Chapter-6

A Critical Study of Bakathir's Historical Dramas.

Since the beginning of the 20th century the dominant theme for writing novel and drama was to go back to Arab history, and to take stands from it so as to redesign it in dramatic templates, regardless of whether it was dramatic or novelistic. Jurji Zaidan's efforts can be seen in the field of historical novel writing and Ibrahim Ramzi's efforts in the field of drama, which is considered as a natural extension of the neo-classicism in the modern Egyptian history.

The main purpose of this research is not to discuss the details of efforts made by these early pioneers in the field of writing novels and dramas, which match the new classic in the direction to simulate the old masterpieces, but these cursory indications explain as how Bakathir received the historical drama from his predecessors, despite the fact that his historical dramas are fundamentally different from the earlier efforts, because his dramas represent a trend which indicates the beginning of the Egyptian society's exit from the narrow concept of Egyptian nationalism so as to compete with other Arab regions in the field of Arab nationalism.[276]

Bakathir gives his explanation for his love for history in his dramas because the events of history crystallized in the course of time and could extract from them the relations and details which were not intended by the writer to achieve through his artistic work. Therefore, the events of history help the writer to achieve his goal by making the artistic work and depicting a truth in a broader and wider way than the truth presented by the reality.

Bakathir was amongst those dramatists who firmly decided to discover the contemporary Arab reality with this time-dimension by deriving the node of dramas from history and by establishing linkages between the past and present so as to push the present towards a better future and more prosperity. The main cause of Bakathir and the writers of his generation behind going back to history

[276] Badr, Abdul Muhsin Taha, *Tatawaru al-Ruiyat al Arabiya al-Hadith fi Misr (1870-1938),* Cairo, Dar al-Ma'arif, P. 398

was that the World War II had raved and forced them to open their eyes and to enrich their hearts after the appearance of the ugliness of political, societal and the economic reality and the culture and awakening worked together for taking a positive national action which can change all this.

Bakathir tried, with the help of historical reality, to show his concern for the Egyptian society- as per his own perception- in many of his historical dramas which he presented during and after this period and during the period when he presented his explanation for the myths and at the later period when he recorded the reflection of contemporary reality in his works. Bakathir returns to the historical reality in his last drama named *Harb al-Basus*.

He did not present his concern about the historical reality by itself but he intended to present the time gap so that he can comment on the contemporary reality of his society, which makes his ability in presenting the issues from his perspective limitation. Thus, his going back to history is something like running away from the reality of the prevailing scenarios so that he can declare his actual stand and his particular vision towards the contemporary reality of his society.

We have known the contents of the uprising which Bakathir wanted to shape in frames taken from the history. His emphasis on the concept in these works emanated from his relation with the national issues and his continuous feeling about the duty of the stage as a means to address the people. But the concept, despite its importance, seldom becomes the life blood in the drama[277] because the drama is a creation which crosses the stage of expression.

6.1 *Ikhnatun wa Nefertiti*

The basic theme in *Ikhnatun wa Nefertiti* is that the right needs the power so as to protect it and strengthen its bases. But the writer begins emphasizing on the

[277] Farjson, Francis, *Fikra al-Masrah*, translated by Jalal al-Ashri, Cairo, Dar al-Nahda al-Arabia, 1965, p. 194.

importance of additional themes and by doing this he has wasted too much time before he could begin the basic differences from which the basic dramatic struggle began- the struggle between two concepts 'concepts of war and peace'. Bakathir has given too much scope in the drama to portray the psychological stand of Ikhnatun vis-à-vis loss of his first wife Tadu, because Bakathir wrote this drama during the period when he was lost in memory of his first wife whom he lost in Hadramawt. Because of this we hear the echoes of this remembrance through the experimental feelings in which he has moulded it.

Actually, Bakathir did not portray his experience in a direct method but he tried to discuss it by what's called subject approximation, which is considered the pivotal thrust in the theory of criticism to Elliot.

Bakathir achieved his goal from the history of Ikhnatun's marriage with the princess Tadukhiba, daughter of the king Dashrata, the king of Matni, who was the wife of his father Amnhatab. The general framework of the relation has been borrowed from the history but Bakathir has endeavoured to pour in it his personal experience. In fact he has portrayed it in such a way that it has the warmth of feelings where we feel his agonies from behind the picture without feeling it in its details in a direct method.

There is no doubt that the play would have suffered too much by portraying the return of Tadu to life- which was originally impossible- had he not portrayed this stand that it was Ikhnatun's inspiration using a well known dramatic trick and that is 'trust' where the queen Ti turns her speech towards the mistress Tai. She discussed with her the plan we know from it as the other characters are known on account of this planning, while the stand is kept unknown to the hero and that is Ikhnatun, who does not know anything about this. We know that Tadu, who returned to life, was not Nefertiti after she was converted into a figure of Tadu. With this stand the writer has proved the reasonability for these

events. Moreover, this legend, which he presents, gets the logic for the return of Tadu to life which might be clear by assumption of Ikhnatun's mental and psychological condition, which is available to prove this return. It also plays a big role in achieving the process of artistic expectation and wait.

This is how Bakathir's psychological crisis turned into something objective and the portrait experienced in the play becomes like a subject approximation for the emotion which was intended to achieve. But it was not the emotion itself; in another word the historical realities (external reality) became similar for the personal emotion (internal reality). With this equilibrium itself the artistic decisiveness gets proven in the view of Elliot.

In order to portray this line Bakathir uses the revival technique. The play begins while many threads of psychological crisis accumulated from which Ikhnatun suffers because of his death which means that this stand was adopted before the beginning of the play and the author's technique from the very beginning was not only narrating what happened in the past before the curtain was raised and nothing was left except the traces. But he wanted to present the past which can be known through revival. And when we reach the point of start of this past it appears that we might have reached with this thread to the point from where the play began in relation to this past.

Hence, in the second chapter Ikhnatun in his prayer for his departing wife hopes for her return and wants to converse with her so that she comes back to him,

I shall call her to restore her to consciousness
Where her body now and where is she now O' mother?
Let me go to her so as to tell her my grief
I shall throw out my loads of tears at her so that
Either she will come to me or I shall destroy myself between her hands

My heart tells me that she shall accept my prayer.[278]

With this stand the writer paves the way for the upcoming events and stirs our expectation for it. It appears that Ikhnatun was ready from the psychological perspective to verify what Ti had decided to convince him that Tadu had already returned to her life.

With this trick he presents to us Nefertiti, who would free Ikhnatun from his crisis, to uncover silently the truth behind what had happened and Nefertiti would get changed in his feeling to a figure similar to Tadu. By doing this he gets his freedom from crisis, if not his freedom from his love for Tadu. He actually loved Tadu and began seeing both of them as two faces of the same thing.

Bakathir has at length portrayed this line so that the reader might presume that it was the basic line of the play. He in fact creates varieties so that many other themes bifurcate from it similar to what the mistress Tai and her husband Aai represented. And also the line which is represented by the queen Ti and her husband Amnahtab the Third. The struggle continues on this line at the specific individual level. There is a struggle burning deep inside the queen Ti between the consciousness and the feeling of jealousy about the wife of her son Nefertiti and struggle burning inside Nefertiti between her love for Ikhnatun and her zeal and the shadow of his first wife Tadu and her remembrances which follow her at every moment and at every place. Though the writer prefers the consciousness to feelings of jealousy in the heart of Ti, the struggle continues inside Nefertiti which has not been mentioned categorically till the end of the play by the dramatist.

Bakathir takes us to the struggle in the third chapter of the play that is the struggle between Ikhnatun and the fortune-tellers (priests) of Amon and their

[278] Bakathir, A. A. *Ikhnatun wa Nefertiti*, Cairo, Maktaba al-Khanji, 1940, p. 45

followers. Through this struggle the writer mentions the basic theme which he wanted to present in this play. The readers will themselves find demanding with every previous chapter the attempt of discovering the general framework of the play and the basic theme in the play, because the additional themes are not connected organically. The relation of cause among the events is not available and therefore the certainty of the tragic event is missing in the Aristotlic meaning.

Bakathir in his presentation of this struggle mentions the event of moving of Ikhnatun to his new capital Ikhitaton which was later known as the city of *Til al-Imaran*. The writer diverts our attentions to this transfer in the second chapter. While doing so the writer does not mention categorically his view about the factors which led Ikhnatun to move to his new capital, which is explained by the historians that it was a part of the concept to provide the religion of Atoon, a secure shelter and a strong fort in every part of the empire to spread his message peacefully and securely. The concept for moving the capital of the country to Ikhitaton was not because of anger or malice in the heart of Ikhnatun against the priests of Amon and the citizens of Tiba Wahsab. Although there was a big share of anger and love to protect the self respect in this movement.[279] Ikhnatun did not accept that he migrated to Ikhitaton on the direction of anyone but he did it on his own.

Bakathir has explained this stand through the queen Ti that it happened because of Nefertiti's incitement, as per this explanation Ikhnatun decided that on the order of the God and not because of any other's behest or request. Nevertheless, the writer did not mention any decisive view on this stand. This explanation, to which the author shows his inclination, had a big impact on strengthening the psychological feelings in the heart of the queen Ti and her

[279] Hassan, Salim. *Misr al-Qadimah*, Vol. v, Dar al kutub al Misriya, 1948, p.271

concern for Nefertiti. It also contributes to push away the psychological struggle and its movement.

Bakathir also quotes the events of queen Ti's visit to Ikhnatun in his new city. He records this event wholesomely which brought back to the dramatic movement its missing vitality.

The struggle between Ikhnatun and the priests of Amon began increasing in the second chapter after Ikhnatun wiped out the name of Amon and took control of its religious endowments so as to spend in respect for his God in whom Atun believed. Then he decided to march towards his new capital, even though the director general of police Mahu tried to assassinate him. But the writer does not leave these events move on their own as per the `construction of the drama, which basically relies on the movement. But he mentions these events in a narrative and oratory dialogue through the tongue of the queen Ti.

This struggle reaches its peak in the third chapter. The writer wants to narrate these events through the tongues of the characters, which slowed down the dramatic movement. The writer did not present to us this struggle in a visible manner until the scene of the clash between Ikhnatun and the priests of Amon comes. This clash makes clear Ikhnatun's firm stands for refusing the politics of violence. He stroke back against them with evidence and proof and exposed them of their greed and their cravings. Ikhnatun stood firmly on his negative stand without knowing its consequences. Meanwhile, the queen Ti joins the general Horemheb and the minister Nakht in their stand in regard to peace achieved with using force.

These secondary characters play their role to strengthening this struggle. Thus, Sankara, despite his short role, contributes in pushing the events to its determined outcome. The writer used him to make Ikhnatun be aware of his fleeing messengers from Syria after their temples were destroyed. This cursory

following of the news leads Ikhnatun to a big anger and therefore he orders them to leave him alone. He realized his mistake after he had heard this news continuously and successively and this mutiny leads Ikhnatun doubt his god for whose religion's victory he sacrificed everything but he left him helpless and without any support.

This intervention from the subject point of view for portraying Ikhnatun's personality in this condition, where he doubts his god and does not believe him against this crisis and test because the messenger throughout his life was the last person whose belief got shaken because of these problems. His portrayal in this way is alright from the perspective of art for the main themes, the way he portrayed it in the beginning. He achieved the stability for the character artistically in such a way that it does not contradict with itself. When Ikhnatun loses his first wife Tadu he becomes heretic and denounces his god, because the edifice of his belief falls apart with falling apart of the edifice of love.

This is the stand of Ikhnatun in the beginning of the play and this was before he could deepen his belief. But at the end of the play Ikhnatun shows this connection between the love and belief in a reflective style and thus we see him losing his belief because of his wife Nefertiti's death whom he loved too much.

Ikhnatun realizes, after he regained his maturity and what was right and he began believing in his god, that the edifice of his works fell because the god's wisdom was missing from him. In this way Bakathir created in Ikhnatun a dramatic character as per the aristocratic meaning. Hence, he is a hero in whom the attributes of nobility and aristocratic social status accumulated in him. But he moves from satisfaction to misery because of a mistake he commits and thence he realizes his mistake when the time is over. The writer has made us to be sympathetic with Ikhnatun and to achieve this impact he has used the cause

of aristocratic pain. Thus, we express our sorrow for his fate, because he is a human being to whom sin comes when he waits for the good.

The end, which he designed for Ikhnatun, comes as a physical interpretation of for his literary and moral death. His physical death was necessary from the perspective of art for the artistic truth, though the historical truth is not proven, as mentioned earlier. If he did not make Ikhnatun die at the end of the play it would mean that there was a glimpse of hope that he could carry his sword, propagate the right message and spread his religion and it could impair the dimension of tragedy of the events. The dimension for which he relies on what has happened and there is no return to it. Probably it becomes clear from this analysis that Bakathir was trying to mix the classical trend with the romantic trend.

The hero in this drama is a Pharaoh King and the main characters are the Queens, Amirs, Princes and the Generals and leaders. He also revolves around the celestial of classic in terms of the poetical dialogue with which he has moulded the events of the play and the way he made the sad end for the play's hero and his great skill for portraying the characters in a way that each character becomes distinguished from others in their points of view, feelings and behavioural stands which contributed in pushing the movement of drama through continuous interaction among these thoughts and contradictory stands. The characters express the classical imprint with these psychological analyses presented by the writer in a style which indicates his originality in reviving the historical personalities in front of us through exposing the internal psychological struggles and this trend to present the internal psychological struggles is considered the style of the classics in their stands to dramatic struggle and their insistence that this struggle should be the internal struggle. He succeeded in presenting through these struggles some general humanistic examples suited in

every period and every place by his treatment of the feelings of love and self respect and by his treatment of the struggle between these feelings and the consciousness. Presentation of the general humanistic examples is considered one of the most important things which the classics try to achieve and even their literary work is called as the human literature. One can get this humanistic imprint in the play in his treatment of the issue of 'war and peace' which he focused in his work. This is a top class general issue of humankind. Therefore, the catastrophe which engulfed Ikhnatun at the end of the play touches the society as a whole. It in this meaning reflects the old classic meaning of the catastrophe in the tragedy.

Among the elements which belong to classicism in this drama is Bakathir's usage of some tricks which Aristotle has discussed and the classical writers have used, for example: the monologue and side talk- introduction. Thus, the monologues were his means to discover what's deep inside the characters and their psychological struggles, as the side talk was his means to discover the trick of the queen Ti which she planned against the mistress Tai, as mentioned earlier. The conversion of Ikhnatun from a heretic and non-believer to a believer and his decision to propagate the message took place by being aware of the queen's design and his liberation from the psychological crisis and his relation with Nefertiti in whom he saw the Tadu's figure.

Above all this, Bakathir preserved the lyrical unity or the unity of the general impact. He does not mix the elements of tragedy with the elements making someone laugh. He uses for getting rid of sadness the means which were followed by the classic writers to achieve this goal and from them are the songs and beautiful poetry.

But these classic elements get mixed up with other elements which belong to the trend of romanticism. The first of these was his violating the unity of topic or

the unity of action. We have seen how he mixed the personal experience with the historical experience.

His portrayal of Ikhnatun's personality reflects the romantic trend. The romantic writers have believed that,

> When a human being wants to realize the highest truth he should know, as far as possible, the universal pictures which the God has created and therefore the romantics loved the nature.[280]

In this drama Ikhnatun shows his utmost love for nature in excellent psychological monologues and he turned to belief through his contemplation in the God's signs in the nature and all the scenes of the beauty. The character of Ikhnatun in his portrayal of sorrows and feelings reflects the romantic depth and excessive emotion which reach in the hands of the romantics to exaggeration in their talk about the feelings and enjoyment of pain and singing it. And this strong emotion becomes firm in Ikhnatun's personality and become something the fate in directing the events towards the definite result, as the romantics did. One of the features of the romantic trend is that the writer is not bound by time and place frames. The events of the play revolve between the Tiba and Ikhitaton cities and these events occur in a period close to 20 years. The period of Ikhnatun's rule comprises at least 18 years and the events of the play begin at the end of period of the King Amnahtab and period of Ikhnatun's rule continues till his death.

His freedom from the frames of time and place made it necessary to mention the events in its right places. Therefore, he made Ikhnatun die on the stage in front of our eyes. By doing this he followed the romantic tradition, which

[280] Rushdi, Rashad. *Nazriya al-Dirama min Aristu ilal aan*, Maktaba Anjlu al-Misriya, p. 120

demands to narrate the events in its places and the heroes had to die on the stage, while they had to die in classicism off the scene of the audiences.[281]

One of the features of romantic trend is that the romantics abide by the location or place imprint[282] and Bakathir followed them in his description of the places around which the events revolve. It becomes clear by getting his historical sensibility reflected in portraying the theatrical scene. In his description of Ikhitaton city, the new capital, he takes us to live in imagination in the historical places, because of his poetical description of these places.

Above all, this is the writer's portrayal of characteristics of Ikhnatun's period, which was bursting with political revolutions that followed his call towards the monotheism.

6.2 *Ibrahim Basha*

This creative story portrays in the planned conspiracy to assassinate Ibrahim Pasha as a symbol for the Arab thought. Bakathir hurries up and exposes the mystery of this conspiracy from the very first lines of the second chapter. With this Bakathir has eliminated these elements of thrill in the internal texture which he added to the historical events. Bakathir uses the melodramatic trick to rescue Ibrahim Pasha in averting moment after he put sleep-induced Numan to Sarhan and goes to a deep slumber and takes the revenge for his father. With this melodramatic trick Ibrahim is rescued from the killing as he gets up from his sleep and the position changes moments before completing the crime. The events develop in this texture by the use of the artificial discoveries which use the disguising trick.

---

[281] Hilal, Mohammad Ghunaimi , *Al-Rumantikia*, Cairo, Daru Nahda Misr li al-Tiba'a wa al-Nashr, 1971, p. 172

[282] Ibid. p. 172

Bakathir could not get slippery spots of this mixed fabric (internal and external) and thus he mutilated the external fabric to meet the demands of the internal fabric and his stress on that was a cause for changing the play to a propaganda in view of the concern of the writer with the message which he wanted to make more clear than the story he narrated. Therefore, the play fell at the general line taken from the history in the narration.

This narrative trend is represented here in developing the events with time in a big serialized story which aims at narrating the events without moving them in a visible form and explains by repeating some of the positions of the hero and his views as well as the positions of his companions.[283] This highlights the narrative imprint of the dialogue and the oratorical lyric with which the characters throb and lead us to feel independent from the writer. Such a dialogue often burdens the play with explaining details specific with its topics in a story style which is not suited with what the speed and emphasis that dramatic dialogue requires and what the condensation that dramatic event requires.

Bakathir's partiality towards the Arab thought in this play made him not to portray his characters with its different sides. They are sometimes the angels and sometimes they are bad people as per the behavioural position, for which and against which he becomes partial. Therefore, he failed in many a time to create living characters from them.

Thus, Ibrahim's personality appears to be having epical attributes which sometimes stir the astonishing but he fails to stir the dramatic feeling. He stirs our surprise with his bravery with which the writer has expressed in many ways, for example his acceptance of the call of the oppressed and his preference for this to his sleep and comfort, thus, there is no problem if he gets late in his sleep

[283] Bakathir, A.A. *Ibrahim Basha,* pp.7-8

but "he should not delay the justice"[284] and he carries the morals of the fighter when the question of the prisoner comes, he refuses to free the Turkish army commander Rashid Pasha after his capture. Although the writer has proved for this character the similarity with its historical origin by painting a true figure historically for Ibrahim Pasha in his fidelity with his father, but Bakathir does not make any effort to provide his character with any dramatic imprint. But despite the factors and the interests that are conflicting in him, Bakathir does not make it clear to the readers except in the internal dialogue with which he begins his play, which does not become clear except for Ibrahim's curiosity to achieve the Arab unity and to revive the dignity of the Arabs. That is a monologue in which we hear Bakathir's voice louder and it does not carry to us anything new. All that he gives to his play is an oratory expression about the basic theme which he wanted to discuss in this play.

All other characters, in the play act as a mirror in which the thoughts of Ibrahim Pasha reflect in such a way that its dialogue turns to an attempt to justifying his stands and commenting on it. Meanwhile the characters through the narrative Bakathir does not highlight anything except some limited dimensions and the character which carries the dramatic value in this play is the character of Numan, despite the fact that it is an additional character. He is a human being who wants to commit a crime and he is aware of its ugliness but some conditions mightier than him block his way to redemption from committing the crime.

Bakathir deepens the psychological struggle in the character of Numan by strengthening excitements in him, when he makes Sarhan to ask Numan at the moment when he decided to put somniferous powder in his coffee, what's going on in his paradise with a lyric in it aiming at increasing Numan's astonishment,

[284] Bakathir, A.A. *Ibrahim Basha*, p. 66

then he uses a symbolic style to strengthen the excitements attached to this stand after establishing a relation between the moon and the mental condition from which Numan was suffering. Bakathir put Sarhan at the scene of the moon whose lights fell on the curtain that he "is a gentle friend who gives, he does not take, he makes sociable and not desolated and he keeps promise and does not betray".[285]

Bakathir also uses element of shadow in which he seems to be influenced by the scene of appearance of the shadow of Hamlet's father to Shakespeare. Thus, when he shows Numan his hesitation to commit the crime after Sarhan went to his deep slumber affected by the somniferous, we see that the shadow of the father of Numan appears to him and reminds him of not forgetting to take revenge for him and he shows Numan his injuries in his chest, neck and abdomen, through a frightening portrayal and he orders him to accompany him to his killer; Numan follows him while he had already taken out his knife from its scabbard.

This approach of using the shadows is considered the simplest means and the most preliminary to use this element and it represents showing the shadow of a dead human being on the stage.

This is how Bakathir suffers between the internal and external struggle in his play. The internal struggle is shown through the axis represented by Numan and the external struggle is shown through the axis portrayed by the hero of the play. Therefore, Ibrahim Pasha in this struggle represents a dominating power and defending force at the same time. Despite his dominance on all the characters and the stands he takes is the stand of defender in front of the main power which is fighting for him and that is the power of Turkish Sultan.

[285] Bakathir, A.A. *Ibrahim Basha*, p. 37

Bakathir exposes the reality of Sabir Beg from the very beginning and throws it on our faces in a single sentence, without giving him a chance dramatic movement. It has deprived the readers of the effect which was possible through what he discusses as its role of element of thrilling which results from concealment of character of the hypocrite and by concealment of its methods, which get exposed with continuing the development of the event. Bakathir finishes this struggle in the victory of defending power and its victory on the dominating power, because this defending power represents those values and thoughts which he intended to and tried to defend it.

In so far the dialogue of the play is concerned, the reporting style dominates it in narrating the events through a narrative method which does not suite the nature of theatrical dialogue, in which the emphasis and précis are considered its most important components it also loses its dramatic nature if it does not help to move the events before us in a visible manner. And this narration becomes clear with continuity in mentioning the dialogue of the previous events in narrative style.

The use of verbal trick has also made it overburdened in some places, as in the dialogue of Sarhan following his victory in Konia war "this is a day when we will get back our lost dignity, this is a day smiling heart and shining moustache. Its morning is pearl, its forenoon is silver and its late afternoon is gold".[286] The dialogue in many places gets burdened by the repetition in mentioning the event. Bakathir mentions an event and then again repeats it. It happened when he narrated Sarhan's method of deception by putting somniferous powder in his coffee so as to get Numan free to implement his plan before the occurrence of the events, which is repeated once again by this talk.[287]

[286] Bakathir, A.A. *Ibrahim Basha*, pp. 57-58
[287] Ibid. p. 33

The required actuality of the dialogue does not prove because Bakathir is concerned with his concept. He therefore puts his thoughts and explanations on the tongues of the characters to an extent that these characters are unable to separate themselves from him as an objective creation which has its independence. This matter reaches the degree of exaggeration and thus we observe some characters talking in a language which cannot suit them, as in the dialogue of Colonel Saif who for his justice to the Arabs and the Muslims becomes matchless to any Arab character of the play, despite the claim that he converted to Islam but he is a French first and before anything else.

Bakathir takes shelter to use some popular national expressions which acquired specific impact on the same public for its amalgamation with the national life, as we see in the talk of Zaid who speaks with Thamir about Sarhan "do you say if Sarhan could do o' Thamir? Have not you seen in the agricultural valley how I see the Turks the stars of the noon?"[288]

These popular expressions have its own characteristics and the towering personalities like Shakespeare and Moliere did not find anything wrong in including these expressions in their works. The dialogue includes some lyrical elements represented in internal monologues and in its use to contain in the dialogue. The most of these monologues revolved between Numan and his soul, and it seemed acceptable in the way that it exposed his psychological conflict between his duty towards his father and the rights of the friendship which bound him with Sarhan. He expresses by the internal monologue also his hesitation to commit the crime of murder and his misfortune which followed him because of his father who failed to take his revenge. These monologues get its dramatic value for being the only means to express the internal conflict which is presented by the author in this drama. The monologues is a trick invented by the

[288] Bakathir, A.A. *Ibrahim Basha*, p.

classics as an alternative for the Juqa songs in the Greek drama which presents these contradictory stands in the same hero.[289]

The other lyrical element is modulation and it is not by itself wrong when the writer knew how to use it and many were dramatists in Europe intended to quote the great poetical lines in their dramas. Maori Polten is of the view that the objective of modulation is high emotion because some of the restricted dramatic moments become broader with emotions where the poet find himself interested to borrow a part of others' verse suitable to these emotions and become capable of expressing it in a more artistic method and with more efficiency.[290] However, the quotations in this play, whether they are in verse form or modulation of Hadith, appear to be not justified dramatically sufficiently.

Bakathir in this play continuously mixes the classicism with romanticism in its artistic construction. Thus the greatness of the character played by the hero belongs to classic traditions and he also takes care of the unity of the general impact. Thus he does not mix the elements of laugh with the elements of sorrow and he uses the lyric to get rid of the sadness feelings, as the classics do.

This drama belongs to the classic trend on the basis of general human imprint represented by its picturisation of the stand of defending the country, his Arabism and his nationalism. The romantic elements can be seen in this play in the form of the internal and external conflicts. Thus, these two kinds of conflict go on side by side in the romantic plays within primary form.[291]

6.3 *Sirr al-Hakim bi Amrillah*

Through this drama, Bakathir tries to revive the personality of Al-Hakim bi Amrillah and gives it a dramatic construction from his own perspective which is

[289] Mandur, Mohammad, op.cit., p. 80
[290] Polten, Marjori, *Tashrih al Masrahia* , translated by Dreni Khashba, Cairo, Maktaba al Anjlo al Misria 1967, p. 223
[291] Nicole, al-Ardees, *Ilm al-Masrahia*, p. 135

strengthened by moral vision in his explanation of Islamic historical personalities.

The basic conflict in the play is shaped in the mind of Al-Hakim between the materialist and spiritual forces; we observe an intention struggle for a particular objective but it does not know the means to reach it and therefore it is bound to fail.

Al-Hakim moves on the path of getting rid of all his human attributes- which was his aim for his internal conflict- his cruel stands to order to kill his helpers and ministers and in his personal life he avoids all sort of cruelties and tries to get his body rid of all needs and thus he avoids the delicious food and takes only a part of bread and a glass of water. Al-Hakim imposes on himself the isolation so that he can see in the dark as he can see in the light, then he tries to save himself from the sedition of women and he orders to put Shams al-Jaria and the rest of mistresses in the boxes covered with soft velvet and sealing the boxes with iron and throws them into the Nile and then his eyes sheds tears with happiness because he got rid of the big temptation. This cruelty reaches its climax when he orders to buy a boy to kill by his own hands.

Bakathir highlights Al-Hakim's good traits while he is on the verge of committing the crime. He wants to make the boy happy and hence he gives him some sweet and he calls his son Ali to gossip with him so that he becomes peaceful and prepares for him a new dress. Nicole is of the view that it's necessary for the writer who portrays this kind of character to clearly present the signs of fear and aversion, which the crime committed by the hero, creates. Because when the writer ignores this the narrative comes down to low level construction and becomes a melodrama only.[292]

[292] Nicole, op. cit., p. 222

Bakathir paid attention to this and hence he reflected the feelings of fear contained by this stand in the mind of Al-Hakim's son when he saw the knife near his father before committing the crime and when he saw the boy killed by his father he fainted. The writer also reflected the feelings of fear in Al-Hakim's wife when she saw the body of the boy after he was killed.

Bakathir has also reflected upon the sufferings of Al-Hakim when he was on the verge of committing crime "O' God give me power to become similar to you, I get the attributes of an eternal force. The problem of last year was a sign of yours, I troubled thousands of people and they could not get your mercy".[293]

But Al-Hakim's character does not appear to be satisfied to us in its dramatic contradictions. The main broad characteristics of this character is that he is a Sufi who wants to attain the righteous Imam-hood by getting rid of human weakness and to overcome his love for life which does not fit with his stand to follow the secrets of the people and to set free the eyes of the spies who shower them with gifts. And to give punishment to a person who showed courage and to describe him as a devil as he did with Ghain, his servant after he ordered to cut his hands, he refused to call him a devil and hence he orders to capture him and to cut his tongue.

Despite Bakathir's portrayal of the character of Al-Hakim with multi-dimensions, it has visible external life which changes before us on the stage. It has also hidden life whose reflection we see on the world of reality and with this he has created a complete character which has life and capability for positive participation in the conflict between him and the other characters.

The importance of his character appears in his psychological greatness portrayed in his persistent determination which reaches the extent of bigotry in his chosen role. He does not appear during this role as a bad character. Bakathir

[293] Bakathir. *Sirr al-Hakim bi Amrillah*, Cairo, Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi, p. 15-16

has informed us of what the character's softness and passion portrayed in his love for his wife, children and mother, despite what his outer behaviour shows the impressions about a bad character which neither shows love nor mercy.

Another conflict begins between Al-Hakim and his sister Sitt al-Malik who criticizes him of inventing a new thing every day, because she fears to lose his father's country because of ambiguous behaviour of Al-Hakim. This conflict grows bigger when she comes to know about Al-Hakim's determination to make Abdul Rahman bin Ayas the crown prince. It further becomes bigger after Al-Hakim's claim for Godhood and his refusal of her advice for repentance from this big sin and the confrontation between them becomes very violent. Sitt al-Malik portrays the defending force in this struggle, while Al-Hakim represents the dominating force and he objects too many misunderstandings of Sitt al-Malik.

Sitt al-Malik got victory in this conflict because her personality was alleged to be wrong and at the end her innocence becomes clear. The end comes tragic in the modern meaning of tragedy. Thus, Al-Hakim's torture and the pains he suffered was a kind of punishment for his action. Therefore, the writer made him come out alive and did not design for him a painful end. Bakathir added to the basic problem of history of the play another problem by his own creation. He did not take care of slides of the one and hence the dramatic movement slowed down and its rashness got destroyed in many places.

The dramatic movement contains a basic change not in Al-Hakim's behaviour or core of his personality but in his relations with others. Bakathir attempted to pinpoint, with this problem which he created, the efforts to finish Islam and the conspiracy against it. But- despite connecting this problem with the basic problem- he weakened the basic problem and made Al-Hakim's character primarily contradictory when he made him verify the claims of Hamza

al-Zuzani that he is a God. Besides, this problem covers big areas of the play and led to hindering the movement at the basic conflict level. And all that justifies the addition of these events is the interest of Bakathir to defend Islam against the conspiracies. He put all the psychological leadings, which was coming out from the curtain of third scene; we hear the voices of the Muazzin at the time when Hamza distributes the sacred fire to discard this religion and probably the writer wants to convey that Islam's lights will spread and these heretic propagandas can do nothing against it.

All the characters of the play appear a joke so as to shed light on the attributes of the basic character and to explain its spiritual crisis. Bakathir made even Hamza al-Zuzani having a particular explanation of Al-Hakim. Bakathir did not discriminate amongst his characters and did not keep himself away from what he created but he just interfered in flow of the events and he puts his own thoughts on the tongues of the characters in a way which might appear at many places unsuitable for character's nature.

And also the plurality of the characters and repetition in narrating the similar stands spread the uncertainty in the play and do away the important characteristics of the dramatic work and that is emphasis and precision.

As for the dialogue of the play, there is repetition in many places. Al-Hakim says many things and then others repeat them as happened in repeating the dialogue about his psychological training on his tongue sometimes and on Hamza's tongue in other times. The dialogue also disseminates the events before it occurs and hence it does away with the element of interest.

The repetition is not the only phenomenon which burdens the dialogue of the play but also it is made difficult by internal monologue which Bakathir uses to highlight what is in the mind of Al-Hakim in regard to different stands. Bakathir sometimes inclines in moving the monologue toward creating another person to

talk to him. This person portrays voice of heart of Al-Hakim. It is indeed an innovative style to operate the internal monologue which provides it with a sort of movement and magnification.

The elements of singing in the dialogue contribute to defunct the play's movement. We have here the song of Shams and the mistresses of Al-Hakim which contains more than two pages where she recites the paired verses:

الأنس والبهجة = وراحة المهجة

ولذة الحـــــب = في البعد والقرب[294]

This song, though it provides the reader an opportunity to express a sign of relief from the horror created by Al-Hakim's actions, it lessens the feeling of fear but it becomes so long that the play's movement stops and the events do not move towards their decisive end.

These paired verses were not the only things which the dialogue carries the elements of song but also there is the poetic modulation which spread in the conversation in a big way. In some places it helps to create a high dramatic feeling, as one can see in the modulation of poetic lines of *Rabia al-Adwia* on the tongue of Al-Hakim:

فليت الذي بيني وبينك عامـر = وبيني وبيـن العالميـن خراب

إذا نلت منك القصد فالكل هين = وكل الذي فوق التراب تراب[295]

Bakathir does avail any opportunity to put the poetic verse on the characters' tongues. Many a time his characters deliver a long poetical dialogue and we have already mentioned the opinion of Elliot regarding this movement between the poetry and prose in the dialogue of the play and what the difficulty it causes for the reader or the spectator, while he consciously get the tool of expression.

The modulation of the poetry is not the only form of modulations which make the dialogue heavy. There are the modulations of Qur'anic verses and

[294] Bakathir, A.A. *Sirr al-Hakim bi Amrillah*, pp. 45,48
[295] Ibid. p. 10

these modulations do not serve any purpose of the dramatic aspect of the play. Its importance is confined to express the writer's religious culture and the linguistic syntax which dominates the style here. The example of the Qur'anic modulation is as: Al-Hakim's statement:

"المال والبنون زينة الحياة الدنيا والباقيات الصالحات خير عند ربك ثوابا وخير أملا".

وقوله تعالى "ما عندكم ينفذ وما عند الله باق".[296]

This study concludes that the drama in its construction rotates around the sphere of classicism in regard to aristocracy of character to whom Bakathir has assigned the role of heroism and that is the personality of Al-Hakim bi Amrillah and in regard to his commitment to unity of place. The events of drama revolve around one city that is Cairo and most of the scenes revolve inside the palace of caliphate, except the third scene which runs in Al-Zuzani's home. Bakathir also rotates in the sky of classicism in regard to maintaining for the drama unity of song or the sharpness of general impact, as classicism tries to respect it. He follows the same classic style to do away with the feelings sadness and horror and thus he uses the dance and song to create this impact till the tragic end in true meaning.

But these classical elements blend with romantic signs, which can be felt from his non-commitment to follow the time frame and in his shaping of joint problem in the drama. We notice here the beginning of impact of expressive trend in this portrayal of the spiritual crisis which Al-Hakim faces. This vision for environment and characters in the drama are presented through Al-Hakim's view point. Amongst the characteristics of expression is to find out the truth inside the human heart and it does not stop at viewing the external phenomena only as done by the reality.

[296] Bakathir, A.A. *Sirr al-Hakim bi Amrillah*, pp. 12, 26

The drama can be considered as having the trend of symbolism in regard to expressing Bakathir's personal vision through dual problem which he added to events of history and he has attempted to pinpoint the conspiracies hatched against Islam.

6.4 *Dar Ibn Luqman*

This drama is characterized by complex construction where different additional lines get intermingled with the basic line. It is also characterized by different additional conflicts and is bound by the main conflict in a unique cohesiveness. The construction of the drama became complex because its basic theme has been treated at different intertwined levels. Thus, at the general level there is an entire nation which faces the crusade invasion and tries to defend its country.

At the particular individual level there is internal texture which Bakathir presented equally with the common line which relies on modernizing history and it portrays the character of Ahmad which was invented by Bakathir and made it a pragmatic expression for the national struggle and he has given the basic capabilities which enables him to play this role because he belongs to the farming class.

Bakathir could bind the historical events with the general conflict envisioned by the drama with an attempt to present events of history in a cohesive artistic framework. To achieve this target he is helped by mixture between events of history and imaginative events and the invented characters which added to this frame a human figure which helped him to interact and develop. He creates a love story between Ahmad and Na'isa- they are his invented characters- which grows from the beginning of the play till the end non-imposed on the background or the historical truths, as was the case in the historical narratives

before this. This love story between Ahmad and Na‘isa exploited to construct a bridge between the Egyptians and the government system because a link is made between her and the young and nonurban Ahmad of the Ashmum community. This was actually an addition which gives Bakathir in the field of historical drama a vision of its broadness in such a way that it covers all the stands without confining to additional aspects.

What Bakathir lacks, is that he did not leave the events moved by them at the general conflict level. He did not present the decisive stands in this conflict in a visible manner and he merely narrated the story through the tongues of the characters, as he did in the narration of fall of Dimyaat and capture of the king Louise. While, Bakathir should have to find in these two stands a big scope for portraying the lighted moments in the struggle of the people till the king is captured, which is considered the utmost victory in this battle. And the reader fails to understand the main event the play portrays but in the last chapter. Fakhruddin says: “fortunately o’ my lord the common volunteers could light the fire in the big market of Dimyaat and the enemy cannot benefit from what’s inside”.[297]

Bakathir also confined to battle of the palace following the fight between Artuwa and Qatz and this matter became a point of criticism for the play, because this fight seems unnatural in a stand where the French should have tried to storm the palace with its entire people. The events of this day helped Bakathir to portray the decisive moments in moving the battle and probably the most important of these events was the encircling movement organised by Amir Bibras al-Banduqdari, which could surround from all sides the French general Cont Robert Arthu and his group at the gate of the palace of Sultan. Bakathir

[297] Bakathir, A.A. *Dar Ibn Luqman*, Cairo, Maktaba Misr , p. 18

confined to make us hear voice of Bibras saying: "I have closed the gate to prevent them and no one of them is remaining".[298]

The method of narration for mentioning the events is not only cause for defecting the play for dramatic movement but also contributed in this the stands which the writer excessively used to portray the enmity between the king Louise and his wife and psychological breakdown from which he suffers due to his doubt about her behaviour and his feeling for it increased by his mother's sin. This animosity and king's pursuit of his wife for his respect and his doubts have occupied big domains on which the unwanted sentences prevail and through this animosity it turned into a struggle which added to the struggles with which the play is full of without any justification for that, although the writer moved the dialogue in these stands with skilfulness.

Bakathir has also made excess for portraying the personal differences amongst the French, as enmity between the queen John, wife of king's brother. He has also made excess to highlight their cheapness and simplicity of their thought to an extent that even Ahmad, a simple farmer, could also deceive them easily, they leave him planning for their military planning. But their supreme commander king Louise appears to be a weak person shaken by the shame of the behaviour of his mother.

This excessiveness in stirring the crusade was on the verge of disturbing the balance among the fighting forces. It's known that the conflict- which is the crux of the play- must be amongst the equal powers. Thus, the basic conflict in the play is between the foreign occupying forces and the national defending forces, and this conflict cannot take its dramatic shape if the balance between various levels of fighting forces is not proved. And it's not possible to present this conflict the real heroes until their victory is against the equally powerful forces,

[298] Bakathir, A.A. *Dar ibn Lukman*, p. 122

if not more stronger than them. The French with this shape, which Bakathir tried to highlight, are a broken power and cannot be a side in this conflict. Had the writer achieved some balance- probably without any intention- in his portrayal of difference inside the Egyptian powers between the soldiers of Mamlukes and the commander Fakhruddin and then between Shajara al-Durr and the Mamlukes on the one hand and between Sultan Turan Shah on the other hand. He also pointed out their superiority in the battle in the beginning of the play on the tongue of Fakhruddin.

> When I saw that the number of the enemy and their preparation are more than us, I thought check them in a small battle where I found them very strong in the battle field, and then I feared that had I clashed with them in a decisive battle the outcome for us could have been bad.[299]

The basic traits also contradict with each other in the character of Fakhruddin with the justification which Bakathir has presented for his withdrawal from Dimyaat. He explained this stand by asserting that Amir Fakhruddin decided to go for a small war and he found the French very strong for the battle and he wanted with this withdrawal towards the eastern land so that the French steadily cross the bridge behind him and he will order to cut the bridge so that it become a hindrance between them and their ships kept in front of western land and hence they will get cut off from their supplies and they will come under his mercy.[300]

It appears that this moral trend, which decides Bakathir's view towards the Islamic Arab historical personalities, was responsible for getting this character shaken off and its contradiction. Bakathir intended to defend him and do away with an accusation that he was the main cause for the catastrophe at Dimyaat for his decision to withdraw to the eastern land. But he failed to defend Fakhruddin

[299] Bakathir, A.A. *Dar Ibn Luqman*, p. 19
[300] Ibid. p. 19

when he presented his justification for his stand by saying that Fakhruddin lacked a soldier's courage and his braveness.

There are historians who prefer that the reason for Dimyaat's catastrophe did not occur because of withdrawal of the commander Fakhruddin to Ashmum Tannah but because of absence of Sultan from the battle field and the rumour amongst the soldiers at Dimyaat that the Sultan is about to die. This is what Ibn Wasil has mentioned in his contemporary description of the events.[301] While in Joinville, the foreign contemporary source comparable to Ibn Wasil in importance, it is mentioned that Amir Fakhruddin dispatched the news of arrival of crusades' ships at Dimyaat by cards put on the pigeon and the cards varied three times a day without receiving even one reply and he believed that the Sultan had died. This presumption spread amongst the Egyptian army which became a sufficient cause to withdraw very fast before a crusade attack which he thought as a light introductory skirmish and some other light skirmishes will follow suit for a few days before entering into a big battle. Therefore, Amir Fakhruddin believed that he could temporarily withdraw his army from the battle field and he could go to first participate in settling the policy of state and the Sultani inheritance. Some of these explanations helped Bakathir to justify event of Amir Fakhruddin's withdrawal from Dimyaat and from these justifications he preferred what he has presented here in the play.

Bakathir tried to substitute him of this stand and he made him sacrifice himself to push the Mamelukes to fight against the invading forces and hence his character suffered from another contradiction because of his decision to send to France a person who can tell him about the fort and he did not prepare himself for the attack and thus he was attacked by the French suddenly while he was in the bathroom.

---

[301] Salamah. M A. op.cit., p. 93

The contemporary sources differ from one another about the person who led the crusades to the Salmoon fort. In Ibn Wasil (Mafraj al-Quroob p. 366) it's mentioned that some Muslims led them to Salmoon fort, while in Al-Ain (Iqd al-Jaman p. 208) it's mentioned that the French attacked from a ford in the Ashmum sea called the Salmoon ford. They were led to ford by people of Salmoon who were not the Muslims. According to Joinville a Bedouin offered himself to lead the French to fort for 500 gold pieces.[302] Some modern historians are of the opinion that there is no need to prefer one source to another for the sake of an individual issue and when it's not categorically referred to a specific person.

Bakathir has followed neutrality in the matter of this Bedouin and thus, he has not specified as to whether he was a Muslim or a Coptic. But he wants to cleanse the Egyptian history off the more dangerous reason and therefore he refers the matter of this Bedouin to Amir Fakhruddin and makes it a planning of a commander who is symbol for national struggle.[303]

Nevertheless, whether it was appropriate on the part of the writer to take up the events of history and re-explain them and decide their factors. Whatever the matter of this Bedouin and the ambiguity surrounding him, which helped him in this regard and what justification he provided for this explanation, he has put this stand along with the upcoming stands in such a way that the occurrence of events looked logical and the outcomes have arranged on introductions, or as the critics say he has proved for them because of the dramatic compulsion.

With this, Bakathir designs his end proven for the historical truth. The historical narration regarding the death of Amir Fakhruddin tells us that he was surprised by the storming of crusades of the Egyptian army at Jadila while he was in the washroom colouring his beard- as what's said- after they crossed over

[302] Quoted from Salamah. M A. op.cit, p. 93
[303] Bakathir, A.A. *Dar ibn lukman*, pp. 108-109

the Ashmum Sea from Salmoon side. And he hurried up to his horse and sat in it without any preparation or precaution to order the Ayubite Egyptian army to be ready for the battle and he faced a group of Dawia soldiers who surrounded him and attacked him and thus his Mamluke and other soldiers ran away from him and left him alone defending himself till a Dawi soldier could attack him with his spear at his neck and hence he fell from his horse and then he was attacked from all sides by swords until he died.

Bakathir stuck to the end, which proved for the historians the lie of accusations directed to him and attached with his personality since his withdrawal with the Ayubite Egyptian army from Dimyaat but it came without verifying the harmony between the events and contradiction of stand of Amir Fakhruddin here despite his knowledge about their crossing the ford but in fact he himself had planned this matter.

In this play Bakathir has created a living world by portraying the human side of the characters of Shajara al-Durr and Amir Fakhruddin through the silent love which bound them. The character Shajara al-Durr took the life from these human feelings and the writer could "retain her composure and made her almost not to point to her love but with easiest intimation and the she preferred her duty to her voice of heart".[304]

Fakhruddin also does the same thing and he gives her hint for his love silently. The writer has exploited this story to establish link between the chapters of the play and its events, as Shajara al-Durr remembered Fakhruddin at every stand whenever the Muslims got victory.

However, Bakathir's interest in distributing his views between the characters of play made most of them appear at the same intellectual level. He does not differentiate between his view and character's view in the stand of drama and he

[304] Quoted from Salamah. M A. op.cit., p. 95

did not confine to a single character speaking his views but most of the characters spoke about them in a way that it makes them surpassing their human truth.

In so far the dialogue of the play is concerned, it characterizes with simplicity and true expression of the character's psychology in many places. These are most important indications of dramatic dialogue and its example is the words which the writer applies through the tongue of King Louise. The dialogue also becomes distinguished by emphasis as a small text conveys a stand with astonishing excellence, as in the statement of Queen Margaret "in this way the ignorant and fanatics always accuse intellectuals of heresy".[305]

As for modulation in the dialogue is concerned, it appears less prevalent in this drama in comparison with previous dramas, as his modulation in a line from a poetic line on Fakhruddin's tongue,

"مولاي دع الأمور تجري في أعنتها".[306]

Again Fakhruddin recites a line from Al-Mutanabbi's poetry and the writer refers to the poet from whom it is taken but he does not do it always:

الرأي قبل شجاعة الشجعان = هو أول وهي المحل الثاني[307]

But these modulations appear fast and not informing about the movement of dialogue as they play a dramatic duty to summarise a stand which the poetic line intended to achieve. Sometimes this modulation discharges it duly for noble feeling, as in the stand where Shajara al-Durr and Fakhruddin wish to say to each other that they feel through the hints only.[308]

It seems that Bakathir succeeded in this play to escape from aggression of old language dictionary. We also do not find the modulation of Quranic verses in the dialogue except one place of the play, where the dialogue moves on the tongue

[305] Bakathir, A.A. *Dar ibn Lukman*, p. 47
[306] Ibid, p. 26
[307] Ibid, p. 33
[308] Ibid, p. 107

of Shajara al-Durr through the Quranic verse. She says while remembering Fakhruddin:

"لقد تنبأت بذلك ورسمت لنا كيف تعامله، ولكنك لم تنبئنا ما ذا نفعل بالسلطان إذا طغى في البلاد وأكثر فيها الفساد"[309].

But the dialogue was being burdened in some places by the internal monologues which Bakathir used to explore what's in the minds of characters, even though the internal monologues portrayed by the psychological dimension of Shajara al-Durr have contributed to bind her story with Fakhruddin with the basic line of the conflict throughout the play, as we have already seen. These monologues carry a high level psychological charge.

We also see the influence of song in the dialogue in these musical pieces sung by the people to express their happiness on the death of Dartuwa in the battle of palace and where they congratulate the commander Fakhruddin who was martyred for the sake of the country. But these songs did not defunct the movement of drama, because Bakathir has made it repeated after gaps of dialogue among the characters on the following pattern:

Shajara al-Durr: Stop

We killed your people o' Francis

We destroyed your respect

Aibak: Yes, my madam.

Shajara al-Durr: March of the people o'Izzuddin.

Aibak: Yes

Shajara al-Durr: With the victory of al-Sidda moved on to enter the lawn of the palace.

Aibak: But o' madam

Shajara al-Durr: I want to see them… do what I told you, hurry up

Aibak: As you order o madam (he goes out)

(the song is becoming more clear as they neared the alace)

Na'isa: It's very beautiful song

[309] Bakathir, *Dar ibn Lukman,* p. 172

Shajara al-Durr: Did you understand what they saying?

Na'isa: We killed your men o Francis

Mutilated you honour o Francis[310]

These songs contributed to lessening the feelings of grief over the news of martyrdom of Amir Fakhruddin. In spite of these observations, Bakathir achieved for the dramatic dialogue a big step toward the maturity, as we see the truths and historical information spread in the dialogue.

But Bakathir failed at the end to achieve unity of general impact for the play, because it consists of a dual end. The play ends by a monologue which explains the feelings of grief which mix with the happiness of Shajara al-Durr. And on the other additional lines the play ends with three marriages: marriage of Ahmad and Na'isa, marriage of Salafa and Jauhar and Saifuddin Qutr and Jalnar, "as it's a story of *One Thousand and One Night*", as some critics say.

From this analysis it becomes clear that the writer mixed between the classical trend and romantic trend. He rotates in the sky of classicism, as per the aristocracy of characters are concerned, to whom the role of heroism referred to and as per his portrayal of psychological dimensions of these characters and their internal conflicts, as he rotates in the sky of the general human imprint in their portrayal of stand of defence of country which is full of humanistic nature and these classical elements mix with romantic elements as his non-compliance of time and place framework, and as the play having no unity of topic. Its events rely on the rush of the topics as it is done in the romantic drama and then it unites between internal and external conflicts as the romantic dramas.

Whatever it may be, *Dar Ibn Luqman* is considered an advanced stage of the development of drama to the writer, the stage which he never attained in his any other drama. Bakathir did not achieve this maturity in any of his historical plays as well.

[310] Bakathir, *Dar ibn Lukman*, pp. 128-133

6.5 *Al-Fallah al-Fasih*

Bakathir does not start drama from the beginning of the ancient Egyptian story, but he uses the flash back technique and with the very beginning of the first chapter he takes us to the crisis that developed before the drama started. We see dissatisfaction of the farmer Khanom at the palace of the King Nej'aroa from his manner who himself failed to appeal for justice from a small employee. So now he ruled out that the king would appeal for his justice to the minister and went to the king who was waiting for him and started to narrate his story and from this point the threads of stand started to unravel.

We knew later that when Khanom was carrying crops on his donkey heading for the city to sell it there Tahuti Nakht met him and grabbed him of his donkey with the loads and walked away even acknowledging that he accused Nakht of being a thief or worse than that. As for Nakht, he presents Ranzi minister as a witness. Khanom objects the witness of minister considering him as an opponent whose witness does not tweak in favour of him especially after when he resorted to him seeking justice and was meted out with injustice and partiality and returned disappointed. Khanom was so stunned with the silence of king on his complaint that he faced him with strong words saying: "take my tongue if you have not"[311]. Despite this, king was silent when Ranzi was trying to arouse the sentiment of farmer in order to force him to speak. Then we see that Reya who helped farmer enter the palace was one of the followers of Ranzi. Bakathir leaves old story here and goes ahead to follow another way. He adds new elements that help him to include it into the thoughtful theme that he wants to put among the new ones.

[311] Bakathir, A.A. *Al-Fallah al-Fasih*, Cairo, Dar al-Tahrir li- al-Taba wa al-Nashr, Translation, 1966, p. 15

The drama construction contributed to the way that Bakathir presented following the style of starting from the end so as to unravel the threads of stand from the starting till the past meets the present and then joins the future. This construction provided the elements to increase interest in the story and used the existing elements of story to build an integrated dramatic stand.

The change in the ancient story was that the stand of king on the ancient Pharaonic story was attributed to Ranzi. *The Eloquent Farmer*'s ancient story tells that king ordered Ranzi ibn Miro to let the case of farmer get over slowly and that he would not reply to what he could say sticking to silence so that the farmer could not stop speaking. He further suggested him not to forget his children and wife without his knowing that he was behind the plan.[312]

This change provided the elements of conflict in the drama stand because the appearance of farmer before king indicates that he is about to appeal for his justice to those who did injustice to him and that he is about to make the conflict to be on equal terms with his suspicion about the justice of king as he strengthened this suspicion in the presence of the sides that are responsible for the injustice and partiality before the king.

This change helped to picture the character of Ranzi with new features. So the model of a fundamentalist human comes forward that utilized the silence of the king before the complaint of the farmer by making him believe that this negative stand on the injustice would increase his feeling for pain. From this pain comes the aura of art that guarantees the immortality for the king. Through all this he tries his best to ascend to the throne after shaking the reign of king as he exploded the feeling for injustice and widened its circles. But this real change that Bakathir made in the old story reflects strongly. It tells that king was glad with Ranzi recording the complaint of farmer than anything in the country.

[312] Lefevre,Gustave, *Ruiyat wa Qisas Misriya min al-Asr al-Firauni*, Translated by Ali Hafiz, Cairo, Maktabat Misr, p. 106-107

Therefore he ordered Ranzi to explain the issue of farmer in detail. Thereupon Tahuti Nakht was punished and properties of this greedy usurper employee were given to the farmer.[313]

The old story ended with justice of the farmer. This stand was not suitable for Bakathir wanting to highlight the conflict between injustice and justice. So it changed and made king to ponder over his doing injustice to Khanom. On this, he ordered to present the special register and then ordered to record his properties and transfer the ownership to Tahuti Nakht conditioning that he would give the farmer's wife and children food on the daily basis. This stand was suitable for the motivation that was described by the writer who did so in the love for art and for extracting the nectar of injustice. In addition to the imbalance between the conflicting forces especially when the farmer was sure that king would not appeal for his justice and his dream of justice was a mirage. This imbalance was a further push for the movement of events with the explosion of revolutionary sentiment whose sparks was ignited by the words and poems of the eloquent farmer.

The additions and changes that Bakathir made in the old story asked for the inclusion of other characters into the central characters that the Pharaonic story mentioned and Bakathir transferred with slight change in its names. The farmer's name was Khounanop[314] and Bakathir named him Khanom when Rainsy[315] was changed to Ranzi, Jihutankht[316] was changed to Nakht and king Vekaora[317] was changed to Nekaora and as far as wife of Khounanop he called

[313] Lefevre, Gustave, op.cit. p. 122
[314] Ibid. p 98
[315] Ibid. p. 98
[316] Ibid. p.107
[317] Ibid. p. 107

her Merih.[318] He added to these characters other ones that were not mentioned in the story. These secondary characters completed the dramatic sense of stand.

Bakathir succeeded in depicting the characters of the play and developing interaction between them and the stand through the funny dialogue as he showed his skill and expertise in connecting these characters through the central theme of the play. As for the character of minister Ranzi; it is a fundamentalist character having contradicting trends and aspiration to rise to the power. Therefore he equipped him with this feature to carry forward the conflict movement of play by exploiting the stand of king interested in extracting an aura of art in the hope that his era would be referred to just as one in which literature flourished and thrived. He took this position so that he could take people's money away and rob them of their properties. In return, he could become rich and distribute the money he got between his supporters. It was aimed at occupying the power.

Bakathir was successful in this play to choose one character as he made it has his ideas and make comments on the stands. He got the Queen take this role because she was always affectionate towards Khanom. She mocks the talk of both Ranzi and the King about the soul of life, because people do not need the soul if they lost life.[319] She sees that the idea about nectar of art is false and that the art is the very human soul. But she has the understanding of the essence of the artist's freedom. So the artist necessarily should be free from taking order and accepting dictation.

If Bakathir succeeded to formulate his ideas by the tongue of one character it seemed he made them from within the character of queen not from the outside because of the basic characteristics given to her on being characterized and

[318] Lefevre, Gustave, op.cit., p. 156
[319] Bakathir, A.A. *Al-Fallah al-Fasih*, p. 32

depicted as a noble person who rejects recklessness and has sharp sense and clever mind.

But Bakathir did not succeed to depict the character of farmer the way the play demanded and his development did not come to fore stage by stage. The character of the farmer is being seen in three phases; Khanom the disappointed oppressed farmer, the funny person at the court and the popular hero who urges mass on the revolution.

He in the first phase stands before king with bravery and courage criticizing and accusing him of injustice. But when he becomes one of his men his character completely changes all of sudden. And then he becomes parrot and above all, he starts to compose the flirting poems for the women at the palace and for the dissolute girls.

This change does not sound good with the indication of an oppressive factor including the farmer in to the men of king. The farmer who was forced to join the men of king was unlikely to be fortunate and satisfied before us. But rather he seemed to hide something. All of sudden, a joker in no time, turns a popular hero moving from one country to another to instigate the masses on the revolution and for the ouster of king. When the masses ignited and got revolutionized we saw him as a good and clean revolutionist denying selling out revolution or compromising it.

The dialogue of this play is very fluent and in standard language. Though Bakathir produced comedy work in the two plays but he introduced it through the standard approach. Even if some colloquial expressions came in the dialogue, it is not perceivable that Bakathir included the Quranic verses in the talk of Alma who- as was depicted- as a morally bad character. The dialogue has

some of the musical elements in the piece of songs that small girls sing from the poetry of Khanom.[320]

Song of Khanom is the inspiration of Queen:

Oh, ray of the Sun, tell me.
Did your eyes see like its a day?
In the beauty or perfection or elegance?
Oh, ray of the Sun, tell me.
Oh, ray of the Sun, tell me.
If it had all these features.
Is it like people from earth and water?
Oh, ray of the Sun, tell me.[321]

This type of musical pieces slows down the progress of the play.

As far as the elements of humour in this historical comedy are concerned, the most distinguished elements are hidden in the talk and they originate from it. That is why the laughing originates from the contradiction in the meaning of the coveted word and of the word uttered by speaker as in the dialogue between Khanom and his wife after Nakht informed her about her husband's matters as well as his dirty life at the palace.[322] In fact the laughing originally comes from the talk that expresses the fundamentalist trend of Ranzi and his tearing out the nobility to achieve his dreams.

Alma: Queen Oh, Ranzi, do you not fear of her that she would succeed to apprise him of the real condition if she continues to delay day after day?

Ranzi: Oh, my darling, king will always be captive of your love. No need for us to fear of him. God bless you. I rely on you in this regard.[323]

The Bakathir uses the style of censure and objection for Queen criticizing the moral value of Ranzi and his wife.

---

[320] Bakathir, A.A. *Al-Fallah al-Fasih*, pp. 39-40
[321] Ibid, p. 65
[322] Ibid, pp. 79-80
[323] Ibid, p. 58

As well, there is an element of humour resulting from the behaviour in showing the disagreement with the position in which wife of Khanom appears before the palace and her behaviour is lesser than the behaviour of society. The laughing emerges from the behaviour of farmer making fun of king and his silence on the injustice along with going deep into his mocking the stand of king.

The construction of the drama is apparently classical in the first chapter in which the central characters were presented and main conflict was put in place after the crisis or the difficulty grew up.

Bakathir emerges in the horizon of classicism in terms of unity of place as the events of play pervade in the royal court and its views spread through the different places of the royal court. He follows the romantic patterns in terms of the dual complexity as there is a central theme that the story of an ejected and disappointed farmer represents. With their opportunist nature Ranzi and his wife are tremendously taking efforts to ride the wave and rise to the power. There is a king who tries to be immortal through this genre of the art. But these topics are completely interconnected each of them has its own role to push forward the movement.

The drama is overwhelmed by the features of romantic comedy. It is that the serious or tragic element could be insured in the stand where the farmer is meted out with the injustice and deprived of his money. In these places, his words are rife with grief and pain that send the comedy into the symbolic drama directing the arrows of criticism against the brutal society and the strongmen’s exploitation of the poor. Thus the play contains one of the cunning elements in the conspiracy hatched by Ranzi and Nakht. So Merih stands defamed before her husband in connection with her chastity. The writer championed the joyous

element in the conspiracy continuing well-designed stands that lead to a series of laughing errors and amusing ends.

The features of romantic comedy are mixed with some elements of behavioural comedy as Bakathir depicts some of the opportunistic social manners that reflect Ranzi and his wife. Here Bakathir mixes different elements of comedy with each other. This mix up goes side by side to the classical trend and romantic trend in terms of art construction.

6.6 *Harb al-Basus*

It is the last drama where Bakathir shows his interest into the historical themes. It gives a historical account of the war of *Al-Basus* which might be literally a good record for the general picture of war of *Al-Basus* the narrators agree on almost. Bakathir mixes up the different narrations pointing to the killing event of Bujair bin al-Harith and his entry into the war[324] as well as his opposition to all the narrations that were mentioned in the killing of Muhalhil.

About twenty years after the war of *Al-Basus*, the events of the play start. Bakathir uses the flashback technique. In the first act to the crisis takes a full round; Hijras suffers from the doubt about his lineage and asks about the reason for the murder of Kulaib Wa‘el. Thereupon the dialogue goes back to narrate the readers whatever happened in the war and its reasons. The method of narration gives a major contribution to the play to deal with the events at length that took place out of the time frame and this is the very reason that the dialogue widened the events.

Bakathir tried to add to the historical events a story invented by its characters and events through which he could point out to the thoughtful content or the central theme he wanted to deal with in this drama. That is necessity of the Arab

[324] Salamah, M.A. op.cit. p. 128

unity, because the split into the country was the main reason of defeat. The invented internal plot arrives at the conclusion that the role of espionage and the agents resulted in the split into the Arab countries. This role was played by two characters the playwright invented, they are Zakwan and Nashwan. He wanted them to be the symbol for the idea on his mind. They, therefore, are playing the role of spies in favour of Rome and Jews. They kept spreading the venom of sedition in the Arab countries. But Bakathir did not pay attention to the pitfalls of double plot. That is why the internal plot played by Zakwan and Nashwan was not visibly noticeable by the end of the third chapter. Thereupon nowhere is balance between the internal and external plots that are pivotal to the events of the historical play and the first scene of the fourth chapter. Finally a meeting is held at the home of Al-Harith bin ‘Ubad to trial Zakwan and Nashwan for doing espionage as the threads of the story get unravelled through this trial. We were all left to watch the movement of the two spies throughout the three chapters in the intricate and cursory indications. This is the reason that the playwright failed to make the story or the internal plot sounds balanced with the external plot. He was more worthy to make it clear before us through the events that run in parallel and by moving the events before our eyes instead of narrating this tale through the trial scene and picture that makes the story to be separate from the central theme.

The conflicts in the drama earn its symbolic value from where they take place between people who the strong family bonds combine together. Bakathir in his drama, makes the readers aware that if danger happened to one of them it would for sure affect others from near or far. He points out to the danger that challenges the Arab nation. He presents through this complicated conflict a picture of society that was torn out from the inside. Therefore it was easy for anyone who wanted to hatch conspiracy against it to achieve his objects. But

when he learned his lesson, he stood to face the danger glaring into his face and rose above the narrow regional malicious feelings in order to take on the common enemy who is waiting for trouble against him.

We could not describe a character in the play as an absolute champion. The characters of the play are nothing but symbols for ideas and certain stands. It stands as witness to the desire of the writer on softening the meaning of independent individual.[325] It is an individual treatment in the play where every character of the play is considered as a part of a great one. The character of Hijras suffers from the psychological conflict for making efforts to belong to his ancestor as he shares his father's lineage. The fact is that he is the hero of the psychological conflict as he is suffering continuous psychological pain that he always describes in his dialogue.

Jassas: I did not kill alone. Your father too joined me.

Hijras: Al-Muzdalif?

Jassas: You have any father other than him?

Hijras: He does not know me.

Jassas: Not at all, he is father of yours.

Hijras: ….

Jassas: That you do not love your father annoys me.

Hijras: There is no one in the world who does not love his father.

Jassas: What happened to you that you do not respect him?

Hijras: I do not find any one who respects his father like me.

Jassas: What happened to you that you do not talk to him better?

Hijras: How I will not talk to him better while I have no body to talk to? I remember him every time openly and secretly. I feel proud whenever I mention his name.[326]

[325] Ardees, Nicole, op.cit, pp. 231-232
[326] Bakathir, A.A. *Harb al-Basus*, p.4

This suffering and grief spread throughout the play pressing Hijras's feelings at every moment when he faced his mother and uncle and also at the moment when he went ahead to kill Muhalhil doubting that he was his uncle. Bakathir shows him in open confrontation with his mother at the end of the first scene of the fourth and final act. At this moment, he gets sure of his real lineage and that Kulaib Wa'el was his father. His getting to the reality was a reason to get out of love for Sadi, daughter of his uncle Jassas and to kill his uncle.

Thus, reaching the reality will be a reason to dislike everything and to make a complete contrast stand from what had happened already. For the past affects the present and future. So neither Hijras could not defend what happened nor what did not happen. Both are connected with each other. Hijras and Jassas emerge together. Asma daughter of Imrailqais bin Ibban intervenes so as to rescue the stand in the melodramatic style while she leads Hijras and Jassas to the scabbard of their swords and then she takes sword of Hijras to protect him and she will give it back to him when he goes for fighting in Yemen.

The prolonged suffering takes him to the level of character of drama in the tragic sense. The other side that earns the character of Hijras much of the dramatic feature is that he takes much bigger task than his capacity and falls in crime of killing Muhalhil. Bakathir made him to commit crime without knowing the relationship between him and Muhalhil. That contributed to find out much of the difference of the stand.

He discloses hesitation of his motives to initiate this stand in the internal monologue. This hesitation takes him close to the style which Nicole calls a famous one in the character of *Hamlet*.[327] Nonetheless, this hesitation does not reach out to the dimensions of emotional revolution and psychological feeling which Shakespeare embodied in his inimitable play writings. However, the

[327] Ardees, Nicole, op. cit., p. 231-232

writer made it speed up the occurrence of the tragic act and he himself insisted on the confrontation instead of his internal problem. This led to the confusion about portraying the character on the account that the style hastened the occurrence of the tragic act.[328]

Lateron, he discloses the fact that Muhalhil is his uncle but this revelation comes after the killing was done. However, Bakathir hides Hijras's disgust for the crime after it happened and he only points out that he leaned over Muhalhil and bitterly wept over him. In this stand, he appears to follow the classics[329] regarding his explanation of Hijras, dislike for crime before and after he committed it and he did not point to any change in the character after committing the crime.

In addition to the narrative trend and style we find in the historic plays of Bakathir, he was eager to record each and every details pertaining to the topic. The nature of the topic seems to have adopted this kind of words without keeping in mind that writer addresses the reader and viewer of the 20th century. Bakathir used the monologues to disclose the nature of conflict simmering in the heart of Hijras. Therefore he discharged special dramatic responsibility in respect with dialogue that exceeds his committing crime.

Bakathir used the bilateral talks between Zakwan and Nashwan as they had effective impact on drawing attention to the nature of the hypocrite characters in this stand. Parody of poetry in the play is apparently common confusing the dialogue and halting its soft flow. They are the poems of the poets of *Bakr* and *Taghlib* tribes in the war of *Al-Basus*.

The play centres on the orbit of classicism in terms of its historic theme and its construction based on the flashback technique for the narration of events that

[328] Ardees, Nicole, p. 224
[329] Bakathir, *Harb al-Basus*, p. 222

took place out of the time frame of the play. There was a crisis that developed before the events of the play started.

In this drama one can see the convergence of both romantic and classical trends to bring out the tragic scenes to the fore while Bakathir follows the classical trend adhering to the stand of hiding the event of killing Bujair bin al-Harith as he reduces this event to the narration only by Asmah bint Imra'ilqais bin Ibban on one side.[330] We see him following the steps of romantics on other occasions by allowing the event of killing Hijras by Muhalhil come to the fore on the other side.

6.7 A Critical Appriciation to Bakathir's Trilogy

Bakathir portrays in his trilogy *Al-Dudat wa al-Thu'ban, Ahlam Nabiliun, Ma'sat Zainab* the struggle of people of Egypt against the French invasion until they repelled them from the country. We have already discussed the substance of this trilogy while discussing the theme and style; we have seen that the basic theme in it is that the country is not defended but by its people and this defence must be through armed power and organised planning. Therefore, the nation must have an army comprising its own people to defend it.

6.7.1 ***Al-Dudat wa al-Thu'ban***

The conflict between the people and foreign invasion has been discussed in this series. This is the main conflict at different levels. At the first level this conflict between army of invasion and Mamlukes seems to be missing from enthusiasm and seriousness and hence it does not come between the capture of Cairo by the French army. The leaders of Mamlukes were busy in their attempt to smuggle their wealth more that their business in repelling foreign invasion. At

[330] Bakathir, *Harb al-Basus*, p. 16

the second level the conflict between the people's struggle led by Sayed Mukarram and the army of invaders without any seriousness to repel the invaders because this struggle is not based on organised method. At the third level it is led by Al-Shaikh Sulaiman al-Jusaqi al-Dareer and his highlight of the first two shapes of the conflict was a means to stress the value of the third shape[331] that is the armed conflict which relies on organisation and planning until it reaches its culmination in the first revolt of Cairo. Bakathir highlights it at the general level representing the leadership and at the particular individual level representing the public.

Al-Jusaqi got special organising skill through his care for the group of blinds and his planning for their matters after he appointed a *Sheikh* for them in their corner which is known as Al-Shinwani following the death of Sheikh al-Shabrawi and a big wealth and properties were accumulated,

> Al-Jubruti has in details described the methods adopted by Al-Jusaqi to gather this wealth and how he inherited the wealth of the person who died from among these blinds till he became a wealthy and influential figure, who was feared of and whose order was listened to….[332]

When Al-Jubruti elaborately described the picture of Al-Jusaqi's character from the social perspective, he does not present Al-Jusaqi's role in people's struggle in details. Al-Jubruti has just said:

> …he continued until the pride overcame him in Francis period for stirring disruption from which he and others suffered and a number of them were killed in the fort and even his grave is still unknown….[333]

However, Al-Jubruti's acknowledgement for Al-Jusaqi that he played the biggest and most dangerous role in stirring the disruption is in fact an acknowledgement of his danger. From this it can be proved that Al-Jusaqi

---

[331] Ismail, Izzuddin, *Introduction of Al-Duda wa al-Tha'ban*, p. (d)
[332] Quoted from Salamah, M. op.cit. p. 99
[333] Quoted from Salamah, M. op.cit, p. 100

played a leading role in these events from which the Cairo revolt emerged later on. It can also be held that this movement was so secret that even historian like Al-Jubruti could not record.

Some critics are of the opinion that this ambiguous part historically of the Al-Jusaqi's personality provided Bakathir an opportunity to attach the role of leadership with him.[334] Bakathir has portrayed him as a leader because of his secret organisation and he develops the skill of Al-Jusaqi through this organisation in such a way that it becomes a political in nature. He could highlight through the insistence of Al-Jusaqi to obtain the concept of national army all the attempts of doubt about its possibility because the people of Egypt are not fighters. The Turks and after that the Mamlukes intended to keep the Egyptians completely away from the military. From the very beginning of the play till the end Al-Jusaqi advocated with all clarity and satisfaction about the need to achieve the concept of national army while the leader does not get satisfied with his concept. Therefore, according to some critics "the view of Al-Jusaqi in this period was narrow; despite it contained a very lovely objective that is to have a national army for the sake of the nation",[335] even though enthusiasm of Al-Jusaqi's was justified because of his excellent administrative capability and the brave army of blinds whom he sometimes use when he wants to get back the right of any of his people.

The character of Al-Jusaqi, as portrayed by Bakathir, is not a motionless character but it is soft which develops along with the development of events. Thus, his psychological stand changed when the French invasion took place and therefore from this period to his death he ruled out personal ambition absolutely for the throne and diverted all his efforts to attain the biggest national goal. Hence, he clearly refused the style of people's struggle against the invaders,

[334] Ismail, Izzuddin, *Introduction to al Duda wa al Tha'ban*, p. (z)
[335] Ibid, pp. (z,k)

which was led by Sayed ‘Umar Mokarram and he was working along with his public on this basis. The style of work, which Al-Jusaqi thinks appropriate in the given situations till a national army is had, is the style of armed national struggle. We see him, after Napoleon settled on Cairo, returning to his previous attempt with the Turkish leader and thus he tries to convince Napoleon about the need for national army.

Al Jusaqi: Have you given a thought to my earlier proposal?

Napoleon: About forming a national army?

Al Jusaqi: Yes

Napoleon: (Laughs) O’ Jusaqi this nation is not fit for the battle.[336]

Historically it’s not known that Napoleon accepted this concept because he was not unaware of the fact this trained armed national army might overthrow the French themselves. Therefore, he formed three large army units and he gave the commanderships to his supporters comprising the traitors and then he sent these units to crush the revolts in the provinces. Bakathir has mentioned the efforts of Umar al-Qalqaji for attacking on Kafr Ashma and killing its leader Ibn Shay’er, as Al-Jubruti recorded it.[337]

Al-Jusaqi kept on trying in hiding to plan the revolt of Cairo. But according to Bakathir he was the leader of that revolt and its real planner, even though he makes Sheikh al-Sa’dat interface for it to guarantee the people’s attention. This stand is the coining of the writer and the history does not mention it to us. At the end of the play we see Al-Jusaqi captured along with all those who were accused of inciting the revolt. Al-Jubruti has mentioned this event and he has also mentioned the names of all those who were captured along with him.

What’s stirring some historians surprise is that Al-Jubruti, while mentioning the death of other leaders, has ended the biography of each of them by saying:

---

[336] Bakathir, *Al-Dudat wa al-Tha’ban*, Cairo, Dar al-Katib al-Arabi, p. 66

[337] Salamah, M.A. op.cit. p. 101

"he (participated) in stirring the revolt and was martyred". But about Sheikh Al-Jusaqi he does not use the terminology 'martyred'.[338]

Probably in Al-Jubruti's stand it is a justification for moments of psychological exposition in the last moments of life of Al-Jusaqi in the play, while he faces his definite fate with utmost courage and refuses to divulge of any information to Napoleon about the revolt and its leader, while he knew very well that he will be hanged. But he finds in this stand repentance from many sins, he acknowledges some of them while some others are known only to Allah. With this the positive deed chooses a path to seek repentance from his sins. His stand was not an unknown suicide but he had a positive stand through which Al-Jusaqi becomes a symbol for the entire nation by slapping on the face aggressive invading power represented by the Napoleon's face. With this Bakathir has created from this character an ideal for the conscious heroism and succeeded in creating a complete existence for this character.[339]

Bakathir's interest appears clear to record all the historical information which he gathered about this period. For this stand there was a bad impact in the movement of play and thus the narration suffer in many stands, even in portraying the important events Bakathir only mentions them through the narrative dialogue and he does not leave them to move on their own in a visible shape, as it's seen in his narration of farmers and Bedouin facing the French.[340]

One of the demerits of the dialogue of play is louder voice of Bakathir through it in a way which highlights the less understanding of duty of dialogue and need for the character which does not suite its nature and stand. He made Napoleon speaking about Islam in a style which cannot be believed, especially

[338] Awad, Ahmad Hafiz, *Fathu misr al Hadith au Nabilun Bonabarte fi Misr* , p. 255
[339] Ismail,Izzuddin, *Introduction to Play*, p. (f)
[340] Ibid. p. 10

when he talks to Bosailaj, director of financial affairs for the campaign and there was no need to adopt this style.

> Bosailaj: Principles of our big revolution?
>
> Napoleon: Freedom, equality and fraternity?
>
> Bosailaj: Yes
>
> Napoleon: This is Islam which came 14 centuries ago.
>
> Bosailaj: Really?
>
> Napoleon: In a complete and greatest humanistic form.
>
> Bosailaj: But we don't see its influence on these Muslims?
>
> Napoleon: The foreigners have corrupted them and a long period has passed over it and thus its signs have gone but it's available in the Quran and life of Mohammad and biographies (lives) of his companions are waiting for a person who can remove its rust and it will shine once again.[341]

The moral trend of Bakathir is clearly seen in his explanation of events and in the analysis of factors, and also in his portrayal of some characters. This moral trend was amply clear in the plays of Shawqi and then Bakathir followed him in this stand. This trend becomes clear in *Al-Dudat wa al-Thu'ban* in his explanation for the reasons which led to the first Cairo revolt. Thus, despite the fact that this revolt had economic reasons which Al-Jubruti has mentioned in details and many historians have agreed with him on this, we see Bakathir following the narration of Naqula al-Turk[342], because what Naqula al-Turk has narrated is suitable for his moral trend. He therefore mentions the killing of Sayed Mohammad Mokarram as one of the reasons for the revolt, which enflamed the anger of the masses, apart from the Muslim women's going out of their homes without veil and their roaming around with the French soldiers on the streets. In addition to demolition of mosques and removal of gates, all these occurred in the narration of Naqula al-Turk. There is no doubt that these reasons

[341] Bakathir, *Al-Dudat wa al- Tha'ban*, p. 63
[342] *Jikr Tamalluk al Fransawia li al-Diyar al-Misria*, quoted from Ahmad Hafiz Awad, op.cit, p. 238

were precursors for the real cause in the form of project of taxes but it these were not the actual reason. But Bakathir prefers to take them because they suited his moral trend and this moral trend is seen clearly in the form which he highlighted for Mohammad Karim as we see him agreeing with Al-Jubruti in his attempt to exonerate him from the collaboration with French and his service to them but he makes this collaboration a service for the national movement.[343]

Bakathir does not stop with exoneration of Mohammad Karim from his collaboration with the French but he makes him express, with practical satisfaction, the concept of national army.[344] But Bakathir describes his as the martyred and presented the high example and enflamed the fire of anger in the minds of the masses. He agrees in this stand the English orientalist Abdullah Barown who had special astonishing with Mohammad Karim and who said in his book *Bonaparte* in Egypt that Mohammad Karim refused to pay the ransom and died with martyrdom. [345]

Despite the fact that Al-Jubruti describes their behaviour as having a deadly terrorist imprint whenever a revolt began or the chaos. As for the imprint of justice and sovereignty of rule, it prevailed in the periods of political stability.

6.7.2 *Ahlam Nabiliun*

This series portrays the time span for historical events resulting out of the first Cairo revolt and the excess anger of the Egyptians against the French. But Bakathir failed to make concept of basic conflict portrayed in front of our eyes that is the conflict between the people's struggle and the foreign invasion. Thus, the stands of the play and its events stresses on a individual tragedy in which the writer has busied himself with the issue of defending the daughter of Sheikh al-

[343] Salamah, op.cit. p. 106
[344] Bakathir, *Al-Dudat wa Thu'ban*, p. 74
[345] Awad, Ahmad Hafiz, op. cit, p. 218

Bikri and presenting an exonerated picture of the accusations. Therefore, the thread of conflict which he presented with all clarity in the first series *Al-Dudat wa al-Thu'ban* got disconnected. And his stress on the stand whose events he invented without characters was a reason with which the play suffered at the level of general conflict or the external texture for unfolding, looking at the insistence of the historical realities on him and his interest to record them completely, which made the play full of comments on the events which occur outside their time and place boundaries. As in his narration of event of occupation of the throne by Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar then the Napoleon's campaign on Syria and his defeat at the walls of Aka. The characters in these places turn into narrators of those events and comments on them and which distances them from their nature as dramatic characters which take its root from the movement inside the developing event. With this Bakathir broadens the circle of conflict to make it contain the struggle of the Arab countries against the French invasion without paying attention to what's in this manner of disintegration and loss of events' axis.

Bakathir's willing to explain the details related to the event which he invented to portray relation of Napoleon with the daughter of Al-Bikri, among them is the mention of event of Islam of Napoleon and declaration of his Islam and whatever the minute details associated with this, even he justifies the acceptance of Al-Bikri for marrying his daughter Zainab to him. If we add this, we will realise to which extent the movement of the play suffered from slowness and made the growth and completeness defunct.

Bakathir does not present in this drama except the external conflict, which is the best colour of the conflict initially in the opinion of Nicole.[346] In addition to the basic conflict between the people and the foreign invasion, which appears

[346] Nicole, al-Ardees. *Ilm al-Masrahia,* p. 135

here in the background of the picture in a cheap shape; there is conflict between Napoleon and Kaleebar and between Kaleebar and Mainu but they are conflicts which take the shape of verbal competitions.

Bakathir in this drama does not present any internal conflict. The nature of drama and dramatic width for its events do not allow the presentation of this sort of conflict, but it takes us to internal world of the characters in quick moments.

Napoleon: I am well versed in this and I can teach you

Zainab: Probably, but

Napoleon: I have agreed with madam Fouzia on this

Poleen: (Separately) with Madam Fouzia[347]

As he highlights the deeper feeling of Napoleon for not belonging to France in a short monologue Saniur Bonabarta after designing all these glories.

The only character written by Bakathir inside the dramatic crisis is naturally the character of Zainab. The first thing which we observe in the portrayal of the writer for this character and its crisis is not celebrating with external intellect for this character or the crisis which he has put in it. And what he understands is that the character should be reasonable in regard to conceptual trend of the play.

The most important traits which Bakathir has given to this character are that she is a woman of self respect who refuses to become something which can be gifted because she is not a mistress (p.7), she is a cautious human who calculates the matters minutely:

Zainab: My heart is small which cannot contain all of your dreams

Napoleon: If your heart loves me it will broaden and contain my dreams

Zainab: Your language is sweet. But…

Napoleon: But what?

Zainab: I fear that whatever you say is for women always

Napoleon: Never, this cannot be said but for you

Zainab: (with low voice) and madam Fouzia?

[347] Bakathir, A.A. *Ahlam Nabiliun*, p. 6

Napoleon: (with low voice) This is my way towards you

Zainab: To whom I will become your way?[348]

But Zainab's nationalist emotion seems to be dominating her behaviour and she keeps this emotion in her dream for the great Arab empire. Bakathir makes out of this dream a factor for her involvement in the contradictory stands with her character's basic characteristics and he explains with this her deception with Napoleon's language about this great Islamic empire, then her acceptance to marry Napoleon despite his trick to delay his conversion to Islam and his shrewdness about fulfilling his promise with her by declaring this marriage after the attack on Syria. Zainab revolts against this stand and she chases him from her home because it will not cost him anything and he is everything for her. But she refuses the proposal of Poleen to stir his respect through Bohartia, son of his wife Jozfeen till he comes to her rule and celebrates his marriage with her. And she sees in this behaviour arm which cuts her before it cuts him. She also refuses to announce to the people about this marriage and wanted to inform them about the receipt. But her hopes shrink, because of Napoleon's insistence on his stand, of his ambition for throne and empire on which shall sit soon and wants to become a wife who is recognised "you failed to make me Sultana (emperor) but you don't fail to make me your wife"[349].

Zainab realises that her problem can be solved only by her and that's why she insists on celebrating the marriage first, then the divorce after Napoleon agrees on the aim of her parents by her divorce and she teases him when he complies with her request that she is not serious about the divorce and thus she tells him about her feeling with him and that his love did not touch her heart.

[348] Bakathir, A.A. *Ahlam Nabiliun,* p. 8
[349] Ibid. p. 36

But Zainab does not seem to be satisfied with this stand as a human of flesh and blood. Bakathir wanted this character to become a symbol for the metaphysical things and hence it suffered from the contradictory and instability, because he failed to convince us of factors logically. But he presents out of it a dramatic character in the true modern meaning for the drama, which emphasises on the responsibility of individual character towards to its actions. Zainab realises that her responsibility is individualistic because none hates her for this stand. Therefore, she refuses her cousin's proposal to marry her, because she sees in this stand a mercy on her and she does not want anyone's mercy…she wants to own the responsibility for her actions. If there is any culprit about her right its Napoleon because he deceived her and hence she expects punishment for her and Napoleon which she sees. And which portrays her attempt to abort the child she carried in her womb and which Napoleon wants and he postpones the announcement of their marriage on her bed. The abortion of this foetus is a suitable punishment for his stand and its death for Zainab will be a symbol for the death of a foreigner, who deceived her and led to this painful result.

Zainab crosses the boundaries of her individual character in her pains, as these boundaries crossed in her dreams. She cries sorrowfully for her false expectations and for loss of her respect, the respect of her family members, of her country and her nation. She lost her naivety and nothing was left for her to fear for and that is why she disrespected Napoleon and she gossips about him with Boharni Fardina to shake him at fell. But Bakathir does not satisfy us with her change of mind about him after Napoleon's travel to France suddenly. Thus, we see her going to Kaliber who succeeded him to lead the campaign and she asked him to send her to Napoleon repeating his words 'here it is not impossible' when he tells her that it is impossible. Her dreams for power come back to her if it is started from the west as Napoleon told us. Her character

contradicts dangerous with the basic trades given to her by the writer. Thus we see her divorced and calling him ‘my husband’, while she was refusing to accept the undeclared marriage and she insists before her divorced to declare the marriage. This change in her basic moral stand does not appear to be satisfactory and her actions contradicts with the characteristics of her character, as Bakathir designed it in the beginning, when she decides to travel to him with Poleen so as to become with him by saying that she will never refuse him even if he rejects her.

Bakathir tries to clear from what is referred to her of shamelessness and her violation of the societal values and her accompany with the French. But Bakathir got in contradiction and he could not get her character perfectly and hence it felt in his hand. She appeared in many places of the play as a buffoon woman; despite the fact he tried to clear her from these traits. Zainab appears as a flat character led by the writer as he wishes and, he is not led by the logic of events and he wants her to save what he wants and therefore what she says is not suits with her character. Bakathir failed to portray her as a woman who lives a life which is full of conflict because it has the same dimension and we can only see what is outside and we don’t know where her character lies in heroism and nationalism, as he wanted to portray her and do justice and to clear her of all the accusations referred by the history to her, as it appears in many places of the drama. She leaves her lover and fiancé Mohiuddin and chooses to marry Napoleon. Bakathir does not present to us except non-satisfactory oratory words for justifying her stand with nationalistic factors which move her behaviour. Thus, she is a nationalist who dreams for the inclusive Islamic unity and Napoleon associates her with ideal capable of achieving this dream. If this justification is logical for a character which crossed the boundaries her feelings relating to her preoccupation to the sorrow, Bakathir has failed to present the

destructive conflict which the heroine lives between love and nationalism. It was possible for the writer to explore the influential dramatic stand, but he only touched its internal construction with cursory short words "secret of my tragedy is that I love you".[350]

Bakathir could prove the link between the characters through the similar relations. Thus, Poleen has relation with Zainab as the broken bones and both of them were the victims of Napoleon deception and Zainab has links with Boharti for their resemblance in jealousy against Napoleon and the willingness to take revenge from him, as in the case of Fardineh, who is jealous on him for his attraction to his wife with a trick. Bakathir proves the link between Zainab as symbol for the tragedy of her generation through similarity in stand between her and with three girls presented by writer in an abstract form as the symbol for hundreds of others who faced the same fate. Then he stressed this similar in fortune on the tongue of Zainab "…I am the daughter of Arabs as you are…Allah may forgive us and all those who are similar to us of losses".[351]

As for the dialogue, the same narrative shortcoming is repeated because of writer's desire for mentioning all the details associated with events of history. One of the shortcomings of the dialogue is the clear prayer music where Bakathir uses the characters for call for his views which he believes in, for example:

> Kaleeber: They have become daring to us because of your exaggerating affection for them and your appreciation of their religion
>
> Napoleon: My affection for them has enabled us to remain with them until today. As for my love for their religion is concerned, by God this is a religion which is loved by all those who have good nature, free mind and high spirit.
>
> Kaleeber: Know I got to know that your praise for their religion is not for the sake of familiarity with them but you believe in it.

[350] Bakathir, A.A. *Ahlam Nabiliun,* p. 54
[351] Ibid.

Napoleon: Yes…Why I should not believe in a religion which conquered half of the world in 1o years?

Kaleeber: And it punishes all those who take liquor?

Napoleon: If you o' my friend could know what's the wisdom behind this law.[352]

The dialogue continues on this music without the botheration of the writer about its length so that it can contain all of his thoughts, even he makes Napoleon speaking about the explanation of a Quranic verse and hence the development of event of drama whenever this discussion ends, in which we hear the voice of writer louder in a way which does not suit the nature of the dramatic art. This is not the only stand where Bakathir put his thoughts on the tongues of the characters.

These observations do not prevent us from mentioning here that the writer's dialogue in this drama is not burdened by the monologues and whatever the monologue it has does not make it prolonged but it comes in short sentences which discharge a particular duty and goes on without hampering the movement of the dialogue.

6.7.3 *Ma'sat Zainab*

This drama represents third series of trilogy in which Bakathir tries to reach the source of conflict between public and government after he covered the conflict in second series.

The drama captures the flash back of the events up to the conflict that evolves between French, Turks and Mamluks to take control over Egypt by the departure of the French. Through this conflict that culminated into the second revolution of Cairo, Bakathir defends the national elements as some of them joined Turks because they were Muslim at least and some joined French under these true and sincere motives that they would leave their country once the

[352] Bakathir, A.A. *Ahlam Nabiliun*, p. 15

Turks and Mamluks get defeated. Subsequently they would finally regain their country getting rid of the foreign control. Bakathir however, sums up the stands of the conflict in a narrative style without going around the events. This is the stand of Zainab and her uncle Muhiuddin whom she questions about the news and on her question, he tells her about the revolutionary events of Turks and Moroccans in *Khan Khalili*:

> Zainab: what is going on Oh Muhiuddin?
>
> Muhiuddin: Revolution is everywhere; crowds are calling for *Jihad* in the way of Allah.
>
> Zainab: But for the sake of Sultan, Nasouh Basha deceived people in the name of Din while he had nothing to do with it.
>
> Fardbeh: But how did you start?
>
> Muhiuddin: I started *Khan Khalili* from Turks and Moroccans.[353]

Bakathir represents the events of initial conflict in the narrative style through this Trilogy. He opted for this narrative style for his eagerness to go deep into all the aspects of it. The writer made us see Sheikh al-Jusaqi having influenced some of the characters he included into the historical background and he described as the followers of Sheikh al-Jusaqi. The role he attributed to them seems to be unclear and undefined and hardly tells something of the development of the conflict between the French and Turks. After Sheikh and his followers came with a special secret plan that characterizes style of the organized resistance in the first series.

Their role does not go beyond conveying the news between the fighting foreign occupants. This role seems to be negative and their role does not have any sort of the positive feature in the first series. So Bakathir failed to develop the play event on the conflict level that he wanted to highlight. He however, did not succeed in achieving the indispensable unity and continuous integration of

[353] Bakathir, A.A. *Masat Zainab*, p. 12.

stands and characters. After unravelling the thread of main conflict in the second series, he came back so as to highlight it a poorly- negative way in the final series.

In this drama, Zainab continues a character that tries to develop it and turns from the phase of negative aspirations to that of positive action to achieve these dreams. She changes her stand after she knows that Muhiuddin works for his own personal dignity and that the dreams by which she was deceived is nothing but a mirage. Therefore, with her dreams, she now shifts to Clipper. But this time, her dreams centre around that he would fulfil his pledge by fleeing the country because freedom from the imperialism is the first criteria to achieve the dream of the Arab unity. Zainab deprived herself of her cousin whom she loved and with whom wanted to be forever. Later on, she gave up this stand for his being unable to achieve her dreams and held on to this stand that continuing poetry was not a gentle thing while her country was surrounded by the great threat. She followed the way of Sheikh al-Jusaqi and got training on the arms to fight against Turks and Mamluks.

Fardbeh:Yyou know the use of fire arms?

Zainab: Each of the followers of Jawsaga got training on the arms.

Fardbeh: You were not his follower?

Zainab: Today I became his follower.[354]

On this stage, Zainab seems to be a character that faces a big misunderstanding from the national popular elements. They accuse her with supporting the French enemy of Islam. However, she endures the hope that the French would end up the rule of Turks and Mamluks and would leave for their country. And after the exit of French, she would intensify the struggle against the British power and boost the trend of Al-Jusaqi's followers. Then she would ascend to the position of a popular hero, but the freedom struggle took her to an

[354] Bakathir, A.A. *Masat Zainab*, p.15.

extremely sorrow end. Each of the elements of Turks, Mamluks and British came together to torture and kill her justifying their claim and action. Zainab moves on until the execution is ordered after she uttered her words like daggers in the heart and slapped the British commander in their face just like Al-Jusaqi did with Napoleon and prays to Allah to hold the flag of her country aloft and provide from inside the country those who protect it.

This finally comes as atonement for her mistakes. But she does not evoke our emotion with her painful end because she commits mistake consciously perceiving what she does. The true factor in the play character is that she must regard herself as superior. Zainab however, ignores the mistake or poor characterization that leads her to the bad end. But she strikes our chord with the noble aspect we ourselves recognize and feel sympathy for it with Bakathir expressing her national emotion.

For Bakathir, the moralism once again, stands superficial and holds much of the stands and events that seem to be untrue in almost all the places of play as Bakathir mentioned the event of the killing of Clipper by Sulaiman al-Halabi that caused a lot of events in the play. Bakathir turned to justify the position of Sulaiman al-Halabi on the killing in the guise of nation and on the account of eagerness to fight the occupant. While Al-Jubruti tells that Al-Halabi did so in the greediness of money. But Bakathir regards him martyr in the way of Allah seeking entry into the Heaven with the killing of Calliper and not wanting to flee with fear that the Egyptians would be accused of killing him and they in return, would be tortured and persecuted.[355]

For the record of all the details, the dialogue took the narrative shape because in the view of time limitation factor, the limitation of play does not

[355] Bakathir, A.A. *Masat Zainab*. p. 30

accommodate each of all events to build a complete play. Thus the dialogue became more accommodative for the event of play.

The dialogue of the play was made beautiful by the usage of the French words such as *Oorvoar* in the talk of Frenchmen and *Aussies Khrciss* by Turkish Pasha. Sometimes, the dialogue has the blend of colloquial and standard as it uses some of the colloquial words and popular slang expressions. But the formulation of the popular examples that earned acceptance among locals does not suit the nature of character when it is put on the tongue of French.

The impact of Bakathir's religious lexicon is apparent in the parody of some of the Quranic verses on the tongue of Zainab (pg 42, 57, 65, 70). Such these Quranic parodies reflect the arbitration of the religious lexicon in the style of writer and show the decorated character of Zainab getting out of the boundaries of realism to appear before all us. It seems that she has memorized the Holy Quran that contradicts with her character as Bakathir characterized it and has a sharp contrast with the stands in which writer showed her as an offensive character having wine in the *Alteoffal* nightclub.

It becomes clear from this analysis that Bakathir wants to present the frustrating characters in trilogy. This inclination urged him to deny these characters any kind of the well-shaped tragedy.

If the series of the central idea were lost in some of the places or its links were not in order all the stands to us would have pointed to one aspect of all those of the conflict that constituted the central idea in the Trilogy. The Trilogy apparently discloses the freedom that Bakathir granted to himself to mix all the trends with each other as a part of the art construction.

Bakathir makes rounds and rounds in the orbit of classicism to go back to the history and to prolong the events of play as well as to use some of the classical technique such as monologue where in Trilogy he portrays the nationwide

struggle against the foreign invasion. It is the stand in which the human being has been equal and common every now and again.

There is a depicted scene in which we see him mixing the stands of classicism and romanticism with each other regarding an offensive scene on the stage that makes Clipper meet his unfortunate fate at the hands of Sulaiman al-Halabi far away from our eyes keeping pace with the stand of classicism in this regard and keeping pace with the stand of romantics in the last scene.

Through this it seems that the features of the romantic trend into individualism while the emergence of Bakathir's entity is visible in his depicting the characters of play and its dialogue. He considered them as an approach to the issues of his country while he presented the play as an idea having social message in its fold for all. Bakathir seems to keep pace with the romantic trend but he neglected the principle of rationalism and distanced himself from the reality on which the classicism laid emphasis in depicting the characters and developing the dialogue. Thus he goes against the principle for separating different kinds of plays or the unity of the melodies that the classical cherished. It however asked for the separation between the serious and comical elements in the one work. Therefore we see him following the romantics in their mixing laughing with weeping as he takes away the movement of the play in *Al-Dudat wa al-Thu'ban* for the purpose of laughing at Ibn al-Jusaqi in a play that has a lot of biting jokes and clever remarks and as in another play in which two blinds pushed each other over Brtlim in the end of play.