

مناجاة النفس باطللة ، غير صالحة في الدراما الحديثة

رافد سامي مجيد
كلية المأمون الجامعة

المستخلص:

مناجاة النفس هي وسيلة أدبية غالباً ما تستخدم في الدراما حيث تعبر الشخصية المسرحية عن افكاره(ها) ومشاعره(ها)دون توجيه الخطاب إلى أية شخصية أخرى. وتختلف مناجاة النفس عن المونولوج الذي هو مشهد مسرحي يؤديه فرد واحد وعن(الاسايد) وهو الكلام الذي يقال على انفراد. تتعامل هذه الدراسة مع فكرة غياب المناجاة عن الدراما الحديثة وذلك لان بعض المسرحيين المحدثين يؤمنون إن الأهم هو ترك المشاهد يعي و يستوعب إن مسرحي اليوم قد اخذ على عاتقه نقل كل المعلومات المطلوبة إلى المشاهد من دون إعاقة الحركة في العمل الأدبي، عن طريق إضافة المزيد من أحاديث مناجاة النفس التي قد تكون خطابات روي وتوصيف طويلة. يؤمن المسرحيون المحدثون بشدة بضرورة معاملة المشاهد باحترام لافتراض إنه يستطيع أن يحقق لنفسه استنتاجاته الخاصة به عن طريق ملاحظاته الخاصة، ويرون إن المشاهد قادر على أن يحصل على صورة كاملة عن الشخصية، إذا ما حصل على حقيقة الشخصية من الداخل إلى الخارج. إن هذا صراع بين مريدي المسرح التقليدي وأولئك الذين يقلدون ويتبعون أفكار المدرسة الحديثة. تستلظ هذه الدراسة المزيد من الضؤ على الأفكار التي يؤمن بها الواقعيون عندما يسقطون من أعمالهم استخدام مناجاة النفس.

Soliloquy is Invalid in Modern Drama

Abstract:

"A soliloquy is a literary device often used in drama whereby a character relates his or her thoughts and feelings without addressing any of the other characters."¹ Soliloquy is distinct from monologue and aside. The study is treating the absence of the use of the soliloquy in modern drama because some dramatists believe that it is more important to let the audience understand and comprehend that today's playwright makes himself responsible of conveying all the needed information to the audience without blockading the action by adding more soliloquies that can fall into long narrative and descriptive speeches. Modern dramatists strongly have faith in treating the audience with greater respect to assume that the audience can make his own deductions from his own observations. Modern playwrights are

¹ Roger Lamer Literary Terms (London:Brothers Publishing,2000),p.146.

sure that the audience can have a full picture of the character if he gets the reality of this character from within to without .Thus it is a conflict between the followers of the traditional school of drama and those followers of the newer school. The study is to shed more light on the ideas that realists believe in when dropping the use of soliloquy in their writings.

Soliloquy is Invalid in Modern Drama

When a character in a play narrates an occurrence or an experience at length or falls into reminiscence, the epic form may appear or reappear in the midst of the dramatic action, i.e. a certain part or piece of the story out of which the play is made has gone away from the dramatist's remodeling and transforming touch and kept its original narrative form.

Whenever a certain character in a certain play cries aloud in his solitude, especially if his speech be so emotional, the lyrical element becomes manifest and clear. It means that a certain phase of feeling or thought that cannot otherwise be made clear, is recited directly to the audience in the form of soliloquy, and that is a stage convention which is in itself dangerous to the artistic illusion.

Modern drama seems to be struggling to separate itself from these older forms. The narrative element began to disappear first, and was not very difficult to get rid of. Indirect speeches are now dropped from the older plays without being greatly missed. An illustration may be found in some of the Elizabethan plays where the form of which has long narrative and descriptive speeches omitted or lopped off. And when the playwright of today holds himself to the purpose of conveying all necessary information to the audience without anywhere blockading the action by putting in a story, he succeeds very well. The qualities of ingenuity and adroitness are needed. When we examine a modern play and observe how few speeches run over two hundred words, we find out that it is not only that long fine speeches are broken up by the way of inserting into them questions and exclamations and expressions of interest from. The whole story-telling seems to have been dispensed with.

The soliloquy, however, is a different matter. It is not easy to drop a soliloquy out of any good play without causing confusion . If we try, for example, to cut out twenty lines in which Willy Loman in Arthur Miller's great play *Death of a Salesman* expresses his depression of his

failure to achieve the American Dream for himself and his family, we know at once that the speech has dramatic value, so that omitting it would necessitate a great deal of reconstruction in other parts of the play. As for what Shakespeare's tragedies would be without their soliloquies — the imagination refuses to take a flight. It is obvious that the lyrical element cannot be left out of the older plays ; and upon examination it becomes quite plain that when the modern play determines not to soliloquize, it must do something else earnestly to make up for the loss of so useful device.

We find the lyric in poetry takes many forms, but it has two invariable qualities : it is self-revealing and it is emotional. The former quality — that of illuminating the innermost feelings of the heart — is the one which the dramatic soliloquy makes advantage of to be used in the play. The question remains is whether it can be abandoned without loss of dramatic expression.

The followers of the older school put the matter like this

The greatest characters in the drama are most in need of this simple, old-fashioned device. The conscience tragedy, the war within the soul, the fight between the higher and the lower nature, which is the most dramatic struggle of all, cannot be set forth in colloquy. The soul of man is solitary and withdrawn. If it expresses itself at all it must be in solitude.¹

and that " the dramatist who rejects the soliloquy limits his opportunities, for it is only the shallower and more superficial characters that can fully reveal themselves without it."²

The defenders and followers of the newer school defend themselves by saying that they are still so busy creating literature and they claim, first of all, that they are striving so honestly like their predecessors to make art create the illusion of life, and that "it is their methods merely, not their aims, which are new."³ Furthermore, they explain that "it is [their] highest ambition to allow the spectator to make the acquaintance of their dramatic characters as he would learn to know strangers in life, merely by accumulating impressions of them."⁴ They consider that when the hero of a play soliloquizes, he is giving the audience the dramatist's conception of his nature. It is treating the audience with greater respect to assume that it can make its own deductions from its own observations. As for the hero himself, "it is treating him more considerately to allow him to maintain a natural reticence and reserve,

and not to drive him upon the stagey device of talking his soul out for the benefit of the audience. "5

The Indirect Vision

The realists have invented nothing completely new to take the place of the soliloquy. But they acknowledge that "if an audience is denied the privilege of seeing the hero as he sees himself, it must be made to see him all the more plainly as he appears to others."6 In this way, they have strengthened and perfected a certain device — that of making their characters seen by the indirect vision. That is to say, they strive to make the audience see each character in a play as he is reflected in the minds of every other person on the stage, believing that "the total sum of these varied reflections is the greatest and truest help the audience can have in forming its mental concept."7 It is the modern dramatist who brought the art of this to perfection, very notably in their presentation of their heroes and heroines. It will be remembered that, although the arch-hypocrite is most indisputably the hero of the piece, their appearance upon the stage is deferred till the second scene of the third act, when the play is more than half finished. But meanwhile, the hero or the heroine has been so thoroughly talked over by the extremely varied other characters of the play, each one of whom has an altogether different point of view, that the hero or the heroine looms up obviously in every one's mind. All the time, the suspense is deepening, and preparation is being made for one of the greatest enters of dramatic art.

A comparison between Shakespeare's way of presenting Iago and the above introduction of Willy Loman is of the greatest significance. Iago talks to himself from the first, in speeches that are doubtless the most highly dramatic soliloquies to be found in or out of Shakespeare's plays. Every one of them forces the action on, and illustrates the most artistic use that can be made of the soliloquial form. Willy Loman, when comes on, naturally talks to other people. There is little left for him to say to himself. Soliloquy would be the form of expression that is the most forced and undramatic that he could use. His character has been thrown into high relief by indirect vision sharpened and strengthened to the uttermost.

The belief in the dramatic value of the indirect vision is the essence of the realist's faith. The followers of realism consider that such a character is the kind they can manage better than any other. They are

doing this when they are so far from fearing to trust their technique in the handling of a character that is subtle or profound or in any way difficult . Moreover, they believe that "the characters are so individual and complex and unusual that the romantic play would reject them as impossible, which can, by the newer method, be made to live and move and have their being on the stage. The man of whom one would say in life, He cannot be described; you must see him to know him,

is precisely the man whom the realist exults in putting into a play, giving him a long rope, so that he can act for himself. A more primitive hero might be forced to talk to himself about himself, but the complex and unique nature requires first to be absolutely created and then to be let alone.⁸

What, for example, could soliloquy do for Hedda Gabler? Would it not seem a very clumsy device for her to use? But we begin to accumulate the distinct impressions of her from the first rise of the curtain. We see her as she appears to Tesman, to Judge Brack, to Lovborg, to Thea and to Miss Tesman. And up gathering these impressions, we value her, not correctly perhaps but as adequately as if we had met her in life.

Recognizing, then, that he must strengthen the indirect vision, and make the audience see each character as all the other characters see him, the realist is forced to a most professional handling of the forces of his play. They must react and interact by all the methods that make for unity and intensification of dramatic effect. No part can be created for its own sake, but every part must be for the play. No character may tell stories or talk about himself to himself. The lines of action must never struggle. "Every force must tend inward instead of outward. "⁹ At the points where the action turns, few words are more effective than many, silence is often filled and charged with dramatic expression.

Popular Discussion:

The discussion of the soliloquy is now one of the most interesting in the study of dramatic art.

It does not quite take the attitude that art lives upon experiment, variety of attempt, interchange of views and comparison of standpoints; but it seems willing to admit that when there are two ways of creating an artistic effect, an impartial comparison of them may be informing and stimulating.¹⁰

We learn that it is possible to entertain two ideas at one and the same time. The familiar protestation, " I don't know anything about art, but I know what I like," is less frequently heard. Sometimes it takes the form of the admission, "¹¹ I am not always sure what I like, but I strive to know something about art." At any rate, we are beginning to realize that if we must draw conclusions about art matters, it is well to have a wide knowledge and a comprehensive breadth of view back of them.

It must be observed that what distinguishes the school of realism from the school of romanticism is not choice of material. The world is all before all artists of whatever convictions, and it would be vain to warn any of them trespass on private grounds there. Perhaps it comes back once more to some vagueness in the concept of what schools of art are, and how they are formed. The more we compare and contrast, the more we think that the aim of all art has ever been one and the same : to create the illusion of life. It is doubtful whether the realist has an especially earnest desire to " show life as it is," to " be true to human nature," to " keep close to actual life " or to " portray real living people." This was the language of the romanticist before him; and if the still earlier classicist did not exploit the same tremendous phrases it was doubtless because he lived in a less introspective age, and was not so curious in searching his own soul. In the endeavor to completely represent life all artists have striven desperately, and have thought their ways the best. It is in the matter of the ways and means employed, some successful, some utterly futile, some honest and artistic, some insincere and tawdry, that we find the variation. ¹²

Now it happens that some artist will begin to create real effects by new and startling methods. If he absolutely triumphs in representing life with fresh vividness and impressiveness he will surely, no matter how revolutionary his ideas, inspire other artists, far and near, to make trial of the same means. After some such fashion the latest school of dramatic art was formed, what chiefly distinguishes the realist, then, is in choosing either kind or any other kind of material, he handles it with a new firmness and precision of touch. Like the novelist, he has triumphed over the helplessness and clumsiness of some of his predecessors.

The Realist's Methods

Granted, then, that it is a matter of technique, all that is necessary is to show what the realist does that has not been done before, and what he manages to avoid doing that has been done mistakenly. First, it is obvious that he is marked out by his attitude toward human nature. It is not enough to say that he respects it more profoundly than it has ever been respected before ; it must be further set forth that his respect is of a certain kind. He admits to himself that a great deal of life is neither grand, nor inspiring, nor powerful, nor exciting. He faces bravely the fact that human nature, whatever it ought or ought not to be, is often tiresome, commonplace, even foolish, and stupid. But he respects human beings and real life with the profound feeling of the creative artist for his material — for it is the only material with which he can ever hope to work. Moreover, he is content to study his material with the aim of understanding it, having the realization that this is the task of a lifetime, so that anything like reforming or refining that which he is working with must be omitted for lack of time and space. His deeply artistic regard for human nature forces him to base his art on observation — on the more or less literal taking of notes

It has been called an immense sensibility — the very atmosphere of the mind — a responsiveness to life in general that causes instant response to its slightest manifestation. To be one of those upon whom nothing is lost is the greatest of all assets for the artist who would represent and in no measure misrepresent life.¹³

It is generally admitted that the theory of the realist, which bases his art on the taking of notes, is more intelligible and consistent than the opposing theories of other schools. For example, a jealous character is to be introduced into a play. The process is to exteriorize the character as completely as possible. The realist has long accustomed himself to observe, with patience and respect that refuses to meddle, precisely how the jealous genus homo acts and speaks, and also how other people act toward him and speak to him. And so he creates and places his character accordingly. He is confident that, if his observation has been fine enough that the spectators will, by adding impression to subtle impression, penetrate the nature of the afore-said jealous human being as if they were observing him in business or social life. The whole process of creation is from without in, the dramatist disclaiming any ambition to do more for his audience, in the way of enlightenment, than

life is to do for the impartial observer. " To show what life shows is enough for me," he seems to be saying to himself. " My care must be that it is not too much."¹⁴ The jealous character neither opens his heart upon the stage in soliloquy nor puts his head out of the window in asides to the audience, while the actors about him turn deaf ears. He is permitted to speak and act like a human being, surrounded by other human beings. The audience, having observed him as in life and considered the attitude of others toward him, is allowed to "make its own deductions with-being spoon-victualled (the term is an invention of the new school) with information by the officious contrivances of the author. " ¹⁵ By a process of gradual recognition, which works from without to the depths of the soul, the character becomes known to the spectator, not supernaturally, but as one human being may be known to another. The realist's art, then, begins by exteriorizing and ends with a revelation of the innermost nature.

The Romanticist's Methods

Against the realist's conception of basing his art on observation and the taking of notes , the romanticist places his philosophy of art, which is not so clean-cut. It seems to be based on a curious combination of experience and imagination, which makes it individual and limited. Experience is certainly a thin reed for the artist to lean upon, since by the very act of creating, which is so often cruel in its demands upon time and strength, he fences himself in from contact with the world. As for imagination and sympathy, it is so popular a view which represents the artist as getting inside of his characters and feeling with them and for them.

Let us fancy the playwright with his scenario before him. It usually involves at least three principal characters: the hero and the heroine (the names are unreal) and somebody to make trouble between them. All of these, as well as the characters which form the setting, must be as highly differentiated as possible, each having enough individuality to give him an excuse for being. Now, if the author adopts the imaginative and sympathetic method, he must adopt it once for all, since he cannot well be outside and inside of his creations at the same time. A jealous character, for example, must act as the author imagines that he himself would act if he himself were jealous; and so with the high, the low, the young, the old, the rich, the poor, the jester, the murderer, the lover, the artist, or the business man, to the end of the

category of characters. Obviously, some of his characters will be more vital than others, since personal experience, however varied and extensive, must somewhere come to an end. In the best, his creations will have a certain personal lyrical effect, not without charm, even in a play. If the dramatist sympathizes at all, he will inevitably sympathize with some of his characters more than with others, the result being those non-dramatic likes and dislikes which distort the truth, and are the scorn of the realist. There will be little spontaneity, because the characters will neither move nor stand still, speak nor keep quiet, except as the author projects himself into them, one after another. The worst of all, the crises will not come about inevitably, but must be brought about by main force. If such an author is reported to have said that he wept over his heroine's misfortunes, to fancy how a murderer would feel, the public is amazed and awed at such evidence of genius, even if the heroine in question is somewhat typical, and the murderer not so very murderous after all.

In contrast to such spectacular distress and exhaustion, the realist has described certain joy and satisfaction in the work of creating. The characters whom he likes best are

the ones who, whether bad, good or indifferent, stand most firmly on their own feet, act out their own natures most independently, and in the end get out of his control, so that they fairly make things happen — even murder and suicide, if such events belong in the play. Thus the author is spared the tiresome necessity of arranging coincidences, pursuing the hero, coercing the heroine and constructing pasteboard murderers.¹⁶

He is in no danger of so sympathizing with his hero that he is to protect from disaster, or to make his misfortunes merely theatrical. He shrinks from nothing, because he is where the author should ever be, outside, not inside, the play. The public, getting the full effect and not the mere intent of his art, is thereby so much the gainer.

The Scope of Realism

It is one of the victories of the form of dramatic art which is based on observation that its scope is so vast. Indeed its boundaries are those of life itself. Any nature may be represented, because any nature may be observed. "The realist fairly exults in creating the uniquely individual human being, whose mental processes cannot be followed,

and whose nature is perhaps remote from anyone's sympathy."¹⁷ Some of the men and women whom Ibsen handled with the easiest mastery Halyard Solness and Hedda Gabler, for example — would have completely frightened a romanticist.

The realist's regard for the freedom of his subjects the true artist's delight when his work of creation is so completely achieved that he can stand aside a little while his creatures act for themselves — this is precisely what the public of today is least able to understand. Undoubtedly it is past the comprehension of anyone but the artist himself. To him it must be the greatest reward of his greatest efforts.

One reason why life in its verity is too much for any but the greatest dramatic artists is because it is full of exceptions and aberrations, and so illogical in its working. Life is very unaccommodating in the matter of illustrating the motives of plays, and leading to striking finales and tremendous catastrophes. Furthermore, it is not instructive in exactly the way the romanticists would like to have it. It teaches chiefly the danger of being too sure what is absolutely right or absolutely wrong. Its situations are all interesting, but are apt to become non-dramatic if meddled with. So, after all, a very good way to make a play is to present a situation which is not too detached from its natural setting. Realism must create the taste by which it is to be relished.

It was Victor Hugo who said "since man is eternally curious about himself, one demand which he always makes of a play is that it shall depict human nature and promote self-knowledge."¹⁸ Now, realism has always exhibited, more effectively than classicism or romanticism, two views of human nature which are always and ever helpful. The one that shows plainly those traits which all human beings have in common, and insists on that because they are common they shall be studied and recognized as not peculiar to anyone. The other view presents individuality as it has never been shown before, and insists that it shall be recognized and appraised, and never considered common. In the art of the new school both views are vivid and active, and each is safer because each is not presented without the other.

Notes:

- 1-Laurence Martin *Studying Drama* (London:Brothers Publishing ,1998.) ,p.24.
- 2- Laurence Martin, p.39.
- 3- Maryana Stevenson *Understanding Drama and Dramatists* (New York:Prentice –Hall Inc.,2004),p.57.
- 4- Maryana Stevenson,p.59.
- 5 -Maryana Stevenson,p.62.
- 6- Albert Bernard *Realism in Drama* (London:Bowes & Bowes, 2005),p.112.
- 7- Albert Bernard , p.113.
- 8- Maryana Stevenson,p.61.
- 9- Albert Bernard, p.113.
- 10- Longe Norman *Modern Drama in Life* (New Delhi: Cambridge University Press,2003),p.97.
- 11- Maryana Stevenson,p.66.
- 12- Albert Bernard ,p.116.
- 13- Suzan Garnet *Dramatists at Work* (Westminster: Arbor House, 1999) ,p.45.
- 14-Albert Bernard,p.114.
- 15 -Suzan Garnet, p.45.
- 16 -Longe Norman, p.100.
- 17 -Mathort Dortin *Novelists and Art* (London:Faber and Faber , 2002) , p.60.
- 18 -Mathort Dortin, p.61

Bibliography

- 1-Bernard, Albert. *Realism in Drama* . London: Bowes & Bowes,2005.
- 2-Dortin, Mathort *Novelists and Art* .London: Faber and Faber ,2002.
- 3-Garnet , Suzan. *Dramatists at Work* .Westminster: Arbor House,1999.
- 4-Martin ,Laurence. *Studying Drama* .London:Brothers Publishing ,1998.
- 5-Norman, Longe *Modern Drama in Life* .New Delhi: Cambridge University Press,2003.
- 6-Stevenson ,Maryana. *Understanding Drama and Dramatists* .New York:Prentice –Hall Inc.,2004.