Manonmaniam Sundaranar University

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TIRUNELVELI - 627 012, TAMILNADU

M.A ENGLISH (FIRST SEMESTER)

World Literature in Translation

(From the Academic Year 2021 - 2022)

Prepared by

Dr. U. Kethrapal

Assistant Professor, Department of English,

St. John's College, Palayamkottai - 627 002

Most student friendly University-Strive to Study and Learn to Excel

for More Information Visit : http://www.msuniv.ac.in

M.A. ENGLISH – I YEAR

WORLD LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION

Objectives:

- To familiarize the students with different socio-cultural context that produce a narrative.
- To make the students understand the significance and nuances of translation.

Course Outcomes:

C.O. No.	Upon the completion of this course, students will beable to	PSOs Addressed	Cognitive Level
CO 1	Get acquainted to the spectrum of world literature.	A, B, C	K1
CO 2	Understand that translation facilitates cultural communication.	B, C, E, G	K2, K4
CO 3	Analyse various socio-cultural texts.	F	K3, K4
CO 4	Undertake an independent research activity.	F, G	K3, K4, K6
CO 5	Validate some of the main theoretical and methodologicalissues involved in reading World Literature.	E, F, G	K5
CO 6	Demonstrate mastery in expressing oneself throughtranslation or mutli-lingual writing in a clear, coherent and persuasive manner, and to construct an interpretiveargument.	D, G, H	K1, K6

K1 – Remember, K2 – Understand, K3 – Apply, K4 – Analyse, K5 – Evaluate, K6 – Create

Unit I – POETRY

Khalil Gibran	:	Joy and Sorrow
Pablo Neruda	:	Ritual of my Legs
Mahmoud Darwish	:	The Passport

Unit II – EPIC

Ilango Adigal	:	The Cilappatikaram:The Tale of an Anklet - **The Book of Pukar (87 Pages) only**

Unit III – SHORT STORIES

Tayeb Salih	:	A Handful of Dates
Marcel Ayme	:	The Man who could walk through walls
Fyodor Dostoevsky	:	An Honest Thief

UNIT – IV – DRAMA

Dario Fo	:	Accidental Death of an Anarchist
Betrolt Brecht	:	Galileo

Unit V – FICTION

Gabriel Garcia Marquez	:	Love in the Time of Cholera
Elie Wiesel	:	Night

UNIT 1- POETRY

Joy and Sorrow

- Khalil Gibran

About the author

Khalil Gibran, Gibran also spelled **Jibran**, Khalil also spelled **Kahlil**, Arabic name in full **Jubrān Khalīl Jubrān**, (born January 6, 1883, Bsharrī, Lebanon—died April 10, 1931, New York, New York, U.S.), Lebanese-American philosophical essayist, novelist, poet, and artist.

Having received his primary education in Beirut, Gibran immigrated with his parents to Boston in 1895. He returned to Lebanon in 1898 and studied in Beirut, where he excelled in the Arabic language. On his return to Boston in 1903, he published his first literary essays; in 1907 he met Mary Haskell, who was to be his benefactor all his life and who made it possible for him to study art in Paris. In 1912 Gibran settled in New York City and devoted himself to writing literary essays and short stories, both in Arabic and in English, and to painting.

Kahlil Gibran‘s paradoxical portrayal of joy and sorrow brings to mind his appreciation for the writing of German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900). Paradoxes characterized Nietzsche's thought and writings. While studying in Paris (1908–10), Gibran came to admire Nietzsche's work, especially *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (published between 1883 and 1885). Much like *The Prophet*, Nietzsche's treatise recounts the fictional travels and teachings of the prophet Zarathustra. The compilation of ideas, parables, and prophecy includes Nietzsche's famous declaration "God is dead".

In general, Nietzsche's philosophy assaulted the idea of eternal truths and served as a catalyst for thoughtful and personal re-evaluation of moral and material values. Although Gibran differed with Nietzsche on his opinion of God, Gibran appreciated the notion of the liberated self, free to discover the essence of his humanness and spirituality.

Joy and Sorrow

Then a woman said, Speak to us of Joy and Sorrow.
And he answered:
Your joy is your sorrow unmasked.
And the selfsame well from which your laughter rises was oftentimes filled with your tears.

And how else can it be?
The deeper that sorrow carves into your being, the more joy you can contain.
Is not the cup that holds your wine the very cup that was burned in the potter's oven?
And is not the lute that soothes your spirit, the very wood that was hollowed with knives?
When you are joyous, look deep into your heart and you shall find it is only that which has given you sorrow that is giving you joy.
When you are sorrowful look again in your heart, and you shall see that in truth you are weeping for that which has been your delight.

Some of you say, "Joy is greater than sorrow," and others say, "Nay, sorrow is the greater."
But I say unto you, they are inseparable.
Together they come, and when one sits alone with you at your board, remember that the other is asleep upon your bed.

Verily you are suspended like scales between your sorrow and your joy.
Only when you are empty are you at standstill and balanced.
When the treasure-keeper lifts you to weigh his gold and his silver, needs must your joy or your sorrow rise or fall.

Joy and Sorrow Analysis

A woman asks Almustafa to talk about joy and sorrow, and he replies that joy is sorrow unmasked. The deeper sorrow carves into one's being, the more joy one can contain. The cup that holds one's wine is burned in the potter's oven, and the lute that soothes the spirit is made of wood hollowed by knives. The joyous should look inside to see the sorrow giving joy, and the sorrowful should see that they are weeping for past delight. People debate whether joy or sorrow is greater, but Almustafa declares them inseparable. People are suspended on scales between them and balanced only when empty.

Joy and sorrow are inseparable. They are two sides of the same thing and complement one another. That which brings joy also brings sorrow. The deeper one's capacity to experience joy, the deeper the capacity to experience sorrow. One emotion is not greater than the other. Both are equally present in life, balanced like scales: one rising as the other falls.

The subject of joy and sorrow is raised by a woman whose lack of further identification suggests her concern is universal. No one passes through life untouched by

these emotional highs and lows. The prophet seeks to reveal the relationship between them and the dependency of one upon the other.

Almustafa begins his lesson with what seems a contradiction as he tells his audience, “Your joy is your sorrow unmasked.” A closer look, however, reveals the truth he is trying to convey. Joy and sorrow spring from the same well. Thus, they are inseparable. By peering deep into the heart of their sorrow, a person also will find the heart of their joy. When that joy is shrouded by lack of awareness and understanding, they believe it is lost. This blindness is the source of pain. They experience unhappiness originating from the assumed loss of something that brought happiness. But contrary to their feelings, that thing of delight is still there, as it always has been. Unmasking sorrow leads to finding joy again.

The prophet then explains why it is impossible to experience only joy and escape all sorrow. Joy and sorrow must coexist. For there to be one, there must be the other. Joy is like wine in a cup. The cup is sorrow: the deeper the cup, the more wine, or joy, it will hold. In other words, the greater the ability to experience sorrow, the greater the ability to experience joy.

Ritual of my Legs by Pablo Neruda

About the author

Pablo Neruda (1904-1973), born Ricardo Eliezer Neftali Reyes y Basoalto, is one of the best-known poets of the twentieth century, and is regarded as one of the finest Spanish-language poets of his time: writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez famously called him “the greatest poet of the 20th century in any language.” Today, his odes and his love poetry remain especially popular, both in their original Spanish and in translation. His poetry is known for its frank exploration of sexuality, its vivid evocations of the natural world, and its firm, accessible grounding in lived reality. A communist with strong political as well as literary commitments throughout his life, Neruda’s later poetry was infused with radical politics and took on historical events such as the Spanish Civil War. Thus, Neruda’s stylistic development and his political beliefs can be traced in concert with one another. However, in both his early erotic mode and his later political one, Neruda’s poetry was known for insisting upon accessibility, materiality, and intense corporeality. As Neruda himself put it, “I have always wanted a poetry where the fingerprints show.” He disdained much of the abstract, elevated poetry of both antiquity and the nineteenth century, and by contrast was excited by the immediacy of surrealism and symbolism. This dramatic vividness has caused some critics to

accuse Neruda of tackiness, melodrama, or crudeness—Spanish poet Juan Ramon Jiminez referred to him as a "great bad poet"— while others have argued that these tendencies, in their proper context, have made Neruda rightfully beloved.

It was through love poetry that Neruda first earned his reputation as a poet. In 1924, at the age of 19, Neruda published his first collection of poems (though he had published in various newspapers and magazines prior). Veintepoemas de amor y una canción desesperada (Twenty Love Poems and a Song of Despair) catapulted Neruda to celebrity, and to this day his writing is in many ways inextricable from his status as a cultural icon, especially in his native Chile. *Veintepoemas de amor y una canción desesperada*draws on sexual and romantic experiences from Neruda's own life, mixing descriptions of human sexuality with those of the natural world, especially that of rural Chile, where Neruda had spent his childhood. These early poems are personal and sensuous, drawing on archetypal images of womanhood and nature. Though its frank eroticism caused some critical backlash, this remains the world's most popular book of Spanish-language poetry: audiences, especially in translation, have broadly embraced his early love poems over his later political work.

In keeping with the Chilean tradition of offering diplomatic appointments to poets, Neruda was sent to Burma as honorary consul in 1927. This sojourn abroad, which brought him to a series of Asian cities under colonial rule, deeply distressed Neruda. Manuel Durán and Margery Safir have argued that, for him, these locales were "a mixture of chaos, poverty, and fascinating perceptions of the ancient cultures in contrast with a degrading colonial present." The experience would lead Neruda to produce a two-part collection, *Residencia en la Tierra* (Residence on Earth), followed by a third installment, *Tercera Residencia,* in, respectively, 1933, 1935, and 1937. Though these poems were, and continue to be, highly praised and even considered Neruda's masterpieces, the poet later renounced their proto-existentialist themes of despair and hopelessness (as Michael Wood has noted in the *New York Review of Books)*. These poems, loaded with surreally dark images of exhaustion, rot, and disease, in many ways contrast with the urgent calls for change that would come to mark much of Neruda's later work. Still, his capacity for creating discomfort and evoking violence emerged in full force in these volumes: Dudley Fitts, in *Poetry m*agazine, notes of Neruda that "His lines are harsh, often deliberately cacophonous. His metric has little to do with the ear: it seems to be a visual-syntactical system whereby lines are measured off arbitrarily at the ends of clauses and concepts."

The poems of the *Residencia* series sit in something of a transitional space between Neruda's earlier, wholly romantic works and his later political ones, venturing in the later installments into advocacy for Republicanism: *Tercera Residencia* includes the poem *Españaenelcorazon*(Spain in Our Hearts), a response to the Spanish Civil War. By firmly taking the side of the Republicans against Francisco Franco's dictatorship, Neruda turned something of a corner, marking himself as a political poet. In his poetic accounts of the Spanish Civil War, Neruda embraced the role of a poet of witness or recorder of historical memory as well as that of an activist, arguing that "Poetry is rebellion." His 1950 collection *Canto General* is an ambitious attempt to mythologize and celebrate Latin America as a whole through a communist lens, linking descriptions of the continent's land itself to accounts of colonialism and celebrations of contemporary Latin American workers. It tracks the life of the continent starting with pre-Columbian history, attempting, in an extraordinarily ambitious manner, to recover narratives lost to and suppressed by cultural imperialism. Yet in his later work, especially upon returning to Chile after a period of political exile, Neruda retreated from some of these overtly political themes, producing poetry that celebrated details of physical existence and everyday life.

Neruda was awarded the 1971 Nobel Prize "for a poetry that with the action of an elemental force brings alive a continent's destiny and dreams," an evaluation that in many ways remains sound today. Neruda remains a celebrated chronicler of South America as at once a source of radical political potential, a home firmly grounded in quotidian rhythms, and a setting of epic and archetypal narratives. Despite his commitment to poetry as a moral force, Neruda himself wavered and changed his mind throughout his life regarding both political and stylistic matters. He has been criticized for his uncritical embrace of certain authoritarian communist governments, and for his treatment of women in poetry and life. Still, his lifelong adherence to the idea that poetry should be concrete and readable has made him enduringly popular in Chile and abroad, and both in Spanish and in translation. He died in 1973, shortly after the authoritarian Augusto Pinochet overtook the government of Chile: today, it is a topic of debate whether Neruda died of prostate cancer or was assassinated, as a means of preventing him from becoming an anti-Pinochet influence abroad.

Ritual of my Legs

For a long time I have stayed looking at my long legs,
with infinite and curious tenderness, with my accustomed passion,

as if they had been the legs of a divine woman,
deeply sunk in the abyss of my thorax:
and, to tell the truth, when time, when time passes
over the earth, over the roof, over my impure head,
and it passes, time passes, and in my bed I do not feel at night that a woman is breathing
sleeping naked and at my side,
then strange, dark things take the place of the absent one,
vicious, melancholy thoughts
sow heavy possibilities in my bedroom,
and so, then, I look at my legs as if they belonged to another body
and were stuck strongly and gently to my insides.

Like stems or feminine adorable things,
from the knees they rise, cylindrical and thick,
with a disturbed and compact material of existence:
like brutal, thick goddess arms,
like trees monstrously dressed as human beings,
like fatal, immense lips thirsty and tranquil,
they are, there, the best part of my body:
the entirely substantial part, without complicated content
of senses or tracheas or intestines or ganglia:
nothing but the pure, the sweet, and the thick part of my own life,
nothing but form and volume existing,
guarding life, nevertheless, in a complete way.

People cross through the world nowadays
scarcely remembering that they possess a body and life within it,
and there is fear, in the world there is fear of the words that designate the body,
and one talks favourably of clothes,
it is possible to speak of trousers, of suits,
and of women's underwear (of "ladies'" stockings and garters)
as if the articles and the suits went completely empty through the streets
and a dark and obscene clothes closet occupied the world.

Suits have existence, color, form, design,
and a profound place in our myths, too much of a place,
there is too much furniture and there are too many rooms in the world
and my body lives downcast among and beneath so many things,
with an obsession of slavery and chains.

Well, my knees, like knots,
private, functional, evident,
separate neatly the halves of my legs:
and really two different worlds, two different sexes
are not so different as the two halves of my legs.

From the knee to the foot a hard form,
mineral, coldly useful, appears,
a creature of bone and persistance,
and the ankles are now nothing but the naked purpose,
exactitude and necessity definitively exposed.

Without sensuality, short and hard, and masculine,
my legs exist, there, and endowed
with muscular groups like complementary animals,
and there too a life, a solid, subtle, sharp life
endures without trembling, waiting and performing.

At my feet ticklish
and hard like the sun, and open like flowers,
and perpetual, magnificent soldiers
in the grey war of space
everything ends, life definitively ends at my feet,
what is foreign and hostile begins there:
the names of the world, the frontier and the remote,
the substantive and the adjectival too great for my heart
originate there with dense and cold constancy.

Always,
manufactured products, socks, shoes,
or simply infinite air,
there will be between my feet and the earth
stressing the isolated and solitary part of my being,
something tenaciously involved between my life and the earth,
something openly unconquerable and unfriendly

About the poem

Published in the collection 'Residence on Earth' translated by Donald D Walsh in 1973. The poem has undertones of sexual longing, a theme he deals with more fully in other poems. It brings out the body to live without owner. It expresses the anguish of loss intensified by necessity. It indicates physical things to show something profound about the world. This poem is a disturbing image and effectively conveys how alienated Neruda feels.

Analysis

The poem is in first person narrative and the poet says the relationship with his legs as a metaphor for how he feels about the society. Like his legs, society is a part of him and he cannot escape it. He starts the poem by saying that a long time he is looking at his long legs with curiosity and tenderness. With passion he observes that as the legs of a divine woman who is deeply there in the mind of the poet. When time passes, he realises over the Earth roof and his head the woman is not with him by his side which made his sad. Though the poet belongs to the society if he is that he is an odd person in the society. He says when he looks at his legs, he feels it belonged to others to another body which stuck into him. He says the society is forced into him in which he has no control at the legs which is the part of his body. Like the adorable thing in the feminine body and like brutal thick arms of goddess everything is completely packed in. The trees seem to be monstrous and the whole body is processing all the partslike tracheas intestines and ganglia. All these things are existing and guarding life but not in a completely way. Though the society is providing everything, Neruda feels nothing isguarding him in the society. People in the society are crossing through a time without carrying anything that is happening in and around the society. They are not remembering that their body is possessing a life within it which is to be guarded. He says as the clothes are used to cover the body certain principles are there to be followed to maintain a good discipline in the society which is lacking now. As our clothes are having different colours, form and design, the society too has diverse diversities. He considers his body lives

beneath many things with obsession of slavery and chains. He is considered to be an alien and not having enough freedom to mingle with the society. The inequality in the society made him to feel like different worlds with different sexes which are not really different. He says the two halves of the legs are different as the upper part will be soft and the lower one will be hard and exposed. But the two halves belong to the same body. As there are difference in the appearance and the uses of the parts of the legs, the society too possess diversified necessities. The short hard masculine legs are ready to perform the hard act without trembling. Though the situation is worst for existence, the mental stamina make the poet to survive in the society. Like a tickle in the feet, the foreign and hostile thought begins from his feet and life end at his feet. He says about his origin and that named his world which is making as an alien in the society. All the manufactured products like socks and shoes isolating the feat from the Earth which is unconquerable and unfriendly. Life on Earth is common for all and manmade obstacles prevent humans to lead a peaceful life in the society.

Mahmoud Darwish: The Passport

About the author

A poet whose work was political to its core, Mahmoud Darwish was a prolific and at times controversial Palestinian poet. Over the course of his career, Darwish published over 30 poetry collections and eight prose collections (novels, essays etc). Reflecting widespread anxieties at the time of writing, much of Darwish's work concerned the place of Palestine within the world and the ongoing tension with its neighbour, Israel. Like with other poets whose country or nationality is disputed and argued over, a key tenet in Darwish's oeuvre was that of 'watan', translated into English as 'homeland'.

Whilst championing Middle Eastern literature in his lifetime, Darwish was also well-read in the Western poetic tradition, citing the French poet Arthur Rimbaud and the American Beat poet Allen Ginsberg - best known for 'Howl'. A keen advocate for Palestinian-Israeli reconciliation, Mahmoud Darwish called Hebrew 'a language of love'. Awarded the Lenin Peace Prize in 1983 and appointed Knight of the Order of Arts and Letters by the French president Francois Mitterand, Darwish continued as an activist and writer up until his death in 2008. Thought of by many as a fatherly figure in Palestine, Darwish's literary legacy continues to influence writers from the region today.

The Passport

They did not recognize me in the shadows

That suck away my color in this Passport

And to them my wound was an exhibit

For a tourist Who loves to collect photographs

They did not recognize me,

Ah . . . Don't leave

The palm of my hand without the sun

Because the trees recognize me

All the songs of the rain recognize me

Dont' leave me pale like the moon!

All the birds that followed my palm

To the door of the distant airport

All the wheatfields

All the prisons

All the white tombstones

All the barbed boundaries

All the waving handkerchiefs

All the eyes were with me,

But they dropped them from my passport

Stripped of my name and identity?

On a soil I nourished with my own hands?

Today Job cried out

Filling the sky:

Don't make an example of me again!

Oh, gentlemen, Prophets,

Don't ask the trees for their names

Don't ask the valleys who their mother is

From my forehead bursts the sword of light

And from my hand springs the water of the river

All the hearts of the people are my identity

So take away my passport!

Analysis

Darwish evokes the image of the passport to defy the Israeli attempts to extirpate the Palestinians from their land of birth and nationality. In addition, the evoked images of the sword, light, hands, and water metaphorically suggest the sense of resistance.

The buds of interconnectedness between identity and land are brought to light in the poem “The Passport” when he says: “Do not ask the trees about their names; Do not ask the valleys about their mother; The sword of light cleaves from my forehead; From my hand gushes the river’s water; All the heart of people are my identity; So take away my passport”. These lines show that the trees and valleys know their own origin, just as the speaker himself is firm of his own identity and land. The images of “the sword of light cleaves from my forehead” and “from my hands gushes the river’s water” implicitly evoke the sense of interconnected resistance when he uses light and forehead and hands and river’s water” which indicate that he has become the primary vein of both land and people. Indeed, it seems that Darwish overtly and covertly wants to emphasize, on the one hand, that they colonizers could occupy his land, but they cannot erase his identity that is firmly interconnected with the occupied land. On the other hand, he aims at evoking a sense of interconnectedness between Palestinians and their occupied land. Furthermore, as a true representative of Palestinian identity and land, Darwish is endowed with an expansive sense of resistance that enables him to create a world of interconnectedness between people and land. He sows the seeds of the elements of nature and human identity to bud as interconnectedness that is the embodiment of both Palestinian land as represented by “the trees”, “the valleys”, “light” and “the river’s water” and the Palestinian identity symbolized by “all the hearts of people”. Indeed, the elements of Palestinian identity and the aspects of the occupied land are delicately merged in his poetry and it is difficult to say which of the two predominates.

Similarly, Darwish uses the image of the bird as a form of resistance and at the same time a symbol of Palestinians-land connection as can be traced in the poem “the Passport” when he says: “All the bird that chased; My palm at the door of the distant airport” .The collective image of the sparrow as seen in this poem highlights the fact that smallness does not equate lack of strength. In the sparrow’s dexterity to fly back and forth, Darwish is also giving ominous warning to the occupiers that Palestinian people will return to claim the land.

In the poem “The Passport”, Darwish is inclined to depict a realistic picture of the contemporary Palestinian life, which is dominated by having a passport in their homeland, with a conscious purpose of evoking resistance internally and externally. In the context of the internal resistance, he uses the images of Palestinian unrest and suffering inside their land where he says, “They did not recognize me”. The poet evokes a kind of suffering as he is being ill-treated and even unrecognized, even though the forms of his land such as the trees, the rain, the sun and the moon have recognized him. He asserts that kind of oppression under the occupation when he cries: “Stripped of name and identity In land which I nurtured with my own hand”. It is hardly acceptable that he remains unknown among the land he has cultivated by his hands, and accordingly the internal resistance finds its way to rise. The poem ends with his overall cry of human resistance: “So, take away my passport”

This reveals a strong sense of resistance when he is addressing the occupiers of his homeland regarding the way in which they treat Palestinians on their homeland. In the context of the external resistance, the forms of nature are present in the poet’s vision and they serve as the best exposition of the spirit of the Palestinians’ connection with their land. His images are taken from the familiar areas of common Palestinian experience, for example “trees recognize me”, “the songs of the rain recognize me”, do not leave me like the moon”. He keeps on advocating the supporting stance of nature in Palestinian suffering as well as resistance through his intense images. Furthermore, forms of Palestinian nature assume to accompany him in the best of manner such as “All the birds which chased my palm at the door of the distant airport”, “all the wheat fields”. These images reveal the constant unity of Palestinians and their land to free themselves from the inhuman restrictions of the Israeli colonizers of their country

This poem highlights the Israeli government’s attempts to define Darwish’s identity and separate him from his homeland by taking away his passport. In response, Darwish draws on nature to demonstrate that his Palestinian identity does not depend on a document. Darwish suggests that the trees and the valleys know who they belong to: “Do not ask the trees about their names, Do not ask the valleys about their mother,” and believes that he is one with the land, and the land is one with him: “The sword of light cleaves from my forehead, From my hand gushes the river’s water.” In the last stanza, “Go, take my passport away from me,” Darwish concludes that his Palestinian identity cannot be defined by a piece of paper.

UNIT II- EPIC

CILAPPATIKARAM: The Tale of an Anklet- The Book of Pukar (87 pages)

About the work

Cantos of the Book of Pukar

1. Mankalvalttuppatal

2. Manaiyarampatutta Katai

3. Arankerru Katai

4. Antimalaic Cirappuccey Katai

5. Intiravilavuretutta Katai

6. Katalatu Katai

7. Kanalvari

8. Venir Katai

9. Kanattiramuraitta Katai

10. Natukan Katai

The authorship of the *Cilappatikaram* is attributed to **Ilanko Atikal** a supposed and **Atikal** literally means a Jain saint or an ascetic and an interesting legend is associated with **Sattanar** the author of the *Manimekhalai* that he actually met **Ilanko Atikal** to seek his permission to bring out the Buddhist version of the epic which within the politics of the period is quite acceptable as there has never been a large scale violence between the Buddhists and the Jain in history unlike the heterodox sects and the Hindu ones. The setting of the epic is within the cities of *Pukar*and Kâñci within the Tamil domains are significant as two Greek works *The Periplus* of the Erythraean Sea dated at 1nd CE and Ptolemy's *Geography* dated at 2nd CE mentions *Pukar*as the town Khaber is and Kaver is Emporium and the flourishing Roman trade with the Tamil kingdoms and both the epics describe at length the markets in the two towns providing a setting which is commonplace and with common men within the larger urban setup unlike the larger North Indian epics the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*. Situated within the larger Jain and the Buddhist themes are the mercantile communities and the guilds and the role of trade and its contribution to urbanity with

courtesans, palaces, the common man and the religious institutions and individuals who people the epics.

Situated in *Pukar* the epic *Cilappatikaram* develop sakernel of the *Kovalan* and *Kannaki* story that was a part of the oral extant tradition and presents it in epic form situated within the larger Jain tradition to be presented before a largely Jain audience. It could have been as a result of the inroads of Jain is minto Tamil society or as a result of the epic being presented to a Jain audience.

Summary

The story begins in the city of *Pukar*a flourishing seaport and the capital of the *Chola* kingdom. The town is festive as the people gather to celebrate the marriage of *Kovalan* and *Kannaki* who belong to two prominent families in the area. The couple live happily for a few years in *Pukar*as *Kannaki* settles down to a life of domesticity and *Kovalan*begins to earn a living. What is noted here is the deep love between them. In the town of *Pukar* lives a beautiful courtesan named *Matavi* who is a very talented dancer. The *Chola* king in recognition of her talent presents her with agar land and a thousand and eight pieces of gold. *Matavi* decides to auction the garland to anybody who will purchase it at the price decided by her and in the process; she would also marry the man who buys the garland. Accordingly, she asks her servant *Vacantamalai* to announce this to the people of *Pukar*. *Kovalan* hears the announcement, purchases the garland and abandons his wife *Kannaki* and begins to live with *Matavi*. *Kannaki* is extremely heartbroken as a result of her husband's actions. *Kovalan* meanwhile is so enamoured of *Matavi* that he squanders a lot of his wealth away on her neglecting his wife, *Kannaki*.

Soon it is spring and the city begins the celebration of the season with a special festival to god *Indra* who is the king of the gods. Everybody heads to the sea shore and *Kovalan* and *Matavi* set up a small pavilion there. *Matavi* hands *Kovalan*a lute and requests *Kovalan* to play the lute. *Kovalan* begins to sing a number of songs about a lovely woman who has hurt her lover. Hearing the songs, *Matavi* assumes that *Kovalan* is not interested in her any more. She takes the lute from his hands and begins to sing a song of a woman who has been betrayed. *Kovalan* too begins to feel that *Matavi* probably does not love him or care for him any longer and leaves her. *Matavi* is heartbroken and writes a letter to *Kovalan* imploring him to come back. *Kovalan* refuses to do so and tells *Matavi*'s servant *Vacantamalai* that at the end of the day *Matavi* is only a dancer and not someone fit to be in a lifelong relationship. *Matavi* is

extremely unhappy about this and endures the loss silently. By the time *Kovalan* ends his relationship with *Matavi*, he is thoroughly impoverished and now at the mercy of his wife *Kannaki.*

Kannaki the ever dutiful wife has a nightmare about a misfortune that *Kovalan* will face. She is obviously extremely worried about her way ward husband and is overjoyed when *Kovalan* arrives home having deserted *Matavi.* Needless to say, *Kannaki* welcome shim back and the couple reconcile as *Kovalan* admits to his relationship with *Matavi* and apologises to *Kannaki*. The happy couple decide to leave *Pukar* together and go to the city of *Maturai* the capital of the *Pandyan* rulers to start afresh.

Analysis

Cilapattikaram uses the unique non-Sanskritic poetic sequence that in corporate *Iyal* (poetry), *Isai* (music) and *Natakam* (dance) and is interspersed with prose sections. The epic in Tamil consists of 5730 lines in 38 *akaval* meter and is said to have been composed around the 5th Century CE. The text also uses *kali* and *venpa* meters. The prose pieces are considered to be one of the earliest in Tamil poetry

The *Book of Pukar* has 10 cantos and is situated in *Pukar* in the *Chola*kingdom. Since the Book is about the conjugal life of *Kannaki*- *Kovalan* and the love affair between *Matavi*-*Kovalan*, the *Akam* form of poetry is used. The *Neytalthinai* is invoked in cantos 6 and 7. It is here that the misunderstanding between *Matavi* and *Kovalan* occur. *Palaithinai* is used in canto 10, where the bankrupt and repentant *Kovalan* and his wife *Kannaki* leave *Pukar* without informing their parents.

Character study

The two women, *Kannaki* and *Matavi*, in this book depict their moral ethics through *Akam* poetry. *Kannaki* owing to her fidelity, patience and chastity depicts the supreme value of *karpu*. Meanwhile, *Matavi* is also presented in a positive light as a chaste woman, though not equal to *Kannaki*.

Character analysis of Matavi:

The character of *Matavi* appears in the "Book of *Pukar*". She is described as an accomplished dancer at the *Chozha* court.

...And from that exalted line

Of heavenly nymphs was Matavi descended.

A woman of flawless birth, of broad shoulders,

And curly hair, spilling pollen,

she was Noted for her style of great distinction.

(Book of Pukar, Canto 3, p.34)

As discussed earlier on in the Block, the King presents *Matavi* with agar land made of one thousand and eight pieces of gold. *Matavi* auctions the garland saying:

A thousand and eight

Of the most excellent gold is this garland worth.

Who buys the garland becomes the husband

Of our vine like girl.

(Book of Pukar, Canto 3, p. 40)

Needless to say, *Kovalan* buys the garland of a thousand and eight pieces of gold and, as per custom, becomes her husband.

Kovalan bough the garland-

Matavi with wide, lot us eyes.

With the hunch back,

He entered Matavi's residence: came

Under her spell the instance he took her in his arms.

He forgot himself, and wished never to part from her

Forgot his own blameless and noble wife, and home.

(Book of Pukar, Canto 3, p. 40)

Kovalan, leaves his wife, *Kannaki*, and starts living with *Matavi*. After a few years of blissful romance, there is a misunderstanding between the two of them –*Kovalan* and *Matavi*. *Kovalan* leaves *Matavi and* goes back to *Kannaki* and reconciles with her.

The girl Matavi

Hada lovers' squarrel with Kovalan as they amused

Themselves on the cool seashore. Inspired by fate, She sang the songs of these aside grove

To accompany her dance. Instead of reuniting them,

The songs made them drift apart. He returned

To his virtuous wife....

(Canto27,63-68)

Matavi, in the meanwhile, gives birth to *Kovalan*'s daughter, *Manimekalai*. **Ilanko Atikal** portrays the character of *Matavi* in a positive light. She is taught the path of virtue by her mother, owing which *Manimekalai* her daughter from *Kovalan* becomes a Buddhist nun instead of becoming a courtesan like her mother *Matavi*.

Matavi turned

To Manimekalai and said:'Comehere, dear innocent girl,'

Andre moved her locks of hair braided with flowers.

Enraged, the go do flove threw down

His sugar cane bow and his flower arrows.

She entered a Buddhi stnunnery and obeyed its rules.

(BookIII, Canto30, 24-29)

She may be a courtesan but she is not responsible for seducing and therefore luring *Kovalan* away from his wife *Kannaki*. She is an artist who has knowledge about the fields of music and dance. When *Kovalan* leaves her, she remains loyal to him and leads a path of virtue. She is compared to thestar*Arundhati*for her conjugal chastity and loyalty. It is in the representation of Madhavi that Ilango wins our heart. She is not depicted as the home-breaker or as the other woman. The inventory of Madhavi's jewellery is a splendid catalogue that indicates her aesthetic taste. It is through the character of *Matavi* that one gets to know about Tamil Nadu's rich cultural heritage-its music, dance, costumes, jewellery and the practices prevalent in the King's court. The mortal *Matavi* stands in contrast to the immortal *Kannaki*. Kannaki is set into a significant contrast with Matavi: a naive, reticent, unsophisticated upper middle-class girl, in contrast to a literate, cultured, witty, brilliant artiste.

***Kannaki*:**

She is the protagonist of the epic. The title "*Cilapattikaram"*, i.e., *The Tale of the Anklet* is associated with her. *Kannaki* adds to the uniqueness of the epic. Firstly, she is a mortal who is immortalized and deified. Secondly, she is the protagonist of the epic. It is a rarity to find a woman as a protagonist in an epic. *Manimekalai*, the sequel to this epic, is the other epic which has a woman protagonist. Thirdly, she belongs to the merchant class. None of the *Sanskrit* epics of India or the Greek epics; depict middle class protagonists.

Kannaki is a human figure in the first two books of the epic. The epic opens with her bound in the domestic sphere. She is the ideal of conjugal love, loyalty and chastity. She is wronged by her husband but she takes him back and supports him by giving up her anklets. Kannagi is idealized as the silent, chaste wife in the Book of Pukar.

Kannaki's transformation is unlike that of *Kovalan*. While *Kovalan* is immortalised by the gods and taken to heaven after his death; *Kannaki*'s gets immortalised directly from her human form. She is closer to the goddess *Valli*, in this regard, thereby, giving her a superior position than her husband. This, further, helps in the projecting the qualities displayed by *Kannaki* as ideal. Therefore, *Kannaki*, through her apotheosis into a divine formal so manages to subvert patriarchy.

Her apotheosis is, however, completed by King *Cenkuttuvan*, who in order to establish himself as the ideal king, establishes *Kannaki*, who embodies the virtues of "*Karpu* (chastity), *Vidamayurchi* (perseverance) and *needhi* (justice)"(*The Hindu Magazine*: April 6, 2014: 2) as *Pattini* in his kingdom. After hearing about *Kannaki* from the tribes men and the poet *Cattan*, King *Cenkuttuvan* asks his wife:

One chaste woman

Gave up her life the moment her husband died.

Another in arage came to our kingdom.

Good woman, tell us who is the better of the two?'

When the king asked her, the great queen replied:

May the joy heaven wait upon the queen

Who gave up her life before she felt the pain

Of surviving her husband. And may the goddess

Of chastity who has come to our good land be honoured.

(Canto25, 108-116)

She is honoured by having a temple in her name in the *Chera* kingdom. *Kannaki* and Cenkuttuvan collaborate to establish the edicts of kingship and chastity:

Pattini whom the whole world now worships Had proved the truth of the Tamil

saying:"The virtue of women is useless if the king Rules unjustly."

She made the Cola realize it. She made the Pantiyan, lord of the south,

Realize,"Thekingcannotsurviveifthissceptrelscrooked."ShemadetheCe ral,

Lord of the west, realize, "The wrath

Of kings will not be appeased till their vows Are fulfilled, and made known to the kings

Of the north.

(Canto28, 210-220)

The king in order to fulfil his promise of building a temple for Kannaki begins an expedition to the north to procure the stone for the idol. He wages a gory battle with the Aryan kings in the north. His expedition institutionalizes Kannakiasa Pattini. It is he who declares; Worship The goddess everyday with offerings and festivities.

(Canto28,238-239)

As has been already stated, the *Book of Vanci* is more about King *Cenkuttuvan* and his expedition to the north. The immortal *Kannaki* turns into a symbol and is referred to whenever *Cenkuttuvan*'s kingship is mentioned. He completes *Kannaki*'s apotheosis by building her a temple. *Kannaki* and *Kovalan*'s kins, subjects from various parts of the *Chera* kingdom and other Tamil kingdoms collect before the temple of the goddess to pay respect to her. This assembly is also the show of strength for the *Chera* king after his triumphant campaign. He accomplishes his imperial dreams through the apotheos is of *Kannaki*:

He said, the king offered grants

To the temple of the immortal Pattini who had wrenched off

Her breast and set fire to the noisy city.

(Canto30,145-147)

Further, it is reported in Canto 30 that;

Then Cenkuttuvan, the other kings and their strong armies

Praised the goddess in impeccable words,

As though they themselves had achieved salvation.

(Canto30,162-164)

Therefore, it can be said that *Kannaki* who subverts patriarchy in *Maturai* is brought back into its fold through King *Cenkuttuvan*. Her deification is at the cost of her human identity. She is no longer referred to by her human name, '*Kannaki*'; she is now a *Pattini*– the goddess of chastity. The power that she had displayed in the court of *Maturai*is silenced in the *Book of Vanci*. She is made the epitome of wifely duties and justice. Her deification and institutionalisation include the process of myth-making surrounding her. In Canto30, *Matalan*, the Brahmin announces:

The water

Will not lose its power till the sun and moon

Vanish.

(Canto30, 63-65)

She legitimizes the *Chera* king as a great king and obviously there are no voices of dissent.

A voice rose

From the heavens:

'Your wish is granted.'

(Canto30,161-163)

People views the apotheosis of *Kannaki* in terms of her subjugation into the patriarchal domain which renders her silenced. "*Kannaki is deified, made into a deity at the cost of totaler a sure of*

her human identity. She is no longer referred to by her name. She has become the Pattini goddess."The reason for her deification is explained through a feminist perspective. She breaks societal norms by entering the public domain in the *Book of Maturai* and "*Society did not, as it still does not, easily allow women to transgress. It draws them in, either to domesticate them or to deify them.*"

The deified *Kannaki* is humanised through the lamentations of her mother as well as her mother-in-law/ *Kovalan*'s mother who refers to her as daughter and daughter-in-law. *Kannaki*'s mother cries:

O my daughter, my partner! When your husband

Abandoned you, I sympathised with you

...My dearest!

Won't you come back and rid me of my great sorrow?

(Canto30,94-98)

Another interpretation of the apotheosis of *Kannaki* is that the *Pattini* and the *Chera* king collaborate to exude the principles of *needhi* (justice) and *karpu* (chastity). The final canto soft he *Book of Vanci* display this synthesis. *Kannaki*'s benediction to the king shows the confluence of the sacred power and the imperial power.

The transformation of *Kannaki* from a human to a divine being is wonderfully displayed through the use of *Akam* and *Puram* poetry. While Book I has mostly *Akam* poetry allocated to her, Book II sees the use of *Puram* for her. This happens when she enters the *Maturai* court and challenges the king. Since Book III is also an attempt to bring her into the purview of patriarchy, most of the *Akam* poems are attributed to her and to *Valli* (only Canto 24). The synthesis of *Kannaki* and *Cenkuttuvan* is completed in the last canto of the Book. It is here in Canto 30 that *Kannaki* is described through *Puram* poetry. The *Book of Vanci* therefore, displays the synthesis of the patriarchal and the feminine, the sacred power and the imperial, the human and the divine and finally, the *Akam* and the *Puram.*

Kovalan

He is the husband of Kannaki, son of a wealthy charitable kind merchant in the seaport capital city of early Chola kingdom at Poomphuhar; Kovalan inherits his wealth, is handsome, and the women of the city want him. The epic introduces him in lines 1.38–41

with “Seasoned by music, with faces luminous as the moon, women confided among themselves: “He [Kovalan] is the god of love himself, the incomparable Murukan“. His parents and Kannaki’s parents meet and arrange their marriage, and the two are married in Canto 1 of the epic around the ceremonial fire with a priest completing the holy wedding rites. For a few years, Kannaki and he live a blissful householder’s life together. The epic alludes to this first phase of life as (lines 2.112–117), “Like snakes coupled in the heat of passion, or Kama and Rati smothered in each other’s arms, so Kovalan and Kannakai lived in happiness past speaking, spent themselves in every pleasure, thinking: we live on earth but a few days”, according to R Parthasarathy’s translation.

Kovalan, the son of a wealthy merchant, Machattuvan, married Kannagi, the daughter of another merchant, Manayakan. At the time of his marriage, he was sixteen years old. They lived together happily in the city of Kaveripattinam, until Kovalan met the courtesan Madhavi and fell in love with her. In his infatuation, he completely forgot his wife and spent his time and parental wealth with Madhavi.

During the annual festival in the honour of Indra, there was a misunderstanding between Kovalan and Madhavi. As a result, the penniless Kovalan returned to Kannagi, who welcomed him whole-heartedly. Realising his mistake, he decided to start a new life by migrating to Madurai with Kannagi. Accompanied by a Buddhist nun, they started their journey towards Madurai city at the stroke of first light.

After many days, they reached the city of Madurai. In the middle of the journey, Kovalan sent word to his parents about his intentions of starting a new life in a new city. Upon arrival, impressed by the grandeur of Madurai city, Kovalan set out to sell one of Kannagi’s anklets (Tamil: Silambu), the only left-over asset they owned, with which he intended to start a business. Kovalan entrusted the anklet to be sold to the palace’s chief jeweller, who promises to fetch him good money from King Nedunjeliyan I. The king, who is tricked by the chief Jeweller, ordered to behead Kovalan without a trial, on account of stealing the Queen’s anklet. Thereby, Kovalan dies in the city of Madurai.

UNIT III- SHORT STORIES

A Handful of Dates

- Tayeb Salih

About Tayeb Salih

Born in Karmakol, a village on the Nile near Al Dabbah, Sudan, in the Northern Province of Sudan, he graduated from University of Khartoum with a Bachelor of Science, before leaving for the University of London in the United Kingdom. Coming from a background of small farmers and religious teachers, his original intention was to work in agriculture. However, excluding a brief spell as a schoolmaster before moving to England, he worked in journalism and the promotion of international cultural exchange.

For more than ten years, Salih wrote a weekly column for the London-based Arabic language newspaper *al Majalla*, in which he explored various literary themes. He worked for the BBC‘s Arabic Service and later became director general of the Ministry of Information in Doha, Qatar. The last ten years of his working career, he spent at UNESCO headquarters in Paris, where he held various posts and was UNESCO’s representative for the Arab states of the Persian Gulf.

Salih’s writing draws important inspiration from his youth in a Sudanese village; life that is centered on rural people and their complex relationships. At various levels and with varying degrees of psychoanalytic emphasis, he deals with themes of reality and illusion, the cultural dissonance between the West and the exotic Orient, the harmony and conflict of brotherhood, and the individual’s responsibility to find a fusion between his or her contradictions. Furthermore, the motifs of his books are derived from his religious experience as a Muslim in 20th-century Sudan, both pre- and post-colonial. Another, more general subject of Salih’s writing is the confrontation of the Arab Muslim and the Western European world.

In his reflections on Salih’s literary style, his translator Denys Johnson-Davies wrote that Salih exploited to the full the richness of the literary language in his narrative and uses the vivid local dialect for his dialog.Tayeb Salih’s work shows his wide reading in the byways of Arabic literature, including poetry, which has helped to fashion a style which is direct and fluent, a style which an Arab critic has described as being closer to dramatic writing than that of the novel.

About A Handful of Dates

Originally published in Arabic in 1964, Tayeb Salih‘s short story “A Handful of Dates“ is about a young Sudanese boy whose loyalty to his grandfather is tested when his grandfather delights in their neighbour’s financial ruin. After learning the grandfather has been taking advantage of their indebted neighbour by steadily buying up the man’s land, and after seeing his grandfather gleefully humiliate the neighbour during the man’s date harvest, the boy feels hatred toward his grandfather. Disavowing his grandfather’s greed, the boy runs into the distance and induces vomiting to throw up the handful of dates his grandfather had taken from the neighbour’s harvest.

“A Handful of Dates” explores themes of greed, innocence, and empathy. Told from the perspective of an unnamed narrator looking back on his boyhood, the story’s narrator often remarks that he doesn’t know why he feels certain emotions when exposed to the greed his grandfather’s displays. By showing how the boy has visceral reactions that he cannot intellectually explain, Salih stays true to the boy’s embodied experience as he loses his innocence and defines himself in contrast to his grandfather.

In 2019, “A Handful of Dates” was adapted for a feature film of the same name directed by Hashim Hassan.

A Handful of Dates Analysis

Narrated from a first-person, past-tense perspective, “A Handful of Dates“ opens with the narrator recalling that he must have been very young at the time the story takes place.
As a boy growing up in a Sudanese village, the narrator spends almost all of his time with his grandfather, apart from the time he spends learning to recite the Koran at the mosque or swimming in the river. The narrator loves his grandfather and is eager to please him by reciting the Koran and helping his grandfather by fetching his prayer rug. He believes he is his grandfather’s favourite grandchild.

One day, the narrator asks his grandfather why he dislikes their neighbour, Masood. The grandfather says Masood is indolent, and that he had once owned all the land the grandfather now owns. Masood had inherited the land from his father, but after years of living a lifestyle that involved marrying many times, Masood’s wealth steadily winnowed, with the grandfather buying more and more of Masood’s land when he was desperate to sell. The grandfather says he has two-thirds of Masood’s original land, and plans to buy the final

third before Masood dies.The narrator feels pity for Masood and wishes his grandfather won't do as he says. He thinks of how his grandfather never laughs, while Masood has a beautiful singing voice and powerful laugh.Masood approaches the narrator and his grandfather to ask if they would like to attend the date harvest. The narrator senses that Masood doesn't actually want the grandfather to attend, but the grandfather jumps up eagerly. Watching from the side, the grandfather sits on a stool while the narrator stands. He watches Masood and is the only one who seems to hear Masood when he tells one of the boys cutting down the date clusters to be sure not to cut into the palm heart.

After various people collect the dates and sort them into thirty sacks, everyone moves aside and allows four landowning men to evaluate the quality of the dates. The grandfather wakes up and joins them, handing the narrator a handful of dates to eat. The men divide up the sacks, allocating ten for Hussein the merchant and five sacks each to the other men, leaving nothing for Masood. The grandfather tells Masood that Masood is still fifty pounds in debt to him.

As the sacks are loaded onto Hussein's camels and donkeys, the narrator feels the desire to reach out and touch Masood's garment hem. Masood makes a rasping sound in his throat, like a slaughtered lamb, and the narrator experiences a painful sensation in his chest.The narrator runs into the distance, disregarding his grandfather calling after him. He feels hatred for his grandfather. He speeds up, feeling that he wants to rid himself of a secret. He reaches the river bank. Without knowing why he does it, the narrator puts his finger in his throat and vomits up the dates he had eaten.

The Man who Walked through the Walls

- Marcel Ayme

About "The Man Who Walked Through Walls"

The History behind Le Passe-Muraille also known as The Man who could Walk through the Walls:

Le Passe-Muraille is a short story by Marcel Aymé (1902-1967) which is forever immortalized in a small square on rue Norvins in Paris. Le Passe-Muraille loosely translates as "walk through walls". The statue in Place Marcel Aymé, which passes through the wall, represents Dutilleul, the main character of Aymé's short story.

The excellent Monsieur Dutilleul has always been able to pass through walls, but has never seen the point of using his gift, given the general availability of doors. One day, however, his tyrannical boss drives him to desperate, creative measures he develops a taste for intramural travel and becomes something of a super-villain. How will the unassuming clerk adjust to a glamorous life of crime?Aymé's genius lies in imagining the practical unfolding of bizarre and difficult situations. In each story, anarchic comedy is arrested by moments of pathos, only to descend into anarchy and hilarity once more.

About the author

Marcel Aymé, (born March 29, 1902, Joigny, France—died Oct. 14, 1967, Paris), French novelist, essayist, and playwright, known as a master of light irony and storytelling.

He grew up in the country among farmers, in a world of close-knit families bounded by the barnyard on one side, the schoolhouse on the other. Aymé drew most of his characters from this setting. After a short-lived attempt at a career in journalism, he launched into writing. His first novels, *Brûlebois* (1926) and *La Table-aux-crevés* (1929; *The Hollow Field,* 1933; Prix Théophraste-Renaudot), are comedies on rural life. The broad wit of *La Jument verte* (1933; *The Green Mare,* 1938) runs through his next novels, *La Vouivre* (1943; *The Fable and the Flesh,* 1949) and *Le Chemin des écoliers* (1946; *The Transient Hour,* 1948). In these works the universe of Aymé takes shape. Through the familiar sites of town and field, strange denizens roam unquestioned, side by side with normal beings who, in turn, often act in absurd ways. This counterpoint of fantasy and reality finds its perfect format in the short story. "Le Nain" (1934; "The Dwarf") is about a dwarf who starts growing at 30, and "Le Passe-muraille" (1943; "The Man Who Could Pass Through Walls") deals with a timid clerk who walks through walls and mystifies the police. *Les Contes du chat perché,* which appeared in three series in 1939, 1950, and 1958, delighted a vast public of children from "4 to 75" with its talking farm animals that include an ox that goes to school and a pig that thinks it is a peacock. Selections were published in English as *The Wonderful Farm* (1951).

Aymé made a late debut in the theatre with *Lucienne et le boucher* (1947; "Lucienne and the Butcher"). *Clérambard* (1950) begins with St. Francis of Assisi appearing to a country squire. The initial absurdity is developed with rigorous logic in the manner of

the Theatre of the Absurd. The mood in *La Tête des autres* (1952; "The Head of Others"), an indictment of the judicial corps, is one of savage humour.

Though Aymé's theatrical works are often cruel and heavy-handed, the wit, wisdom, and morality of his short stories place them in the tradition of the fables of Jean de La Fontaine and the fairy tales of Charles Perrault. Aymé was long considered a secondary writer whose extravagant creations could not be taken seriously; only belatedly was he recognized for his skill in tone and technique.

About the work

Among his 43 fantastic or supernatural short stories "The Walker-Through-Walls" ("Le Passe-Muraille"), first published as the title story of a 1943 collection, is probably Aymé's most successful. (See, for example, J. L. Dumont in *Marcel Aymé et le merveilleux.*) In contradiction to the implications of its title, "The Walker-Through-Walls" starts with two elements that are indicative of a traditional story: the name and address of the main character. This is immediately counteracted, however, by the information that Dutilleul, the main character, a "third-grade clerk at the Ministry of Registration," finds out one day that he can walk through walls. This quick shift to the supernatural, done in a very matter-of-fact manner and combined with Dutilleul's lack of reaction to his "special aptitude," gives a dimension of reality to the story.

Not only can Dutilleul walk through walls, but he does it "without experiencing discomfort"; the implication is that others may have already walked through walls and did experience discomfort from doing so. Possibly Dutilleul is better skilled than others, or his gift may be more "complete." The doctor needs to be convinced of what Dutilleul is actually experiencing, not so much because of the impossibility of the occurrence but in order to justify his prescribing the adequate medication, "tetravalent reintegration powder." The fact that such a medication exists confirms that others may have caught this "illness." The contents of the medication (rice flour and centaur's hormones) contribute to the fantastic setting as the mythological animal finds a place in the reality of the story.

The discovery of Dutilleul's ability to walk through walls is treated by both doctor and patient as if it were a mere headache, as if two pills could take care of it. It does not affect Dutilleul, who has "little love for adventure" and is "non-receptive to the lures of the

imagination." He goes on leading life as usual, "without ever being tempted to put his gift to the test," until one day M. Mouron, his superior at the Ministry of Registration, is replaced by M. Lecuyer. This rather ordinary event is referred to as "extraordinary-nary," and it is going to "revolutionise" Dutilleul's life. The discovery of his "special ability" has not provoked the slightest stir in his imagination, but M. Lecuyer's "far-reaching reforms" ("calculated to trouble the peace of mind of his subordinate") will. To Dutilleul's horror he is required to change the formula that he used for years and to start letters with one that is shorter and more "trans-Atlantic." "With a machine-like obstinacy," Dutilleul keeps using the former, increasing his superior's animosity, which creates an "almost oppressive atmosphere" in the ministry. The crisis is such that Dutilleul ends up brooding over it for "as much as a quarter of an hour" before going to sleep.

The caricature is now complete. Dutilleul, the civil servant, is shown as thoughtless, lacking any intellectual substance, robotlike, and unimaginative. Through Dutilleul's "adventures" Aymé pursues one of his favorite themes as he satirizes the excessive and absurd uniformity of any kind of routine. He uses as an example what is viewed in French society as the epitome of repetitiveness: government work and its effect on the human mind.

Although imagination (the "queen of the faculties," according to the French poet Baudelaire) did not disturb Dutilleul's life, pride over a very trivial item does. It causes him to be inspired when the discovery of his ability to walk through walls has failed to do so. Now, surprisingly and ironically, "sanguinary thoughts" pop into Dutilleul's mind, and in a facetious manner Dutilleul sticks his head through the wall of the little room where he has been relegated as a punishment for his "rebellion" so that he appears in M. Lecuyer's office like an insulting "trophy of the chase." Later, "having acquired a certain skill at the game," Dutilleul feels the urge to go further and terrorizes his superior with his tricks, described as demoniac by the narrator. After two weeks of this treatment M. Lecuyer, extremely disturbed, both physically and mentally, is taken to a mental home.

A new life starts for Dutilleul. He now feels a "yearning," "a new, imperious impulse"—"the need to walk through walls," to which the narrator also refers as "the call of the other side of the wall," using an animalistic terminology. In an almost philosophical tone that enhances the irony, the narrator acknowledges that walking through walls does not constitute an end in itself; as a beginning it calls for a reward. In search of more inspiration Dutilleul turns to the "crime column" of the newspaper. Then, without any kind of transition,

the narrator very casually announces the "Dutilleul's first burglary took place in a large credit establishment on the right bank of the Seine."

This amazingly rapid transformation of Dutilleul into a burglar adds a new dimension to the world of the narration and to the satire. The dull, unimaginative, robotlike civil servant has become "the werewolf" (another animalistic term), a gentleman *cambrioleur*, an Arsène Lupin, as Michel Lecureur suggests in *La Comédiehumaine de Marcel Aymé*. Like his brilliant predecessor Dutilleul/werewolf has a strong impact on French society. Not only is the whole Parisian population now in awe of his exploits, but any woman "with romance in her heart" lusts for him. And two ministers have to resign as a result of their failure to arrest "the werewolf."

After having finally "allowed himself to be arrested" in order to prove to his colleagues that he is the "genius," Dutilleul has the opportunity to fulfill his career, that is, to experience prison walls. As the narrator declares, "No man who walks through walls can consider his career even moderately fulfilled if he has not had at least one taste of prison." After escaping several times Dutilleul, his pride wounded, decides that he has had enough of prison life, and he goes into hiding. He undergoes a complete metamorphosis. But, ironically, the drastic transformation simply consists of changing the four elements the narrator used earlier on in the story to identify the character: Dutilleul has shaved his black tuft of beard, substituted horn-rimmed spectacles for his "pince-nez," started to wear a "sports cap and a suit of plusfour in loud check," and changed his apartment.

Now comes the moralistic aspect of the tale. Dutilleul, whose disguise has been discovered by Gen Paul, painter and friend of Aymé, is on the verge of leaving Paris for Egypt since the pyramids constitute the highest challenge for a person who can walk through walls. He meets his fate, however, in the person of a ravishing blond who is immediately seduced by him since "nothing stirs the imagination of the young women of the present day more than plus-fours and horn-rimmed spectacles." His passion for this young woman, who is locked up by a jealous but dissolute husband who leaves her alone every night, brings about the end of his adventure. As a result of their transports Dutilleul suffers from a severe headache that will, ironically, cause the cessation of his ability to walk through walls. Instead of taking aspirin, Dutilleul takes two pills of the "tetravalent" that he had negligently thrown into a drawer. After sensing "friction" and "a feeling of resistance" on the third night of his

going through the walls to meet with his lover, Dutilleul finds himself “petrified in the interior of the wall.”

However shocking and horrifying, the ending is treated in the same matter-of-fact manner encountered at the beginning. Here again, the extraordinary occurrence appears realistic. “To this day,” the narrator adds, Dutilleul is “incorporated in the stone.” And not only can the birds of Paris hear Dutilleul mourn “for his glorious career and his too-brief love,” but Gen Paul plays the guitar regularly “to console the unhappy prisoner.” It is not Dutilleul who goes through the walls now but only the notes of the music that “pierce through the heart of the stone like drops of moonlight.” The irony is undoubtedly enhanced by the use of terms like “mourning” and “tomb,” which give a macabre dimension to the story in contrast to the almost fairylike image evoked by the last line.

As in “Dermuche” and “The Seven-League Boots,” two other Aymé stories, the fantastic in “The Walker-Through-Walls” does not find a resolution in the end. Dermuche, the criminal who has metamorphosed into a baby, is executed for a crime that he has not committed because, as his transformation went on, the crime came undone. Antoine, the poor little boy, and not his richer companions of “The Seven-League Boots” was finally given the magic pair, and he finds himself “at the end of the earth”—”in ten minutes.” Dutilleul, the man who walks through walls, becomes the beating heart of an object that never had a heart before, namely the wall.

Analysis

The passer-through-walls (French: *Le Passe-muraille*), translated as *The Man Who Walked through Walls*, *The Walker-through-Walls* or *The Man who Could Walk through Walls*, is a short story published by Marcel Aymé in 1941.

A man named Dutilleul lived in Montmartre in 1943. In his forty-third year, he discovered that he possessed the ability to pass effortlessly through walls. In search of a cure he consulted a doctor, who prescribed intensive work and a medicine. Dutilleul made no change to his rather inactive life, however, and a year later still retained his ability to pass through walls, although with no inclination to use it. However, a new manager arrived at his office and began to make his job unbearable. Dutilleul began using his power to annoy his manager, who went mad and was taken away to an asylum. Dutilleul then began to use his ability to burgle banks and jewellery shops. Each time, he would sign a pseudonym “The Lone Wolf”

in red chalk at the crime scene, and his criminal exploits soon became the talk of the town. In order to claim the prestige and celebrity status "The Lone Wolf" had gained, Dutilleul allowed himself to be caught in the act. He was put in prison, but used his ability to frustrate his jailers and repeatedly escape.

He then fell in love with a married woman, whose husband went out every night and left her locked in her bedroom. Dutilleul used his power to enter her bedroom and spend the night with her while her husband was away. One morning, Dutilleul had a headache and took two pills he found in the bottom of his drawer. His headache went away, but later that night, as he was leaving his lover's house, he noticed a feeling of resistance as he was passing through the walls. The pills Dutilleul had thought were aspirin were, in fact, the medicine his doctor had prescribed for him a year earlier. As he was passing through the final outer wall of the property, he noticed he was no longer able to move. He realized his mistake too late. The medicine suddenly took effect, and Dutilleul ended up trapped in the wall, where he remains to this day.

An Honest Thief

- Fyodor Dostoevsky

About the author

Fyodor Dostoyevsky, in full **Fyodor Mikhaylovich Dostoyevsky**, Dostoyevsky also spelled **Dostoevsky**, (born November 11 [October 30, Old Style], 1821, Moscow, Russia—died February 9 [January 28, Old Style], 1881, St. Petersburg), Russian novelist and short-story writer whose psychological penetration into the darkest recesses of the human heart, together with his unsurpassed moments of illumination, had an immense influence on 20th-century fiction.

Dostoyevsky is usually regarded as one of the finest novelists who ever lived. Literary modernism, existentialism, and various schools of psychology, theology, and literary criticism have been profoundly shaped by his ideas. His works are often called prophetic because he so accurately predicted how Russia's revolutionaries would behave if they came to power. In his time he was also renowned for his activity as a journalist.

Major works and their characteristics

Dostoyevsky is best known for his novella *Notes from the Underground* and for four long novels, *Crime and Punishment*, *The Idiot*, *The Possessed* (also and more accurately

known as *The Demons* and *The Devils*), and *The Brothers Karamazov*. Each of these works is famous for its psychological profundity, and, indeed, Dostoyevsky is commonly regarded as one of the greatest psychologists in the history of literature. He specialized in the analysis of pathological states of mind that lead to insanity, murder, and suicide and in the exploration of the emotions of humiliation, self-destruction, tyrannical domination, and murderous rage. These major works are also renowned as great “novels of ideas” that treat timeless and timely issues in philosophy and politics. Psychology and philosophy are closely linked in Dostoyevsky’s portrayals of intellectuals, who “feel ideas” in the depths of their souls. Finally, these novels broke new ground with their experiments in literary form.

Background and early life

The major events of Dostoyevsky’s life—mock execution, imprisonment in Siberia, and epileptic seizures—were so well known that, even apart from his work, Dostoyevsky achieved great celebrity in his own time. Indeed, he frequently capitalized on his legend by drawing on the highly dramatic incidents of his life in creating his greatest characters. Even so, some events in his life have remained clouded in mystery, and careless speculations have unfortunately gained the status of fact.

Summary

The story opens with the narrator taking in a lodger, an old soldier named AstafyIvanovich, at his apartment. One day, a thief steals the narrator’s coat, and Astafy pursues him unsuccessfully. Astafy is dismayed by the theft and goes over and over the scenario. The narrator and Astafy share a distinct contempt for thieves, and one nightAstafy tells the narrator a story of an honest thief that he had once known.

One night in a pub, AstafyIvanovich happened upon EmelyanIlyitch. The two knew each other previously, but from the look of his tattered coat, Emelyan had fallen on hard times. He was aching for a drink but had no money. Astafy, moved by Emelyan’s pathetic position, had bought him a drink. From then on, Emelyan followed Astafy everywhere, eventually even moving into his apartment. Astafy did not have much money himself, but he allowed Emelyan’s imposition because he was very aware that his drinking was a terrible problem. Emelyan would not stop his drinking, however, and even though he was quiet and not disruptive when he was drunk, Astafy could see that Emelyan would never be able to support himself with such a habit. Astafy urged him to stop drinking, but to no avail.

Eventually, Astafy effectively gave up on him and moved, never expecting to see Emelyan again.

Very soon after Astafy had moved, Emelyan appeared at his new apartment, and the two continued to go on as they had before. Astafy would support Emelyan with food and lodging, and Emelyan would always go out and come back drunk. Sometimes he would disappear for days only to return drunk and almost frozen.

Astafy, now working as a tailor, was short on money. One of his projects, a pair of riding breeches for a wealthy customer, was never claimed. He thought he could sell the breeches to get money for more useful clothes and some food, but he then discovered that they were nowhere to be found. Emelyan was drunk as usual, and denied the theft. Astafy was terribly vexed by the theft, and kept looking for the breeches while still suspicious of Emelyan. Emelyan always denied the theft.

One day, Astafy and Emelyan had a terrible fight over the breeches and Emelyan's drinking. Emelyan left the apartment and did not return for days. Astafy even went to look for him, but with no success. Eventually, after a couple of days, Emelyan returned, almost starved and frozen. Astafy took him back in, but it was clear that Emelyan's days were numbered. Days later, after Emelyan's health had deteriorated terribly, Emelyan wanted to tell Astafy something about the breeches. With his last words, Emelyan admitted to stealing the breeches.

Analysis

Fyodor Dostoevsky is one of the few writers who are credited to have been early existentialists. This is obvious in the author's books and short stories including this one. 'An Honest Thief' shows Dostoevsky's in-depth knowledge of psychology as well as the mental, social, cultural and political condition of the Russia of his times. There are many instances of this in the story, especially through the inane ranting of EmelianIIyitch (Emelyan), the main and poignant character in this story when his 'father benefactor' AstafiIvanovich tries to coax him into taking on a job as a tailor. 'An Honest Thief' may seem to the general reader as a simple story of Emelian's downward spiral because of addiction to alcohol,l but it is not so. The story has a lot of deeper sub-plots, hidden messages, and some of the most puzzling

descriptions of the mental faculties of the minds of AstafiIvanovich and Emelian in particular.

There is definitely that important event when a thief brazenly runs off with the first narrator's short coat that triggers off in the memory of AstafiIvanovich, the retired soldier, about the honest thief he had encountered in his life by the name of Emelian. At first, if you notice in the story, the hermit like reclusive introverted character is the narrator of this tale but after the robbery, AstafiIvanovich becomes the narrator of the inner core story. Thus, it is a dual narrator story with the second plot being the main part of the short story. To understand the relationship between Emelian and AstafiIvanovich is to ponder over the marvelous, surreal and very startling prose of Fyodor Dostoevsky. Emelian, in the eyes of AstafiIvanovich, is indeed a robber; but it is not only the expensive breeches that Emelian robs to buy himself alcohol that makes him a thief, but the way he is robbing AstafiIvanovich of his common sense, his sanity, his emotions, his house, his money, et al. There is a certain, dog like affection that AstafiIvanovich has for this drunkard who follows him to his home and stays there. There are many references to the word 'dog' mentioned by AstafiIvanovich in relation to Emelian which one spots throughout the second part of the story. Emelian truly acts like a creature, not a person. He truly acts like a dog who latches on to a person he adores, for no reason in particular, and then makes himself devoted to the person, in this case AstafiIvanovich. AstafiIvanovich is very sentimental about Emelian. He simply is unable to throw him out even though the drunkard has robbed him and he is aware of it. It seems he can't be parted from Emelian and finds excuses to keep him still with him at home. This is very evocative. It is evocative of the many excuses the Russian peasants and semi-educated classes in Dostoevsky's time were giving to continue their tormenting existence under their leaders in the 19th century. AstafiIvanich also keeps on giving excuses just to keep Emelian at his home under his roof. He wants to even ration the food, water, money, et al., to get it all done to fit this useless creature of a man under his roof who is only sponging on AstafiIvanovich and yet, who adores him all the same. I would even go to the extent of saying that maybe Emelian wanted to take over the personage of AstafiIvanovich if he had not died at the end of the story 'An Honest Thief'. When we go back to the text, there are some very unnerving hints that maybe AstafiIvanovich was really now in Emelian's shoes, as he too has rented the spare room near the kitchen in the hermit like first narrator's home. He too sits on the window seat, just like Emelian used to do in AstafiIvanovich's home and is busy at tailoring or sewing, a trade which he had tried to coax Emelian into. If you think that

is scary enough, there is another theory racking through my head that maybe on the death bed of the cold and hungry Emelian, it was not Emelian who died but maybe AstafiIvanovich in the sense a complete psychological takeover of some sort? There are many possibilities when one reads about the death of Emelian, because how could he die from only being out in the cold for four days? I admit the winter and cold in Russia is terrible, but AstafiIvanovich tried to do the best he could, didn't he? Then what about AstafiIvanich? He was a broken man, a man who the hermit like narrator mentions 'worries a great deal over trifles.' One's heart tends to bleed at the descriptions of Emelian when he is ranting in a drunken state about the poverty and unfairness in Russia and for that matter in the world, through the eyes of an existentialist. Take note the mention of the baskets of huckleberries and the baron's money found by two poor and needy muzhiks or Russian peasants. There is a sort of uncomfortable sense of guilt and an overriding guilt complex throughout the story which was evoked from AstafiIvanovich by the creature like Emelian. It certainly reminds us of how the poor and middle class in Russia were like Emelian, pitied but where it remained as a blind spot to those in power – no one can bear to see the tears of an innocent suffering man. It is a real strategic event in the story when Emelian starts to cry for the first time and Dostoevsky wants us to take note of it. To AstafiIvanovich, it is mentioned that the love he had for Emelian was like that of a father for his own flesh and blood. This is an obvious indication of the rich vs the poor in Russia. What I want to draw your attention to is the fact that Emelian, through his persona, had literally and metaphorically 'disarmed' a once upon a time retired soldier, that is AstafiIvanovich. It seems that like a faithful dog Emelian would never leave AstafiIvanovich, but does so ironically when the latter started to lock his trunk before he would go out for work. Take away points from this story are:

- The coincidence of both cases, women housekeepers in attendance in both, the first plot in the hermit like narrator's home and then in AstafiIvanovich's home. Could they have been one in the same person?
- Emelian's obvious extraordinary capabilities to be robbing AstafiIvanovich of his very soul and life spirit.
- The psychological game Emelian was playing knowingly or unknowingly with AstafiIvanovich. That is quite the usual fare when one reads a short story or novel by Dostoevsky.
- Emelian was very dear to AstafiIvanovich and he treated him like some sort of 'prodigal son'.

• The allusion to the 'Good thief' in the Bible (New Testament) who confesses his sin when crucified on the cross with Jesus the Christ and who gains absolution from the Christ. Emelian also on his death bed confesses to the stealing of the expensive breeches to AstafiIvanich, who forgives him with all his heart.
• The title of the short story – not only pointing out to the New Testament's 'Good thief', but also the self-righteousness of Emelian to have a spot in AstafiIvanovich's life, like the 'Good thief' who wanted to be remembered by Jesus the Christ when the Christ would enter his kingdom.

Accidental Death of an Anarchist

- Dario Fo

About the author

Dario Fo, (born March 24, 1926, Leggiuno-Sangiano, Italy—died October 13, 2016, Milan), Italian avant-garde playwright, manager-director, and actor-mime who was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1997 though he often faced government censure as a theatrical caricaturist with a flair for social agitation.

Fo's first theatrical experience was collaborating on satirical revues for small cabarets and theatres. He and his wife, the actress Franca Rame, produced (1962) humorous sketches on the television show *Canzonissima* that soon made them popular public personalities. They founded the theatre companies Campagnia Dario Fo–Franca Rame (1958), Nuova Scena (1968), and CollettivoTeatrale La Comune (1970), developing an agitprop theatre of politics, often blasphemous and scatological but rooted in the tradition of commedia dell'arte and blended with what Fo called "unofficial leftism." With the latter troupe they began to tour factories, parks, and gymnasiums.

Fo wrote more than 80 plays, coauthoring some of them with Rame. Among his most popular plays are *Morteaccidentale di un anarchico* (1970; *Accidental Death of an Anarchist*) and *Nonsipaga, non sipaga!* (1974; *We Can't Pay? We Won't Pay!*). As a performer, Fo is best known for his solo tour de force *Mistero Buffo* (1973; "Comic Mystery"), based on medieval mystery plays but so topical that the shows changed with each audience.

His later works, some of which were written with Rame, include *Tutta casa, letto e chiesa* (1978; "All House, Bed, and Church"; Eng. trans. *Adult Orgasm Escapes from the Zoo*), *Clacson, trombette, e pernacchi* (1981; *Trumpets and Raspberries*), *Female Parts* (1981), *Coppiaaperta* (1983; *The Open Couple—Wide Open Even*), *L'uomonudo e l'uomo in frak* (1985; *One Was Nude and One Wore Tails*), *Il papa e la strega* (1989; *The Pope and the Witch*), *Johan Padan a la descoverta de le Americhe* (1992; *Johan Padan and the Discovery of the Americas*), *Il diavolo con le zinne* (1998; *The Devil with Boobs*), *Lu santojullàreFrançesco* (1999; *Francis, the Holy Jester*), and *L'anomalobicefalo* (2003; *The Two-Headed Anomaly*).

About the work

Accidental Death of an Anarchist is a form of political theater, written in response to the death of Giuseppi (Pino) Pinelli, an anarchist who died while in police custody for questioning about a bombing in which he played no part. Some of Fo's regular playgoers requested that he write the play to provide counter-information to the misinformation being propagated about the event by the media. He researched the case thoroughly, drawing from two official inquiries as well as facts shared by friendly journalists and lawyers. His aim was to present this counter-information in a way that would be accessible to all.

The event took place in Milan, Italy, in December 1969, at the end of a tumultuous decade. The two main political parties in Italy at the time were the Christian Democrats and the Italian Communists, with underground forces conspiring to keep the Communists out of government, or to introduce a non-democratic system (possibly fascist or totalitarian). Two failed attempts at a *coup d'etat* in 1964 and 1970 added to the sense of unease among the populace. Activists reacted by demanding new politics and advocating for revolution, with students ready to join forces with striking trade unionists. Neo-fascists, meanwhile, began carrying out terrorist attacks blamed on left-wing groups, with the aim of creating a climate of fear in which the public would support a powerful totalitarian regime in order to stop the killing. The "attack on the twenty-fifth" (24) mentioned by the Superintendent in the play refers to two bombings on April 25, 1969 at the Milan Exhibition Center and the railway station, both blamed on left-wing organizations. By blaming the left, this "strategy of tension" was also designed to halt the growth of strength of the working class.

On December 12, 1969, a bomb went off in the Banca dell'Agricoltura in Piazza Fontana, located in the center of Milan. 16 people were killed and another 90 were injured. An hour earlier, a bag of explosives had been found at a different bank in Milan, but it did not detonate; the police blew it up rather than disarming it, thus destroying a key piece of evidence. Nobody knows the full truth of what happened that day, but newspapers reported that anarchist groups were responsible. Giuseppe (Pino) Pinelli was one of the first anarchists to be taken in for questioning. He was detained for three days before "falling" out of a fourth-floor window to his death around midnight on December 15. Another anarchist, ballet dancer Pietro Valpreda, was put in jail for three years for his supposed complicity. Neither Pinelli nor Valpreda were actually involved in the attacks, nor, as far as we know, were any members of anarchist groups.

Inspector Luigi Calabresi was in charge of Pinelli's interrogation. Calabresi, whom many suspected of being sympathetic to the fascists, had blamed the Piazza Fontana bombings on "left-wing extremists" and was unlikely to have been impartial to Pinelli. There were five additional officers in Calabresi's office when Pinelli died, as well as a group of journalists in the courtyard below. An autopsy revealed that Pinelli had bruises on his neck. There were massive inconsistencies between the various reports of what happened that night, a fact Fo capitalizes on throughout the play.
A leftist newspaper called the *Lotta Continua* blamed Calabresi for Pinelli's death, coining or at least popularizing his nickname, "Officer Window-Straddler." Calabresi sued the *Lotta Continua* and its editor, Pio Baldelli, for criminal libel. The case was still ongoing two months later when *Accidental Death of an Anarchist* initially premiered on December 10, 1970, one year after Pinelli's death. The script was adapted for each performance to take into account new developments. The trial was contentious, centering more on the death of Pinelli than Baldelli's libel. At one pointCalabresi's lawyer challenged the judge, who was removed from the case.

On May 17, 1972, three days after his bodyguard was declared unnecessary, Calabresi was murdered. Nobody was arrested at the time, but in 1988 a man named Leonardo Marino claimed he had driven Calabresi's killers and named the four supposedly guilty men. All had been members of the *Lotta Continua* in the 1970s. Fo has continued to be interested in the case and wrote *Free Marino! Marino is Innocent!* in 1998 to satirize Marino's evidence.

Accidental Death of an Anarchist has been performed in over 40 countries, including fascist Chile and apartheid South Africa. It is Fo’s best-known play and his second most popular play in Italy (after *Mistero Buffo*). While some adaptations have mutated into whimsical farce, Fo intended the play to be intensely political, as it was during its initial run in Italy. The first performance took place just a few hours after a demonstration to commemorate the one-year anniversary of the Piazza Fontana bombing. A student was killed by tear gas fired by police, and the next day 700 participants convened to discuss the death. The day after that, 3,000 people met to vote on how to commemorate the first anniversary of Pinelli’s death. They ended up bringing the city center to a halt with pickets, marches, and demonstrations.

Fo did not advertise his play, yet even so, it was so popular - and so timely - that 500 people had to be turned away one night. Fo often performed outside of conventional theaters, such as in public squares or occupied factories, wanting to bring his message to the common people. There was a “third act” in each performance, a debate between the actors and the audience on the issues raised, with the intention of empowering the audience to think critically and hopefully take action. Fo would also typically begin the evening by talking about current events and finishing with a discussion of the historical context. He rewrote the play many times during rehearsals and also made alterations based on public reaction or in response to ongoing events.

It has been difficult to maintain this same intensity of political activism in translation, where the play is stripped of the introduction and the third act, and where audiences are less familiar with the events upon which the play is based. However, Fo has given translators and directors the freedom to adapt the play as they see fit, substituting appropriate cultural and political references and changing the setting. While at times directors have taken this freedom too far in favor of comic effect, Fo’s openness to adaptation has helped his message reach audiences around the world, of whom all can relate to corruption found within state institutions.

Accidental Death of an Anarchist Summary

The first scene of *Accidental Death of an Anarchist* introduces the Maniac, a certified madman with an “acting mania.” Bertozzo, a police officer, interviews the Maniac about his latest charge of impersonating a psychiatrist. The Maniac denies any wrongdoing, revealing

his quick wit in his responses. When Bertozzo leaves, the Maniac reenters the empty room and looks through Bertozzo's files. The Inspector from the fourth floor calls, looking for Bertozzo; we can infer that a judge is coming to the station to reopen the inquiry about the death of the anarchist. The Maniac pretends Bertozzo is in the room making rude comments about the Inspector and his situation, prompting the Inspector to later punch Bertozzo in the face. Meanwhile, the Maniac decides to impersonate the judge and conduct the inquiry himself.

In the second scene, the Maniac interviews the Inspector and the Superintendent, asking them to recreate what happened the night of the anarchist's death. They told the anarchist they had proof he had planted bombs at the railway station, that his comrade had confessed to planting a bomb at the bank, and that the anarchist's alibi had collapsed. None of these things were actually true. To demonstrate the effects of such "psychological warfare," the Maniac tells the policemen that there is evidence that they were both negligent and that their careers are ruined. He encourages them to jump out the window, as the anarchist had supposedly done, and they both later admit that they seriously considered doing so.

The Maniac admits his deception and offers to help the policemen make their story more coherent. In their second version of events, the anarchist didn't jump until four hours after the interrogation, allowing the men to claim their lies could not have been what caused the anarchist to commit suicide. The Maniac invents details that support this story: the Superintendent put a hand on the anarchist's shoulder, the Inspector pat him on the cheek and told him not to lose heart, and they all sang a song. The policemen object to the fictions, but the Maniac argues that the public would love such a story and they agree to play along.

At the beginning of Act Two, the Maniac says they need to determine what could have happened between 8pm and midnight to cause the anarchist to jump out the window. Instead, however, he points out a number of inconsistencies in the policemen's testimony: the window was open, yet it was midnight in December when the temperature was below zero; the anarchist would have had trouble reaching the window without a running start or a leg-up; and if the constable had really tried to stop him and held onto a shoe, as he said, then the anarchist must have either had three feet or been wearing two shoes on one foot, since witnesses reported he had both shoes on when he landed on the pavement.

The Journalist arrives and the Maniac says he will take on the disguise of the Captain from Forensics to prevent the Journalist from learning that the inquiry has been reopened. His costume includes an eyepatch, a glass eye, and a wooden hand and leg. The journalist brings up additional incriminating evidence against the police. Why did the previous inquiry omit the report on the trajectory taken by the anarchist's body, which would have established whether or not he was alive when he went through the window? Why was an ambulance called for five minutes before the "jump"? Why, too, were there bruises on the back of the dead man's neck? The Maniac explains that there has been a version of events floating around that says that a few minutes before midnight, one of the interrogators lost control of himself and gave the anarchist a whack on the neck. The whack half paralyzed the anarchist, so they called an ambulance. In the meantime, they opened the window and two policemen leaned the anarchist out, hoping the cold air would revive him. However, they accidentally dropped him, each man thinking the other was holding on. The Journalist says the story would explain a lot, including the reason the prosecutor stated the death should be classified as an "accidental death" rather than a suicide. She and the Maniac also discuss the "unreliability" of the witnesses who confirmed the anarchist's alibi.

The play gears up for its climax with the reappearance of Bertozzo, who has brought a copy of the bomb that exploded in the bank. Bertozzo is acquainted with the real Forensics Captain and knows that the Maniac is an imposter. Eventually, he realizes that he is the madman he had been interviewing at the start of the play. The other policemen, thinking Bertozzo will reveal that the Maniac is a judge, kick him and engage in other slapstick humor to try to keep him silent. Bertozzo, meanwhile, tries to dismantle the Maniac's disguise, revealing that there is no reason for the eyepatch or the false leg.

During this time the Journalist continues her questioning, and it comes out that the bomb was very complex - likely the work of the military. She points out that two of the ten members of the anarchist group were spies and asks how the group could have pulled off such an operation while being kept under close scrutiny. The Maniac agrees that the police would have been better off pursuing fascist or paramilitary organizations rather than ragtag anarchist groups. He tells her his beliefs about scandals - they make the public think that the authorities are doing something, but in reality, nothing changes.

The pace quickens as the Maniac switches his disguise to that of Bishop. Bertozzo tries more frantically to reveal the Maniac's identity, and the Inspector and the

Superintendent try more frantically to prevent him. Finally, Bertozzo whips out a gun and threatens to shoot. He has the constable handcuff the others to a horizontal bar and orders the Maniac to confess who he really is. The Maniac shares his files and the others are outraged. He grabs the bomb and tells Bertozzo to drop the gun or he will press the detonator and kill them all. When Bertozzo complies, the Maniac reveals a tape recording of their conversations, which he plans to copy and distribute to political entities and the media.

Suddenly the lights go out and the bomb goes off in the courtyard below. When the lights come back on, the Maniac is gone; we can infer he has jumped out the window and fallen to his death. Since neither the journalist nor the handcuffed policemen had anything to do with the Maniac jumping, the Journalist says she may have to rethink her position about the anarchist's jump. She leaves and the policemen take keys out of their pockets and unlock their handcuffs.

There is a knock on the door and the actor who played the Maniac enters. The policemen surround him, thinking he is the Maniac. However, it turns out he is the actual High Court Judge, there to reopen the inquiry into the death of the anarchist.

Note - this ending appears in Simon Nye's translation. Other adaptations feature different endings, including one where the Journalist must decide between saving the evidence or the handcuffed police officers before the bomb detonates. Please see the section on Challenges of Translation for more information.

Galileo

- Betrolt Brecht

About the author

Bertolt Brecht, original name **Eugen Berthold Friedrich Brecht**, (born February 10, 1898, Augsburg, Germany—died August 14, 1956, East Berlin), German poet, playwright, and theatrical reformer whose epic theatre departed from the conventions of theatrical illusion and developed the drama as a social and ideological forum for leftist causes.

Until 1924 Brecht lived in Bavaria, where he was born, studied medicine (Munich, 1917–21), and served in an army hospital (1918). From this period date his first

play, *Baal* (produced 1923); his first success, *Trommeln in der Nacht* (Kleist Preis, 1922; *Drums in the Night*); the poems and songs collected as *Die Hauspostille* (1927; *A Manual of Piety,* 1966), his first professional production (*Edward II,* 1924); and his admiration for Wedekind, Rimbaud, Villon, and Kipling.

During this period he also developed a violently antibourgeois attitude that reflected his generation's deep disappointment in the civilization that had come crashing down at the end of World War I. Among Brecht's friends were members of the Dadaist group, who aimed at destroying what they condemned as the false standards of bourgeois art through derision and iconoclastic satire. The man who taught him the elements of Marxism in the late 1920s was Karl Korsch, an eminent Marxist theoretician who had been a Communist member of the Reichstag but had been expelled from the German Communist Party in 1926.

In Berlin (1924–33) he worked briefly for the directors Max Reinhardt and Erwin Piscator, but mainly with his own group of associates. With the composer Kurt Weill he wrote the satirical, successful ballad opera *Die Dreigroschenoper* (1928; *The Threepenny Opera*) and the opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* (1930; *Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny*). He also wrote what he called "*Lehr-stücke*" ("exemplary plays")—baldly didactic works for performance outside the orthodox theatre—to music by Weill, Hindemith, and Hanns Eisler. In these years he developed his theory of "epic theatre" and an austere form of irregular verse. He also became a Marxist.

In 1933 he went into exile—in Scandinavia (1933–41), mainly in Denmark, and then in the United States (1941–47), where he did some film work in Hollywood. In Germany his books were burned and his citizenship was withdrawn. He was cut off from the German theatre; but between 1937 and 1941 he wrote most of his great plays, his major theoretical essays and dialogues, and many of the poems collected as *SvendborgerGedichte* (1939). Between 1937 and 1939, he wrote, but did not complete, the novel *Die Geschäfte des Herrn Julius Caesar* (1957; *The Business Affairs of Mr. Julius Caesar*). It concerns a scholar researching a biography of Caesar several decades after his assassination.

The plays of Brecht's exile years became famous in the author's own and other productions: notable among them are *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* (1941; *Mother Courage and Her Children*), a chronicle play of the Thirty Years' War; *Leben des Galilei* (1943; *The Life of Galileo*); *Der gute Mensch von Sezuan* (1943; *The Good Woman of*

Setzuan), a parable play set in prewar China; *Der AufhaltsameAufstieg des Arturo Ui* (1957; *The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui*), a parable play of Hitler‘s rise to power set in prewar Chicago; *Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti* (1948; *Herr Puntila and His Man Matti*), a Volksstück (popular play) about a Finnish farmer who oscillates between churlish sobriety and drunken good humour; and *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* (first produced in English, 1948; *Der kaukasischeKreidekreis,* 1949), the story of a struggle for possession of a child between its highborn mother, who deserts it, and the servant girl who looks after it.

Brecht left the United States in 1947 after having had to give evidence before the House Un-American Activities Committee. He spent a year in Zürich, working mainly on *Antigone-Modell 1948* (adapted from Hölderlin's translation of Sophocles; produced 1948) and on his most important theoretical work, the *Kleines Organon für das Theater* (1949; "A Little Organum for the Theatre"). The essence of his theory of drama, as revealed in this work, is the idea that a truly Marxist drama must avoid the Aristotelian premise that the audience should be made to believe that what they are witnessing is happening here and now. For he saw that if the audience really felt that the emotions of heroes of the past—Oedipus, or Lear, or Hamlet—could equally have been their own reactions, then the Marxist idea that human nature is not constant but a result of changing historical conditions would automatically be invalidated. Brecht therefore argued that the theatre should not seek to make its audience believe in the presence of the characters on the stage—should not make it identify with them, but should rather follow the method of the epic poet's art, which is to make the audience realize that what it sees on the stage is merely an account of past events that it should watch with critical detachment. Hence, the "epic" (narrative, nondramatic) theatre is based on detachment, on the *Verfremdungseffekt* (alienation effect), achieved through a number of devices that remind the spectator that he is being presented with a demonstration of human behaviour in scientific spirit rather than with an illusion of reality, in short, that the theatre is only a theatre and not the world itself.

In 1949 Brecht went to Berlin to help stage *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* (with his wife, Helene Weigel, in the title part) at Reinhardt's old DeutschesTheater in the Soviet sector. This led to formation of the Brechts' own company, the Berliner Ensemble, and to permanent return to Berlin. Henceforward the Ensemble and the staging of his own plays had

first claim on Brecht's time. Often suspect in eastern Europe because of his unorthodox aesthetic theories and denigrated or boycotted in the West for his Communist opinions, he yet had a great triumph at the Paris Théâtre des Nations in 1955, and in the same year in Moscow he received a Stalin Peace Prize. He died of a heart attack in East Berlin the following year.

Brecht was, first, a superior poet, with a command of many styles and moods. As a playwright he was an intensive worker, a restless piecer-together of ideas not always his own (*The Three penny Opera* is based on John Gay's *Beggar's Opera,* and *Edward II* on Marlowe), a sardonic humourist, and a man of rare musical and visual awareness; but he was often bad at creating living characters or at giving his plays tension and shape. As a producer he liked lightness, clarity, and firmly knotted narrative sequence; a perfectionist, he forced the German theatre, against its nature, to underplay. As a theoretician he made principles out of his preferences—and even out of his faults.

About the work

Life of Galileo, also known as *Galileo,* is a play by Bertolt Brecht, written in 1938 and first performed at the Zurich Schauspielhaus in 1943. At the time of its premiere, Brecht, who typically directed his own plays, handed over directorial duties to Leonard Steckel, who also played the title character.

The play follows Galileo's discovery of Jupiter's moons and of the heliocentric nature of the earth's solar system. With this discovery comes a great deal of controversy, as Galileo must come into conflict with the Roman Catholic Church, whose officials fear that Galileo's teachings (published in vernacular Italian rather than Latin) will stir up revolutionary impulses among the lower classes.

The play, in addition to being an historical account of Galileo's scientific findings, has a Marxist bent. Brecht interprets Galileo's astronomical discoveries as significant not only for their scientific implications but for the ways they dispel many of the superstitions and beliefs put forth by the Catholic church. By simply sowing seeds of doubt among the citizens of Italy, he presents a huge threat to the authority of the church, which is not only a threat to religion, but a threat to the economic hierarchies of the country as well. As the play describes it, peasants and workers are willing to do their work so long as they feel that their position in society has been made for them by an all-powerful God. Galileo's proof that the

universe does not revolve around the earth, and that the heavens are more elusive than previously believed, throws this system of thought into doubt.

After premiering the work in Germany and fleeing from the Nazis, Brecht retooled the play into an English version, collaborating with Charles Laughton, which premiered in Los Angeles in 1947. This version, the most commonly produced English version, was simply called *Galileo*. Brecht changed some of the original version of the play to reflect a more ambivalent depiction of scientific progress, having seen the devastating effects of such events as Hiroshima. In 1947, the same year the play premiered in Los Angeles, Brecht was brought in for questioning by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Life of Galileo is a 1938 play by German playwright Bertolt Brecht. The play was first performed in 1943 in Zurich, accompanied by music by German composer Hanns Eisler. The play chronicles the illustrious but tragic career of the Italian philosopher and astronomer Galileo Galilei, with particular attention to his persecution, trial, and punishment by the Catholic Church for sharing his scientific findings with the world. Central to the play is the tense power dynamic between dogmatic religious belief and scientific truth. Brecht's play is highly sympathetic to Galileo's perseverance in a battle against the Church in which the odds were overwhelmingly stacked against him. *Life of Galileo* is a tribute to one of history's most impactful scientific minds, as well as a vindication of his search for scientific truth that might liberate people from their own ignorance.

The play begins with Galileo and his housekeeper's son, Andrea Sarti. Andrea, Galileo's future protégé, listens as Galileo interrogates the Ptolemaic assumption that the earth is the center of the universe. Galileo argues that it is time to dispose of obsolete scientific truths and to replace them with new ones that accurately model reality. Galileo also challenges Ptolemaic physics, which holds that the earth is a fixed object surrounded by movable ones. At first, Andrea is unconvinced. He talks about Galileo's theories at school, and they soon come to the attention of his mother, Mrs. Sarti. Mrs. Sarti worries that Galileo is distorting Andrea's concepts of reality, while neglecting his basic responsibilities, such as staying out of debt.

In the next scene, Galileo reveals his telescope to the world. The invention, merely a novelty to the general public, rocks the scientific community, who understand it as a tool

that can improve current models of the universe and ultimately educate the public. The plot then shifts to the night of January 10, 1610. Joined by his colleague Sagredo, Galileo uses his telescope to observe the moon. On this night, they discover that the moon does not create any light of its own - it reflects light from the distant sun. This insight provides strong evidence for Galileo's theory that the earth is not the center of the universe. Galileo wants to immediately publish his findings for the benefit of science, but Sagredo tells him that he will be perceived as insane. Galileo writes to Cosimo de' Medici, the Grand Duke of Florence and one of the wealthiest men in Europe. He tells him that he will name Jupiter's recently discovered moons after the Medici family.

On the duke's invitation, Galileo and Andrea relocate to the Medici palace in Florence. When Galileo shows Cosimo the Copernican theory of the universe, Cosimo rejects it. Medici's own scholars tentatively reject the Copernican model and side with the earlier, Ptolemaic system that positioned the Earth at the center of the universe. To inquire further, they invite Christopher Clavius, the Vatican's head astronomer, to examine Galileo's research.

The play shifts forward to 1616. The Vatican's research center, the Collegium Romanum, finally accepts Galileo's findings and the accuracy of the Copernican model. The monks fear that the Church will lose credibility should the findings be made public. Further, Clavius continues to deny his researchers' conclusion. In March of that year, the Inquisition bans Copernican science as heresy. Two Cardinals, Bellarmine and Barberini, ask Galileo to stop pursuing his theory. They argue that it is more important for people to rationalize the universe according to biblical ideas than to understand scientific reality. The Vatican then decides to permit Galileo further study if he does not publish his conclusions.
Galileo stops researching for eight years to study mathematics. However, once he hears that Cardinal Barberini, a scientist, has been named the next Pope, he goes back to studying astronomy, thinking that he will now be protected. In the following years, Galileo publishes his findings widely. The Church names him a heretic and many followers proclaim that he has brought an end to Christianity. Others believe that he has performed heroic acts by dedicating his life to science and openly rejecting the Church's unscientific dogma. In 1633, Galileo attends the Grand Duke's reception despite the protests of his daughter, who fears they are in danger. Her suspicion turns out to be true when the Duke arrests Galileo to be questioned in the Inquisition.

After the Church's first threats, Galileo publicly renounces his research to save himself. He remains the Inquisition's prisoner for nine years, until 1642. One day, Andrea visits him. Galileo sends him off with two of his works, collectively called the *Discorsi*, and Andrea reaches Holland with the forbidden books. The play ends as Andrea overhears children talking about a possible witch in their village. Demonstrating that he now believes the value of skepticism, Andrea interjects that it is scientifically impossible for a person to fly on a broom.

In his silent life in the home arrest, he writes *the Discorsi*, the sum of his scientific theories and discoveries, but the pages of the manuscript are confiscated by the Church as they are written. Galileo is finally able to hide a copy, which he later hands over to his student Andrea to smuggle out of Italy. In the end, Galileo declares: *"I have betrayed my profession. Any man who does what I have done must not be tolerated in the ranks of science."*

Love in the Time of Cholera

- Gabriel García Márquez

About the author

Gabriel García Márquez, (born March 6, 1927, Aracataca, Colombia—died April 17, 2014, Mexico City, Mexico), Colombian novelist and one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, who was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1982, mostly for his masterpiece *Cienaños de soledad* (1967; *One Hundred Years of Solitude*). He was the fourth Latin American to be so honoured, having been preceded by Chilean poets Gabriela Mistral in 1945 and Pablo Neruda in 1971 and by Guatemalan novelist Miguel Ángel Asturias in 1967. With Jorge Luis Borges, García Márquez is the best-known Latin American writer in history. In addition to his masterly approach to the novel, he was a superb crafter of short stories and an accomplished journalist. In both his shorter and longer fictions, García Márquez achieved the rare feat of being accessible to the common reader while satisfying the most demanding of sophisticated critics.

Born in the sleepy provincial town of Aracataca, Colombia, García Márquez and his parents spent the first eight years of his life with his maternal grandparents, Colonel Nicolás Márquez (a veteran of the War of a Thousand Days [1899–1903]) and

TranquilinaIguaránCotes de Márquez. After Nicolás's death, they moved to Barranquilla, a river port. He received a better-than-average education but claimed as an adult that his most important literary sources were the stories about Aracataca and his family that Nicolás had told him. Although he studied law, García Márquez became a journalist, the trade at which he earned his living before attaining literary fame. As a correspondent in Paris during the 1950s, he expanded his education, reading a great deal of American literature, some of it in French translation. In the late 1950s and early '60s, he worked in Bogotá, Colombia, and then in New York City for Prensa Latina, the news service created by the regime of Cuban leader Fidel Castro. Later he moved to Mexico City, where he wrote the novel that brought him fame and wealth. From 1967 to 1975 he lived in Spain. Subsequently he kept a house in Mexico City and an apartment in Paris, but he also spent much time in Havana, where Castro (whom García Márquez supported) provided him with a mansion.

Before 1967 García Márquez had published two novels, *La hojarasca* (1955; *The Leaf Storm*) and *La mala hora* (1962; *In Evil Hour*); a novella, *El coronel no tienequien le escriba* (1961; *No One Writes to the Colonel*); and a few short stories. Then came *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, in which García Márquez tells the story of Macondo, an isolated town whose history is like the history of Latin America on a reduced scale. While the setting is realistic, there are fantastic episodes, a combination that has come to be known as "magic realism," wrongly thought to be the peculiar feature of all Latin American literature. Mixing historical facts and stories with instances of the fantastic is a practice that García Márquez derived from Cuban master AlejoCarpentier, considered to be one of the founders of magic realism. The inhabitants of Macondo are driven by elemental passions—lust, greed, thirst for power—which are thwarted by crude societal, political, or natural forces, as in Greek tragedy and myth.

Continuing his magisterial output, García Márquez issued *El otoño del patriarca* (1975; *The Autumn of the Patriarch*), *Crónica de unamuerteanunciada* (1981; *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*), *El amor enlostiempos del cólera* (1985; *Love in the Time of Cholera*; filmed 2007), *El general ensulaberinto* (1989; *The General in His Labyrinth*), and *Del amor y otrosdemonios* (1994; *Of Love and Other Demons*). The best among those books are *Love in the Time of Cholera*, about a touching love affair that takes decades to be consummated, and *The General in His Labyrinth*, a chronicle of Simón Bolívar's last days. In 1996 García

Márquez published a journalistic chronicle of drug-related kidnappings in his native Colombia, *Noticia de un secuestro* (*News of a Kidnapping*).

After being diagnosed with cancer in 1999, García Márquez wrote the memoir *Vivir para contarla* (2002; *Living to Tell the Tale*), which focuses on his first 30 years. He returned to fiction with *Memoria de mis putas tristes* (2004; *Memories of My Melancholy Whores*), a novel about a lonely man who finally discovers the meaning of love when he hires a virginal prostitute to celebrate his 90th birthday

About the work

Love in the Time of Cholera, published in 1985, was Gabriel Garcia Marquez's first book after winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1982. Although it has often been compared negatively with Marquez's greatest achievement, One Hundred Years of Solitude, many critics see Love in the Time of Cholera as a convincing and powerful love story that deftly accomplishes the goal Marquez set for himself: writing a story about love between two people of an age that no respected writer had managed before.

Marquez was inspired to write Love in the Time of Cholera, which followed Chronicle of a Death Foretold, by his admiration for Daniel Defoe's *Journal of a Plague Year*. Marquez also claims that the story was inspired by his own parents' marriage, or his memory of it. The novel has an unusual structure--it jumps around chronologically, as well as between focal perspectives, so much so that it seems to be a collection of tangential stories tied together by the love Florentino Ariza feels for Fermina Daza. Love in the Time of Cholera also has multiple protagonists and countless characters, many of whom are deftly and carefully brought to life despite their fleeting presences in the novel.

The novel is concerned most generally with love, time, and death, and it is influenced by the oral traditions of story-telling as well as by the magical realism that Marquez essentially defined in One Hundred Years of Solitude. Love in the Time of Cholera is written unlike any traditional representation of love, but it is not only in this apect that it affected the twentieth-century novels to follow. Its unorthodox structure and its combination of a more European-style realism with its use of story-telling traditions mark a turn away from the traditional novel style; the novel also shuns any obsession with the everyday.

Love in the Time of Cholera mainly tells the story of Florentino Ariza, Fermina Daza, and Dr. Juvenal Urbino. The story opens with the day of Dr. Urbino's death, then essentially

jumps back fifty-one years, and with flashback, repetition, and foreshadowing, meanders back to the day of Urbino's death, and then to the final decision, a couple of years later, of Florentino and Fermina to spend their eternity riding a riverboat together, while a flag flies high to indicate a cholera infection. In this half-century span, Marquez tells the story of Fermina's and Florentino's early love, Fermina's quest for identity and independence, Florentino's economic progress and his many love affairs, and Fermina's and Dr. Urbino's marriage, as well as many other side stories of the countless characters who flow into and out of their lives.

The main themes repeat. We see all three protagonists struggle with the indignity of aging and a fear of death; cholera, choleric symptoms, and cholera epidemics come throughout the novel; and love is, of course, the one thing that ties all of it together. With these repetitions comes a deeper meaning for each of the themes; for example, Marquez makes clear that there is no one definition of love but instead many kinds, all complicated, all unpredictable. Similarly, while the deaths of all three protagonists are inevitable, the end of the novel complicates the definition of death and certainly makes clear that age, and thus time, do not put an end to love.

Analysis

Dr. Juvenal Urbino, the City of the Viceroy's most esteemed doctor, is sent to examine the body of his close friend and finest competitor at chess, Jeremiah Saint-Amour, who has killed himself at the age of sixty so that he will not grow old. The Doctor returns home and discovers that his pet parrot has escaped from his cage to the top of the mango tree outside. Dr. Urbino climbs a ladder to the branch on which the parrot sits, but just as he grasps the parrot, the Doctor falls to his death. Flo rentino Ariza professes, for a second time, his "eternal fidelity and everlasting love" to the Doctor and his wife, Fermina Daza. Fermina is horrified by such an insensitive display, and, for the first time, realizes the magnitude of the "drama" sh e had provoked at the age of eighteen.

Although Fermina Daza may have erased Florentino Ariza from her memory, he has not stopped thinking of her since their long, troubled love affair ended fifty-one years, nine months, and four days ago. Florentino first meets Fermina when he delivers a tele gram to her father, Lorenzo Daza, who is notorious for his shady dealings. After watching Fermina, always accompanied by her Aunt Escolástica, walk to school each day from the Park of the

Evangels, Florentino works up the courage to approach her o ne day. He asks that she accept a letter from him, but she refuses because she is obligated to get her father's permission. He demands that she "get it," which she does the following week. Florentino decides to give her a subdued note (instead of the sixt y-page letter he had originally written) in which he resolutely declares his love for her. He is in agony as he awaits her reply, but is overjoyed when Fermina finally answers approvingly.

In the two years that follow, Fermina and Florentino see one another only in passing, though they write love letters daily. Florentino proposes marriage to Fermina, and again her reply is favorable. Fermina is caught writing a love letter by the Mother Superior at her academy and is expelled. Lorenzo finds love letters in Fermina's room and as punishment, banishes Escolástica and forces Fermina to accompany him on a long journey, not to end until she has forgotten about Florentino. On the journey, Fermina meets and befriends her older cousin, Hildebranda Sánchez, who helps Florentino and Fermina communicate via telegraph messages.

Florentino hardly recognizes Fermina upon her return from the long journey, because, now seventeen, she has matured into a woman. He sees her in the Arcade of the Scribes, and approaches her. When Fermina sees him, she is suddenly disgusted with him and w ith herself for ever having been foolish enough to love him. Coolly, she tells Florentino to "forget it." Florentino tries once more to woo Fermina, but to no avail. In the fifty-one years, nine months, and four days that follow, not once does Florentino have the chance to speak or see his beloved Fermina in private. Initially, he vows to save his virginity for only Fermina, but after being seized by Rosalba aboard a ship to a faraway city, he turns to sex to ameliorate the pain he feels at having lo st Fermina. He returns home, intent upon once again making her his own. Meanwhile, he conducts affairs, however secret, with innumerable women, though he is rumored to be a homosexual.

Dr. Urbino courts Fermina, who resists his affections. Lorenzo Daza forces the Doctor upon his daughter, and she reluctantly concedes. When Florentino hears that Fermina is to marry a prestigious physician, he vows to make himself worthy of her. His uncle , Don Leo XII Loayza, gives him a job at the River Company of the Caribbean, of which, after thirty years, Florentino becomes President. Fermina and the Doctor honeymoon in Europe for three months. When Fermina returns, she is pregnant with her first child. Despite his determination

to win Fermina, Florentino continues his lustful affairs with other women, whom he finds at the transient hotel and on the trolley. It is on the trolley that he meets Leona Cassiani, whom he mistakes for a whore. Leona asks him only for a job, which he gives to her.

Florentino realizes that he must wait, without violence or impatience, for Dr. Urbino to die before he can win over Fermina. When in public, he is greeted by Dr. Urbino with familiar cordiality, though Fermina lends only a courteous glance or smile, and w ithout memory of their past. Fermina and the Doctor appear to be a very happy couple, but in reality, they are quite dissatisfied. The unhappy but stable marriage is rocked when Dr. Urbino conducts a four-month affair with Barbara Lynch, though he ends it when Fermina confronts him with her knowledge of it. Infuriated by her husband's infidelity, Fermina goes to live with Hildebranda on her ranch. The Doctor arrives at the ranch unannounced to take Fermina, who is overjoyed by his arrival, home with hi m.

Upon the Doctor's accidental death, Florentino, now elderly, abruptly ends his affair with fourteen-year-old América Vicuña and, at Dr. Urbino's wake, professes his "eternal fidelity and everlasting love" to Fermina. After having banished him from her home in anger, she sends him a hateful letter. He responds with a meditation on life and love, which helps her overcome her grief. Gradually, after a letter correspondence, they rekindle their relationship and spend afternoons together in Fermina's ho me. Florentino asks Fermina to accompany him on a river voyage, and she accepts. On the voyage, Florentino and Fermina finally make love. As the ship reaches its last port, Fermina sees people she knows and frets that if they see her with Florentino, itw ill cause scandal. Florentino orders the Captain to raise the yellow flag of cholera, which he does. There remain no passengers on aboard but Fermina, Florentino, the Captain, and his lover. No port will allow them to dock because of the supposed cholera outbreak aboard, and they are forever exiled to cruise the river

Night

- Elie Wiesel

About the author

Elie Wiesel, byname of **Eliezer Wiesel**, (born September 30, 1928, Sighet, Romania—died July 2, 2016, New York, New York, U.S.), Romanian-born Jewish writer, whose works provide a sober yet passionate testament of the destruction of European Jewry during World War II. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1986.

Wiesel's early life, spent in a small Hasidic community in the town of Sighet, was a rather hermetic existence of prayer and contemplation. In 1940 Sighet was annexed by Hungary, and, though the Hungarians were allied with Nazi Germany, it was not until the Germans invaded in March 1944 that the town was brought into the Holocaust. Within days, Jews were "defined" and their property confiscated. By April they were ghettoized, and on May 15 the deportations to Auschwitz began. Wiesel, his parents, and three sisters were deported to Auschwitz, where his mother and a sister were killed. He and his father were sent to Buna-Monowitz, the slave labour component of the Auschwitz camp. In January 1945 they were part of a death march to Buchenwald, where his father died on January 28 and from which Wiesel was liberated in April.

After the war Wiesel settled in France, studied at the Sorbonne (1948–51), and wrote for French and Israeli newspapers. Wiesel went to the United States in 1956 and was naturalized in 1963. He was a professor at City College of New York (1972–76), and from 1976 he taught at Boston University, where he became Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities.

During his time as a journalist in France, Wiesel was urged by the novelist François Mauriac to bear witness to what he had experienced in the concentration camps. The outcome was Wiesel's first book, in Yiddish, *Un di velt hot geshvign* (1956; "And the World Has Remained Silent"), abridged as *La Nuit* (1958; *Night*), a memoir of a young boy's spiritual reaction to Auschwitz. It is considered by some critics to be the most powerful literary expression of the Holocaust. His other works include *La Ville de la chance* (1962; "Town of Luck"; Eng. trans. *The Town Beyond the Wall*), a novel examining human apathy; *Le Mendiant de Jérusalem* (1968; *A Beggar in Jerusalem*), which raises the philosophical question of why people kill; *Célébrationhassidique* (1972; "Hasidic Celebration"; Eng. trans. *Souls on Fire*), a critically acclaimed collection of Hasidic tales; *Célébrationbiblique* (1976; "Biblical Celebration"; Eng. trans. *Messengers of God: Biblical Portraits and Legends*); *Le Testament d'un poètejuifassassiné* (1980; "The Testament of a Murdered Jewish Poet"; Eng. trans. *The Testament*); *Le CinquièmeFils* (1983; *The Fifth Son*); *Le Crépuscule, au loin* (1987; "Distant Twilight"; Eng. trans. *Twilight*); *Le Mal et l'exil* (1988; *Evil and Exile* [1990]); *L'Oublié* (1989; *The Forgotten*); and *Tous les fleuvesvont à la mer* (1995; *All Rivers Run to the Sea: Memoirs*).

All of Wiesel's works reflect, in some manner, his experiences as a survivor of the Holocaust and his attempt to resolve the ethical torment of why the Holocaust happened and what it revealed about human nature. He became a noted lecturer on the sufferings experienced by Jews and others during the Holocaust, and his ability to transform this personal concern into a universal condemnation of all violence, hatred, and oppression was largely responsible for his being awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace. In 1978 U.S. Pres. Jimmy Carter named Wiesel chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust, which recommended the creation of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Wiesel also served as the first chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

About the work

Author Elie Wiesel wrote Night (1960) about his experience that he and his family endured in the concentration camps during World War II between 1944 and 1945, primarily taking place the notorious camps of Auschwitz and Buchenwald. More than just about the horrific conditions that prisoners had to endure in the camp, *Night* is also an unnerving insight into the breakdown of humanity and followers' loss of faith in God himself. Wiesel's writing conveys the nightmare of darkness, indeed, a never-ending "night" from which the book derives its name, that the reader comes to understand as a metaphor for the holocaust itself. It is thus not just a book about the holocaust, but indeed the very nature of the human condition, imploring the reader to ask where civility and barbarism intersect, and we conceptually draw the line between humans and beasts. After being liberated at the age of 16 from Buchenwald by the United States Army, Wiesel moved to Paris. He completed an 862-page manuscript in Yiddish by the end of 1954 about all of his experiences during the holocaust. He then revised it to a 245 page edition entitled "And the World Remained Silent" which was published in Argentina. The most famous version that we know today by the title "Night" was published in French as "La Nuit." Little known to many is that *Night* is actually the first of a trilogy, followed by *Dawn* and *Day*, which is said to convey both a Jewish folkloric practice of beginning day at nightfall, and also conveys Wiesel's own transition in life post holocaust. The book has since been translated into 30 different languages, and is often thought of as a keystone of holocaust literature.

Analysis

Night is narrated by Eliezer, a Jewish teenager who, when the memoir begins, lives in his hometown of Sighet, in Hungarian Transylvania. Eliezer studies the Torah (the first five

books of the Old Testament) and the Cabbala (a doctrine of Jewish mysticism). His instruction is cut short, however, when his teacher, Moishe the Beadle, is deported. In a few months, Moishe returns, telling a horrifying tale: the Gestapo (the German secret police force) took charge of his train, led everyone into the woods, and systematically butchered them. Nobody believes Moishe, who is taken for a lunatic.

In the spring of 1944, the Nazis occupy Hungary. Not long afterward, a series of increasingly repressive measures are passed, and the Jews of Eliezer's town are forced into small ghettos within Sighet. Soon they are herded onto cattle cars, and a nightmarish journey ensues. After days and nights crammed into the car, exhausted and near starvation, the passengers arrive at Birkenau, the gateway to Auschwitz.

Upon his arrival in Birkenau, Eliezer and his father are separated from his mother and sisters, whom they never see again. In the first of many "selections" that Eliezer describes in the memoir, the Jews are evaluated to determine whether they should be killed immediately or put to work. Eliezer and his father seem to pass the evaluation, but before they are brought to the prisoners' barracks, they stumble upon the open-pit furnaces where the Nazis are burning babies by the truckload.

The Jewish arrivals are stripped, shaved, disinfected, and treated with almost unimaginable cruelty. Eventually, their captors march them from Birkenau to the main camp, Auschwitz. They eventually arrive in Buna, a work camp, where Eliezer is put to work in an electrical-fittings factory. Under slave-labor conditions, severely malnourished and decimated by the frequent "selections," the Jews take solace in caring for each other, in religion, and in Zionism, a movement favoring the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, considered the holy land. In the camp, the Jews are subject to beatings and repeated humiliations. A vicious foreman forces Eliezer to give him his gold tooth, which is pried out of his mouth with a rusty spoon.

The prisoners are forced to watch the hanging of fellow prisoners in the camp courtyard. On one occasion, the Gestapo even hang a small child who had been associated with some rebels within Buna. Because of the horrific conditions in the camps and the ever-present danger of death, many of the prisoners themselves begin to slide into cruelty, concerned only with personal survival. Sons begin to abandon and abuse their fathers. Eliezer himself begins to lose his humanity and his faith, both in God and in the people around him.

After months in the camp, Eliezer undergoes an operation for a foot injury. While he is in the infirmary, however, the Nazis decide to evacuate the camp because the Russians are advancing and are on the verge of liberating Buna. In the middle of a snowstorm, the prisoners begin a death march: they are forced to run for more than fifty miles to the Gleiwitz concentration camp. Many die of exposure to the harsh weather and exhaustion. At Gleiwitz, the prisoners are herded into cattle cars once again. They begin another deadly journey: one hundred Jews board the car, but only twelve remain alive when the train reaches the concentration camp Buchenwald. Throughout the ordeal, Eliezer and his father help each other to survive by means of mutual support and concern. In Buchenwald, however, Eliezer's father dies of dysentery and physical abuse. Eliezer survives, an empty shell of a man until April 11, 1945, the day that the American army liberates the camp.