal music from a distant room. In other words he is within sound and 'within the range of the other senses" (George Williamson, p. 62).

A dying fall – a highly vocal music.

So how should I presume? — He has known all this without doing what he now considers ; so how should he presume to disturb the accepted order?

And I have known the eyes.....them all – He has already known the inimical eyes.

The eyes that fix you.....phrases — Now the eyes fix him, give him his place in the accepted order, with a formulated phrase.

And when I am formulated..... On the wall — 'Sprawling' and 'wriggling' recall the image of an insect. When Prufrock has been classified like an insect, how can he deny his classification and break with his past? These lines also recall to our minds the austerities practiced by a 'yogin', a hermit. It is not unlikely that the speaker, who has met failure in life, should have turned to the austere practice for his consolation. 'Sprawling' means 'crawling'; 'wriggling' means 'struggling'.

Then how should I begin.....days and ways? — The speaker can't change his 'days and ways'.

'Spit out' means 'change,' and 'butt-ends' means 'the ends of smoked cigarettes', here 'targets' and 'objects'.

So how should I presume— So how can Prufrock declare his love to his beloved?

And I have known ..... brown hair ! — Prufrock has known the arms already, the arms which are ornamented, white coloured and bare, but which are covered with light brown hair in the evening.

'Braceleted' means 'ornamented'; 'downed' means 'lowered', but here ' covered up.'

Is it perfume.....so digress? — He is distracted for a moment by the erotic symbol contained in 'downed with light brown hair' and 'perfume from a dress'. The 'arms' and the 'perfume' together create a romantic and aromatic atmosphere.

'Digress' suggests 'giving up his intention to speak out his love'.

Arms that lie..... a shawl — The places where the arms may be found lying.

And should I .....begin? – The insistent problem with the speaker is that of communication or 'beginning'.

Shall I say.....of windows? — For a moment he gathers al his powers to 'begin'. But again soon he digresses is fancying what he might say or might not say. These line emphasis the loneliness and depression of the speaker.

'Dusk' means 'twilight

I should been.....silent seas — These lines indicate the kind of creature Prufrock should have been – 'a pair of ragged claws' in 'silent seas', not Prufrock in a drawing room.

'A pair of ragged claws' means 'a kind of sea species with rough claws'; 'Scuttling means' 'moving quickly'.

And the afternoon.....beside you and me — The scene is once more the drawing room where the afternoon, the evening, sleeps peacefully, or it pretends to sleep stretching on the floor beside the speaker and his companion.

'Malingers' means 'pretends to be asleep' (indicative of the sickening atmosphere in the room).

'Stretched means 'resting, spreading'.

Should I, after tea.....to its crisis ? — Prufrock does not, after the party is over, have the strength to force or precipitate the crisis.

But though I have wept..... And here's no great matter — Although Prufrock had been remorseful for his misdeeds, and although he has seen his bald head cut and dished, he is no prophet, as John the Baptist was, for we know that Baptist's head was demanded by Salome because he had rejected her love.

'Brought in upon a platter' suggests the cutting of the speaker's head and serving it in a dish; Prufrock is aware here of his limitations as well as certain eligibilities as a lover.

'Prophet' is John the Baptist. His 'bald' head indicates his weak, olds age.

I have seen the moment.....flicker — Prufrock has let his chance go, his 'greatness' (achievements) flicker.

And I have seen.....I was afraid — Timidity has suppressed his amorous self.

'The eternal Fooman' is 'Death'; 'snicker' means 'laugh decisively'.

And would it have been.....after all — Prufrock asks whether it would have been worth it to force the 'crisis'.

After the cups.....worth while — He thinks that the 'crisis' won't have been worth while after taking tea and jam and participating in a social gathering.

'Marmalade' 'is a kind of jam'; 'porcelain' is crockery or china-ware.

To have bitten off.....with a smile — Should he have spoken of his love quickly with a smile ?It would have been improper.

'Bitten off' means 'introduced quickly.'

To have squeezed.....a ball — Prufrock is presently out of the room in the street, and us rationalizing his failure at the party. He now feels that to force the 'crisis' would have meant to attempt an impossible task, for it is not possible to 'squeeze the universe into a ball.'

To roll it.....question — It won't have been worthwhile for him to rush toward the 'crisis'(which is real love).

*To say:' I am Lazarus.....*tell you all — It won't have been proper for him to say that he is Lazarus, the beggar mentioned in Luke, 16, who was raised by Christ from the world of the dead. Here Prufrock imagines himself to be the representative of the dead people.

Lazarus – *He was a beggar lying at the richman's gate; was sent to Hell, but wanted re-life. This was granted to him by Jesus Christ.*

If one selling a pillow.....at all. — Prufrock is afraid the lady's rejection of him. It is likely that the lady, keeping her head on a pillow, should have said that she did not mean love.

'One' implies 'the lady of lady'*;* 'settling' means 'keeping'.

And would it have been.....and as much more ? — Prufrock is struck by his own inadequacy. He feels that it would have been unwise for him to force the 'crisis' after attending the evening party.

'Sprinkled' means 'watered'; 'skirts suggest 'the dancing girls'.

It is impossible.....*I mean ! — He* can't express his meaning or intention.

But as if a magic lantern..... a screen — Though Prufrock is unable to state precisely his feelings, he can still form vague ideas or patterns about them, which are not unlike 'a magic lantern' throwing pictures on a screen.

'Nerves' indicate 'inner feelings'; 'patterns' means 'pictures'.

Would it had been..... at all— *Once again Prufrock is afraid of the unfavorable reaction of the lady.*

No! I am not Prince Hamlet.....meant to be— The passage beginning with this lines provides, as Joseph Margolis says, 'the only occasion on which Prufrock has attempted to sustain an exact evaluation of his entire career, and the statement — including his denial of heroic pretensions — forms a part of a larger and most remarkable unity.' Prufrock asserts that he is not Prince Hamlet, though indecision might suggest it. One should remember that Hamlet proposed to Ophelia, but postponed the 'crisis.'

As an attendant lord..... the prince —Instead he is cautious attendant like Polonius, a courtier of King Claudius; he is the attendant who will be fit to increase the number of a procession, to begin a scene or two, and to advise the Prince.

'Progress' means 'procession'.

no doubt, an easy tool.....the Fool — Certain characteristics of a good attendant are detailed herein, – – he will be compliant, easy to handle, respectful, useful, courteous ,careful, full of wise words ,but a little dull, sometimes laughable, and at the others playing the role of a fool(used in the Shakespearean sense).

'Deferential' means 'respectful, obedient'; 'politic' means 'courteous, mannered'; 'meticulous' means ''careful', 'full of high sentence' means 'full of maxims'; 'obtuse' means 'dull' morose'.

I grow old.....trousers rolled. - Here Prufrock assumes the role of a prudent character and indulges in self – mockery. There is a sense of weariness in the repetition 'I grow old… I grow old…' Though he is resigned to his sad role and unromantic character, he resolves to be a little sportive in dress (by wearing his trousers cuffed).

Shall I part my hair behind?..... a peach? – Having resigned to his sad role. Prufrock would raise 'the overwhelming question' no more. Now the problem before him whether he should try to hide his baldness, whether he should dare to eat a peach.

'Peach' is a kind of stone – fruit.

I shall wear white flannel trouser.....beach. – The rising tempo of the lines suggests Prufrock walking hastily to the sea – beach after he has put on white woolen trousers.

'Flannel' means 'woolen'.

I have heard the mermaids.....sing to me – Prufrock is an aging man standing on the sea – beach and wistfully watching the girls, who pay no heed to him. He is sunk into a vision or dream of beauty and vitality. These girls become mermaids riding triumphantly seaward into their creative natural element and singing to each other. But the mermaids, like the lady, probably will not sing to him (as to Ulysses).

I have seen them.....white and black – The reference here is to the mermaids riding seaward on the waves and floating on the white foam at a time when the wind blows the water white and black.

'White hair' stands for 'foam'.

We have lingered.... and we drown – The concluding lines (129 – 131) take us to the mermaids, reminding us of Prufrock's original situation: he has 'lingered', not in the drawing room surrounded by the women talking of Michelangelo, but in the 'chambers of the sea' surrounded by 'sea – girls', who are garlanded with red and brown seaweed. But such an experience is possible only in dream: '…human voices wake us'. And to wake is to return to the human world of suffocation and death: 'and we drown.'

'Lingered' means 'stayed'; 'wreathed' means garlanded'; 'wake' means 'disturb'; 'we drown'; implies suffocation and death. The dawn of reality on Prufrock and his friends, who are lost in visions so far, disturbs them and renders them sad and frustrated.

SECTION III: CRITICAL NOTES ON "THE WASTE LAND"

1. Composition of "The Waste Land"

The Waste Land was first published in the opening issue of the *Criterion* (October 1922) and then in the *Dial* (November 1922) . Since its publication, it has taken the literary world by storm and become a classic representing the twentieth century in all its complexity and diversity. The poem is Eliot's *magnum opus,* showing the birth of a new kind of English poetry with new patterns of speech and rhythm, with new poetic devices and technique. The composition of this great poem has a history of its own, and it is an interesting history by all means. This history is well reflected in *The Waste Land : Facsimile And Transcript Of The Original Draft* edited by Valerie Eliot (1971), in *Letters of Ezra Pound* (1950), in *An Exhibition of Manuscripts and First Editions of T.S. Eliot* (1961), and in the Quinn Collection of the New York Public Library.

The distinguished critic, Helen Gardner, has given her thought to the question of the composition of *The Waste Land.* She suggests that we should not speak of 'the first version' or 'the original version' of this poem. She

thinks that the only authentic version of *The Waste Land* is the published text. But many Eliot readers are not satisfied with this sort of suggestion.

The earliest drafts of *The Waste Land* were written as early as 1914. On 5th November, 1919, Eliot wrote to Quinn about this poem – 'I have in mind', and in December 1919 he informed his mother that he was to 'write a long poem I have had on my mind for a long time'. In October 1921, Eliot's health ran down alarmingly and he was advised complete rest for three months. He went to Margate in mid – October of the same year, and in November he joined a clinic in Lausanne for his treatment. He wrote *The Waste Land* - 'a damn good poem of 19 pages', according to Pound – partly at Margate and partly at Lausanne in 1921. Eliot was then recovering from a physical and psychological breakdown. At that time, Eliot was also engaged in writing the 'London letter' to the *Dial* (New York) which clearly vented his despair and helplessness over the threatened destruction of several churches in London which were designed by Sir Christopher Wren. His condition was no better than that of an imprisoned person who is always thinking of a way out:

… each in his prison
thinking of the key, each confirms a prison….
(The Waste Land, lines 413 – 414).

The allusion is to Dante's *Inferno,* Canto XXXIII, where Ugolino is shown as confirmed to the awful tower in which he is destined to die of starvation. Modern man living in London is also leading a life of loneliness and imprisonment.

Eliot himself has acknowledged various sources contributing to the structure of *The Waste Land.* In his Notes on the poem, he specifically mentions Miss Jessie L. Weston's book on the Grail legend, *From Ritval to Romance* (Cambridge, 1920), and Sir James Frazer's book, *The Golden Bough* (1922). These two books have largely inspired the composition of Eliot's poem. Also, the works of F.H. Bradley, Joseph Conrad, Ezra Pound, James Joyce and Henry James as well as the Indian Scriptures have contributed a good deal to the making of the poem.

2. The Theme of "The Waste Land"

The main theme of *The Waste Land* (1922) is the perversion and sterility of sexual desire in modern man which leads to loss of spirituality in the world. The theme of the poem operates on several planes of experience. As a result, different kinds of the waste land appear in it – the waste land of religion, the waste land of the spirit, and the waste land of the instinct for fertility. The poet has wonderfully given a poetic expression to 'his feelings of futility and anarchy in the face of contemporary – civilization'. The contemporary civilization is a decayed and degenerated civilization, having lost roots in love and religion, in natural and spiritual existence. Consequently, the modern world is seen burning in the fire of sex and lust, and hence fallen on evil days. The spiritual waters which once revitalized European civilization have now dried up, and people are involved neck – deep in 'birth, copulation and death', particularly those living in the metropolitan city of London.

The Waste Land primarily deals with the theme of barrenness, which is symbolically related to the myth of the waste land. Miss Jessie Weston in her book, *From Ritual to Romance,* offers details about the quest for the Holy Grail (the cup used by Christ at the last Supper) and about the legends connected with this quest. These legends depict a region turned into a waste land by a cruel curse. Nothing can grow on this land; crops have withered; animals cannot reproduce. The land is without greenery, without water, without fertility. The land has become so because its ruler, the Fisher King, is excessively indulged in sexual exploits and has received a severe wound on his genitals. This wound has rendered him powerless to procreate. How can this curse be removed, or how can the rainlessness of the land be overcome? This can be done by a questing knight who asks the meanings of various symbols which are presented to him on his visit to a castle. In the original legend the sterility or barrenness is actually physical, but in Eliot's poem it is basically spiritual. The poem under consideration depicts the visit of the knight to the Chapel Perilous, where the Grail is supposedly kept.

Apart from this, death is another theme of *The Waste Land.* Death is usually contrasted with life, Eliot's two favourite phrases are 'death in life' and 'life in death'. His 'Death by Water' in *The Waste Land* is an example of 'life in death', whereas most of his characters in poetry are living in a situation of 'death in life'. The degraded life of the denizens of modern metropolis (like London) is an instance of 'death in life' – the worst kind of life one can think of. As contrasted to this, 'life in death' promises a better time ahead in spiritual terms. Both kinds of life have been suggested by Eliot in *The Waste Land.* The negation of one kind of life signals the birth of another kind. Eliot is very fond of paradoxes and variations in his poetry, and this is one of his paradoxes. Another paradox to which he frequently resorts is 'the intersection of timelessness' with time (see his *Four Quartets*, 1943, for this).

Some scholars like Paul Elmer More and F.R. Leavis think that *The Waste Land* deals with 'the disillusionment of a generation' or with, 'the destabilization of an order'. Consequently, the modern man has become dejected and dispirited. Whether Eliot likes this sort of expression - that the poem is a mirror of its time – or not, the fact remains that *The Waste Land* is a vigorous and valid document of its age. This is well in tune with his statement in *The Sacred Wood* (1920) that a poet writes with an intense awareness of his whole civilization. *The Waste Land* is though claimed by Eliot to have been written to 'release his personal feelings', it is no doubt a very valuable document of its age. Paul Elmer More rightly thinks that this poem deals with 'the chaos of its time'.

Another scholar, Ian Hamilton, is of the view that *The Waste Land* effectively projects the 'superb trinity of culture, sex and religion. The culture that Eliot highlights in this poem is the European culture, and the religion that he treats of is the world religion (not mere one religion). The first three Sections of the poem stress the prevalence of sex and lust in modern human world. Is there any value of sex without love? What do you get married for if you don't want children? Eliot treats of the debasement of love – both inside and outside marriage – in a forceful manner in this poem. He dwells on the three vital aspects of human life – culture, sex and religion – in their social and spiritual contexts.

Only some important themes to be found in *The Waste Land* are discussed above. There are other related themes too in the texture of the poem, and they will be hinted at while discussing the other aspect of the poem. For example, Eliot mentions in his notes on the poem that "In the first part of part V three themes are employed: the journey to Emmaus, the approach to the Chapel Perilous (see Miss Weston's book) and the present decay of eastern Europe". Thus, there are themes within themes in the poem under discussion.

3. The Epigraph

The Epigraph is taken from the *Satyricon* of Petronius Arbiter and suggests the essence of the principal theme in *The Waste Land*. The Satyricon narrates the story of the sibyl of Cumae, the beloved of Apollo. Once the sibyl asked Apollo to grant her to live for as many years as the grains of sand in her hand. But she forgot to ask for eternal youth. Hence she become aged and shrank so small that she hung up in a bottle. When the passers –by, especially children, asked her what she wanted at that time, she could only say, 'I want to die'. Her statement shows unequivocally the predominant theme of the poem decay and destruction. D.G. Rossetti, the great Pre-Raphae- like poet of the mid – nineteenth century, has beautifully versified this story of the sibyl:

I saw the sibyl at Cumae,
(one said) with rune own eye.
She hung in a case, and read her rune
To all the passers – by.
Said the boys, "what would thou, Sibyl?"
She answered, "I would die."

As *The Waste Land* employs the primordial imagery of death and rebirth in accordance with the Grail legend, the Sibyl belongs to the machinery of initiation in the poem. The Sibyl appears in one of the Grail romances, and links the medieval legend to the classical myth. Her misfortune as mentioned in the epigraph symbolizes

the motif of *The Waste Land.* The hint is that the feminine power which should enable the protagonist to complete his quest for initiation cannot deliver goods to the waste land. Similarly, Tiresias remains blind and impotent. The Sibyl here symbolizes 'death in life', and can be identified with Madame Sosotris of Part I.

The epigraph to the poem may be translated as follows:

For once I saw with my own eyes
the Sibyl at Cumae hanging in
a glass bottle, and when the children
said to her, 'Sibyl what do you wish?'
she answered, 'I wish to die?

The only escape from 'death in life' is death proper. That alone will release the Sibyl from her suspended, even painful, life. The words in the epigraph are spoken by the drunken Trimalchio in the *Satyricon,* which is a satire written by the Roman author, Petronius Arbiter, in the first century A.D. Trimalchio is, in a drunken state, boasting to his companions and telling them stories of wonder. The story of the Sibyl is actually one such story.

4. The Dedication

The Waste Land is dedicated to Ezra Pound, '*il miglior fabbro* (*i.e.,* 'the greater craftsman'), who edited the manuscript of the poem and 'reduced to about half its size'. As we know, both Eliot and Pound were of American origin and both had identical views about the art of poetry – that it should be meant for 'the minority audience. Hence they both made it esoteric and allusive, imagistic and concrete.

Pound (1885 - 1972) himself was a poet of stature, and it was his habit to promote other authors and poets. About Eliot he wrote thus:

Eliot, in bank, makes $ 500. Too tired
To write, broke down; during convalescence
In Switzerland, did Waste Land , a
Masterpiece, one of the most important
19 pages in English.

- D.D. Paige, ed. *The Letters of Ezra Pound* ***(1950), p.171.***

Of course, Pound had done a lot towards reducing the size of *The Waste Land* through his pruning and expert advice. The great service rendered by Pound, to Eliot becomes so clear when we browse through *The Waste Land: Facsimile and Transcript Of The Original Draft,* edited by Valerie Eliot after the Poet's death on January 4, 1965.

Fortunately, Pound was alive when Eliot died. Eliot was buried in East Coker, as per his wish. Pound was present at the memorial service in Westminister Abbey, and travelled a long way – from Rome to London – specifically to attend it. Pound recalled Eliot as 'the true Dantescan voice' and urged the people to 'READ HIM'.

5. The Structure of the Poem

The structure of *The Waste Land* follows a circular pattern, not a linear one. The poem continually connects past and present, fertility and barrenness, life and death. The quests of various characters in this poem do not develop in linear directions; they do not arrive at a real end. The poem does not offer a hope of reaching a destination, does not promise a happy reunion. If rather articulates the failures of the protagonist's journeys.

The structure of the poem permits a new poetic technique to Eliot. This technique can accommodate a number of references and allusions in its texture. This is usually called allusive technique, which is 'at once laconic, quick, and precise, for representing the transmutations of thought' (as Edmund Wilson puts it). The technique

of allusiveness has its own merits and demerits. In his seminal essay on "Tradition and the Individual Talent", Eliot expresses his ideas about the use of this technique. According to him, the use of allusions is one of the ways of enriching a tradition as well as of promoting the individual talent. In fact, it is very difficult to reconcile 'tradition' and 'the individual talent', but Eliot achieves this rare feat through his allusions. And his poem, *The Waste Land* is a living example of the use of his technique of allusiveness. With the help of allusions, Eliot is able to establish an association between such contrarieties as past and present, sterility and fertility, death-in-life' and 'life-in-death'.

In his well – known essay, "The Frontiers of Criticism" (1956), Eliot clarifies that his endeavor as an artist is to 'assemble the most desperate material to form a new whole'. His technique of allusiveness enables him to achieve this objective in a considerable way. To achieve 'a new whole', Eliot strives to master at least three kinds of maturity in his work – 'maturity of mind', 'maturity of manners' and 'maturity of language; These three kinds of maturity have been his ideals in art, as he points out in his "What is a Classic?" *The Waste Land* is a powerful poem which reflects the three kinds of maturity. It aims at expressing "a wholeness of feeling, a completeness encompassing within itself the entire tradition of English culture and literature" (see Introduction to *The Waste Land,* ed. V.A. Shahana Delhi: O.U.P., 1987, P.18): Eliot's sense of culture and literature is not limited to England alone; it rather extends to include the rich, old heritage of Greece and Rome and of the enture continent of Urope. The density of allusiveness adds the quality of suggestiveness in this poem.

In structuring *The Waste Land,* Eliot drew upon a number of past authors and contemporaries. He called ideas and methods from various literary *genres,* and from a variety of fine arts – from music, painting, the theatre, the novel, and films. But these literary devices employed by Eliot are directed towards exploring the basic theme of the poem and expressing his vision of life. Of course, Eliot's vision remains gloomy and dismal here, though in the last Section it turns to be a bit optimistic and promising.

In *The Letters of Ezra Pound* , we come across a few letters about *The Waste Land*. From Pound Eliot seeks some suggestions, and asks him on the two points in particular:

1. Do you printing 'Gerontion' as a prelude in book or pamphlet form?
2. Perhaps better omit Phlebais also? And to this Pound replies thus:

   I do *not* advise printing 'Gerontion' as preface. One don't miss it *at all* as the thing now stands. To be more lucid still, let me say that I advise you NOT to print 'Gerontion' as prelude. I do advise keeping Phlebas. In fact I more'n advise, phlebas is an integral part of the poem ….

Eliot accepts Pound's suggestion , taking him an accomplished craftsman. But Eliot does not accept the Master's advice that the Sanskrit words proper be dropped.

Eliot's scholarship comes out openly in his "Notes" to *The Waste Land* . The Notes clearly show that he is 'a scholar poet'. Also why he writes these Notes, he gives the following explanation:

> *Then when it come to print 'The Waste*
> *Land' as a little book… it was*
> *discovered that the poem was inconve –*
> *niently short, so I set to work to expand*
> *the notes, in order to provide a few more*
> *pages of printed matter, with the result*
> *that they became the remarkable exposition*
> *of bogus scholarship that is still*
> *on view today.*

This pertinent statement of Eliot points out that the scholarly background to *The Waste Land* is not of great importance in understanding it. In his brilliant essays. "The Frontiers of Criticism" Eliot expresses the same idea when he remarks that he does 'not think that most poetry… requires that sort of dissection for its enjoyment

and understanding.' It is somewhat erroneous to approach a poem through the poet's scholarship. Rather a reader should approach it by a consideration of the amount of transformation of the raw material at hand by his 'poetic genius.' The poet has to discover an 'emotional equivalent' to his thought for producing a gem of a poem. In its structural context, Eliot's poem should be read in this light.

6. Myth in the Poem

Eliot makes use of myth in a discernible way. In this matter, he is deeply influenced by the method of James Joyce in *Ulysses* (published in 1922). Both the works appeared in the same year, and hence the question of borrowing does not arisc. *Ulysses* contains parallels to Homer's *Odyssey.* V. Larband reviewed Joyce's *Ulysses* in the opening issue of *The Criterion* (October 1922), edited by T.S. Eliot. Reviewing *Ulysses* for *The Dial* (1923), Eliot lauded Joyce's mythical method, thereby revealing the attractive malities of his own method in *The Waste Land*. He stressed the classical quality of Joyce's novel. Speaking of the mythical pattern of the novel, Eliot remarked thus:

> *In using the myth, in manipulating*
> *a continuous parallel between contemporaneity*
> *and antiquity Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method*
> *which others must pursue after him… it is*
> *simply a way of controlling and*
> *ordering, of giving a shape and a*
> *significance to the immense panorama*
> *of futility and anarchy which*
> *is contemporary history.*
>
> ("*Utysses,* Order and Myth", *The Dial,* 1923, pp. 480-83).

Eliot also adopts the mythical method in the structuring of *The Waste Land,* but his method tends to be suggestive and selective. He makes use of the Grail legend in this poem.

The Grail legend is connected with the life – story of the Fisher king, an important ruler of the Waste Land. The grail was the disk or plate used by Christ in the Last Supper, in which the blood of the Saviour was held up on the eve of his crucifixion by one of his devotes. Subsequently, it came to be an object of devotion and dedication. But, after some time, the Grail disappeared mysteriously, and several bold knights went out in search of it. It was generally believed that the lost Grail sometimes appeared in the sky as a floating saucer of great beauty and splendour, but it could be seen only by a knight of perfect purity. Lord Tennyson dealt with this theme as the finale of his *Idylls of the King,* making Sir Galahad, the brave and pure knight of King Arthur's Round Table, as the leader destined to succeed in his noble mission. In some other versions appearing in Germany and France subsequently, however, the protagonist is Sir Percival or Parsifal. Miss Jessie L. Weston in her book, *From Ritual to Romance,* one of the sources in the making of *The Waste Land,* has treated the legend critically and historically. She thinks that the Grail was originally connected with the fertility myth and associated with sexual symbols, but later it suffered a sea – change being associated with the founder of Christianity.

Parsifal and his fellow adventurers once arrived in a country ruled by a prince named the Fisher King. It was one of the regions where the Grail worship had been in vogue and a temple, known as the Chapel Perilous, still stood there, broken and dilapidated. At that time, the king himself had become a human wreck, maimed and impotent as a result of a sin committed by his soldiery in out raging the modesty of a group of nuns attached to the Grail temple. Because of this sin, the Fisher King had become impotent and his land barren. The king was, however, waiting with hope that one day the knight of the pure soul would visit his kingdom and the Chapel Perilous, answer questions and solve riddles prior to the ritual washing of his sinful body, which would purge it and renew its health and energy. Then, the land would also become watery and green, full of 'soft incense' and 'lisping leaves'.

Eliot's poem under review is an allegorical representation of this story to modern society and religion. The modern human world is actually a waste land. We can have youth and health by journeying far, questioning our condition, and practising self – control and spirituality. Sex is certainly the source of life, and as such it was glorified and worshipped in ancient days by primitive communities. But sex is now debased in the human world and the whole universe is presently 'burning' in the 'fire' of lust. This 'fire' can be extinguished by the purification of the soul through the practice of asceticism and spirtualism. To teach this lesson, Eliot resorts to the Scriptures of India – to the *Rig Veda* and the *Upanishad.*

Thus, the use of the Grail legend in the texture of *The Waste Land* proves an effective tool to draw parallels between the ancient and modern situations. It renders the poem compact and compressed, suggestive and symbolical.

7. The Role of Tiresias

Tiresias is the central figure in *The Waste Land ,* and it is through him that we watch all the events and situations taking place in it. What Tiresias sees from the substance of the poem. Writing about him, Eliot observes thus:

Tiresias, although a mere spectator and
Not indeed a 'character', is yet the
Most important personage in the
Poem, uniting all the rest… and the two
Sexes meet in Tiresias. What Tiresias sees…
Is the substance of the poem.

("Notes" on The Waste Land)

Tiresias function as a unifier of all the episodes and experiences to be had in the poem. He is a representative of the entire humanity. His vision reflects the vision of the poem. He is derived from the Greek source, where he is a wise soothsayer. But in his youth he becomes blind. Why? The reasons are variously suggested – (1) that he once saw Athena taking her bath; since his mother was her friend, she did not cause her death, but blinded him and gave him the power of prophecy by way of compensation; and (2) that he one day saw snakes coupling and struck them with his stick, whereat he became a woman; later the same thing happened again and he turned into a man. He was asked by Zeus and Hera to settle a dispute as to which sex had more pleasure in love, he decided for the female. Hera got angry with him and blinded him, but Zeus compensated by granting him a long life and the power of prophecy.

Tiresias is a bi – sexual with a wide range of experience in life. This is how the poet has introduced him in the text of the poem:

I Tiresias, though blind, throbbing between two lives,

Old man with wrinkled female breasts, can see
At the violet hour, the evening hour that strives
Homeward, and brings the sailor home from sea,
The typist home at teatime, clears her breakfast, lights
Her stove, and lays out food in tins.
… … … … …
On the divan are piled (at might her bed)
Stocking, slippers, camisoles, and stays.
I Tiresias, old man with wrinkled dugs
Perceived the scene, and foretold the rest –

("The Fire Sermon", The Waste Land lines 218 – 229)

Here Tiresias is presented as an old, blind man, having the power of 'foretelling', and also a person combining the two sexes in himself – 'Old man with wrinkled female breasts'.

As a spectator, Tiresias has watched the depressing spectacle of modern humanity which has fallen on evil days. He is at once the relic of the past and a seer of the present, at once a prophet and a detached spectator of the contemporary scene. He is a representative of the whole humanity. His camera eye is seen rolling backwards and forwards. He can move about in history and in time; he can become a modern city – man, a medieval, or an ancient Greek at will. The Waste Land in his spiritual autobiography, his search through the junkheap of modern culture for an integrating principal. His search goes on several planes: autobiography, archeology, mythology, anthropology and religion. It is often accompanied by sufferings and frustration, and yet it does not give hope of rebirth and resurrection. The Grail legend aptly suggests it through symbols.

8. "The Waste Land" as and International Poem

T.S. Eliot's poetry presents an interesting example of the application of international themes. *The Waste Land* (1922), his *magnum opus*, combines in its texture a number of sources ranging from the fertility rituals, the Grail legends, the Tarot pack of cards (all representing the primitive pagan ways of life), through St. Augustine and the *Bible* (both forming the Christian tradition), the Greek myth and the creation of Tiresias, the Latin writers and poets (constituting the continental Classical tradition), Buddhism and Hinduism (both championing the Indian tradition), to a host of British, French, Italian and German authors (all betokening the various nationalities of Europe). There is nothing surprising in it because one who know Eliot's background, education and wide range of reading can easily understand his sound scholarship and varying interests. When Stephen Coote in his study of *The Waste Land* calls it "a central work of modernism," he implies thereby "its desperate engagement with the [entire] modern world"[1] (the word 'entire' mine). It is when we consider the work in its entirety that it really becomes "a seminal par of our heritage."[2]

1. Various Sources of the Poem

Eliot discovered a fine analysis of the fertility rituals in Sir James Frazer's monumental work, *The Golden Bough* (3rd ed., 1911 – 1919) in twelve volumes (out of which Eliot used only the two volumes *Adonis, Attis to Romance* (Cambridge, 1920) the two work which have "influenced our generation profoundly."[3] Sir Frazer offers vivid accounts of the fertility gods, Adonis, Attis and Osiris, chosen from the ancient culture of the Eastern Mediterranean. Of these gods, Adonis (or Tammuz) belonged to the Babylonians and the syrian; Attis originated in Phrygia and was worshipped by the Romans; and Osiris was Egyptian. The worship of these three gods being common to the sources of European culture is "essentially similar."[4] They were the divine yet mortal lovers of the Mother Goddess – in the shape of Ishtar, Cybele, or Isis – who personified 'the various potency of nature.' The union of the god and goddess guaranteed the fertility of the land. The death and the sexual maiming of the god followed by his consort's search for him in the underworld brought about the onset of winter and the land's infertility. With the departure of the god, the world turned into a Waste Land.

Miss Weston's book is another interesting anthropological document to which Eliot confesses his indebtedness in unequivocal terms. He observes: "Not only the title, but the plan and a good deal of the incidental symbolism of the poem were suggested by Miss Jessie L. Weston's book on the grail legend."[5] The Grail legends are based on the tales of the Knights of the Round Table (e.g., Parcifal. Gawain and Galahad). Miss Weston claims to have found 'the origins of Grail imagery in the vegetation cults analysed by Frazer.' The Waste Land of the Grail legends is mainly due to the sickness of the king for an unknown reason, reduced as it is to 'the desolation of drought and death.' The king being the Grail's guardian has to be nursed back to health. In *The Waste Land*, the Fisher King is shown maimed like a fertility god. Miss Weston relates the Tammuz – Adonic cult of Frazer to her own Grail legends, and explains that the wound suffered by Adonis was in his genitals by Dolorous Stroke, and adds that this accounts for the infertility of the land. By associations, the wound of the Fisher King was identical. The hyacinth girl is the Grail bearer in Eliot's poem; she is an embodiment of love. But the Fisher King fails with the girl in the hyacinth garden (a place of water and flowers). Madame Sosostris,

who is advanced in years and who is a 'wise woman', is unmistakably another Grail – bearer, she is surely "a charlatan" and "an old witchwoman."[6] Another instance of the Grail – bearer is the tired typist in a luxurious boudoir whose helplessness is contained in the lines –

What shall we do to- morrow?
What shall we ever do?

(11.133 – 134)

It is quite clear that the Grail legend initiates a quester – in the poem under discussion; it is Tiresias – to go on, and set the land in order by breaking the magic – spell of infertility and sterility and thereby curing the wounded king. Through a maze of symbols, this legend is primarily "primitively associated with sex."[7] According to Sir Frazer, some of the primitive communities of the world used to indulge themselves in nocturnal orgies and sensuous merry – making for their welfare.

The Tarot pack of cards meant originally for divination has now degraded into fortune – telling. It consists of 78 cards out of which 56 form the Lesser Arcana (divided into four suits – Batons [Eliot's 'staves'], Cups, Swords and Coins) and the remaining 22 cards constitute the Greater Arcana, each depicting a symbolic figure or scene (such as the Wheel of Fortune and the Hanged Man). The cards were known in Western Europe by the late 14th century, but nothing definite can be said about their origin. Miss Weston suggests that the Tarot is "a possible repository of primeval symbols of fertility,"[8] and traces its elements in antique Egyptian and Chinese monuments, and opines that it might have been introduced from India by the gipsies (pp. 73 – 76). In the initiation ritual, the four Grail talismans (Cup, Lance, Sword and Dish) have the 'sexual value' in essential details – the first and fourth being feminine and the second and third being masculine in their symbolic connotations. They are the life – symbols by all means. In the Tarot, the drowned Phoenician Sailor and the Hanged Man symbolise respectively 'the loveless death' and 'the potential healing or rebirth of Tiresias'. Madame Sosostris sees 'the crowds of people' turning on the Wheel of Fortune; these people signify 'a purposeless circle.' In his Notes on the poem, Eliot tells us that the Hanged Man has been associated with the Hanged God of Sir Frazer, which in Part V of the poem gets transformed into 'the hooded figure.' The Man with Three Staves, an authentic member of the Tarot pack, is arbitrarily associated with the Fisher King himself.[9] Taken as a whole, the Tarot cards and their reading denote the degeneration of spiritual health for man.

Fertility rituals or vegetation cults and the Grail legends and the Tarot pack of cards combinedly allude to primitive religion as represented by ancient communities of the world. In the Christian context, they are contained in the mysteries and miracles of the olden days. Another significant growth of early Christianity is St. Augustine, whose *Confessions* is "the European example of true autobiographical writing."[10] Though he appears briefly at, the close of Part III The Waste Land, he is placed significantly beside Lord Buddha as the great exponent of Western asceticism. In his Notes, Eliot inform us that "The collocation of these two representatives of eastern and western asceticism … is not an accident."[11] St. Augustine fought vehemently with his own powerful sexual urge and 'the restless sexuality of Carthage.' He presents a graphic account of his spiritual and emotional bankruptcy – of his personal Waste Land – in his *Confessions* thus:

To Carthage then I came
Burning burning burning burning
O Lord Thou pluckest me out
O Lord Thou pluckest
burning.

(11. 307 – 310)

This meaningful passage highlights 'the sordidness of urban pleasure' in a big city, and should be read in the background of Part II ("A Game of Chess") of the poem. It depicts sex without love, particularly within marriage, whereas Part III paints the same horror without marriage – if the former brings into sharp focus a category of women consisting of Imogen, Philomel, Bianca, and Ophelia, the latter highlights another category

of women comprising Madame Sosostris, Belladona, Lil (the pub woman having undergone an abortion), Cleopatra and Dido. The Fisher King receives his wound as a result of the gross violation of the norms of chastity, as a result of the immoral rape. Seen against such a background, the passage beginning with 'To Carthage then I came' is highly revealing. Modern man has to throw away all 'burning in lust' and the resultant restlessness and horror if he has to come out of the prevailing state of infertility and sterility around him. This is certainly the path of Negation, as opposed to the path of Affirmation, and this path of Negation has been best shown by Lord Buddha, the great Indian ascetic, who abjured his wife and son and grad palace for the sake of real englightenment. The title of Part III is directly based on "The Fire Sermon" delivered by the Buddha at Sarnath (Varanasi) to his first five disciples immediately after his enlightenment. In his Notes, Eliot tells us that the Fire Sermon "corresponds in importance to the Sermon on the Mount."[12] In that historical Sermon the Buddha has shown that the entire world is 'on fire', which has got to be extinguished for the redemption of mankind. So important is the Fire Sermon that a noted critic like William Empson is prompted to remark that it "leaves Christianity far behind"[13] in its insistence on spirituality and asceticism. Here at least is a possibility for the modern man to emerge out of his Waste Land. The well – known critic, E.L. Mayo, is of the opinion that the passage 'To Carthage then I came' remarkably fuses into one the three religious traditions – the Christian, the Hebrew and the Buddhist.[14]

The Bible has been occasionally by Eliot. The Jews' destiny of waiting for a Redeemer (in the Old Testament) resembles the destiny of human beings as described in *The Waste Land.* In line 20 of this poem, the vision of Ezekiel ('the son of man') is alluded to - the vision of the coming of the Messiah and the return of the Jews to the Promised Land – and in line 23 the cricket and in line 353 the cicada are borrowed from the vision of cataclysm in the Ecclesiastes. If the Old Testament presents a world without a Redeemer, the New Testament is its fulfilment. Christ is the risen God who trimphs over man's sin and wins forgiveness for him. In lines 322 – 326 of *The Waste Land,* the scenes in Christ's life just before the crucifixion, and in lines 359 – 365 the scenes of His life after the resurrection are beautifully recalled. The opening paragraph of "What the Thunder Said" has distinct analogies with the incidents in arrival of soldiers and the imprisonment before the trial. In his Notes, Eliot informs us that the first section of Part V employs three themes – "the journey to Emmaus, the approach to Chapel Perilous… and the present decay of eastern Europe."[15] Eliot purposely compares the risen Christ to Sir James Frazer's Hanged God. But the world of the Waste Land is so much decayed and degraded that it cannot recognise the resurrected Christ or 'the hooded figure.'

Besides a fair use of *The Bible,* the Hindu scriptures have also been drawn upon in a bid to make the poem truly representative of the entire humanity. Eliot has used them in *The Waste Land, Four Quartets,* and the shorter piece "To the Indians Who Died in Africa." The hoary wisdom of ancient India is contained in the *Vedas,* the *Upanishads,* and the *Bhagavad-Gita.* Miss Weston traces the symbolism of the Grail legend to the *Rig Veda* (see p. 25 of her book for this). There are two self-evident references to the Hindu scriptures in *The Waste Land,* the first being 'Da Da Da' and the second being 'Shantih shantih shantih.' The first one is derived from the cryptic teachings of Prajapati to his disciples – gods, men and demons – as found in the *Brihad aranyaka Upanishad* (5.1-3). The father –preceptor enjoins upon them the necessity of practising the three laudable virtues of Love, Sympathy and Control (i.e., 'Datta,' 'Dayadhvam' and 'Damyata') by modern man for his deliverance from his self-created prison. The second one, as the poet puts it, is "a formal ending to an Upanishad,"[16] which is also echoed *verbatim* by the noted critic, Elizabeth Drew.[17] It is derived from the *Yajur Veda* (36.17) as well as from the *Upanishads* (which invariably end it). The triple 'shantih' actually reflects a peaceful state of mind attained after a complete resolution of all disturbances, anxieties and doubts.[18] Very adroitly the poet has given a clear-cut clue to modern man to turn away from the selfish, worldly pursuits to the moral, spiritual quests to cure his otherwise incurable malady.

Tiresias, an omnipresent, mythic figure, is unmistakably Greek in origin, precisely to be found first in the Oedipus plays. His omnipresence in the poem creates a structural coherence and a psychological insight into the prevailing unhealthy conditions in the world. In his Notes, Eliot offers a detailed commentary on Tiresias in

the following manner:

> *Tiresias, although a mere spectator and not indeed a 'character,' is yet the most important personage in the poem uniting all the rest. Just as the one-eyed merchant, seller of currants, melts into the Phoenician Sailor, and the latter is not wholly distinct from Ferdinand Prince of Naples, so all the women are one woman, and the two Sexes meet in Tiresias. What Tiresias sees, in fact, is the Substances of the poem.*[19]

From this commentary it is obvious that Tiresias is a blind old man combining both the sexes in himself – in other words, the entire humanity – and that his observations constitute the central core of the poem. His position is that of a silent spectator, not that of a redeemer or an active participant in the enactment of the tense drama of *The Waste Land.* Both Sophocles and Seneca opened their Oedipus plays when the plague was at its height on Thebes after Oedipus had unwittingly killed his father and married his mother Jocasta. The incestuous relationship with his mother caused the blight of the land, and the horrible plague descended on Thebes. In these plays, the blind prophet Tiresias could reveal the truth to Oedipus and thereby hasten his tragedy. "The Fire Sermon" contains three clear references to Tiresias : in the first, he is

> *Blind, throbbing between two lives,*
> *Old man with wrinkled female breasts…*

In the second, he speaks of himself as an 'old man with wrinkled dugs' (line 228), and in the third he presents himself thus –

> *And I Tiresias have foresuffered all*
> *Enacted on this same divan or bed;*
> *I who have sat by Thebes below the wall*
> *And walked among the lowest of the dead.*
>
> *(11.243-246)*

The Latin poet Ovid (who is referred to in line 99 of the poem) describes vividly about the transformation of Tiresias into a woman for seven years and then again into a man as a result of his striking of the two intertwining huge serpents in the depths of the green wood, and about his condemnation to 'eternal blindness' by angry Juno, for he had given his verdict in favour of Jupiter over a delicate issue – that 'women get far more pleasure out of love than men do.'

No doubt, the most dominant classical personages to have influenced Eliot's *The Waste Land* have been Sophocles, Seneca and Ovid, but some Latin works also contribute their shares to the making of the poem. These works are: the *Satyricon* of Petronious, the anonymous *Pervigilium Veneris*, the *Aeneid* of Virgil, the poets of *The Greek Anthology.*[20] Petronius clearly suggested the epigraph of the poem to Eliot wherein the Sybil of Cumae expresses her desire to die – 'I want to die.' The *Pervigilium Veneris* (meaning literally 'the Vigil of Venus') provides Eliot with one fragment for the close of *The Waste Land* – 'Quanndo fiam uti chelidon' (meaning 'When shall I be as the swallow'), - expressing a certain longing for singing in full freedom. The references to Virgil in "A Game of Chess" is very brief, and it focuses our attention on the panelled ceiling of the boudoir which is actually derived from the first book of the *Aeneid*. *The Greek Anthology* consisting of over four thousand epigrams on a variety of subjects is drawn upon in the Phlebas episode.

Amongst the various authors alluded to by Eliot in this poem, mention may be made of German poet Richard Wagner (whose *Tristan* and *Isolde* is the human world's marvellous expression of romantic love, including torrential passion, sexuality and death, and who is alluded to in lines 31-34 and line 42 of *The Waste Land*), the Frech poet Baudelaire (who is referred to in lines 60 – 'Unreal City' – and 76 where Eliot is mainly concerned

with a powerful evocation of the picture of the gloomy modern city, the image of London as a contemporary Waste Land), the Italian poet Dante (who supplied Eliot with suitable incidents to 'measure the moral bankruptcy of his times,' as in lines 63-64 and in lines 411-412 –both from *Inferno*, Books III & IV, which describes the horrors, lamentations and tortures to the guilty like Count Ugolino), and in line 293 (which refers to the unhappily married La Pia) and in line 427 (which alludes to Arnaut Daniel slipping back into the cleansing fire – taken from Purgatorio, Books V and XXVI respectively), and noted German writer Herman Hess (whose *Blick ins Chao, i.e.,* 'In sight of Chaos' is alluded to in lines 366-376, pointing out the utter exhaustion of traditional Europe), and a host of British authors like William Shakespeare (whose plays *Antony* and *Cleopatra* and *The Tempest* have been specifically referred to in Eliot's Notes), John Milton (whose Paradise Lost is mentioned in line 98), Webster (II.118 and 407), Middleton (I.138), Spenser (Prothalamion is alluded to in line 176), Marvell (whose *To His Coy Mistress* is mentioned in line 196), Goldsmith (whose *The Vicar of Wakefield* is drawn upon in line 253), Kyd (whose The *Spanish Tragedy* is touched upon towards the close of the poem), and a number of other minor sources.

II. Titles of the Five Parts

The title of part I of *The Waste Land* is "The Burial of the Dead," and is derived from the majestic Anglican service for the burial of the dead. The theme of resurrection finds its counterpoint here in the rhythmic annual return of the Spring, which proves to be the cruellest month with 'dull roots,' and memory and desire blend an old man's insert longing and lost fulfilment.[20] The speaker Tiresias is content to let himself covered up with winter 'in forgetful snow.' Blind and spiritually embittered, he wrestles with buried emotions which have been unexpectedly revived. The opening paragraph is actually a pointer to both joy and agony in human life.

The title of Part II is borrowed from the Jacobean dramatist Middleton's play, *Women, Beware Women* (Act II, Scene 2). It recalls the scene of seduction of Bianca by the Duke, while her mother-in-law's attention is diverted by a game of chess. Bianca is another Philomel in her woeful fate. Eliot also reinforces his theme by resorting immediately to a reference to *The Tempest,* wherein also a game of chess takes place between Ferdinand and Miranda (Act V, Scene I, lines 172-175), but which in contrast betokens amity and love. The overall subject of this Part is sex without love, particularly within marriage, which reduces it to a mere physical subjugation and bondage.

Part III also enacts the drama of sex without love, but this time outside marriage. Its title is taken from Lord Buddha's "Fire Sermon." First delivered at *Sarnath, Varanasi,* to his five disciples, the emphasis of which is 'burning of the entire world' in the fire of lust and passion. A similar voice was also raised by St. Augustine together herein, especially at the close. The wind that blows in the 'Unreal City' is quite unwholesome and unhygienic.

Part IV is very small and fragmentary; it symbolises failure in love and ascendancy of lust. It paints the picture of Phlebas the Phoenician. It is translated from one of Eliot's earlier experiments in French, and underlines 'the brevity of sensual life,' according to Bullough. It suggests that man should give up 'the traffic in worldly things and the lusts of the flesh' in order to secure the love of God and humanity.

Part V has its title from the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* (5.1-3), which throws light on the teachings of Prajapati to his disciple-sons – men, demons and gods – to practise the triple virtues of Love, Sympathy and Control in the interest of all. In the first section of this Part, at least three themes are employed – the journey to Emmaus, the approach to the Chapel Perilous, and the present decay of eastern Europe. The poem ends on a note of 'peace' ('shantih'); at least it throws up the possibility of man's redemption by following the virtuous path.

III. The Subject and the Style

The subject-matter of *The Waste Land* is simply religious and spiritual: precisely speaking, it is the growth of the loss of religious feeling in man. This theme is set within the framework of primitive ritualistic sex. According

to V.de S. Pinto, "*The Waste Land* is an essay in creating a poem on a grand scale out of vision of a devitalized world that has denied or ignored the spiritual life. He had already treated this theme on a small scale in *Gerontion*… The central conception of *The Waste Land* is sexual impotence used as a symbol for the spiritual malady of the modern world."[21]

The main theme and sub-themes of this poem are cast in the form of a series of scenes which are rather like film-shots fading and dissolving into each other, and are seen from the viewpoint of an impersonal observer, Tiresias (the protagonist of the poem), who is identified with the impotent Fisher King. The two cardinal motives in the poem are: Memory and Desire. The noted scholar, Anthony Thwaite, has rightly remarked that "*The Waste Land* is … not a mere reflection of hopelessness but a panoramic view of spiritual exhaustion comparable in desolation to the 'terrible' sonnets of Hopkins. The soul is scoured, and waits in emptiness for its revival."[22]

I.A. Richards takes this poem as 'a music of ideas,' while Grover Smith regards it as "the possible release" from "the quandary of intractable flesh contending with reluctant spirit."[23] The style of the poem is a typical compression of clearly visualised, often metaphysical, images, a vocabulary essentially modern, and a subtly suggestive use of the rhythms of ordinary speech. It tends to be highly allusive and over-burdened with literary and mythical references. Eliot evidently does not pay due regard to syntax and punctuation. Yet his skill in conveying a metrical sense is unquestionable, as observed by Helen Gardner – "*The Waste Land* (1922) represents the culmination of this period of metrical virtuosity. Its basic measure is the heroic lines, which it handles in almost every possible way."[24] As the first section of this essay will indicate clearly, Eliot is quite derivative here in his technique and full of difficult scholarship. His notes given at the close of the poem will also confirm this view.

IV. Eliot's International

We have already thrown light on Eliot's varied sources and vast scope in *The Waste Land.* He has culled his material from all possible sources, and this makes him truly 'international' and 'universal.' It may be pointed out here that Eliot's 'internationalism' or 'universalism' does not get in the way of his American 'individualism' or his Catholic 'Eruopeanism.' It rather transcends the narrow limitations of caste, creed and clime, rendering his work readily acceptable to all mankind. *The Waste Land* is *verily* a poem of this kind, and it displays the poet's, as well as the reader's, readiness to accept 'the best that is known and thought in the world.' O. Paz comes very close to admitting this fact when he remarks that –

> *Eliot is universal in the sense in which all great poetry from the funeral chants of the pygmies to the Hai-ku of the Japanese, is the common heritage of all men; and he is universal also because of his influence in world literature of our time, comparable to that of Klee in painting or that of Stravinsky in music: an influence which differs from others because it is a critical influence.*[25]

The Waste Land definitely adds laurels to the creative cap of Eliot and helps build for him an internationally acceptable stature. It is this that M.C. Bradbrook suggests when she states that the poem is "certainly Eliot's most influential poem," and that "The generations which grew up in the later nineteen-twenties took it to themselves and absorbed it so that it became part of their habit of mind."[26]

V. Conclusion

Eliot was an American by birth and breeding, a British by acquired citizenship and anglo-catholicism, a European by culture and tradition, and an 'internationalist' by taste and outlook upon life. His liberal education and broadbased training enabled him to adopt a cosmopolitan outlook upon life and letters. He never hesitated to

take the services of any land or people in meeting his poetic purpose and furthering his literary designs. It is when *The Waste Land* is seen in this perspective that it becomes truly 'international' in its scope and structure, adding an extra punch to the reader's sensibility by enabling him to have a clear "vision of a devitalized world"[27] around him.

Notes and References

1. Stephen Coote, "Afterword," *The Waste Land* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England : Penguin Books, 1985), p. 141.
2 *Idem.*
3 T.S. Eliot, "Notes on *The Waste Land*," *The Waste Land and Other Poems* (London; Faber & Faber, 1972), p. 44.
4 Coote, *op. Cit*., p. 95.
5 See Eliot's Notes, p. 44.
6 Grover Smith, T.S. Eliot's poetry and Plays, 9th Impr. (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), p. 76.
7 _____, *The Waste Land* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983), p.90.
8. *Ibid*., p. 91.
9. See Eliot's Notes, p. 45.
10. Coote, op. Cit., p. 127.
11. See Eliot's Notes, p. 49.
12. *Ibid*., p. 48
13. "William Empson and the Fire Sermon," *Essays in Criticism*, VI, No. 4 (Oct. 1956), 481.
14. E.L. Mayo, "The Influence of Ancient-Hindu Thought on Walt Whitman and T.S. Eliot," *The Aryan Path,* XIX (Jan-Dec. 1958), 174.
15. See Eliot's Notes, p. 49.
16. *Ibid*., p. 51.
17. Elizabeth Drew, T.S. Eliot: *The Design of His Poetry* (New York : Charles Scibner's Sons, 1949), p. 116.
18. For details, please look up my book, *T.S. Eliot's Major Poems: An Indian Interpretation* (Salzburg, Austria: University of Salzburg, 1982), pp. 53-56.
19. See Eliot's Notes, p. 46-47.
20. Coote, *op. Cit*., p. 129.
21. See Pinto's Book, *Crisis in English Poetry:* 1880-1940, p. 170.
22. See Thwaite's book, *Contemporary English Poetry*, p. 60.
23. G. Smith, *op. Cit*., p. 129.
24. Helen Gardner, *The Art of T.S. Eliot.*, p. 19.
25. O. Paz, "Inaugural Address," *T.S. Eliot: Papers and Proceedings of a Seminar* (Mumbai: Manaktalas, 1965), p. 2.
26. M.C. Bradbrook, *T.S. Eliot*, a British Council Pamphlet (London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1955), p. 19.
27. Pinto, *op. Cit.*, 170.

9. "The Waste Land": A Critical Study

The Waste Land appeared in 1922. It was the first attempt of the poet to create a major poem with a philosophical message the poem provides a good illustration of the use of 'objective correlatives' and the great economy of

words which such use can bring about. It is almost an epic in less then five hundred lines. 'It is an epic on man and on human civilization, not any particular civilization. But on the sum total of human achievements since the dawn of history to the modern times"[1]. According to Matthlessen, the poem expresses "the agony of a society without belief."[2]

Grover Smith sees *The Waste Land* as a consummation of 'Memory and Desire'. Leavis hails the work as one "that compelled recognition for the achievement". Of course, with the appearance of this poem in five Sections, the world began to realize Eliot's greatness as a modern poet. "In 1922 a new star became lord of the ascendant. Mr. Eliot's *Waste Land* was hailed by the rising generation as a landmark in English poetry comparable to the *Lyrical Ballads*."[3]

The title of the poem comes from Miss J.L. Weston's book. *From Ritual to Romance,* which has an anthropological theme: the Waste Land in that work has a significance in terms of Fertility Ritual. The question is – what is the significance of the modern Waste Land? The answer may be found in "the rich disorganisation of the poem."[4] Leavis remarks that "the seeming disjointedness" of the poem is closely connected with the erudition so puzzling to the reader and with "the wealth of literary borrowings and allusions." The characteristics noted here reflect "the present state of civilization." As a result, traditions and cultures have mingled, and the historical imagination makes the past contemporary; no one tradition can digest so great a variety of materials. This naturally leads to a break-down of forms and the irrevocable loss of that sense of absoluteness which seems necessary to a robust culture.

Nobody would deny the fact that the poem is a difficult and complex one in content and technique; its details are inextricably woven together. The poem, as such, passes the comprehension of the common reader. It hints can be picked up, but they can't be easily explained. "It is no use approaching Eliot in a state of wise passiveness. You have to use your wits."[5] It is partly so because it was written under the stimulus of Ezra Pound, whose ruthless abridgments sealed the shape of the poem. Pound was helpful to Eliot in more than one way.

In *The Waste Land* we have, in addition to the 'ritualistic figures,' 'legendary myths', complex structure based on analogy and anomaly, the abrupt progression through five Movements or Sections – (1) "The Burial of the Dead". (2) "The Game of Chess", (3) "The Fire Sermon", (4) "Death by Water", and (5) "What the Thunder Said". Throughout the poem appears the figure of Tiresias, representing entire humanity; it is his presence that gives unity to the work. The real unity of the work as the historian Albert has noted, lies in its "emotional atmosphere"[6]

One of the things that makes *The Waste Land* really difficult is the use of symbols by T.S. Eliot. The poem is built round the symbols of drought and flood, representing death and birth. This is a recurrent thought in the poem. Other symbols used in it are hardly capable of precise explanation. Mark what Bullough has to say in this respect in *The Trend of Modern Poetry*. 'Mr. Eliot uses symbols drawn from kindred myths and religion'. And F.O. Matthlessen says, "The drama of *The Waste Land* is built upon the contrast of repeated and varying symbols of drought and rain; much of its unified effect depends upon the frequent return of the Unreal City, with its 'trams and dusty trees', its murky streets 'under the brown fog of a winter noon', its dull canal made suddenly horrible by the slimy belly of a rat."[7]

Another much-complained thing contributing to the complexity of the poem is its remote references and recondite allusions. The opening epigraph of the sibyl legend, the *Tristan* and *Isolde* verses, Baudelaire's *Fleurs du Mal* (line 76), the *Aenled* remembrance (line 92), Ovid's '*Metomorphoses'* and Philomela (line 99), Verlaine's *Parsifal* (I. 202), the Grail legends, the Vegetation myth, the Chapel Perilous in Part V, seen against the background of "the hyacinth garden" in Part I, the mystical teachings of the Indian sages and of the *Upanishads* are some of the references out of the reach of common reader. The poem is reminiscent of the Elizabethan and Metaphysical extravagances and conceits. In evoking the images Eliot seems to echo Baudelaire, and in adopting a symbolic device in poetry he is close to the French Symbolists. The echoes of Dante, St. Augustine, Lord Buddha, Miss J.L. Weston are heard throughout the poem. Yet George Morris has suggested another

figure who left deep mark on Eliot's *The Waste Land*; it is Countess Marie Larisch, who wrote "My Past". Morris says, "T.S. Eliot was certainly one who read it, and before he wrote *The Waste Land*,"[8] He traces this fact on the philological basis.

The best way to begin reading the poem is to regard it as a phantasmagoria of futility a series of trains of thought in the mind of a social observer. Eliot has introduced such an observer in the person of Tiresias, the seer, who having been both man and woman represents the characteristics of all mankind.

Section I, called *The Burial of the Dead* to emphasise the inevitable dissolution which must precede new life, begins with a lament over the loss of fertility in what should be Spring-season, and illustrates this by means of typical chatter of cosmopolitan idlers, passing thence to symbols of our barrenness. The decay of love in the modern world is then suggested by a quotation from Wagner's *Tristan and Isolde* (romantic idolatory), with which is compared an instance of amorous sentimentality. That secret wisdom, too, has fallen on evil days is shown by the introduction of the Tarot pack of cards, used formerly for divination, now for fortune-telling. He ends with a vision of London as an unreal city in a nightmare of memories –

That corpse you planted last year in your garden,
Has it begun to sprout? Will it bloom this year?
Or has the sudden frost disturbed its bed?

The connection with the fertility cult is thus stressed here.

In Section II, called *A Game of Chess* to recall the dramatic irony of Middleton's Bianca and the fatal power of woman, the poet depicts two types of modern woman in contrasted literary styles. After a picture of a luxurious boundoir which rivals Keats's he gives the petulant conversation of its tenant, and her eternal question–

What shall we do to- morrow?
What shall we ever do?

The man replies –

The hot water at ten.
And if it rains, a closed car at four.
And we shall play a game of chess,
Pressing lidless eyes and waiting for a knock upon the door

Then the scene changes to a pub at closing time, and the garrulous mean talk of another woman follows.

In Section III, the tone of disgust deepens. It is called *The Fire Sermon* to suggest to the initiated the sermon of Lord Buddha, in which he spoke of mankind as burning in the flames of lust, hatred and infatuation. Here we are shown the sordidness of urban pleasures. Just as the poet introduced into the boudoir scene touches of Cleopatra and Dido, so now he recalls the river of Spenser's *Prothalamion*, and with equally devastting irony goes on to parody Goldsmith's *When Lovely Woman,* in order to contrast the cynicism of the modern girl with the 18th century sentimental ideal. So also is used Wagner's *Rheingold* melodies, and a picture of Queen Elizabeth flirting with Leicester in her barge, to emphasise the permanence of human sensuality and the degradation to which it has now fallen. With agony of soul the allusions are made to the repentance of St. Augustine and to the teachings of the Buddha :-

O Lord Thou pluckest me out
O Lord Thou pluckest

burning.

In the short fourth Section, called *Death by Water,* the picture of Phlebas the Phoenician is painted. This section is translated from one of Eliot's earlier experiments in French. It emphasises 'the brevity of sensual life' (Bullough). It suggests that man should give up 'the traffic in worldly things and the lusts of the flesh,' which separate him from love of God and humanity at large.

In Section V, called *What The Thunder Said*, several themes are recapitulated to assert the sterility of our life. The picture of a dreary desert is first painted. In this desert we suffer illusions; where two walk, there goes a shadowy third. There are murmurs and lamentations. When the seer reaches the a Chapel Perilous it seems empty; but as the doubting begins (betraying Christ), the cock crows twice. Thus God gives a sign, by thunder bringing rain. And the message of the thunder is delivered: *Datta*, *Dayadhvan*, *Damyata* (*i.e.*, self-surrender, sympathy, self-control). These three ideals are the way to Salvation.

The poet then speaks of setting his own house in order, though the London Bridge is falling down. He must pass through the fire of purification, as Dante has shown us. He is obsessed by images of desolation, and a shower of literary allusions shows him slipping into frenzy. But like the charm of healing rain he repeats the message of the thunder and ends with the Sanskrit blessing : Shantih shantih shantih ("The peace which passeth understanding").

We have so far given an interpretation of *The Waste Land*. Now we shall consider its theme. The subject is really simple and religious one – The growth and loss of religious feeling in man. The theme is set within the structure of primitive ritualistic sex. Pinto has observed about its theme and conception in the following manner : "All Eliot's poetry converges on *The Waste Land* (1922)… *The Waste Land* is an essay in creating a poem on a grand scale out of vision of a devitalized world that has denied or ignored the spiritual life. He had already treated this theme on a small scale in *Gerontion*…The central conception of *The Waste Land* is sexual impotence used as a symbol for the spiritual malady of the modern world".[9]

The themes of this symphonic poem are a series of scenes rather like film-shots fading and dissolving into each other, seen from the view-point of an impersonal observer, the protagonist of the poem, who is identified with the impotent Fisher King and also with Tiresias, the blind prophet of Greek legend. Two main motives in the poem are: Memory and Desire. One should rightly favour the judgement of Thwaite: "*The Waste Land* is thus not a mere reflection of hopelessness but a panoramic view of spiritual exhaustion, comparable in desolation to the 'terrible' sonnets of Hopkins. The soul is scoured, and waits in emptiness for its revival".[10]

Almost all critics have given their unfeigned admiration to this epoch-making poem. To examine a few of them and heir utterances on *The Waste Land*, Miss M.C. Bradbrook emphasises the note of modernity in it which has been responsible to draw the younger generations to it. She says, "If it is not his greatest poem, *The Waste Land* is certainly Eliot's most influential poem. The generations which grew up in the later nineteen-twenties took it to themselves, absorbed it so that it became part of their habit of mind."[11] Leavis takes it as a representative poem of the age it was written in, and praises it for its "psycho-analysis".[12] He does not subscribe to the view that "the poem lacks organization and unity."[13] Matthiessen commends its dramatic intensity "in the externallized structure of parallel myths".[14] This was achieved through the use of 'objective correlative'. R.A. Scott-James thinks that in *The Waste Land* Eliot's "imagination takes a higher flight".[15] I.A.Richards takes it as 'a music of ideas'. D.E.S. Maxwell first notes its derivative nature and then praises its valuable execution: "The initlal impulse comes from Baudelaire; its application is Eliot's alone".[16] Grover Smith sees in it "the possible release" from "the quandary of intractable flesh containing with reluctant spirit".[17]

The style of *The Waste Land* is a typical compression of clearly visualized, often metaphysical, imagery, a vocabulary essentially modern, and a subtly suggestive use of the rhythms of ordinary speech. It is highly allusive and over-burdened with literary and mythical references. As a modern poet, Eliot does not pay due regard to syntax and punctuation. Yet his skill in conveying a metrical sense is unquestionable, as has been noted by Miss Helen Gardner: "*The Waste Land* (1922) represents the culmination of this period of metrical virtuosity. Its basic measure is the heroic lines, which it handles in almost every possibleway."[18] We can definitely say that *The Waste Land* is Eliot's *magnum opus.*

References

1. A.G. George, *T.S. Eliot: His Mind And Art*, p. 118.
2. *American Renaissance* (N.Y., O.U.P., 1939), p. 356.

3. Grierson & Smith, *A Critical History Of English Poetry* p. 511.
4. Leavis, *New Bearings in English Poetry,* p. 90.
5. M.C. Bradbrook *The British Council Pamphlet*, p. 12.
6. *A History of English Literature*, p. 532.
7. *The Achievement of T.S. Eliot*, p. 136.
8. See "Marie, Marie, Hold on Tight", *T.S. Eliot*, ed. H. Kenner, p. 86.
9. See his *Crisis in English Poetry* (1880-1940), p. 170.
10. See his *Contemporary English Poetry*, p. 60.
11. The *British Council Pamphlet*, p. 19.
12. *New Bearings in English Poetry*, p. 95.
13. *Ibid*, p. 103.
14. *The Achievement of T.S. Eliot.* P. 59.
15. *Fifty Years of English Literature,* p. 156.
16. *The Poetry of T.S. Eliot,* p. 60.
17. *T.S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays,* p.99.
18. H. Gardner, *The Art of T. S. Eliot,* p.19.

10. Indian Thought in "The Waste Land"

T.S. Eliot was a profound scholar of Sanskrit. He was well read in Indian philosophy and scriptures. Though he borrowed and derived his material from the Pagan and Christian sources, the influence of the *Rig Veda*, the *Upanishads* and Buddhismis quite explicit in *The Waste Land*. He was so lured by Buddhism that of the time of writing this poem, he seriously considered becoming a Buddhist, and he entitled the third Section of the poem as *The Fire Sermon* after *The Fire Sermon* of Lord Buddha.

Going through Eliot's poetry, one may mark his irresistible attraction for the wisdom of ancient India, It is said of him that 'but for Indian thought and sensibility he would have written altogether different kind of poetry'. In his poetry references exists to show that he had acquired knowledge of the *Vedas*, the *Upanishaeds,* the *Bhagavad-Gita*, Patanjali's *Yoga-Sutras,* and Buddhistic lore and literature. For one thing, what is Upanishadic may also be Vedic for the simple reason that the *Upanishads* form the closing part of the Veda: for instance, the use of 'Shantih Shantih Shantih'. *The Waste Land* is both Vedic in origin and Upanishadic in content. In the same poem, Eliot has drawn upon the *Brihadaranyake Upanishad* (5.1) in the threefold message of the Thunder – "Da Da Da". These three words stand for *Datta, Dayadhvam, Damyata,* meaning 'Given, sympathise, Control' respectively. The message is symbolic in the context. It sums up the cryptic mode of Prajapati's teaching to the three kinds of his disciples: gods, men and demons. When these disciples approach the father-preceptor, after the completion of their formal education, to ask him what virtues they should cultivate to lead a meaningful life, he utters the same word *Da* for three times, with a different meaning each time. For the gods, it means *Damyata* (Control yourself); for the men, it connotes *Datta* (Give in); and for the demons, it signifies *Dayadhyam* (Be compassionate). The clear-out-hint of Eliot in using this highly symbolical event from the *Upanishad* is at the prevailing sterility in the Waste Land, which can hardly be turned into an oasis unless the virtues exhorted by Prajapati are earnestly practised by mankind. The use of the *Upanishad* at a proper moment confirms Eliot's digestion of the Hindu Scriptures. It shows that Eliot wanted the poetic fragments of the Hindu Scriptures incorporated in *The Waste Land* to be read and understood in a way alien to Western habit of thought. Hence the repetition of the actual Upanishadic words at the end of the poem. Conrad Aiken has brilliantly put it: 'Why, again, 'Datta,' 'Dayadhvam', 'Damyata' or 'Shantih'? Do they not say a good deal

less for us than 'Give: sympathise: control' or 'Peace'? Of course; but Eliot replies that he wants them not merely to mean those particular things, but also to mean them in a particular way that is, to be remembered in connection with a Upanishad.'

Buddhism

> *What we are today comes from our thoughts of yesterday, and our present thoughts build our life of tomorrow: our life is the creation of our mind.*
> *If a man speaks or acts with an impure mind, suffering follows him as the wheel of the cart follows the beast that draws the cart.*
>
> ***– Dhammpada (trans. Juan Mascaro)***

Eliot took the title of one of the Buddha's sermons for the title of the third Section of *The Waste Land.* At the close of this he fuses its subject-matter with reminiscences of St. Augustine's *Confessions*, and comments: 'The collection of these two representatives of eastern and western asceticism, as the culmination of this part of the poem, is not an accident.' We should therefore try to trace the importance of *The Fire Sermon* in the Buddhist teaching.

At the heart of Buddhism lies enlightenment of the Buddha himself. Born a prince and sheltered from knowledge of the world's ills, the inevitable contact with age, illness and death roused in him an irresistible desire to find the causes of the suffering and their solution. To this end, he gave up the life of his palace and for six years meditated on the problem of pain, imposing on himself the greatest physical austerity. Despite such discipline he found no answer. Eventually, at the age of thirty-five, he seated himself under a tree in the lotus position of meditation and vowed not to rise until he had achieved enlightenment. After a night of profound spiritual experience, he rose the next day as the all-Enlightened One.

Suffering and freedom from suffering lie at the heart of the Buddhist vision, and the cause of suffering is selfish desire. Each person sees himself as separate, unique, individual, and this self is the centre of his interest. How he wishes to exploit it may vary. A man may long to do good works or he may be consumed with lust. Either path is his 'Karma', the destiny that he has created for himself by the things he has yearned to do: 'What we are today comes from our thoughts of yesterday.' Desiring to act on the world weaves man into a net of cause and effect, and this binds him tight.

Man is caught on the wheel, the endless revolution of cause and effect, because he believes in the power of his separate, illusory self which wants now this, now that, now another thing. But this lower self is an illusion precisely because it is changed by its various wants. It is never the same but is in a constant state of flux. Such flux is suffering:

Birth is suffering, decay is suffering, disease is suffering, death is suffering, association with the unpleasing is suffering, separation from the pleasing is suffering, not to get what one wants is suffering.

The way beyond suffering is to realize that the self to which we are so attached has no fixed reality. Man must get beyond the circumstances that cause desire: 'Our mind should stand aloof from circumstances, and on no account should we allow them to influence the function of our minds'. We must go beyond *Karma* and free ourselves from the Wheel of Life by right action and thought – what is known in Buddhism ass the Nobles Eightfold Path and so enter *nirvana,* that state described as coming to pass when, after 'the destruction of all that is individual in us, we enter into communion with the whole universe and become an integral part of the great purpose.'

Such freedom from desire – particularly sterile sexual desire – is one clear way out of *The Waste Land.* However, just as in his use of Dante Eliot could refer only to the world of the *Inferno* and *Purgatorio*, so with Buddhism it is not the final beatific end that is glimpsed in *The Waste Land*; rather, it is the analysis o f worldly

suffering provided by religious experience. This is particularly clear in Eliot's citing of *The Fire Sermon.* This was actually preached to a group of Indian fire-worshippers whose beliefs formed its imagery. In the Sermon, Buddha describes how burning desire binds men to the world and to illusion and suffering Freedom from these is the goal of the wise man:

> All things are on fire: the eye is on fire, forms are on fire, eye-consciousness is on fire: the impressions received by the eye are on fire, and whatever sensation originates in the impressions received by the eye is likewise on fire. And with what are these things on fire? With the fires of lust, anger and illusion, with these they are on fire, and so were the other senses, and so was the mind. Wherefore the wise man conceives disgust for the things for the senses he removes from his heart the cause of suffering

In *The Waste Land*, the Narrator still feels consumed with desire, and in this he is at one with St. Augustine wrecked by the lust of Carthage. The two – Lord Buddha and St. Augustine – make a 'collocation' here because their experience of lust and desire is similar. So, too, was their belief that the solution to the problem was ascetic and spiritual.

The Rig Veda

The Waste Land opens with a description of Nature in April. The word 'nature' takes a different meaning if we relate to the primitive Aryan cult of nature, and the seasons have a different meaning if we try to imagine what they meant for the singers of the *Rig Veda*. More than a disguise of Eliot's convictions as a Christian, the allusions to Indian rituals are the whole foundation of the poem.' These rituals have never been completely lost: they still exist in various isolated manifestations of folk-lore, they have been observed, and transmitted by the Templars and the Knight of the Grail; they were preserved by the early Grail legends, then they were forbidden by the Church, and they make a last literary appearance with Tennyson, Wagner, E.A. Robinson and Matthew Arnold. The disappearance of these rituals in Western Europe coincides with a weakening of religious belief and with the corresponding meaninglessness of our life. *The Waste Land* of our epoch is a dry land, that is a land deprived of its connections with the help from supernatural forces and fertilizing deities.

In order to understand why water occupies such an important place in *The Waste Land*, it is necessary to remember *the meaning of water* for the Indian populations where the 'nature cult' and 'vegetation ceremonies' took place: 'We must first note that a very considerable number of the Rig-Veda hymns depend for their initial inspiration on the actual bodily need and requirements of a mainly agricultural population, i.e. of a people that depend upon the fruits of the earth for their subsistence, and to whom the regular and ordered sequence of the processes of Nature was a vital necessity.' (*From Ritual to Romance*) This passage throws an intense light on the opening lines of *The Waste Land.*

In the third Section of the poem, Eliot wants to show that passion and lust are inherent elements in human nature and they are the sources of suffering. Eliot finds the 'objective correlative' for this theme in the *Fire Sermon* preached by Lord Buddha to the assembled priests. The Section closes with the words of the Buddha and St. Augustine about the 'burning' of the human world in 'the fire of lust'.

In the fourth Section, "Death by Water", Eliot derives much from the Indian philosophy. When he writes:

> *A current under sea*
> *Picked his bones in whispers. As he rose and fell*
> *He passed the stages of his age and youth*
> *Entering the whirlpool.*

It seems that Eliot was acquainted with a basic conception in Indian Philosophy – that the sense-ridden soul is tied to the cycle of birth and re-birth through endless ages till it is disciplined and enlightened by subduing the strong pull of the senses which pave the way for its final release.

The allusion to water in "Death by Water" takes us to the hymns of the *Rig Veda*. What 'death by water' meant for the early Indian is well-explained by Miss Weston. 'Tradition relates that the seven great rivers of India had been imprisoned by the evil giant, Vitra, or Ahi, who Indra slew, thereby releasing the streams from their captivity.' The *Rig Veda* hymns abound in references to this feat…

'Indra has filled the rivers, he has inundated the dry land.'

'Indra has released the imprisoned waters to flow upon the earth.'

The Upanishads

In the whole of the world there is no study so beneficial and so elevating as that of the *Upanishads*. It has been the solace of my life – it will be the solace of my death.

- *Schopenhauer*

Near the end of *The Waste Land*, after the disappointment of the empty Grail chapel, the Narrator sees a flash of lightning and feels the promise of rain. We return to the vegetation cults, the rites that secured the fertility of the land, but we also move forward to the Hindu teachings of the *Upanishads*.

At the core of these Sanskrit gospels (which date from about 600 B.C.) is the idea that the goal of man's religious quest lies in identifying his self, or *atman*, with *Brahman*, the supreme source of all things. It is a mystical union in which the ego frees itself and the soul is at one with the great cosmic force who fashioned the world out of his self-delighting creativity. The core of the individual is now joined to the essence of the universe. It is a state of heightened sense of being, consciousness and delight.

In *The Waste Land* Eliot draws upon the *Brihdaranyaka Upanishad*. It has a parable that tells how when the gods, men and the devils had finished their student days with Prajapati, the Lord of Creation, they asked him for some final words of wisdom. To each he uttered the syllable 'Da'. The gods understood this to have been 'Damayata'. Meaning 'to be subdued' or 'self-controlled.' Men thought, he said '*Datta'* which is the Sanskrit for 'give'; while the evil spirits thought they heard him say 'Dayadhvam' or 'be merciful.'

The presentation here of the Lord of Creation as a god calls for some explanation. After all, the passages from the *Upanishads* make it clear that he is a force rather than an incarnate deity. In fact, Hinduism recognizes the supreme difficulty of visualizing a purely spiritual godhead and so allows incarnation in many forms as an aid to worship. In this particular case, the incarnation of the source of life as Indra, a deity who could take on an endless variety of forms at will, is important since he is the god who, with his thunderbolt in his right hand, is the dispenser of thunder and lightening. Indra is the god of rain and fertility who is constantly at war with drought.

It is this figure who thus brings to a head the vegetation gods who have their roles in the earlier sections of the poem. Indra, the God of Thunder, suggests the promise of a Waste Land redeemed through rain. But he is more than this. He comes in the lightning, and lightning is an Indian symbol of enlightenment. The enlightenment that he brings is the moral teaching of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*:

The divine voice of thunder repeats the same Da Da Da, that is, be subdued, Give, Be merciful. Therefore let that triad be taught: Subduing, Giving, Mercy.

Here are the Hindu principles of 'right action', whose practice has little to do with the intellect and nothing to do with selfish desire. They are a form of moral teaching that also happen to be associated with fertility. They do not in themselves bring rain, but in Eliot's interpretation. They are close to some of the Narrator's most spiritual experiences (11.395-422), which are in turn connected with the possibility of a Waste Land redeemed. It is partly for this reason that Eliot can end his poem with the three repeated Sanskrit words that close an *Upanishad* and mean in a western, Christianized translation: 'The Peace which passeth all understanding'.

11. Annotations of the Poem

The Epigraph

In Greek mythology Sibyls were women possessing great prophetic powers. The Sibyl at Cumae was the most famous of them. The Sibyl Cumae was the most famous of them. At her request Apollo granted her immortality, but in her excitement she forgot to ask for perpetual youth. Consequently she became aged and infirm, and though she held grains in her hand as a count of her years her powers of prophecy declined.

For once I saw with my own eyes the Sibyl at Cumae near Naples hanging in a cage, and when the children said to her, 'Sibyl, what do you wish?' she answered, 'I wish to die'.

These words are uttered by the drunken Trimalchio in the *Satyricon*, a satire composed by the Roman satirist Petronius Arbiter in the first century $_{AD.}$

The Sibyl at Cumae is said to have guided Aeneas through Hades and this journey is described by Virgil in his Aeneid. However, the Satyrican or Virgilian prophetic woman seems to 'have degenerated into Madame Sosostris' in *The Waste Land.*

Ezra Pound (1885-1972): Well-known American poet and critic whose Cantos earned him an important place in the modernist movement in American and European poetry. Eliot dedicated *The Waste Land* to pound as a token of his gratitude

il miglior fabbro: Meaning 'the better craftsman'. These words, in Italian, are used by Dante (Purgatorio $_{XXVI}$, 117) as a tribute by Guinicelli to Arnaut Daniel, the twelfth-century Provencal poet and artist.

1. The Burial of the Dead

The burial of the dead: 'The Order for the Burial of the Dead' is the complete title of the burial service in the Church of England, as derived from *The Book of Common Prayer.* In a related context the burial of the dead is also intended to convey the burial of the fertility gods as explained by Jessie Weston and James Frazer. These myths are related to vegetation cults and harvest festivals, and the cycle of fertility and decay, spring and winter, in nature. In Egypt the cycles of fertility and decay were personified as gods, such as Osiris, who were buried or drowned in the sea and reclaimed in the spring.

Line 1, April…month: April, the harbinger of Spring, is also connected with the great event of Christ's resurrection, Easter. In the fertility rituals also, April is connected with the new harvest, and the strength and potency of the Fisher King, which give fertility to his lands. However, Eliot calls it 'cruellest' because resurrection and new harvests are looked upon with fear in the valueless waste land. The idea has already occurred to him in 'Gerontion' ('depraved May', line 21).

Line 2, Lilacs out of the dead land: Lilac flowers are symbols of spring, renewal in nature, and fertility Eliot reverses the implication of this allusion.

Lines 6-7, feeding/A little life with dried tubers: Eliot alludes to James Thomson (1832-82), 'To Our Ladies of Death': cf. 'Our Mother feedeth thus our little life,/ That we in turn may feed her with our death'.

Line 8, Starnbergersee: The name of a lake resort near Munich in West Germany. It is also known for King Ludwig's Castle, Schloss Berg. It was in this lake that Ludwig tried in vain to escape and was drowned, Eliot visited the place in 1911.

Line 10, Hofgarten: A public park in Munich: 'Royal Garden'.

Line 12, Bingar… echt deutch: 'I am not Russian at all. I come from Lithuania; I am pure, real German'.

Lines 15-16, Marie, Marie, hold on tight: An incident derived from *My Past* (1913), the autobiography of Marie Larisch, a countess and relation of King Ludwig. Eliot had met her and talked about the sledding which is referred to in the poem. Marie was interested in fortune-telling through cards and was assassinated on the banks of Lake Leman.

Line 20, Son of Man: cf. Ezekiel 2:1. 'And he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will, speak unto thee'. Eliot himself refers to 'The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel' (Old Testament) in his notes.

Lines 22, A heap of broken images: cf. Ezekiel 6:6: 'And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, "In all your dwelling places the cities shall be laid waste, and the high places shall be laid waste, and the high places shall be desolate; that your altars may be laid waste and made desolate, and your idols may be broken and cease, and your images may be cut down, and your works may be abolished" (Old Testament).

Line 23, the cricket no relief: cf. Ecclesiastes 12:5. Eliot refers to this passage: 'Also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets'.

Line 26, (Come in under the Shadow of this red rock): These lines seem very similar to the opening of one of Eliot's early poems, 'The Death of Saint Narcissus' (written about 1912):

Line 30, I will…handful of dust: This significant phrase is found in John Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occassions* (1624), in Meditation $_{IV:}$ 'What's become of man's great extent and proportion, when himself shrinks himself, and consumes himself to a handful of dust.… The allusion is also Biblical: cf. Ecclesiastes 12:7: 'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was'.

Lines 31-4, *Frisch…weilest du?:* Eliot himself has referred to *Tristan and Isolde,* $_{I}$, verses 5-8. The reference is to Richard Wagner's opera *Tristan and Isolde* in which a young man sings of his absent sweet-heart: 'The wind blows fresh to the homeland. My Irish girl, where are you lingering?'

Line 35, hyacinths: A flower presented as a symbol of resurrection. Hyacinthus was the name of a pre-Hellenic god. He was killed in an accident, and, in Greek myth, a flower grew out of his blood.

Lines 37-41, Yet when… silence: An experience of love which is partly mystical. The tragic passion of Tristan and Isolde, and the potion they drink, binds them together eternally. 'Silence in the heart of light' is an image derived from Dante's *Paradiso.*

Line 42, *Oed'… Meer:* Another reference to the Wagnerian opera, *Tristan and Isolde*, $_{III,}$ 24. Tristan is about to die and is waiting for his beloved, Isolde, but a shepherd, appointed to watch for her sail, can only report that there is no. sign of her ship: 'Desolate and empty is the sea'.

Line 43, Madame Sosotris, famous clairvoyante: There appears a fake fortune-teller in Aldous Huxley's novel *Chrome Yellow* (1921) in chapter $_{XXVII}$, whose name is Madame Sosostris. Eliot had read this novel before writing *The Waste Land* (1922), but the borrowing is quite unconscious. Originally, it was an Egyptian name: Sesotris, the sorceress of Echatana.

Line 44, Had a bad cold: Eliot's mode of creating bathos and an unexpected ironic touch.

Lines 46-56, With a wicked pack of cards: Eliot said he was 'not familiar with the exact constitution of the Tarot pack of cards' and that he made use of it to 'suit my own convenience'. The four suits of the Tarot pack(described by Jessie Weston) are the cup, lance, sword and dish – the life symbols found in the Grail legends. Originally the Tarot pack of 78 cards was used by Egyptian priests to read the future or to foretell the rise and fall of the Nile waters. This ancient art has here been vulgarized by fortunetellers such as Madame Sosostris.

Line 47, Phoenician Sailor: He is kind of fertility god whose image was commited to the sea and later reclaimed. He is also shown as Phlebas in section $_{IV}$ of *The Waste Land.*

Line 48 (Those are pearls that were his eyes Look!): This is a quotation from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610), part of Ariel's song in which he tells Prince Ferdinand about the supposed drowning of his father Alonso, the king of Naples:

Full fathom five thy father lies;
Of his bones are coral made;
Those are pearls that were his eyes:
Nothing of him that doth fade
But doth suffer a sea –change
Into something rich and strange.

(I.ii. 396-401)

Line 49, Belladonna: In Italian this means 'beautiful lady', is also the name of one of the three 'Fates' in classical mythology.

Line 49, Lady of the Rocks: Eliot had in mind a passage from Walter Pater's *The Renaissance* (1873) where Pater (1839-94) discusses Mona Lisa, La Gioconda, a picture painted by Leonardo da Vinci. The picture shows a woman with a haunting smile.

Line 51, man with three staves: He is identified with the mythical Fisher King. Here he is only a figure on the Tarot pack of cards.

Line 51, Wheel: The wheel of Fortune which rotates and shows the ups and downs of life.

Line 52, one-eyed merchant: He is described as 'one-eyed' (Jack) because only one eye is visible on the Tarot card picture. He is linked with the Smyrna merchant, Mr Eugenides. It is believed that these merchants carried on foreign trade and also communicated the mysteries to fertility cults of their fellow men in Syria and other places in the Middle East.

Line 55, The Hanged Man: Figure with a T-shaped Cross on the Tarot pack, a man hanging. Eliot obviously associates him with James Frazer's Hanged God, the divine idol sacrificed for restoring fertility to the land.

Line 55, Fear death by water: A timely warning which reverberates in many places, particularly in section IV.

Line 60, Unreal city: In this allusion Eliot refers to the poem by Charles Baudelaire (1821-67) entitled 'Les Septs Vieillards' (The Seven Old Men). The 'unreal city' of Baudelaire (Paris) seems to merge with the other 'unreal' cities, such as Eliot's London or Dante's city in the Inferno.

Lines 62-3, so many,… so many: cf. Dante, *Inferno*, $_{III}$, 55-7:

It never would have entered in my head
There were so many men whom death had slain.

(trans. Dorothy sayers)

Dante spoke these words to Virgil as he observed the 'damned' in hell perpetually moving towards a constantly shifting ideal.

Line 64, Sighs… exhaled: cf. Dante, *Inferno,* $_{IV}$, 25-7:

We heard no loud complaint, no crying there,
No sound of grief except the sound of sighing
Quivering for ever through the eternal air.

(trans. Dorothy Sayers)

Dante describes the state of the virtuous pagans in Limbo, excluded from the bliss of God's presence.

Line 66, King William Street: A street in London where Eliot walked daily to reach his office.

Line 67, Saint Mary Woolnoth: A famous Anglican Church with beautiful interior decorations designed by Sir Christopher Wren. It was proposed to be demolished, but a report recommended its preservation.

Line 69, Stetson: A reference to Ezra Pound who was nicknamed 'Buffalo Bill'. Pound was known for his very impressive stetson hat.

Line 70, Mylae: The Battle of Mylae (260_{BC}) was part of the Punic wars fought between the Romans and the Carthaginians.

Line 71, 'That…garden: This refers to ancient fertility rites in which the images of gods were buried in the fields or thrown into the sea.

Line 74: Eliot refers to the dirge in John Webster's play, *The White Devil.* This is sung by Cornelia as a lament for her son, Marcello (Act V, Sc. iv).

Line 76, 'You… frere!': Eliot alludes to Charles Baudelaire's book of poems *Fleus du Mal* (Flowers of Evil). The last line in the poem 'Au Lecteur' (To the Reader) is translated thus: 'O Hypocrite reader, my fellow-man, my brother!' This is the prefatory poem in Baudelaire's volume.

II. A Game of Chess

A Game of Chess: The title is taken from the play *A Game Of Chess* (1624) by Thomas Middleton (1570-1627), a satire on an uneasy marriage forced by political necessity. In another play of Middleton, *Women Beware Women* (1621), is shown an actual game of chess played by Livia. She is the Duke's accomplice and plays with the mother. Meanwhile the Duke is seducing Bianca, which is another kind of game. The woman at the dressing table is reminiscent of *Belinda in Pope's The Rape of the Lock* (1714).

Line 77, The Chair…throne: This is based on Enobarbus's description of Cleopatra in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. The queen is travelling in a decorated barge on the river Cydnus in Asia Minor.

Line 80, Cupidon: The golden image of Cupid, the god of love.

Line 82, candelabra: A large, branched candlestick.

Line 87, synthetic perfumes: Artificial perfumes made out of chemicals. This is in tune with the artificiality of the lady's way of life.

Line 88, unguent: Oily.

Line 92, laquearia: A panelled ceiling. Eliot refers to Virgil's description of the banquet given by Dido, Queen of Carthage, in honour of her lover, Aeneas, who finally deserted her.

Line 93, coffered: Adorned with sunken, low panels.

Line 98, sylvan scene: Eliot has referred to the description in Milton's *Paradise Lost* of Satan's response to his first sight of the Garden of Eden:

Line 99: Eliot has referred to Ovid's ($43_{BC\text{-}AD}$ 18) *Metamorphoses* (vi) and his version of the myth of Philomela. Philomela was raped by King Tereus of Thrace. She was the sister of Procne, wife of Tereus. The king cut out Philomela's tongue to prevent her from speaking about the outrage. Philomela depicted her misfortune on a piece of tapestry and sent it to her sister. In revenge the sister slaughtered Itys (the child of Tereus by Procne) and fed him to Tereus (the eating of human flesh becomes the symbol of Communion). The crisis grew to a pitch and the king then tried to kill both Procne and Philomela into a nightingale, Procne into a swallow and King Tereus into a hoopoe.

Line 103, Jug Jug: This was a conventional way of representing a bird song in Elizabethan poetry. Crudely, the term was also used as a suggestion for sexual intercourse, even as a joke. The tragic myth of Philomela is thus vulgarized.

Lines 111-23: This scene resembles the one described by D.H. Lawrence in 'The Fox' (published in *The Dial*, 1921).

Line 115, rat's alley: A meaningful image of spiritual darkness and modern man's sense of loss.

Line 118: The reference is to *The Devil's Law Case,* III.ii.162 by John Webster and to the surgeon's comments in it.

Line 125, 'Those…his eyes': Ariel's song in *The Tempest.*

Line 128, The 'Shakespeherian Rag': A very popular jazz song in the years of the Fist World War (1914-18). It was an American 'hit' of 1912. It was partly an adaptation of Kenneth Ball's song, 'O you Beautiful doll':

That Shakespeherian rag
Most intelligent, very elegant

The 'OOOO' and the extra syllable catch the syncopated rhythm of ragtime music.

Line 137: Eliot refers to the game of chess in Middleton's *Women Beware Women* II. ii. While Livia plays chess, Bianca is being seduced.

Line 139, demobbed: Discharged from the army; a slang expression, an abbreviation for 'demobilized'.

Line 114, HURRY...TIME: The call of the bartender notifying the customers of closing time in a pub. The bartender's call is perhaps an echo from Shakespeare's 'knock'.

Lines 142-70: This episode seems to have been based on a real experience as described to the Eliots by their house-maid, Ellen Kellond.

Line 166, gammon: Ham or bacon.

Line 171, Ta ta: (Slang) good-bye.

Line 172: These are the last words of the mad Ophelia as she leaves the royal room. She imagines she has been deserted by Hamlet and sings a song of St Valentine's Day (*Hamlet,* IV.v.72). More importantly, Ophelia meets her death by water.

III. The Fire Sermon

The Fire Sermon: The subtitle is based on Lord Buddha's great sermon to his disciples against the fires of anger, lust and malice, the temptations that consume men. It also evokes the sentiments of St. Augustine about unholy passions as well as the injunctions of St Paul against unholy alliances.

Line 173, The river's …broken: An image of the shelter provided by leafy branches of trees over-hanging the river.

Lines 175-9: Eliot cities the source in the refrain of the nuptial song in *Prothalamion* by Edmund Spenser (1552-99). Elizabeth and Katherine Somerset, daughters of the Earl of Worcester, were being married (1596) and the nuptial song was composed for that event. The Elizabethan nymphs of pastoral grandeur are gone; so are the modern nymphs – the call girls of London.

Line 182: The lamentation and sorrow of the Israelites recalling their exile in Babylon, when they remembered Zion. The local Swiss name for Lake Geneva in Switzerland is Lake Leman. By a curious coincidence, parts of *The Waste Land* were composed near Lake Leman in Lausanne. The common noun 'leman' is also associated with a mistress, hence 'the waters of Leman' are linked with the fires of lust.

Line 185, But at my…I hear: cf. An ironic contrast to the lines of Andrew Marvell in his poem, 'To His Coy Mistress':

But at my back I alweis hear
Time's winged chariot hurrying near

The lover urges his beloved to forsake coyness since time is fleeing. The reference to Marvell occurs again.

Line 189: cf. The Fisher King of mythology. To fish is to seek eternity and salvation.

Lines 191-2: Eliot refers to *The Tempest* I.ii and to the passage where Ferdinand is made to think of his father:

Line 196: Another ironic reference to Marvell's To His Coy Mistress'.

Lines 197-8: Eliot cites John Day (1574-1640), *The Parliament of Bees*, quoting:

When of the sudden, listening, you shall hear,
A noise of horns and hunting, which shall bring
Actaeon to Diana in the spring,
When all shall see her naked skin…

According to Greek legends the huntsman Actaeon shocked Diana (godness of chastity) who was bathing with her nymphs. As a punishment she turned him into a stag and he was hunted to death.

Line 198, Sweeney: In Eliot's poetry he is the sensual sex-hungry man who occurs in three poems: 'Sweeney Erect', 'Sweeney Among the Nightingales' and 'Sweeney Agonistes'.

Lines 199-201: Eliot writes that these lines are derived from a ballad which was popular among troops in the First World War. The soldiers sang it as they invaded Gallipoli in 1915, and a reporter from Sydney, Australia, described that scene.

Line 202: 'And O those children's voices singing in the dome': In these words (translated) Verlaine is alluding to Wagner's *Parsifal*. Eliot says the source, the final line to the sonnet 'Parsifal' composed by Paul Verlaine (1844-96), describes how the questing knight – Parsifal – resists the seductive charms of Kundry. His feet are washed to the accompaniment of children's choir music. In the Grail Legend the food washing precedes the restoration of the wounded Antortas (the Fisher King) by Parzival, and then the curse on the waste land is lifted.

Line 205, So rudely forc'd: A phrase derived from 'A Game of Chess'.

Line 206, Tereu: Tereu is the Latin vocative form of Tereus, the king, who raped Philomela.

Line 209, Smyrna: Modern Izmir in the western part of Turkey, a great centre of trade.

Lines 209-14: The events described in these lines actually happened. A man from Smyrna invited Eliot, and he had currants in his pocket. The implication of homosexuality, however, is imaginary.

Line 211, C.i.f.: 'Cost, insurance and freight'. Velerie Eliot has corrected Eliot's original note: see *The Waste Land Facsimile,* p. 147.

Line 211, documents at sight: The bill of lading was to be given to the buyer upon payment of 'draft at sight'.

Line 212, demotic: Vulgar, abominable.

Line 213, Cannon Street Hotel: A hotel close to Cannon Street station in London.

Line 214, Metropole: A fashionable luxury hotel in Brighton, a seaside resort on the south coast, sixty miles from London. The proposals made by Eugenides to the protagonist for a 'week-end at Brighton' has homosexual implications.

Lines 215-23: These lines recreate the evening scene at the opening to the *Purgatario*, viii.

Line 218, Tiresias: Eliot notes that Tiresias is 'the most important personage' in the poem and that 'the two sexes met in him'. He also quotes the relevant passage from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* which narrates the story of Tiresias's change of sex. Tiresias came across two snakes copulating in a forest. He hit then with his staff and, in consequence, was changed into a woman. Eight years later he repeated the blow in a similar situation and regained his masculinity. Later a dispute arose between Jove and Juno on the issue of whether in love the woman derives the greater pleasure than the man; Juno argued that the reverse was the truth. Tiresias sided with Jove and therefore Juno blinded him. To compensate for this Jove gave him the gift of prophecy and long life. Tiresias forgot to ask for the gift of youth.

Line 219, old man…breasts: A repetition of the phrases used by Ovid in *Metamorphoses.*

Line 221: Eliot mentions Fragment 149 written by the seventh-century Greek poetess Sappho, which is a prayer to the Evening Star. 'Evening Star, that brings back all that the sinking Dawn has sent far and wide, you

bring back the sheep, the goat, and the child back to the mother.' But the connection with 'Requiem' by Robert Louis Stevenson is more immediate:

Home is the sailor, home from sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Line 227, Camisole: Under-bodice.

Line 227, stays: Corests.

Line 231, the young man carbuncular: Pimpled. An echo, in Eliot's mind, of 'that old man eloquent' in Milton's sonnet 'To the Lady Margaret Lay'. Car buncles are associated with lechery.

Line 234, Bradford millionaire: Bradford is a great centre of wool manufacture in Youkshire and an abode of many millionaires in that trade. Rapid fortunes were made here during the First World War.

Lines 245-6 who…wall: This refers to Homer's account of Tiresias, who sat in the market place at Thebes and prophesied. Later he did the same in Hades where Ulysses consulted him.

Line 253: Eliot notes the source, Olivia's song in Oliver Goldsmith (1730-74), *The Vicar of Wakefield.* She returns to the scene of her seduction by Squire Thornhill.

Line 257: cf. *The Tempest,* I.ii.389, Ferdinand's words recalling the music and responding to Ariel's song. He expresses his grief over his father's supposed death.

Line 258, Strand: A famous street in London, leading eastward.

Line 258, Queen Victoria Street: A busy street close to the Thames.

Line 260, Lower Thames Street: Near the Thames at London Bridge. Eliot worked in this area in Lloyds Bank.

Line 263, fisherman: These are not fisherman, but workers at the nearby Billingsgate fish market.

Line 264, Magnus Martyr: The beautiful church designed by Sir Christopher Wren, build in Lower Thames Steet.

Line 265, Inexplicable…gold: Eliot says 'the interior of St Magnus Martyr is one of the finest among Wren's interiors'. In these lines Eliot suggests a world of true values which is now lost.

Line 266: The song of the three Thames daughters starts at this point. From line 292 to 306 they sing in turn. See *Gotterdammerung*, III.i. The Rhine daughters and their song are the theme of Richard Wagner's lengthy opera, *The Ring of the Nibelungs.* The Rhine daughters express their sorrow over the loss of the magic hoard of gold of the Nibelungs, which they had guarded. The loss of the gold is symbolic of the loss of the beauty and charm of the Rhine. Eliot has tried to pattern these lines on Wagner's rhymes.

Line 272, spar: Strout pole supporting the mast.

Line 275, Greenwich reach: The south bank of the rive Thames of Greenwich, downstream from the centre of the city.

Line 276, Isle of Dogs: The river bank opposite Greenwich.

Lines 277-8: The lament of the Rhine maidens over the loss of gold. The refrain is from Wagner's opera.

Line 279: Eliot refers to J.A. Froude's *History of England,* vii, 349, and quotes the letter of de Quadra to Philip of Spain.

The river cited is the Thames; Elizabeth entertained Leicester (Lord Robert Dudley) at Greenwich House near Greenwich reach.

Lines 280-5: These lines represents Enobarbus's description of Cleopatra (see note to line 77).

Line 281, stern: Hind part of the ship.

Line 293: Eliot in his Notes draws attention to Dante's *Purgatory*, v: 133; the sorrow of La Pia who was murdered by her husband. 'Remember me, who am La Pia; Siena made me, Maremma unmade me'.

Line 293, Highbury: A residential suburb in the northern part of London.

Line 293, Richmond and Kew: Two riverside districts on the Thames. Kew is well known for its botanical gardens.

Line 296, Margate: Part of the East End of London. Eliot used this underground station for this daily travel to Lloyds bank.

Line 300, Margate Sands: A seaside resort in Kent on the Thames Estuary. Eliot began composing *The Waste Land* here in 1921 while he was recovering from an illness.

Line 307: Eliot traces the source to *The Confessions* of St.Augustine. 'To Carthage then I came, where a cauldron of unholy loves sang all about mine ears'. St Augustine writes about the sensual temptations of his youth in Carthage.

Line 308: This is taken from the Buddha's 'Fire Sermon', where he says everything in the world is on fire:

Line 309: Eliot in his Notes refers to his source, the *Confessions* of St. Augustine: 'I entangle my steps with these outward beauties, but thou pluckest me out O lord, thou pluckest me out'.

IV. Death by Water

Death by Water: A reference to the practice at Alexandria (narrated by Jessie Weston) of throwing into the sea an effigy of a pagan fertility god such as Adonis as a symbol of the death of nature's power. The head was carried to Byblos. It was later retrieved and worshipped as a symbol of the resurrected god. The Christian sacrament of baptism could also be cited as another significant tradition in this context.

Line 312: 'Dans le Restaurant' in turn may have been suggested to Eliot by a passage in the *Life and Death of jason* (1867) by William Morris (1834-96). In Book $_{IV}$ the song of Orpheus to the Argonauts speaks of a Phoenician sailor as a victim of the sea. Eliot was familiar with this.

Lines 315-16: Image of 'sea-change' is derived from Ariel's song in *The Tempest.*

Line 319: This is an reference to all mankind. The Bible distinguishes between the faithful, the Jews, and those who reject God.

Line 320, wheel: The wheel of fortune as engraved on the Tarot pack of cards, which is turned by a figure holding a sword and a crown. Perhaps the mysterious nature of man's fate is suggested in this picture.

V. What the Thunder Said

Eliot says the source of this subtitle is the Indian legend of the Thunder derived from the sacred book, the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* V.i(see note to line 400).

Eliot also says that in the first part (lines 322-94) three themes are explored. First, the story told in the Bible (Luke xxiv: 13-31) of the two disciples walking on the road to Emmaus (a village near Jerusalem) on the day of Christ's resurrection. Eliot's second theme is the final stage of the Grail Quest and the journey to Chapel Perilous of the Knight. This theme is interwoven with the theme of the Emmaus journey. Eliot's third themes is modern – the decay of eastern Europe in the twentieth century.

Lines 322-8: These lines evoke the course of great events from the betrayal and arrest of Jesus Christ, the agony and prayer in the garden of Gethsemane to the moment of crucifixion. Also, they are indirectly evocative of the death of the Fisher King.

Line 323, silence in the gardens: Gethsemane, the scene of Christ's final moments beofre the arrest (see Matthew 26:36) and Golgotha, the hill of Christ's crucifixion.

Line 324, agony…places: cf. Matthew 21:38: Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death…'

Line 326: Christ was taken to the palace of the High Priest where he was publicly interrogated before being taken to Pilate, the Roman governor, in the Hall of Judgement. See Mark 15:13-14: 'And they cried out again, crucify him…And they cried out the more exceedingly, crucify him!'

Lines 326-8, reverberation…dead: At the death of Christ the whole earth shook. See Matthew 27:51: 'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent…'

Lines 331-59: Eliot thought very highly of these twenty-nine lines and wrote about them to Ford Madox Ford in a letter (*See The Waste Land Facsimile,*p.129).

Line 339, carious: Decayed.

Line 346, If…rock: This is shown as two lines, but the line numbering in the text shows it as one line.

Line 353,cicada: An insect with a shrill sound.

Line 356: Eliot notes that the water-dripping song of the hermit-thrush is quite well known.

Lines 360-6: The vision of the risen Christ is revealed to his disciples on the road to Emmaus:

Eliot has also cited the event of the Antarctic expedition. He was moved by this account (in *South*, 1919) by Sir Ernest Shackleton. The tired Antarctic explorers were haunted by the delusion that there was one more persons with them who could not be counted, and this makes the Biblical parallel very interesting.

Lines 366-76: This is a nightmarish picture of the decay of eastern Europe brought home to Eliot by a reading of *Blick ins Chaos* (1920), written by Hermann Hesse (1872-1962). Eliot quotes a passage which refers to the Russian Revolution and other upheavals in Europe:

There is a close connection between this decay of eastern Europe and the destruction of the Roman empire by barbarian hordes (see St. Augustine in *City of God*).

Line 377: The hair is a symbol of fertility as well as an object of sacrifice to the fertility gods.

Lines 379-84: This nightmarish portrayal of macabre images is perhaps influenced by the paintings of the Dutch artist Hieronymus Bosch (1450-1516) Medieval versions of the Grail Legend portray the horrors of the entry into Chapel Perilous which were intended to test the Knight's nerves, and these nightmarish visions, including bats with baby faces, were encountered by him. Bosch's paintings of Hell also influenced Eliot in portraying this scene.

Line 391-2: An echo, perhaps, of Peter denying the Lord three times and then the cock crowing, as Christ had anticipated. There are two traditions of the crowing cock. The first tradition shows Peter denying acquaintance with Christ and then breaking down in tears at his own cowardice. Here it is seen as part of a ritual preceding the death of Christ and mankind's salvation. The second tradition shows the cock as the trumpet of the morn and is associated with ghosts (*Hamlet*, I.i.).

Line 395, Ganga: The original sacred Sanskrit word for the Ganges.

Lines 396-420: These important lines project the message of the Thunder.

Line 397, Himavant: The original Sanskrit name for high mountains in the Himalayan ranges.

Line 400, $_{DA}$: This is the voice of the Thunder. The parable embodying the divine message of thunder is found in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad,* V.i.

Eliot alludes to a very significant episode in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* which describes how gods, men and demons approached Prajapati, their father-preceptor, for instruction and message after completing their formal education.

Line 401, Datta: Give.

Lines 403-4: In *The Waste Land* the act of giving has been generated into immoral acts such as sexual surrender.

Line 407: cf. *The White* Devil, V.vi, by Webster. Eliot refers to Flamineo's speech warning against the frailty and inconstancy of women:

> *they'll re-marry*
> *Ere the worm pierce your winding –sheet, ere the*
> *Spider*
> *Make a thin curtain for your epitaphs.*

Line 411, *Dayadhvam*: Sympathize.

Line 411, I have …key: Eliot cites Dante, *Inferno*, xxxiii: 46, quoting the words of Ugolino della Gheradesca, the thirteenth-century Italian nobleman as he recalls his imprisonment in a tower. He, his two sons, and two grandsons were starved to death in that tower.

Line 416, broken Coriolanus: The hero of Shakespeare's play, Coriolanus. He was broken because pride and selfishness brought about his death. He scorned the hostile Roman mob, but was broken by his own pride.

Line 418 Damyata: Control.

Lines 418-22: The young Eliot was a keen yachtsman.

Lines 423-4: cf. *From Ritual to Romance*. Eliot cites the story of the Fisher King described by Jessie Weston.

Line 425: Prophet Isaiah's words to King Hezekiah, a sick person whose Kingdom was ruined by the Assyrian conquest.

Line 426, London…down: This is the refrain in a well-known English nursery rhyme.

Line 427: Eliot cites the source as Dante, *Purgatorio,* xxvi: 145-8.

Line 428: This is a quotation from an anonymous Latin poem, *Pervigilium Veneris* (The Vigil of Venus). The poet's lament is that his song is unheard and he awaits the coming of spring to give it voice, like the swallow. Eliot, in his Notes, also cites the story of 'Philomela and Procne'.

Line 429: This line is quoted from a sonnet 'El Desdichado' (The Disinherited) by Gerard de Nerval (1808-55), a French poet. The poet calls himself a disinherited prince, stressing the lost tradition of troubadour poets. A Tarot card showing a tower strick by lightning symbolizes the lost tradition.

Line 430, These fragments…ruins: This is also a reference to the broken kingdom of the Fisher King.

Line 431: Eliot cites the source in *The Spanish Tragedy* by Thomas Kyd (1557-95). The play's alternative title is *Hieronymo is mad againe*. Hieronymo is driven mad due to the murder of his son. He is asked to write a court entertainment and replies, 'Why then Ile fit you!', ironically suggesting that he would give them (the murderers) their due. He arranges that his son's murderers themselves are killed in his play, which is composed of poetic fragments in several languages.

Line 433, Shantih: Eliot says the Sanskrit word signifies 'the peace which passeth understanding' and is a meaningful repetition of the well known formal ending of the great *Upanishads.*

SECTION IV: MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

1. Possible Short Answer Questions

(Answer to be in 200 words each)

1 Attempt a short note on the composition of "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock".

2. Throw light on the appropriateness of the title of this poem.

3. What are the sources of this poem?

4. Comment on the line 'Like a patient etherised upon a table' in the poem.

5 Critically examine the following lines:

In the room the women come and go
Talking of Michelangelo.

6. Critically analyse the following:

I have measured out my life…coffee spoons.

7. Explicate the following:

I should have been a pair of ragged claws
Scuttling across the floors of silent seas.

8. Explain the following lines:

I grow old…I grow old…
I shall wear the bottoms of my trousers rolled.

9. Point out the contributions of Ezra Pound to the shaping of *The Waste Land*
10. Is it correct to state that *The Waste Land* lacks a formal structure? Furnish details.
11. Do you consider the poem to be dramatic in quality? Give reasons in support of your answer.
12. Examine the mythical method used by Eliot in this poem.
13. How does Eliot treat of earthly love in this poem? Illustrate your answer.
14. What do you consider to be the main theme of the poem? Give details.
15. Do you agree with the view that *The Waste Land* ends on 'a note of chaos' as it began? Give a reasoned answer.
16. Consider *The Waste Land* as a religious poem.
17. What is the message of this poem?
18. Evaluate *The Waste Land* as a symbolist poem.
19. Comment on the following:

April is the cruellest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.

20. Critically analyse the following lines:

Unreal city,
Under the brown fog of a winter dawn,
A crowd flowed ever London Bridge, so many,
I had not thought death had undone so many.

21 Explicate the following:

The 'change of Philomel, by the barbarous King
So rudely forced; yet there the nightingale
Filled all the desert with inviolable voice
And still she cried, and still the world pursues.

22 Tell briefly, how does Tiresias represent 'the entire humanity'?

23 Explain the following:

When lovely woman stoops to folly and
Paces about her room again, alone,

She smoothes her hair with automatic hand,
And puts a record on the gramophone.

24. Comment on the following:

To Carthage then I came

Burning burning burning burning
O Lord Thou pluckest me out
O Lord Thou pluckest

Burning.

25. Explicate the following:

Ganga was sunken, and the limp leaves
Waited for rain, while the black clouds
Gathered far distant, over Himavant.

26. Attempt a brief note on the source of "The Fire Sermon".
27. Which is the source of "What the Thunder Said"? Does Eliot fellow that source *Verbatim* or not? Give full information about it.
28. Comment briefly on the last two lines (432-433) of *The Waste Land.*

2. List of Possible Long Questions

1. Discuss Eliot's contributions to the development of English poetry.
2. What are the main themes of Eliot's poetry and how does he deal with them? Give details.
3. Critically examine Eliot's impersonal theory of poetry.
4. Write a detailed note on the use of imagery in "The Love song of J. Alfred Prufrock."
5. Give a pen-portrait of J. Alfred Prufrock.
6. Assess "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" as a modern poem.
7. Discuss *The Waste Land* as a poem dealing with "the chaos of life" or "the disorganization of life" (F.R. Leavis).
8. Throw light on the title and structure of *The Waste Land.*
9. Comment on the poetic technique ("the technique of allusiveness") used by Eliot in *The Waste Land.*
10. Examine *The Waste Land* as a poem embodying "the release of personal feelings" (Eliot).
11. What are the various sources of this poem?
12. Discuss *The Waste Land* as an international poem.
13. Comment on the role of Tiresias in this poem
14. Critically analyse *The Waste Land* as a mythical poem.
15. Consider the relevance or otherwise of the use of the Hindu Philosophy (or, the Sanskrit words proper) in *The Waste Land.*
16. I.A. Richards consider *The Waste Land* as "a music of ideas". Comment on the statement.
17. Bring out the story of the Fisher King and the appropriateness of its application in this poem.

Suggested Readings

1. Bradbrook, M.C. *T.S. Eliot* (the British Council Pamphlet).

   Revised ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1963.

2. Cox, C.B. & Hinchliffe, A.P. Ed. *T.S. Eliot: The Waste Land - A Casebook.* London: Macmillan, 1968.
3 Drew, Elizabeth. *T.S. Eliot: The Design of His Poetry.* New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.
4. Dwivedi, A.N. *T.S. Eliot's Major Poems : An Indian Interpretation.* Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg University, 1982.
5. Eliot, T.S. *Collected Poems*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd. 1969.
6. Frazer, Sir James George. *The Golden Bough.* Abridged ed. London: Macmillan, 1970.
7. Gardner, T.S. *The Art of T.S. Eliot*. London: The Cresset press, 1949.
8. George, A.G. *T.S. Eliot :His Mind and Art*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1962.
9. Howarth, Herbet. *Notes on Some Figures Behind T.S.Eliot.* London : Chatto & Windus, 1965.
10. Kenner, Hugh .Ed. *T.S.Eliot: A Collection of Critical Essays (*Twentieth Century Views). Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice – Hall , Inc. , 1962.
11. _____ *The Invisible Poet: T.S.Eliot* . London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1965.
12. Leavis, F.R. *New Bearings in English Poetry.* New ed. London : Chatto & Windus , 1961.
13. Martin, Jay, Ed. *A Collection of Critical Essays on "The Waste Land"*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, Inc, 1968.
14. Matthiessen, F.O. *The Achievement of T.S. Eliot*. A galaxy Book ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
15. Maxwell, D.E. S. The Poetry of T.S. Eliot. 5th Impr London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.
16. Paig, D.D. Ed. *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd,. 1971.
17. Pinto, V.de S. *Crisis in English Poetry: 1880-1940.* 5th ed. London: Hutchinson University, 1967.
18. Pusey, Edword B. Tr. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. New York: The Modern Library, 1949.
19. Rai, V. *The Waste Land : A Critical Study.* Varanasi & Delhi: Motilal Banarasidas, 1965.
20. Rajan, B.Ed. *T.S. Eliot: A Study of His Writings by Several Hands.* London: Dennis Dobson, 1947.
21. *Sewanee Review, The* (Special Issue). XXIV, No.1. Winter 1966.
22. Shahane, V.A. *The Waste Land : A Critical Study* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987.
23. Smidt, Kristian. *Poetry and Belief in the Work of T.S. Eliot*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.
24. Smith , Grover. *T.S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays: A Study in Sources and Meaning*. Phoenix Books ed. 6th impr. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
25. Southam, B.C. *A Student's Guide to the Selected Poems of T.S. Eliot*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd. , 1965.
26. Tate, Allen. Ed. *T.S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1967.
27. Unger, Leonard. Ed. *T.S. Eliot : A Selected Critique*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.
28. Weston, Jessie L. *From Ritual to Romance*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday &Co. , Inc., 1957.
29. Williamson, George. *A Reader's Guide to T.S. Eliot*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1957.
30. Wilson, Edmund. *Axel's Castle.* London & Glasgow: Collins, The Fontana Library, 1961.

ARTHUR MILLER

Price

Unit-III
Arthur Miller

CHRONOLOGY

1915 : Arthur Asher Miller born on 17 October in New York City to Isidore and Augusta Miller. Second of three children.

1929 : Father's clothing business declines because of the Depression, forcing the family to move to Brooklyn.

1933 : Miller graduates from high school, but is rejected from Cornell University and University of Michigan. Works at a variety of jobs and writes his first short story "In Memoriam" depicting an aging salesman. Reapplies to University of Michigan and is granted a conditional acceptance after writing to Dean that he is now "a much more serious fellow."

1934 : Studies journalism at University of Michigan where he becomes night editor of *Michigan Daily*. Studies playwriting under Professor Kenneth T. Rowe.

1936 : First play, *No Villain*, is produced and wins University of Michigan's Avery Hopwood Award.

1937: Receives second Avery Hopwood Award for *Honors at Dawn*, but the play is never produced. Receives the Theatre Guild's Bureau of New Plays Award for *They Too Arise* (revision of *No Villain*).

1938: Comes in second for Avery Hopwood Award for *The Great Disobedience*, which is produced at University of Michigan, Graduates and moves to New York.

1939: Completes another revision of *They Too Arise* (now entitled *The Grass Still Grows*), Writes scripts for Federal Theatre Project until it is closed by Congress. He then writes radio plays for CBS and NBC.

1940 : Completes *The Golden Years*. Marries Mary Grace Slattery. They will have two children, Jane (1944) and Robert (1947).

1941 : Completes two radio plays, *The Pussycat and the Expert Plumber Who Was a Man* and *William Ireland's Confession*. Also works at various odd jobs.

1942 : Completes radio play, *The Four Freedoms*.

1943 : Completes *The Half-Bridge*.

1944 : Tours army camps gathering material for screenplay, *The Story of G.I. Joe*, and book, *Situation Normal*. First Broadway production, *The Man Who Had All the Luck*, closes after four performances, but wins Theatre Guild National Award and is published in *Cross Section: A Collection of New American Writing*.

1945 : Publishes first novel, *Focus,* on anti-semitism. Completes radio play, *Grandpa and the Statue*, and a one-act play, *That They May Win*. Attacks Ezra Pound for his pro-Fascist activities.

1947 : *All My Sons* opens on Broadway and wins New York Drama Critics' Circle Award. Auctions off manuscript on behalf of Progressive Citizens of America. Becomes involved in variety of anti-Fascist and pro-Communist activities.

1949 : *Death of a Salesman* (originally entitled *The Inside of His Head*) opens in New York with Lee J. Cobb in the title role. Jo Mielziner designs the innovative set. Wins the Pulitzer Prize and the New York Drama Critics' Circle Award. Miller publishes the first of his many theatrical and political essays.

1950 : Adaptation of Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* opens; but closes after thirty-six performances.

1953 : *The Crucible* opens in New York to mixed reviews that differ on play's relevance to McCarthyism. Play wins Antoinette Perry and Donaldson Awards.

1954 : Denied passport by State Department to attend opening of *The Crucible* in Brussels because of his alleged support of the Communist movement. Miller supporters claim this move is a retaliation for the parallels between McCarthy era tactics and the Salem witch trials evident in *The Crucible*.

1955 : Contracts to write a film script for New York City Youth Board, but is dropped from film after a condemnation of his leftist activities appears in a New York City newspaper. *A Memory of Two Mondays* and the one-act version of *A View from the Bridge* produced as double-bill in New York.

1956 : Two-act version of *A View from the Bridge* opens in London. Testifies before the House Un-American Activities Committee and refuses to name names of others attending meetings organized by Communist sympathizers. Divorces Mary Slattery and marries Marilyn Monroe.

1957 : Indicted on charges of contempt of Congress for refusing to name suspected Communists. Publishes *Collected Plays*.

1958 : US Court of Appeals reverses contempt of Congress conviction. Filming begins of Miller's *The Misfits*, starring Marilyn Monroe.

1959 : Awarded Gold Medal for Drama by National Institute of Arts and Letters.

1961 : *The Misfits* released. Divorces Marilyn Monroe. Opera versions of *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible* produced.

1962 : Marries Ingeborg Morath, an Austrian-born photographer. Daughter, Rebecca (1963).

1964 : *After the Fall* and *Incident at Vichy* open in New York.

1965 : Elected president of PEN (Poets, Essayists and Novelists), an international literary association.

1967 : Publishes *I Don't Need You Any More*, a collection of short stories.

1968 : *The Price* opens on Broadway. Serves as a delegate to the Democratic Party National Convention.

1969 : Publishes *In Russia* (travel journal) with photographs by his wife, lngeborg Morath. Films *The Reason Why*, an anti-war allegory. Refuses to be published in Greece to show his opposition to the government's oppression of writers.

1970 : Two one-act plays, *Fame* and *The Reason Why*, performed at New York's New Theatre Workshop. The Soviet Union, in response to *In Russia*, bans all of Miller's works.

1971 : *The Portable Arthur Miller* published. *The Price* and *Memory of Two Mondays* appear on television. Helps win release of Brazilian director/playwright Augusto Boal.

1972 : *The Creation of the World and Other Business* produced in New York, but closes after twenty performances. Protests oppression of artists worldwide - very active politically through the 1970s. Permission granted for all-black production of *Death of a Salesman* in Baltimore. Revival of *The Crucible* in New York.

1973 : Revival of *Death of a Salesman* in Philadelphia - first time the play is performed within one hundred miles of Broadway since 1949.

1974 : *Up from Paradise* (musical version of *The Creation of the World and Other Business*) produced in Ann Arbor, Michigan. *After the Fall* appears on television.

1975 : Revival of *Death of a Salesman* in New York at Circle in the Square.

1977 : *The Archbishop's Ceiling* has limited run in Washington Dc. Publishes *In the Country* (travel journal) with photographs by lnge borg Morath.

1978 : Visits China. *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller* published. *Fame* appears on television. Protests the arrests of dissidents in Soviet Union.

1979 : Publishes *Chinese Encounters* (travel journal) with photographs by Inge borg Morath.

1980 : *The American Clock* opens in New York. In spite of its success in South Carolina, the play closes in New York after a few performances. *Playing for Time*, adaptation of Fania Fenelon's book, appears on television.

1981 : Arthur Miller's *Collected Plays, vol. II* is published.

1982 : Two one-act plays, *Some Kind of Love Story* and *Elegy for a Lady*, open in New Haven.

1983 : Directs *Death of a Salesman* in Beijing with Chinese cast. Revival of *A View from the Bridge* in New York. Revision and revival of *Up from Paradise* in New York.

1984 : Publishes *Salesman* in Beijing with photographs by Inge borg Morath. *Death of a Salesman* is revived on Broadway with Dustin Hoffman in lead role. Involved in dispute with the Wooster Group over their unauthorized use of scenes from *The Crucible* for their production of LSD.

1985 : Revival of *The Price* opens successfully on Broadway. Hoffman version of *Death of a Salesman* produced on television. *Playing for Time* produced in Washington Dc.

1986 : *The American Clock* and *The Archbishop's Ceiling* produced in London. Revival of *The Crucible* in New York and Washington Dc.

1987 : *Timebends: A Life* (Miller's autobiography) published. *Danger: Memory!* (two one-act plays, *Can't Remember Anything* and *Clara*) produced in New York. *All My Sons* appears on television.

1989 : Revival of *The Crucible* in New Haven. Opening of Arthur Miller Centre, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

1990 : Revival of *The Crucible* in New York and London. Screenplay for motion picture *Everybody wins*.

1991: *The Ride Down Mount Morgan* opens in London.

1992 : *Homely Girl, A Life* published.

1993: *The Last Yankee* opens in New York. Continuing a lifelong commitment to the freedom of writers, Miller contributes to volume on censorship entitled *Censored Books: Critical View points*.

1994: *Broken Glass* opens in New York and London.

1995: *Plain Girl* published in England. Eightieth birthday marked by Gala Performance at the Royal National Theatre in London and Gala Dinner at the Arthur Miller Centre.

1996: Film version of *The Crucible* released.

LIFE AND CAREER

"The plays are my autobiography. I can't write plays that don't sum up where I am . I am in all of them. I don't know how else to go about writing". (Miller in an interview to BBC recorded in 1995 to mark his 80th birthday).

Arthur Miller is undoubtedly one of the three greatest American playwrights of the 20th century – the other two being Eugene O' Neill and Tennessee Williams. Miller's plays though dealing with American issues, appeal to audiences from Brazil to Russia and Iceland to China. In China, **Death of a Salesman** has enjoyed immense popularity though China till recently was a communist state. In India, Miller's plays, specially *All My Sons* and **Death of a Salesman,** have been translated into many languages and staged in many parts of the country.

Birth and Childhood

Miller was born in 1915 in a then fashionable part of Harlem, New York in a middle-class Jewish family. He was one of the three children, the others being an elder brother Kermit and a younger sister, Joan. His father, almost illiterate, was a successful manufacturer of ladies coats. His mother on the other hand, was an avid reader and taught public school. She was intensely devoted to her children and had high ambitions for them.

School

The Millers observed Jewish customs and holidays and provided their family with a sound moral and religious background. Miller attended a public school in Harlem but much to the disappointment of his mother, he was an undistinguished student. However, he was a competent athlete and a rather good football player.

Moving from New York to Brooklyn

In 1929, when Miller was fourteen years old, The Great Stock Market Crash occurred, creating havoc in America. This was a traumatic experience for the young Miller who wrote about the effects of the Depression in a number of plays, specially **Death of a Salesman**. His father's business, like that of thousands of others, suffered and the family consequently moved to Brooklyn. Although the Millers were now living in middle-class poor surroundings, the place was rather rural with great elm trees and flat grasslands.

Miller's neighbourhood was just a few blocks long and essentially Jewish. Socializing between neighbours was limited but everyone knew his neighbour. "I don't recall any time when the cops had to be called,' Miller wrote years later. "Everyone was so well and thoroughly known that the frown of his neighbour was enough law to keep things in line". (Arthur Miller, 'A Boy Grew in Brooklyn, **Holiday** (March 1995), p 119.

For the young Miller the school days passed pleasantly and leisurely. At James Madison High School he neglected his studies and devoted his time and energy to football and athletics. His only responsibility during these days was the job he held with the local bakery, delivering bread and rolls each morning before school. The job not only required strict punctuality but also the utmost care in delivering the right bag to the proper house.

High School

He progressed from James Madison to Abraham Lincoln High School, football being his main interest. So carefree was his life that years later he recalled, "I can fairly say we were none of us encumbered by any thing resembling a thought". Indeed, Miller's only encumbrance was a knee injury he sustained in one of the games which would later on exempt him from military duty.

The young Miller became aware of the economic chaos caused by the Great Depression of the 30s. He saw millions of Americans suddenly become penniless and unemployed. Some committed suicide while others took whatever jobs came their way. The domestic situation became increasingly painful. His father's garment factory which employed about a thousand workers suddenly lost business. His maternal grandfather, his savings depleted by the depression, started living with his daughter. Indeed, the crash left such a profound impression on him that it became a recurrent theme in many of his plays.

In 1932 , Miller graduated from high school and applied to Cornell University and the University of Michigan. But he was rejected by both and began looking for a job.

Early jobs

He went to work in his father's garment factory but soon found the job distasteful what with the atmosphere claustrophobic, the workers loud, vulgar and aggressive. In the next few months he held a number of jobs from truck driver to an announcer at a local radio station. Finally, he became a shipping clerk at an automobile parts warehouse in New York where he worked for more than a year for fifteen dollars a week.

He applied again to the University of Michigan and to his surprise and joy was accepted on the condition that he achieve good grades at the end of the first semester.

In the warehouse he learned about hollowness and despair and hope and fulfillment. The experience would always be with him. He drew upon this experience when he came to write his autobiographical play, **A Memory of Two Mondays.**

University

The University of Michigan with its sprawling green campus and radical atmosphere was a paradise compared to the warehouse where Miller worked for about two years. He "fell in love with the place" and he "resolved to make good". He did though with much difficulty and hardship. He had never been a distinguished student and a two-year absence from studies hardly helped. By dint of hard work and application he achieved proper grades.

With each passing day, Miller grew more and more fond of Michigan. Its main difference from the depressing and hopeless world he had been exposed to in Brooklyn and New York was its vivacity. The atmosphere of the University was one of hope and fulfillment rather than of despair and despondency. The campus was full of speeches, meetings, leaflets and issues. Informal courses in politics were available to anyone who was receptive. His fellow students were as exciting to Miller as the causes they supported and attacked. In sharp contrast to his previous dull and drab social life his classmates came from different backgrounds. They were sons of bankers, advocates, doctors, engineers, and even unemployed recipients of dole; they came from all parts of America. Interacting with them was part of Miller's education at the University of Michigan. No wonder he loved every minute of it.

Since Miller's parents were in no position to bear the cost of his education, to support himself he washed dishes in the cafeteria to pay for his meals, and earned a modest salary as editor of the **Michigan Daily**. He also did some other odd jobs to maintain himself.

Though he began a journalism major, he soon moved to the English department, which provided him an incentive for creative writing. He attended Professor Kenneth Rowe's Course on play writing who impressed Miller with his learning and ability as also his dedication and interest in his students.

"He may never have created a playwright, no teacher, ever did", Miller observed later on, "but he surely read what we wrote with the urgency of one who actually had the power to produce the play".

While Miller's interest in play writing was encouraged by Prof. Rowe, it was reinforced by an alumnus of the University, Avery Hapwood. The latter left a considerable legacy out of which the University founded an annual award for creative writing. Miller submitted the play **Honors at Dawn** in 1936 for this competition. He was surprised and elated when it was announced that he was the winner of the prize which was worth two hundred and fifty dollars! Suddenly he had achieved recognition, money, and most importantly, the realization that play writing as a vocation was open to him. His hopes were further encouraged the following year when a second Avery Hopewood prize of $250 was awarded to him for his play, **No Villain.**

Both **Honors at Dawn** and **No Villain** remain unpublished and unproduced. Their essential merit today lies not in their intrinsic merit but in the themes, characters and situations they foresh adow in Miller's later and more mature work.

Honors at Dawn is about a young man named Max Zabriskie who unwittingly and reluctantly supports and participates in a strike at his factory. He is fired for his role in the strike, although he is hardly aware of the cause for which his fellow workers have been fighting. With hardly any hope of getting a job, under the influence of his

elder brother he goes to college. Max initially regards the University as a citadel of learning and idealism. But his optimism is soon shattered and he becomes disillusioned. He finds corruption all-pervasive in many walks of university life and is shocked to learn that his brother is in the pay of the administration to spy upon young radicals. Shocked by his brother's betrayal and disgusted with college life, he returns to the factory, but this time with a new sense of commitment and a full understanding of the cause for which he and his co-workers are fighting. The play ends with Max taking a bad beating but, realizing that he has finally gained at a new "dawn" the honors of individual integrity and social responsibility that he had Vainly sought at the University.

Honors at Dawn is melodramatic, didactic and naive. It is clearly influenced by the protest literature if the Depression era. Yet, for us the worth of the play lies in that it has themes, Miller would develop in greater depth and intensity in later work.

Set against a negative image of university life, the conflict between the Zabriskie brothers is a precursor of sibling rivalry that characterizes Miller's later plays. Equally significant is the conflict between the individual and his society. These themes would recur later in **All My Sons, Death of a Salesman** and **The Price.**

Like many later heroes, Max is a confused man who is out of touch with reality. Also, his self- awareness begins with the revelation that his brother is bribed by the University. This device takes the form of a pair of spectacles in the novel, **Focus,** a letter in **All My Sons,** an accusation of witchcraft in **The Crucible** and a mistaken identity in **Incident at Vichy.**

It cannot be claimed that the early Miller of this play had fully worked the thematic considerations and dramatic structure of the later and more mature plays. But at the same time it cannot be denied that **Honors at Dawn** contributed, in however small a way, to the profound growth and development of Miller's dramatic art.

They Too Arise is an enlarged and revised version of Miller's second Avery Hopwood Award winning play, **No Villain.** It continues the pattern established in **Honors at Dawn** of linking familial conflicts with societal problems that affect the family.

The play opens in the drawing room of Abe Simon's home in a New York City suburb in the 1930s. The Simon family comprises Abe, a manufacturer of women's coats (like Miller's father), his son Ben, who works with him, his wife Esther, and his young daughter Maxine. Although it is late, the family is waiting for the arrival of the younger son, Arnie, who is studying at the University of Michigan.

The tensions in the family are obvious. Although there is a strike in the factory the Simons are far from united. Esther, who is alienated from her husband and son, remonstrating with Ben for not marrying the daughter of a wealthy businessman and faulting Abe for being ineffective. Estranged from his wife he becomes indifferent to her and spends most of his time in the shop and showers great affection on his daughter. Caught in the conflict between his parents and frustrated with his job, Ben becomes increasingly bitter and unhappy. His bitterness surfaces when his eighty year old maternal grandfather comes to stay with them. His arrival intensifies the conflict between Abe and Esther. Though she and her sister have been taking care of their old father by turns, Abe resents the burden thrust upon him by his prosperous sister-in-law.

The only pleasant topic of discussion is Arnie and even he becomes the cause of conflict when Ben questions the wisdom of his father to offer him (Arnie) a share in the shop because his younger brother has always disliked the work. Moreover, he has become a radical in the college and might support the workers in their ongoing strike.

At this point Arnie enters and is warmly welcomed by all. He is overwhelmed by his family's affection and the atmosphere is relaxed for the time being. This is where the first act closes.

The second act opens in Abe's factory. In spite of Ben's objections, Arnie, who does not understand the issue involved in the strike, agrees to help his father. Soon after, Arnie is bashed up when he unwittingly crosses a picket line. He criticizes his father for keeping him in the dark and supports the workers facing financial disaster. Abe pleads with Ben to agree to marry the girl of a wealthy businessman that may save the family. Much against his wishes but for the sake of the family, Ben accepts the marriage proposal.

In the concluding scene of this act, which takes place in the Simon home, Arnie is tying to persuade his father to accept the workers' demand and asks Ben to break off his engagement. Ben , however, with his feet firmly planted on earth, asks his brother to abandon his noble ideals and rescue their father from financial ruin.

As the two brothers are quarrelling, Esther cries that her father is having a heart attack.

As the third act opens, Abe is besieged by creditors and in despair realizes that his business is finished.

The last scene is in the Simon home. The death of Esther's father brings her and Abe together. After experiencing defeat and death they discover their love for each other and the family decides to come to terms with life and its realities. Ben calls off his marriage and decides to strike on his own in the world. Arnie warmly and proudly welcomes his brother's act. As the two brothers prepare to go to bed, Abe says softly to Esther ; "We gotta learn how to laugh again, we gotta learn how to laugh". The play ends with these words.

They Too Arise is undoubtedly didactic and melodramatic and has many other dramatic weaknesses. But like **Honors at Dawn** it deals with characters and situations which Miller was to develop in the later plays. The characters form the center of a family which will develop in depth and complexity in Miller's later work.

Abe Simon with his selfless desire to sacrifice himself for his sons, is an early portrait of Joe Keller and Will Loman, to give only two examples.

"We' re finished Through", he exclaims, "But Ben, some day I want you should – I wanna, see you on top. You can do it Ben, without me".

Abe's anguished cry will be echoed by Patterson Beeves in **The Man Who Had All The,** Luck; it will figure in Joe Keller's painful justification of his deeds in **All My Sons;** it will form the core of Willy, Loman's extravagant dreams for Biff and Happy; and it will reverberate again in **After the fall** in the Fathers impotent rage at the discovery of his ruin.

If Abe embodies many characteristics of father figures Esther is similar to many mothers in later plays. She, a dutiful and protective wife, is not unlike Kate Keller and Linda Loman. They all provide their sons with the best possible homes.

Arnie and Ben provide a pattern of two contrasting brothers that is repeated in many later plays. Though temporarily blinded by their father's, formula for success they, or at least one of them, gains self-knowledge and realize the hollowness of their fathers dream.

So, **Honors at Dawn** and **They Too Arise** are significant not so much in their intrinsic merit as in prefiguring the characters and situations that Miller was to develop in later drama .

Miller graduated from the University of Michigan in 1938. He was armed with B.A degree, two playwriting awards, a fiancee, Mary Slattery and a lot of high hopes. The Michigan years proved to be fruitful and crucial; he learned a lot about the world and himself.

He later commented about this period, "I felt I had accomplished something there. I knew at least how much I did not know …It had been a small world, gentler, than the real one, but tough enough."

After his marriage he turned to radio writing while his wife did secretarial work. After the outbreak of the Second World War, he wrote scripts for radio and worked on ships in the Navy Yard. But he despised radio as it placed too many restrictions on him. He had to deal with the censors, meet the deadlines and cram each story into a half-hour limit. However, he continued to write radio scripts for it gave him some economic stability.

Miller wrote a vast number of radio plays. While some celebrate the integrity and potential of the common man, others, are openly and unabashedly patriotic.

His radio scripts are noteworthy for what they reveal of his thematic considerations and dramatic technique. The plays reveal a number of non realistic experiments. Fanciful and fantastic situations, the use if a narrator, rapid and plastic shifts of scene, and the collapse of chronological time – all these elements which are perfected in **Death of a Salesman**, **A Memory of Two Mondays, A view from the Bridge**, and **After The Fall**- are

even employed boldly and interestingly in his radio plays Of them all perhaps, the most interesting is the fanciful **'The Pussy Cat and the Expert Plumber who was a Man'**. It is a delightful comedy about a talking cat called Tom who blackmails some politicians into contesting for governorship before he is exposed by a bold and honest plumber.

Although Miller was a successful scriptwriter for radio, he was dissatisfied. His first love was play writing, the radio plays were no more than potboilers.

His first major play after he gave up radio was the **Man Who Had All The Luck**. The play had its premiere in 1944 and Miller hoped the play's title would apply to the author as well. But it closed after only four performances.

For him success was still a couple of years away.

The protagonist of **The Man Who Had All the Luck** is a young man who works as a motor mechanic in a small town. Though happy with his job, he is unhappy in his personal life. He cannot marry his sweetheart, Hester because her father is opposed to the marriage, The rest of the play dramatises David's" rise to fame and fortune through luck and chance. As David is contemplating giving up Hester, he learns of the death of her father in an accident. Now, they are free to marry. But at this point a rich farmer brings an expensive car for repairs with the offer that if he can fix it the owner will extend his patronage to him. At this moment a stranger appears, informs him of his plans to open a garage. Though a potential rival he becomes friendly with David and offers to help him with the car. Exhausted, David falls asleep and Eberson fixes the car. The next day David earns the benefits promised by Dibble, the owner of the car.

The second act opens three years later. David is now a rich and famous man. While he is marching to fame and fortune he is dogged by the fear that good fortune will not last forever. To test his luck he invests in a number of ventures all of which turn out to be successful. At the end of the play, David's lot is better than ever and it is wholly gratuitous.

The play suffers from many inherent defects, the chief being that many critical situations and the incidents depend on coincidence and chance. Miller's main problem is to persuade the reader or spectator to believe these strange happenings. That Miller himself was dissatisfied with the play is obvious from the fact that he did not include it in his **Collected Plays.**

Miller 's old football injury kept him out of the Second World War. So it was with great readiness that he accepted an offer by a film producer to collect material for a film about the war. He threw himself heart and soul into the project. He spent a couple of months visiting recruitment centers, training schools. When after he turned in his reports his interest in the war continued. He had become so involved in the project that he shaped his material into a book with the title **Situation Normal.** It is a book of first-rate reportage and personal impressions that was published in 1944. The central point of the book is Miller's interview of a soldier called Watson. For him Watson was to some extent the victim of a society that taught him no sense if commitment to anything beyond self and family. His story looks forward to the main themes of **All My Sons.** In **Situation Normal** Miller did not explore the in depth the implications of the conflict between. self – interest and commitment to society that he probed twenty years later in *After the Fall*, **Incident at Vichy** and **The Price.**

While doing various add jobs in the 30s Miller encountered anti-Semitism. Though there is no direct influence of this on Miller's novel **Focus** the book is imbrued with anti-semitism. To start with **Focus** was conceived to be a play but gradually Miller realized that the material could best be dealt with in the form of a novel. It tells the story if Lawrence Newman, a New York executive who becomes, more and more disoriented as the action progresses. The novel, which is about anti-Semitism in America, proved remarkably successful . Nevertheless, he returned to the theatre with **All My Sons,** a play written during the war but produced in 1947. It was an immediate and phenomenal success**.**

ALL MY SONS

The idea of the play was provided by an actual incident. During a casual talk a relative told the Millers about a family in their neighbourhood that had been ruined because the daughter had reported to the authorities that her

father had supplied defective spares to the Army during the war. The girl's story had a profound effect on him. He describes the impact in the following words in his introduction to the Collected Pays:

*I knew my informant's neighborhood. I knew its middle-class ordinariness, And I knew how rarely the great issues penetrate such environments. But the fact that a girl had not only wanted to, but had actually moved against an erring father transformed into fact…….what in my previous play [**The Man who had All the luck**] I had only begun to hint at had no awareness of the slightest connection between the two plays. All I knew was that somehow a hard thing had entered into me, a crux toward which it seemed possible to move in strong and straight lines. Something was crystal clear to me for the first time since I had begun to write plays, and it was the crisis of the second act, the revelation of full loathsomeness of an antisocial action".*

Miller transforms the daughter into a son and plans the climactic confrontation between him and his father in the second act. Also, he was determined to write a well-made play like Ibsen whose influence on him is direct and pervasive. Like most of Ibsen's dramas Miller's new play is meticulously structured and carefully plotted. The guilty past of Joe Keller is revealed through revelatory dialogue as in Ibsen's **Ghosts.** In the Norwegian's work a close relationship is established between past actions and present consequences and so it is in **All My Sons.** Another similarity between Ibsen and Miller is in dealing with the theme of sins of the fathers being visited on their children, a theme which is at the core of his new play. He fully understood Ibsen's attitude to life. He explains in the introduction to the collected plays:

"His [Ibsen's] intention [was] ……..to assert nothing he had not proved, and to cling always to the marvelous spectacle of life forcing one event out of the jaws of the preceding one and to reveal its elemental consistencies with surprise. In other wards, contrast his realism not with the lyrical, which I prize, but with sentimentality, which is always a leak in the dramatic dike. He sought to make a play as weighty and living a fact as the discovery of the steam engine or algebra. This can be scoffed away only at a price, and the price is living drama."

In the words of Nelson "The thematic image of **All My Sons** is a circle within a circle, the inner depicting the family unit, and the outer representing society, and the movement of the drama is concentric, with the two circles revolving in parallel orbits until they ultimately coalesce."

All My Sons tells the story of Joe Keller, the owner of a small factory who allows defective aeroplane parts to be supplied to the Air Force during the war. His hopes of not being caught are dashed when twenty one pilots die in accidents caused by the faulty planes. When it is found that the accident occurred because of his cracked cylinder heads, he passes the blame to his partner who is imprisoned. In this way he escapes responsibility and **when the war is over he is merrily running his factory**.

When his son Chris returns from the Army, ignorant of his father's guilt, he joins the family business. Soon he becomes engaged to Ann Dee Ver, the daughter of Joe's ex-partner who is in jail and the fiance of Chris's brother Larry, who was killed in the war. But Mrs. Keller is opposed to their marriage because she refuses to believe that Larry is really dead and is convinced that he will soon return. Another obstacle to the marriage is her imprisoned father.

The central action of the first half of the play consists of the attempts of Chris and Ann to overcome the difficulties in their path. They overcome Mrs. Keller's objection and even succeed in persuading Ann's brother George that his father was solely responsible in shipping defectives spares. All seems to be well for the time being. But tension mounts as it is revealed that Joe was equally guilty. Now the dramic interest shifts from other characters to Chris and Joe, the guilty father and the prosecuting son. The confrontation between these two now becomes the central action a of the play.

With mounting intensity the play focuses on the two, Joe desperately trying to defend his actions and Chris not forgiving him to all. Despite all his attempts the son fails to make his father realize the enormity of his deeds.

Then Ann discloses that she received a letter from larry in which he revealed his intention of committing suicide as an atonement for his father's crime. Now Joe realizes his responsibility and it dawns upon him that the pilots who died were 'my sons'. At the end of the play he seeks expiation in death.

The first act of the play is a vivid example of Miller's ability to treat his theme in a particular context. Through casual and informal conversation and leisurely pace and accumulation of detail he draws the portrait of a small mid-Western town. After this the portrait of Joe Keller, a pleasant and affable man is convincingly drawn. He is no ruthless, heartless businessman but a devoted family man and a nice neighbour. It is his single-minded devotion for and commitment to his family, which is his tragic flow and that brings about his ruin. He is narrow-minded. He is so preoccupied with providing for his family that he neglects his responsibility to the society. He believes that the deaths of thirty one men was a 'mistake' rather than a crime. He has no hesitation in advising Ann to ask her father when he is released to return to the factory. He is not a cold-blooded murderer but a loyal husband, a loving father and a nice neighbour.

In the main confrontations with Chris, Joe explains everything he believes in and stands for. At the end of the second act when he is forced to admit his guilt he pleads with his son to understand his reasons:

What could I do! I am in business, a man is in business; a hundred and twenty cracked, you are out of business; you got a process, the process don't work you're out of business, you don't know how to ep rate, your stuff is no good, they close you up, they tear up your contracts, what the hell is to them? You lay forty years into a business and they knock you out in five minutes, what could I do, let them take forty years, let then take my life away? I never thought they'd install them.....Chris, I did it for you. I'm sixty one years old, when would I have another chance to make something for you? Sixty-one years old you Don't get another chance do ya?

Joe Keller believes there is nothing, dishonest in being loyal to one's Family. His second appeal to his son Goes a little beyond the worth of the Individual effort and sanctity of family Life but is shall defined by them. You want me to go to jail', he asks His son. 'If you want me to go, say so.' What's matter, why can't you tell me …… I'll tell you why you can't say it. Because You know I don't belong there…..Who worked for nothing in that war? When they work for nothing, I'll work for nothing. Did they ship a gun or a truck out a Detroit before they got there price? Is that clean? It's dollars and cents, nickels and dimes; War and peace, it's nickels and dimes, What's clean? Half the goddam country Is gatta go if I go! That's why, you cant tell me.

Joe's problem is not that he is unable to differentiate between right and wrong but his own concept of morality in which loyalty to family is more important than responsibility to society. He is both a sinner and one sinned against. His society has encouraged him to subscribe to false values. In this sense society is partly responsible for his actions. Because of his intense and selfish loyalty to his family he has committed a crime against society. So, Miller dramatizes a conflict not so much between good and evil as between family and society.

Chris is pitted against his father. He is an idealist who refuses to accept his father's justification of his actions. He tells Ann what the war has meant to him.

"They were not just men," he says, referring to his fellow soldiers. One time it'd been raining several days and this kid came to me, and gave me his last pair of dry sacks. Put them in my pocket. That's only a small thing….but… that the kind of guys ! had. They did not die; they killed themselves for each other…..And got an idea….watching them go Down. Everything was being destroyed, see, but it seemed to me to one new thing was made. A kind of responsibility. Man for man….to know that, to bring that on earth again like same kind of monument and everyone would feel it standing there, behind him, and it would make a difference to him and then I came home and it was incredible!…… there was no meaning in it here; the whole thing to them was a kind of a bus accident. I went to work with Dad, and that rat-race again. I felt…. ashamed somehow. Because nobody was changed at all. It Seemed to make suckers out of lot of guys to his father's plea that he acted in his interests, Chris retorts: For me! Where do you live,

where have you come from? For me ! – I was dying every day and you were killing my boys and you did if for me? What the hell do you think I was thinking of, the Goddam business? Is that as far as your mind Can see the business? What is that, the world the business? What the hell do you mean you did it for me? Don't you have a country? Don't you live in the world? (collected plays : pp 115-116)

In reply to his mother's question as to what more they can be Chris answers :

'you can be better, he exclaims. Once and for all you can know There's universe of people outside and your'e responsible to it And unless you know that you threw away your son because that's why he died.' (bid, pp.126-127)

Finally, Chris brings his father to a genuine understanding of the meaning of his crime and so at the end of the play he commits suicide.

It is noteworthy that Miller is an economical play wright. The secondary characters are all significant. There is no character, no dialogue which does not advance the action, reveal character, or is irrelevant to the theme. Neighbours like Lydia and Frank Lubey represent those who during the war stayed at home and led ordinary lives. They provide a contrast to Joe, Chris, Larry, and Ann. Perhaps the most fully realized minor character is Dr. Jim Bayliss, who is a next door neighbour. Chris, as his friend, has encouraged him to specialize and do research rather than general practice. But under the influence of his wife he abandons research and becomes a general physician.

Miller's dialogue is highly artistic. A striking feature of the dialogue is the frequency of questions and their effectiveness. The questions reveal the dilemma of a naturally garrulous man like Joe who finds it impossible to communicate with other. "What do I do? Tell me, talk to me, what do I do?" Joe asks Kate in the final scene when Chris returns after an angry outburst. Joe enquires : "Exactly, What's the matter? What's the matter? You got too much money? Is that what bothers you? Questions like these abound in the play.

To emphasize the contrast between the comfortable life of the Kellers and the gravity of the revelation that cost twenty-one lives, Miller sets the small talk of every day suburban life against the condition of Chris' men lost in the battle. The family conversation deals with such mundane objects as meat, champagne, clothes, car etc. The imageny of the play, derived from nature, also employs contrast. Kate's faith in astrology contrasts with Jim's reference to 'the star of one's honesty'. The apple tree, symbolic of Larry, has been blown down the night before by a storm , which symbolises the violent action about to erupt.

In act two as Joe's guilty secret is revealed, each line of dialogue between father and son gathers intensity until it explodes in Chris's outburst. The short lines strike like rapier thrusts:

Chris : Dad….Dad you killed twenty one men!

Keller : What killed?

Chris : You killed them, you murdered them ?

Keller : …..How could I kill anybody!

Chris : Then explain it to me. What did you do? Explain it to me or I'll tear you to pieces!

In contrast to this sharp exchange are the longer speeches. Two prominent examples are Joe's defense and Chris's accusation; their style and content differentiate each speaker. The stage directions emphasize the contrast: "Their movements are the those of subtle pursuit and escape. Keller keeps a step out of Chris's range as he talks." Joe's speech is characterized by repetitions , the rhythm reflecting his thought processes, as if he is wondering what to say next" : I'm in business, a man is in business."

The act ends with Chris's speech which is the most significant in the play. It begins with eight questions, the rising crescendo in each like a hammer below: 'Don't you have country? Don't you live in the world?

When **All My Sons** had its premiere on Broadway in 1947, two years after the war, it was enthusiastically received by critics and audiences. Louis Kronberger wrote in his review, "**All My Sons** slashes at all the

defective parts of our social morality : but most of all it slashed at the unsocial nature of family loyalties, of protecting or aggrandizing the tribe at the expense of society at large. He called Miller as easily first among our new generation of play wrights." Brooks Atkinson in the New York times of 30 January 1947 praised Miller's 'many-sided. Genius : 'Writing pithy yet unself conscious dialogue, he has created his characters vividly, plucking them out of the run of American society, but presenting them as individuals with hearts and minds of their own ….. He drives the play along by natural crescendo to a startling and terrifying climax .'

Some critics emphasized the topicality of the play, regarding it an expose of war profiteering." But this aspect of the play should not blind us to the fact that Miller is dramatizing a universal and not a local situation.

DEATH OF A SALESMAN

When **Death of a Salesman** premiered at Broadways in 1949, two years after the success of **All My Sons,** it had a powerful impact on audiences. Men and women wept openly; during the interval spectators asked in wonder how Miller knew their stories. And this experience was repeated again and again all over the country, indeed all over the world. "They were weeping", Miller said in an interview on the Canadian Broadcasting Company network in 1979, "because the central matrix of the play is… what most people are up against in their lives…… They were seeing themselves, not because Willy is a salesman, but the situation in which he stood and to which he was reacting , and which was reacting against him, was probably the central situation of contemporary civilisation. It is that we are struggling with forces that are far greater than we can handle, with no equipment to make anything mean anything."

Death of a Salesman tells the story of a man's life in its final painful days. The protagonist is Willy Loman, a travelling salesman who lives in Brooklyn and covers the New England territory by car. Sixty years old, he is physically and mentally tired and can't meet the rigorous demands of his job any longer. His exhaustion is apparent in the opening with Willy, with back bent and shoulders drooping, carrying two heavy suitcases containing his merchandize. Despite the support and love of his wife, Lynda, he knows his life has been a failure. This awareness has driven him to attempt suicide several times. His depression is further enhanced by the inability of his two sons to achieve success in life. Happy is anything but happy; he is a shallow and vain braggart who is stuck in an inferior position in a department store and Biff, from whom Willy had great hopes, has turned out to be a petty thief and a vagabond. It is Biff's return home after a long absence that sets the play in motion.

Through a series of elaborate flashbacks, occurring in Willy's mind the reasons of his family's tragedy are gradually revealed. He has instilled false values into his sons. He has told them that the key to success is an attractive personality, smartness, a ready smile, an interesting joke and a fine appearance. He has neglected to impress upon them the value of honesty and hard work. In this respect he is the architect of their ruin.

Acting upon his father's advice, Happy becomes a frustrated, good-for-nothing fellow while Biff leads a desultory aimless life. When Biff was in school he caught his father in an adulterous affair in a Beston hotel. This traumatic experience led him to understand that his father was a hypocrite and a liar.

With his sons now home after a long absence, Willy makes one last desperate attempt to achieve happiness. Both he and Biff visit prospective and current employers. Instead of getting a desk job and a promotion, Willy is fired by the son of the founder of his company for his old age and growing incompetence. And Biff wastes a whole day waiting to see the man he has hoped to sell a promotion scheme. In anger and frustration, he steals a gold fountain pen as he is leaving the office.

Biff finally realizes that his father has brought him up on false and exaggerated dreams rather than solid virtues. In the play's central scene he tries to share his knowledge with his father but he spares him further agony and instead breaks down weeping on Willy's shoulders. Overwhelmed by his son's love for him, Willy decides to sacrifice his life for him. He drives into the night to kill himself and so provide Biff with twenty thousand dollars of insurance money. Willy's suicide may be regarded as both an atonement for past sins and an affirmation of his love for his family, especially Biff.

The drama ends with a requiem around Willy's grave. In contrast to the hundreds he dreamed would flock to his funeral only his immediate family, his friend Charley, and Charley's son, Bernard, are present. In brief eulogies each person tries to assess Willy's life and death.

Death of a Salesman has many things in common with **All My Sons**. Both plays depict the conflict between the family and society. However, in **Death of a Salesman** the action resolves more around the family; man's social responsibility is there but it plays a less vital role than the father's conflict with his sons. In both plays father's authority is challenged by their sons. Both fathers have loyal, devoted and supportive wives. Both are haunted by a guilty past which casts a shadow on their present lives. In the case of Joe Keller the guilt of

supplying defective aircraft parts gnaws at his conscience; Willy Loman realizes that his adulterous affair with the woman in the Boston hotel has destroyed Biff's life.

However, despite its similarities with **All My Sons, Death of a Salesman** is structurally different from the earlier play. The structure is a blend of realism and expressionism. Although steeped in realism, the play goes much beyond it because it portrays the processes of a disoriented mind. So, the form of **Death of a Salesman** is perfectly suited to the protagonist's nervous breakdown. One important feature of this structure is the breakdown of chronological time to connect the past with the chaotic present. This is not a simple flashback technique but rather a complex juxtaposition or intermingling of past and present, illusion and reality.

The form is necessary to the theme and characterization of the play in at least two respects. First, it shows Willy's painful search for elements in the past which have brought about his ruin. He recalls characters and incidents which, he thinks, have led to his fall. The second significant result of the play's structure is that by linking Willy's final days with the past that has shaped them, it gives his life and death a dramatic cohesiveness. In other words, Willy's suicide is vividly linked to past events which have led to it. The flashbacks are not scattered through the play at random. Miller selects and arranges them in a definite pattern that gives depth and meaning to the hero's life and reveals his character.

Basically, the flashbacks fall into two categories. One group consists of events involving Willy and his brother, Ben. Willy is presented as the respectful and supplicating child seeking guidance and assurance from Ben who is an epitome of success for him. In the second group of flashbacks Willy is giving rather than seeking guidance to his sons, especially Biff, how to achieve success. Both sets of flashbacks culminate in the one depicting his infidelity, a symbol of his ultimate failure.

Willy's life is full of errors of judgment, moral lapses and false hopes but perhaps his greatest mistake has been living with the wrong dream. He articulates this dream in the advice he gives to his sons in the first flashback when he compares them to Bernard.

"Bernard is not well liked?' Willy asks rhetorically. 'He's liked,' Biff replies agreeing with his father, 'but he's not well liked."

'That's just what I mean," Willy exclaims.

"Bernard can get the best marks in school, y'understand, you are going to be five times ahead of him. That's why I thank Almighty God you're both built like Adonises. Because the man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest is the man who gets ahead. Be liked and you will never want. You take me for instance. I never have to wait in line to see a buyer. 'Willy Loman is here!' That's all they have to know, and I go right through," (Miller, 'Death of a Salesman,' Collected plays, p. 146)

This is the success formula to which Willy has dedicated his life and those of his sons. Here he's the root of his tragedy.

Lynda is a key figure in the tragedy. She is the greatest supporter of her husband. When Biff says Willy has no character toward the end of the first act, she replies angrily.

"I don't say he's a great man. Willy Loman never made a lot of money. His name was never in the paper. He's not the finest character that ever liked. But he's human being and a terrible thing is happening to him. So attention must be paid. He's not to be allowed to fall into his grave like an old dog. Attention, attention must be finally paid to such a person." (p. 162).

But for all her love and devotion to her husband, she is a woman of limited understanding. She says in the requiem:

"I can't understand it, at this time especially. First time in thirty-five years we were just about free and clear. He only needed a little salary. He was even finished with the dentist."

Charley replies, "No man only needs a little salary'. When this is lost on her he makes a moving defense of Willy's life."

"Nobody dare blame this man. You don't understand: Willy was a salesman. And for a salesman, there is, no rock bottom to the life. He don't put a bolt to a nut, he don't tell you the law or give you medicine. He's a man way out there is in the blue, riding on a simile and a shoeshine. And when they start not smiling back – that's an earthquake …… Nobody dare blame this man. A salesman is got to dream boy. It comes with the territory. A few lines after these lines Biff replies with what is the essential theme of the play, 'Charley, the man didn't know who he was." Biff 's self-realization is expressed in those words", I know who I am ……".

At the heart of all Miller criticism is the major question which is asked again and again. Does Miller write tragedy? When the play was attacked as a tragedy he wrote a defense in **New York Times** soon after the opening of the play in an essay called "Tragedy and the Common Man". The main points have to do with the terms originated in Aristotle's **Poetics:** the exalted subject, the tragic flaw, action, pity and fear, the catharsis (or purging) of these emotions.

According to Miller in the essay, "the common man is as apt a subject for tragedy in its highest sense as kings were." He could have added the obvious that in the long history of mankind from slavery to democracy the common man had acquired an importance never known before. Miller further points out:

"I think the tragic feeling is evoked in us when we are in the presence of a character who is ready to lay down his life, if need be, to secure one thing – his sense of personal dignity. From Orestes to Hamlet, Meeia to Macbeth, the underlying struggle is that of the individual attempting to gain his rightful position in his society. "

"Tragedy, then," says Miller, "is the consequence of man's total compulsion to evaluate himself justly."

How does Willy Loman qualify as a tragic hero? First of all, as Miller has pointed out elsewhere, Willy must be responsible for his actions; he must be aware of and understand the issues involved. The passive protagonist could never become more than a pathetic figure, arousing pity and not terror – Willy must act out of his convictions and beliefs. What then dues Willy believe; upon what will he stake his life? Willy has devoted his entire life to starting small and ending big. And he pursues it to the end.

He recommends it to his sons, Biff and Happy. Even after more than thirty years of service with his company, he is taken off salary and put on straight commission like a beginner, he sticks to his dream. When Happy announces an outlandish scheme to sell sports goods, Willy responds enthusiastically: "You guys together could absolutely lick the civilized world." Even in his advice to Biff on what to say to Bill Oliver, the prospective employer, we can detect the old formula: "It is not what you say, it's how you say it because personality always wins the day."

This, then, is the essence of Willy Loman's dream, this is the way to achieve success in life. The tragic condition, according to Miller, will be met when Willy sacrifices his life in the pursuit of his dream. "It is the tragedy of a man," Miller continues to explain, "Who did believe that he alone was not meeting the qualifications laid down for mankind by those clean-shaven frontiers men who inhabit the peaks of broadcasting and advertising offices."

Death of a Salesman had 742 performances on Broadway and won the Drama Critics and the Pulitzer prizes. Despite this, however, the play was attacked by some critics. Eric Bentley criticised it on the following grounds:

The tragedy destroys the social drama; the social drama keeps the "tragedy" from having a genuinely tragic stature. By the last remark I mean that the theme of this social drama, as of most others, is **the little man as victim.** The theme arouses pity but no terror. Man is here too little and too passive to play the tragic hero.

More important even than this, the tragedy and the social drama actually conflict. The tragic catharsis reconciles us to, or persuades us to disregard, precisely those material conditions which the social drama, calls our attention to ……. Or is Mr. Miller a "tragic" artist who without knowing it has been confused by Marxism? (Theatre Arts, Nov. 1949, p. 13)

Miller rebutted this criticism in his celebrated essay, "Tragedy and the Common Man", that appeared in **The New York Times** soon after Bentley's savage attack. Miller defends Willy as a tragic figure who far from being a "Victim", is an active agent and whose fate arouses both pity and fear.

Exactly the opposite argument was advanced by Elenor Clark in **Partisan Review;**

It is, of course, the capitalist system that has done Willy in; the scene in which he is brutally fired after some forty years with the firm comes straight from the party-line literature of the thirties and the idea emerges lucidly enough through all the confused motivations of the play that it is our particular form of money economy that has bred the absurdly false ideals of both father and sons……. Immediately after every crack the playwright withdraws behind an air of pseudo-universality and hurries to present some cruelty or misfortune either to Willy's own weakness, as when he refuses his friend's offer of a job after he has been fired, or gratuitously from some other source, as in the quite unbelievable scene of the two sons walking out on their father in the restaurant.

The whole play, according to Clark, is characterized by an intellectual muddle and a lack of candor that regardless of Mr. Miller's conscious intent are the main earmark of contemporary fellow-traveling……

On the other hand, critics who praised the play because they regarded Miller as a Marxist were not wholly satisfied with it. They find the presence of Willy's capitalistic friend Charley in the Requiem irksome. Nor do they like Miller's tacit approval of Bernard's success in the capitalist system.

But **Death of a Salesman** is neither a leftist attack on American capitalism nor an approval of this system. Miller has rightly stated that his play in particular and art in general, cannot be simply equated with political theories:

"I do not believe that any work of art can help but be diminished by its adherence at any cost to a political program, including its author's and not for any other reason than that there no political program – any more than there is a theory of tragedy – which can encompass the complexities of real life. Doubtless an author's politics must be one element and even an important one, in the germination of his art, but if it is art he has created it must by definition bend itself to his observation rather than to it is opinions or even his hopes. If I have shown a preference for plays which seek causation not only in psychology but in society, I may also believe in the autonomy of art, and I believe this because my experience with **All My Sons** and **Death of a Salesman** forces the belief on me." (Miller, 'Introduction, Collected Plays, p. 36)

AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE

Soon after the last performance of **Death of a Salesman,** another play by Miller, **An Enemy of the People** opened on Broadway. This is an adaptation of the play by his mentor and master, Henrik Ibsen. This is Miller's only attempt, at adapting another man's work. Though his purpose was to show the relevance of Ibsen today, the play was far from successful and folded after only thirty – six performances.

An Enemy of the People describes the trials and tribulations of one Dr. Thomas Stockmann, a physician who has helped to develop the mineral baths that may become a tourist attraction. When the project is completed, he is rewarded with a lucrative position as the inspector of the baths. Soon, the doctor discovers that the baths are contaminated with typhoid germs. So, he proposes to publicize his findings and have the baths demolished and rebuilt. Happy that he has discovered the germs in time he is confident that his community will hail him as a hero. Several important political leaders support Dr. Stockmann. But there is one important politician, his brother, the mayor, who opposes him. He argues that the repairs will require a considerable amount of money and labour. He suggests an alternative plan – the baths be kept in operation while repairs are undertaken slowly and secretly. The good doctor tries to convince his brother that if the baths are not closed typhoid epidemic may break out. But the mayor is guided by financial considerations. The doctor takes his case to the entire village which supports the mayor rather than him. Not merely that. He is branded a traitor, an enemy of the people. As the play ends the doctor refuses to be cowed down and vows to continue his battle for truth and honesty.

THE CRUCIBLE

Miller has stated that the inspiration for his plays has been "What was in the air." In the early 1950s it was the hearings of the powerful House Un-American Activities Committee, presided over by the redoubtable senator Mccarthy, which declared that the American Communist Party posed a threat to the nation. Party members, sympathizers, "fellow travelers, indeed any one suspected" to be a friend of Russia, could be summoned by the committee. They were grilled and asked to reveal the names of friends and associates who were Communists, Marxists or even socialists. Mccarthyism became a menace in democratic America. Miller was struck by the similarities between the committee hearings and the witch trials of seventeenth century Salem, Massachusetts.

In **The Crucible** John Proctor is an ordinary man who achieves extraordinary moral victory when he is tested in the crucible of the 1962 Salem witch trials. In his struggle against the mass hysteria of his community and their unjust and authoritarian court, he loses his life but preserves his "name", his integrity.

The Crucible premiered in 1953, ran for about 200 performances and won both the Antoinette Perry and Donaldson awards as the most distinguished American Drama of the Year. It had a successful off-Broadway production five years later. Moreover, in the 50s and 60s it had three London productions, including one by Lawrence Olivier for the National Theatre, which Miller regarded as the best staging of the play till then.

The Crucible describes the disintegration of a society under the influence of mass hysteria. Beginning slowly and then gaining momentum, it dramatizes the storm that breaks ever Salem. When the play opens, a group of adolescent girls are discovered by the local minister, Reverend Parris, indulging themselves stealthily in the forest under the guidance of a superstitious Barbados servant, Tituba. To escape punishment some of them including Parris' daughter Bety and niece Abigail Williams fall into 'mysterious' trances. Two of their neighbours, the farmer John Proctor and the respected matron Rebecca Nurse look upon the girls' activities with compassion and understanding. Soon, however, a dread spreads in the town and the girls are suspected to indulge in witchcraft.

When Tituba is threatened with hanging for indulging in strange forest rituals, he confesses to demonism. Abigail, who had earlier told Proctor privately that the whole thing was a prank, now says she practiced witchcrafts, and as she discloses the names of other culprits mass hysteria spreads like wild fire in the town. It is quickly spread by many citizens, partly out of superstition, partly out of their guilts, suppressed desires and frustrations.

Ann Putnam, whose daughter is one of the victims and whose other eight children died in their infancy, is convinced that witchcraft is responsible for her misfortunes as is evident in her outburst to Rebecca Nurse:

"You think it God's work you should never lose a child, or grandchild either, and I bury all but one. There are wheels within wheels in the village, and fires within fires."

Her husband, Thomas is equally convinced of the existence of demonism in Salem but his reasons are more mercenary and selfish than his wife's. He brands his enemies as witches because he wants to avenge the legal reverses over his land and property.

On the other hand, the Reverend John Hale of Beverly, who has been invited by the community as an authority on witchcraft, regards it as a challenge to his profession and authority.

So, superstition, malice, self-interest are so rampant that they smother to the few voices of reason that want to be heard.

To escape the madness, John Proctor returns to his farm and family. But when he comes to know that Rebecca Nurse and other friends have been accused of being witches and are being persecuted, he goes back to Salem to rescue them. He is shocked to learn that Abigail Williams who had worked for the Proctors and had a brief affair with him, has accused his wife Elizabeth of witchcraft. As she is arrested Proctor realizes that the vortex has engulfed him.

The trial takes place in the third act of **The Crucible.** The panel of Judges is presided over by Deputy Governor Danforth, who agrees to hear the evidence of Proctor's current servant Mary Warren. She, however, falters in

her testimony and in desperation Proctor confesses that he committed adultery with Abigail and that is why she has implicated his wife. Elizabeth is summoned by the tribunal to verify his story. She, however, tells a lie to protect his good name. Hale believes Proctor's charge but the Deputy Governor and the presiding officer Danfoarth remains unconvinced.

Just as Hale proceeds to condemn Abigail, she indulges in hysterics as do the other girls. The action moves to a crescendo when she charges Proctor with witchcraft. Sickened by the proceedings, Proctor denounces the tribunal.

"You are pulling Heaven down and raising up a whore," he shouts at Danforth force and quits the court.

The final act belongs to Proctor: It is the day if his scheduled execution His Wife's life has been temporarily spared because she is pregnant but Rebecca Nurse has been sentenced to die along with him.

"There are orphans wandering from house to house," Hale reminds Danforth. "Abandoned Cattle bellow on the high-roads, the stink of rotting crops hangs everywhere, and no man knows when the harlots cry will end his life."

But Danforth refuses to put off the executions. He agrees to intervene on Proctor's behalf only if he confesses his collusion with demons. Finally, he surrenders and signs a confession, but when Danforth tells him that it must better shown to all the inhabitants of Salem to (Proctor) tears it to pieces. The realization dawns on him that it is better to die than betray those who have died before him and are dying everyday.

The Crucible contains a gallery of sharply drawn characters who are skillfully woven in to woof and warp of the play. The play has a large cast with more than twenty speaking parts but Miller handles than with skill and care and his minor characters are sharply etched and made memorable. Three of them – Reverend Parris, Aleigail Williams, and Giles Corey are particularly vital to the theme and development of play. Each is a gem of in depth character study.

The Reverend Parris is a key figure in the mass hysteria he helps to let loose. He is a vivid personification of the surrender of conscience for self-survival. He is more petty and mean than evil. Abigail Williams also is an embodiment of spite and hatred. She is highly frustrated after Proctor has ended their affair. Giles the irascible old man, is one of the most mysterious characters in the play. His death as a martyr precedes that of Proctor and strongly influences his final decision. Facing death by stoning, Corey refuses to confess that he is a witch.

Though the characters are based on actual persons, they are Miller's own creations. So it is with dialogue which is his own invention, though it is modeled on the spoken language of the real persons. It is bare yet eloquent in its simple images and rhythms; it carries a flavour of seventeenth century Salem, but it is not a realistic reproduction, but Miller's own version. He states that as he sat in Salem's courthouse, "reading the town records of 1692, which were of ten spelled phonetically….. [by] the court clerks or the ministers who kept the record as the trials proceeded , he then, "after a few hours of mouthing the words…… felt a bit encouraged that I might be able to handle it, and in more time I came to love its feel, like hard burnished wood. Without planning to, I even elaborated a few of the grammatical forms myself." (Introduction, The Collected Plays)

One striking feature of the speech patterns is the use of the double negative. Rebecca Nurse declares: "I am innocent and clear…… I never afflicted no child……..., I am as clear [innocent] as the child unborn." Miller also changes verbs and tenses to conform to those of the period. Aby threatens a reckoning that "will shudder you". Sometimes verbs are transformed to adjectives. Says Mary Warren, "My insides are all shuddery."

Miller uses archaic diction sparingly, to create an atmosphere of the past, ley choosing simple, everyday words such as **yea** and **nay** and **goodly.** Women are addressed as "Goody" instead of Mrs. In the above cited quotation Rebecca uses **clear** to mean **innocent.**

A characteristic of the imagery of the play is nature images relating to winter, to suggest the harshness of New England life. In contrast to these images are those of heat and fire, for the main metaphor is that of the crucible in which fire melts and purifies. Frequently used is the fire of Hell. John's passion for Abigail is described in

terms of the "heat" of animals. In the forest scene Abby uses the image of fire as both purification and passion. In the opening scene Ann, points out that there are "fires within fires" in Salem. As fire and crucible are central metaphors, the three main characters – John, Hale and Elizabeth are tested by enduring the fire of suffering which burns away their defects and makes them nobler or purer persons.

Imagery suggesting good and evil use light and dark and their association with black and white, Abigail complains that Elizabeth is "blackening" her name in the village. Lucifer's book is "black". Danforth tells John in act 4 that his "soul alone is the issue here, Mister, and you will prove its whiteness……." Abigail in the forest scene vows to "scrub the world clean" for the love of God and to make John "such a wife when the world is white again". Deriving images from household work is appropriate, for she has been a servant since childhood. One of the most vivid images, based on the simple, everyday act of weaving, appears in John's final speech," I do think I see some spread of goodness in John Proctor. Not enough to weave a banner with, but white enough to keep it from such dugs."

Red colour symbolizes murder and passion. In the last act when Danforth asks Hale why he has returned, he replies, "There is blood on my head! Can you not see the blood on my head!" Abigail, asked by Parris if her name is "entirely white" in the town, replies, "There is no blush about my name." Speaking of the soil, Proctor tells Elizabeth in act 2, "It's warm as blood beneath the Clods."

The modulations, rhythms, and even the diction of the Bible characterize Hale's speeches, especially in the final act. As he and Danforth try to convince John to save his life by admitting collusion with the devil he tells him in poetic language," I came into the village like a bridegroom to his beloved, bearing gifts of high religion; the very crowns of holy law I brought, and what I touched with my bright confidence, it died; and where I turned the eye of my great faith, blood flowed up."

Danforth's imagery is clear, sharp and precise; in act 3 he describes the age in these poetic wards, "This is a sharp time, now, a precise time – we live no longer in the dusky afternoon when evil mixed itself with good and befuddled the world. Now, by God's grace, the shining sun is up, and them that, fear not light will surely praise it". He is hardly aware of the irony of his view, for soon the night and darkness of the trials will follow. He tells Proctor, "we burn a hot fire; it melts down all concealment," Ironically the concealment of the accusers goes undetected, even when Proctor tries to expose them.

Is **The Crucible** a successful analogy for the McCarthyism that prevailed in America in the early 50s? Miller's comment was, "McCarthyism may have been the historical occasion of the play, not its theme". Had it been a one-to-one analogy between the Salem trials and the hearings of the House un-American Activities Committee, the play would be a political document and not a highly artistic play.

By 1956, Miller was a famous playwright, well-known for his crusading zeal and his fearless defence of freedom of speech. When he applied for routine renewal of his passport, the House un-American Activities Committee summoned Miller to a hearing. He refused to disclose the names of other communists and fellow travelers. He told them, "I want you to understand that I am not protecting the Communists or the Communist Party. I am trying and I will protect my sense of myself. I could not use the name of another person and bring trouble on him….. I take the responsibility for everything I have ever done, but I cannot take responsibility for another human being." He was held guilty of contempt, fined and given a thirty-day suspended jail term. He appealed against the verdict and won his case. Miller's stand before the committee is not unlike that of John Proctor in **The Crucible.**

When Miller was briefly in Hollywood in 1950 he had met Marilyn Mouroe, and the two had fallen in love. They were married in 1956 after his divorce from his first wife. He writes about her with love and compassion in his autobiography, **Time bends,** relating the joys and sorrows of their marriage. During that time he wrote no plays, but, instead, devoted three years to a writing a movie script for her, **The Misfits,** based on his short story of the same name. By the time the film was released in 1961 they had been divorced.

A VIEW FROM THE BRIDGE

About two and a half years after **The Crucible**, two new plays, **A Memory of Two Mondays** and **A view from the Bridge** opened as a double bill on Broadway. But both plays were disappointing.

The story of a **A View from the Bridge** was told to Miller by a friend who worked among longshoremen in Brooklyn. Miller originally conceived the play in one act in the classical style: "a hard, telegraphic, unadorned drama" that moved to its catastrophe in a "clear, clean line". Somewhat like the heroes of Greek tragedy, the protagonist carbone is seized by a powerful passion which leads to a fatal decision. He betrays the social code by which he lives and for which he lays down his life to regain his good "name." Lawyer Alfieri like the chorus in Greek tragedy, introduces, participates in and comments on the action. As Miller observes, "It must be suspenseful because one knew too well how it would come out, so that the basic feeling would be the desire to stop this man and tell him what he was really doing to his life."

For the London premiere the play was expanded into two acts. It is the revised version that is discussed here.

The story describes Eddie Carbone, an Italian American longshoreman living in Brooklyn with his wife Beatrice and his niece Catherine. He has brought up the girl from childhood and now that she is a grown up girl he does not want to part with her. Torn between an overt paternal protectiveness and sexual passion, Eddie threatens to destroy Catherme, Beatric and two other individuals who have come to live with them.

Marco and Rodolpho, two illegal immigrants, are given refuge by Eddie. Catherine and Radalpho fall in love and Eddie forcibly tries to destroy their relationship. But when he fails to separate them and they came closer, he reports against Rodolpho and Marco to the immigration authorities. For this he is denounced by Marco and the neighbours. Condemned by one and all, he challenges Marco to a combat. In the resultant fight he is killed by Marco and thus the play ends.

As already pointed out, the story was initially dramatized in a single act. "This version was in one act" he wrote in the introduction to his **Collected Plays** "because it has seemed to me that the essentials of the dilemma were all that was required, for I wished it to be kept distant from the emphatic flood which a realistic portrayed of the same and characters might unloose." (p.50)

In the introduction to the original version of the play, Miller elaborated further:

"I saw the characters purely in terms of action…… they are a kind of people who, when inactive, have no new significant definition as people. The form of the play, finally, had a special attraction for me because once the decision was made to tell it without an excess line, the play took a harder, more objective shape. In effect, the form announces in the first moments of the play that only that will be told which is cogent, and that this story is the only part of Eddie Carbone's life worth our notice and therefore no effort will be made to draw in elements of his life that are beneath these, the most tense and meaningful of his hours." (Miller, "On Social Plays, **A view from the Bidge**, p. 18)

The intention was good but the result was unsatisfactory. So, Miller expanded and revised the London version into two acts. When the neighbourhood was represented by twenty actors instead of four (as in the Broadway version), the larger group, like a Greek Chorus, enhanced the audience's understanding of the protagonist. As Miller says, "the mind of Eddie Carbone is not comprehensible apart from its relation to his neighbourhood, his fellow workers, his social situation. His self-esteem depends upon their estimate of him, and his value is created largely by his fidelity to the code of his culture." In the revised version, "once Eddie had been placed squarely in the social context, among his people, myth like feeling of the story emerged of itself, and he could be made more human and less a figure, a force," observes Miller.

The chorus-like character of lawyer Alfieri opens and closes the play. In the two-act version he speaks prose rather than verse, though it is poetic prose. As the play opens, Alfieri strikes the note of inevitability : Every few years there is still a case, and as the parties tell me what the trouble is, the flat air in my office suddenly washes in with the green scent of the sea, the dust in this air is blown away and the thought comes that in some Caesar's year….. another lawyer, quite differently dressed, heard the same complaint and sat there as powerless as I, and watched it run its bloody course……. This one's name was Eddie Carleone."

In enlarging the play, Miller developed the character of Eddie's wife, Bea, so that she becomes a sympathetic, wronged woman. If Alfieri is the spokesman of society and human nature, she is the voice of individual neighbours. Miller also expands the role of Catherine. If she is passive in the original version, she is now active tasting love for the first time. When Eddie learns that she is going to work, he finds fault with the neighbourhood and the company. "Near the Navy Yard plenty can happen…… And a plumbin's company! That's one step over the water front. They're practically longshoremen." He has no answer when Bea asks him, "You gonna keep her in the house all her life?"

Catherine and Bea are enthusiastic about the brothers whom they have given shelter but Eddie is suspicious. And when Rodolphio becomes the center of attention and sings a song Eddie asks him to be quiet or else he might be picked up. When he finds that his niece is attracted to Rodolpho, Eddie questions his manhood and tells Bea that he is "like a weird" and a chorus girl. He also tells Alfieri that "guy ain't right." Eddie's sexual obsession with Catherine increases as the affair between Catherine and Rodolpho advances. In the second scene of act one Bea asks Eddie, "When am I gonna be a wife again?"

In the revised version, the characters of both women are developed. Beatrice warns her niece, "I told you fifty times already, you can't act the way you act. You still walk around in front of him in your slip." She cautions her that she is now a grown woman. "You're a woman, that's all, and you got nice body, and now the time came when you said good-by. All right." Alfieri warns Eddie and is as blunt as he can be, "we all love somebody, the wife, the kids – every man's got somebody that he loves, heh? But sometimes…… there's too much," he says, "too much love for the daughter, there is too much love for the niece."

When Alfieri tells him, "let her go," Eddie's reply shows that his love for her is sexual, "I take the blankets off my bed for him, and he takes and puts his dirty hands on her like a goddam thief!" Alfieri replies, "She wants to get married, Eddie. She can't marry you, can she." Angry and desperate Eddie replies "I don't know what the hell you're talking about."

Act one ends on a note if high drama – Eddie's oral threats turn physical and he becomes violent. As Catherine says she must dance with Rodalpho, Eddie starts insulting and humiliating, even casting doubts on his manhood. He challenges the brothers to a boxing match.

The next scene witnesses even more high drama. When Catherine is alone in the house with Rodalpho, she asks him whether they could live in Italy after marriage: "I am afraid of Eddie here." Catherine is a changed young woman in the revised version. In the original version she is a passive creature, a mute witness to the quarrels between Eddie and Bea. In the enlarged version, however, she is an active and sympathetic person. Rodolpho encourages Catherine to leave Eddie and takes her to the bedroom.

As they come out, Eddie enters, drunk. He orders Radalpho to leave the house; Catherine says she will leave too. Eddie tells her not to. "He reaches out suddenly, draws her to him, and as she strives to free herself he kisses her on the mouth." A fight ensues between Eddie and Rodolpho.

Eddie's kissing Catherine confirms his incestuous passion for his niece. If this is shocking, what is even more shocking is Eddie's kissing Rodalpho. This has led some critics like Nelson to consider that there is a "possibility" of "latent homosexuality" in Eddie But this seems to be unconvincing in the face of his sexual obsession with his niece, so much so that for this he betrays his community and destroys his good name. Alfieri tells him to let her go. However, as Eddie leaves, Alfieri suspects that in the attempt to destroy Radalpho, he (Eddie) will destroy even himself.

Alfieri expresses the fears and suspicious of the audience about the catastrophe that is to follow. Eddie reports against Rodolpho and Marco to immigration authorities. "The betrayal achieves its true proportions as it flies in the face of the mores administered by Eddie's conscience – which is also the neighbours," observes Miller in the **Introduction** to the Collected Plays.

Eddie like Oedipus is expelled from the community for an abhorrent act. He also somewhat resembles John Proctor who in order to preserve his name sacrifices his life. To the neighbours, Eddie tries to defend his act as

one wronged by strangers whom he had given shelter: "to come out of the water and grab a girl for a passport…… Wipin' the neighbourhood with my name like a dirty rag! I want my name, Marco." Saying this he attacks Marco and a fight ensues. Eddie dies in the arms of Beatrice. Alfieri comes forward and utters the last words:

Most of the time now we settle for half and I like it better. But the truth is holy, and even as I know how wrong he was, and his death useless, I tremble, for I confess that something pure calls to me from his memory – not purely good, but himself purely, for he allowed himself to be wholly known and for that I think I will love him more than all my sensible clients. And yet, it is better to settle for half, it must be! And so mourn him – I admit it – with a certain…… alarm.

A view from the Bridge is a tragedy of the common man, as defined by Miller, in which the hero, regardless of his rank, is forced to "evaluate himself justly." Eddie, like Willy Loman, is unwilling "to remain passive in the face of what he conceives to be a challenge to his dignity, his image of his rightful status." Miller continues further that "the commonest of men may take on….. [tragic] status to the extent of his willingness to throw all he has into the contest, the battle to secure his rightful place in his world." His fate evokes fear in the audience, "fear of being displaced, the disaster inherent in being torn away from our chosen image of what and who we are in this world."

As Miller joints out in his introduction to the two-act version, the expansion enabled him to include "the viewpoint of Eddie's wife, and her dilemma in relation to him." Making Beatrice active rather than passive lends depth and intensity to her portrait as well as that of her husband. But despite her being an assertive and strong character, she is unable to prevent the tragedy.

As in his previous plays, Miller creates dialogue that is both realistic and poetic. Unlike **The Crucible,** in which he invented almost a new language for his seventeenth century characters, here, his people, except for Alfieri, are uneducated longshoremen and their families. To express their feelings, Miller gives them speech that is bare, enthusiastic and rhythmic. He employs active verbs and simple adjectives with little imagery except for ordinary and everyday allusions. Descriptions are vivid and direct, as in Beatrice's account early in the play, of a teenaged informer: he had five brothers and the old father. And they grabbed him in the kitchen and pulled him down the stairs – three flights his head was bouncin' like a coconut."

Omissions, double negatives and other ungrammatical devices make the language realistic but also humorous. When Catherine in act one announces a job offer, Eddie is at first hostile, then reluctantly' agrees and offers advice:

Eddie : I only ask you one thing – don't trust nobody. You got a good aunt but she's got too big a heart, you learned bad from her. Believe me:

Beatrice : Be the way you are, Katie, don't listen to him.

Eddie : [to Beatrice – strangely and quickly resentful]

You lived in a house all your life, what you know about it? You never worked in your life;"

While the speech of the longshoremen and their families sounds realistic and contemporary, Alfier's poetic words evoke the past with musical and alliterative proper names, "some Caesar's year, in Calbaria perhaps or on the cliff at Syracuse." The Brooklyn Bridge is symbolic as a link between modern Brooklyn and traditional Sicily – a bridge between the past and the present. The "view" of the title suggests an objective distancing between the action and view of it by Alfieri and the audience.

When the one-act play was staged on Broadway, the reviews were disappointing. Miller himself was dissatisfied with it: "If **A View from the Bridge** more than thirty years later has a vigorous life on stages all over the world, it is no thanks to the original production, which made it appear at best an academic and irrelevant story of revenge," says Miller "What I had written was something different, something plain and elementary and frightening in its inexorability…… the play on the stage had no tang: it lacked the indefinable webbing of human involvement that can magically unify many otherwise dismally ordinary separate parts." (Time bends, p. 354-55)

However, two years later the British premiere of the enlarged and revised play was a great success.

A MEMORY OF TWO MONDAYS

Arthur Miller had firsthand experience of the Depression: "through no fault or effort of mine it was the ground upon which I learned to stand." He started writing plays during the Great Depression. Although today the period is regarded with some romanticism, it was actually a frustrating time; everyone was suffering because there was no money.

Miller describes this play as "pathetic comedy: a boy works among people for a couple of years shares their troubles, their victories, their hopes, and when it is time for him to be on his way he expects some memorable moment, some sign from them that he has been among them, that he has touched them and been touched by them. In the sea of routine that swells around them they barely note his departure." It was written, he says in the introduction to the **Collected Plays,** "in part out of desire to relive a sort of reality where necessity was open and bare; I hoped to define for myself the value of hope, why it must arise, as well as the heroism of those who know, at least, how to endure its absence. Nothing in this book was written with greater love, and for myself I love nothing printed here better than this play."

It is not difficult to understand why this is Miller's favourite play. It contains memories of several years when he worked as a store keeper in an auto parts warehouse. In his introduction to the TV version he noted that the dusty warehouse, cold in winter and hot in summer may seem awful to viewers today, but it was "a haven in the thirties. It was a place to go; at least you had a job — this was a great thing — that's what remained with me — that I was so lucky."

Miller observes that the warehouse setting, although "dirty and unmanageably chaotic," is also, "a 'little world, a home to which unbelievably perhaps, these people like to come every Monday morning, despite what they say." The Two Mondays of the title are a Monday morning in summer when Young Bert is just beginning his job as a warehouse store boy, and a winter Monday morning when Bert is about to leave for college, having saved some money from his weekly salary. The people of the warehouse, as seen through Bert's eyes, are portrayed vividly and come to life. The mood is nostalgic, even sad at times, like Gus's describing his years at the warehouse in terms of old cars.

The play tells a simple story. Bert mixes with his fellow workers, and at the end he leaves for college while they remain. The entire action takes place in the warehouse with "factory-type windows which reach from floor to ceiling and are encrusted with the hard dirt of years".

The main characters are three middle-aged men: Raymond who has become manager by dint of hard work; Larry, who is still a clerk after long years of service; and Tom, the accountant who is almost sacked for drunkenness when the play opens but who has given up liquor at the end. The boss Mr. Eagle also belongs to the same age group. The two older characters are Gus, who is in his sixties and his friend Jim who is in his seventies. The principal younger men are Bert, who is eighteen (Miller's age in 1933 when he worked in the warehouse) and Kenneth, a young Irish immigrant who sings and recites poetry. There are two women, Agnes the telephone operator, in her 40s and Patricia, in her 20s.

Of all the workers the most interesting and memorable is Gus. Blunt and out spoken he wears a hat in the office. He and Jim are pals and spend week ends eating and drinking heavily. Gus's wife, Lilly, is invariably ill. He, like Agnes, protects the drunken Tom and threatens to quit if Tom is fired. At the end of the first Monday his wife, Lilly, dies, alone and neglected while he was drinking and carousing with friends. By the second Monday he is a reformed character; he has never recovered from the death of his wife.

When Gus receives her insurance money he goes on a pleasure trip with Girm; on the second Monday they report for work drunk. He is not afraid of Mr. Eagle who will arrive soon. In a nostalgic tribute to the years gone by, Gus sums up, in a catalogue of cars now extinct, his twenty two years at the warehouse.

He and Jim leave the warehouse even through it is only nine-thirty in the morning. On Bert's last day, at lunch

time, Girm informs that, on one last binge Gus has died.

The other workers, however, do not play with their lives and are more careful. They need their jobs. Larry has a phenomenal memory and knows where every auto part is kept in the multi story building.

He is the father of triplets and though denied a promotion buys a new car because he thinks it is beautiful. Because of the car, Patricia, the office beauty, is attracted to him. But by the second Monday he is forced to sell the car and loses Patricia too.

Within an hour and a half Miller succeeds in making the audience and readers take interest in the characters, each of whom is an individual with his own idiosyncrasies. Kenneth, who has just arrived from Ireland and is young like Bert is, perhaps, the most pathetic of them all. He is constantly singing and reciting poetry. When Bert asks him how he learned it he replies, "why, in Ireland, Bert, there's all kinds of useless occupations in Ireland." Some of his dialogue, like Bert's, is in free verse, but even his prose speeches are poetic. "It's the poetry hour, Gus, "he declares." This is the hour all men rise to thank God for the blues of the sky, the roundness of the ever lasting globe, and the cheerful cleanliness of the subway system…."

While others suffer from lassitude, Kenneth is full of drive and energy. He washes, with Berf's help, the windows reaching from floor to ceiling. But by the second Monday, in winter, Kenneth is disenchanted with life and seeks solace in drink. As Bert is about to leave for college, he advises Kenneth to regain his optimism and vibrancy To this Kenneth replies:

How's a man to live,
Freezing all day in this palace of dust
And night comes with one window and a bed
And the streets full of strangers
And not one of them's read a look through.
Or seen a poem from beginning to end
Or knows a song worth singing.
Oh, this is an ice-cold city, Mother,
And Ruosevelt's not making it warmer, somehow.

Throughout the play Kenneth, sings the Irish ballad "The Minstrel Boy", symbolic of both myself and Bert. Though like the minstrel boy, Kenneth has hope and joy at first, he loses these by the second Monday. He thinks of joining the civil service but as he tells Bert he is going to be at the warehouse for good.

The ending is pathetic. When Bert departs his companions hardly take notice. On the other hand, Bert thinks he will always remember them. He at least is going to college, but the others are, "caught by necessity and by their lives."

Both humor and pathos are there in this "pathetic comedy." Miller asserts time and again that during the Depressive people did not lose their optimism; they could laugh and enjoy as well as bemoan the hard times. The physical humors in the play derives naturally from the situations. Gus is so much larger than life that everything he does is exaggerated. Even though he cynically disapproves of the hopes of his coworkers, he is amiable and good-natured. The reactions of the workers are both humorous and typical when the washed windows reveal a next-door brothel.

As an escape from the drudgery of the warehouse, drinking ii common to almost all the workers—Gus and Jim, Tom and Kenneth. Sooner or later, they all became drunkards.

AFTER THE FALL

Miller had been absent from Broadway for about nine years. So, the public was excited when **After The Fall** premiered in 1964. However, the play was greeted with rage rather than critical evaluation. Robert Brustein commented: "Mr. Miller is dancing a spiritual striptease …. He has created a shameless piece of tabloid gossip, an act of exhibitionism which makes us all voyeurs." While some critics saw only "the most nakedly autobiographical drama put on public view," Miller protested that the "man up there isn't me … a play wright doesn't put himself on the stage, he only dramatizes certain forces within himself." The philosophical and artistic merit of the play went unnoticed, while reviewers concentrated upon the marriage of the hero, Quentin, to a popular sex goddess, Maggie. It was tempting not to notice the resemblance to Miller's marriage to the film star Marilyn Monroe, followed by divorce and her suicide by an overdose of sleeping pills.

Miller describes the play as a trial by a man's "own conscience, his own values, his own deeds." Apparently, Quentin is a lawyer.

As both prosecutor and defense attorney, he selects and considers evidence from the past before he can take a decision about the future. Miller's technique, as in **Death of a Salesman** is expressionists; incidents follow one another not in chronological order but, instead by association, one thought leading to another. "The action takes place in the mind, thought and memory of Quentin. He seeks self-knowledge with the help of Holga, whom he is going to marry. In his search he will encounter and overcome temptations that are sexual (Elsie), moral (deserting his friend Lou), and material (saving his job at Lou's expense). As Quentin is intellectually honest, he will recognize betrayals, those he commits and those committed against him by his family and friend Mickey. He will see that in the real world, after the Fall, evil cannot he faced by denial or guilt, but by assuming responsibility.

The action is like a stream of consciousness in Quentin's mind, making free associations between characters, incidents and fleeting images. The one realistic piece of setting which dominates the stage is the tower of a German Concentration Camp. As Quentin remembers people and incidents, they will be picked out by light or disappear into darkness. As in the mind, all the characters are present in the background, from which they emerge when necessary.

As the play opens Quentin, who is in his forties, separates from the others, comes to the front of the stage, and addresses an unseen listener. The listener has been differently interpreted as a psychiatrist, priest, judge, God, or the audience itself. Or he may be Quentin himself on the verge of his quest for knowledge. During the action Quentin may speak directly to the listener or participate in the action or comment on it. Making him a lawyer imposes a certain order on his account. He says, "I looked at life like a case at law."

Quentin evaluates his two previous marriages. Was he responsible for their failure? He must review these as he is about enter a third marriage with Holga, an Austrian woman who survived World War II. Has he the right, he asks the listener, to marry her? He feels guilty for failing his first wife, Louise and his second, Maggie. He also feels remorse when friend Lou's suicide saves him from defending him (Lou) before the House Un-American Activities Committee, a defense that might have cost him his job. Quentin's personal and professional conflicts reflect the larger problem that he probes and tries to resolve—the existence of evil (symbolized by the concentration camp tower) and the denial of personal responsibility.

Quentin's two marriages as he examines them, to Louise mainly in the first act and to Maggie in the second, reveal that he has searched in vain for a connection within those sacred unions, marriage and friendship. "It's like some unseen web of connection between people is simply not there," he reflects. "And I always relied on it, somehow; I never quite believed that people could be so easily disposed of." When he is informed that the head of his firm is asking him not to defend his friend Lou, he feels relieved.

Although Quentin has not had an extramarital affair, he has been tempted to do so, which Louise regards as betrayal, causing him to feel guilty. The first act ends with their divorce as inevitable.

Like other characters, Louise is presented through his eyes. She is portrayed as cold and selfish. They may have

been love when they were married; what he now recalls is a loveless marriage with mutual suspicion, betrayal and guilt. The characters of Felice, a dancer, and Elsie, Lou's wife, appear and disappear. Felice, whose divorce case Quentin has argued successfully, worships him. Felice is associated in his thoughts with Quentin's mother who also admired him. Unlike Maggie and Felice who are sympathetically drawn, Elsie is a seductress. She appears naked and inviting before Quentin (an invitation which he declines), betraying her husband Lou, his friend and client. Appearing again and again throughout the play is Holga, an Austrian whom Quentin met in Germany. She is a symbol rather than a fully developed character like Maggie or Louise. Holga carries the burden of the theme in as much as she has attained the self-knowledge Quentin seeks. "Holga teaches him the necessary lesson that guilt, loss, and betrayal are not punishments to be avoided but inevitable signs of the human condition."

The Maggie episodes develop emotionally rather than chronologically. They provide a contrast to the philosophical import of the play. Though she resembles Marilyn Monroe to some extent and may have been modeled on her, she is a convincing character in her on right. The Maggie episode is an integral part of the play reinforcing its theme in terms of human relationships and commitment. Many years later Miller would write in his autobiography the agonizing story of his marriage to Marilyn Monroe. In an articles in Life magazine shortly after the opening of the play, however, Miller would like us to take a broader view of the play: "The character of Maggie … is not in fact Marilyn Monroe. Maggie is a character in a play about the human animal's unwillingness or inability to discover in himself the seeds of his own destruction …. She most perfectly exemplifies the self-destructiveness which finally comes when one views oneself as pure victim. And she … exemplifies this view because she comes close to being a pure victim — of parents, of a Puritanical sexual code and of her exploitation as an entertainer".

Maggie is afraid of and haunted by her mother, who, like Monroe's was promiscuous. Quentin's own mother appears early in the play in an incident of betrayal. In **Timebends** Miller also associates Monroe with his mother.

Maggie assures Quentin, "I …. don't really sleep around with everybody. I was with a lot of men but I never got anything for it. It was like charity, see? My analyst said. I gave to those in need." After their marriage Maggie's jealousy, vulgar language and extravagance embitter their relationship. In their last scene together she even tries to make him take the bottle of sleeping pills, so that she can snatch it from him thus making him responsible for her death.

She swallows lot of pills; he holds her wrist and reaches for her throat. Just at that moment his mother appears. Quentin informs the listener that though Maggie survives this time she commits suicide a few moments later.

The play ends as Quentin, approaching the tower, realizes, "who can be innocent again in this mountain of skulls? I tell you what I know! My brothers died here…. But my brothers built this place…. And what's the cure? …. No, not love; I loved them all, I And gave them willing to failure and to death that I might live…." Holga appears, with her greeting, the word that opens and closes the play. "Hello!" Quentin cries, "That woman hopes," and realizes that "she hopes, because she knows."

Miller describes his style in **After The Fall** as "impressionistic." "I was trying to create a total by throwing many small pieces at the spectator." The play is poetic both in structure and in its language. Quentin's final realization is expressed in, perhaps, Miller's most poetic prose. It is unparalled in his plays for its rhythm, imagery, simplicity and perfect harmony of theme and style :

Is the knowing all? To know, and even happily, That we meet unblessed; not in some Garden of wax fruit and painted trees, that lie of Eden, but after, after the fall, after many, many deaths. Is the knowing all? And the wish to kill is never killed, but with some gift of courage one may look into its face when it appears, and with a stroke of love — to an idiot in the house — forgive it again and again … forever?"

INCIDENT AT VICHY

The main idea of **Incident at Vichy** according to Miller, continues the theme of **After The Fall** – "that when we live in a time of great murders, we are inhabiting a world of murder for which we share the guilt…. We have an investment in evils that we manage to escape, that sometimes these evils that we oppose are done in our interest…. By virtue of these circumstances, a man is faced with his own complicity with what he despises."

A psychoanalyst who had hidden in Vichy, France during the second world war before the Nazis occupied the country told Miller a story on which the plot is based: "a Jewish analyst picked up with false papers and saved by a man he had never seen before. This unknown man, a gentile had substituted himself in a line of suspects waiting to have their papers and penises inspected in a hunt for Jews posing as Frenchman." "What **Incident at Vichy** reiterates is our proclivity to evade troublesome facts so that confrontation with evil and hence our responsibility for it are avoided."

The plot unfolds in a straightforward and linear manner. In Vichy in the waiting room of a place of detention in 1942 ten men seated in a row await interrogation by the authorities. The incharge is a Nazi major, the other officers are French. The suspects are called one by one into an inner room, where the police captain is in charge, assisted by two detectives and a professor of social anthropology. Some of the suspects will be released and leave, while others will be killed. The hopes and fears of the detainees are revealed and dramatic tension mounts as each is summoned. The occupation, looks, behaviour, attitude of each of the suspects differentiates him from others and engages the sympathy as well as suspense of the reader and the spectator.

Though the men are anxious and frightened, they try to delude themselves into believing that the questioning is only routine and as long as their papers are in order they will be discharged. A waiter among them even tells them that the Nazis major, a client at his restaurant is not a really bad chap. The audience learns that the men one being taken off the streets. There is a rumour that only Jews are being picked up. **Bayard**, a railway employee informs that a train has just arrived from **Toulouse** from which cries were heard; that the engineer is Polish suggests **Auschwitz**. **Moncean**, a complacent actor, claims that even at **Auchwitz** Jews have nothing to fear. "The important thing," he says, "is not to look like a victim. Or even to feel like one," for "they do have a sense for victims." **Leduc**, the psychiatrist comments, "that is true; we must not play the part they have written for us."

When Merchand, a businessman, is interrogated and released with a pass, others are hopeful. Then the waiter's boss, who brings in coffee for the authorities, whispers to his employee that people are being burned up in furnaces. Monceau does not believe this and calls it fantastic nonsense.

Von Berg, a prince, has been arrested by mistake, may be because of foreign accent. When **Bayard** declares that the future belongs to the working class **Von Berg** asserts that most of the Nasis are ordinary working class people. When Leduc notices that there is only one guard at the door, he suggest that they overpower him and escape. But no one accepts his suggestion. Lebeau reveals that he and his parents could have emigrated to America before the German occupation but his mother would not leave. A gypsy evokes different responses, including the same prejudices as held against the Jews. Bayard thinks that the gypsy has been detained because he belongs to an inferior race; others suspect that the pot the gypsy carries is stolen one. Among the detainees are an old; bearded Jew and a fifteen year old boy. The boy' story is poignant. He had gone out of his house to pawn his mother's ring to buy food for his famished family.

Aristocrat Von Berg and psychiatrist Leduc, the last two of the detainees encapsulate the theme of the play. Von Berg says: "I would like to be able to part with your friendship. Is that possible?" **Leduc** replies that he is not angry with him: "I am only angry that I should have been born before the day when man has a accepted his own nature; that he is not reasonable, that he is full of murder, that his ideas are only the little tax he pays for the right to hate and kill with a clear conscience:" When he says that gentiles have a dislike for the Jews Von Berg denies that this is true of him. Leduc replies:

Until you know it is true of you,

You will destroy whatever truth can come out of this atrocity. Part of knowing who we are is knowing we are not someone else. And Jew is only the name we give to that stranger, that agony we cannot feel, that death we look at like a cold abstraction. Each man has his Jew; it is the other. And the Jews have their Jews. And now, now above all, you must see that you have yours – the man whose death leaves you relieved that you are not him, despite your decency. And that is why there is nothing and will he nothing – until you face your own complicity with this….your own humanity:"

Von Berg again denies involvement in this evil, for he even tried to commit suicide when the Nazis murdered his Jewish musicians. Leduc informs him that Von Berg's favorite cousin is Nazi who peresecuted Jewish doctors. Von Berg cries, "What can ever save us?" Just as he utters this the door opens and he is called to the interrogation room.

He comes out after a short while. With a pass. He forces it with the wedding ring, into Leduc's hand: "Take it! Go!" Leduc, however, is embarrassed and tells him, " wasn't asking you to do this! You don't owe me this." Von Berg insists, "Go!" As the guard appears, Leduc hands him the pass and leaves. The professor is the next suspect. On seeing Von Berg he shouts and sirens sound; the Major rushes in and confronts Von Berg. The two stand there staring at each other with fire and fury. Four new prisoners are brought in to sit on the bench, as the play ends.

The reviews were by and large favourable; some however charged the characters with being symbols rather than real and lifelike. Some critics defended the play against the charge pointing out that Leduc, Von Berg and the Major grow and develop as the action advances. Both Leduc and Von Berg through argument and discussion learn and change previously held opinions.

The Major is one of the earliest sympathetic portraits of a Nazi by an American writer. Injured in battle, he has been assigned against his wishes to be in charge of the interrogation. He tells Leduc, "I would only like to say that…… this is all as inconceivable to me as it is to you." Leduc replies:" I would believe it if you shot yourself. And better yet, if you took a few of them with you." But the Major explains that they would all he replaced: "There are no persons any more."

Cultured, educated, soft-spoken, Von Berg does not know much about the havoc caused by the war. A patron of music and fine arts he lives in the cocoon of his luxurious villa and it is only when the Nazis kill his musicians that he realizes the reality of war. And he tells Leduc: "When I told the story to many of my friends there was hardly any reaction. That was almost Worse." Von Berg learns more than any other character. Leduc's realization does not come as surprise for his previous arguments prepare us for this. But Von Berg by surrendering his pass and perhaps his life shows that it is not enough to accept guilt, one must also assume responsibility.

Leduc's speeches emphasize the theme. Miller has the unique gift to dramatize ideas. From the beginning Leduc is the most rational, as he questions the arrest. It is he who urges the others to join him in subduing the single guard. All others interpret the situation personally; only Leduc sees the universal. Leduc's final speeches persuade Von Berg to act and enrich the intellectual and emotional content of the play.

Tension and suspense build up as each suspect is called into the inner room where his fate will be decided. The inner room symbolizes the uncertain future or death.

Though the play is set in World War II, it has remained relevant since its premiere in 1964. "The occasion of the play is the occupation of France, but it is about today," says Miller. "It concerns the question of insight – of seeing in oneself the capacity for collaboration with the evil one condemns. It's a question that exists for all of us."

THE PRICE

The Price deals with the issues of free will and responsibility that were themes of **After the Fall** and **Incident at Vichy**. Some critics think Miller was writing an apolitical play in the midst of political turmoil. But Miller saw the issues of illusion and denial in **The Price** in the context of the sixties. For him the 60s were a time when Americans were looking outside themselves for salvation; both the play and life were telling him that we were doomed to perpetuate our illusions because truth was too harsh to face. Though Miller claims that his play reflects the mood of the 60s, illusion, reality and betrayal have been his themes throughout his career.

The Depression has cast its shadow over many of Miller's plays: **The Man Who Had All the Luck, Death of a Salesman**, **After the Fall** and **The American Clock**. **The Price** is no exception. Indeed, though it was produced in 1968, he had known the story since the 30s but as he said, "I can't imagine writing a play just to tell a story. My effort is to find the chain of moral being moving in a hidden way. If I can't sense that I don't know where to go". It took him about thirty years to find it. He tried it in the 50s, jotting ideas for the play in a notebook, but it wasn't until the late 60s that he noticed a shift in cultural values which reminded him of the 30s. In the midst of the idealism of the anti-Vietnam war protests and the black awakening he saw "the seeds of a coming disillusionment and recognized an indifference for personal morality". To his mind the 20s were characterized by the assumption that society was immune to moral standards. As the 60s were coming to a close he felt the same mood and, therefore, the same urgent need to come to terms with fundamental issues. As he explained, "the whole question arose as to whether any kind of life was possible that wasn't completely narcissistic, whether there was any truth in any emotion that wasn't totally cynical".

The conflict between father and sons is a recurrent them in Miller. It is the central issue in **All My Sons** and **Death of a Salesman**. It is present in **The Price** too with this difference that here it is seen from the view point of the sons. Although he is dead, Father Franz has decided the characters and destinies of his sons, Walter and Victor. In a room cluttered with the old furniture of their youth the brothers meet, or rather confront each other, after sixteen years of separation, marked by estrangement and hostility. They re-examine old values and learn that a price must be paid in the present for choices made in the past. As they defend their actions and accuse each other of selfishness and betrayal, the unlikely mediator is an eighty-nine year-old second hand dealer appropriately named Solomon. A surrogate father, he symbolically sits in the paternal chair, commenting, sympathizing, reprimanding and advising as the brothers squabble.

The plot is deceptively simple. As the house of his dead parents is about to be torn down, cop Victor meets Solomon to negotiate a price for the furniture. Victor has left a message at the office of his brother, a successful surgeon, to come to the site and approve of the price. In their two-hour confrontation each brother reexamines old family crises, blames the other and defends himself. They recognize, if not fully accept, responsibility for past actions and present situations. Although the dialogue is realistic and the time of the action is actual, Miller's symbolism, his portraits of the contrasting brothers in a common family situation, and his creation of the wise though comic Solomon make the play universal in its appeal.

That Miller regards the conflict between the two brothers as archetypal can be seen in his choice of Cain and Abel as antagonists in his next play, *The Creation of the World and other Business* (1972). Victor's and Walter's initial disagreement is upon an acceptable price for the second hand items, but deeper hostility gradually comes to the surface as they discuss the past of which the furniture is a symbol. Victor, the idealistic younger brother sacrificed his college education and career to support his father, ruined by the failure of his prosperous business during the 1929 crash. To support his father, Victor chose a policeman's job and now, nearing the age of fifty, is debating whether to take early retirement.

Act one is Victor's just as act two is Walter's. In the former, before Walter arrives, there is tension but also affection between Victor and his wife, Esther. She believes that he has suffered because he sacrificed his career to enable his brother to go to medical school and become wealthy and famous. She is convinced that the money from the sale of the furniture should go to her husband and so she is there to see that he gets the right

price: "he can never keep our minds on money! We worry about it, we talk about it, but we can't seem to want it. It do but you don't. I really do, Vic, want it! Vic? I want money!" Her wish is understandable, for all their life they have lived modestly on his meager salary. To her the money to be paid for the furniture could be utilized for all the minor comforts they could not afford. In act two when Walter offers Victor a handsome amount (if the furniture becomes a tax deductable donation), Esther is emphatic that Victor be rewarded materially for his earlier sacrifices. Embarrassed to be seen in public with him in uniform, she goes to the cleaners to collect his civilian jacket.

When he is alone with Solomon he recalls his frustrations in life: making decisions without being aware of their consequences, like dropping out of school to support his father; "we always agreed, we stay out of the rat race and live our own life. That was important. But you shovel the crap out the window, it comes back under the door - it all ends up she wants, she wants. And I can't really blame her - there is just no respect for anything but money. At the very end of the first act, just as Victor has accepted the price and is receiving Solomon's money Walter appears. He is also unhappy. Though successful in his profession he is very frustrated in his personal life. He rarely meets the children of his broken marriage and has had a nervous breakdown. He also feels guilty for deserting his father to pursue his career. Now in his mid fifties, he will try to defend his actions and argue that Victor should have thought of his career; their supposedly penniless father had saved thousands of dollars.

In the verbal war fare between the brothers, in act two Victor presents himself as the loyal son and Walter as a selfish one. The latter, however, regards him as an idealistic fool and himself a realist: "There was nothing here but a straight financial arrangement … And you proceeded to wipe out what you saw".

In his Author's Production Note at the end of the published text, Miller warns the actors of Victor and Walter to maintain "a fine balance of sympathy". Walter, notes Miller, "attempting to put into action What he has learned about himself", and the actor "must not regard his attempts to win back Victor's friendship as mere manipulation." Miller explains the theme of the play." As the world now operates, the qualities of both brothers are necessary to it, surely their respective psychologies and moral values conflict at the heart of the social dilemma". He says, "the production must therefore withhold judgement in favor of presenting, both men in all their humanity and from their own viewpoints. Actually, each has merely proved to the other what the other has known but dared not face. At the end, demanding of one another what was forfeited to time, each is left touching the structure of his life".

Miller's insistence that the production be fair and balanced in creating sympathy for both brothers did not find favour with criticsl oath to cater to the taste of the audiences. He explained in an NBC TV interview in 1968 that in The Price: I have done something which is probably intolerable. I've suspended judgement. I've simply shown you what happens when you take these two courses and the price you pay for being responsible, and hopefully, it would agitate people to think about this". In his plays, the author noted, "you are pretty well cued in to what's happening from moment to moment and ultimately you arrive at a paradox which, because I think I don't let you off the look, is quite intolerable. You want me to tell you".

The paradox in *The Price* comes in the second act. The audience is prepared to see Walter through Victor's eyes until Walter gives a different interpretation of past events. As Gerald Weales has pointed out, The Price is an extremely talky play, with a curious blend of psycho analysis and Ibsenite revelation. The revelation in act 2 creates dramatic conflict and reveals more fully the characters of the brothers. A common Miller theme illusion vs reality emerges as they re-evaluate their past and the motives for their choices.

The setting provides visible proof of the family's affluence. Expensive, heavy, solid furniture is piled up in the attic, the favourite place of Victor and his father. Living on "garbage", throw-away food from restaurants, the elder Franz sat all the time in the overstuffed arm-chair (at center age now occupied by Solomon), listening to the radio and looked after by Victor.

Victor recalls that when he asked Walter for a loan for college fees, the latter replied, "Ask Dad for money". When Victor does so, the father merely laughs. At this Victor walks to a park. In an emotional speech he reveals why he could not desert his father, blamed by his mother and abandoned by Walter.

The grass was covered with men. Like a battlefield: a big open-air flophouse. And not bums – some of them still had shined shoes and good hats, busted businessmen, lawyers, skilled mechanics. Which I'd seen a hundred times. But suddenly – you know? – I saw it there was no mercy. Any where … One day you're the head of the house, at the head of the table, and suddenly you're shit overnight. And I tried to figure out that laugh How could he be holding out on me when he loved me?"

(The Price, Penguin, p 88)

Walter, however, quickly dispels Victor's illusion that they were brought up to believe in each other; that only he could save their father: "Were we really brought up to believe in one another?" He asks. "We were brought up to succeed, weren't we? Why else would he respect me so and not you?" He reminds Victor of their father's laugh when he (Victor) asked him for money. "What you saw behind the library was not that there was no mercy in the world, kid. It's that there was no love in this house. There was no loyalty. There was nothing here but a straight financial arrangement, that's what was unbearable" (p. 89)

Point, counterpoint, argument and counter argument as in courtroom drama – this is what sustains the dramatic conflict. As soon as one brother presents his defense it is demolished by the other. And this see-saw battle continues till the end. Each case must be presented with equal weight and force. Miller was anxious that the audience should not pass judgement on Victor or Walter. The play, Miller said, was finally about love. The brothers love each other and want to come together, but can't.

Walter's belief that they "were brought up to succeed", would explain his motivation to leave the father, attend medical college and become an eminent surgeon. But it also reveals why the crash crushed their father and why Victor chose a safe job. After the elder Franz's success ended in failure, Walter was motivated even more strongly to succeed. In the "Production Note" Miller says, "from entrance to exit, Walter is trying to put into action what he has learned about himself"…

Walter tries to explain to Victor and Esther how he has changed since he left home; "The time comes when you realize that you have not merely been specializing in something – something has been specializing in you; … And the whole thing comes down to fear, he tells them, "the slow, daily fear you call ambition and cautiousness, and piling up the money". But when he began taking risks, he says, "suddenly I saw something else. And it was terror. When Victor asks "Terror of what?" Walter responds, "Of it ever happening to me … as it happened to him. Overnight, for no reason, to find yourself degraded and thrown down". He asks "You know what I am talking about, don't you? Isn't that why you turned your' back on it all?" Victor replies, "Partly Not altogether, though".

There is more to come. Walter wants that Victor should accept at least some responsibility for his sacrifice and not place all the blame on him for deserting their father and not sending him (Victor) for college. Walter discloses that he telephoned their father to offer to pay the tuition (a message never delivered), insisting that his brother should not join the police and waste his talent. The father's reply was, "Victor wants to help me. I can't stop him".

Walter's last disclosure is even more painful to Victor. When Victor was supporting him, their father had about four thousand dollars. He had asked Walter to invest it fearing that some day Victor would desert him. Victor argues that he had no choice but to remain. Pointing to the harp Walter tells him; "Even then it was worth a couple of hundred, may be more! Your degree was right there. There is no doubt that Walter does feel some responsibility for his brother's lost opportunities, for he offers him a job in his hospital. Victor's reaction is an angry one: "Why do you have to offfer me anything?" "There's a price people have to pay. I've paid it, it's all gone. I haven't get it any more. Just like you paid, didn't you? You've got no wife, you have lost your family, you are rattling around all ever the place?"

After they have re-evaluated their past, denied personal responsibility and defended their earlier choices, there is a faint hope that the brothers might at last sink their differences. But as Miller remarks, "they think they have achieved the indifference to the betrayals of the past that maturity confers. But it all comes back; the old angry

symbols evoke the old emotions of injustice, and they part unreconciled. Neither can accept that the world needs both of them – dutiful man of order and the ambitious selfish creator who invents new cures" (Miller, Timebends, 542).

Although for three decades he tried to prevent the kind of disaster his father suffered, Walter has learned a painful truth: "I only got out alive when I saw that there was no catastrophe, there never had been." He thinks if Victor could recognize his past self-delusion, they will resolve their differences;

We invent ourselves, Vic, to wipe out what we know. You invent a life of sacrifice, a life of duty; but what never existed here cannot be upheld. You were not upholding something, you were denying what you knew they [their parents] were. And denying yourself. And that's all that is standing between us now – an illusion, Vic. That I kicked then in the face and you must uphold them against me. But only saw then what you see now – there was nothing here to betray. I am not you enemy. It is all an illusion and if we could walk through it, we could meet. (P. 90).

But not only can they not meet, their accusations gather momentum. Victor tries to force Walter to confess to some responsibility to thwart his career.

Victor: you came for the old hand shake didn't you! The Okay! … And you end up with the respect, the career, the money and best of all, the thing that nobody else can tell you so you can believe it that you're one hell of a guy and never harmed anybody in your life! Well you won't get it, not till I get mine! Walter : and you? You never had any hatred for me to destroy me with this saintly self-sacrifice , this mockery of sacrifice? (p. 92).

Shouting, "you will never again make me ashamed! And throwing their mother's gown at Victor, Walter leaves. His angry outburst alarms Victor. But Solomon advises him: "Let him go… What can you do?" Acting like his father in whose chair he is sitting, Solomon offers him sane advice.

Miller describes Solomon "a phenomenon". An Old Testament figure he is an original, wise and ancient. He is Miller's equivalent of the Elizabethan wise fool, in the same class as Feste (Twelfth Night) and the fool in **King Lear**. With a Russian Yiddish accent, Solomon personifies the theme of the play: on the realistic level he examines, evaluates, and offers a price for the actual furniture; in a symbolic parallel Victor and Walter reexamine the past which the furniture evokes and then realize the price each has paid for his choice. Victor cannot trust Walter because of his behaviour in the past; when Victor says it's good furniture, Salomon remarks, "I was also very good; now I am not so good. Time, you know, is a terrible thing". With comments applied to the furniture but true of the brothers' relationship, Solomon reminds him that values change with the times. "People don't live like this any more. This stuff is from another world. So I am trying to give you a modern viewpoint". The view point each brother has of the other is not up-to-date, it belongs to the past.

The very solidity of the furniture valued in the past, is out of fashion today, says Solomon: "the average he'll take one look it will make him very nervous… because he knows its never gonna break". He bangs on the library table to drive home his point. "A man sits down to such a table, he knows not only he's married, he's got to stay married – there is no more possibilities".

Eighty-nine year old, Solomon is reluctant to buy such a large quantity of furniture which may require more years to sell than are left to him. He came in the hope of getting some nice prices. To sell all the furniture "could take a year, a year and a half. For me that's a big bet". He is not a shirker; "The trouble is I love to work".

While delaying his offer he is carefully examining the furniture, expert that he is. He is eating to keep up his energy. He eats a hard-boiled egg and a chocolate bar, describes incidents from his long life. He philosophizes, from drawing upon his vast experience. He pretends to leave at one point when victor loses his temper, "No, I don't need it" and telling him, "And don't forget it – I never gave you a price".

At last as Victor is about to ask him to go, Solomon decides, "I'm going to buy it! I mean I'll … I'll have to live that's all, I'll make up my mind! I'll buy it. As he hops from piece to piece, taking notes and making estimates, mementos of the affluent past appear: a robe, a top rat, evening gowns. And from all this he could go so broke, asks Salomon. "And he couldn't make a come back?" Well, some men don't bounce, you know, is replies Victor.

With his zeal for life, Solomon is the opposite of the elder Franz, who after the crash lost the will to live. “Listen, I can tell you bounces. I was busted 1932; then 1923 they also knocked me out; the panic of 1904, 1898… but to lay down like that.” Like the furniture Solmon was strong is his youth, As an acrobat, he was the one at the bottom”, in a vaudeville act The Five Solomon’s, “may be fifty theatres”. He left Russia at the age of twenty-four: “I was a horse them days… nothing ever stopped me. Only life.."

While the depression, their parents deaths and their estrangement have cast a shadow over the lives of Victor and Walter, Solomon’s nostalgic memories of his daughter are a reminder that domestic tragedy is not uncommon. Time and again, he refers to his daughter. First he compares Victor to her: “you are worse than may daughter! Nothing in the world you believe nothing you respect – how can you live? Near the end of act one he confides that his daughter, who “had, a lovely face, large eyes, has been appearing to him every night, “I lay down, to go sleep, so she sits there. And you can’t help it, you ask yourself – what happened? May be I could have said something to her… May be I did say something… it’s all…”

While the brothers live in a make believe world of illusions… Victor that he sacrificed his career for his selfish brother, Walter that he chose self preservation and his brother self deception – Solomon is a realist. He knows that time is a terrible thing” that change is inevitable. He knows like a wise man that adversity must be faced and misfortune accepted. Near the end of the play he alludes to his daughter for a third time. “Every night I lay down to sleep, she’s sitting there, I see her clear like I see you. But if it was a miracle and she came to life, what would I say to her?" Although he respects Walter, Solomon does not hesitate offering him advice saying that the tax deduction may be disallowed, and defending Victor when he accepts a price rejected by Esther and Walter.

In the quarrel between the brothers in act two, Esther plays an active role. It is because of her that the play remains a drama and does not degenerate into a debate… Though she and Victor disagree, there is understanding and love between them, in contrast to Walter and his ex-wife. Knowing her husband, she rightly suspects that Victor will, rather than negotiate, accept a price that is too low. Now that their son is in college she is tired of leading a frugal life and believes that they deserve all the money; she is angry when Victor wants to share it with Walter, and feels relieved when the latter offers all of it to his brother. Their reactions are different when Walter discloses to them their father easily could have supported himself as well as paid for Victor’s tuition. Victor remarks, "The man was a beaten dog …. How do you demand his lat buck - ? But Esther reacts angrily, “It was all an act. Beaten dog! He was a calculating liar. And in your heart you knew it! No wonder it all seemed like a dream to me – it was; a god damned nightmare”.

Esther has another vital role in the play; it is she who reveals, for Victor is too proud to admit it, the hardships of their married life: “We lived like mice” their furniture was “Worn and shabby and tasteless. And I have good taste”. She sums up their life, “It’s that everything was always temporary with us. It’s like we were never anything, we were always about-to-be”.

She does not want to lose the opportunity to gain some money (Walter’s office of tax-deduction saving). She loses her temper and gives Victor an ultimatum.

“You can’t go on blaming everything on him or the system or God knows what else! You’re free and you can’t make a move, Victor, and that’s what’s driving me crazy… You take this money! On I am washed up”. Walter’s reentry saves Victor from replying.

At the end it is Esther who narrates the sad story of her married life. "I was nineteen years old when I first walked up those stairs – is that’s believable. And he had a brother who was the cleverest, most wonderful young doctor … in the world. As hed be soon. Somehow, some way … and a rather sweet, in offensive gentleman, always waiting for the news to come on.. And next week, men we never saw or heard of will come and smash it all apart and take it all away. So many times I thought – the one thing he wanted most was to talk to his brother, and that if they could – But he’s come and he's gone. And I still feel it – isn’t that terrible? It always seems to me that one little step more and some crazy kind of forgiveness will come and lift up everyone. (P. 93).

Brought closer by the confrontation, Esther and Victor go off to see a movie. She does not insist on his changing into his civilian clothes, says good bye to Solomon, and “walks out with her life”. Victor puts on his policemen’s

jacket and tells Solmon he will return for masks and a couple of other items. While Walter has flung at him the dress representing their mother, Victor has accepted their past family life.

The Price begins and ends, with laughter. Perhaps, it is appropriate "Though scarcely a comedy, it is a play in which humour has a vital role" points out Bigsly. That it is so is to a great extent because of Gregory Solomon. It is doubtful whether Miller could have created such a figure earlier in his works until After the Fall in 1964. It took long for Miller to assimilate the meaning both of genocide and survival. "Now the guilt of the survivor, gives way to the celebration of the survivor", Solomon is the result, a man who at the very end of his life can now believe in possibility again.

There is, however, another kind of laughter in the play that is not generated by Solomon or inspired by an old record. This too comes from the past. It is the laughter which haunts Victor's memory, the laughter with which his father had greeted his request to finance his college education. This laughter is crude and self mocking. That in the end it is wiped out by the present laughter shows that Miller is offering a certain grace. The present may be price we pay for the past but it is not perhaps without its redemption.

In discussing the language of his plays, Miller notes, "my own tendency has been to shift styles according to the nature of my subject". In **The Price** the speech of Esther, Victor and Walter is simple, sharp and precise; it is realistic though a little heightened. The language Miller invents for Solomon, however, is distinctively his own and like that of no other character in his work. Its basic feature is its Russian – Yiddish idiom. His dialogue is in turn humorous, aphoristic and ironic. If even style is the man, it is true of him. His accent and his age differentiate him from the brothers.

His wise and witty remarks are made memorable by their idiomatic expression, which is achieved by the use unorthodox syntax and strange metaphors. Verb tenses are ungrammatical: "I never dealed with a police man". The order of adjectives and adverbs is reversed; metaphors are exotic: "Anything Spanish Jacobean you'll sell quicker a case of tuberculosis". Aphorisms are expressed in a unique fashion: "In a day they didn't build Rome".

It is characteristic of Miller's art that every element of the play has it purpose: structure, language, and symbolism reveal character and theme. He is master of economy; not a word is wasted. As Gerald Weales has noted "talk is both tool and subject". In the first act suspense is created by the extraordinary sight as the curtain rises: lots of furniture piled high. Interest is aroused by the situation – waiting for the offer of a price, by the disagreement between Esther and Victor and by the arrival of Walter which shatters hopes of a bargain.

The conflict between Walter and Victor gathers momentum as act two proceeds. It begins with Walter's rejection of the price offered; Esther supports Walter, Victor resents her implication that he is incompetent. When Walter suggests tax deduction, Victor suspects his motives. Now each successive speech reveals more and more of the past and upsets present assumptions. Finally, Miller avoids a happy ending, the brothers are unable to resolve their differences.

The deceptively simple realistic dialogues and action, crafted by Miller left some critics dissatisfied when the play premiered in 1968. However, the symbolic furniture piled high in the attic and a larger than life character like Solomon make the play more than realistic. Another complaint about the play was that action is static, nothing is changed during the action. This is far from true. In Solomon's words, "what changed, of course, was the viewpoint … as the audience was drawn first to one character, then to the other; the result was one of the rarest of dramatic (or human) experiences, understanding, sympathy, with all".

Verbal metaphors advance the action and reveal characters. It was Victor's walk to the park which led to his decision to become a cop walking the beat to support his father. Looking back at this life he says, "all I can see is a long, brainless walk in the street". His decision caused destitution that is captured in such images as: they ate garbage and lived "like mice", burying away our existence, down the sewer". Many images are based on the household. Advising Victor to take a decision on retirement Esther says, "It is like pushing against a door for twenty five years and suddenly it opens… and we stand there". Victor reacts angrily to Walter's offer of an administrative job. You can't walk in with one splash and wash out twenty eight years".

Often both past and present have a dreamlike quality Solomon tells Victor: "I pushed, I pulled, I struggled in six different countries … It's tell you it's dream, it is a dream. Esther describes the strangeness of Victor's wearing his first uniform as "a masquerade; years later he is "walking around like a zombie ever since the retirement came up. Walter regards over assessing the furniture, for a tax credit as a "dream world". To Esther the misery of their destitute married life is both dream and nightmare: She comments: "I knew it was all unreal. I knew it and I let it go by. Will, I can't any more.

Both brothers emphasize that one has to pay the price for past actions which is the theme of the play. Walter describes his profession as a "strange business, with too much to learn and far too little time to learn it. And there is a price you have to pay for that… there's simply no time for people" When Victor is offered a job at the hospital he suspects a payoff because he is unqualified. "There is a price people pay. I have paid it". What the play suggests is that there is no outsider who can lay down moral values. Each man must set his own price on his action and then learn to accept his evaluation.

The furniture and other items symbolize the past and the brothers' clothes the present. In the beginning of the first act Esther does not want to be seen with Victor in his uniform (why must every body know your salary). At the same time the uniform also symbolizes law and order; a person wearing it might well sacrifice his life for another, as Victor has done. Walter's camel hair coat and confidence imply success. Victor recalls to Solomon, "the few times he'd come around, the expression on the old man's face – you'd think God walked in. The respect, you know, what I mean? The respect!" Solomon agrees, well sure, he had the power. The prosperity of their boyhood is suggested by the father's tap hat and their mother's evening gowns.

While the arm chair in the center of the stage (in which Solomon seats himself) symbolizes the father, who was confined it after his fall, the harp represents the mother. Walter offers it to Victor who declines – "nobody plays". Victor was his mother's favorourite, as Walter points out with some envy: He tells Esther that his mother adored him. Both acts end with Solomon counting out the money, the price paid for the furniture, into Victors hand, symbolizing that the present pays a price for the past.

After purchasing the furniture, Solomon is left alone on the stage. He goes over to the phonograph and plays a record, the same one heard at the beginning before any dialogue was spoken. As Victor joined in the laughter earlier, so Salomon does now, as the curtain falls slowly.

Writing about **The Price,** Miller says, "In the milttancy of the sixties… I saw the seeds of coming new disillusionment. Once again we were looking almost completely outside ourselves for salvation from ourselves the play and life seemed to be telling me that we were doomed to perpetuate own illusions because truth was too costly to face. At the end of the play Gregory Solomon finds an old laughing record and, listening to it, starts laughing uncontrollably, nostalgically, brutally, having come closest to acceptance rather than denial of the deforming betrayals of time". (Timebends, p. 542).

Some Topics for Discussion

Before discussing any topic the student must form his own opinion based on a close reading of the play. The edition recommended is: Arthur Miller: **The Price** (Penguin Plays).

1. Discuss the conflict between father and sons and Victor and Walter.
2. Comments on the role of Gregory Solomon in **The Price.**
3. What is the role of Esther in the play?
4. Discuss the use of symbolism in the play
5. In The Price "The past presses on the present and the present reinvents the past". Elaborate.
6. Bring out the contrast between Victor and Walter.
7. Discuss the significance of the title.
8. "Though scarcely a comedy, it is a play in which humour has a vital role". Discuss.

MILLER'S 1970s PLAYS

The decade of the 1970s was a period of turmoil and turbulence. The American invasion of Cambodia leading to the bloody protests of Kent State University, the withdrawal from Vietnam after many years of protests at home, South Vietnam's collapse, Watergate and the resignation of a president under threat of impeachment all shook the very foundations of American democracy.

Miller wrote three plays in the seventies that dwelt upon cultural differences. **The Creation of the World** and **Other Business** and **The American Clock** offer reflections on the issues of the 70s. *The Archbishop's Ceiling* . (Written in 1977 but revised in 1984) deals with a world that has lost moral values. Two plays present an ideal and the other puts the ideal into confrontation with the real.

In **The Creation of the World** and **Other Business** Miller has produced his own interpretation of Genesis. It has been variously called religious parody and a comic reworking of creation. The play includes the creation of Eve, the Fall, and the Cain and Abel story, hardly suitable for the comic treatment Miller gives it. The source of humour is various anachronistic insertions, including comments by characters which sound more like 70s conversations in New York than momentous dialogues in the Garden of Eden.

In this play Miller attempted to demytholozie and localize biblical events. Miller tried in it what Shaw had done in *Caesar and Cleopatra* and **Saint Joan**. Miller has made mythic figures real and life like "In the words of C.W.E Bigsby the play "is a consciously naive attempt to trace human imperfection to its source by unwinding the process of history and myth. On the surface, the play seems out of place in the Miller canon, but as he himself observed," there are reverberations of all my plays in this one. It's ray, but with an underlying earnestness."

The play is remarkable for Miller's reinterpretation of God and Lucifer, who represent forces of good and evil. The play opens with a confession by God. Miller's God is a learning God and the universe an evolving one.

Lucifer apparent selfishness is an evil not easily identifiable as such. Far from a disaster, he sees the Fall as opportunity to join forces with God. Miller's genesis is related to the problems of contemporary world in which if appears we have chosen Lucifer over God. The play may or not be seen as an apology for Judeo. Christianity, but it is a dramatization of moral issues. It offers a new cosmology for a world in need of fundamental revaluation, a world in which mankind in general and the individual in particular assume responsibility for their actions and for their world.

Miller idealized his conceptions in *The Creation of the world, but in The Archbishop's Ceiling* these idealizations are put to hand test. The latter play is set in the capital city of an Eastern Bloe country (Miller identifies it as Czechoslovakia). Adrian, an American novelist, makes a surprise visit to his literary friends in that city, a visit that is his poorly disguised attempt to gather material for a novel he is writing, to capture the difficulties of living under a totalitarian regime.

Adrian meets his old friend Maya, a poet who has given up poetry and joined the state-run radio. Her former lover is Marcus, a former dissident who has become an unofficial host for foreign literary visitors. Sigmund is another dissident who attacks the regime though others think it is more lenient than the old one. This group of four, plus a Danish whom Marcus picks up, meet in Marcus's government – allocated apartment, the former residence of the country's archbishop. It is a large, dilapidated, formerly luxurious set of rooms. The ceiling of the living room oppressively dominates the action. In this ceiling it is presumed there is concealed microphone allowing the state to over hear all. Millen's use of the microphone is ingenious, employed in the play at various levels. At one level, the microphone represents the violation of privacy by the totalitarians regime. At the symbolic level it represents the invasion of Lucifer into God's former house. Seen in this light, the play could seem little more than a simple allegorical tale of good subdued by evil.

Miller, however, goes beyond this superficial level by having the microphone work upon its victims at a subtle psychological level. It discourages genuine human communication. Because everyone in the room assumes that the state is overhearing what they say, they never fully reveal themselves. At another level the microphone

stands for the omnipresent ear of God which was embedded in the original ceiling decorations. That has now been replaced by the multiple ears of Lucifer, represented by the totalitarian state.

It is obvious why the play finds its setting in an East European country. But as Miller notes, we must remember that in the 70s when the play was written the "White House was bugged, businesses were bugging competitors to defeat their strategies and Watergate and the publication of Pentagon Papers … demonstrated that the Soviets had little to teach American presidents about domestic espionage". While Miller points out the political significance, he adds that eventually "the real issue changes from a political one to the question of what effect this surveillance was having on the minds of people who had to live under such ceilings, on whichever side of the cold war they happened to be".

Miller returns to the American scene with **The American Clock**. The play is set in the 1920s and 1930s. The play initially depicts a rich and comfortable country. That world is shattered by the Great Depression. Yet people seem content to wait for a return to prosperity. What is required is something or some one to return America to the old prosperity. Ironically it is World War II. Which brings the country out of the Depression.

In his autobiography, **Time bends** Miller states about **The Ceiling and the Clock**:

"Both were hard-minded attempts to grasp what I felt life in the seventies had all but lost – a unified concept of human beings, the intimate psychological side joined with the social-political. To put it another way, I wanted to set us in our history by revealing a line to measure from. In Clock it was the objective facts of social collapse, in *Archbishop*, bedrock circumstances of real liberty." (p. 587)

MILLER IN 1980s

During the 1980s Miller wrote four plays: **Some Kind of Love Story**, **Elegy For a Lady**, **I Can't Remember Anything** and **Clara**. The plays are dramatic, with sharp dialogue and varied styles.

Miller's themes in these plays are: grief, old age, memory, betrayal and disappointment in relationships that are friendly, sexual, political and familial. The duration of the action varies from twenty minutes to two hours. Miller has remarked that his subject determines his style, which he may change from play to play "in order to find speech that springs naturally out of the characters and their backgrounds." *Elegy* is dream like, *Love Story* is a detective story and **Can't Remember** is realistic. In mid eighties when Miller reached seventy, he write his autobiography *Time bends*. The four new plays produced in the 80s cover the emotions from comedy to tragedy.

In 1982 *Love Story* and *Elegy* were presented in New Haven, Connecticut, directed by Miller. In an "Author's Note" Miller declares that "in different ways both works are passionate voyages through the masks of illusion to an ultimate reality." The reality in *Love Story*, says Miller, is "Social reality and the corruption of justice." As the only witness to a murder for which an innocent man has been imprisoned. Angela, a call girl, holds the key to its solution. Being "delusionary", she both "conceals and unveils" the facts in order to hold the attention of private detective O'Toole, her ex-lover.

In her last interview with Tim, Angela assumes three of her multiple personalities: the tough but frightened call-girl, an eight year old girl and a cultured lady. O'Toole suspects her fears are imaginary, including her claim that cops in a "Cruiser" are parked just outside the door. During the meeting Angela discloses that she has known intimately three of the main figures in the case: the chief of detectives, murdered drug dealer who supplied him and the prosecutor, who at the trial obtained a verdict of guilty for an innocent spectator. In these associations Angela has seen police corruption, during peddling, and miscarriage of justice. Miller describes her as both "dedicated to clearing an innocent man and possibly implicated in his having been condemned. She is part where and part challenge to his [O'Tooles] moral commitment to justice, and of course the reviver of his moribund sexuality." When O'Toole threatens to abandon the case, she reminds him", I am the only one alive who knows. There are names that' knock your head off." She tantalizes him with the thought that "the whole criminal justice system could be picked up by the tail like a dead rat."

In both this play and **Elegy for a Lady**, observes Miller, "the objective world grows deem and distant as reality seems to consist wholly or partly of what the characters need require it to be, leaving them with anguish of having to make decisions that they know are based on illusion and the power of desire." (Time bends, p. 590)

Elegy for a Lady deals with grief and love and old age, and about despair and hope. Its funeral tone echoes the music Miller describes at the opening: "a fine, distant fragility, a simple theme, repeated – like unresolved grief." The two characters are nameless; they are called Man and Proprietress. **'Elegy'**, Miller says, "is an attempt to write a play with multiple points of view – one for each of the characters, plus a third, that of the play…. like the neutrality of experience itself." The setting is dreamlike: a boutique without walls, its displays "suspended in space."

A well dressed old man enters the boutique, asking the proprietress, "Can you help me?" He is looking for a gift for his dying lover. As he selects and rejects various items, the story of his love unfolds. While he is describing the relationship from his point of view, he notices that the proprietress is the same age as his lover. The man realizes that it was their "uncommitment" that makes it difficult for him to choose a gift.

From the beginning the proprietress seems to speak on behalf of the man's lover. She insists that the illness may not be as serious as he thinks, that there are cures. She tries to comfort him with the thought that the lover may be terrified of an operation. Miller points out that "at moments the proprietress seems actually to be the dying lover herself. A play of shadows under the tree of death."

The Proprietress suggests to the man another facet of the affair. They never spoke, he says, "of negative things." "You met only for pleasure, she says. "Yes," the man replies, "But it was also that we both knew there was no where it could go. Not at my age. So things tend to float pretty much on the surface".

Her comments lead to his recognition that "if she makes it…. it would not be good for us – to have shared such agony. It won't cure age. Embracing him the proprietress says, "She wants to make it stay exactly as it is…. for ever." He decides upon a gift – an antique watch. The lover may or may not live. What has died, and what the man is lamenting is the affair.

I Can't Remember Anything and **Clara** were first staged in 1987. Miller observes that he became "more and more deeply absorbed by a kind of imploding of time – moments when a buried layer of experience suddenly surges upward to become the new surface of one's attention and flashes news from below." (**Time bends**, 590)

The play gives a gently humorous account with somber over ones, of an evening meal by two elderly friends, a man and a woman in the man's small country house.

Leo, an armchair Marxist and Leonara, a wealthy widow, discuss death in a matter-o-fact manner. She eats with Leo everyday and drives her car dangerously. Because she believes that "this country is being ruined by greed, mendacity, and narrow-minded ignorance," she prefers to ignore present events and evades responsibility by saying she cannot remember anything.

She departs, as he cautions her to drive carefully and observes, "We could have a lot more interesting conversations if you'd stop saying you can't remember anything." "Or if you could occasionally learn to accept bad news?" she retorts. He reminds her to phone when she gets home, and the play ends with her call.

Clara is the more complex of the two plays, a character study of a conscience – stricken Albert Kroll. The reviews were disappointing. One reviewer complained that "Miller is continually presenting shadowy events that haven't quite happened within imagery that makes no sense" Miller replied that the critics failed to understand the main character or even the story.

The story is presented clearly and economically; as the action unfolds, facets of Kroll's character are revealed, and an incident buried in the past creates dramatic interest and resolution at the end. In a blood spattered room in a New York apartment, Kroll discovers the body of his murdered daughter; he is lying on the floor in a state of shock as Detective Lieutenant Fine enters.

The action, with flashbacks, consists of Fine's dialogue with Kroll to discover the name of the murderer believed to be a Hispanic man released from jail term served for killing a girl-friend. Clara, who was engaged in the work of rehabilitation of former prisoners was having an affair with him, Fine interrogates Kroll to know the man's name, but he can't remember. Kroll feels guilty for instilling in Clara the idealism that made her vulnerable.

To show the way a buried memory comes back, Miller employs flash bulbs of the police photographers to denote flashes from Kroll's memories of Clara, some of them enacted. As she talks with her father on a visit with her lover, Kroll tries to express his disapproval, but Clara defends the murder as "rage" and an "illusion". After the incident, Kroll admits to Fine, "I guess I am a little ashamed of one thing. I didn't tell Clara how strongly I felt about this man."

By the end of Kroll's odyssey through memory he recognizes truths he earlier denied, and he regains his lost idealism. Ironically, it is not the grilling of Fine but, rather, the playing of an old record of Kroll singing which enables him to recall the name of the suspect, but, more important, his old faith in people.

Music and memory enable Kroll to gain recognition and acceptance. As Miller observes, "Must he disown it [his earlier ideal], suffer guilt and remorse for having missed his child? Or, despite everything, confirm the validity of the ideal and his former trust in mankind, in effect keeping faith with the best in himself….. The play ends on his affirmation; in her catastrophe he has rediscovered himself" (Time bends, p. 591).

Both these plays describe the pain of recollection, whether in unpleasant relationship of two aged individuals who were once young and glamorous or in an experience such as Kroll's, of going to World War II with hope and faith only to lose them later in life.

The publication of **Time bends**, Miller's autobiography in 1987 brought a number of rave reviews. Liz Smith's judgement was that "Miller lifts autobiographical writing to the level of genius" (Daily News), Jay Parini expressed this belief that "Time bends may be among the great books of our day" (USA Today), Roger Shattuck characterized the book as "a work of genuine literary craftsmanship and social exploration" (New York Times Book Review), and Peter Ackroyd declared, "This is autobiography as art" (The Times London).

MILLER IN THE NINETIES

In 1990 Miller was seventy-five years old. He might have been forgiven if he had chosen to retire. Ibsen wrote his last play when he was seventy one while Beckett produced little after he was sixty. Miller's public career had already lasted forty-six years, longer than those of Chekhov, Strindberg, Brecht, O'Neill, or Williams. Surprisingly, the 90s proved his most prolific period since the 60s. During this decade he wrote three new plays, a film script for **The Crucible** and a novella published as **Homely Girl**, in America and **Plain Girl**, in England. He continued to take interest in politics, writing articles for The New York Times, supporting oppressed and imprisoned writers and traveling widely. In other words, he was as active as ever in theatrical, political and social life.

His new play **The Ride Down Mount Morgan** opened in 1991 in London. As Miller points out in **Staging Note**, "The play veers from the farcical to the tragic……" The farcical aspect of the play is its plot: a man married to two women in different cities is able to deceive them for the ten years until a car accident in Mount Morgan lands him in the hospital. Both wives arrive at his bedside to confront him and each other. Although his behaviour shocks the two women, he maintains to the end that he has done nothing wrong. When someone asked Miller what the play was about, he replied that, "it's in direct succession with the rest of my work. It's basically about the problem of sincerity: if you convince yourself you're sincere, you can do anything."

Lyman Felt is a man of the 1980s. A rich insurance executive in his late fifties he enjoys all the luxuries of life, but he is unhappy with his wife. On a visit to his firm's upstate office he meets the dynamic young Leah, and they become lovers. When she becomes pregnant, he marries her, telling her that he has divorced Theo. Lyman's assertion that he is beyond the law may sound familiar to those who recall the political and economic scandals of the 80s. **The Ride** says, Miller is "a completely political play." Lyman, he observes, "is the apotheosis of the individualist who has arrived at a point where the rest of the world has faded into significance. This type of character, he continues, isn't new. "It's just that Ronald Regan gave it imprimatur of society."

After attaining love, money and fame, Lyman becomes aggressive and charming . At the same time he is lonely and frightened of death. His dead father appears from time to time trailing a long black shroud, a symbol of death. In the final scene, in the presence of Theo, Leah and Bessie the shade of the father successfully covers Lyman with the shroud. The play closes with Lyman's wonder and envy at the comradeship of the little group on the ice.

THE LAST YANKEE

The Last Yankee opened simultaneously in New York and London in 1993. Leroy is "the last Yankee", for he adheres to the founding fathers' beliefs in independence, tolerance and diligence. Miller in the play returns to the theme of **Death of a Salesman**, the destruction of the individual and the family by false values of society. The play was hailed as a "miniature masterpiece" of ninety minutes' duration. It portrays four characters whose words and gestures are significant. The story is simple. Two husbands, one in his 40s and the other in his 60s, meet in a mental hospital and discuss their wives, who are suffering from depression. In the second scene the wives reminisce about their past lives and contrast them with the present ones. The husbands enter, and the four interact. While the older ones are still squabbling, the younger couple come to an understanding and leave for home. So life like and realistic are Miller's characters and so deep his sympathy for them that the audience is left hopeful and overjoyed.

Yankee symbolizes the old ideals new lost in the conflicts of modern life. It also has another significance in the small town where Leroy and his wife Patricia grew up, he a descendant of Alexander Hamilton and she as the daughter, of immigrants, Yankee was the immigrants' pejorative term for Americans.

A prosperous businessman, Frick judges people by their appearance, occupation and contacts. The American dream has worked for him, unlike Willy Loman. However, despite the material success he has achieved, his wife is unhappy and their marriage disintegrates. The couple are clear-eyed about their chances of success, but they are willing to try. Miller provides no easy answers, but the fact that the couple kiss suggests that they are hopeful..

The Last Yankee was praised in both England and America. Richard Corliss wrote in Time magazine, "In the wonderful character of Patricia Hamilton, we hear a troubled soul having a chat with herself….. She seeks a release from the ghosts of her golden youth. But wry or wistful, she speaks with the reckless lucidity of someone liberated from drugs and intoxicated by the impending peril of real life." (Time, 8 February, 1993, 72)

John Peter, in England's Sunday Times of 31 January 1993, observed , "No other American play wright has written with such power and unrighteous, un-censorious understanding about marriage under stress: the need for independence and reassurance, domination and comfort; the hopeless, helpless, battered affection people can feel for someone close but unreachable; the need to speak and the fear of being either heard on unheard." The "half-optimistic ending", notes Peter, rings both touching and true: it has been bought at a price. There is no rosy sunrise here, no glib, perky rebirth, only a sense of survival fleshed but by dogged hope and the burdensome, unbreakable bond called love."

BROKEN GLASS

In 1994 **Broken Glass** opened in both New York and London and was widely acclaimed. While it ran for only two months on Broadway, it ran for a much longer period in London. Before the performance in his "Platform Lecture" Miller was applauded for a long time by a housefull crowd.

"This is a story I have known and thought about for fifty years," stated Miller. In the 30s he had known a woman who had lost the power to walk for inexplicable reasons. "I thought about it a lot, and years and years later realized that it was a hysterical paralysis……. One day I saw the image of that woman sitting there unable to move, and nobody knowing why and it seemed on exact image for the paralysis we all showed them in the face of Hitler……. But I haven't written it before because it always seemed to be part of the past. Until two years ago, when ethnic cleansing came into the news, and suddenly it became part of the present."

The play is set in Brooklyn in 1938, but the title refers to the night of broken glass, when the Nazis in Berlin broke the windows of Jewish shops and synagogues. "I've probably been influenced in selecting the theme by the recrudescence of anti-Semitism in this world which is something that I wouldn't have believed." Miller told an interviewer. "It always comes as a surprise, whenever it happens. It's well, that's over with; its not going to happen anymore and suddenly there it is again." Sylvia Gellburg, Jewish housewife in Brooklyn, is obesessed with the newspaper stories of atrocities on Jews, and when she suddenly loses the power of her legs, no physical cause can be found. Her husband, Phillip, consults a doctor who solves the mystery of her hysterical paralysis and who helps her to change.

Sylvia in way is a continuation of Karen in **Yankee**. Both women have domineering husbands; their own needs are repressed. Only when their repression takes an extreme form does anyone pay attention to them. Karen becomes so depressed that she has to be confined to an institution; Sylvia loses the use of her legs and is confined to a wheel chair. Both confinements are symbolic of a repressed married life.

Despite their serious illness, both women grow and change though Karen does so only temporarily. Sylvia's change is the central point of **Broken Glass.** The play is so complex in the manner in which it combines the political and the personal and so full of compassion in the understanding of Sylvia and her husband – that audiences are deeply moved.

Philip Gelburg is a very complex character. He is a self-hating Jew who sometimes sounds anti-Semitic. He is proud that his name is Gelburg. He is not popular among his neighbours who regard him as disagreeable and cantankerous. At the same time, says Miller, the audience is "supposed to really feel for him," because "he's trying to be invulnerable."

By discovering the causes of his behaviour, Miller creates sympathy and understanding for him. His impotence, he tells Sylvia in scene 8, was a result of what he believed was her rejection of when he refused to allow her to return to work." Miller describes the play as "a tragedy." The tragedy is the waste of a life, that of middle-aged Sylvia.

In scene II Sylvia brilliantly analyses the causes of her disintegration after marriage, how her potential was destroyed by a domineering husband.

Philip's realization is less dramatic but more hurtful. Like Willy Loman, he is a victim of the American dream.

Symbolism is pervasive in **Broken Glass** Sylvia's paralysis is a metaphor for the inability of the outside world to act in 1938 when the Nazi persecution of Jews was gathering momentum. Images of birth and death, babies and funerals, symbolize Sylvia's rebirth and the death of her marriage.

In 2003 at the ripe old age, of 88 Miller is undoubtedly one of America's three greatest playwrights, along with Engene O'Neill and Tennessee Williams.

ART AND DRAMATIC THEORY

Arthur Miller's articles, essays, speeches and introductions provide a rich source for his theory and practice of drama. From the fifty-two-page introduction to his **Collected Plays,** which appeared in 1957, to the 1993 essay "About Theatre Language," Miller's theatre essays are considered major contributions to modern dramatic theory. Miler discusses not only the aesthetics of his plays but also their genesis and the artistic, commercial, political and social climates of the times.

Miller admits his debt to Ibsen in **All My Sons.** He admires Ibsen's "ability to forge a play upon a factual bedrock. A situation in his plays is never stated but revealed in terms of hard actions, irrevocable deeds; and sentiment is never confused with the action it conceals." Miller also appreciates Ibsen's solution to the "biggest single dramatic problem, namely, how to dramatize what has gone before," to achieve "a viable unveiling of the contrast between past and present, and an awareness of the process by which the present has become what it is……. What is precious in the Ibsen method is its insistence upon vivid causation." Miller's observations on Ibsen are equally applicable to himself.

Miller also states that "for younger writers such as myself, [Clifford] Odets for a couple of years was the trail blazer…….. he has dared to invent an often wildly stylized stage speech…… It was as though O dets were trying to turn dialogue into jazz…… It was an invented diction of a kind never heard before on stage – or off." Miller remarks that Odet's dialogue was not realistic but poetic. Likewise, although Miller's dialogue is realistic it is carefully created to suit his character. It would be more correct to characterize his speech as "poetic realism:" "Attention must be paid," "he's liked, but he's – well liked."

Death of a Salesman

"My own tendency," writes Miller, "has been to shift styles according to the nature of my subject……. In order to find speech that springs naturally out of the characters and their backgrounds rather than imposing a general style." He explains that the New Englanders in **Yankee** do not speak like working men and women in **A Memory** or Eddie Carbone and his fellows in **A view.** For T**he Crucible** he crafted a language that begins with the idiom of the verbatim court records of the period and proceeded to take on flavour and a poetry of its own which is bare, strong, and earthy, like the people who speak it.

Miller's drama is a drama of ideas. He says, "Idea is very important to me as a dramatist", pointing out that playwrights need not invent new or original ideas, but rather "they have enunciated not yet popular ideas which are already in the air, for which there has already been a preparation…. Which is to say that once on idea is "in the air' it is no longer on idea but a feeling, a sensation an emotion, and with these the drama can deal". Miller may draw his theme from ideas in the air, but his plots often are suggested by actual events he hears about Images drawn from life, sometimes his own, may suggest a play: **Broken Glass** based on the picture of woman he knew in the 30s who for no known reason lost the power of her legs, **Death of a Salesman,** he says began as a series of images: the little frame house, now deserted Miller admits that his plays contain autobiographical elements: his friend Sidney who became a cop suggested Victor in **The Price;** Cousin Abby, Happy in **Death of a Salesman;** his own mother, who like Sylvia in **Broken Glass,** felt she wasted her life when she married. His illiterate father, says Miller, was a testing ground for the plots of his plays: "He'd ask what I was writing, and I would tell him the story. I could see in his eyes whether it was going to hit house. I can't remember a time when he was wrong….. He wanted to he astonished and when he was – Boy, the power that came out of him."

Though some of his characters may be based on his own life and experience, Miller insists that they are dramatic beings, created for the stage and existing in their life there. Sometimes readers and audiences ignored this as in the case of **After the Fall.** Maggie was equated with Marilyn Monroe and Quentin with Miller. Sometimes, however, spectators or readers recognize themselves or their parents or friends in the plays, Willy Loman is the best example, but Linda Loman, Joe Keller, John Proctor, Eddie Carbone, and Sylvia Gellberg fall in the same category.

Miller's plays attempt neither "escape from process and determinism" nor "inverted romanticism" but instead seek a new balance that "embraces both determinism and the paradox of will." "If there is one unseen goal toward which his plays strive, he says, "it is that very discovery and its proof – that we are made and yet are more than what made us."

Bibliography

Collection of Plays.

Arthur Miller's Collected Plays . Vol 1, New York, Viking 1957.

The Probable Arthur Miller. Edited by Harold Clurman, New York, Viking 1971.

Arthur Miller's Collected Plays. Vol 2, New York, Viking, 1981. (plays through 1980. Subsequent plays published singly)

Works about Arthur Miller

Bigsby, C.W.E. The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Modern American Drama 1945–1990, Arthur Miller: The moral Imperative, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Griffin, Alice, Understanding Arthur Miller, University of South Cerobne Press 1996.

Nelson, Benjamin, Arthur Miller, Portrait of a Play Wright, London, Peter Owen 1970.

Welland, Dennis, Arthur Miller, New York: Grove, 1961, Edinburgh; Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

JOHN OSBORNE

Look Back in Anger

Unit-IV
John Osborne: Look Back in Anger

John Osborne: His Life and Times

Osborne's autobiography titled 'A Better Class of Person: An Autobiography: 1929 – 1956', provides a valid record of Osborne's childhood and youth. John Osborne was born on 12th December 1929 of parents of very different backgrounds. Nellie Beatrice Grove, Osborne's mother was from a working class family, the daughter of Adelina Rowena Grove whom Osborne describes with a sense of regard, which he admittedly had for the Proletarian. Almost every working day of her life, she has got up at five clock to go out to work, to walk down what has almost seemed to me to be the most hideous and coldest streets in London. Osborne's approbation and idolisation of the woman who has the inborn dignity comes out in his words "She'd put her head down, hold on to her hat and push. And she did so with grit". His maternal grand father, William Crawford Grove, was smart in more than one way he had, always, other women in his life which was not a secret from Mrs. Grove.

On the paternal side Osborne's grandmother was snobbish and unpleasant, she ill-treated her husband as well as her son. Old Osborne is described by John as "a shambling shy figure who said little" and was "ill-treated contemptuously as a servant". She is compared to the Redferns by Osborne in that her behaviour and words were always utterly studied, she lacked naturalness and spontaneity to such an extent that young John never for once heard his grandma raise her voice. Adept at concealing her emotions, she could ill-treat people without betraying the least bit of anger or disgust.

The two older women, in 'Look back in Anger' are born out of Osborne's own experience. Alison's mother Mrs. Redfern is a copy of his paternal grand mother. His friend Hugh's mother of his maternal grandmother.

Osborne lived for sometime, when his parents were not living together at Fulham Palace Road quite near the Groves home. That his childhood was not a happy one is established by his memories of his having blooming fainting fits when his parents came to live together in 1936. Osborne's father was contemptuous of many things including the clergy, and John was to inherit this contempt for the church from him.

John's memories of both the families were one of unpleasant quarrels, which, he recounts with a tinge of remorse in his autobiography. The Osbornes moved house from Stoneleigh to Ewell bypass in 1938. John was at this time nine, he joined the Ewell's Boys school where unlike the other boys, he made few friends and remained rather lonesome. He had only me friend, Micky Wall, the boy who read a lot and with whom he formed the Viper Gang Club. His greatest love at the time was cinema, which was to him, his church and academy.

John Osborne fell in love with Joan Buffen, three years his senior (she was twelve, he only nine) who tried to draw his attention to sex. John was treated affectionately by both Joan as well as her mother: the affair came to an end abruptly when she was sent to the boarding school.

Two things seem to have afflicted Osborne the most in his childhood. He suffered, for years, as he himself records the humiliation of being a fairly regular bed-wetter. The other, one, of a deeper consequence was the death of his father. John experienced the death of his father, who, they were told had only six weeks to live. More than his death, it was the callous attitude of "Black Look" John's unpleasant and irritable mother that saddened and angered him. Even the senior Mrs. Osborne never mourned her son's death. The humiliation and anger at the apathy, he saw were to leave a scar on Osborne's mind for life.

John flung himself with girls, his love for Isabell Seller who was ten years older to him was the innocent love of an adolescent who wanted to escape a mother he hated. Later in St. Michael's Boarding school, he fell in love with Jenny, the niece of the Principal. The letters that Jenny wrote, unfortunately fell in the hands of Eric her uncle, the Principal and the affair came to an end. John's term, at the boarding school, ended equally abruptly, when unexpectedly, slapped by Eric, John retaliated by slapping him and was expelled.

John had a short stint with journalism. Working for 'Gas World' and 'The Miller'. He had, at this time another of his affairs. A woman of great physical attraction, she had no brains to match it. John Orborne's interest in her was limited to the erotic, he knew that he would not like to marry her. Finally, he succeeded in breaking the affair by drifting into the world of theatre. He first acted in 'No Room at the Inn', a music hall drama and worked as an Assistant Stage Manager.

He wrote a play on the persuasion of Stella Linden, his mistress for sometime who was married to Patrick Desmond. The play was first named 'Resting Deep' which was later changed to the 'Devil Inside Him.' He also had a brief and inconsequential affair with Sheila, a juvenile actress. He took on small jobs in Restaurants till his second assignment as an Assistant Stage Manager at the Theatre Royal. His first play was produced here in 1950. From this year onwards, Osborne started his career as a playwright, writing some plays in the beginning in collaboration, later all of them on his own. His output is varied, apart from his well known plays he wrote adaptations of earlier literary work and plays for T.V.

John Osborne was a growing boy during the second World war. The era of Imperialism seemed to be closing during the period after war. During this period the process of dismantling started with the Labour government coming to power in 1945 and when the Conservative government came to power in 1951, the process continued unabated. On the international level, the western nuclear monopoly was challenged by the Soviet Union. They had manufactured the atomic and the hydrogen bomb triggering the arms race. With the destructive power of these scientific innovations the fear of annihilation at the slightest provocation raised doubts and fears in the hearts of mankind. CND, the campaign for nuclear disarmament was the new slogan of the people who wanted the human race and nations to survive. There was, understandably resentment against the Church of England when it extended support to the nuclear programme. The resentment mounted into antagonism and there was considerable withdrawal of faith in the Bishops.

Another change was in the industrial side. After the recovery of industry in the post war era, people migrated in response to job positions and though it led to better prospects of income, people who had migrated felt cut off from their moorings. The work they under-took to do on the machines was also so repetitive that their work-life became stereotyped. Automation in industry crept into human life rendering them unable to live with individual passion and pride.

Osborne responded sensitively to the Major issues of this period. Though other writers of this period had also reacted sharply to some of the issues, Osborne's reaction was much more aggressive. Jimmy Porters tirades against the conservative party, his inactive against the Bishops for supporting the nuclear programme are all an expression of the author's own impatience with these establishments. Jimmy Porter and the other characters in his plays only expressed the anger and dismay of their author, none of them offers a practical solution, since their creator offered none. Osborne just raise the issues which demanded people's attention, he wanted the people to fed, the way his protagonists did about the prevailing situation, he did not expect them either to know or offer any solutions.

With a more socialistic pattern emerging in society, with the class distinctions becoming less distinct, with the economic security offered by the governments in the shape of housing, unemployment and old-age pensions, the old and the young felt more relaxed. They became complacent with no social or political injustice to fight against. Even the taboos related to sex became less rigid, the middle-class morality and Victorian prudery was replaced by more freedom in the behaviour amongst opposite sexes. The charm of struggle, chivalry, romance in love was becoming a thing of the past, disillusionment was bound to follow.

Lineage and place in Modern Drama

John Osborne did not find any dramatist in the contemporary drama who could be his model. English drama had become during Osborne's earlier phase hermetically sealed. The drama of T.S. Eliot and Fry were too far removed from reality those of Coward and Rattigan, through commercially successful lacked in the spirit that could inspire. The theatre of the Absurd, the most popular on the French stage had not taken root in Britain. Becket had himself translated the play from French into English and it was being talked of like the verse plays of T.S. Eliot, 'Murder in the Cathedral', 'The Cocktail Party' and 'The Confidential Clerk' etc and Fry's 'A Phoenix Too Frequent' and the Lady's Not For Burning', Venus Observed' and 'The Dark Is Light Enough'.

The only prose dramatist of significance, in England, at that time was John Whiling, but John Osborne looked up to earlier writers in England for inspiration.

Amongst the foreign writers who influenced him, Ibsen stands in the forefront. Ibsen dealt with the social problems of the day, presenting the every day life with a verisimilitude: his plays come close to reality in characterization, themes and the stage setting. Osborne was to adapt, 'Hedda Gabler' of Ibsen's plays later when he was working on scripts for T.V. and film productions. The violence and death that recurs in Ibsen's plays, the suicides in the 'Wild Duck', 'Rosmer Sholm' and 'Hedda Gabler'; the deaths in 'Little Eyolt' and 'The Master Builder' reverberate in the violence and deaths of Osborne's plays.

If Osborne is closer to Ibsen in creating sensational ends, he is closer to Checkov in his characterization. Unable to communicate fully with one another, they feel isolated. His plays like Osborne's long monologues and even while talking to each other his characters are always at cross purposes. They are, like Jimmy, drifters who have lost their moorings.

Checkov does allude to death and violence in some of his plays, 'The Sea Gull' includes a suicide and like 'The Three Sisters' death in duel, but these take place off-stage and the ending of 'The Cherry Orchard' is quiet. Mostly his characters only sit, talk, eat and drink evoking a certain mood in the audience.

Another playwright who comes to mind while reading Osborne is August Strindberg. He set a precedent by portraying brutal pictures of the man-woman relationship in plays like 'The Father', 'Miss Julie' and 'The Bond'. The man-woman and class conflict of 'Miss Julie' was to occupy Osborne in 'Look back in Anger', with Jimmy, Alison and Helena replacing Jean, the valet, Miss Julie and the working maid in the house.

George Bernard Shaw was too optimistic with the substance of life held firmly in his hand to be confirmed with the Nihilism so visible in Osborne. Some of Shaw's plays do present a grim picture of England as well as decry its values and systems but Shaw never completely renounces hope and none of his protagonists is ever a drifter.

It is only the 'Heart-break House' of Shaw, which comes nearest to Osborne's perception of the futility of human relations and social customs.

Oscar Wilde was another writer whose novel "The Dorian Gray' Osborne dramatized. In Oscar Wilde, Osborne found a playwright who, in his well-made plays, looked at man-woman relationships, erotic attachments and social conventions from a satiric perspective, turning the prevalent norms upside down and suggesting a diametrically opposite sense of values. Osborne refers to Helena as Lady Bracknell of Wilde though it would have been more appropriate to compare her with the still more repulsive and dominating Mrs. Redfern.

Osborne himself admitted his debt to D.H. Lawrence in his colliery plays like 'The Widening of Mrs. Holroyd', 'A Colliers Friday Night', 'The Daughter in Law' and other prose-plays where he recreated the atmosphere of the world of he knew through the dialogue of the mining district and a general evocation of working class life. He had in his plays recorded the mental tensions arising out of the differences in the class backgrounds. Osborne was to later deal with the same kind of marital tensions arising out of the inability to adjust. The tough, coarse but vigorous working class man was portrayed by both Lawrence and Osborne married to the sensitive, snobbish upper class girl— ill-matched and angry for the class distinctions.

Jean Anouilh was another acknowledged model. Osborne's similarity with Anouilh lies in creating strong central characters who defiantly challenge the existing institutions of power and control. Antigone and Joan are given long, powerful speeches like Jimmy and Archie to make their views known. They, at the same time, defy the opinions of the other characters and the society at large.

Osborne, was influenced by another playwright, Tennesse Williams. Tennesse Williams, like Osborne chose for his characters, social outcasts, who find the crass society they live in intolerable and refuse to conform to its values. They also, like Jimmy and company, play roles and identify with names in literature in order to escape from or cope with the problems that confront them. Williams' realism is however, notably different from the usual sense in which it is used. He calls his theatre The 'Plastic Theatre' since reality is not literally copied but moulded, transformed for presentation on the stage.

In some other plays, like Van Moody's, 'The Great Divide', the woman, like Alison, in 'Look Back in Anger' comes back to her man affirming her new loyalty across the divide of class.

It should be noted, that many playwrights had prefigured in their plays elements of 'Look Back in Anger': an alienated rebellious character who defies the World, surrounded by certain character types; intense marital tensions and a central love triangle; class conflict, vitriolic satire on social, political and religious institutions; the structure of the well-made play; rhetorical speeches and role – playing and the creation of atmosphere through speech variations, set and music, but without the frame-work of realism.

Osborne had, in the area of drama, many kindred spirits who if not his mentors, were men Osborne could identify with. In spite of similarities John Osborne stands on his own ground as a dramatist.

John Osborne Works

The Devil inside Him (1950)

The Devil inside him, Osborne's first play was written in collaboration with Mrs. Stella Linden. It is the melodramatic story of a Welsh youth who is considered to be a sex-maniac by his relatives because he writes poetry. A visiting medical student to the village where he lives recognized the talent of the youth, though he has so far only been taken for an idiot. The tragedy of his killing a girl who tries to misappropriate him by passing him off as the father of her child is melodramatic in nature.

Personal Enemy (1955)

Written again in collaboration, this time with Anthony Creighton, his theatrical partner. The story of a soldier who refuses to be repatriated from Captivity in Korea, the play suffered on account of the large-scale deletions demanded by the Lord Chamberlain, a stand of homosexuality in the play was also ordered to be deleted.

Look Back in Anger (1956)

John Osborne started working on 'Look Back in Anger' on 4th May, 1955 and finished of on 3rd June. Osborne was just twenty-six and the play that was to make him world-famous had been completed within a month. The play was sent, quite simply by Osborne to the recently established English stage company, a group with the mission of introducing new theatrical writing. Though the reviews were of mixed nature, Osborne was recognized as the 'Juvenile prodigy', who had brought new drama on the stage in the sweep.

The Entertainer (1957)

The Entertainer is the story of a Archie Rice Music Hall performer who improvises his artistic integrity by bringing nude-woman on the stage in a vain bid boost his business. A photograph of his father Billy, who was an authentic artist remind Archie of his fall from the standards set in The Edwardian period. Nostalgia for this period is evident in the play. His personal life also suffers, tired of his aged wife Phoebe, he becomes a

philanderer who seduces every other woman. The decline of the Music Hall becomes in a larger sense symbolic of the declining fortunes of the British Empire. A note of protest against the policies of the government is registered by Jean, Archie's daughter from his first wife. Her one half-brother in action and the other, frank is sent to goal for his conscientious spirit and faith objections are raised against the British invasion of the Suez Canal. The play was presented in the framework of fantasy music-hall numbers, letting it away from realism. Archie Rice's journal emotional failure signifies the loss of nerve and purpose on a wider plane. The play closes with Archie being forced to leave for Canada by old A Billy's brother who pays off his loans. Old Billy dies. A highlight of the first production was Sir Lawrence Oliver playing the lead role.

Epitaph for George Dillon (1957 – in collaboration with Anthony Creighton)

The play focuses on, the life of an artist, who compromises with his art and in the process loses his integrity. George Dillon starts living with the Elliots and gets involved with their frivolous daughter Josie. George is treated variously by the different characters. Mrs. Elliot welcomes him to the house. Her husband opposes his stay and Ruth the divorced sister-in-law puts George in position by telling him that he is a failure. But George continues to stay in the house impregnating Josie. There is also in the play, a purely, commercial producer. Barney Evans who fires George to cut-off the high-know staff and replace it with a list of dirty stuff to make the play commercially viable. Barney Evans', character, it seems was drawn in contempt of Patrick Desmond, Stella Linden's husband, who was associated with Osborne in the beginning of his career. It is, a sort of caricature of the commercial producers in England who are savagely satirized by Osborne. George's play becomes a big commercial success, but only inspires him to talk of his own epitaph.

The World of Paul Slickey (1959)

The world of Paul Slickey, an ambitious musical, with all the ware of songs, dances and musical pieces was a failure Jack Oakham, alias Paul Slickey, a journalist has been asked to investigate the affairs of Mort Lake Hall, who happens to be his father-in-law. The whole family, including Paul, himself is promiscuous; besides being greedy, hypocritical and unfeeling. Paul Slickey has an affair not only with his secretary Jo, but also Deirdre, his sister-in-law. Osborne attacked through his character, not only the aristocracy, the Clergy and the British Empire but also exposed journalism. The play was innovative in its use of stage devices with the newspaper office evoked as a huge cloth representing a sheet of newsprint and a chorus punctuating and qualifying the action on the stage

A subject of scandal and concern (1960)

The play is based on an incident that happened in 1842. George Holyoake, was tried for blasphemy of atheism. The police, the jury and the judge, Erskine are shown to be incredibly unfair to him, and sentence him to six months imprisonment. The play ends tragically with the news of the death of George's former Comrade South Well and the death of his daughter. Though, there were no more trials in England of this nature after George Holyoake, a narrator steps onto the stage and announces that he is to defend some one charged with a similar crime, suggesting that persecution of this nature is still prevalent.

Luther (1961)

Luther is an adaptation of a sort. Osborne, dramatized the career of Martin Luther on the basis of Erik .H. Erikson's sketch of him in his 'psychobiography'. 'Young man Luther'. Luther's inadequate faith in his earthly father, Hans Luther lends to his less faith in God. He rebels against he Divine father as well as the concept of the Holy Father, the Pope. The psychosexual predicament of Luther forms the core of the play is presented impressively combining the impressionistic as well as epic devices. The agony and suffering of Luther is presented visually by the round cone of light and the torso of a naked man hanging across a knife. A knight formally announces the time and place of every scene creating a sense of distance, which lends to an objective viewing of the play rather becoming a part of it. The person of Luther is psychology

determined and the peculiarities of the treatment of Luther disallow any moral judgement on him as a public figure.

Under Plain Cover (1962)

The techniques used in this play are also not-realistic like his earlier play. The play repeats the theme : it parodies the world of journalists the protagonists Tim and Jenny live their life playing different roles each time they encounter a new person. Their life is however shattered when they come to know that they are brother and sister. Jenny breaks away from Tim to marry a post office clerk but returns soon after Tim. They come together but live secluded from each other. New devices are used. A reporter in the play talks directly to the audience, and cinematic techniques help the fading away of characters and quick change of scenes.

The Blood of the Bambergs

This is a companion play : drawing into the area of attack not only the journalists but also the Royalty. The assault is on the royal wedding of Princess Margaret to a photographer, it showed how, when on the day of the Royal wedding Prince Wilhelm dies in an accident, he is replaced by a double, Alan Russel, a photographer from Australia to marry Princess Melanie. There is direct address to the audience, this time by Wimple, who functions as a kind of narrator.

Inadmissible Evidence (1964)

Inadmissible Evidence, as the title suggests is an attack on the judicial system. The play is about the efficacy of the judicial system, its methods of questioning and, trial. The main character Bill Martland who passes through anxiety and a sense of guilt in his dream trial cannot shake off the impression it has cast even after the dream is over.

The play records not only the professional life of Bill but also his personal relationship with women; he makes overtures not only to his mistress and wife but also to his clients and his employees. Bill suffers a kind of disorientation in spite of the affirmation of love from his mistress Liz and writes a five-page long monologue to his only daughter revealing his disintegrated state of mind and failure to communicate with people.

A Patriot for Me (1965)

The play covered a significant phase of history in its dramatization of the military career of Alfred Redi. Enlisted in the Austro-Hungarian Army. Alfred Redi was blackmailed by the Russian intelligence for his homosexuality. The play records a series of Redi's sexual encounters, first with woman and then with young men. Spectacle is provided by the big names like Archduke Ferdinand and countess Dalyanoff, who is shown to be involved with Redi. The grandeur of some scenes stands in contrast to the scenes of complete darkness. The tragic end of Redi and the final Victory of Oplensky who continues his espionage activities leaves the reader in a very peculiar state of mind.

Time Present (1968)

Pamela, The female protagonists of the play has striking similarities with Jimmy Porter of 'Look Back in Anger'. Her bitterness after the demise of her father and her sardonic invective against the politicians, woman writers, homosexuals reminds the reader of Jimmy's Virulence. An actress by profession, she dominates all the characters in the play, her mother Edith, her stepsister Pauline and her ex-lover, Edward.

The Hotel in Amsterdam (1968)

The play is set in a suite in a large first class hotel in Amsterdam. Three English couples are spending a weekend here. They occupy themselves most of the times talking about their mother or mothers-in-law and discuss topics like homosexuality, Airlines, Pills and marriages. Some flutter is created by confessions of love between the character who come later, but the climax of the ply with the death of K.L. K.L, a film personality is shown to be some what mysterious in his life as well as death, in his unexpected suicide. The play has an air

of emptiness which adds to the suffocation of stillness and lack of action.

West of Suez (1971)

Wyatt Gilman, a writer is on a holiday with his four daughters to a sub-tropical ex-colonial island. They are accompanied by three man, husbands of two daughters and the lover of the third. During the excursion, they are interviewed by a local newspaper reporter Mrs. James. They also meet a popular writer named Lamb, the conversation with these two brings out the emptiness of their lives. Wyatt's recollections of the Colonial Past suggest a feeling of nostalgia about the Imperial glory of England's past. The play becomes sensational after the arrival of Jed who warns them of their impending death. His presumption comes true when several armed islanders come and shoot Wyatt.

A sense of Detachment (1972)

This play, most reflex in one sense is also in another sense more group oriented. Posing questions about the artistic and dramatic illusions, which the author had experienced it, has direct references to Osborne's autobiography. The audience become participants in the drama by virtue of the direct address to them and also by the invitation by The Box Man they receive to join in the songs or interrupt if there is a genuine need for it. Stills from political, social and military life are shown in the background. There are references to the contemporary playwrights like Harold Pinter, Arnold Wesker and Samuel Beckett to name a few. The autobiographical references include the death of his father because of T.B. and his sexual life with Stella Linden.

Watch it Come Down (Published 1975)

Marital discord and the resultant violent fights is the theme of 'Watch It Come Down'. Ben, the renowned people director and his wife Sally, fight their sordid battles in the presence of their guests. Glen the young artist doomed to die, his devotee Jo and Raymond a homosexual, all witness their ugly scene.

Ben is shown to be lustful, he desires Shirley as well as Jo. The play ends on a violent note with the death of the Couple's dog, and their physical skirmishes. Ben is shot dead by The Yobbos, and Jo commits suicide after Glen's death. The play has been compared to G.B. Shaw's 'Heart-break House' for its violence and promiscuous lovemaking.

The End of Me Old Cigar (1975)

Lady Regina Frimley an arch-feminist lays a trap for the dignitaries whom she has invited to her country-house. She has fixed women for them for the night and would have them expose while they are making love to them. It is discovered however that one of the couples, Leonard Grim Thorpe and Isobel really fall in love. Lady Regina's plans are also foiled since, her lover betrays her for promised life of luxury in Spain.

T.V. Plays & Adaptations:

The Right Prospectus (1970)

Very Like a Whale (Published 1971)

Jill & Jack (Published in 1975)

You're not Watching me Mummy (1978)

Try a Little Tenderness (1978)

These plays repeat some of Osborne's typical characters and themes. The characters are aliens, actors, artists, discordant couples, the theme that of maladjustment, compromise with one's integrity in art and family discord.

Adaptations

A Bond Honoured (1966) a reworking of Lope de Vega's La Fianza Satisfecha – The play is a class, apart for its physical violence. Whereas Leonido rapes his sister before her wedding, in the original, in Osborne's

adaptation he rapes his mother too. Sadist to the utmost degree, he takes out his father's eyes and tortures everyone.

Hedda Gabler (1972)

Osborne, except for a few changes in names and places stuck to the original by Henrik Ibsen. Osborne was able to retain the verisimilitude of Ibsen.

The Picture Of Dorian Gray

Osborne is like Oscar Wilde, adept at the art of portraying intense characters and sensitively portraying their agonies and conflicts. Osborne reduced the number of characters and condensed the story to suit his medium of drama.

Place calling itself Rome

Adaptation of Shakespeare's 'Coriolanus', Tom James by Firlding Osborne adapted the novel for the screen.

Osborne's Introduction (collected plays Vol. I. Faber & Faber)

Reception as a playwright – 'Look Back in Anger'

With a writer like Osborne, who has little pretention about either his intellect or intentions, it is comparatively safer to take him for his face value for an authentic answer to some of the major questions about his life and work.

This is how Osborne recounts the first production of 'Look Back in Anger':

May 8th, 1956, is one of the few dates usually quoted in accounts of modern theatrical history, and generally regarded as the commencement for good or ill, of a tangible change in the climate and direction of The English Theatre. It was the first, performance of 'Look Back in Anger' at the Royal Court Theatre, an occasion I partially remember, but certainly with more a accuracy than 'those who subsequently claimed to have been present and, if they are to be believed, would have filled the theatre several times over.'

Osborne refutes the claim of the literary historians contradicting the attendance at the first performance as well as the impact that the play had. He says, 'The compilers of these histories have deduced all sorts of theatres about the consequences of that sparsely attended first night and its social, political and then revolutionary implications.'

Osborne finds the appraisal of the play speculative and disordered and the motives of Osborne fanciful inventions of the critic and the general reader. He regrets that "all this has served to draw attention to the piece as an historical phenomenon, while the play itself is passed over under the weight of perpetuated misinterpretation."

The most offending question to an author according to Osborne is one of his motive in creating a piece of work. Exasperated by the question, "Why did you writen Look Back in Anger", Osborne says 'that writing comes to a writer as naturally as breathing, laughing or falling in love, without any explainable reason, without any motive.'

The main ingredients of the play, which have contributed to its survival, are vitality and honesty, says Osborne. Unlike, some writers who in order to seek intellectual respect and approbation 'flatter, indulge and offer false and easy comfort'; Osborne claims, 'to write in a language in which it is possible only to tell the truth.'

Osborne discusses the use of language in drama at length. In Literature, he observes, drama has been, unfortunately considered as a supernumerary branch and the most successful playwrights assigned a place below that of the poets and novelists. Even in drama, which has sometimes been very successful, the language is according to Osborne far from living and true. Speaking of Somerset Maugham's plays, which he knew closely since he had acted in a few of these, he says: Somerset Maugham, on the other hand, appeared to have the trick of it and entertained middle-class audience for a quarter of a century. As a young actor I did a lot of

Maugham — and one of the things I discovered was that they were extremely difficult to learn — Maugham's language was dead, elusively inert, wobbly like some synthetic rubber substance — you could approximate with little difference in meaning or nuance.'

The nuances of language are important to Osborne and the notations are meant to be meticulously followed. They are constructed for reasons : even 'ands' and 'buts' contributing to the syntax and truth, to convey the full meaning. A play is according to Osborne, an intricate mechanism, and the whole mesh of its engineering logic can be shattered by a misplaced word or emphasis.

Osborne is sore about the mistake of the critics who claim that the language of 'Look Back in Anger' was naturalistic. If negates the two basic properties of a play that according to Osborne lend credibility to it. "The Pursuit of vibrant language and patent honesty" are the hall-mark of drama were denied to him by attacking the epithet of naturalistic to his language. The naturalistic language, is according to him inadequate. The language of 'everyday life' is almost incommunicable for the very good reason that it is restricted, inarticulate, dull and boring, and never more so than today when verbal fluency is regarded as suspect if not downright 'elitist'.

The other point that people have missed, to the dismay of Osborne is that 'Look Back in Anger' is a comedy. He recollects the objections of the directors, George Devine and Tony Richardson at the public dress rehearsal of the play on 7th May, 1956, when some audience, mostly young, laughed where expected. The following nights, there were fewer laughters, which was more re-assuring to the directors, more discomfiting to the author. Vehemently stressing that play is a comedy Osborne makes his point. A performance of 'Look Back' without persistent laughter is like an opera without arias. Indeed, Jimmy Porters in a accurately named 'tirades' should be approached as 'arias' and require the most adroit handling, delicacy of delivery, invention and timing.'

Osborne, in this introduction, written after thirty years of the play's first performance admits that some of the misunderstandings about the play have been cleared over the years. His impression that the play was a monologue by Jimmy, 'a vacuum', as the other characters in the play hardly had the substance either to support or contradict him. Alison's obdurate withdrawal had also been misjudged." This part of the introduction, where he discusses the nature of the play and the characters therein will be taken up later while dealing with the issues, where it is relevant.

It would suffice, here to say, that the one thing Osborne resented the most was that the theatre-managers as well as directors "followed in their productions the playgoer's directions instead of the play-wrights, he resented, as a matter of fact the constraints which involved conciliating the audience by confirming their prejudices and not mocking their expectations.

'Look Back in Anger', Osborne declares, is a much misunderstood play because the time it came up was not yet ripe for it. 'In my profession' says he, "the surest road to penury is to be ahead of your time'.

John Osborne narrates the particulars of the how the play was received by the viewers, readers and the critics on the publication and presentation of the play. In the Introduction to the first volume of his collected plays, by Faber & Faber. This is what he has to say.

"In spite of the attention to the play at the time, amounting to something like crazed tumult, it did not transfer to the West End. The misgivings and private distaste of the presiding managements were unpersuaded. Timidity prevailed over agonized avarice. The one producer prepared to compromise his reputation insisted that all references to bears and squirrels he excised. This, I was told, embarrassed the customers; it made them squirm. Even the plays most quoted supporter, Kenneth Tynan, had described them as 'painful whimsy'. A few years on, whole pages of respectable national news papers would be devoted to 'Valentine's Day' massages from 'Snuggly Bouffel Bears' to 'Squiggly Whiffly Squirrels', far more nauseous them my own prescient invention."

This is what Osborne recalls of the difficulties that arose when the play was first brought public in 1956. Since he wrote the introduction to this collection after more than there decades had passed between its first reception,

he had much to say: the play's durability is now unquestioned; its popularity, and success unchallenged. He is no longer interested in refuting his critics.

He says: Some where in the world the play is performed every night. People are bemused, dismayed or, I hope, exhilarated by it and driven to laughter. There have been homosexual and black versions. The lesbian angel must surely be to come. Misogyny is attached to it for ever and the American – Freudian view of Jimmy and Cliff as lovers is still irresistible to academics and feminists alike. It is an old war-horse that has paid my rent for a lifetime and seems able to bear the burden of whatever caparism is placed upon its laden back.

The responses to the play, it seems were dictated by the dons of literature. People are guided in art and literature by the rules set for them by who, they consider have superior talent, intellect or scholarship. Bewildered by novelty stage they fail to comprehend their responses in absence of a standard gauge. Osborne read the same bewilderment in the First Night audience. "The First Night audience, if they were conscious, seemed transfixed by a tone of voice that was quite alien to them. They were ill at ease; they had no rules of conduct as to respond".

Mention must be made of the incident Osborne relates about the first-night production of his play 'The World of Paul Slickey'. He became, he says, "the only living playwright to have been pursued down the London Streets by an angry mob – Anyone reading the play now may well wonder what the fuss was all about. I can only refer them to my own account of the strange events and climate of the time, which led up to bizarre, rowdy and ugly event."

The incident, at once evokes the memory of the playboy riots after J.M. Synge's, 'The Playboy of the Western World' was played in Dublin more than half a century before 'Look Back in Anger'. The tone of the two writers is equally stubborn in their refutation of the public as well as critics.

Osborne was in spite of slight discomfort which the audience felt in the unexpected turn from the usual and expected, hailed as a sensational discovery. Gareth Lloyd Evans records in the Chief Chronicler of the fifties and sixties, John Russell Taylor was empyrean in his enthusiasm – for him Osborne "Started everything off". Only slightly less ecstatic is his view that the play was the first "type-image of The new-drama' (Modern British Dramatists 'Twentieth Century view – New Perspectives edited by John Russel Brown. Prentice Hall inc. 1984.

Summary and Critical Appreciation

Act I

The action of the play takes place in a one room flat in a large mid-land town. It is a fairly large attic room on the top of a large Victorian house. The room serves as the living room, bedroom and kitchen, household chores like ironing are done in the same room.

The room is occupied by Jimmy Porter, his wife Alison and a friend Cliff Lewis. They are all in the same age-group say about twenty-five. That they are not affluent is apparent from the ordinariness of the room, the furniture is simple and old, there are only three dining chairs instead of a set of four or six and the chairs are shabby.

It is springtime, the play opens on a Sunday in April, the time is early evening.

Jimmy and Cliff are buried in a heap of newspapers and weeklies, both of them are intently absorbed in them. Alison is busy ironing the clothes. An ironing board is in front of her a pile of clothes beside her. It is chilly. There is an atmosphere of stillness in the room, which is full of smoke.

It should be noted that Jimmy starts the very first dialogue in the play on a note of discontent. He creates fuss about the quality of book reviews and blames himself for wasting his Sundays on them. He comments on the quality of the book reviews, half of them are in French; more over much of what has been written is a repetition of what had been said earlier about a totally different novel. To his question whether Cliff feels ignorant after

reading them and receiving a positive 'no' as reply, he asks Alison, the same question. She does not pay much attention to Jimmy's question evading him by saying that she had not read the paper so far. Jimmy's sarcastic remarks about Cliff and Alison set the tone of the play. Jimmy is throughout disparaging, Cliff amiable and reconciliatory, Alison preferring to ignore and avoid argument.

Jimmy complains that Alison starts to sleep when he is talking. Cliff suggests that Jimmy not disturb Alison since she cannot think when he is talking, Jimmy replies that Alison hasn't had a thought in her head for years. Jimmy's question, ' does the white women's burden make it impossible to think?' is a dig at the British women at large and at Alison in particular.

The manner of speech and the behaviour of Jimmy and Cliff suggest their lower-class upbringing. There is sincerity and fondness in their attitude. Cliff does not mind Jimmy's calling him ignorant, a peasant, uneducated and a welsh ruffian. Jimmy similarly does not mind being called the big horrible man. The familiarity with which they treat each other establishes Jimmy's affection and trust in Cliff, a very rare feeling from Jimmy. Though critical of Cliff he does not tear him to pieces the way he does Alison and many others including Alison's family.

Cliff's remarks about Jimmy are also more cutting than caustic and spoken in a light vein. He calls Jimmy a pig. He says to him' you're like a sexual maniac—only with you its food that you lust for. When Jimmy replies' yes, yes, yes, I like to eat, I'd like to live to eat, his immediate response is most natural, 'Don't see any use in your eating at all. You never get any fatter.' Jimmy's reply is, ' people like me don't get fat— we just burn everything up'.

Jimmy continues to rail, he denounces the posh papers, the Bishop of Branley and the younger generation of girls all in one stroke. The girl who wants to know if her boyfriend will lose all respect for her if she gives him what he asks for is disgusting, she is to him a stupid bitch. Against the clergy, he has more than one grievance, the first that they are supporting the Christian world in the manufacture of the H- Bomb, the second against their hypocrisy. The Bishop wants to clarify his position in regard to the rich and the poor. He denies that he makes any distinction in classes and blames working classes for persistently and wickedly fostering this idea.

That neither Cliff nor Alison give much attention to these vitriolic speeches by Jimmy is obvious from their reaction. Cliff remains mostly unmoved by Jimmy's most scathing remarks, his only concern is to make Alison get the least effected. His gestures of friendliness show not only his fondness for Alison but also his anxiety to put a sort of safety valve on her growing impatience. Jimmy finds Cliff's acts of caressing sickening. He finds love sickening paradoxically he finds the lack of it devastating.

He wants Cliff and Alison to share in his utter frustration in things he declaims as debunk. He refers to the news about a lady having been badly wounded during a mass meeting of a certain American evangelist at Earl's Court. People's confession of love in theory is marked sharply against their practice of indifference and apathy. The example of the woman who went to the mass to declare herself for love and broke four ribs and got kicked in the head, is cited by Jimmy in order to get support for discrediting the Church where in their enthusiasm for the ' onward Christian soldier march, they became oblivious of the woman who kept yelling her head in agony.

Jimmy also suggests that probably all the stuff about the Bishop of Brombey, has been written by Alison's father under the assumed name of the Bishop. Cliff urges Alison not to take any notice of what Jimmy had said because Jimmy was deliberately trying to be offensive. Jimmy's aim is to evoke some response from his wife and Cliff, but they both remain indifferent, with the result that Jimmy gets frustrated. Ironically he says that there must be something wrong with him. His failure to elicit a response from both of them deepens his sense of isolation.

Jimmy's first piece of rhetoric comes soon afterwards. He finds the dull routine of Sundays so monotonous, the same papers, the same cups of tea, the same ironing of clothes. He gets impatient not only with his boredom but also the complacency with which Cliff and Alison accept it. He is impatient with the people around, he avoids going to the pictures on Sunday night fearing that his enjoyment will be ruined by the yobs in the front

row.

He wants Cliff and Alison to share his concern for what is happening around in the world or at least about what is happening in England. Hi misses in them his own ardor and avidity. He bursts into a tirade against lethargy of mind and lack of enthusiasm. None of the two have red Priestley's piece in the weekly that he gets. He resents their indifference, their dubious sloth. Nobody except him seems to be bothered.

It must be particularly noted that Jimmy feels as muffled under the weight of their passivity as they do under the weight of his supercilious and overbearing vigour. They are imperturbable, he susceptible to the slightest provocation.

He longs to feel really alive. He even suggests that they play a little game to revive the life force in them. He exclaims in utter helplessness the loss of feeling really alive and looks to Cliff and Alison for help. 'Let's pretend we are human— oh brother, its such a long time since I was with anyone who get enthusiastic about anything.'

Cliff now asks Jimmy what Mr. Priestley has said in the paper Jimmy, who is always looking for an excuse to target Alison's family immediately compares him to Alison's father. Priestley, like Colonel Redfern always keeps looking back to the Edwardian times the glory is lost but the Colonel persists to live in it. Please mark the use of the word' comfortable' to describe Colonel's attitude.

The scene reveals another side of Jimmy. He is humane and tender when it comes to the people he loves. He notices the condition of Cliff's new trousers and snubs him for ruining the pair of new trousers he had spent so much money on. His question to Cliff, ' What do you think you are going to do when I'm not around to look after you?' is almost patronizing.

Cliff does not need any reassurance about Jimmy's feelings for him and turns to Alison who is emotionally a part of the trio.

Cliff's distaste for the smell of the pipe that Jimmy is going to smoke and Jimmy's denial of a cigarette to him evoke a mood of easy understanding rather than disapproval. Jimmy is only concerned about the ulcers Cliff is suffering from. He wishes to be treated with concern; he wishes to treat people the same way. His self-pity makes him a bore "I am sick of doing things for people and all for what?"

His personal grouse takes a much larger dimension. Again, suddenly and uncalled for, Jimmy thinks of listening to a musical programme by Vaughan Williams which Jimmy welcomes since it is truly English unlike the English cooking, which somebody said came from Paris, their politics from Moscow. They copied their morals from the Port-land, it was said. Jimmy does not forget to attack Cliff and Alison, forgetting the name of the person who said it, he taunts them by saying that there was no point asking them as they would have no clue to things like these. A long speech on the shrinking of the empire after the British departure from India show's Jimmy's regret at the glory that is now lost. The old Edwardian brigade of whom Colonel Redfern was a part is justified in missing the high summer, crisp linen, volumes of verse etc in India. The picture is glorious and tempting. What with the home made cakes and croquet, bright ideas and bright uniforms, an idyllic picture of life lived grandly, romantically. Jimmy understands that a part of the story was phony, yet the picture is so tempting that he who had never been a part of it becomes a compulsive mourner for the passing away of it.

He finds the American age ' pretty dreary', as he calls it and his fear is that the children in England will be Americans soon. The glorious past of imperial Britain is regretfully compared with the Americanized Britain of future times.

Jimmy talks incessantly. A compulsive talker, his thoughts run from one topic to another without a second's break. Feeling let down by Cliff's disinterest in his last 'thought', as Jimmy calls it, he kicks Cliff and asks him to make some tea for him.

His thoughts now wonder to Webster, a friend of Alison, who though he does not like Jimmy, is more acceptable to him. Webster has the 'bite, the edge, the drive' and gives to Jimmy what the others fails to give.

Alison makes a reference to Madeline, who she reminds Jimmy had the bite and the drive. When Cliff asks who Madeline was, Alison says with a kind of mockery that Madeline has been talked of so many times that Cliff should have remembered who she was. Cliff remarks that there were quite a few. Alison also asks Jimmy again, ironically whether he had an affair with her when he was thirteen or fourteen. Jimmy unabashedly says that he was eighteen and that Madeline was ten years older to him. Alison does not forget to add that Madeline was his mistress and that according to Jimmy he owed almost everything to her. Cliff calls him Marchbanks, reference to the names in literature as well as authors are scattered all over the play. Here, Cliff compares Jimmy with Marchbanks the young poet of Shaw's ' Candila' who is in love with her. Candila is married and older to Marchbanks.

Jimmy goes back to look for the time of the concert, he had been wanting to hear on the radio. Cliff's distaste for the kind of work they are doing particularly the sweet stall is obvious. Jimmy talks of the routine of going to the factory for the fresh stock and setting up the stall in the morning.

To the reader it should be obvious that Alison in not as unaffected and non-participating as the critics would have us believe. Though not as excited and exuberant as Jimmy, her words are measured, suggestive and meaningful.

Jimmy continues to talk of the sweet stall waiting for the concert, which is to start in five minutes time. Cliff rouses himself from lethargy to make some tea. But Alison has not forgotten Madeline, she resumes the topic inciting Jimmy to go on with Madeline's staggering curiosity about things and people. He reverts to the reverie of the time spent with Madeline. Every small thing became an adventure with her. Even sitting on the top of a bus with her was like ' sitting out with Ulysses'. Osborne, here uses Ulysses as a metaphor. Madeline was like Ulysses, the Greek hero of Homer's classic adventurous, living life to the full.

Cliff's absent-minded remarks stand in sharp contrast to the willful disinterest of Alison. They also provide relief from the tedium of Jimmy'' talk. Cliff rebuffs Jimmy, comforts Alison and goes back to himself, only partially conscious of what Jimmy is talking about. Jimmy compares Webster to Emily Bronte, the well-known English novelist and teases Alison that it was surprising that she could get along with a man like Webster, who was worth something, suggesting that she was not worth much. Webster's merit and value lay in his guts and his sensibility, a rare combination.

Alison's appeal to Jimmy to give a break suggests that his persistent assiduous chatter is wearisome to her. Her earnestness and quickness do not suggest the submissiveness generally associated with her, her attitude is one of simple exasperation.

Jimmy's continued assault on Alison is irritating to the reader. He tries to provoke her and having failed exclaims that , she would not be provoked even if he dropped dead. But why does he want to provoke her. What reaction does he expect from her? He does not himself seem to know.

Jimmy now, diverts his attack to Alison' family. They were militant, arrogant and full of malice. Her brother Nigel was straight backed, chinless wonder from Sandhurst. Jimmy continues to rail at them, coining phrases and making the most odious comparisons. Jimmy calls Nigel a commonplace object from outer space. His acrimonious attack becomes almost cankerous towards the end. His rancour and resentment against the entire privileged class becomes evident in the passage. 'Nigel is sure to make it to the cabinet one day. The politicians have been plundering and looting everybody for generations'. That Nigel was difficult to define since he was so vague and that there was a very thin line between being vague and being invisible, that the invisible politicians are of no use even to their supporters. 'Nigel is most vague in his knowledge of life and human beings and deserves to be awarded some kind of decoration for it'. Jimmy's subtlety and felicity with words, which he uses with such negative force, is amazing. He says, Nigel is vague about everything his motives and ideas are vague, he is immune to the notion of right and wrong and not even the greatest injustice will move him, nothing will strike or pierce his conscience.

Jimmy continues to bombard the Englishman, who is too stupid and satisfied to think of change. During his long

speeches, Jimmy moves up and down lending rhythm to his speech and movement. He is angry at everything. He is angry with the socially upper class, he is angry with politicians, he is angry with the Englishman and he is angry at the system of education. The very fact that Nigel had received an education which had made him unfit for thought will help him secure a position better than anyone else.

Osborne describes Jimmy as a man who is not only angry but also bent upon drawing blood. Seeing that Alison is determined to maintain her brazen calm, he composes himself and carrying on his blabber unabated he hammers Alison and her family. Talking of Alison in the third person and ironically alluding to her parents as Mummy and daddy. ' Their manners are royal but they are under the skin as schemy as would not hesitate biting you under the groin the moment you turn your face.' For Alison and Nigel, Jimmy uses words like sycophantic, flattering parasites, phlegmatic, which stands for sluggish and pusillanimous which means lacking in firmness of mind.

Cliff has by now completely lost his cheerfulness and looks troubled. He asks Jimmy to turn the radio on since it is already the time for the concert.

Jimmy continues his non-sensical talk about pusillanimous, saying that Alison typifies the qualities of the word. He goes into one of his far-fetched comparisons again. The word pusillanimous, he says, sounds like a Roman word and pictures Alison going to watch games in Rome along with her husband Sextus. The nuisance caused by Jimmy becomes unbearable for Alison as well as Cliff.

Jimmy continues the simile of the games, with himself playing Sextus and Alison Pusillanimous. He transgresses into the world of Hollywood. If a film were to be made on him, the beefcake Christians would take off with his wife in the stereophonic sound before the picture is over. In one stroke he demolishes the Christians, the British actors and the Roman Empire. Sextus is unimpressive, the British actor suitable only to play unimpressive role like that, the Christians making away with pusillanimous and Pusey herself willing to go for an easier, brighter and more promising future. He calls Alison Pusey and suggests that both of them go into the Arena and feed themselves to the lions.

It is for the first time in the pay that Alison feels the loss of her nerves and exclaims that unless Jimmy stopped she'll go out of her mind.

Jimmy remains unruffled. In his hunt for Alison he takes out the dictionary and reads out, emphasizing each word, the meaning of pusillanimous. As if not satisfied with this he refers to the origin of the word. A Latin word, he says, 'Pusillus' means 'very little', 'animus' mind. He again points at Alison calling her lady Pusillanimous, watching and waiting for her to break down. It seems as if Jimmy would succeed but Alison retains her composure.

Jimmy gives himself a short break to listen to the concert and the conversation between Cliff and Alison serves as a pleasant interlude. Cliff's trousers have been ironed, he wears them and Alison and he smoke cigarettes.

Jimmy's fuss about the noise Cliff is making by turning the pages of the newspaper and his reminder that he has spent his nine pence on it restores the atmosphere in which the play had started.

Jimmy's objection to Alison's ironing the clothes and his subsequently switching off the radio shows, as Alison rightly says, his childishness.

Jimmy does not like to be patronized, he hates sensitivity, he hates sentimentality. He hates indifference he hates attention. The speech that follows shows Jimmy's hidden hatred for women. Apart from Madeline and his friend's mother, of whom we shall learn later, he hates to live with them. Jimmy sounds like a misogynist, he finds women clumsy in their movements and wonders what would happen if the world had more women surgeons. He finds Alison clumsy the way she jumps on the bed, the way she draws the curtains back, even her dressing up when she for example is applying her make up or doing her hair. There are two simile's comparing a woman to the old Arab and another one comparing her to a surgeon operating on a patient. Jimmy's picture of a woman surgeon operating on a patient with his guts taken out and put back in the body just

like a puff in a powder-box suggest mockery and impatience of the woman's ways. Jimmy recounts one of his past experience to prove his point. He had a flat once, he says, just beneath the one occupied by two girls, the girls movements and actions were a kind of assault on his sensibilities. Even a simple visit to the lavatory sounded like a medieval siege. Jimmy suffers not only from class hatred and opposite sex hatred but also bears against them a strong ill will. He does not spare the use of, he himself admits, the most ingenious obscenities for the bastard girls as he calls them. The marriage is for him, in itself agonizing to the man. The two girls, he imagines, must be married by then, driving their husbands out of their minds. The slamming of doors, the stamping of high heels and banging of irons and saucepans add to the assault on the sensibilities of man.

Jimmy wants the world to tune itself to his fancies and whims. He had earlier expressed his unhappiness at the clouds appearing on the sky, now it is the ringing of the Church bells that disturbs him. He rushing to the window and asking for the bells to stop suggests the frenzy that is taking hold of him. His denial of everything leads to paroxysm of despair and disgruntlement.

Alison stops him from shouting but recovers herself in a moment. Jimmy's attitude towards Mrs. Drudery, who is mentioned by Alison for the first time is the same as for everybody else. She is their landlady, a robber according to Jimmy. She is a Church-goer too, which is not a recommendation as far as Jimmy is concerned.

Cliff's understanding of Alison and Jimmy is most near perfect. He closes the window and acts as if they are on the dance floor. Their jokes are lightly vulgar, Cliff asks him if he comes there,(imagining that they are at the dance floor) to which Jimmy naughtily replies, only in the mating season'. His warning that all Cliff's teeth will come out if he does not stop his tomfoolery is also in lighter vein.

There is a light irony in the question whether the bosoms ill be in or out this year, it is a passing remark on the changing fashions of the times.

Jimmy's and Cliff's fights and physical assaults throw light on their relationship, which is one of deep affection and understanding. The tussle between Jimmy and Cliff is an everyday affair says Alison, it is distasteful to her, disgusting and vulgar may be, but she uses restraint describing the place as a zoo. Jimmy and Cliff after grappling with each other fall on the ground, bringing down the ironing board with them. Alison burns her arm with the hot iron. Alison, who has been controlling herself so far, can constraint herself no longer. Both the men apologize to her but she is difficult to appease. She asks both of them to get out. It is Jimmy only, however, who leaves and Cliff remains to tend her.

The relationship between Cliff and Alison is tender and effortless. That they have a deeper understanding between them than Jimy and Alison enjoy becomes clear from the uncertainty of Jimmy after Alison is hurt. It is Cliff who nod, asking Jimmy to go. Cliff brings the soap and assures Alison that he will wash it gently without giving her pain.

Alison is on the breaking point, her gestures when Cliff goes to get the soap show her failing spirit. She can fight no longer, she seems to be telling herself. The front that she has been putting up ultimately seems to be collapsing. Feeling utterly defeated she tells Cliff, ' I don't feel very brave— I don't think I can take much more—I think I eel rather sick'.

The scene where Cliff and Alison are left alone is important to understand the feelings of both Cliff and Alison, towards each other and for Jimmy.

Cliff, a sensitive man lives on the assumption that he is a coarse and ordinary man, he would have others believe it too. His concern for Alison and Jimmy, his effort at disregarding Jimmy's behaviour and trying to bring things back to normal show a man whose emotions and suffering are much deeper than they seem to be. He embarks on the reason for his staying with jimmy and Alison , ' one gets fond of people', he says, ' which unfortunately makes one dependent on them'. Alison is too tired of hearing about love. Her speech suggests two things, one, that both Jimmy and Alison have lost the spontaneity and verve of youth and two that they

have lost the naturalness so essential to sustain a relationship. Even an apology, a consolation, a word of love are difficult, nothing comes on impulse.

Cliff's sadness of the relationship between Jimmy and Alison is also expressed by him, his doubt as to how long he will be able to bear the recurring ugly scenes between the two confirms his feeling of uneasiness in living with them. What renders him helpless is his love for Jimmy and Alison.

Alison discloses to Cliff that she is pregnant. She expresses her own unhappiness about it. She does not want a child in their present condition and is also apprehensive about Jimmy's reaction. It is clear that they do not want a child, since they succeeded in avoiding it for three years after their marriage, says Alison.

Cliff asks her whether the pregnancy is in and advanced stage, she says, she guesses so. It is suggested that Alison would have got it aborted if it were possible but will have to bear it now.

Alison's fear of how Jimmy would react to the news make her cautious of her moves. He is suspicious of Alison's designs on him, he is vulnerable to the smallest thing that means commitment. One can perceive in Jimmy a kind of revulsion for confirmation and continuity. Stagnation to him means binding by laws that don't come to you naturally—feelings of compassion, ecstasy of music, good art, even physical energy are the things worth the salt. Their sexual life seems also inhibited by the fact that after making love with Alison, Jimmy feels hoaxed, cheated as if Alison was trying to ensnare him, kill him, make him her slave, her prey.

Jimmy's vary of a morality that lays restrictions on natural love, love on impulse. Alison tells Cliff that Jimmy and she never slept together before getting married. It was simply because they did not have much opportunity. Later when Jimmy realized that she was a virgin he taunted her. Jimmy's morality instead of being conventional is evolutionary in an idiosyncratic way. He felt, having been defiled, by an untouched woman. The compulsion with which he is out to bulldoze everything that comes from the upper classes, authority, morality, politics, Church, even marriage is indicative of the grievances and hatred he has against them, in his heart.

Cliff tells Alison that both he and Jimmy have common views about so many things since they both come from the working classes. Jimmy's hatred for the posh is evident from the fact that he hates some of his relatives who are better off. He likes Cliff and gets along with him because he's common.

Cliff and Alison have no guilt about their affection. They have therefore, no shame of it. Even after Jimmy enters the room, Cliff and Alison continue to have their arms around one another. Cliff has already asked her to disclose her pregnancy to Jimmy, assuring her that all will be well.

Jimmy is some-where unsure of himself. When Cliff says, that Alison is beautiful, he says that Cliff seems to think so. He also asks whether Cliff feels that Alison was more suited to him. Alison answers Cliff's remark that he was not her type, in very meaningful words, ' I'm not sure what my type is'.

Jimmy's aversion for excessive physical fondling and sexuality is brought out in his words, ' they look pretty silly slobbering over each other: their freedom with each other would be enough to scandalize Alison's parents. Every time Jimmy creates a scene, he tries to normalize things, to restore and reestablish himself.

Jimmy comments on Cliff becoming shorter and smaller everyday and calls him a mouse. Cliff readily welcomes this. Cliff dance happily like a mouse around the table. The old friendly atmosphere of their world is reestablished; Jimmy is the horrible 'old bear', Cliff the mouse, dancing the Mourris dance. Jimmy and Cliff resume their tomfoolery, Alison her affectionate way. Cliff is sent to get some cigarettes since Alison has run out of them and Jimmy and Alison are left together standing close to each other. We see a glimpse of Jimmy's other self, the loving Jimmy, which gives the reader a respite from the ongoing madness. He apologizes to Alison and breaks into a speech, which brings out his feelings for Alison, much deeper than one has perceived so far. He would not have her busy herself with the drab routine of ironing clothes and other household chores.

Jimmy is lonely and furious. He hates staleness and yet he fears losing people he is used to. 'The trouble is', he says, 'you get used to people'. 'Even the trivialities of people, you get used to, become indispensable to you'. He now wants to make love to Alison but will have to wait, since Cliff will come back any time. He wants to

know what Alison has been wanting to tell him but Alison is unable to do so. He talks of his school friends, recalling their names and mentions Hugh's mother, who to him, is special. She is let Jimmy buy her sweet stall and pay in his own time. She had as a matter of fact bought the shop for them only. It hurts Jimmy that Alison maintains her distance with Hugh's mom in spite of the old woman's fondness for her.

Alison feels alarmed at Jimmy's sudden change of mood. After his avowal of watching and wanting her every moment, his reversal to Hugh, Hugh's mother and Madeline is foreboding. Jimmy senses the growing anxiety of her mind and re-assures her by calling her a grey-eyed squirrel. He continues to call her by endearing names like, 'hoarding nut munching squirrel', she responds by calling him a 'jolly', 'super and marvelous bear'. The bestial sensuality has replaced the intellectual and emotional rancour.

Alison takes no time to get into the animal exhilaration of love. She stars jumping and taking out sounds like a squirrel. It is in this happy mood that Alison wants to tell Jimmy what she had been intending to say. But as in a drama, the dramatic turns must be contrived so as to keep the audience's interest intact. Cliff suddenly appears saying that he had not been able to go for the cigarettes at all. He was all this while with Mrs. Drudery, who hadn't gone to the Church. He tells Alison that there is a phone call for her and the news of Alison's pregnancy is postponed for another time. Jimmy is upset to hear the name of the caller since Helena Charles, a friend of Alison is his enemy, he says. He fears that Helena Charles' visit will disturb the atmosphere of the house further.

After Alison leaves to hear the phone call he falls into another unpleasant speech. He had had enough of women and sensual pleasure. He then goes on to speak of Andre Gide and then of Webster, adding that if a revolution ever comes, he would be the first to be shot with all the poor old liberals.

He alludes to the fact that Webster does not like him and sarcastically comments that Webster is not an exception since nobody seems to like him. Webster keeps thrusting his strawberry mark as if he was the only one with it. Jimmy has his own strawberry mark, he says, only it different from Webster's. The leftists would mistake Jimmy for a liberal if ever the revolution came and he would be killed along with the other liberals.

While talking he opens Alison's bags and sees her mothers letters in it. He resents the fact that his name is never mentioned in the letters. Jimmy admits that he has become mean but explains that that was the only way of knowing Alison's secrets. Cliff objects to his opening of Alison's bag. Jimmy replies unabashedly that to know whether or not Alison is betraying him, he not only opens her bag but also then searches the drawers, the bookcase, the trunks and what have you.

He takes out a letter from the bag, a letter from Alison's mother wherein he has not been mentioned at all. He bitterly says that his name is never mentioned in their letters by either Alison's mother or her because it is a 'dirty word' to both of them.

The return to the rancorous mood is complete. Helena is coming to stay but Alison would arrange for her the spare room that is vacant with Mrs. Drudery.

Jimmy's phrases like he will kick her in the face and that Helena should bring armour as she would need one, reveal the extreme hatred he has for her.

The last part of Act 1 is important in that it is here that we see Jimmy not only as a man who resents the treatment meted out to him, but as a man who has no control over his nerves. He tells Alison that she is living in a dream world and that she needs a tragedy of a great magnitude to happen to her to shake her out of her sleep. A tragedy like she having a child and then losing it, the tragedy will bring some expression on her expressionless face.

He describes how passionately Alison can make love and says that at such times, he is devoured by her as if he were a rabbit. The most offensive of Jimmy's speeches this establishes him as not only an 'angry man', an epithet usually used for him, but as a maniac, a sadist, whose perversity in inflicting pain becomes sacrilegious.

ACT II Scene (1)

The same room.Two weeks have passed since Helena arrived and she has already made herself at home. We see Helena for the first time though we had heard of her in Act 1. It is a hot evening and Alison and Helena are preparing the evening meal. Helena is almost the same age as Alison, carefully and expensively dressed. She has a personality, which draws attention and commands respect. She is seen helping Alison prepare the salad. Both the women are busy talking side by side.

Alison asks whether Helena has been able to adjust to which Helena replies that she feels comfortable working and reminds Alison that it is she who had done most of the cooking the previous week. She says that the only problem is fetching water from the bathroom on the lower floor since she is not used to a thing like that.

The fact that the system is rather primitive is agreed upon by the two. The conversation between Alison and Helena is of a casual manner. Alison tells Helena that Cliff manages most of his own jobs and even helps Alison with her household chores. Helena says that she has already knocked at Cliffs' door to call him for the meal. Jimmy is heard playing loudly at his trumpet, which as usual is upsetting Alison.

This scene brings out the relationship between Helena and Alison, the scene is also important to hear from Alison what her feelings about Cliff, Jimmy and her marriage are.

The sound of Jimmy's trumpet is disturbing to both the women. Alison says that one of these days, Mrs. Drury, the landlady is going to ask them to vacate because of this noise. She imagines the irritation it must be causing to the people and fears that they will soon start banging at their door, asking them to stop this menace.

Helena starts to analyse Jimmy's behaviour. Her first question, as expected, is whether Jimmy drank, to which Alison replies that he was not an addict if that is what Helena meant. Helena observes that 'Jimmy's hatred could be seen in his very eyes and that the magnitude of his hatred was bewildering and horrifying. He hated all, but Helena in particular', she says. It must be noted that Helena finds his anger horrifying but at the same time ' oddly exciting'. She had never seen 'such hatred in some one's eyes before' is what she tells Alison.

Alison offers, what to her seems to be the most apparent reason for Jimmy's frustration, the sweet stall that he runs. Jimmy had, while he was still a student, his own jazz band. Jimmy would, she says, like to start another jazz band and give up the sweet stall altogether.

Helena finds the relationship between Cliff and Alison slightly suspect; their behaviour is what would seem strange to most people. It does not confirm to the accepted standards. It is not normal and Helena seeks clarification from Alison about it.

Alison asks whether it is the hugging and embracing which she finds strange. Helena feels that there is something strange about them and has noticed Cliff restraining himself in her presence. To Helena's question whether it is something beyond affection, Alison replies that it is not a consuming passion, it is like the comfort that you get in a warm bed which is so relaxing and satisfying that you don't look for anything more exciting.

Jimmy's comfort and lack of anxiety about this relationship is difficult for Helena to understand. Alison tries to explain Jimmy's attitude towards their relationship as a part of his larger psyche. For Jimmy it is a question of allegiances, loyalty and devotion. Jimmy expects Alison to fully share not only his present and future but his past as well. Jimmy expects Alison not only to share his present but also to share the memories of his past, to then cherish the relationships he cherished. He is unhappy if Alison does not share his love and admiration of people. He expects Alison to identify herself with his suffering of the past, of his father's death and even share the memories of the women he loved in his early years.

Helena fails to comprehend the meaning and justification of what Jimmy demands of Alison. Alison has herself not been able to figure it out completely. Alison has failed to feel about things the way Jimmy does.

Cliff seems to have come by chance as a stroke of luck in their life. He is kind and lovable and Alison is genuinely fond of him, she says. He is so very unlike Hugh, a former friend of Jimmy in whose house they lived for some time after their marriage.

Jimmy had no money at that time, he had recently left the university and had no place to go. Alison also mentions that Jimmy went to a University, which was most ordinary, it looked most unimposing with an ordinary campus and rooms with white tiles. Everything that Alison describes proves that Jimmy came from a poor background, so did his friends. Hugh Tanner lived with his mother in a warehouse in Poplar and that is where Alison found herself on her wedding night. Alison's loss of hope and a sense of frustration are evident from her narration of those days. Hugh and Alison had taken a dislike for each other on the first sight. Jimmy wanted Alison to have a most wonderful relationship with his friends. Alison's discomfort with the class of people she had come to live with comes out in words like ' three of us tried to get tight in some cheap port they'd brought in'. There is even a kind of remorse in her at having burnt her boats and having being cut off from the people she'd always known, her family and her friends. Alison felt trapped unable to return to her parents whom she had bitterly opposed. She had nowhere to go. Her brother, Nigel was busy for the coming elections since he was contesting for membership to the Parliament, he didn't have time to think of anyone at that time. Though, if approached he would surely have been kind to her, she never went to him.

There are things in the play, which don't seem too plausible. Alison did not inform her brother of the trouble she was in, she did not go to Helena since she was away on tour for a play, look less than probable reasons for either Helena or Nigel not having been approached.

Alison describes the days at Poplar as a nightmare. She recalls that those days were full of horror, Jimmy and Hugh were so ruthless: Hugh subtly insulting and sarcastic, Jimmy steadily depressed; they were a savage team. She was made to feel stupid, she was snobbish and squeamish, she was told. She felt as if she had been dropped in a jungle. Hugh's character can be guessed from what Alison says of him, ' he takes the first prize for ruthlessness- from all corners. They both seemed to regard Alison as a hostage from those sections of the society they had declared war on. They were together frightening to Alison; they started another campaign to avenge themselves on Alison's family. . They would invite themselves to Alison's family, friends, the people her parents knew and their relatives. They went everywhere uninvited to the Arksdens, to the Tarnatts, for cocktails, parties and entertainment. Living in Poplars, SW, SW 3 and other posh localities were for them the enemy territory. Jimmy and Hugh felt happy at plundering them of their drinks, food and cigars. The people they visited did not disallow them, they were in the first place too decent for it, and secondly afraid they would hurt Alison if they objected.

Hugh was the worst of the two. He even black mailed a friend of Redfern's by giving him the story that they were being turned out of the flat they were occupying for non-payment of rent. They were such men that people would have given anything to get rid of them.

Alison had no money to sustain them since her mother had got all the shares transferred in her name before Alison got married. For want of money and for revenge, the guerrilla-warfare, which Jimmy and Hugh had waged against Alison's class, continued unabated.

Helena is surprised that Alison had not tried to put a stop to it, neither opposed them nor voiced her anger. As a matter of fact, she asks, why did Alison marry Jimmy in the first place? Alison has no precise reason for it. She describes the circumstances in which she met Jimmy. Her parents, she says, had come back from India. Col. Redfern had become uncertain and irritable; Mrs. Redfern had little understanding to confide in. Alison was only twenty-one. She met Jimmy at a party. He was the odd man out, with a bicycle, looking different from all the others in the party. He had oil all over his dinner jacket. He looked a creature from a different world; the men looked at him with distrust, the women with contempt. Alison's narration of the past in this scene is the vantage point from which Alison's feelings and attitude towards Jimmy can be studied fully. Alison continues to describe how she was charmed by Jimmy It was a lovely day and Jimmy had been in the sun. What

attracted Alison towards Jimmy was the fire in him. Everything about him seemed to burn his face; the edges of his hair glistened and seemed to spring form his head, and his eyes were so blue and full of the sun. He looked so young and frail in spite of the tired line of his mouth.

Alison knew her limitations but she had no choice. She was in love and whether he was in love or not he was determined to marry Alison simply because her people were outraged at Alison's choice. Jimmy wanted to prove his victory in the teeth of opposition.

Everything seemed so romantic to Alison, Jimmy was to her like a chivalrous knight rescuing the damsel in distress. Alison continues to recount incidents that occurred in the past. Nigel's meetings were sometimes disturbed by Hugh and his companions. Alison then describes the circumstances under which Hugh left England. Hugh had been writing a novel. He suddenly made up his mind to go and try some other country. England was no longer a place to stay, he said. Alison's reference to China or some other God-forsaken place suggests her hidden contempt for these countries of the East, which she considered' God-forsaken'. Hugh felt that the conditions in England had been rendered hopeless by people like Alison's family. He sarcastically called Alison's family, ' Dame Alison's mole'. Jimmy disapproved of Hugh's idea of leaving his country as well as leaving his mother alone. Jimmy considered it shirking from responsibility. The friends fought bitterly over the issue till ultimately Hugh left. Alison's remarks like ' I almost wished they'd both go and leave me behind', are enough to indicate the extent of her frustration.

Alison continues to narrate the past to Helena. Alison and Jimmy came to their present flat after Hugh left. Hugh's mother seemed to be blaming Alison for Hugh's departure. Alison tells Helena that she has nothing against Mrs. Hugh. She is a kind lady, sweet and ignorant to Alison, adorable to Jimmy. Jimmy's admiration for Hugh's mother is partly because she has always been poor. Poverty to Jimmy is something, which deserves attention and admiration. Poverty to him it seems is a quality, a virtue, not a state.

Helena advises Alison to make up her mind finally about Jimmy. She says she that since she is pregnant she has to worry not only about her life but about the life of her future child.

Alison again makes remarks, which show how closed, uncommunicative and stifling her relationship with Jimmy has become. ' I'm so tired. I dread him coming into the room'. The pity is that she loves Jimmy in spite of everything and has never wanted any other man in her life. Alison tells Helena and assures her that the child she is carrying is Jimmy's only. Helena says that things should be set in order. Either Jimmy should learn to take responsibility or Alison should quit, what to Helena is a 'madhouse', a menagerie, a wild place inhabited by animals like Jimmy.

Alison now shows Helena a bear and a squirrel, the bear, she says, is Jimmy, the squirrel she and than they both play a game, ' bears and squirrels, squirrels and bears'.

Helena looks bewildered and remarks that Jimmy may be mad for doing such things. Alison tells her, how after Hugh's departure, Jimmy and Alison had resorted to this game. Bitterly lonely and having little rapport, they retreated into the animal world; they played like animals with one another, made love like animals: 'they became furry creatures with little brains'. This was something that gave them a short lease of life, she recoils from the thought of living like mere animals but adds that bereft of that animal spirit, they have nothing to live on. Helena again urges Alison to make up her mind as if she lived with Jimmy, she would go mad.

The conversation between Alison and Helena is interrupted by the entrance of Cliff. In his usual light mood, he asks Helena if the tea is ready. He calls out to Jimmy asking him to stop his bloody noise. Cliff asks Helena and Alison if they were going to the pictures, he is surprised to hear that they were going to the church instead. To Helena's question whether he would like to accompany them, he replies, that he would like to read the papers since he had not been able to do so in the morning.

Jimmy's remarks about the newspapers and his love for music expose his hatred for Alison and Helena. Jimmy lets out his hatred, by his insolent and brutal attack on the two women, he spares Cliff, ensuring at the same time that Cliff remained his ally, not theirs. Jimmy makes uncalled for remarks to instigate Helena and Alison,

'Cliff likes music, all right, only the women don't and those who don't like jazz, have no feeling for music or people', he concludes. Helena snubs him calling his remark rubbish.

With no controversial topic to pick on, Jimmy again reverts to the lack of care in handling newspapers in the house. His focus now shifts to Cliff. He comments on the lack of intellect and curiosity in him, denounces him as 'Welsh trash' and asks him 'what are you'? 'what are you'?, here does not signify doubt in Jimmy's mind about Cliff's worth, it is simply his way of dealing with him. If Cliff is nothing than he should be the Prime Minister, Jimmy's target shifts; it is not Cliff but the Prime Minister he seems to denounce now.

Jimmy's tirade against Alison and her class continue while they are having their meal. They, the people where Alison belongs are all very spiritual, so refined in taste that they discuss matters of sex as if it were the 'Art of Fague'. Picking up and keeping the continuity of the argument in musical tones, he passes adverse comments like the following on Alison without any provocation. ' She is sweet and sticky outside while messy and disgusting if you see deeper.

Cliff is like Alison, Jimmy says, he is always keen to please and to appease. Jimmy warns him that he will end up being like Alison and others of her class, black-hearted, evil minded and vicious if he continued to live like them. Alison does not react even once against the mad ravings of Jimmy, she seems to have insulated herself against them.

Jimmy says that he had composed a new song. Talking to the ladies by turn he asks Helena if she would help him give a religious angle to the song since that is bound to make the song more popular. Jimmy recites the lyric, which deals with booze and whoring. Sick of sex and being constricted by women, he would prefer booze, which is at least pure, celibate.

Jimmy repeats his weariness with sex, revealing in him a kind of revulsion for the physical. Jimmy is tiresome in his repetition but he must make his point. After sex, it is religion that becomes his target. For his denunciation of religion he chooses Helena as his special listener. He tells her that the other poem he had written has the religious strain of Dante and Eliot; the religious element, he adds sarcastically should particularly appeal to Helena.

The title of the poem is the Cess Pool and Jimmy is the stone trapped in the pool of filthy water. Cliff's derogatory remarks about Jimmy bear no ill will against him, nor do Jimmy's remarks bear any malice for Cliff.

Helena asks Jimmy why he tries to be so unpleasant, to which Jimmy replies that he is happy to incite Helena, to instigate her into entering into an argument. Helena's remark that Jimmy is very offensive makes him still happier and he roars with laughter at having won the battle.

Jimmy's curiosity about where Alison was going with Helena, betrays his sense of insecurity. Though domineering in his treatment of others, the fear that his authority would be challenged is always lurking in his mind.

He tries to instil a fear in Helena as he had done earlier in the case of Alison. The pride, which he tries to flaunt, and the arrogance that he displays is only skin-deep. He is desperate to know where Alison is going with Helena. He tries to hide his fear of Helena usurping his authority over Alison by calling Helena's company an affliction. It is Helena, more of a match to Jimmy who makes a confident reply, telling him that they were going to the Church. Jimmy is for once beaten at his own game.

He accuses Helena of trying to win Alison over and accuses Alison of being so feeble. He reverts to the old story of what all he had endured to marry Alison. Alison's outburst that yes Jimmy had rescued her from the clutches of her family shows her contempt for Jimmy's claim. To her taunt that he was like a knight who had carried her off on his white charger, he replies in a voice that is calculated and calm. He lends to the entire episode a touch of parody, a mock-heroic by describing her mother as the off white charger, their house as a castle and her family's war against Jimmy as a holy crusade. Mummy, Jimmy says bitterly was prepared to use any weapon to shield her daughter, she could resort to cheating, bullying, lying and blackmailing.

Jimmy makes another odious comparison between Alison's mother and a female rhinoceros in labour. Alison's mother would be so dreadful and disgusting to the male rhinoceros that they would pledge themselves to celibacy.

In Jimmy's long speech, Alison's mother is the object of hatred and attack. Alison's mother, he says, looked over fed and flabby on the outside, inside she was all armour plated, ever ready to strike. She was rough as a night in a Bombay brothel and tough as a paired animal's arse. His hatred amounts to the wish that he kill her, annihilate her. He sits on the cistern saying that Alison's mother may be hiding in it and listening to them and beats it with bango drums.

Jimmy's hatred for Alison's mother is a reaction to her contempt for him. She hated his long hair, she considered him a ruffian, she found him unfit for her daughter and would do anything to save her from him. She would not mind resorting to any measure, intrigue, even conspiracy to ruin Jimmy's reputation, puncture his guts and get him going. She wanted to ruin Jimmy's reputation so that discredited and despoiled he would flee the field, leaving Alison free.

Cliff is throughout trying to control Jimmy good-humouredly. Jimmy continues to pour profanation not only on Alison's family but against Helena as well. Helena is the sin-jobbler who would take Alison to the Church to supplicate herself to worship and to pray for forgiveness. Helena tries to stop Jimmy but he continues in an even more menacing tone. Alison's mother was a bitch and should be dead. He challenges Alison to rise in her mothers' defence. Cliff, alarmed by Jimmy's tone and apprehending the worst, tries to stop him but is savagely pushed back. Jimmy continues to spit venom against Mrs. Redfern. After she is dead, the worms who eat her body will suffer from stomach ache. Her body is so poisonous that even the worms will need laxatives to cure themselves of the mal-nutrition. ' From purgatives to purgatory', the phrase used by Osborne is effective for its alliteration as well as its meaning. From cleansing of the body to the cleansing of the soul is purgatory.

He incites Alison to react but Alison, to his dismay, will not. He insults her, he mocks her by statements at once witty and surprising by their paradox. She would, he says, react if someone insulted him, by springing into one of the moods of lethargy and saying nothing. To Jimmy, Alison can rise to an occasion by merely not rising to it. She can neither be lifted nor pushed down from her level. It is her static position that exasperates him. She remains unruffled even by the most deadly provocation.

Helena is the only one who does not withhold her contempt and loathing for Jimmy, but Jimmy goes on undeterred. He shall he says, write a book one-day. The book that he will write with his blood will be all 'fire and blood'. His book will have no thoughts of comfort and tranquility; he shall not go picking daffodils with Annie Wordsworth. He will write about the flames a mile high, the most unwordsworthian of all poems.

Helena tries to be reason out with Jimmy, for a change. It is Alison who remarks that she better not take Jimmy's suffering away from him, he'd be lost without it. The remark is very meaningful since Jimmy according to her is sustaining himself only on his bitterness against the world, he thrives on the grievances he nurtures in his heart, his anger and hatred are his blood, he breathes them, he feeds on them, he lives on them.

Jimmy is for a moment surprised by this subtle attack by Alison but decides to continue his war. Jimmy feels more and more threatened by Helena's presence and asks her why she had not left even a week after her play was over. He accuses her of hatching a plot against him, to which Helena smartly replies that there was enough of villainy already (meaning in him) for them to think of furthering it by conspiracy. He then asks Alison why she is letting herself be influenced by Helena. Alison shows her displeasure for being questioned for everything small but Jimmy does not give up.

Jimmy says, and this speech is mostly for Alison's consumption, that they had in the past never gone to Church. The last time they had gone to a Church was when they got married. He remembers his marriage with a kind of scorn, scorn for the lust of marriage, which involves physical abandonment and indulgence. Jimmy and Alison had decided for a wedding in the Church, since the Registrar was a close friend of Col Redfern. They wanted to keep it a secret for fear of Alison's parents. When Jimmy and Alison went to the Church, they found

to their surprise that Alison' parents were already there. Jimmy's words like 'execution' and 'lusting for marriage' again reveal his disgust for the carnal, his anguish at having surrendered to the lust of the body, continuing his metaphor of the female rhino he describes how Alison's mother sat in the Church. Alison's father was upright and unafraid; he was still living in the hey-days of British glory, imagining himself still in India. Jimmy recalls that there were only four of them in the Church, he, Alison and her parents.

Jimmy continues to incite Helena. He calls her a cow, a sacred cow, a saint in Dior's clothing, alluding to what she was and what she would have people to believe.

Cliff reprimands Jimmy for going too far but Helena pays no heed. Jimmy accuses Cliff of going over to Helena's side, the side of Christianity, to the Church, which are as commercial in their dealings as any other business house: they promise you reward in heaven for your good deeds on earth, penalty for the sins you have committed. They are the share brokers who make promises of gain in heaven for your investments in spiritual matters here on earth.

Jimmy continues to impugn the Church for merchandising and trafficking in souls. He says, the Directors of religion with their new skills in management always ensure that the dividends are good; they also have the knack of approaching the right people, those who are vulnerable and can easily be taken in. The method adopted by these religious propagandists is simple, go back to the old times, paradoxically their only way to progress is by a return the past. They romanticize their spirits, they close themselves in the small hermitage of their hearts and become oblivious to the problems around them. Helena is such a person. Like many others, the only place where she can see light, is the Dark Ages. She is ecstatic in her solitude, confessing and absolving herself of all guilt privately. She is not interested in what is being explored and created, she likes to cut herself off from the modern conveniences that man has discovered and invented. She does not like to meddle with the problems that the world faces either.

Helena maintains her calm throughout the speech. She puts Jimmy in place by saying that had he been within her reach she would have slapped him. When Jimmy moves towards her, she repeats that if gets any closer she will slap him. Jimmy retorts by saying that he can slap Helena back without a moments thought. He had neither the public school education nor the scruples of a gentleman to stop him, he would not hesitate striking her and lay her down.

Helena's simple reply that she does not fancy any such notions about Jimmy since she knows his class as well as his manners, serves to rebuff as well as insult him.

Jimmy explains that he does not wish to be threatened by any women, for he would not take from her without giving back to her. Retaliation will come naturally to him but he prefers to avoid violence, since he hates it.

Jimmy asks Helena again whether she had ever watched anybody die. He recounts the death of his own father who came back from the war in Spain and died after suffering for a year. His reference to the God-fearing men who had rendered him unfit to live for long is a painful reflection on the violence and pain inflicted by man on man on the pretext of patriotism and principles. Jimmy was at that time only ten years old and his father's suffering and alienation bereaved him. Jimmy's mother hardly cared for him, she saw him as a man who allied himself with the wrong side. She was all for minorities provided they were a smart and fashionable minority. The family did not fail in its duty by way of money or provision but the care that one longs for was missing. Only Jimmy cared, the others it seemed, waited for him to die. The father did not want to create any vulgar fuss but he shared with Jimmy, things, which he could hardly understand, at that age. The sad outpourings of his fathers' heart made Jimmy sad and brought tears to his eyes. Jimmy recalled the bitterness and despair of the dying man and his sweet sickly smell.

Jimmy knew what it was to be angry and helpless at the age of ten, he had become a veteran in suffering. Whereas Helena was still a virgin as far as death and suffering were concerned, she had experienced neither.

Jimmy's speech does not leave much impression on Helena whose immediate remark that it was time they went, is very matter of fact in tone.

Jimmy cannot bear to be defeated at anyone's hands. Losing his bravado in the face of defeat at Helena hands, he appeals to Alison to save him. His words to Alison that it does not matter to her what people do to him again reveal the weaker side of Jimmy's personality. He would expect Alison to stand by him, to refute and fight Helena for the sake of his prestige. He abuses Alsion for letting Helena do this to him.

Alison is not moved by either Jimmy's appeal or anger. She changes into a new dress and is ready to go. However, she is so upset that she feels giddy and leans against a wall for support. All she wants is a little peace, she says. But Jimmy's complaints are perpetual refusing to offer even a minute of respite to Alison. He complains that people do not understand him, they either pity him or denounce him, his grudge is that Alison's treatment of him is the most painful, to him she is indifferent to his suffering. When his heart is full or he is sick with rage, she simply keeps herself clear of him, unconcerned and undisturbed she even goes off to sleep.

Jimmy's self-searching speech makes him slightly pitiable indeed. Who is to blame, who is mean and stupid, who is the tyrant, he or Alison, he asks himself. He resorts to self-pity to relieve himself of the utter rage and desolation that have overtaken him. Alison's rejection of him in the act of wearing her shoes and going to the Church signify to Jimmy a loss of power, the loss of his power as a man. He compares himself in the futility of his words to a hysterical girl.

His helplessness at Alison's treatment of him infuriates him even further. He now falls to the level of cursing Alison. He wishes that Alison may one day suffer and that he may be able to gloat in her suffering. He would, then stand in her tears and rejoice in them, dance in them, splash in them. Defeated and beaten Jimmy feels out bargained by Alison and Helena. He wants Alison to suffer, fall and be subdued, that is what can satisfy him, he wants nothing more.

It is in this mood that Jimmy goes to hear the phone call for him. Helena's hatred for Jimmy comes out in her words, ' I want to claw his hair out by the roots' etc. She is more concerned about Alison's pregnancy and the child and blames Jimmy foe upsetting Alison in her present state.

Cliff's long speech, the first out of the two or three that he has in the entire play, makes us familiar with the situation between jimmy and Alison form his point of view. He calls their house a battlefield, a narrow strip of plain hell and tells Helena that he has played a role in keeping Jimmy and Alison together. Alison and Jimmy would have broken of long back but for Cliff, who has served, he says, as a no man's land between the two. He makes a statement of his love for both Jimmy and Alison, about the atmosphere in the house, he says, brawling and excitement are a part of life and he doesn't mind being in the thick of it. Cliff adds sadly that he pities himself and others in the house for the situation they are in. Helena discloses that she has sent a telegram to Alison's father to come and take her home. Alison's simple yes to Helena's disclosure that she had sent a telegram and that Alison should go back to her parents shows that she has no power to resist or oppose anyone, she agrees to go with her father without even asking one question to Helena. She does not even mind Helena having called her father without consulting her. Jimmy comes back after taking the phone call. It was from a hospital, where Hugh's mother had been admitted after a stroke. She was dying he says. By the manner of his speech, it is obvious that he expects Alison to go with him. He falls into one of his sentimental speeches reminiscing their days with the Tanner's.

Mrs. Hugh had seen Alison's photograph after their marriage. She was charmed by Alison's beauty. Jimmy remembers the genuineness with which she had exclaimed, ' Alison was pure gold, she was priceless.' Jimmy again expresses his sense of loneliness while asking Alison if she could come with him and looks baffled when she walks away. In utter disbelief he picks up the bear and throws it down stage. The groaning and rattling of the bear are symbolic of Jimmy's own feelings at that time.

ACT II (Scene II)

Scene 2 is important for two reasons. The first that we meet Colonel Redfern, who arrives in response to Helena's telegram and second because Alison walks out on Jimmy. Unexpectedly Helena stays back.

The Colonel is described as a large handsome man, his basic goodness is proved by the fact that he is sad for Alison, disturbed by the turn of events rather than being happy as his wife would be, perhaps in case she were present.

In the course of his conversation with Alison the Colonel says that he has failed to understand the situation, he says that Jim speaks a language different from any one of them. Alison tells him that Jimmy was away to meet Mrs. Tanner the mother of Hugh Tanner, a friend of Jimmy. She had suddenly taken ill and Jimmy had left for London immediately. Since the Colonel has only a vague idea about Hugh and his mother, Alison tells him that she was the same person who had helped Jimmy set up the sweet stall. To her fathers question whether she was in any way like her son, Alison says that she was nothing like her son. The question is indicative of the impression that the Redferns had of Hugh, it also confirms that Hugh was obnoxious to their family. Alison describes Hugh's mother as very ordinary. She was a charwoman who had married an actor. She had worked hard throughout her life to support her husband and son. Her ordinariness was what Jimmy admired, since ordinariness to him was the tag of the working class.

She tells her father that Cliff is managing the stall in Jimmy's absence. The Colonel expresses surprise at the fact that an educated man like Jimmy who was clever in his own way has found nothing better to do.

It is also disclosed during the conversation that Alison had not shared with her parents the conditions in which she had been living.

She tells her father that Jimmy thought that it was a great treason on the part of Alison to be writing to her parents. The question of what she wrote was of no consequence, when to Jimmy corresponding with them was betrayal in itself.

Colonel Redfern admits that they were to some extent responsible for igniting the fire of revenge and hatred in Jimmy's heart. He remembers with regret how hostile Alison's mother had become towards Jimmy. He hadn't been able to stop it but the inquiries about Jimmy, the detectives they had hired, the accusations, the insults they had hurled at Jimmy were horrifying. He re-affirms his disapproval of Jimmy as a match for Alison but the way things were handled was undignified.

Colonel Redfern's views which strike Jimmy as more balanced than most other characters in the play are reveled in his speech was honest in his dealings per se, Alison's mother was justified in her anxiety to protect her daughter. But the method adopted was undesirable. Redfern blames Alison and himself for letting the situation take an ugly turn. They never put their foot down, never fought them back refusing to disturb their position which was by comparison more comfortable. They, Alison and her father were alike in the sense that they avoided anything that disturbed their peace and were in that sense responsible for what happened. He then suggests that Alison should not have written letters to them when she knew that it infuriated Jimmy and hurt his sense of pride. Both the father and daughter find the situation awkward, Alison continues to tell Colonel Redfern what Jimmy said about Mrs. Redfern. She reproduces the very words used by Jimmy without reservation. She says that Jimmy's feelings about Colonel Redfern are not so hard. He just talks of him more humorously, portraying him as a 'plant left over from the Edwardian wilderness', that can't understand why the sun isn't shining anymore. The phrase suggests the ludicrousness and absurdity of the man, but not the hatred, which every word that Jimmy says about Alison's mother, conveys.

To her father's desperate question as to why did she have to meet Jimmy at all, she appeals that the question was meaningless as she had paid for it by suffering for four years. She is scared of any argument and logic since nothing can reverse what has already happened. Alison renders different reasons for Jimmy's determination to marry Alison. It may have been revenge, revenge with the class he hated. The reader would remember that Alison had in the earlier scene said the same thing to Helena. Jimmy and his friends felt that

Alison was the hostage they had taken to settle their score with her class. Alison feels that Jimmy takes himself to be P. B. Shelley, the poet and wonders why Alison is not Mary, the woman Shelley loved and why was Colonel Redfern not the villain Godwin. Jimmy weighs himself as well as others in his own scale, he measures himself to be a genius for love and friendship, the others lacking in both. Jimmy has his own set of values and would not accommodate any other idea. She calls Jimmy, ' a spiritual barbarian, meaning, the man who has his own scruples and conscience but guards them unscrupulously, without any restraint or without any civilized code of conduct. He throws the challenge at Alison's face, challenging the righteousness of her class. Her situation is so complex that it is difficult to understand it.

Colonel Redfern acknowledges Jimmy's mastery over words and turn of phrase. He tells Alison that she had learnt a good deal from Jimmy whether she realized it or not. The Colonel is unable to understand the mind of the younger people. He says that he always believed that people marry because they are in love but love seems, no longer to be a sufficiently a valid reason for people to marry. He does not understand what a man woman relationship has to do with challenges and revenge. The Colonel wonders why his own daughter of all the people should have got trapped in a marriage where revenge and anger had taken the place of love, when she herself had admitted that not all marriages even of the younger generation were as hard as hers.

Colonel's long speech explains why he feels like an' old plant left over from the Edwardian Wilderness'. He says that Jimmy is justified in calling him that. The Colonel's reminiscences of his days in India, when the sun was shining on the British Empire are full of nostalgia. He recollects the long years he spent in India from 1914 to 1947. He as the Commander-in-chief of a Maharaja in India had enjoyed a position and prestige, which was difficult to forget. He remembers the long cool evenings in the hills, all purple and golden, the faith of the British people in their Empirical power was so strong that they never thought that it could come to an end. When he had to leave India in 1947 he knew that all was over for them. When the train left the dirty and suffocating station, he knew that the end of a golden period in his own life not only but also the Golden era of the British Empire had come to an end.

He had loved his life in India, which now seems like a dream that had ended. The Colonel had lost the world that he loved and the England he came back to was a disappointment too. The England of 1914 when he had left for India was hardly recognizable. The country had totally changed. He felt sorry but tried to live in the England of the past.

Alison tells her father that it is difficult to comprehend and define the situation; it was strange that the Colonel thought that things hade changed so drastically whereas Jimmy is sad that nothing had changed or was changing.

Alison has by this time packed her things, she picks up the bear and is about to put it in the suitcase when she suddenly decides to leave it behind. Alison lingers for a moment, trying to make up her mind. Suddenly she leans against her father and begins to weep softly. The Colonel asks Alison to give a second thought to her decision of leaving Jimmy and going back to her family.

Just at this point, Helena enters the room, she asks Alison if she needed any help and whether she had packed everything. Alison replies that she had managed to pack most of the things but if anything was left behind, Cliff could send it later. Her remark that Cliff should have returned by now shows that she is unconsciously waiting for him. It is after the Colonel is ready to take the suitcases down to the car that Helena tells him that she would not be leaving with them. This comes as a surprise to Alison, it also comes as a surprise to the reader. The reason that she gives about her appointment for a role is not entirely convincing. Helena's staying back in Alison's house after she has left, with a man whom she abhors, is difficult to understand.

Cliff who has by now come back also finds Helena's staying back aberrant, unaccountable. He is polite and gentle to the Colonel as the Colonel is to both him and Helena. The Colonel bids them good-bye and asks Alison not to delay the departure since her mother would worry if they don't reach in time.

Helena taking the responsibility about telling Jimmy that Alison has left also shows her presumptuousness, she seems to believe that she has the right to decide things for others as also act on their behalf. It is with amazing ease that she takes over the household chores of Alison.

Cliff wants Alison to consider her decision again. He also feels that it would be more fitting if Alison told Jimmy before her leaving. When Alison hands over her letter to him he simply says that it was a conventional way of doing things to which Alison replies that she was a conventional girl. Alison's concern for Jimmy and her confidence in Cliff come out in her words, ' Look after him'.

Cliff feels that Helena is responsible for the break between Alison and Jimmy. He doesn't like Helena staying back and refuses the cup of tea she offers to make for him. His irritation with Helena is an indication of his doubt about her honesty. When Helena tries to cajole him into talking about Jimmy's involvement with his old woman friends, his replies are rude. When Helena asks him if there were any chances of Jimmy going back to Madeline, he loses his cool and says that it was not probable since Madeline was old enough to be Jimmy's mother. Cliff's exasperation is visible in his reply ' why the hell should I know'. We see Cliff unhappy and angry for the first time in the play. But Helena's excessive firmness verging on stubbornness is unwelcome to Cliff, even the reader feels disturbed by her obstinacy and stubbornness.

Cliff is ready to leave the room, he finds not only Helena's company unsavoury but also the task of giving Alison's letter to Jimmy painful. His exit, leaving the letter with Helena shows that he has doubts about Helena's honesty. He would not like to see Jimmy hurt. His sorrow about the situation is so deep that his attempts to hide it in humour fail miserably. He tells Helena that he would like to have a good meal and few drinks before witnessing Jimmy suffer. His words, ' he's all yours', reveal how deeply he felt for both Jimmy and Alison, Cliff can already see that Helena is going to take Alison's place. Cliff's hatred of Helena comes out in words, which sound vulgar when spoken by Cliff. He wishes that Jimmy should ram the letter up her nostrils.

Jimmy walks into the room to find Helena sitting on the bed, with her head back on the pillow, holding the toy bear. She looks at him. Jimmy is almost giddy with anger and has to steady himself on the chair. He has just seen Colonel Redfern drive away with his daughter. 'The old bastard nearly ran me down in his car,' says Jimmy. Unable to fully grasp the situation he wonders why Cliff had avoided him in the street, he had pretended as if he had not seen him. Jimmy's disbelief on reading Alison's letter shows how he had disregarded even to himself any doubts about her. He had believed foolishly that Alison could never desert him. Her words that she always would have a deep love for him further infuriate him. Alison's words of love and concern don't ring true to him, he expected her to express her true feelings of hatred for him and curse him rather than cover her hatred by the humbug of civilized words. He finds the whole thing phoney and disgusting, then realizing that he has been letting himself over to Helena, he checks himself. He asks Helena to clear out from there. But Helena knows how to handle Jimmy, she knows where and when to strike. She immediately tells Jimmy that Alison was pregnant and asks him cunningly if that meant anything to him.

Jimmy is surprised, but he holds his ground for the next round with her. He assures her that the news had not filled him with remorse as she had expected. He says that he didn't care if Alison was going to have a baby, he didn't care even if the child had two heads. He then starts telling about the death of Hugh's mother, in the vein very similar to the one he had used to describe his fathers death. He accuses Alison of being callous and unfeeling towards Mrs. Tanner. Alison was like the people of her class indifferent to the suffering of the people who were ordinary and poor. To her class they were insignificant.

Jimmy asks Helena to leave since her performance was over. He calls her 'evil-minded little virgin'. The scene closes with Helena slapping Jimmy and kissing him passionately and drawing him beside her.

Act III

Several months have passed since Alison left. The scene takes place in the same room on a Sunday evening. Helena is seen ironing the clothes on the ironing board; Jimmy and Cliff are busy reading the papers. The furniture is the same. Jimmy and Cliff are stretched in their respective armchairs; only Alison's things have been replaced by Helena's on the dressing table. Jimmy hasn't hanged he is still smoking the pipe which he was smoking in the first scene, he is reading the papers and commenting on the content and categories of the

newspapers, the dirty ones and the posh ones. Cliff tells him that his pipe stinks, but Jimmy continues to smoke saying that Cliff himself stank. Jimmy then asks Helena whether the pipe bothered her, she replies that it didn't and adds instead that she liked it.

Jimmy then makes some critical remarks about the news of the grotesque and evil practices going on in the midlands. As Cliff has not read this, Jimmy tells him that some people there have been indulging in midnight invocations of the Coptic Goddess of fertility. A debutante during an evil orgy in the Market Harborough killed a cock and drank it's blood. The revelry of the devotees was maddening. Jimmy says, ironically that the people in poultry business must be doing roaring business since the demand for cocks would have risen suddenly. He then goes on to say that perhaps their landlady, Mrs. Drudery also performed the same ritual on Sunday evenings and may be doing the same at that moment. He turns his attention to Helena every time he talks of something. He asks her if she had ever been a part of such a ritual. Helena laughs at the question and jokingly remarks that she had not tried it, at least lately. Jimmy suggests that things involving blood are suited to Helena's and that such an exercise would at least keep her busy. He says that it takes different kind of people to make this world. He suddenly shifts the topic; he says that somebody has been sticking pins into his wax image meaning that somebody has been busy stabbing away at it. He immediately concludes that it can be no one else but Alison's mother who must be getting wax from Harrods every week to wound his image. Jimmy is suggesting that Alison's mother would find Jimmy's sacrifice the most befitting.

(1. Coptic refers to Egyptian Christians)

Helena says that he could also make a sacrifice to which Jimmy replies that the first sacrifice they make could e of Cliff. They could roast him over the gas stove but So much of gas would be consumed to roast Cliff that they wouldn't have money to pay for it. He says that such an occupation will keep them busy on those autumn evenings. He ridicules the people who feel that they are making a sacrifice when they give up something, their career, sex or belief. In reality they befool themselves as well as others because they only renounce and give up what they didn't care for in the first place. Such people should be pitied instead of being admired.

Jimmy keeps talking for the sake of doing so. Jimmy blabbers most of the time to give vent to his pent up feelings. He again turns to Cliff and says that Cliff is the most suited for a sacrificial offering. He, however, modifies his statement by saying that Cliff's blood will not make as good a sacrifice as Helena's since his blood was common whereas hers was pale Cambridge blue. He compares Cliff's blood to the red-dye consisting of dried bodies of the female cochineal insects. He continues to impugn on the posh newspapers and the articles they publish. Cliff says that they being men should not sacrifice to the Coptic Goddess since they didn't want to be blessed with fertility. He addresses Helena and tells her that there was an article in the paper on artificial insemination. The article criticizing artificial insemination had been written by a lady and would be of more interest to Helena since it was she who could use it.

Jimmy ridicules the journalists and the contributors to the papers for the weird topics they write about. One of the topics discussed in a long correspondence was whether Milton wore braces or not. Most of the papers were full of news about murders, rapes or riots, since these sensational news made the papers popular. Jimmy wants to know who got shot down that week. Cliff referring to another correspondence going on in another paper, says that that particular correspondence was now closed because a fellow of a Church called ' All Souls' had died because the Athenaem was destroyed in fire.

Jimmy makes fun of the academicians who flourish and gain by coming out with the most absurd things. Lately an American professor had come out with the theory that Shakespeare had changed his sex while he was writing 'The Tempest'. He was obliged, consequently to go back to Stratford since none of his actors took him seriously after that. The professor, the paper said, was coming to England to substantiate what he had said . It

further said that Shakespeare, later married a Warwickshire farmer but only after he had three children from him. Jimmy's opinion of the Professor needs no further elaboration.

Helena laughs and says that she was beginning to understand Jimmy. She tells Cliff that earlier she was never sure as to when Jimmy was serious and when he was not. Cliff says that Jimmy himself was half the times not sure.

Jimmy then asks what they were going to do that evening, there was a no concert worth listening to. He asks Helena if she was going to the Church, the question surprises her as she was never expecting it. She says that she did not intend going to the Church unless he wanted to go.

Jimmy remarks that he had observed a growing shine in her eyes, which was satanic and evil. He then asks Helena if she had the guilt of living in sin with him. Jimmy says that he was only curious about her feelings and that he did not intend to make fun of her. Helena herself does not like to believe that Jimmy was trying to ridicule her. Helena is shaken by the coolness in Jimmy's eyes; his remark has upset her a bit. The normalcy in Jimmy's tone, immediately restores her confidence.

Jimmy asks her if she had met the parson, a friend of Mrs. Drudery the previous day. Helena replies in the affirmative in an uneasy tone. Jimmy tells her that she need not be defensive. Jimmy realizes that Helena is hesitating since she knew of Jimmy's dislike for the Church and the clergy. He says that there was no harm in calling the parson to tea in their house. He asks Helena if it would be worth his while to try building up his moral and spiritual strength. He makes an analogy between building up of spiritual strength and physical muscle. He was earlier a liberal skinny weakling, he was afraid of seeing naked truth about himself, but the anomaly was that the abstinence from conventional religion had made him so strong that people now envy him for the strength he has acquired.

Jimmy has by denouncing all accepted norms and conventions given himself a facelift which beats the uplift of a starlet hollow, he claims.

Helena and Cliff tell Jimmy to give them respite from his talk about religion and politics. Cliff tells him to change his record, since it was becoming too much for them.

Jimmy then says that he has thought of a title for his new song. The title is ' My mothers' in the mad-house - that's why I am in love with you'. The lyrics of the song that he has written are catchy, he suggests that they work the lyric into an act.

Helena agrees and Jimmy suggests minor changes in the names of the characters they could give themselves new names instead of Jock and Day. There is a sort of play within a play, with Jimmy taking the lead.

Cliff falls in with the familiar line, he utters three words Mirth, Mellerdy (Malady) and Madness, the core of what they are enacting, the primal elements of man's mind and heart, the sources of his joys, sorrows and madness. Both the lovers are not only guilty but they are insane as well.

The lines seem to touch the cords of Jimmy's heart, he stands up and rattles off the next lines in an almost unintelligible speed. Jimmy here tries to entertain in the style of a traditional fool, the quiz master of the game. ' Ladies and Gentlemen', he says, as if addressing the audience in a theatre, as he was coming to the theatre, a man walked up to him on the stage door and asked him whether he had seen nobody. He was answered that he hadn't seen nobody and that he didn't want to waste his time in further conversation. Jimmy recites the title of a poem, which runs like this, She said, and she could be any woman for Jimmy, that she was called Little Giddling but she was in reality more like a sharp knife, capable of cutting, of castrating. Jimmy's remarks an ironical comment on the nature of women, innocent to look at, killers at heart.

The other man is still looking around for nobody, he is desperately looking for nobody since he has a case to deliver to him and repeatedly asks Jimmy if he had by any chance seen nobody.The actor, played by Jimmy is irritated at being interrupted in entertaining the ladies and the gentlemen present.

Cliff plays the stranger who is looking for nobody, Jimmy the entertainer. The tomfoolery continues for some time till Helena joins as nobody and mocks at the play.

Helena says that Jimmy's play stinks but her attitude of ridicule is only a sham. The play ends with Helena saying that she was nobody and Jimmy telling her that since the case was for nobody she shall take it. He hurls a cushion at her as if it were the case being talked of. The cushion hits the ironing board.

The two men enact another comic act. The song that Jimmy and Cliff sing is about a young man who wants to marry a girl with blue blood in her veins. She is better than him but he shall persist and marry her, he shall approach the sweet hearts father since her mother had already turned him down.

The lover says that he is waiting for a more favourable time to marry her; he will then build a little home for the two of them.

The middle-class may spurn the lower classes but the people with real blue blood still care.

The angels above know that your love is true, they shall therefore bless you,

Their little household will be quiet and happy, they will send their children to public school

The song encourages the lover not to be afraid because his sweet heart was better than him. He should not fear making love and sleeping with her.

The song over, Jimmy and Cliff resume their normal tone. Jimmy has had enough of the gag and wants Cliff to make some tea. They kick and chide each other, again more out of familiarity than contempt. Cliff manages to push Jimmy down, kneels on him and pretends that he is going to read the paper in that pose.

The childish game between the friends continues till Jimmy succeeds in taking the better of Cliff.

The important thing to be noted is that there is continuity of life in the house. Cliff and Jimmy continue to have the same relationship as they did in the beginning of the play, their games and amusement are the same, the absence of Alison has not affected them, their mutual trust and affection is intact. Helena has taken Alison's place. She is now going to wash Cliff's shirt as Alison had, in the first Act ironed his trousers. But one can perceive the difference. In the short time that Helena is away washing Cliff's shirt, Jimmy asks him if he is fond of Helena. Cliff says that it is not the same as with Alison, to which Jimmy replies that one woman is never the same as the other. Since, however, relationships are not permanent it is better not to give much thought to these things. The thoughts that hurt you must be avoided. Cliff's hurt is as deep as Jimmy's, he for the first time lets out his feelings. He tells Jimmy that he won't like to stay in that house much longer. Cliff also says that he would like to try his hand at something else and quit the tea stall, he reasons it out saying he felt that looking after the two of them is quite a job for Helena. Jimmy's casual attitude and his assumed indifference to Cliff is skin deep. He doesn't take Cliff seriously at the face of it betting him that he will not be able to last even five minutes without him. He needed Jimmy even to understand the score. He tells Cliff that Helena would find a suitable girl for him, one of her friends with lots of money and no brains. Cliff has an inherent modesty and a natural amiability, which has insulated him against any sense of hurt and false pride. His replies to Jimmy's questions about his plans of marriage and occupation reveal an imperturbable calmness; Cliff refuses to be instigated as well as to instigate Jimmy, calls Cliff ' scruffy little beast' who would end up as clean as a pin after he marries a rich girl from Pinner or Guildford. Jimmy's feelings for Cliff are clear-cut. He, for the first time expresses the value Cliffs friendship has for him. Cliff has been to him, a generous and loyal friend and yet he is prepared for the coming separation. Jimmy deplores the frailty of human nature, the fact that man hopes to get things which he knows are impossible to get. He now is hoping to get from Helena what he knows; she is incapable of giving to him. He knows the futility of his search for the relationship he is looking for. He feels sorry to say goodbye to Cliff as this would be another of the painful partings he has had.

Jimmy deliberates on the man woman relationship that is so mysterious and strange to him. He knows that Cliff is worth half a dozen Helena's and yet there is something strange that impels him to be drawn and destroyed by women. The men have no good causes left to die for. All good causes came to an end in the thirties and

forties when Jimmy and his friends were just kids. There is no scope for a dedicated life, no chance of death for a noble cause, there is nothing left for men but to be bled by women.

The era when man's life and even death had a purpose is over. People are now likely to die in the devastation of war, a death that is as inglorious and accidental as dying under the wheels of a bus. Jimmy says that men re now bleeding for women, even the appeal for the donation of blood by the post office is merely an appeal on behalf of all the women of the world for the blood of men; nothing less than that would satisfy them. Jimmy's words sum up the absurdity and purposelessness of the ' Brave new nothing- very- much- thank you present times with the yesterdays world of a grand design and purpose lay bare the cause of his frustration.

Helena has in the meantime washed Cliff's shirt, and is back with it. Cliff's words of thanks, ' that's decent of you', throw light on the difference between Cliff's feelings for Alison and Helena. With Alison it was genuine emotion, with Helena a courteous decency. Cliff goes to dry his shirt and Jimmy asks him in the same tone to make him a cup of tea; he announces they shall go for a drink. He looks at Helena and asks her to make herself a bit glamorous, he feels depressed to see her busy at the ironing table all the time. He would like her to have a little puck and not wear a dull and dead look. He flirts with her, he says that he wants that her heart should flutter every time she sees him. Helena says that her heart does stir whenever she sees Jimmy.

Jimmy tells Helena that Cliff will be leaving them, he is told by Helena that Cliff had already told her about his decision the previous night. Jimmy complains that he is always the last to get information. Helena is unhappy over Cliff's decision to leave and so is Jimmy. Jimmy again expresses his feelings for Cliff, he is a man, says Jimy who can be forgiven his untidiness and sentimentality simply for one of the rarest things he possesses, he has a big heart. He knows not only how to take but also how to hand over, to give.

Jimmy appreciates not only Cliff but also Helena. Talking of her he says that he admires Helena for almost the same reason. She could step forward and give without expecting the other person to make the first move. She had no inhibitions in love, from the first day itself it was Helena who had put out her hand first. She had not expected anything in return of her love. She was a formidable enemy when it came to fighting but that is what made her a worthy opponent.

Jimmy appreciates Helena's spontaneity in love; she had no hesitation in caressing and fondling him. Jimmy then analyses what love means to Helena. To her, love means giving comfort to the general, in this case Jimmy who is tired, hungry and dry after a campaign. Jimmy and Helena share a feeling of tenderness, Jimmy kisses her fingers and she fully reciprocates by pressing his hand against her.

Jimmy is grateful to Helena for having taken the initiative to express her love for him and to seek his in turn. He entreats her to ensure that nothing goes wrong between them. They will make a good pair, a good double of T. S. Eliot and Pam. If Helena helps him, he says, he will start afresh and build a new life, close the tea stall and go somewhere. Helena shares his promise of a new future for both of them, where they will love each other tenderly, he will love her so passionately that she will forget everything else in the world.

Helena and Jimmy are now ready to leave. Helena wants to change from Jimmy's old shirt to go out. Jimmy moves towards the door to call Cliff. But before Jimmy reaches the door, Alison enters. She is wearing a raincoat, her hair is untidy and she is looking ill. Jimmy is stunned to see her. He regains his composure after a minute and walks out of the room. He refuses to greet Alison as his wife and asks Helen to attend to her.

The meeting between Alison and Helena in the last scene of the play is not noisy or obtrusive, as would normally be expected. Nothing much happens in the scene, though the return of Alison is very significant for its dramatic effect. Helena is seen pouring out a cup of tea, while Alison sits on the armchair. The sound of Jimmy playing on the trumpet in Cliff's room can be heard. Alison tries to revive her memories of her life in that room. She picks up a little pile of ash from the floor and drops it in the ashtray.

Alison asks Helena if Jimmy still smokes the pipe. She tells Helena that though she hated the smell of it initially, she had later on got quite used to it. She narrates an incident to tell Helena that she has become so habitual of the smell that she had almost started liking it. Only the previous week, she says, he had gone to the pictures, an

old man was smoking a pipe a few rows away, she got so drawn by the smell of the pipe that she went and sat beside him.

Alison apologizes to Helena for coming there so abruptly. Helena asks why she should feel guilty about coming there. Helena is polite throughout and asks Alison if she was better. Alison recounts how she had fought the urge to come back to that house many times. She narrates how on that day itself when she had bought a ticket from St. Pancras, she doubted whether she would really board it. It was all like a riddle, was the place she was returning to hers by any claim, she felt that she was intruding. Everything seemed to have receded into oblivion. She seemed to be unsure if there was ever a house like this one where she had lived. But now that she was there, she tells Helena everything had become suddenly real. Absent-mindedly Alison foot plays with the newspapers on the floor. She recollects how in the months that she was away, the picture of the days spent in that place flashed on her mind. There was no sequence in her thoughts and memories, just solitary pictures suspended in isolation.

Alison tells Helena that a sense of timing was one of the things she had learnt from Jimmy, this refers to her returning at precisely the moment when Jimmy and Helena had committed themselves to each other. When Helena wants to tell Alison what she had learnt from Jimmy, Alison says that she realizes the blunder she had made in returning. Alison's remark that all of them must be wishing that she was a thousand miles away shows that she is aware of the fact that Jimmy and Helena have grown very close.

The conversation between Alison and Helena is a dialogue on the institution of marriage. Helena holds the view that Alison's place in the house was the rightful one and that she had usurped her place. But Alison has stopped believing in the divine rights of marriage, there were no prescribed rules about relationships; it was only a matter of consent she believes now. When the divine rights of the Kings could be substituted by Constitutional Monarchy, where was the surprise if the pattern of marriages also changed?

Alison assures Helena that she had not come to disturb Jimmy and her. She had no intention of blackmailing them. She was herself at a loss as to why she had came there, it could be just hysteria, impulse, madness or the macabre curiosity to see Jimmy and Helena living together. She was sure of one thing in any case; she did not wish to make a breach between Jimmy and Helena. Helena has full faith in what Alison is saying, but her distrust of herself makes her feel guilty. Helena feels all the more outraged at what she has done because Alison does not reproach or blame her.

Alison tells Helena that she need not feel that she had cheated on her for Jimmy. Helena is surprised at Alison's new outlook on the modalities of life. She recognizes Jimmy speaking through Alison. Helena is shocked that Alison does not expect any confirmation to any values by either her or Jimmy. She blames herself for living in sin with Jimmy and says that though she had flouted the rules she believed in, she had never for once doubted their validity.

Alison's reference to Helena's letters to her about Jimmy tell us that Alison was posted with whatever was happening from time to time between Jimmy and Helena.

Helena had professed her love for Jimmy in these letters; she had also condemned him whole-heartedly. Alison finds it difficult to understand Helena's stance, Helena herself finds it difficult to explain it. Alison tries to explain Jimmy's position, he was born out of times, she says. Jimmy finds the mundane everyday life of his times too ordinary, with no purpose, nothing to dedicate yourself to, nothing to live for and nothing worthwhile to die for, life is too unexciting and ordinary. Jimmy still lives in the times of the French revolution, when people fought and rebelled for a cause, he should have belonged to those times. In the present times Jimmy has no direction with no motive of any significance, Jimmy would live an insignificant life. Alison says that Jimmy was an eminent Victorian and slightly comic as all Victorians were. Helena then declares her intention of leaving Jimmy. The moment Alison returned Helena realized that she had made a grievous mistake, she says. Helena had never believed in the principles that Jimmy believed in and would never be able to believe in them. Jimmy and Helena were diametrically opposite in their views, Jimmy's amorality was not compatible with Helena's

strong views on right and wrong. Helena says that she does not feel that she needs to apologize for her opinions and convictions, which are quite modern and not outdated, as Jimmy would call them. She says that even making love to Jimmy and sleeping with him can never bridge the gap between them. Helena tells Alison that she is convinced that what she had done was wrong.

Alison tries to dissuade Helena from leaving, since then Jimmy would be left alone. Helena however, takes a firm stand and even advices Alison not to make the blunder of coming back.

The scene not only throws light on the difference in Helena's and Alison's character but also proves Alison's strong feeling for Jimmy. Helena has no fear of Jimmy being lonely; she feels that soon after both the women walk out, he will find somebody else. He may even hold a court in the fashion of the Renaissance papers in that room. It was all over between Jimmy and herself asserts Helena and tells Alison that though it was strictly her business, she would be a fool if she came back to Jimmy. A change had come about in Helena's feelings by the way Alison looked, tired, hurt and ill. The suffering and loss of Alison's child was, according to Helena, a punishment, a divine judgement on them.

Alison does not seem to agree with Helena's view. She simply feels that it was something that had happened and it must be taken as such. No body can be blamed for it, nor can it be attributed to any judgement. In this sense it must be noted that Alison's views are closer to those of Jimmy than Helena's.

Alison tries to explain the logic of it but Helena feels that there can no logic in your sense of right and wrong. Alison, once again tells Helena not to leave Jimmy, since he needed her but adds that none of them were suited to Jimmy anyway.

While the two women are talking Jimmy continues to blow his trumpet, its volume growing louder and louder. Helena gets impatient of the sound and asks Jimmy to stop it. The rest of the scene with Jimmy's attempts to spurn Alison, looking for dark plots in whatever the two women do, helps the characters move towards the denouncement in the play. Helena decides to tell Jimmy about her decision. Jimmy has noticed Alison's condition which he describes as ghastly, in the meantime when Helena tries to describe her condition to him, his impassioned tone in ' I can see what's happened to her', reveals Jimmy's deeper feelings for Alison. He is somewhere still concerned about her.

Jimmy being averse to any sentimental talk, dismisses his concern for Alison as simply an aversion for pain and suffering in general. The loss of the child was one of the many he had suffered in his life. It was in the case of Alison, a big loss and the first one she had suffered.

Jimmy hates sentiment and sympathy more so because of the the reserved solemnity that they are usually accorded. He asks Helena why was Alison there and what made her look so serious. Alison tries to say something but is choked with emotion. Helena checks Jimmy from swaying into one of his moods. She tells him that Alison had nothing to do with her decision to leave. Helena re-affirms her faith in the concept of right and wrong. She proclaims that one can never be happy if what one was doing I hurt someone else. She tells Jimmy that things between them would never have worked out, she had however loved Jimmy and would never be able to love the way she loved him.

Helena takes command of her emotion and is ready to pack. She tells Alison, that the arrangement for her stay for the night could be made in a hotel.

Jimmy's long speech addressed to Helena is about love One needs guts and defiance, the freedom of mind and soul to be in love. People who are scared of suffering and defying the norms of society and religion are incapable of loving. Religion and the sense of right and wrong incapacitate human beings from loving without fear, without inhibitions. He hands over Helen's things to her with the final words,' If one wants to live, one has to live as a human being, if one wishes to be a Saint, one has to reject life, renounce life. You cannot be human and saintly at the same time'.

Jimmy is shaken and avoids looking at Alison. He is disturbed by the Church bells ringing in the distance. The call of religion is to him the call for the denial of the natural life.

Jimmy's outburst about what Alison had done is to give vent to the hurt feelings he has been nursing in his heart. He rambles into a long speech, reviving each and every hurt that Alison had inflicted upon him. She had not even cared to send flowers to Mrs. Tanner's funeral. In doing so she had denied flowers not to the dead lady but to Jimmy himself, since he cared for her. He continues to deplore the fact that there was no justice in the world, since wrong people went hungry, wrong people died and wrong people were loved.

Jimmy's final speech, gains in strength by virtue of being tragic without being vindictive. Was he wrong to believe that there is a burning virility of mind, a potent force of spirit, could find a spirit akin to itself in an ever loving energy- looking ever for more and more. The strongest men in the world are lonely like the old bear following his own breath in the dark forest. The ordinary ones walk in herds, the stronger ones alone, the weaker ones have many allies, the strong ones no one to understand, no one to match. The strong are the ones who are utterly lonely. Jimmy tells Alison what he had marked in Alison, which demarcated her from others. On the first night that he saw her, he observed in her a wonderful relaxation of spirit. Jimmy mistook this relaxation for a balance of spirit, struck after much struggle and fight, later on, however, he discovered that Alison had no real strength. She had never seen struggle in her life, she had never fought, she had never opposed. He may be a lost cause, says Jimmy, but if Alison really loved him, it shouldn't have mattered. He reminds Alison that her desertion of him meant that she never loved him truly.

Alison's affirmation of faith in a life of futility and corruption rather than attitude of passivity and neutrality is at once, her avowal of comradeship with Jimmy and her emergence as an individual rather than a dummy of her class.

It is the loss of the child, which has taught her how helpless one could be. She had lost the child she felt was hers; it was so safe and secure in her body. All she wanted after the loss of the child was to die. She wanted Jimmy to see her, in such an abject condition, so stupid, so helpless. This is what Jimmy had always wanted, he wanted to see her defeated. He wanted to splash in her tears, to revel in her suffering. All that had come about, Jimmy could see that Alison had suffered, though he had, himself, lost his child in the process. Alison tells Jimmy that he should be happy since she was now in utter sorrow, groveling in the mud. Alison's emotions are fully worked up; unable to hold herself she falls at his feet. For a moment, Jimmy stands rigid, then he bends and takes her trembling body into his embrace. He tells her that he cannot bear to see her in that condition. He then reminds her of the bears and squirrels game that they used to play. He says that they will continue to live like a bear and a squirrel, eating honey and nuts. Lying in the sun they will sing songs about trees lying in the sun. Alison will keep her eyes on his fur and keep his claws clean since he was a careless sort of a bear. He would see that his squirrel keeps her tail bushy and shining forever. They shall be careful of the steel traps lying about everywhere to catch the timid, little animals. He calls Alison rather mad and slightly satanic but a beautiful squirrel, warning her of the traps thrown in for people like her. Alison reciprocates affectionately calling him ' Poor Pears'. The bears- the men, are like squirrels- the women very, very poor creatures indeed.

John Osborne-as an Innovator

John Osborne was hailed as an innovator in drama in the mid twentieth century. His protagonist, Jimmy Porter was regarded as the first non-hero, his language considered revolutionary.

In the heat of enthusiasm for the angry man who was not a hero and his use of language, which was far from the language conventionally used in drama, Osborne was credited with more innovation than he deserved or even himself claimed. Gareth Lloyd Evans elaborates on this in his essay on John Osborne and naturalism. He says, that to regard Osborne as the first to bring this concept on stage would be to belie the truth. There were people who had presented the non-hero protagonist before Osborne. Stanley Kowalski, was by the time ' Look back in Anger' was written was well known and had spawned, in films, a number of progeny of his own type. Evans contends that Osborne's scything newness, which seemed to his admirers a break-away from the well made play is also in reality not so. The author also contends the opinion held by many that Jimmy represented a post-war generation. Many of Jimmy's generation would not recognize them in him and that Jimmy is only a

mouthpiece for one man's disillusionment with the society he lived in. Jimmy's anger, petulance, dissatisfaction, infirmity of purpose, railing and complaining is more an expression of his own frustration than that of the younger generation of that period as a whole. Even the label of raw naturalism is to the critic a bit exaggerated. Osborne's language might have seemed permissive by contemporary standards but it was far from being either raw or natural.

Evans quotes Osborne, who, himself delivered the greatest blow to these claims. Osborne described the play as formal and old fashioned which Evans elaborates. Evans says, ' A summary examination of the play reveals some interesting facts. It is a Three-Acter, it has a thoroughly conventional set; that is in the old fashioned sense, a box set, the play has a very precise conventional pattern- statement, development, crisis and resolution- in dramatic and theatrical terms, even if thematically it is opaque and lacks direction, no special effects are required, the situation is naturalistic in that it could well be equated with real life events. Indeed, a cursory examination alone amply confirms that Osborne's view of his play is indeed forthright'.

What Evans misses out is that the last part of his statement where he says that the play is opaque and that it lacks direction negotiates a novelty in approach, Osborne is taking us to an experience that is unfamiliar, introducing us to characters who are not only complex in the typical humours they personify but in the inconsistency of their professed beliefs and behaviour. A conventional pattern is not enough to designate the play as conventional. Apart from Jimmy, the other characters are also, all through, in a dilemma. Jimmy's is constantly wavering between agnosticism and belief; he faces helplessness in his attachments and attractions, the purposelessness of life and the wantonness of death and suffering. These are the maladies of the modern times. The consciousness of the malady by the one who suffers from it is even more modern.

Nature of Lanaugage in 'Look Back in Anger'

Two claims have been made for 'Look Back in Anger', one that it is vehement in its approach and second that the language of the play is markedly distinct from the language of drama written before it. The first and most striking feature of the pattern of language which he observes while reading the play is the rhythm that is set up between monologue and dialogue. The dialogues seem sparse and thin comparison to the long monologues.

The characters speak in a fashion that can be called neutral. Little can be made out of their lass or character from the dialogues. Except for a few words from Cliff, like 'girlie' and 'not arf', there is no individualization in the dialogue. The words in 'Look back in Anger' just pass information; they do not help us identify the characters. The conversation between Helena and Alison or the dialogue between Alison and her father reveals rather a lack of dimension than a measure of their scope. The dialogue between Redfern and Helena is an instance.

Colonel: 'Well I'd better put this in the car then. We may as well get along. Your mother will be worried, I know. I promised her I'd ring her when I get here. She's not very well'.

Helena: " I hope my telegram didn't upset her too much. Perhaps I shouldn't have. ——

Colonel: 'Not at all. We are very, very grateful that you did. It was very kind of you indeed——

The use of everyday speech, by way of words fails to lend authenticity to Osborne's characters. The truth of character created by Shakespeare or Shaw is missing in Osborne. Whatever pleasure we get from Jimmy's speeches is not because of the character they reveal but his oratory and the use of rhetorical devices such as hyperbole, metaphor, literary illusions and blatant abuse.

The language of the other characters in the play apart from Jimmy, is lacking in personality. Even in the case of Cliff and Alison, who share a feeling of affection and trust, the words spoken to each other only express a sense of sympathy and understanding but do not help to throw light on either Cliff or Alison as a person.

Evans further says, ' the dialogue as such, which, of course, involves Jimmy too, is on the whole a neutral speech. Little attempt is made by Osborne to characterize thorough it, or to indicate class or accent— there is no identification, no individualization in this dialogue.'

He cites the example of the following speech of Alison, which, he says, is not much different form Jimmy's self indulgent speeches. ' I am wrong, I was wrong! I don't want to be neutral; I don't want to be a Saint. I want to be a lost cause; I want to be corrupt and futile'.

The language in the play fails to fulfil the very first requirement of dramatic language—the embodiment of individual character.

Evans discusses the language of Jimmy, which, to him is nearer the naturalistic, in the sense that it has a degree of truth. Jimmy's speech, is however, not naturalistic in the sense of the language of the other contemporary dramatists like Edward Bond. He does not speak of the lowest common speech.

He is eloquent. It is not so much raw as vehement in a very lucid way. It is the language of the University graduate. He has delved deeply in the arts, it is a language that he has acquired by a self-willed awareness. A conceit born out of Jimmy's consciousness of his intelligence is evident in his words. Jimmy's is the language of a youth determined to chalk up a victory in the intellectual stakes, convinced of his role as a rebel, determined to put things right. Jimmy's naturalism is special in the sense that it is elitist as compared to the language of the drama of the 1970s.

Jimmy uses speech for most part of the play, to pour out his invective, his invective, which is so wide-ranging that nothing escapes it. Exaggeration, hyperbole, is used by Jimmy to show his anger towards most of what he targets. Jimmy's constant use of hyperbole makes his the most vehement of all the speeches in the play, highlighting the element of exaggeration in his character. Jimmy, exaggerates through repetition and his speeches tend to be rhetorical in the vein of a public speech rather than spontaneity of a personal grief or emotion. Consider the following speech for example:

"Reason and progress, the old firm, is selling out! Everyone gets out while the going is good. Those forgotten shares you had in the old traditions, the old beliefs are going up- going up. A lack of spontaneity lends Jimmy's speeches a colour of eloquence sans depth. Jimmy's outbursts lack consistency of logic, though it can often suddenly eliminate an idea or a feeling or an intuition. " If you have no world of your own, it's rather pleasant to regret the passing of someone else's. I must be getting sentimental. But I must say it's pretty dreary living in the American age- unless you are American of course."

Jimmy loves to parody; writers, drama, newspapers, pamphlets, and journalists all fall into the ambit of his attack. The parody is sometimes more conscious and deliberate. Jimmy's attempt to be witty is mostly successful, he being intrinsically an exhibitionist, prefers to be loud to then being quiet. His metaphorical use of his wax image is a proof of Jimmy's ability to make the most far-fetched comparisons, profitably to use.

'All I know is that somebody's been sticking pins into my wax image for years (suddenly) of course Alison's mother? Every friday the wax arrives from Harrods, and all the through the weekend she is stabbing away at it with a hatpin! Ruined her bridge game, I dare say.'

Jimmy does abate into a more commonplace language at times. It is then, that a kind of youthful pathos can be glimpsed behind the cataract of his words:

" The heaviest, strongest creatures in this world seem to be the loneliest like the old bear, following his own breath in the dark forest. There is no warm pack, no herd to comfort him. The voice that cries out doesn't have to be a weaklings, does it?"

The use of the simile, the comparison of the loneliness of Jimmy with the old beard does bring out how lonesome and isolated Jimmy is. Jimmy's speeches are innately melodramatic. They are meant to appeal to the emotions. G. L Evans considers the use of language at length, Jimmy's emotions, sentimentality as it proceeds and emerges from the language he uses. Sentimentality, says Evans, emerges less as an inevitable facet of the character than as a function of language. Rhetoric is often the mother of sentimental expression, with its recourse to repetition, its self regarding rhythms, its tendency to seem impersonal while pushing unerringly towards the emotionally subjective.

The entire impact of Jimmy's personality lies in his waywardness and versatility of his capability to talk himself into one posture or another. It is the sentimentality of the language, which sometimes proceeds to turn from the object of Jimmy's speech to himself.

The sum total of Jimmy Porter is the language he uses, the language in a way becomes, the protagonist, it is the words that hold are attention and it is the words we behold for comprehension.

Alison makes use of the language, as a tool, not merely of expression, but to hold attention once or twice, like in her speech " I want to be a lost cause". Helena and Cliff use language unconsciously, deriving not much from it not dominating by there use of it. Colonel Redfern, though not rhetorical by any standard, is eloquent in his speech of the now lost long summers of India. Though not much of a talker, he is not inarticulate; he is able to express himself fully as a left over plant from the Edwardian period. He is also able to convey fully, his regret at the way Jimmy had been treated by his wife. More restrained by nature and training, he establishes himself favourably by his dignity of manner and speech.

Imagery and Symbolism in the Play

Jimmy and Alison are happy when they are playing Bear and Squirrel. They impersonate them when they are in love; the loves turns into hostility when they resume their human form, with individual minds and thoughts. Alison tells Helena the game Jimmy and she played, describing it with a childish love for rhythm, 'Bears and Squirrels, Squirrels and Bears. In the beginning, when they were left to each other after Hugh's departure, the game was a symbol of their uncomplicated affection for each other. They lived in their world of make believe as two dumb furry creatures. They were then, all love and no brains. Becoming human is painful but to reclaim the animalism, the sensuality of that time difficult too. The poor little creatures are now dead, as humans Jimmy and Alison cannot live the life of abandonment, the cosy life they had led in the zoo. It should be noted that though Helena finds their game quite mad, to Alison it is absolutely natural and agreeable. The animal symbol works in two ways. It offers a refuge from the married couples daily life, secondly it provides the only way for them to communicate, love between Jimmy and Alison is based only on physical attraction which functions below the level of rational thought.

The bear is the symbol of masculine power and virility. After, Alison's departure, when Helena is opening the drawers in the chest, she picks up the toy bear and sits on the bed, looking at it. She lays her head back on the pillow, still holding the bear. Jimmy himself throws the bear down showing what to him seems a fall from grace after Alison has walked out on him.

The reappearance of the animal symbols and the resumption of the game of bear and squirrel with all the vows of love, promises happier times for Jimmy and Alison. The apprehension that the game that had failed them earlier, may fail them gain lingers in our minds.

Another recurring image, though no symbolic in the strict sense is that of the newspapers. Jimmy and Cliff are shown reading the papers in the opening scenes of all the Acts and all Jimmy's discussions on politics and religion start from these. It brings the outside world into the small world of Jimmy, Alison and Cliff more than that it, like an invader upsets the familial setting of their home.

The images in the play, mainly verbal are sometimes pleasant and romantic, at other times disgusting. Colonel Redfern's description of Edwardian England evokes a pleasant image of the 'brief little world' that he nostalgically speaks of. Alison's image of ' I'm in fire and I'm burning' describes her anguish metaphorically. Some of the images, however, are employed only to shock or disgust, the image of ' a mass of India rubber and wrinkles' used for a newborn baby is an example.

The only image of an animal, who is human in his solitude and grandeur unlike the timid little animals referred to in the play, is that of the old bear following his own breath in the forest.

The bear and the squirrel were images of animal sensuality; the lonely bear one of dignified solitude who has no pack since he has no equal.

Jimmy Porter: An Appraisal

Jimmy Porter has been seen by many as a self-portrait of Osborne. A substantial body of critical appraisal of Jimmy is based on the critics. Subscribing to the view that Jimmy shares not only his anger with his creator, but they have many more things in common. Not only is the episode of Jimmy's fathers' death almost autobiographical but the class, economically and otherwise which they belonged to is almost the same. Gareth Llyod Evans' statement that Jimmy is the mouthpiece of one man's disillusion about the societyhe lived in can be further qualified by saying that this man is not Jimmy but Osborne himself.

Osborne's impatience with the contemporary British society and Empire, his denunciation of the Church, of the upper and middle classes are at once discernible in Jimmy's character. Jimmy embodies Osborne's derision of the Conservative Government, the Royalty. Jimmy hates the stiff upper lip of the privileged classes in England; he sees them as a personification of apathy and detachment.

Jimmy's contempt of the British is explained by what he calls their lack of enthusiasm. He mourns the loss of vitality, vigour and the will to fight in the generation of the day. He attributes this not only to a degeneracy of character but also to the times, which have nothing to offer to infuse enthusiasm. ' Nobody thinks, Nobody cares'. No beliefs, no convictions and no enthusiasm", laments Jimmy. He attributes it to the fact that there are no brave causes left to fight for.

Though a spokesman of Osborne's views, his emotion and empathy, Jimmy is a much more complex character. To base him only on a comparison with his creator would be limiting the scope of his character and the study.

Jimmy Porter's character has a huge sentimental element. This sentimentality, should however, not be confused with the characteristics it is generally associated with. Jimmy is a romantic; his sentimentality segregates and isolates him from people. Though Jimmy talks sentimentally about his father's death and angry about his treatment by the Redfern's, it is difficult to relate fully his resentment to his experiences. We can only conclude form his long speeches and rhetoric that it is not so much his prejudice against any principle or people that urges him to make these long vitriolic attacks, it is the indulgence of listening to himself. Gareth Llyod Evans finds a sure proof of Jimmy's love of indulging himself in self-pity: ' There is no surer evidence of this than in the famous speech about his dying father, hailed by many as an example of an underlying sensitivity and vulnerability in the angry, deprived, perturbed spirit of Jimmy Porter. In truth, what is remarkable about the speech is not any revelation of the deeper soul of Porter, but the utter shallowness of his responses. The language as it grows more rhetorical, ' turns in the sentimentality and as this proceeds, the object of the speech turns away from the dying father to Jimmy himself. He has talked himself into being victim. His father was the stalking-horse for Jimmy's self-indulgent eloquence'.

The childhood experience, says Jimmy has hardened him, embittered him towards the world, resulting in mistrust and a feeling of hatred. According to Mary McCarthy, Jimmy's profoundest, quickest, most natural instinct is mistrust.

In classical Freudian terms, Jimmy can be seen as a paranoid personality, suffering from the fear of losing his dear ones. He makes a property of the people he loves, he cherishes them as invaluable possessions, he feeds his sense of tragedy on his separations from them. People as well as fate play his adversaries, the entire world is against him, horrifying Cliff, Hugh and his mother, everyone is included in his list of persecutors, even Alison is not spared.

The inferiority complex from which Jimmy suffer, is, according to one school of thought proved by constant attention-seeking. Jimmy waivers between moods of cruelty and kindness, which is attributed to schizophrenia in his personality.

Jimmy is insecure. M.D Faber relates his insecurity to neurosis. According to him Jimmy has problem the origin of which lies in the stresses of the 'oral stage'. The characters suffering from the 'oral stage' are prone to passivity, fear of retaliation and a sense of alienation; these tendencies in turn can lead to sadism. In the case of Jimmy persistent fear of being abandoned, of being separated from the mother surrogate is evident from the

many references he makes to his separations in the past and his fear of the ones that may come in the future. The distinctive features that mark him out as a psychoneurotic prevent him from emerging as hero, he remains the protagonist but fails to emerge as a man to be remembered.

Jimmy's suffering entails by its violent outburst a suffering of others. He is clearly a sadist and a masochist. His brutal behaviour towards Alison indicates that he enjoys all the pain that he inflicts on her. He abuses and rails at her brother, her parents and friends and mounts his attack more and more forcefully on seeing her unarmed. He looks for the strongest words of disapprobation for Alison and her people. He calls her Pusillanimous and describes its meaning from the dictionary word by word to make his attack more vehement. Bamber Gascoigne's view that the real reason for Jimmy's cruelty to his wife is the excess of energy, which he cannot use in the Sweet-stall. This may explain his atrocious behaviour, as being the outcome of his pent up animal energy, but not the joy he derives from hurting Alison. Nor does it account for the way he bullies Cliff and does not miss any chance at physically hitting him. His pleasure in giving pain is obvious. Instances like, when he twists Cliff's ears and he cries in pain, Jimmy only grins back at him.

Jimmy's defence of suffering as an essential part of the process of personal involvement lead him to his glorification of himself as well as condemnation of those who had not suffered. He asks Helena if she had ever seen someone die. He also wishes that Alison should suffer by losing a child to become a better human being. Jimmy lives happily with Helena but misses no opportunity to wound her either. Jimmy's misogyny as well as his sado-masochism are evident in his behaviour towards all the three characters, he lives with. Jimmy's cries of social justice and psuedo-philosophical dogmas are only the expression of his desperation for recognition. That Osborne is insufficiently critical of the flaws in Jimmy's character is confirmed by John Mander, who aptly remarks, ' Jimmy is a phony: but we are left with the impression that his creator cannot admit the fact."

The Feminist Viewpoint

Alison and Helena

It is possible to see all the characters in the playas the sites where the vexed realities of class and gender play themselves out.

There are two women characters in the play. Both belong to the same class and both love Jimmy. They both accept their positions. Helena's assertion differentiates her from Alison very marginally, willingly, even happily. Alison and Helena are shown busy with household chores, ironing the clothes on the ironing table and wearing Jimmy's old shirts.

Both of them hate Jimmy's way of talking, his pipe and his trumpet and yet both of them get accustomed to these. Their complaints of Jimmy are rendered null and void by their tone of him. It is Helena who manipulates to stay back when Alison is leaving and it Alison again who comes back without being approached by Jimmy, even once.

Alison has a long list of grievances against Jimmy which she share with Helena but is absolutely quiet when Jimmy is present. Helena's defiance also slowly gives way to a kind of servility.

The women who are discussed in the play are either Jimmy's favourites or the ones he hates. Mrs. Redfern apart, he hates his landlady, he hated the girls who lived in the same house as he at one time, he hates all the women for their noise and lack of poise in movements.

Jimmy adores the women who are poor and helpless. Two women fall in this category. His own grandmother and Hugh's mother. Both had worked to support their families, both were ordinary to look at. Jimmy's love for the under-dog surfaces even in his relationship with women.

Glossary

Naturalism: Historians and critics of drama have held divergent views on the interpretation of the term' Naturalism in Theatre'. The term was first used for the French Literature, which stemmed from the writings

of Zola and his followers. Though an extension of realism in literature, naturalism differs from it in deliberate emphasis on the ugly., the shabby, the vicious. The author offers no moral or ethical judgement; the stance is amoral and no judgements are passed on characters who are invariably seen as biographically and socially determined.

The Well-made Play : The term is applied to a neatly constructed play with all the conventional requirements of plot and structure

Dramatic Personae: The characters in a play

Hyperbole: Is a figure of speech that means using exaggeration for emphasis. It is used, usually, to convey a sense of emotional disturbance, in exaggerated praise or invective, to give vent to one's feelings of love or hatred.

Parody: A burlesque imitation of a literary or musical work or style. Ludicrous in nature, it is used to mock at a person in high position or a reputed work of art/ literature. The person who parodies refutes their claim to fame and recognition.

Imagery: A figure of speech forming mental images, imaginative description of a picture or pictures, images in general or collectively.

Symbolism: To represent by symbols, use of symbols in literature and art.

Contemporary: OF the same time or period. Used for writers etc..

Ambiguity: when views are not clearly defined. Having a dubious meaning.

Bildungaroman : A piece of literature that educates. It is educative in the sense that while tracing the protagonist's growth to maturity, it educates the reader through the development of his character.

Subjectivity: Belonging to the inner self, having an individual perspective of things by looking at them not objectively and rationally but relating them to personal experience and vision.

Misogyny: Dislike or hatred for women

Articulation: Ability to express one's self in words

Evangelist: Person who preaches the gospel that is the life and message of Jesus Christ.

Colloquial: Every day informal speech

Vanderville: Form of light variety entertainment with skits, songs and dances

Masochism: Abnormal pleasure obtained from pain or suffering inflicted by a member of the opposite sex.

Questions

1. The other characters in ' Look Back in Anger' are not more than stage furniture with the result that the content of the play is reduced to Jimmy's views. Do you agree?
2. Does the author deliberately keep our attention focused on Jimmy? If so, what are his intentions in doing so? Substantiate your answer with examples from the text.
3. The conflict between Jimmy and Alison is a part of the larger class-war. Jimmy's vitriolic attack on Alison and her family is part of his frustration at being on the lower side of the dividing line. Do you agree?
4. Class and gender are two grounds for conflict and strife in ' Look Back in Anger'. Both of them, the class-war as well as the battle of sexes are conflated in the play. Discuss in view of the marriage between Jimmy and Alison.
5. Discuss how the romantic and modernist concepts of the delineation of character are combined in the portrayal of Jimmy's character. Do you sympathize and identify yourself with him?

6. As an ' Angry Young Man', Jimmy is not only the protagonist, but also a delegate of the younger generation? How far do you think, does Jimmy represent the men of his age in those times?
7. The action is reduced to a minimal in ' Look Back in Anger'. The only action is the interaction between the characters, Discuss.
8. The re-appearance of the animal symbols may appear to give the play a conventional, sentimental happy ending but that is only a contrivance that offers no real solution. Do you agree? Do you believe that Jimmy and Alison will have a happier life in future?
9. Do you agree with Dyson's observation that Jimmy's trumpet can mock the universe but not sound a call to battle? Discuss in view of Osborne's own statement about Jimmy where he says, " To be as vehement as he is, is be almost non-committal."
10. Attempt appraisal of the relationship between Jimmy and Alison? Would you describe it as a love-hate relationship?

Short Questions

1. Jimmy's invective in 'Look Back in Anger' is meant to convey the mood of his generation. Does it perform this function effectively?
2. Pretence in Play- acting in ' Look Back in Anger' comes out in its rhetoric and imagery of animals. What is the role-playing in the lines of the characters in the play?
3. What do you understand by the term hyperbole? How is it used and what purpose does it serve in ' Look back in Anger'?
4. What issues in ' Look Back in Anger' can be highlighted from the feminist perspective? What impression do you form of the situation of women in England at that time form the play?
5. Locate Osborne's' main concerns in the play.
6. Briefly discuss how Helena engineers the departure of Alison. Is she justified in this as well as in leaving Jimmy at the end of the play?
7. What does the term morality mean in the context of the play? What is Jimmy's morality and how does it differ from that of others whom he denounces?
8. Do the social and economic realities of Britain find expression in the play? How do the characters react to them?
9. Cliff stands in sharp contrast to Jimmy. What is the bond between the two friends, which lasts longer than Jimmy's love for the two women discussed?
10. Helena's character and role is the least convincing of all in the play. Do you agree?

Important Passages for Reference to Context

Act One

JIMMY: Well, she can talk, can't she? You can talk, can't you? You can express an opinion. Or does the White Woman's Burden make it impossible to think?

JIMMY: Oh heavens, how I long for a little ordinary human enthusiasm. Just enthusiasm - that's all. I want to hear a warm, thrilling voice cry out Hallelujah! Hallelujah! I'm alive! I've an idea. Why don't we have a little game? Let's pretend that we're human beings, and that we're actually alive. Just for a while. What do you say? Let's pretend we are human. Oh, brother, it's such a long time since I was with anyone who got enthusiastic about anything.

JIMMY: The old Edwardian brigade do make their brief little world look pretty tempting. All homemade cakes and croquet, bright ideas, bright uniform. Always the same picture: high summer, the long days in the sun, slim volumes of verse, crisp linen, the smell of starch. What a romantic picture. Phoney too, of course.

If you've no world of your own, it's rather pleasant to regret the passing of someone else's. I must be getting sentimental. But I must say it's pretty dreary living in the American Age - unless you're an American of course. Perhaps all our children will be Americans.

JIMMY: The Platitude from Outer Space - that's brother Nigel. He'll end up in the Cabinet one day, make no mistake. But somewhere at the back of that mind is the vague knowledge that he and his pals have been plundering and fooling everybody for generations.

JIMMY: And nothing is more vague about Nigel than his knowledge. His knowledge of life and ordinary human beings is so hazy, he really deserves some sort of decoration for it - a medal inscribed 'For Vaguery in the Field'. But it wouldn't do for him to be troubled by any stabs of conscience, however vague.

JIMMY: All this time, I have been married to this woman, this monument to non-attachment, and suddenly I discover that there is actually a word that sums her up. Not just an adjective in the English language to describe her with - it's her name! Pusillanimous! It sounds like some fleshy Roman matron, doesn't it?

JIMMY: Have you ever noticed how noisy women are? Have you? The way they kick the floor about, simply walking over it? Or have you watched them sitting at their dressing tables, dropping their weapons and banging down their bits of boxes and brushes and lipsticks? I've watched her doing it night after night. When you see a woman in front of her bedroom mirror, you realize what a refined sort of butcher she is. Did you ever see some dirty old Arab, sticking his fingers into some mess of lamb fat and gristle? Well, she's just like that. Thank God they don't have many women surgeons! Those primitive hands would have your guts out in no time.

ALISON: I keep looking back, as far as I remember, and I can't think what it was to feel young, really young. Jimmy said the same thing to me the other day. I pretended not to be listening-because I knew that would hurt him, I suppose. And - of course - he got savaged, like tonight. But I knew just what he meant. I suppose it would have been so easy to say 'Yes, darling, I know just what you mean. I know what you're feeling.' It's those easy things that seem to be so impossible with us.

ALISON: Tonight it might be all right - we'd make love. But later, we'd both lie awake, watching for the light to come through that little window, and dreading it. In the morning, he'd feel hoaxed, as if I was trying to kill him in the worst way of all.

ALISON: And, afterwards, he actually taunted me with my virginity. He was quite angry about it, as if I had deceived him in some strange way. He seemed to think an untouched woman would defile him.

JIMMY: There's hardly a moment when I'm not – watching and wanting you. I've got to hit out somehow. Nearly four years of being in the same room with you, night and day, and I still can't stop my sweat breaking out when I see you doing – something as ordinary as leaning over an ironing board.

JIMMY: I've got my own strawberry mark – only it's in a different place. No, as far as the Michelangelo Brigade's concerned, I must be a sort of right – wing deviationist. If the Revolution ever comes, I'll be the first to be put up against the wall, with all the other poor old liberals.

JIMMY: Oh, my dear wife, you've got so much to learn. I only hope you learn it one day. If only something – something would happen to you, and wake you out of your beauty sleep! If you could have a child, and it would die. Let it grow, let a recognizable human face emerge from that little mass of indiarubber and wrinkles.

She just devours me whole every time, as if I were some over-large rabbit. That's me. That bulge around her navel – if you're wondering what it is – it's me. Me, buried alive down there, and going mad, smothered in that peaceful looking coil.

Act Two

HELENA: It's almost as if he wanted to kill someone with it. And me in particular. I've never seen such hatred in someone's eyes before. It's slightly horrifying. Horrifying and oddly exciting.

ALISON: It isn't easy to explain. It's what he would call a question of allegiances, and he expects you to be pretty literal about them. Not only about himself and all the things he believes in, his present and his future, but his past as well. All the people he admires and loves, and has loved.

ALISON: Those next few months at the flat in Poplar were a nightmare. I suppose I must be soft and squeamish, and snobbish, but I felt as though I'd been dropped in a jungle. I couldn't believe that two people, two educated people could be so savage, and so – so uncompromising. Together, they were frightening. They both came to regard me as a sort of hostage from those sections of society they had declared war on.

ALISON: Hugh fairly revelled in the role of the barbarian invader. Sometimes I thought he might even dress the part – you know, furs, spiked helmet, sword. He even got a fiver out of old Man Wain once. Blackmail, of course.

ALISON: Everything about him seemed to burn, his face, the edges of his hair glistened and seemed to spring of his head, and his eyes were so blue and full of the sun. He looked so young and frail, in spite of the tired line of his mouth. I knew I was taking on more than I was ever likely to be capable of bearing, but there never seemed to be any choice.

ALISON: She's been poor almost all her life, and she's frankly ignorant. I'm quite aware how snobbish that sounds, but it happens to be the truth.

ALISON: It was the only way of escaping from everything – a sort of unholy priest-hole of being animals to one another. We could become little furry creatures with little brains.

Full of dumb, uncomplicated affection for each other. Playful, careless creatures in their own cozy zoo for two. A silly symphony for people who couldn't bear the pain of being human beings any longer. And now, even they are dead, poor little silly animals. They were all love, and no brains.

ALISON: Oh yes, we all know what you did for me! You rescued me from the wicked clutches of my family, and all my friends! I'd still be rotting away at home, if you hadn't ridden up on your charger, and carried me off!

JIMMY: The funny thing is, you know, I really did have to ride up on a white charger – off white, really. Mummy locked her up in their eight-bedroomed castle, didn't she? There is no limit to what the middle-aged mummy will do in the holy crusade against ruffians like me.

She wouldn't hesitate to cheat, lie, bully and blackmail. Threatened with me, a young man without money, background or even looks, she'd bellow like a rhinoceros in labour – enough to make every male rhino for miles turn white, and pledge himself to celibacy.

JIMMY: My God, those worms will need a good dose of salts the day they get through her 1 Oh what a bellyache you've got coming to you, my little wormy ones 1 Alison's mother is on the way! She will pass away, my friends, leaving a trail of worms gasping for laxatives behind her – from purgatives to purgatory.

JIMMY: One day, when I'm no longer spending my days running a sweet-stall, I may write a book about us all. It's all here. Written in flames a mile high. And it won't be recollected in tranquility either, picking daffodils with Auntie Wordsworth. It'll be recollected in fire, and blood. My blood.

JIMMY: Progress, the old firm, is selling out! Everyone get out while the going's good. Those forgotten shares you had in the old traditions, the old beliefs are going up – up and up and up.

She's moved long ago into a lovely cottage of the soul, cut right off from the ugly problems of the twentieth

century altogether. She prefers to be cut off from all the conveniences we've fought to get for centuries. She'd rather go down to the ecstatic little shed at the bottom of the garden to relieve her sense of guilt. Our Helena is full of ecstatic wind – aren't you?

JIMMY: At the end of twelve month, I was a veteran. All that that feverish failure of a man had to listen to him was a small, frightened boy, I spent hour upon hour in that tiny bedroom. He would talk to me for hours, pouring out all that was left of his life to one, lonely, bewildered little boy, who could barely understand half of what he said. You see, I learnt at an early age what it was to be angry – angry and helpless. And I can never forget it. I knew more about – love…betrayal…and death, when I was ten years old than you will probably ever know all your life.

JIMMY: But that girl there can twist your arm off with her silence. I've sat in this chair in the dark for hours. And, although she knows I'm feeling as I feel now, she's turned over, and gone to sleep.

I want to stand up in your tears, and splash about in them, and sing. I want to be there when you grovel. I want to be there, I want to watch it, I want the front seat.

CLIFF: I've been a – a no man's land between them. Sometimes, it's been still and peaceful, no incidents, and we've all been reasonably happy. But most of the time, it's simply a very narrow strip of plain hell. But where I come from, we're used to brawling and excitement. Perhaps I even enjoy in the thick of it. I love these two people very much. And I pity all of us.

JIMMY: She looked at it, and the tears just welled up in her eyes, and she said: "But she's so beautiful!' She kept repeating it is if she couldn't believe it. Sounds a bit simple and sentimental when you repeat it. But it was pure gold and the way she said it.

Scene Two

COLONEL: I don't know. We were all to blame, in our different ways. No doubt Jimmy acted in good faith. He's honest enough, whatever else he may be. And your mother – in her heavy-handed way, as you put it – acted in good faith as well. Perhaps you and I were the ones most to blame.

ALISON: 'Poor old Daddy – just one of those sturdy old plants left over from the Edwardian Wilderness that can't understand why the sun isn't shining any more.'

COLONEL: I always believed that people married each other because they were in love. That always seemed a good enough reason to me. But apparently, that's too simple for young people nowadays. They have to talk about challengers and revenge. I just can't believe that love between men and women is really like that.

COLONEL: Those long, cool evenings up in the hills, everything purple and golden. Your mother and I were so happy then. It seemed as though we had everything we could ever want. I think the last day the sun shone was when the dirty little train steamed out of that crowded, suffocating Indian station, and the battalion band playing for all it was worth. I knew in my heart it was all over then. Everything.

HELENA: You're his friend, aren't you? Anyway. He's not what you'd call reticent about himself, is he? I've never seen so many souls stripped to the waist since I've been here.

JIMMY: Alison'. Oh, how could she be so bloody wet! Deep loving need! That makes me puke! She couldn't say 'You rotten bastard! I hate your guts, I'm clearing out, and I hope you rot!' No, she has to make a polite, emotional mess out of it!

Act Three

JIMMY: After all, it wouldn't do if we was all alike, would it? It'd be a funny world if we was all the same, that's what I always say! All I know is that somebody's been sticking pins into *my* wax image for years. Of course: Alison's mother! Every Friday, the wax arrives from Harrod's and all through the weekend, she's stabbing away at it with a hatpin! Ruined her bridge game, I dare say.

JIMMY: Do you feel sin crawling out of your ears, like stored up wax or something? Are you wondering whether I'm joking or not? Perhaps I ought to wear a red nose and funny hat. I'm just curious, that's all.

JIMMY: I was a liberal skinny weakling. I too was afraid to strip down to my soul, but now everyone looks at my superb physique in envy. I can perform any kind of press there is without betraying the least sign of passion or kindliness.

JIMMY: No, of course it's not the same, you idiot! It never is! Today's meal is always different from yesterday's and the last woman isn't the same as the one before. If you can't accept that, you're going to be pretty unhappy, my boy.

JIMMY: Why, why, why, why do we let these women bleed us to death? Have you ever had a letter, and on it is franked 'Pleased Give Your Blood Generously? Well, the Postmaster-General does that, on behalf of all the women of the world. I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer.

JIMMY: Right from that first night, you have always put out your hand to me first. As if you expected nothing, or worse than nothing, and didn't care. You made a good enemy, didn't you? What they call a worthy opponent. But then, when people put down their weapons, it doesn't mean they've necessarily stopped fighting.

JIMMY: Perhaps it means something to lie with your victorious general in your arms. Especially, when he's heartily sick of the whole campaign, tired out, hungry and dry.

JIMMY: We'll get pleasantly, joyfully tiddly, we'll gaze at each other tenderly and lecherously in 'The Builder's Arms', and then we'll come back here, and I'll make such love to you, you'll not care about anything else at all.

Scene Two

ALISON: Because it was unfair and cruel of me to come back, I'm afraid a sense of timing is one of the things I seem to have learnt from Jimmy. But it's something that can be in very bad taste. I felt like a criminal. I told myself I'd turn round at the other end, and come straight back. I couldn't even believe that this place existed any more. But once I got here, there was nothing I could do. I had to convince myself that everything I remembered about this place had really happened to me once.

ALISON: I regret it, and I detest myself for doing it. But I did not come here in order to gain anything. Whatever it was – hysteria or just macabre curiosity, I'd certainly no intention of making any kind of breach between you and Jimmy.

HELENA: When I saw you standing there tonight, I knew that it was all utterly wrong. That I didn't believe in any of this, and not jimmy or anyone could make me believe otherwise. How could I have ever thought I could get away with it! He wants one world and I want another, and lying in that bed won't ever change it!

HELENA: When you came in at that door, ill and tired and hurt, it was all over for me. You see – I didn't know about the baby. It was such a shock. It's like a judgement on us.

JIMMY: It's no good trying to fool yourself about love. You can't fall into it like a soft job, without dirtying up your hands. It takes muscle and guts. And if you can't bear the thought of messing up your nice, clean soul, you'd better give up on the whole idea of life, and become a saint.

JIMMY: The injustice of it is almost perfect! The wrong people going hungry, the wrong people being loved, the wrong people dying!

The heaviest, strongest creatures in this world seem to be the loneliest. Like the old bear, following his ownbreath in the dark forest. There's no warm pack, no herd to comfort him. Do you remember that first night I saw you at that grisly party? You didn't really notice me, but I was watching you all the evening. You seemed to have a wonderful relaxation of spirit. I knew that was what I wanted. You've got to be really brawny to have that kind of strength – the strength to relax.

ALISON; It doesn't matter! I was wrong, I was wrong! I don't want to be neutral, I don't want to be a saint. I want to be a lost cause. I want to be corrupt and futile. I'm in the fire, and I'm burning, and all I want is to die! It's cost him his child, and any others I might have had! But what does it matter – this is what he wanted from me! Don't you see! I'm in the mud at last! I'm groveling! I'm crawling!

JIMMY: We'll be together in our bear's cave, and our squirrel's drey, and we'll live on honey, and nuts – lots and lots of nuts. And we'll sing songs about ourselves – about warm trees and snug caves, and lying in the sun. And you'll keep those big eyes on my fur, and help me keep my claws in order, because I'm a bit of a soppy, scruffy sort of a bear. And I'll see that you keep that sleek, bushy tail glistening as it should, because you're a very beautiful squirrel, but you're none too bright either, so we've got to be careful. There are cruel steel traps lying about everywhere, just waiting for rather mad, slightly satanic, and very timid little animal. Right?

Notes

1. *Midland.:* the central part of England.
2. *attic:* a room at the top of a house directly under the roof.
3. *landing:* the level part of a staircase between flights of steps.
4. *skylight:* a window in a roof or cei1ing.
5. *tweed:* woollen cloth with a rough surface.
6. *flannels:* trousers made of loosely woven woollen cloth or similar material.
7. *disconcerting:* surprising and upsetting.
8. *freebooting:* random and almost uncontrolled.
9. *importunate:* annoyingly persistent.
10. *blistering:* fiery, strong enough to disturb.
11. *loudmouth:* one who boasts in an unpleasant manner.
12. vehement: very assertive, passionate.
13. *To be as vehement* as *he is :* The author implies that a person who always talks aggressively may not be committed to any idea or viewpoint.
14. *exact it:* obtain it by pressure.
15. *counterpoint :* total contrast.
16. *polyphony:* uneasy combination of different elements. The term is used in music to describe a composition combining a variety of sounds, apparently not in harmony.
17. *She is turned in a different key. :* Alison is very different from Jimmy and Cliff, suffering from 'well-bred malaise', i.e. the sickness or weakness resulting from being well brought-up. She cannot cope with Jimmy's aggressive behaviour. Her personality is in contrast to the 'robust orchestration', that is, harmonious vitality of the other two.
18. *grubby:* somewhat unclean.
19. *equivocation:* avoiding frank and honest statements or behaviour.
20. *not arf: not* really or not at all, suggesting contempt.
21. *While Woman's Burden :* This is an ironic variation of White Man' s Burden which means. in the history of Colonialism, the responsibility to ruling the colonised. Jimmy is angry because Alison, like so many of her class, seems uninterested in serious ideas.
22. *Old Porter talks :* Jimmy complains that people don't take an interest in his talk but respond even to a yawn by Alison! He implies that it is so because she belongs to a higher class than he does.
23. *Welsh Ruffian:* a violent, brutal person from Wales, which is on the mid-west coast of England.
24. *You'll end up in the "News of the World, .. boyo, …..* : Thcre will be some scandal about you and it will be reported in the kind of newspaper that gives prominence to scandals.
25. *boyo:* affectionately critical term for boy.
26. *bound over:* colloquial for imprisoned.

27. *Builder's Arm. :* name of a pub, a place where alcoholic drinks are served.
28. *black-outs :* a condition in which a person appears to lose consciousness.
29. *guzzled:* swallowed food or drink greedily.
30. *Girl here* wants to *know... .*: reference to a letter in a Personal Advice Column of a newspaper, asking for an expert opinion on a sexual situation.
31. *Bishop of Bromley :* a church correspondent in the newspaper.
Bromley is a Greater London diocese.
32. *dullin* : slang for darling.
33. *nom de plume:* pen name.
34. *evangelist:* a person who preaches Christianity, especial1y at large public meetings.
35. *Earl's Courl: a* district of S.W. London
36. *yobs:* rough, dirty, bad-mannered persons.
37. *Hallelujah:* song of praise to God; used ironically here.
38. *Edwardian twilight:* end of King Edward VII's reign (1901-1911); a period characterised by complacency of the socially privileged.
39. *disenfranchised wilderness:* a place in which one is deprived of the right to vote; metaphorically, without any influence. one whose voice is no longer heard.
40. *slinks the place out:* fills the place with a dirty smell.
41. *ulcers:* sores that do not heal easily, on the skin or inside the body.
42. *Vaughan Williams:* (1872-1958) eminent British composer.
43. *Port Said:* a port and fuelling station at the Mediterranean end of Egypt. An implication of sleaziness.
44. *The old Edwardian brigade. . . pretty tempting:* The conservative upper class made their former narrow environment seem attractive.
45. *croquet:* a game in which wooden balls are driven by long-handled wooden hammers through a series of hoops fixed in the ground. The game was once popular among the English upper classes.
46. *phoney:* not genuine, false, full of pretence.
47. *he's got bite, edge, drive:* he is capable of thinking sharply and effectively; has the determination to get things done.
48. *Proper little Marchbanks:* the comparison is with a character in Shaw's play *Candida* who fell in love with a woman (Candida) much older than himself.
49. *naive nosiness.*- childlike curiosity.
50. *Ulysses:* the hero in the Greek epic *The Odyssey* attributed to Homer. An ironic reference to a long epic journey.
51. *A sort of female Emily Bronte':* the *author of Wuthering Heights,* a novel of tempestuous passion, written under a malt: pseudonym. 'A female Emily Bronte' is an ironic tautology.
52. *there's a shower for you:* Jimmy considers Alison's friends 'wet', that is uninteresting, dull.
53. *That blooming droning:* that damned noise (the concert on the radio).
54. *sadist:* one who gets pleasure in being cruel to others.
55. *Sandhurst:* The popular name for the Royal Military Academy (1802) of Great Britain. formerly at Sandhurst. Berkshire. but since 1947 at Camberley, Surrey.

56. *We//-bred commonplaces :* polite and superficially cultured but rather ordinary statements.
57. *bowler hat : a* type of hard, round felt hat.
58. *The Platitude: from Outer Space:* a platitude is a statement of something 'obvious and trivial, said many times before but made as if it were new and important. The reference to outer space suggests a thin, insubstantial creature, hardly real.
59. *he'll make it:* he will be a success.
60. *shakily triumphant:* successful without confidence.
61. *draw blood somehow:* succeed in creating the effect he has in mind, which is to shock and upset.
62. Ma*rquess of Queenberry:* the Marquess of Queensberry (1844-1900) established the code of rules governing modern boxing. The implicution here is that despite the civilised outward manner the individual will observe no rules of civilised conduct.
63 . s*ycophantic:* flattering behaviour with the intention of gaining some advantage for oneself.
64. *phlegmatic:* not easily moved or excited.
65. *pusillanimous:* cowardly, weak, incapable of action.
66. *the Games:* public entertainments organised by the Ancient Romans.
67. *beefcake Christians:* muscular Christians, i.e., solid. Fundamental, unwavering Christians.
68. *stereophonic:* of recorded Or broadcast sound giving the effect of coming from different directions.
69. *feed ourselves to a couple of lions :* referring to the Ancient Roman pastime of feeding the Early Christians to lions in their amphitheatres.
70. *The iron mingles with the music:* the electricity on which the irons interferes with the music from the radio.
71. *patronise:* a way of behaving towards another which is kind and friendly but indicates that one is superior.
72. *grimacing:* twisting the face.
73. *ingenious:* inventive.
74. *Miss Drury:* the landlady.
75. *takes in:* convinces, though not honestly.
76. *swinging on those bloody bells:* being emotionally aroused; enjoying something.
77. *Do you come here often?:* Cliff pretends comically that Jimmy is a single woman at a public dance.
78. *Only in the mating season:* Jimmy replies ironically as if he is a single woman, though such a woman wouldn't confess she is in search of a husband.
79. *Do you think bosoms will be in or out, this year?:* Will it be in or out of fashion for women to reveal or to conceal their bosoms? Alternatively, whether the size of bosoms will determine the male response to women.
80. *Your teeth will be out….:* Stop harassing me with your questions or I'll break your teeth.
81. *getting close to breaking point…..*: about to collapse or to become violent under pressure.
82. *infallible :* incapable of making a mistake, always right.
83. *vulnerable :* in this context, easily hurt, sensitive.
84. *trying to kill him in the worst way of all:* making him accept their relationship because of the pregnancy; making him confirm to the expectations of society; destroying his real personality and convictions.
85. *loose:* freewheeling, morally unscrupulous, promiscuous.

86. *common:* low, vulgar.
87. *Puritlan :* one who is excessively strict, precise in religion or morals.
88. *slobbering :* literally, to let saliva dribble from the mouth; metaphorically, to seem overflowing with sentiment.
89. *randy :* full of uncontrollable sexual desire.
90. *mourris dance:* Cliff distorts the word Morris, which is the name of a dance that originated in Medieval times and now is performed at festivals, to *mourris* so as to suggest mouse - a Morris dance done by a mouse, so to speak, as he explains later.
91. *whimsy:* odd or fanciful.
92. *half wit:* half-mad.
93. *half a crown:* a coin worth 2s 6d before the UK went metric; hence a coin of low value.
94. *That's* my *boy:* That's the kind of person I like.
95. *a lot* of *old-stock:* The conventional way of' his parents and ancestors asserting itself in Jimmy which, he adds immediately, "Nobody wants".
96. *I know what I want now:* i.e. sex.
97. *You'll have to wait till the proper time:* i.e. at night, when we go to bed.
98. *There's no such thing:* There is no fixed time for sex.
99. *mimes:* using movement to perform the functions *of* speech.
100. *"expense* of *spirit" lark:* Quoted *from* a sonnet by Shakespeare

    - 'The expense *of* spirit in a waste of shame

    Is lust in action.'

    Jimmy calls it a lark, i.e., a piece *of* fun or mischief.
101. *a scoutmaster:* one who is likely to be conventionally' moral and to preach morals.
102. *Gide:* Andre Gide (1860-1951), French author, who wrote frankly about his homosexuality.
103. *Greek Chorus; boys:* they are believed to have been homosexual.
104. *he's like a man with a strawberry mark-* He's like a man with a strawberry-coloured birthmark *of* discolouration on the face; who is self-conscious about it.
105. *Michelangelo Brigade:* men who are alike the Renaissance artists who were supposcd to be homosexuals.
106. *right-wing deviatianist:* a conservative who disagrees with the conservative establishment.
107. *the Revolution :* a sexual revolution in which opponents of homosexuality win be shot.
108. *predatory:* living by attacking and feeding on others.
109. *Hippodrome:* name *of* a theatre.
110. *digs:* (colloquial) inexpensive accommodation.
111. *She just devours me whole every time:* Every time we have sex she seems to eat me up, i.e. reduces me to something impersonal. She does not change as a result *of* the experience. She returns to her conventional way *of* thinking, feeling and behaviour.
112. *tripes:* parts *of* the stomach *of* a cow or sheep, used as food; the reference here is to Alison's intestines, which Jimmy describes as "distended, overfed".
113. *slip:* a kind *of* undergarment.
114. *intermittent:* stopping for a while and starting again.

115. *matriarchal:* like a mother who dominates a family.
116. *rabble-rousing instincts:* urge to use words and phrases which will excite listeners.
117. *catcalls:* shrill whistles indicating disagreement or disapproval.
118. *salad colander:* a bowl with small holes in it for draining water from salad, vegetables, etc.
119. inhibiting: repressive, causing inability to relax and to express one's feelings in an open and natural way.
120. *allegiances :* loyalties, Jimmy is loyal to Cliff and will not be suspicious of his relationship with Alison.
121. *literal:* following the exact meaning with no exaggeration and nothing added by the imagination.
122. *fluke:* something that happens by chance.
123. "comes down" : a phrase denoting that a student has left a university; used only in relation to students of the best English Universities such as Oxford and Cambridge.
124. red *brick:* universities founded in England from the late nineteenth century onwards and so without a long tradition or learning and cultural values. The term comes from the building material or the time.
125. *white tile :* not even as good as the red-brick universities; virtually without intellectual standards.
126. wa*rehouse :* a building in which goods are stored.
127. *tight :* slightly drunk.
128. port *:* a kind of strong, dark-red, sweet wine.
129. *burnt my boats :* destroyed any means of retreating.
130. *brawling :* quarrelling.
131. *squeamish :* easily shocked.
132. *snobbish:* inclined to admire people of high rank or social class and to look down upon those of a lower class.
133 *hostage :* a person who is held prisoner as a guarantee that certain demands, conditions of any agreement etc. are carried out.
134. W. *I. S. W. I. etc. :* Postal codes for some *of* the more affluent London districts.
135. *gate crash :* go to a party, meeting etc., without being invited or without paying.
136. *the silver :* anything made *of '* or looking like silver, specially knives, forks, spoons, etc.
137. *guerrilla warfare : w*ars conducted by small groups, generally outside the regular army, who make sudden attacks on the enemy.
138. *that did it :* I made my final decision to marry Jimny because the family objected to it so strongly. (If it had left me alone, I might have changed my mind!)
139. 'the *knight in shining armour :* the fighter for a cause, with high ideals.
140. *cronies :* friends, close companions.
141. *Dame Alison's Mob:* a sarcastic reference to Alison's high society upbringing contrasting with her working-class marriage.
142. *The New Millennium :* a millennium is a period of thousand years. The reference here is to a New Age or Utopia likely to last for a long time.
143. *menagerie :* a place with a collection of wild animals.
144. *fey :* with homosexual tendencies.
145. *boyo :* affectionate substitute for the word boy.
146. *blinkin* : slang term for damned.

147. *washes over you :* has no effect on you.
148. *trash :* something worthless.
149. *Blimey :* a vulgar interjection of surprise or contempt.
150. *fugue :* a piece of music in which a tune is repeated by different parts of an orchestra or by voices.
151. *spinster :* an unmarried woman, specially one who is past the usual age for marrying.
152. *You know your trouble. son? Too anxious to please :* Jimmy is imitating Cliff's father giving advice to his son.
153. *meringues :* very sweet cakes made of sugar and egg-white.
154. *tom-toms :* small drums.
155. *top of the bill :* above all.
156. *religious angle :* some religious ideas, words and phrases.
157. *a big hit :* a great success.
158. *necking :* kissing and embracing.
159. *pecking :* a quick kiss.
160. *blues :* low spirits, depression.
161. *booze :* liquor.
162. *hetero :* heterosexual.
163. *metero :* the word metro, which means underground railway in London, is extended to rhyme with hetero.
164. *perpetual :* constant.
165. *whoring :* going after prostitutes.
166. *python coil :* deadly embrace.
167. *celibate :* doing without sex.
168. *theology :* study of or system of religion.
169. *slosh of :* tone and influence of.
170. *the theology of Dante with a good slosh of Eliot:* Dante Alghieri (1265-1321), the great Italian renaissance author of *The Divine Comedy.* and T.S. Eliot (1886-1965), the distinguished twentieth century Anglo-American poet; both representatives of high culture; thus models for emulation.
171. *Cess Pool :* for collecting waste or sewage.
172. *rise to the bait :* like a fish (be tempted to criticise him, which is what he wants).
173. *Lady Bracknell... :* a large and formidable prospective mother-in-law in Oscar Wilde's play *The Importance of Being Ernest* who interviews her son-in-law to be over tea and cucumber sandwiches.
174. *charger :* a war horse.
175. *off white :* a colour near white.
176. *crusade :* a continued effort to help a good cause, derived from the military expeditions of Christians to win back the Holy Land from the Turks.
177. *chivalry :* kindness towards women, a higher standard of politeness towards them than towards men, derived from the medieval knightly social code.
178. *guzzler :* one who swallows food or drink greedily.
179. *He clutches wildly :* he tries desperately to think of something.

180. *matelot's arm :* French for a sailor's arm.
181. *cistern :* a tank for storing water.
182. *get me into the News of the World :* find a scandal about me which can be reported in the newspaper of that name, which focuses heavily on scandals.
183. *tricked out :* pretentiously equipped.
184. *caparisoned :* colourfully dressed in some old historical style.
185. *mare :* a female horse; a reference to a Nursery Rhyme "The Old Grey Marc, she ain't what she used to be".
186. *brawl :* to quarrel noisily.
187. *genuflecting :* bowing in an exaggerated way, showing excessive respect for someone's opinions and wishes.
188. *sin jobber :* one who helps another with various kinds of jobs for payment, in this case to the extent of committing sins.
189. *he brakes for a fresh spurt later :* he pauses before bursting out again.
190. *He's saving his strength for the knock-out :* He controls himself so that he will be able to hit hard to the point of defeating his opponent in argument.
191. *those worms will need……:* even the worms in Alison's body will not get the salt they need to survive, because she has no salt in her (metaphorically, i.e. nothing strong).
192. *declamatory :* oratorical, as in a speech intended to sound dramatic, forceful.
193. *purgatory :* a place or state after death in which a soul is purified before it goes to heaven; any state of suffering or unpleasantness.
194. *She hasn't broken :* Alison is not wholly upset by Jimmy's remarks about her and her mother; her endurance has not collapsed.
195. *on the end of his line :* metaphorically, his fishing-line or rope at the end of which is the bait.
196. Written in flames a mile high: remembrances which are extraordinarily fiery.
197. Recollected in tranquility: Wordsworth's definition of how poetry is written.
198. picking daffodils with Auntie Wordsworth: Recent research indicates that Wordsworth's sister Dorothy made entries in her diary about their walks together in the Lake District, which inspired Wordsworth's poem "The Daffodils".
199. *expediency*: a practical necessity but not down with belief or conviction.
200. *the local registrar*: registrar of marriages (i.e. outside the church).
201. *spill the beans* : to tell what is expected to be secret.
202. *like a shot*: immediately.
203. *vicar*: priest.
204. *my best man* : a friend of the bridegroom who accompanies him to the church altear for the wedding services.
205. *to watch the execution carried out*: Jimmy maliciously describes the wedding as an execution.
206. *buzzed* : dizzy, exhausted, irritated.
207. *pew:* a seat or bench in a church.
208. *vestry :* a room in or near a church used by the clergy as a dressing room and for small meetings.

209. *He can smell blood again*: one more opportunity to be provocative.
210. *Saint in Dior's clothing*: Christian Dior, one of the popular fashion designers of our time. A saint would not wear fashionable clothes and would arouse suspicion if he or she did so.
211. *Sacred cow :* a person, idea or institution considered beyond criticism, derived from the Hindu veneration of the cow.
212. *dry up:* stop talking.
213. *pay off:* make it worthwhile.
214. *the Economics of the Supernatural:* a way of thinking about the world in which everything is explained in terms of the supernatural.
215. *apocalyptic:* relating to the end of the world.
216. *share pushers:* share sellers or promoters who hide the weaknesses of their case.
217. *a transfer of power:* from the system of ideas under the category of Reason and Progress to "The old traditions, the old beliefs" in the Supernatural.
218. *There's going to be a change over:* Jimmy describes (ironically) a possible change in the spiritual and religious ethos in terms of shares and dividends. etc.
219. *The Big crash:* The collapse of the beliefs considered modern (Reason and Progress. etc) The term is usually applied to the stock exchange, the prices of shares, the rates of interest, and so on.
220. *gilt-edged:* absolutely reliable.
221. *capital gain :* a term in economics which means an increase in the main sum of money and not only in the rate of interest.
222. *The Dark Ages:* the period (5th - 8th centuries) of European history for a bad or chaotic period, here ironically.
223. *ecstatic :* intensely joyful.
224. *wind:* air of gas in the stomach.
225. *smouldering:* burning slowly.
226. *public school:* A British boarding-school, in this context, established as rule a long time ago and noted for its intellectual standards, devotion to traditional morals, manners, etc.
227. *scruples:* a feeling to hesitation or doubt about doing something because one thinks or knows that is might be wrong, or unkind to do it.
228. *cash in on:* take advantage of.
229. *just plain Irish:* the Irish are said to be more outspoken than the English.
230. *a pretty bad case of virginity:* metaphorically, a case of ignorance, lack of experience, etc.
231. *the was in Spain:* the Spanish Civil War (1936-39)
232. *a veteran:* one who is old and experienced (Jimmy uses the word ironically).
233. *bravado:* a show of daring but not real bravery.
234. *Judas:* Judas Iscariot. one of the 12 Apostles, who is said to have betrayed Jesus for 30 pieces of silver.
235. *phlegm:* thick, slimy liquid brought up from the throat by coughing.
236. *He's drawn blood at last:* he has been successful in his attempt to provoke.
237. *twist your arm off:* do something very cruel.
238. *hysterical:* uncontrolled in speech and behaviour, often without adequate reasons.

239. *grovel :* to make oneself excessively humble because one wants something.
240. *I want the front seat:* I want to have a clear view of it.
241. *see your face rubbed in the mud:* see you humiliated.
242. *raving :* talking and behaving as if made.
243. *got a kick out of:* a pleasant thrill.
244. *hardly audible:* not clearly heard.
245. *speaks a different language:* has a different attitude, view-point, way of behaving.
246. *charwoman:* a woman employed in house-cleaning.
247. *heavy-handed:* clumsy, not very intelligent.
248. *take after me:* resemble me.
249. *sit on the fence:* avoid taking sides.
250. *trails off:* concludes rather weakly.
251. *blow-out:* a feast.
252. E*dwardian :* of or in relation to the reign of king Edward VII (1909-1911).
253. *sturdy old plants...sun isn't shining any more:* a survivor of the cosy reactionary background of the Edwardian era who can't understand why the former age of cosy comfort for the socially privileged has vanished.
254. *quite a turn of phrase:* a special way of using language which brings it alive, makes it more effective.
255. *the famous American question-you know the sixty-four dollar one:* a question that can't be answered at all or is very difficult to answer.
256. *uncomprehendingly:* without understanding.
257. *another Shelley...*Shelley had a romantic marriage with Mary, daughter of the philosopher William Godwin, who did not approve of it.
258. *barbarian:* rough, wild or uncultured person.
259. *throws down the gauntlet at me:* challenges me.
260. *mystified:* puzzled, confused.
261. *why the sun isn't shining any more:* why life is not enjoyable.
262. *the Blimps:* people who resemble Colonel Blimp, a die-hard reactionary named after a cartoon character representing a pompous, obese old man.
263. *the stall:* the sweet-stall, which Cliff and Jimmy manage jointly to earn a living.
264. *cock-eyed:* in the state of confusion.
265. *nut-house:* mad-house.
266. *reticent:* reserved, withdrawn.
267. *souls stripped to the waist:* half-naked souls, persons who reveal what they think and feel without any respect for social conventions.
268. *tart:* a prostitute or a Woman who behaves like one.
269 *old mother Drury:* a mocking reference to the elderly landlady Mrs. Drury.
270 *rams:* pushes it hard.
271. *snorts:* forces air noisily through the nostrils.

272. *bloody wet:* disgustingly insensitive.
273. *puke:* vomit.
274. *soggy:* wet and soft.
275. *sordid:* dirty, unpleasant .
276. *aria:* a song for one voice in an opera. Jimmy means that he is not going to make a fuss, not dramatise...
277. *the dirty ones...the posh ones:* the poor and the rich.
278. *wet round the mouth:* cowardly in speech.
279. *grotesque :* very odd, almost ugly.
280. *the old place :* the Midlands,. familiar place.
281. *invocations:* appeals, to summon a spirit into the mind.
282. *the Coptic Goddess of fertility:* the Goddess of a primitive culture, supposed to be responsible for the conception and birth of children.
283. *depraved:* evil, corrupt.
284. *rather us:* somewhat like us.
285. *snarling:* becoming confused.
286. *debutante:* a girl making her first formal appearance at a gathering in upper-class society.
287. *orgy:* a wild party or celebration.
288. *cockerel:* a young cock.
289. *Fortnums:* a well-known department store in London.
290. *a roaring line:* successful sales.
291. *a stint:* a short appearance.
292. *Y.W.:* YWCA Young Women's Christian Association.
293. *a workout:* some practice.
294. *dabbled in :* attempted in an experimental sort of way.
295. *Your cup of tea:* the kind of thing you would enjoy.
296. *accent:* a special way of pronouncing words in a particular area or way of life.
297. *Sticking pins into my wax image:* reference to the superstition that if you stick pins in a wax image of someone, he or she will experience bad luck, suffer financially or in health.
298. *Harrods:* a famous department store in London, with many branches.
299. *Kidding:* deceiving.
300. *brooding:* thinking anxiously or with great seriousness.
301. *excursion:* a trip, an outing (used metaphorically to describe Jimmy's long speech about why people make sacrifices).
302. *Dry up:* Stop talking.
303. *cochineal:* a scarlet dye used in colouring food.
304. *a long letter…:* in the newspaper Jimmy has been reading.
305. *artificial insemination:* making a woman pregnant by non-natural means.
306. *whether Milton wore braces or not:* a sarcastic reference to the english preoccupation with literary correspondence in the major newspapers, largely concerned with inconsequential, or downright farcical matters.

307. *who gets shot down:* whose argument is destroyed by a counter-argument.
308. *A Fellow of All Souls:* a Fellow is a distinguished instructor in a college; All souls is in Oxford.
309. *bitten the dust:* been humiliated in argument.
310. *the Athenaeum :* probably a reference to a London club founder in 1824 for men of distinction in literature, art and learning.
311. *acquiring yourself a curiosity:* learning to be curious in matters of knowledge.
312. *Yale:* an eminent and well-known American university.
313. *When Shakespeare was writing the Tempest he changed his sex:* referring sarcastically to the far-fetched and sensational research thesis of American literary scholars.
314. *second best bed:* other than the one shared with one's marital partner.
315. *Old W.S. ended up .. three children by him:* a continuation of the whimsy mentioned above. Actually, Shakespeare married Anne Hathaway, and had three children. He left Anne his second-best bed in his will.
316. *quizzically:* as if asking a question.
317. *mark it down:* consider it.
318. *satanic glint:* a devilish gleam or sparkle.
319. *living in sin:* a sexual relationship without being married.
320. *Reverend:* a Christian priest.
321. *Parson:* a Christian priest in charge of a parish (organised neighbourbood).
322. *Spiritual beefcake:* moral and spiritual ideas which are not reliable or convincing but have a good "teste".
323. *moral weight-lifting:* exercises with moral ideas which have been traditionally accepted.
324. *a liberal skinny weakling:* one who believes in democracy, tolerance, progress, reason and so on, but without much conviction.
325. *physique:* the structure of the body, here intended to mean the structure of the soul.
326. *any kind of press:* perform any action.
327. *uplift:* a high moral and spiritual condition.
328. *tumbling over:* discussing.
329. *change the record:* don't repeat yourself.
330. *pipe down:* stop talking or talk less.
331. *catchy:* attractive, likely to be popular.
332. *scrub:* cancel, drop.
333. *Jock and Day:* the names of the two main characters in the musical Jimmy is composing.
334. *"And jocund day…" a* quotation form Wordworth.
335. *that peculiar man's plays… have finished with him:* the thorough literary analysis of Jimmy Porter's plays by academic intellectuals.
336. *snappy:* smart, short and crisp.
337. *T.S. Eliot and Pam:* T.S. Eliot, the distinguished modern Anglo-American intellectual and poet, and Pam Ayres, the pop poet. An incongruous pair.
338. *falling in :* accepting and co-operating with.

339. *mellerdy:* melody, deliberately mispronounced for the sake of making it sound funny.
340. *rattles his lines off:* sings them very fast; unintelligible: not clear.
341. *a little Gidding:* ironic reference to one of T.S. Eliot's Four Quartets entitles "little Gidding" which is the name of an English village.
342. *gelding iron:* instrument used for gelding, i.e. castrating animals.
343. *perlease:* please, deliberately mispronounced for comic effect.
344. *stinks:* is worthless.
345. *a Flanagan and Allen:* a pair of music-hall comedians.
346. *Roedean:* a distinguished English public school for girls.
347. *ménage:* household.
348. *marge:* short form of margarine, a butter-like substance made mainly from vegetable fats.
349. *true blue:* who has real merit.
350. *gag:* joke
351. *wrench my guts:* sprain my ribs.
352. *oaf:* fool.
353. *Marlon Brando:* a Hollywood actor admired for his tough, manly appearance and style.
354. *to explain the score to you:* help you to assess the situation.
355. *scruffy:* dirty and untidy.
356. *Pinner or Guildford:* small English towns, known for their conventional morals and manners.
357. *gobbles you up:* swallows you, i.e. makes you resemble her in respectability.
358. *make out:* make a career.
359. *bleed us to death:* destroy our individuality.
360. *franked:* marked with a rubber-stamp.
361. *the big bang:* the atomic explosion.
362. *the old-fashioned, grand design:* the traditional social and moral ideal.
363. *Brave New:* reference to Aldous Huxley's novel (*Brave New World)* about an ideal society.
364. *butchered:* slaughtered, killed.
365. *glammed up:* dressed up glamorously.
366. *hit the town:* go into town to have an entertaining time.
367. *shroud over Mummy:* a cloth over the photograph of Alison's mother.
368. *Union Jack:* the British National flag.
369. *sloppy :* untidy.
370. *how to take it:* how to endure or accept harsh things said or done to him.
371. *how to hand it out:* how to hit back, in words and action.
372. *a good double:* a good pair.
373. *tiddly;* mildly drunk.
374. *lecherously:* with strong sexual desire.

375. *"TheBuilder's Arms":* name of pub.
376. *St. Pancras:* one of the three major railway terminuses in London.
377. *charade:* a piece of ridiculous pretence which is so obvious that it does not deceive anyone.
378. *Suspended and rather remote:* not involved in whatever happens, with a sense of its unreality.
379. *don't bring out the book of rules:* don't refer to conventional notions of right and wrong.
380. *strong-arm stuff:* in this case, trying to assert your rights in a marriage.
381. *blackmailer:* one who seeks money or a favour by threatening to reveal something the victim wishes to keep secret.
382. *macabre:* horrible.
383. *breach:* gap, disturbance, conflict.
384. *He was born out of his time:* he is completely out of tune with the present age, belong to a different historic period.
385. *never amount to anything:* he will never be a success in any way.
386. *An Eminent Victorian:* the reference is to a famous book of biographical essays by Lytton Strachey entitled *Eminent Victororians.* Alison is obviously very confused about Jimmy who has nothing of the Victorian in him; no faith in reason, Progress, a society with high moral standards, etc.
387. *get away with it:* succeed in reconciling Jimmy's way of life and ideas with mine.
388. *hold court:* assemble people and pass judgement on those he dislikes as if they are "the accused" in a law case.
389. *like one of the Renaissance popes:* in Helena's statement they represent the all powerful. There is irony in Jimmy, with his anti-religion slant, being compared to the popes.
390. *a kind of cross between:* an odd combination of.
391. *courtesan:* a prostitute.
392. *henchwoman:* a faithful supporter or follower who will engage in dishonest practices: a principal attendant.
393. *Cleopatra:* Cleopatra VII (9-30 BC), queen of Egypt, mistress of Julius Caesar and later Mark Antony, representing a powerful, attractive, dominating personality.
394. *Boswell:* James Bosewell (1740-95) biographer of Dr. Johnson; a respectful, admiring person devoted to another's life and work.
395. *wrenching:* pulling with a violent movement.
396. *Jimmy (off):* his voice is heard but the audience can't see him.
397. *dark plots:* plans for doing something evil.
398. *draw a diagram:* explain the simple and obvious.
399. *They all want to escape.*. This is one of Jimmy's central convictions. That one must face life's sufferings and cope with them.
400. *hot-house feeling :* artificial feelings, not genuine, apparently strong but not really sincere.
401. *like of soft job:* a situation in which there are no serious problems.
402. *muscle and guts:* strength of mind and courage.
403. *the injustice*….the wrong people dying. Life is full of underserved suffering.
404. *as powerful as itself:* equal vitality in people, relationships, work experience, etc.
405. *The heaviest…the loneliest*: an independent mind is alone, since few mind are genuinely independent.

406. *warm pack, herd…:* company.
407. *The voice that cries out..:* that expresses its sufferings.
408. *grisly:* horrible, unpleasant.
409. *brawny:* muscular as applied metaphorically to the mind.
410. *sweat your guts out:* work hard, think intensely till you arrive at your basic convictions.
411. *a hair out of place, or…..:* you've never been really disturbed in your mind.
412. *I may be a lost cause:* isolated, unsuccessful, with ideas shared by very few people, etc.
413. *I don't want to be a saint…:* Alison asserts Jimmy's values.
414. *splash about in:* experience all the time, remain familiar with, not avoid for the sake of mental comfort and security.
415. *this is what he wanted from me!:* he wanted me to know suffering as it really is.
416. *I'm groveling:* begging for something with excessive humility, respect and fear.
417. *bear's cave and …:* Jimmy sees himself as a bear living happily with Alison as squirrel, each acknowledging the nature of the other.
418. *drey:* a squirrel's nest.
419. *snug:* warm and comfortable.
420. *soppy:* foolishly sentimental.
421. *Scruffy:* dirty and untidy.
422. *none too bright:* not very intelligent.
423. *satanic:* evil.
424. *Poor squirrels!… Poor bears!* Jimmy and Alison, each recognises and feels a kind of a affectionate pity about the essential nature of the other.

Bibliography

The author wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to the following sources in the preparation of this book:

Look Back In Anger: A Selection of critical essays edited by John Russell Taylor

The Plays of John Osborne: By Simon Trussler

British Theatre (1950 –1970): By Arnold Hinchliffe

Osborne (Writers and Their Work Series): A British Council Pamphlet

Contemporary Playwrights: John Osborne: By Ronald Haymen

The Theatre of Protest and Paradox: By George. E. Wellworth

Drama from Ibsen to Bracht: By Raymond Williams

English Literature: By R. J. Reese

Modern British Dramatists: Edited By John Russell Brown

A Short History of English Drama: By Ifor Evans

John Osborne: Look Back In Anger: Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

John Osborne: A Better Class of Person: An Autobiography (1929-1950)
(London: Faber & Faber 1981)

Carter Allan: John Osborne, Edinburgh. Oliver. A. Boyal 1969

Ronald Haymen: John Osborne, Great Britain: Helmermann, 1968

Evans Gareth Llyod: The Language of Modern Drama, Everyman, London 1977