An Analysis of Dramatic Monologue in Shah Jo Risalo: A Case Study of Sur Leela Chanesar

Abstract:

This study aims to explore the characteristics of the dramatic monologue, a poetic genre, in Sur Leela Chanesar of Shah Jo Risalo. The Sur is textually analysed with close reading technique in the light of the theoretical framework of the dramatic monologue presented by Ina Beth Sessions. The framework comprises seven fundamental characteristics of the dramatic monologue: speaker, audience, occasion, interplay between speaker and audience, revelation of character, dramatic action, and action taking place in the present. The analysis reveals that Sur Leela possesses all the above stated seven fundamental characteristics of the dramatic monologue. Leela being the protagonist in the story appears as the speaker. Chanesar, wives of Chanesar and her sisters are silent audiences or listeners in the sur. Occasion is observed through the conflict taking place between Leela and Chanesar over the matter of necklace. Interplay takes place between Leela and her audiences when she speaks to them time and again. Leela reveals not only her own character by condemning herself but also describes good as well as bad features of other story internal characters. The dramatic action is reflected through Leela's performative speech in rhetorical style. Leela's speech mainly takes place in the present tense. Thus, this study is another important contribution on Shah Jo Risalo from generic perspective.

Key terms: *dramatic monologue, speaker, audience, occasion, interplay, revelation of character, dramatic action, and action taking place in the present.*

Introduction:

This study is motivated by the fact that very little or no attention has been paid on *Surs* of *Shah Jo Risalo* for exploring features of poetic genres. Although, various *Surs* of the *Risalo* are studied from thematic perspectives, the generic studies have been limited to very few or merely statements are made in passing. The statements of the scholars that *surs* of *Shah Jo Rislao* are 'epic, elegiac' (Khalid 235; Allana 202), 'folk songs or folk stories' (Kalbani 193; Iqbal 90; Shaikh 182), 'romances' (Hassan 244), 'fairytales' (Sorley 259), etc., lack formal and thorough examination. In an attempt to address this need, the present study is undertaken to explore the features of the dramatic monologue, one of poetic literary genres, in *Sur Leela Chanesar* of *Shah Jo Risalo*. The objective of the study is guided by the question: How are the various characteristics of the dramatic monologue deployed in *Sur Leela* of *Shah Jo Risalo*?

Poetry being main genre of literature has itself different sub-genres. The epic, ballad, lyric, etc., have always been regarded the most common poetic genres. These main genres evolved and gave away to many other sub-genres, which later came to be recognized as independent genres. Lyrical ballads, lyrical dramas, dramatic romances and dramatic monologues are said to be some of the popular poetic sub-genres which evolved from the main poetic genres (Myhre 15-17).

The dramatic monologue, one of the poetic sub-genres, descended from the lyric (Howard 43). Though the genre was employed by the poets of previous centuries, it got popularity after its being frequently employed in 19th century by Robert Browning, one of the Victorian poets (Slinn 16). The genre is composite of two terms, i.e. the 'dramatic', and the 'monologue'. The word 'dramatic' is associated with theatre or drama which signifies some action or movements. On the other hand, the word 'monologue' means the speech of a single person (Coelho 11). In broader terms, the dramatic monologue is a genre in which a single person or character addresses to silent listener(s) or audience(s) in a dramatic situation, in the first person narration, without being identical with the poet (Maenhout 22). Most of the critics and theorists like Sessions (508), Coelho (13), Finch (31), Howard (40), Williams (42) and Halbert (21) agree saying that the presence of a well-defined speaker, silent audience (s) and the occasion in any poem is sufficient to claim that poem to be the formal example of the dramatic monologue.

Most importantly, the dramatic monologue as discussed above has been studied in the poetry of different poets including mystics like Browning in the west but no subsequent generic

study is carried on in the east, specifically, in the poetry of mystic or *Sufi* poets. Finding this as a research gap, the present study aims at exploring the generic techniques in the form of the dramatic monologue employed in *Sur Leela Chanesar* of *Shah Jo Risalo.* The Risalo is claimed to be the collection of 30 *Surs* (Khalid 231; Hotechand 151; Iqbal 81).

Sur Leela Chanesar is chosen as a case study for the generic exploration mainly because it is claimed to have a speaking character named Leela who addresses to other story internal characters (Sorley 259; Sayed 289). Chanesar, the king and Leela's husband, remains silent throughout the poem. Leela is presented in the dramatic situation in which she is shown pleading before her anguished husband for seeking forgiveness (Shaikh 182-185). If the above statements of the scholars are inspected closely, They are nothing but relevant features of the dramatic monologue (see literature review and theoretical framework). *Sur Leela Chanesar* is the story of two divided lovers namely Chanesar and Leela, the husband and the wife, who were the king and the queen respectively. Leela was a beautiful and charming wife of Chanesar. Leela deceived her husband by accepting a diamond-necklace from another lady named *Kaunroo* for sharing Chanessar with her for one night. Thus, Chanessar in rage dismissed her from the palace. Being dejected queen, Leela kept imploring before her husband for forgiveness.

Since the present study is library research and non-empirical in approach, the methods of data collection and data analysis are made through descriptive and interpretive procedure. The selected stanzas of the *sur* are chosen purposefully and are analysed textually in the light of the theoretical framework of the dramatic monologue to discuss as to how the described features of the dramatic monologue are presented through them. Since *Shah Jo Risalo* is in Sindhi language and has been translated into various languages including English, for the present study Mustaq Ali Shah's translated version of the Risalo is referred.

Conclusively, the textual analysis of the *Sur* demonstrates that there is a speaking character (Leela) who speaks to silent

audiences (Chanesar, playmates and other wives of Chanessar) on a particular occasion under the dramatic situation. There is interplay between Leela and her audiences. In the course of arguments, Leela has revealed not only her own character but has also manifested various character-traits (good or bad) of her audiences. Her addresses in the rhetorical style imply dramatic action which are often made in the present tense forms through simultaneous mode of telling. Precisely, *Sur Leela Chanesar* is experimented with all the taxonomic features of the dramatic monologue as presented in the theoretical framework. Thus, this study contributes to the existing literature on *Shah Jo Risalo* from generic perspective.

Literature Review

Prior to the analysis of this *Sur* from generic perspective by using the theoretical framework of the dramatic monologue, *Sur Marui* of *Shah Jo Risalo* has already been analysed from the generic perspective in the light of the dramatic monologue. Khoso (60-85), by using the model of the dramatic monologue of Ina Beth Sessions as theoretical framework, analysed *Sur Marui*. His study is said to be one of the significant contributions from generic perspective in general and the dramatic monologue in particular. The characteristics of the dramatic monologue such as the speaker, audience, occasion, interplay between speaker and audience, revelation of character, dramatic action and action taking place in the present were used as tools for analysis. Khoso's findings suggest that Marui, the main story internal character, speaks throughout the *Sur*. She being only speaking character speaks to different but silent audiences. Omar, her kinsfolk, the camel rider, the courier, ladies of Omar, her cousins and her playmates function as her audiences in the *sur*. The occasion in the *Sur* is reflected through Marui's captivity in the prison of Omar. She is presented as enchained and marginalized speaking character. The character revelation takes place when Marui describes her character-traits as well as character-traits of her audiences. The dramatic action is observed through her various activ-

ities in the rhetorical style. The action throughout the *sur* takes place in the present tense. Thus, the *Sur* possesses all the seven features of the dramatic monologue. Making Khoso's above study as a supporting argument, the present study can be claimed another but fresh contribution in the form of generic study.

As far as the dramatic monologue as a poetic genre is concerned, according to Maenhout, it is a mixture of lyric, dramatic and narrative aspects. In the dramatic monologue, a single speaker addresses to one or more imaginary audiences who remain silent throughout the poem (23). According to Lane, in dramatic monologue, a speaker other than the poet addresses to another character. He or she reveals dramatic situation through speech and tries to win the sympathy of both the audiences and readers. The dramatic monologue can be written on any topic (9-13). It has no proper introduction rather it begins in 'medias res' (Lescrauwaet 18).

Regarding origin and development of the genre, it has been stated that Anglo Saxon poem 'The Sea-Farer' is regarded to be the first example of the dramatic monologue (Salgado 33). However, Howard has given a comprehensive historical classification of the genre. He divides the classification into two stages of its development, i.e. the unconscious and the conscious. The unconscious stage of the genre begins from Chaucer's love lyric 'To Rousemounde' and ends just before Browning's period. On the other hand, the concious stage of the genre origins from Browning's adopting of the genre to date (58-61).

Although several attempts have been made to propose the models of the dramatic monologues, Sessions's model has been considered most comprehensive and authentic for that it covers all the aspects of the genre (Lescrauwaet 25). Sessions's analyzing Browning's poem 'My Last Duchess' and declaring it the perfect example of the dramatic monologue is worth mentioning. She analyses the poem in the light of her proposed model of the genre comprising seven features to what she names the fundamental taxonomic characteristics (503-516). Since the present study is carried on in the light of Sessions's model of the

dramatic monologue, the model is discussed below under heading of 'the theoretical framework'.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework proposed by Ina Beth Sessions includes the seven fundamental taxonomic characteristics such as: speaker, audience, occasion, interplay between speaker and audience, revelation of character, dramatic action and action taking place in the present. Each of these seven characteristics is discussed separately as follows:

1. Speaker

The first and foremost characteristics of the dramatic monologue is the 'speaker'. Without the speaker there will be no dramatic monologue at all. The speaker is presented under the dramatic situation who addresses to different but silent audiences or listeners in the rhetorical style mainly using the rhetorical questions. The speaker provides every information regarding him/herself as well as about the rest of the characters. He/she through telling his/her version of the story tries to motivate the audiences to agree with his/her sayings. He/she attempts to draw attention as well as seeks sympathy of his/her audiences in particular and readers in general by delineating his/her critical present conditions (508-513).

2. Audience

Audience(s) or listener (s) is another important characteristic without which, according to Sessions, there will be no genre at all. Audience (s) remain silent throughout the poem and is addressed either directly or indirectly. His/her words are not included in the text as it is but are repeated by the speaker. The reactions or replies of the listener are to be assumed from the telling of the speaking character. Speaker's rhetorical speech is mainly framed as the reaction to the silent moves of the audience. There can be one or several audiences in the same poem (508).

3. Occasion

Another important basic characteristic of the dramatic monologue is 'Occasion'. It is the stage like setting where the speaker has to begin his/her speech. According to Sessions, occasion is the point from where the action begins. It helps to provide background which becomes the cause of the exposing conflicts to initiate the action (509).

4. Interplay between speaker and audience

Interplay, according to Sessions, is another essential feature of the dramatic monologue. It is through the interplay between the speaker and the audience which maintains the flow of ideas in the poem. It causes the unfolding of conflicts between two parties and thus contributes in creating the theatrical effects in the poem. If there is no interplay, there will be no progression of the conflict. If there is no conflict, there will be no significant dramatic action (509).

5. Revelation of character

The speaker reveals not only his/her character in his/her own words but also of audience (s) in the poem. The speaker sometimes reveals character-traits (positive or negative) directly as well as indirectly in the poem. Readers are invited to notice both positive and negative remarks of the speaking character from his/her interplay with audience(s). The character revelation is also maintained through ironical remarks that the speaker passes under critical situations (510).

6. **Dramatic action**

Another very important feature of the dramatic monologue is 'dramatic action'. The dramatic action suggests that there is to be some kind of performative moves in the poem. Since in the lyric oriented poems where one character is engaged in the speech, action cannot be performed as it happens in the drama,. Thus, the action is reflected through verbal moves in rhetorical style. Direct address clues in simultaneous mode of telling mainly display action in the poem (510-511).

7. Action taking place in the present

Since the action in the poem is noticed through the verbal rhetorical moves of the speaker, it takes place in the present tense forms. The speaker addresses his/her audience in action-oriented lines using present tense forms. It is also known as simultaneous mode of speaking in which telling and happening of events take place at the same time. However, the use of past tense forms can not be ignored completely. The speaker sometimes employs the past tense forms merely for comparing his/her present pathetic situation with happy past in order to create more dramatic effect in the poem (511).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the *Sur* takes places in the light of the above theoretical framework. All the stanzas for the purpose of analysis are taken from Mushtaq Ali Shah's translated version of the *Risalo*. *Sur Leela Chanesar* begins with Leela's speaking to her husband Chanessar. In the very first stanzas of the *sur,* Leela addresses directly to her husband with simultaneous mode of telling:

داغُ تنهنجو دائما ماري مَعذُورِين،
سائِينءَ كارَڙِ سُپِرين وَڃِج مَ ڏُورِين،
آءٌ تون حُضُورِين، تہ مَٽِيو وِجهان مَڃَ ۾.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 493)

Your blemish is ever; fatal for the hamstrung,
Go not away, oh sweetheart! For sake of Sire,
Shall toss trinket in blaze, please! Come back
(Shah, 2014, Episode-I: 1, p. 367).

هائِيءَ وِجهان هارَ کي مَنَجهان کَارَ کَٽِي،
ڇِنَائِي ڇِٽو کَريَان هَٿَن سين هَٽِي،
تو سِين جَامَ تَٽِي، اَگَلِيُون سَپِ اوڇُون ٽِيُون.
(شيخ، سُر ليلا چنيسر، ص: 196)

Shall rebuff the trinket; out of bitterness,
Crushing by bare hands; shall throw it away,
Odious were able, oh Noble! To entice you.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-I: 3, p. 367).

If the above stanzas are closely inspected, they are nothing but direct addresses of the speaking character. Here the speaker is Leela who is to be seen engaged with another character of the story namely Chanesar, her husband. Chanesar is to be identified as silent audience. His speech is not included in the text. Moreover, he is addressed in the second person pronouns in rhetorical style. Lines such as:

'Go not away, oh sweetheart! For sake of Sire,
Shall toss trinket in blaze, please! Come back',
Odious were able, oh Noble! To entice you'

In the above stanzas clearly give impression that they are spoken in the rhetorical style carrying dramatic effect by means of the verbal moves. Furthermore, the speaker seems expressing her thoughts in face-to-face interaction with her audience in the present tense form implying that happening of events and their telling go together, thus she has employed the simultaneous mode of telling. Another feature of the dramatic monologue can be noticed from the above stanzas is the beginning of the *Sur* in 'media res'. Very first stanza suggests that the conflict between both husband and wife might have taken place somewhere in the past but at the moment telling it has taken it to climax. In this connection, Sorley (200) has rightly interpreted saying that Shah's every love story begins with climax.

The conflict between both husband and wife seems to have taken place due to latter's accepting of the precious necklace from *Kaunroo*, the daughter of the Raja, by allowing her to stay with her husband. She herself tells this happening by describing her own character-traits as well as character-traits of *Kaunroo:*

مَٽيُون وِجهان مَچَ ۾، هائِيءَ هَٽان هارُ،
ڀري جي ڀَتارُ، تہ ميريائِي مانُ لَهان.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 498)

Tossing trinket in blaze; shall chuck the necklace,
Blemished would be honored; if spouse reunites.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-I: 2, p. 367)

مَٽِيي مَٿي جي هُئا، تَنِ چِٽَنِ ڦيريُم چِٽُ،
هارُ کَٽَينديِسِ هوڏَ ۾، نيبَهُ ٿِيندُمِ نِتُ،
ڪَؤنرُؤَ جو ڪِرِتُ، مُونهان مَٿانهُون نِيو.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 499)

Patterns on the trinket; had duped my mind,
Hoped winning bets; could also retain relation,
Cleverness of *Kaunroo*; surely outshined mine
(Shah, 2014, Episode-I: 11, p. 368).

Though through the above telling Leela tries to justify her position that she wanted to be attractive to her husband by wearing that necklace, actually she seems to have been tempted by the beauty of the necklace. She seems to have described her character-trait by calling herself blemished 'ميريائِي'. Similarly, she also depicts the character-trait of *Kaunroo* with phrase 'Cleverness of *Kaunroo'* 'ڪَونرُوءَ جو ڪِرِتُ'. Furthermore, accepting her guilt and regretting over it, Leela tries to convince her audience in particular and readers in general by saying:

جيڪرَ ڀانيَان اِيئن، تہ ڪو دِلِ مَٽيندو داسَڙو،
تہ سُوڙهَ لَڳندي سِينئن، هُوندَ هَٿين هارُ نہ جهَليان.
(شيخ، سُر ليلا، ص: 221)

If I knew Dassrho; could change his heart,
Would never touch the necklace; by any chance
(Shah, 2014, Episode-I: 12, p. 368)

Very often, Leela condemns herself from her own mouth. She is also caught between conflicting feelings. On the one hand she sees herself as victim of circumstances and on the other hand she also expresses feelings of deep guilt and questions about her own role in her current circumstances. Leela comes across as strongly accusing and judging herself for attracting sympathy of readers and audiance. Having been dejected by her husband on account of her misdeeds she comes to know about the wrath of her husband. Her husband gets furious due to her that folly and dismisses her from the palace. Though her husband does not speak nor his words are included as it is in the text, but his anger or mistreatment with Leela can be noticed

from Leela's speech when she warns other wives of Chanesar addressing them in rhetorical style:

چَنيسَرَ سِين چاڳُ، مَتان ڪا مُنڌَ ڪَري،
جان مُون پوءِ پَروڙِئو تَہ هِيءُ نہ ماڻي ماڳُ،
ڏمِرِئو ڏُهاڳُ، سِگهو ڏِئي سُهاڳِڻِين.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 507)

No lady dare take Chanesar for granted,
Realized it too late; no place for coquetry
Cherished become outcast, if he is incensed
(Shah, 2014, Episode-III: 1, p. 372)

سِ، حيلو هُنهِين هارَ جو، مرِيوئِي ڏ ڏ
سُڻِهو سَڀَ سَرَتِيُون، وَرُ نہ ڪَهِين وَسِ،
دَعَويٰ پِهرِين دَسين، ڀَڄِيو ٿو ڀورا ڪري.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 501)

Was ever displeased; made the necklace a ruse,
Listen, wedded wives! Husband out of control,
Ready to rebuff any claim with his first volley.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-III: 9, p. 373)

Through the above direct addresses the speaker seems to have created the dramatic situation by addressing directly to other wives of Chanesar in rhetorical style. There is verbal performance, the dramatic action when the speaker says to her audience 'ڪَرِي چَنيسَرَ سِين چاڳُ، مَتان ڪا مُنڌَ' (No lady dare take; Chanesar for granted), 'سَڀِ سُهاڳَڻيُون، اِيءُ وَرُ نہ ڪَنهِين وَسِ،' (Listen, weeded wives! Husband out of control). Moreover, the speaker has also revealed the character of Chanesar as well as that of other wives of Chanesar through above addresses. Other wives of Chanesar furnish the information necessary for understanding the frustration that Leela is feeling towards Chanesar, and this provides a sharp contrast between two characters. Besides above interpretation, it can be evidenced throughout the *sur* that Leela reveals not only her character but also reveals character-traits of other characters of the *sur*. The revelation begins when Leela describes unfairness of her husband and her self-made guilt. She reveals much about herself in this *sur*. She spends several lines com-

plaining about her misdeeds and her pleading for the same. She also reveals the strongest nature of her spouse who does not pay any attention towards her pleading. This shows listener's petty obstinate nature and one can assume that he displays aggressiveness. He does not get convinced till the end of the poem. She admits her faults but simultaneously makes readers believe that others too are responsible for her faults.

Some moves of the silent audience can further be noticed from the replies that the speaker seems making as reactions. This happens when Leela goes to Chanessar and seeks forgiveness:

تان ڪا وائِي وارِ، دِلاسي جي داسَڙا،
تون منهنجو وَلَهو، آئون تو ۾ طَمَعُدارِ،
ڍَڪِي ڍولَ! گُذارِ، لَڄَ منهنجي لوڪَ ۾.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 509)

Give me some hope, oh Dassrha! Of consolation,
You are my spouse; I shall always look up to you,
Be shroud to bear out, oh Darling! Save me ridicule.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-IV: 2, p. 373)

ڍولا! ڍيلِ مَ مُون، ڪانڌَ! ڪَمِيڻِي آهِيان،
سِڪَ تنهنجي سُپِرِين! ڀيري وِڌِيَسِ ڀُون،
مُون وَرُ تُونهِين تُون، تو، وَرَ! وَهُون ڪيتَرِيون.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 509)

Sidestep me not, oh Darling Mate! Am a plebian,
Longing for you, oh Sweetheart! Lobbed aground,
You may have many spouses; for me you are the one.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-IV: 3, p. 374)

The above rhetorical speech of the speaker suggests that the speaker is speaking to someone (Chanesar) who seems to be unmoved. Leela's saying, 'تان ڪا وائِي وار دِلاسي جي داسَڙا' (Give me some hope, oh Dassrha! Of consolation) and 'ڍولا ڍيل مَ مُون، ڪانڌَ ڪَميڻِي آهِيان' Sidestep me not, oh Darling Mate! Am a plebian), is action-oriented suggesting that there are dramatic moves. The progression of action is led through one sided argumentation that Leela makes to convince Chanesar.

There is always interplay between Leela and her silent audiences. She seems addressing to different characters time and again. After addressing to Chanesar and other wives of Chanesar with direct address clues, she speaks to her sisters saying:

پيـنَـرُ پـيـرِئـو داسَـڙو، چَـنـيـسَـرُ چَـئِـي،
هِـيءُ جـو ڏَـنـيُ ڏُـهـاڳَ جـو سَـڳـهَـان کـونَ سَـهِـي،
مُـون کـان تَـان پَـئِـي، کَـمـيـن نَـ کَـانـديـلا سُـپـريـن.
(شيخ، سُر ليلا، ص: 224)

Help me, oh sisters! To persuade Chanesar,
Cannot bear any longer; affliction of outcast,
Forgive my misdeeds, oh Serene Sweetheart
(Shah, 2014, Episode-II: 18, p. 371)

She again speaks to Chanesar in rhetorical style saying:

مُـون تـي وَهَـرَ وَرِي، وارو ڏيـنـدُمِ وَلَـهـو،
تـوکـي سـاري سُـپـريـن! آئُـون پُـونـديَـسِ مـاڳ مَـري،
توکي سَرِي سُپِرين اَسان تان نہ سَرِي، وارو ڏينڈُمِ وَلَهو،
اسـان تـو ريءَ نـاهِ کـا، ڳُـجـهـانَـدَرَ ڳَـرِيُ
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 506-507)

Give me a chance, oh spouse! Returning to me,
Missing you, oh sweetheart! Shall die on site
You can survive, oh sweetheart! But I cannot,
Have no one except you; to share confidence
(Shah, 2014, Episode-II: *Wayee*, p. 372)

The analysis of the above as well as the subsequent stanzas suggest that Leela dramatizes herself where she is in the action while speaking to other story internal characters. The text of this *sur* looks as if it could be read as a text to be performed by actors in front of audiences. There seems to be the theatrical descriptions throughout the *sur* . Most importantly, the action does not take place the way it happens in the drama but is displayed through her words and verbal moves. Leela's verbal moves displaying action can also be seen when she comes in face -to-face interaction with Chanessar:

اَوَڳُـڻَ کَـري اَپـارَ، تـو دَرِ آيَـسِ داسَـڙا!
جيئن تو رُسَڻَ سَندِيُون رُوحَ مِر، تيئن مُون پيڙي ناهِ پَتارَ!
سـائـيـنءِ لَـڳَ، سَـتـارَ! مـيـڙِ مَـدايُـون مُـنـهـنـجـون.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 508)

Knocking at your door, oh Dassrha! With myriad misdeeds,
Cannot bear, oh Sweetheart! Your calculated dissent,
Shroud my improprieties; for sake of Lord Sattar.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-IV: 1, p. 373)

ڏولا! کُـجـاڙيـان، بـولائِـيـو بـوڏ چَـئـيـن،
آئـون تـو پـيـرانـدِئـا، کَـرَ مـوڙِئـو وَرَ اُڇـيـان.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 501)

Why do you, oh Darling! Repudiate me aloud?
Still keep tossing; and turning at your bed feet
(Shah, 2014, Episode-IV: 5, p. 374)

ڪوڙيين تُنهنجيون ڪامِڙيُون، تُون ڪوڙِيَن سَندِوڪانڊُ،
مـونـکـي چَـڊِ مَ داسَـڙا، تـه وَڃـان نَـ وِڇـوانـدُ،
مـون ڳِـچِـيءَ مِر پـانـدُ، تـو چَـنـيـسَـرَ هَـڏَ مِر.
(شاهواڻي، سُر ليلان چنيسر، ص: 509)

Keep dozens of courtesans; be spouse of dozens,
Spurn me not, oh *Dassrha!* Don't want to be tramp,
Am earnestly pleading, oh Chanesar! Please answer.
(Shah, 2014, Episode-IV: 7, p. 374)

The above stanzas are illustrative of the dramatic action taking place in simultaneous mode of narration. By means of the rhetorical tone, Leela seems to have been engaged with her audience. Lines such as: 'Knocking at your door, oh *Dassrha*! With myriad misdeeds,' /'Why do you, oh Darling! Repudiate me aloud?', /'Still keep tossing; and turning at your bed feet', /'Spurn me not, oh Dassrha! Don't want to be tramp' demonstrate speaker's action-oriented moves which create dramatic effect in the poem. Moreover, the above lines also imply that speaker has responded to the silent moves of the audience. The above analysis of different stanzas suggests that there is active interplay between Leela and her different audiences which helps in progressing the action in the story.

Conclusion:

The close analysis of *Sur Leela Chanesar*, in the light of the theoretical framework of the dramatic monologue presented by Sessions, shows that the *sur* is the best example of the dramatic monologue. It has all the seven characteristics described in the theoretical framework. Leela is the speaker who speaks throughout the poem. Chanesar, other wives of Chanesar her sisters/friends are audiences who do not speak throughout the poem rather their say is to be noticed through her rhetorical questions. The occasion in the poem is to be reflected from the moment of separation between husband and wife where dejected wife is seen imploring before her husband for reunion. There is very active interplay between Leela and her audiences. The strongest interplay occurs when she comes in face-to-face interaction with Chanesar. Leela reveals her character as damned, outcast, covetous, adolescent, remorseful, and unwise. She reveals Chanesar's character as an obstinate, aggressive, influential, embarrassing, and intelligent as well. She reveals *Kaunroo's* character as tactful, enticing, sharp and satanic. Other wives of Chanesar are revealed as scared. The dramatic action is presented through her verbal moves attempted in the rhetorical style. Her active engagement with Chanesar in rhetorical style can be noticed when she arrives and knocks at the door of Chanesar and beseeches by standing beside his bed. Her conversational speech with other wives of Chanesar also is an example of the action in the poem. Precisely, most of the stanzas of the last episode of the *sur* can be claimed to have reflected the action in the poem. The action through words seems to have taken place in the present tense form by means of simultaneous mode of narration. In other words, the telling and happening of events have taken place in the present tense. However, the use of the past tense in the *Sur* cannot be ignored but it is employed for creating more dramatic effect by letting the character compare her painful present with the happy past. Conclusively, *Sur Leela Chanesar* can best be placed in the category of the perfect example of the dramatic monologue with having all the seven fundamental taxo-

nomic features as discussed in the model of the dramatic monologue presented by Ina Beth Sessions.

References:

1. Allana, Ghulam Ali. "Shah Abdul Latif's Imaginative Use of Sindhi Language." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif,Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 201-222. Print.
2. Agha, Muhammad Yaqoob. Shah jo Risalo alias, Ganj Latif. Trans. 2nd ed. Karachi: Sindhica Academy, 2004. Print.
3. Brohi , A.K. "The Philosophical Dimensions of Latif's Poetry." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 101-121. Print.
4. Coelho, Patrick Prashant. Exploring the Lyric-Dramatic Interaction in the Work of T.S.Eliot. Ph.D. Diss. Victoria University of Wellington, 2010. Web. 7 July 2022. <https://www.core.ac.uk/display/41339693>.
5. Finch, Matt. Thrown Voices: A Series of Dramatic Monologues, With a Discussion of the Genre. MA Thesis, East Carolina University, 2010. Web. 14 Sep. 2016. <http://www.thescholarship.ecu.edu/bitstream/handle/10342/2911/Finch_ecu_0600M_10200.pdf>.
6. Halbert, Steven J. And Yet God Has Not Said a Word: The Dramatic Monologue as Inverted and Secularized Prayer. MA Thesis, Auburn University, Alabama, 2008. Web. 20 Aug. 2016.<https://www.etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/1085/Halbert_Steven_51.pdf?>.
7. Hasan, Sabiha. "The Romances of Risalo." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 243-249. Print.
8. Hotechand, Tirathdas. "The Risalo: Its Musical Compositions." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 157-163. Print.
9. Howard, Claud. "The Dramatic Monologue: Its Origin and Development." Studies in Philology 4 (1910): 31+ 33-88. Web. 24 Mar. 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4171651>.
10. Iqbal, Afzal. "Impact of Rumi on Shah Abdul Latif." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 73-98. Print.
11. Kalbani, Abdulally F. "Heroes of Shah." Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 193-197. Print.

12. Khalid, Karim Bakhsh. “Shah: Poet Laureate of Sindhi.” Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 235-239. Print.

13. Khoso, Muhammad Hassan, Panhwar Abdul Hameed and Sangi, Muhammad Khan. “Dramatic Monologue in Shah Jo Risalo: A Generic Study of Sur Marui.” ARIEL, Vol.29 (2020): 60-87. Print.

14. Lane, Aleksandra. Bridging the Gap between Traditional and Experimental Poetry:

15. Dramatic Monologue and Dramatic Lyric in Contemporary New Zealand Poetry. Ph.D. Diss. Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand, 2014. Web. 22 Dec. 2016. <https://www.mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/6247/02_whole.pdf>.

16. Lescrauwaet, Tim. The Speaker in and Analyses of Robert Browning’s Dramatic Monologues: My Last Duchess, Fra Lippo Lippi, Porhpyria’s Lover, The Bishop Orders Is Tom at Saint Praxed’s Church, A Toccata of Galuppi’s and Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came. Master Thesis, Ghent University, Germany, 2009. Web 17 Aug. 2016. <http://www. lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug 01: 001366170>.

17. Maenhout, Freya. Gender Relations in Robert Browning’s Dramatic Monologues. Ph.D. Diss. Ghent University, Germany, 2007. Web 17 Aug. 2016. <http:// www.lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug 01: 001414432>.

18. Myhre, Cecilie Berg. “Quiet is Hell, I Say: The Role of Women Poets in the Development of the Victorian Dramatic Monologue.” MA Thesis. University of Oslo, 2016. Web. 22 April 2017. <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/.../Thesis-Cecilie-Berg-Myhre.pdf?...1>.

19. Salgado, Ralph Henry. Robert Browning: An Interpreter’s Analysis of Selected Monologues. MA Thesis, University of Arizona, 1966. Web. 12 Aug. 2016.

20. <http://www.arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/.../1/AZU_TD_BOX40_E9791_1966_5.pdf>.

21. Sayed, Dr.Durreshahwar. The Poetry of Shah Abdul Latif. Jamshoro/ Hyderabad: Sindhi Adabi Board, 1988.

22. Sessions, Ina Beth. “The Dramatic Monologue.” MLA 62.2 (1947): 503-516. Web. 12 Dec. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/459275>.

23. Shah, Mushtaq Ali. Message of Shah (Shah Jo Risalo). Trans. Kandiaro: Roshni Publication, 2014. Print.

24. Shaikh, Abdul Rhim. “Heroines of Shah Abdul Latif.” Shah Abdul Latif, his Mystical Poetry. Ed. Abdul Hamid Akhund. Karachi: Shah Abdul Latif Bhit Shah Cultural Centre, 1991. 181-189. Print.

25. Sorley, H.T. Shah Abdul Latif of Bhit. Karachi: Sindhi Kitab Ghar, 1989.

26. Williams, David. “Re-inventing the Form: The Dramatic Monologue in West Indian

27. Poetry.” Caribbean Studies 27.3/4 (1994): 444-447. Web. 09 September 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25613281> .