

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Parody on Christianity in Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
For the Master's Degree of Arts in English
Central Department of English,

By

Ramesh Chandra Bhusal

University Campus

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

2008

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled "Parody on Christianity in Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Ramesh Chandra Bhusal, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of Research Committee,

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of the
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Ramesh Chandra Bhusal has completed his/her thesis entitled "Parody on Christianity in Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*" under my supervision. He carried out his research from Oct. 2006 to December 2008 A.D. I hereby recommend submitting his thesis to the research committee for viva-voce.

.....

Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung

Supervisor

Date:

Acknowledgements

The supervision, encouragement and assistance of many individuals have contributed in the completion of this thesis work. In this regard, first of all, I wish to express my sense of indebtedness to my respected advisor Mr. Pam Bahadur Gurung, central Department of English, for his excellent academic guidance, constant encouragement and humble help throughout this research work. Despite his busy schedule and pressure of other academic works, he provided me his scholarly guidance.

I have a great pleasure to express my deep sense of gratitude to Mr. Ghanashyam Bhandari for his enthusiastic encouragement. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of the department, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Birendra Pandey, Dr. Sanjeev Upreti and Mr. Sadan Adhikari for their scholarly suggestions and comments on some points of research work. I will be failing in my duty if I do not extend my gratitude to my senior teachers of this department for providing me such an opportunity to write dissertation and my special thanks goes to my classmates.

December, 2008

Ramesh Chandra Bhusal

Abstract

The research is held to see how Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* chops out the convention of classical dramas through the dealing of epic theatre concepts. Another significant issue that is raised in the research is, use of communist overtones to parodize Christianity by using the Christian images, assumptions and sacraments. As Brecht seems to undermine Christianity by the Christian images, assumptions and sacraments, he seems to have been questioning on the existence of God nor he sees any types of roles of the God to the individuals lives rather Brecht dramatically celebrates individualism to the world of materialism

Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
I: Brecht's Epic theater and parody	1
II: Brecht's Epic Theater	9
Christianity in Brecht's Epic Theatre	11
Marxist Perspective to Christianity	14
Epic Theater and Marxism	20
Epic Theater as the Parody to Christianity	23
III: Brecht's <i>The Caucasian Chalk Circle</i> as a parody to Christianity	26
Chapter IV: Conclusion	43
Works Cited	45

I: Brecht's Epic Theater and parody

The present research deals with how Brecht has made the parody of Christianity in his work *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*. Further, the work has shown the reconstruction of various Christian stories like "Fall and Redemption," "Christ's Birth and 'Baptism , Christian myths about resurrection, help in the time of need, courage in the time of fear and even the way Brecht mimics the sense of Solomonic judgment and the Solomonic garden. In order to prove the drama as the parody or mimicry of Christianity, the researcher has brought the stories from the Christian Holy Scripture, Bible as the reference; then only the relation of Marxism and Christianity, to come up with the theoretical tools for textual analysis.

Since Bertolt Brecht has been known as the profounder of the concept of epic theatre, the concept of anti -Aristotelian theatre, critics have mainly focused their criticisms in regard to *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* around the periphery of epic theatrical concept rather than other. The logic they produce is similar and varied but the idea that the present researcher picks is either in shade or not mentioned earlier. The play itself is unusual for Brecht because it has happy ending: everything works out for Grusha, the servant lady at the governor's house.

In surface, *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* is a communist play with a message: Whoever can make the best use of the resources in order to provide for others deserves to get those resources. In the very prologue of the drama, *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*, Brecht draws the anti-capitalist thesis. The land dispute between two different parties, goat herder and fruit farmer, the judgment is given to the side of the party who does not inherit the land but can make the best use of it. Similarly, the play's original print was not allowed due to the communist overtones. The communist

overtone is also expressed through the economic gap between the capitalists and proletariats. By raising the issue of such economic equality, Brecht has been able to denounce the capitalist society that focuses on 'money' rather than 'kindness'.

Another significant idea that *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* carries is the religious aspect, specially the Christian references and reconstructs in other ways such as resurrection into insurrection, Solomonic judgment into Adzak's way of judgment, Jesus's birth and Baptism to Michael's birth and baptism to draw the attention of the readers. Significance of bringing those parallel stories suffice us that Brecht focuses on materiality and general human beings rather than focusing on God so that he could show mimicry of good to his readers. This reconstruction over Christianity or Christian images is not only the departure of Marxist critics but also Brecht's departure from religion and also his theory of epic theatre. So, Brecht has been able to craft the jumble and juxtapose the images from the traditional religious beliefs to the social background or reality.

In this remark, Bertolt Brecht seems to be an anti Christian Marxist as he shows the empty and bleak life of his characters in the capitalist structure of the society that has no God to look after its people. Brecht, being an influential Marxist playwright, has juxtaposed the images of the ordinary lives of his characters within the images taken from Christianity. As the play opens on 'Easter Sunday' at the time of 'Christ's resurrection', there is insurrection of the Governor; people are being chased through the Church in stead of going to the Church. Promise of Grusha to Michael for his Baptism and adoption by the unmarried mother and father as of Jusup and Mary. Similarly her promise for Michael's Baptism with the glacier water instead of Church and Solomon's way of judgment, the judge and Solomonic garden are juxtaposed in the play from the beginning to the end.

However various critics have viewed this play from various angles, some critics say it epic drama and some others regard it as the Marxist drama with a communist overtone. *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* (1963) by Brecht was written while he was in exile in the US during World War II. Since the publication of *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*, the drama has drawn the attention of many critics, especially because of its varying themes and Brechtian techniques. Critics have agreed that Brecht loves "to incorporate Marxist theory into his drama to show the bleak and empty side of human life with theatrical effect of alienation". (Wilkinson 12). This concept of Wilkinson is close to the idea of other critics who regard Brecht as a whole in the periphery of epic theatrical concept and Marxist theory. John Willet's view on Brecht's technique is also similar to Wilkinson, who says, "Theatre consists the things that make lively representations of reported or invented happenings between human beings and doing with a view to literature. At any rate that is what we shall mean when we speak of theatre whether old or new" (14).

As Wilkinson and Willet support the idea of epic theatre, another critic Robert W. Corrigan's idea is also similar to them. He argues that Brecht is different from the Aristotelian concept of pity and fear or to say arousing catharsis as the fundamental idea of drama. Further Corrigan gives emphasis on the ideation, feeding and emotion as equally as to the entertainment:

Human beings go to the theatre in order to be swept away, captivated, impressed, uplifted, horrified, moved, kept in suspense's , released, diverted, set free set going, transplanted from their own time and supplied with allusions. All of this goes so much without saying that the art of theatre in candidly defined as having the power to release, sweep away, and uplift. It is not an art at all unless it does so. (106)

By supporting the concept of epic theatre with close connection to the Marxist idea of changes and influences, Samuel L. Leiter asserts his strong view on the concept of epic theatre. He sees the need of societal implication of the drama rather than of the catharsis. As Corrigan has asserted earlier, he sees the audiences not to be involved in the emotional mode of the drama neither arousing the pity nor fear rather they should enjoy it with the thought of a mere art. He asserts for the " use of theatre as an instructional medium, Theatre should make him ponder the drama's Marxist implications the need for societal change" (158).

Here, Samuel L. Leiter's remark does not only support the idea of epic theatre but also connects epic theatre's concept with Marxist idea of changes and influences. Waste of the theatre's resources to memorize an audience and purge its emotions through identification with the characters and the situation. All such empathic theatrical experiences he identified as " Aristotelian." He called theatre that existed safely to give sexual pleasure without provoking socially meaningfully through 'culinary'.

Christopher Innes, on the other hand, reviews the drama and says that *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* fulfills all the requirements that any type of epic drama does carry. Further, he says that the capitalist system becomes the backdrop of *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*. He comments that "*The Caucasian Chalk Circle* with its complex mix of pathos and comedy is the finest play' (112). Similarly, Walter Weideli views the drama, *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* from same line. Focusing on the capitalist system that becomes the backdrop of *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*, Walter Weideli writes on how Brecht opposes the underlining of the society. As he writes:

The Caucasian Chalk Circle becomes the symbol of all those who in a world violence, obstinately pursue a work of peace. And it, for once it gains the upper hand; this is because there has always been slight change for expectation. The feudal underlining of 'Grusinie' has risen against the Grand Duke and his governors because his work like plans have failed. (95)

In the above quote, Weideli highlights the functioning of a capitalist society and its bleaker side of human life. But in doing so, he later on brings forth Brecht's rising doubts regarding the existence of God: "*The Caucasian Chalk Circle* which forms Brecht's testament defines morality in terms of law [. . .] and takes up the quasi universal theme of judgment of Solomon. Brecht opposes the myth form, the beginning of the model demands of a world" (97).

In the above mentioned quotes replacing morality in terms of law, Brecht reconstructs his own 'Testament' presenting a lot of Christian images with the help of ordinary human beings. Creating his own testament is in a way to reject the traditionally believed religious idea. Jessica Helfand, in *Reinventing The Wheel*, states the similar idea to Weideli. Helfand's strong remarks comment the idea of the Christianity or Bible as St. Augustine described the nature of god as a circle whose center was everywhere and its circumference no where. As she states: "The circle has no beginning and no ending. It is unbiased, solid and unwavering in its geometric simplicity, denoting unity and eternity, totally and infinity [. . .]. The circle draws its rich symbolism from numerous sources, including, but not limited to biblical liturgy" (13).

Charles R. Lyons remarks the drama *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* "concerns a young servant girl who saves the deserted infant child of the prince during revolution" (133).

This assertion shows the departing attitudes between the aristocrats and working class people. Alfred D. White also comments about the Lyons idea by stating that Brecht has "constructed model situation shows social relationships, rather than more or less naturalistic depictions of probable and improbable" (39).

This voice of Alfred shows the Brechtian concept of drama departed from the Aristotelian concept of drama which sees the drama having the coherence in the plot. Since many critics have seen *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* as a drama under the category of epic theater, some of the critics see the glimpse of this play as a political play too. Under the group of such critics, Samuel. L. Leiter is one who sees the play as left Winger. This remark gives us the clue that Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* is also a political reaction against the racist's politics of Hitler and Nazi. Following the same vein of criticism, Ronald Hymen reviews the play *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* as the autobiographical reference due to the political pressure of its background period. He says:

Heartening though it was, the American declaration of war (1941) made life more difficult. He was now an enemy alien. [. . .] like other German imminent in and around. Brecht comes under suspicion. Some neighbor thought that they were working for Nazis and others thought it was for Russians. (259)

The above mentioned quote directly does not present the contemporary political ups and downs as well as the political pressure over the general public who were not free to think about their own nor could they defy according to their own senses.

But some other critics like Thomas P. Adler analyze the drama *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* in association with the religion. Among the critics, Adler:

The latter part of the play focuses on the story of Adzak, a crude, drunken scoundrel who, throughout a bizarre twist of fate, becomes the village Judge. He settles the conflicting claims on the baby between criticism and governor's widow by putting the baby in a circle of chalk to see how each supposed mother will put it out. (70)

The logic of Adler's criticism and John Fuegi's concept of judging *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* seems closer to Fuegi who claims that "Brecht hates both fascism and right using capitalism" (15). Both of the critics seem close to say that both fascists and rights are based on greed and eager to abuse the poor during peacetime and provoke wars that keep the poor miserable. As we observe the play with in play, we realize that *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* blends a cynical world view with a positive conclusion. In this context, Adler adds:

The latter part of the play focuses on story of Adzak, a crude , drunken scoundrel who throughout a bizarre twist of fate, becomes the village judge. He settles the conflicting claims on the baby between Grusha and the governors widow by putting the baby in a circle of chalk to see how much each supposed mother will put it our. (70)

Making a close contact to Weideli's view about Brecht's own testament, Adler also supports the idea of Brecht as an anti religious playwright. In the same line where as J.N. Smith also writes on how Brecht manipulates various stories to undermine the Christian religion and to parodize its ideal. He comments that "Brecht continues to undermine religion in both subtle and obvious ways; notice that the act of entering the church is juxtaposed with the image of soldier's pushing" (3).

In this way, the above mentioned critics have seen *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* in different ideas and lights but the present research is planned to state the problem that why Brecht has used various images by Juxtaposing them with the images from the Christian Holy scriptures to prove that it is to parodize and hence mock at the Christian religion. So to prove the stated problem, the present research moves with the help of few theoretical tools like parody, reconstruction reference stories from Christian holy scriptures Bible, the relationship and departure of Marxism and Christianity to focus on how Brecht reconstructs religion into human dimension of present socio- economic reality.

II: Brecht's Epic Theater

Since the present research aims to prove Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* as the parody on Christianity, it is essential enough to discuss how Brecht applies his theory of drama 'epic theater' to parodize the religion, Christianity. In this reference, Brecht being a Marxist dramatist, reacts to Christianity in relation to the Marxist perspective. Brecht picks up the concept of 'epic theater' that Erwin Piscator had already innovated. Because Aristotlean concept of theater was still in practice with various presupposition of social and economic harmony with the help religion at depth. So, Brecht's principal target is to show failure in the dramatic theater providing such a lively picture of the modern world.

In this sense, 'Epic Theater' as what is Epic Theater is certainly non-Aristotelian in so far as it upsets the sequence of time which Aristotle presupposed as one of the constituents of tragedy. Brecht writes early in *The Note to Mahogany*: "Narrative' is to replace 'plot' instead of being, 'a part of the whole', each scene is to be 'an entity in itself', moving in the Jesus rather than in the evolutionary necessities' by which one follows form the other" (19). Plot has the main role in tragedy for Aristotle, characters as to be the noble or role models, and social message as the essentially required one with the harmoniously attached actions. Saying generally, Drama, mainly Tragedy for Aristotle requires sequence of events. The actions should be complete and guiding with having the beginning, middle and ending. 'The beginning is that from which further action flows out and which is intelligible in itself and not consequent or dependent on any part on any previous situation. 'End' is that which flows with the similar coherence of the beginning and the middle. This way Aristotle sees the artistic wholeness in tragedy but concept of epic theatre is the

antithesis to his notion of the drama because epics theatre never seeks any logical built of the plot, no need to have coherence nor that needs to bring catharsis to the spectators as in the following quote:

Brecht's 'Epic Theater' is the antithesis of Aristotelian drama rather than the thesis of Aristotelian concept of tragedy or drama as a whole because Brechtian concept of drama as a whole epic theater rejects those general requirements of drama that Aristotle supposes.(18)

Epic theater rejects logically built and artificial plot of the 'well made' plays, is free from the need of suspense, loosely knit and episodic; instead mourning to a dynamic climax, the story unfolds in a number of separate situations, each rounded and complete in itself. The total effect of the play is achieved through the juxtaposition and 'montage' of contrasting episodes while the Aristotelian drama' can only be understood as a whole. Brecht claimed that idea of epic theater as universally valid. His theories were only the stage theories to meet the needs of a new revolutionary scientific age. Is it possible to reproduce the modern world in the theater? Brecht answered:

I have all the possibilities but I can't say that the dramaturgical ideas which I call non-Aristotelian, and the epic manner of acting they entail, represent the one and only solution. However, one thing has become clear the modern world can be described to modern man only when it is described as an alterable world. (xiv)

Since earlier concept of drama that followed the concept of 'unity' for the sake of 'meaning', Brecht's concept of epic theater sees 'meaning' underneath the fragments, isolation. This concept sees the world as 'alterable' in the sense of modern man attached to the social dialects rather than to the lesson oriented spectaclity. As

Brechtian technique of drama rejects the idea of Aristotle form various Angles, 'pity and fear' or "Catharisis" doesn't have any place in Brecht's'. According to him, tragedy rouses pity and fear form potentiality to actuality through suitable stimuli.

Christianity in Brecht's 'Epic Theater'

Brecht doesn't believe the illusionary aspects that are created with means of religion. Especially he discards the idea that 'God creates us, rather believes on we create God.' This very idea is sharply concern with the concept of epic theater in which some so called truths and bonds that are created in the earlier dramas, are shown as the false consciousness even about the existence of God. "Christianity would later go further, still, and depict God as actually appearing in certain the author becoming a character in his own story, so to speak and suffering as a creature the consequences of its fallen state in order to restore it: Byfield (16).

To falsify the existence of God, he gives central position to the human beings and their actions rather than hoping for the fate or beliefs. In the earlier dramas like Aristotlean or dramatic theater, the spectacles are aspected to get moral lessons and to mourn for the fall of the protagonist and rise of the antagonistic forces very blindly but Brecht seeks a critical spirit to his spectacles. His spectators in a number of separate situations, each rounded and completed in itself. The total effect of the play is achieved through the juxtaposition and 'montage' of contrasting episodes while the Aristotelian drama' can only be understood as a whole.

Brecht claimed that idea of epic theater was universally valid. His theories were only the stage theories to meet the needs of a new revolutionary scientific age. Is it possible to reproduce the modern world in the theater? To this he answered:

I have all the possibilities but I can not say that the dramaturgical ideas which I call non-Aristotelian and epic manner of acting they

entail, represent the one and only solution. However one thing has become clear: the modern world can be described to modern man only when it is described as an alterable world. (xiv)

Brecht sees their existence in relation to society. Human beings as the part of a society and their position in it, they should have got the critical spirit to analyze the good and bad and should be detached from the performed goods. Not as the earlier concept of dramas, the audiences have neither time to sit back and show sympathy nor to mourn rather they begin to be distanced or are action guided. So, so 'fate' as the Christians believe, does have not position in Christianity.

The idea of 'alienation' is that the audience shouldn't identify themselves with any of the characters but should observe each characters from the general human perspective rather than the noble identity so that they could form their independent opinions about the persons and events. The aim of epic theater is to fight for the socialist transformation of society on national and international scale. There is a long believe that the 'capitalist system' has long ago out lined its historical usefulness and has converted itself into a monstrosly oppressive, unjust and inhuman system. The ending of exploitation and the creation of a harmonious socialist order based on a rational and democratically run plan of production, will be the first step in creation of a new and higher form of society in which men and women will relate to themselves as human beings. So, Brecht's epic theater sees Christianity as the part of capitalist production and hopes the characters to be alienated. Martin Esslin remarks its significance as follows:

By inhibiting the process of identification between the spectator and the characters, by creating a distance between them and enabling the audience to look at the action in a detached and critical spirit, familiar

things, attitudes and situations appear in a reward strange light, and create, through astonishment and wonder, a new understanding of the human situations. (114)

Now, the question that why epic theater, brings the anti-religious themes or anti-capitalist theme may arise so, it's significant to discuss on it. In the very period of origin of religions, they minded that to change the society. Originally, both Christianity and Islam were revolutionary movements of the poor and oppressed. Christianity in primitive period, they organized a mass movement of the poorest and most downtrodden sections of the society. It's not an accident that the Romans accused Christians of being a "movement of slaves and women" (111). The early Christianity has notable points of resemblance with the modern working class movements. Both are persecuted and baited, their adherents are despised and made the object of 'exclusive laws', the former as the enemies of human race and the latter as the enemies of state and religion, of family and social order. So, epic theater expresses the voices of those marginal and make them action guided for their rise rather than being hypnotized form the 'exclusive laws' which created them as the enemies.

As we discuss about the origin of early Christianity it becomes clear that Christ himself was also a radical communist who moved among the poor and dispossessed and frequently attacked the rich. It's not an accident that his first action on entering Jerusalem was to drive the money changers out of the temple so, it's clear that this discipline of religion was also made by capitalist on the other hand.

Marxist Perspective on Christianity

The major aim of the Marxists is to fight for socialist transformation of society on a national and international scale. They believed that the capitalist system has long ago outlined its historical usefulness and has converted itself into a monstrously oppressive, unjust and inhuman system. The ending of exploitation and the creation of a socialist world order, based on rational and dramatically run plan of production, will be the first step in the creation of a new and higher form of society in which men and women will relate to themselves as human beings.

Christianity thinks the God as the creator as Byfield says, "This God is the Hebrew portrayal, which came in its day (i.e. 3500 years ago) as a revolutionary and startling concept. It offended all the nature religions that surrounded it by portraying both man and nature as having failed or 'fallen' and God as intervening in his creation to restore it to what it was intended to be" (7).

Christianity would later go further still, and depict God as actually appearing in creation, the author becoming a character in his own story, so to speak- and suffering as a creature the consequences of its fallen state in order to restore it. Apparently rejecting all this, however, spirituality wants to return to worshipping nature itself, cherishing its beauty and seeing God more as Great Art than Great Artist. It usually fails, however, to reckon with nature other aspects: It's harsh exploitive ness. Every creature lives by over-coming, enslaving or devouring other creature. Marxists see there individualist activities holding in nature for individual survive and existence. So, to say the encourage to be 'eclectic' rather than the blind spirituality 'Eclectic' has been the favored term for them. Either the people are urged to derive their religious practices in numerous other ways or even not for examples.

Ronald Hayman says, "They borrow silent meditative prayer from the Quakers, a dash of ceremonial from the orthodox, a dab of Bible reading from the Evangelicals, with respect for ancestors added, and occasional church service are the way to changing process but the deep roots of Christianity, faith on discipline has still not been allowing to be completely changing. The people have now begun to think what is right and what is wrong" (3).

Christianity has always approved meditation, Bible reading, Cherishing nature's beauty and creating art our own because we are made in the image of nature's great Artisan-and worshiping him, not his creation. Since Christianity sees those all as the religious options, Marxists regard them as the individualistic options. As there are rules under Christianity like; requirements, codes of conduct, fasts and feasts, a season for this and a seasons for that and they apply to all the members, regardless of personal inclinators such structure imposes distinct inhibitions upon human beings. There are things people might like to think, say or do which are simply prohibited but things we don't like are ordered to be done otherwise it's thought as 'sin'. Christianity thinks this idea of individuality as the betrayal to the Christ but Marxists celebrate individuality into a great extent.

Marxists stand on the basis of "philosophical materialism", which rules out the existence of any supernatural entity, or anything outside or above nature. There is fact, no need for any such explanation for life and the universe least of all today. Nature furnishes its own explanations and it furnishes them in great abundance. Alan Woods remarks in his criticism, Marxism and criticism:

Science has proven that human kind has been developed like every other species-over millions of years, and that life itself has evolved form in organic matter. There can't be a brain without a central

nervous system, and there cannot be a central nervous system without material body, blood, bones, muscles etc. In turn, the body must be sustained by food derived from a material environment. The most recent discoveries of genetics in the human genome project have finished in controversies evidences for the material standpoint. This idea of 'philosophical materialism' questions about the religious origin point of human kind. The Christian story of 'fall of Adam and Eve' as the first ancestors of human beings or God creating the first generation of the human kind according to Hindus has been proven faken and proof-less or less-scientific, a myth. (15)

In this way, 'Creationism' has been proved as the nonsense gossip from the revelation of genome and its complex long history. It has prompted discussions about the nature of human kind and the process of creation. Incredibly, in the first decade of the twenty first century, the ideas of Darwin are being challenged by the so called creationist movement in the USA and other Christian countries, which wants to teach the school children that God created the world in six days, that man was created from dust and that the first woman was made out of his ribs. But, Marxists see this plot of the 'creationism' as nonsense. It has comprehensively demolished the notion that every species was created separately, and that man, with the 'eternal soul', was especially created to sing the praises of the lord. It's very clearly said that humans are not at all unique creatures from the genome project's perspective but the creationist claim them to be supreme and ideal than other species. The Marxists believe to the perspective of the 'genome project and Darwin, and believe that human beings shares the genes with other species going far back into the mist of time. In fact, a small part of this common genetic inheritance can bet raced back to primitive organism such as

bacteria. In many cases, humans have exactly the same genes as rats, mice, cats, dogs and even fruit flies etc. In this way Marxists propose the final proof of evolution as been established and they find no divine intervention as required one.

'Life after Death' is another part that the Marxist regard as another false consciousness. Christianity or other religions offer men and women the consolation of a life after death. But Marxists deny the possibility of such thing. Mind, ideas, the soul are the product of matter organized in a certain way. Organic life arises from inorganic life at a certain stage, and likewise, simple forms of life-bacteria single celled organism, evolve into more complex forms involving a backbone, a central nervous system and a brain. Woods further says:

The desire to live forever is at least as civilization, probably still older. There is something in our being that resists the idea that 'I' must some day cease to be. And indeed, to give up forever this wonderful world of sunshine and flowers, the wind etc. to enter an endless realm of nothingness which is hard to take or even to comprehend. Thus, early on, humans have sought imaginary communion with a non-material spirit world where it is believed on, a part of me will live on. This was indeed one of the most powerful and enduring messages of Christianity: 'I can live after death'. (19)

Since there is a great problem with the current life that is led by most men and women in the present society, so hard and so intolerable, or at least so meaningless, that the idea of a life after the death seems only the way to invest it with any meaning. And those people who regard religion as the part of life, with no education at all speak with confidence on the subject of 'soul and life after death'. They just imagine it is just waking up after a sleep and being blissfully united with long lost loved ones, and

to live happily ever after. Marxist under the idea of philosophical materialism discard this idea, by complaining as impracticable because there is no scientific proof at all. The soul is supposed to be immaterial. But what is life without matter? The destruction of the physical body means the end of life of the individual being.

'Resurrection' is also as important idea that Christianity believes. Resurrection as a whole has the connective idea to 'life after death' or to say Christ is supposed to get resurrect or born again and again in order to save the true Christian followers, believe on the Christian doctrine as such. But Marxism sees no place of 'resurrection' nor of rebirth because body is made up of the atoms and work never after death. They thinks that rebirth impossible because there is neither unions nor separate existence of the human body and mind nor of soul and spirit rather its all the composition of Atoms. By pointing to death as integral part after life. William Raymond in his book *Drama from Ibsen to Brecht* says, "Marxists suspect upon this resurrection of Christ because they think it as a false propaganda or rumour. [. . .] is because they suspect upon the existence of God in one hand and if it had got existence, there is no possibility of rebirth due to the existence of material body further it's all fake" (17).

The love of the life is the true hallmark of philosophical materialism must entail a passionate desire to change the world we live in and improve the lives of the fellow men and women. Where religion teaches to lift the eyes to the heavens. Marxism tells to fight for better life on earth. Marxist believe that men and women should fight to transform their lives and to create a genuinely human society which would permit the human race to lift itself up to its true stature. Their believes of the single life inspire them to make better and self-fulfilling. So, doing better makes on memorable in future will be the life after death rather than getting life after being a heaven. There is therefore a profound philosophical difference between Marxism and

all forms of religion. Marxist emphasize in struggling against the oppression and injustice for the socialist transformation rather than the spiritual transformation. Marxists further blame the world of religion as the mystified world, a distorted impression of reality. At present, the Marxists think the revolutionary port of early Christianity been turned and twisted and been the manifests of the capitalists and Church as the principal vehicle of the enslavement of the socialists.

On the similar ways, Williams adds, 'Crisis to the capitalism is due to religion' (19). Marxists call religion as a 'false consciousness', because it directs the understanding of human beings away from the world. Religion for them is the enemy for the Marxists which always talks of mystic ideas and blinds the people. Science for them is the struggle of rationality against irrationality so, Marxism sides wholeheartedly with science. The whole purpose of acquiring rational knowledge of the world is to change it. They think the roots of Christianity lie in the distant past, when humans were struggling to free themselves form the animal world, in order to make sense of natural phenomena which were beyond their control, humans had recourse of magic and animalism. In class society, the market economy has been powerful to set ideas. Social being determines consciousness. The entire world has been dominated by the gigantic monopolies which plunder the globe, ravish the planet, destroy the environment and condemn countless million to a life of unbearable misery and suffering.

Similarly, Marxists debate on the idea of multinational corporations which are mostly practicing Christianity. Their worship of religion is less important rather they worship capitalism. By using mass-media or other broadcasting, they give the name of religion but twist the purpose on the other side. 'religious fundamentalism works as the showing guideline but distortion takes place hidden. They say, religious

fundamentalism is only a concrete expression of the impasse of capitalist society, which drives people to despair and madness. So, Marxists believe religion or religious fundamentalism as false consciousness and seek a radical break with dreams and a willingness to see the world as it is; as mortal men and women working for social transformation and see crisis to capitalism too.

Epic Theater and Marxism

Epic theater and Marxism, seem to have same thesis of celebrating 'individuality'. 'Individualism' for those both has its significant place. Epic theater as the anti thesis of the primitive theory of drama, the dramatic theory, breaks various so called disciplinary aspects that are set with various purposes, and so does Marxism. Marxism also tries to blend the so called capitalist and religious constraints that don't allow any individuals to cross for individual rights, justice and social transformation. Epic theater seeks transformation in the field of theory in a subtle manner but radically from the capitalistic notion of dramatic theory whereas Marxism struggles ideally for the social transformation through class struggle or by discarding the oppressing forces as the false director. As Martin Esslin writes:

The audience must be discouraged from losing its critical detachment by identification with one or more of the characters to opposite of identification is the maintenance of separate existence by being kept apart, alien or strange therefore the producers must strive to produce effects which will keep the audience separate estranged, alienated from action. (110)

Epic theater is the concept that emphasizes the view of action so, it doesn't see any plot, made artificially so that the characters would move in the same track.

Marxists also the track that is set by the capitalist the notion. Since Dramatic theater

'implicates' the spectators in the stage situation and wears down his capacity for action, the epic theater 'turns' the spectators into an observer but arouses capacity for action. Here, the difference is that due to one wants the spectator to be silent and stable but the latter one wants to change the spectators to motion or action. Providing sensation and experience to the spectators are the effects of dramatic theater but epic theater forces the individual to take decisions by showing the picture of the world in which he is not mere a puppet.

In the similar way, dramatic theater has the purpose of providing suggestions, preserving the instinctive feelings, sharing the experience but epic theater in the opposite makes the spectators arguing, brought to the recognition of him/her and standing outside study. The human beings as such are taken as the granted in the dramatic theater but they are the object of inquiry in epic theater as well as alterable.

Some other points that are radically brought in the concept of epic theater theory are, each scene is for itself, the plot doesn't move in accordance of linearity rather jumping and leaping are held because it sees man as the process and social beings determining the thought. Reasons has its significant place than the feeling and emotions.

Those constituents that fall under the concept of epic theater, carry the characteristics of celebrating individuality. Since the dramatic theory carries only the primitive ideas as the part to human beings to follow but not break them, epic theater doesn't give any place to them and wishes the individuals to transform themselves with the sense of transformation by reasoning capacity and power to take actions in the time of need.

'Alienation' is the main idea that epic theater picks up in opposite of 'catharsis' or 'pity and fear' or dramatic theater, epic theater finds it as the illusion and wishes the

spectators to be alienated or detached from such emotions so that they could begin reasoning.

Argumentation, reasoning, thinking critically and examining with radical vision are the parts of epic theater so that there seems a close relationship between epic theater concept and Marxist perspective because they both carry the similar characteristics. Since there is no place for emotion and sentimentality in Marxist perspective, epic theater carries anti-sentimental thesis of 'alienation' effect that emphasizes or reasoning, thought and action motivated, which is completely fit to the Marxist perspective.

The other factors of epic theater that fit to Marxism are; importance of action guided characters or individuals in Marxist sense, characters in the epic theater is more important who wish to be in the process of change rather than being more spectator and it regards a man as a process which fit with Marxism that thinks human beings as the process, to be transform by the reasoning power or even from the 'false consciousness' of religion, capitalism or any types of imposed burdens to practical, socialism etc. As epic theater finds social being determining thoughts, Marxism believes on it because social factors are the guidance and determiner of their 'recognition' of the spectators as the individual is also the vital part of epic theater and so is the case of Marxism that ever wish to integrate and profound the oppressed people their own identity so that they could work as the member of any society rather than to be ruled. Epic theater has its main purpose to stimulate the critical faculties and to make think about the historicity of the actor and the audience as John Willet remarks:

Historical incidents are unique transitory incidents associated with particular periods. Social evolution is determined by the modes and

relation of production, and progress and social transformation result from class struggle and social intervention. The historical relativity of events in the play, therefore, had to be made more comprehensive to the audience. (39)

This can be done by setting the dramatic incidents in the past, or by constructing the play in the form of a story which had already happened, hence, 'epic.' Historicizing was thus a means of making the present look strange and there by suggesting the need for social change.

As it's already discussed from the characteristics of epic theater, we can see a sharp association between those; means between Marxism and epic theater. The main purpose of epic theater is to have radical change in the dramatically field so that it could work as the social change enter and Marxism wishes to have social change form any means. So, Brechtian concept of epic theater is significantly fit for the Marxist perspectives.

Epic Theater as the Parody to Christianity

Since Epic theater is known as the Anti-thesis of the dramatic theater or Aristotlean concept of theater, is regarded as the parody to Christianity. The English dramatic concept since primitive era has been working as the chart of Christianity and capitalist notion, epic theater has been an advance form, raised by those who wish radical changes and transformation in the society.

As parody is known as a method of criticism, by mocking and poking fun at the cultural Icons, heredity and so-called centers, it has been the way of those dramatists under the concept of epic theater, like Bertolt Brecht, whose association is with Marxist view point. Since epic theater and Marxism has close relation, it's here to say that Marxists never regard religion as the ideal rather poke fun at it and mock on it

that they could prove Christianity as the 'false consciousness.' On this subject, Trotsky writes, "Religion, as indeed any other, ideas being born out of soil of the material conditions of life and above all the soil of class contradictions, [. . .] effects of serious social shocks and crises" (167).

'Epic theater' concept is opposite to the dramatic theater notion due to various characteristics, like the celebration of individuality, alienation effect, no linearity and no moral lesson from the dramatic performances but those all characteristics are oppositely associated to Christianity. The coherence, unity, moral lessons, nobility, emotional effect and sentimentality are formed in dramatic theaters so that they could further blind the oppressed in the name of religion and with the dreams of heaven in life after death. Epic theater sees it as the false ideal of Christianity.

That only could keep the condition as it is even in the future too. The resurrection of Christ in the time of need or for help or the unseen God doesn't have any existence in the concept of epic theater.

For a very long decades back, Christianity has defined the females and poor people as the enemy of religion and coherence, epic theater tries to blend this idea in oppositional way. There is a very irrational idea quoted in Christian holy script use Bible that Eve, a female being is cause the fall of Adam, a male identity. Seeing through the view point of Marxist idea, Eve resulted consciousness to Adam, who was kept under illusion in the name of fall so, Eve is greater than Adam. The another issue could be risen there is that if Eve hadn't been guided by action, the human origin would not have been to the world either. Neither Marxist nor the dramatists of epic theater deal with the second idea but they always deal with the first, due to the marginality and false consciousness given to the females and poor. Trotsky further writes:

While not having over-come primitive peasant mythology as time went on, turned into the apparatus Tsarism. The priest walked hand in hand with constable and any development of sectarian dissent was met with repression [. . .] the Russian worker shook off religious thinking altogether. (169)

Moral lesson ideas of meditation, celebration of the non-existed entity and following tradition of the so-called noble characters fall under the tradition of dramatic concept of theater which seeks people to perform those upper duties in the name of God but epic theater seeks the critical judgment from those characters so that they could judge and deal with their consciousness. So, epic theater always deal with the anti-religious, anti-capitalist and marginal issues that make parody to Christianity and negate the religion as a whole.

Thus, Brecht uses various techniques and creates a circulatory subject matters around the play. This debate against the primitive dramatic idea which due to the Aristotelian concept and bases of drama. Brechtian techniques of sense of Alienation, anti-religious themes the plot structure, societal influences and even by the subject-issues from the common class people are significant.

III. Brecht's *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* as a parody on Christianity

The Caucasian Chalk Circle by Bertolt Brecht is an immensely communist play not only because it exploits the communist overtone to undo the capitalist victory but also it discards the capitalist ethics of cherishing Christianity as ethics of morals as good ideals overloaded to common people. Brecht parodizes various biblical stories and images which are recognized as the platform for the public purification but for him are the determining forces of arousing false consciousness and fake ideals. Here, the present research sees Brecht as the playwright who emphasizes more on humanitarian ground of religion rather than false ideals, the Christian religiosity.

From the very beginning of the play, Brecht supports the sides of the commoners who have been long suffered from the capitalists traits. The dispute on the land owning is judged from the Marxists perspective; land should be owned by the people who can use it best. Since, Christina expects on the right of property as inheritance, Brecht's delegate in the play gives decision to the side of farmer arguing how he can give better production rather than the previous owner. The land dispute based on Marxism, present says, "Don't get angry. It's true that we have to consider a piece of land as a tool with which one produces something useful" (5).

As Brecht has offered his message of the play as anti-capitalist and anti-religious, this remarks attempt to support to the prologue that he offered before the play begins. It seems extremely clever of him because the audience receives the moral of the play without even watching it. The 'Christian images' are frequently used in the play but they don't give the exact meaning as they have long been shaped to give rather as Brecht's undermining religion throughout the play in both subtle and obvious ways. 'Easter Sunday' in which the play opens, is shaped as the day, a time for the "Resurrection of Christ' for the help of common people, to save from a big

problem but here in the play, Brecht draws it negatively. On which 'insurrection' does take place and causes of the ruining and disordering of the Caucasian village. As 'Resurrection' is important for the Christians, as ideals, 'insurrection' has been drawn as equally important for them for the sake of 'power and property' that's why the Governor has been killed by his own brother; it's only for the capitalists because the following remarks exclaims that the poor and helpless are not been cared on the day. "Mercy, your grace, the taxes are beyond our means. I lost my led in the Persian war, [. . .] my child is starving in my arms [. . .], the water inspector is corrupt" (10). Brecht here seems to show the disorder of the society, as the reality which is thought to have a solution through religion, as the kindness of the capitalists. It's all Brecht's mock on religion which is thought as the solution or help to the needed.

The act of 'entering to the Church' is another image we notice in the opening of the play. As Christianity defines, the people should move to the Church to purifying their soul form sin so that they could get the way to heaven. The another reason for those commoners to go to the Church is to plead to the God, to get rid of from the existing problems, but Brecht juxtaposes the 'entering' image into expelling form the church. The commoners are being chased from the church. This very action of being chased form the church on 'Enter-Sunday' is the reality of the modern world. This idea in 'the Caucasian Chalk Circle' also supports, Brecht's parody is the undermining of the religion.

Not only through the use of anti-Christian images Brecht continuously makes sacraments to Christianity, the second act of the Caucasian chalk circle Sarcasm begins and that continuous even to the last act. In the second act, Brecht reintroduces sarcasm through the following remarks: "And now you don't need on architect, a

carpenter will do" (13). This sarcasm bring another image 'a carpenter' which alludes to the fact that Jesus was a carpenter; as the Governor needs Jesus to intervene and save him on Easter Sunday; but the later part prove that this will never happen.

"Silver cross chain" is another image that Brecht uses in the second chapter of the Caucasian chalk circle, and he makes another sarcasm to religion" (15). Since, chain is know as the agreement to engagement and later to be married, it carries the religious significance and agreement but Brecht mocks to such promises which could be broken due to the compulsion of the present time:

Simon Chachava, I shall wait for you.

Go calmly into battle, soldier

The bloody battle, the bitter battle

From which not everyone returns.

When you return to will bet there.

I will be waiting for you under the green elm

I will be waiting for you under the bare elm

[. . .] the pillow beside mine will be empty

my mouth will be unkissed

When you return, when you return. (19)

As it is mentioned in the earlier paragraph, it is a sharp sacrament in *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* because Grusha, the beloved to Simon couldn't fulfill her promise until her lover Simon returned back. The silver chain couldn't work as the engagement tool. The act of confirmation has been shown as failure.

'Baptism' is also another image from religion. As catholic Church believes, there should be given the name to the newly born baby, which carries the religious meaning and significant about Brecht being a Marxist playwright uses 'Baptism across

the Glacier' instead of Church Baptism. So, his character Grusha, not being a real mother to the Child Michael promises to give another name after fleeing away from the dangers:

Since I carried you too long.
 And with sore feet
 Since the milk was too dear
 I grew fond of you.
 (I wouldn't be without you anymore)
 I'll throw the fine little shirt away
 And wrap you in rags
 I'll wash you and Christen you
 with glacier water.
 (You will have to bear it). (40)

This short song is a parable which mocks the way the common people's minds are about baptism. As the Christian ideology taught the common people its faith about baptism or naming after birth, people believe in baptism. Making a mouthpiece to Grusha, Brecht makes a satire on the baptising process. The third sacrament Brecht uses in the Caucasian Chalk Circle is about 'Holy Eucharist'. Holy Eucharist refers to the last supper of Jesus Christ, the wine and bread. Since the extreme poor are there in the Caucasian village and hunger has been the great problem, Brecht makes a sacrament of it in scene three, "No on time, eating time. Now will sit here quietly in the grass, while the good Grusha goes and buy a little mug of milk [. . .]. Grandpa, could I have a little mug of milk? And perhaps a corn cake?" (27).

The fourth sacrament that Brecht uses in the Caucasian chalk circle is about 'penance'. Penance refers to the way people begin to suffer themselves so that they could get rid of their sins but Brecht modifies this sacrament in another way. Grusha, here is suffering not for herself but for the baby Michael. This suffering doesn't last at once but develops a process. Her suffering is not a get rid from her sin but for her good deed because to save the life of an abandoned baby is not a sin but is a holy work in common sense. In other hand this penance doesn't take place at the same place but as the process. Grusha is chased away from the Caucasian village, she takes a risk of her and baby's life while crossing the bridge, being hungry for a long:

The rosy dawn in the corn fields

Is nothing but could to the sleepers.

The gay clatter of the milk cans in the farmyard where the smoke rises
is nothing but a threat to the fugitives.

She who drags the child feels nothing but its weight. (34)

This very short song is very symbolic because it gives the sense of Grusha's suffering but it's very sarcastic since Grusha's acceptance of this suffering is not for herself but for the baby's sake instead of purifying from the scene. This cleverness of Brecht is not only to make his character to prove good but it's to mock at 'penance'.

In act four, again Brecht makes fun of religion. Jessup, a sick and dying man has been chosen as the bridegroom for Grusha. Jessup is meant to represent 'Joseph' who married 'Mary' when she was pregnant. It's very funny to see that 'Joseph' and Mary gave birth to Jesus but here, Brecht represents a dying man replacing Joseph and another human character Grusha to replace Mary. Now the baby Michael has got the place in Brecht's comic of religion. By joining this consequence to another so called religiosity of her lover's wife, Aniko, Brecht's strongly makes fun of

religion. Brecht's idea might be that to produce an echo that the so-called religious people aren't kind inwardly as much as they appear outwardly. Brecht somehow attempts to show such reality through the characteristics of Aniko. As the following remarks try to show her goodness; but in reality she pokes Grusha again and again by her dialogues which later compel Grusha to marry with a dying man.

Laverenty: [. . .]I wanted to talk about Aniko she has a good heart but she's very, very sensitive. People only have to mention our farm and she is worried. She takes everything to heart, you know. Our milkmaid once went to church with a hole in her stocking. Ever since then my dear Aniko has always worn two pairs of stockings to Church. It's hard to believe, but it's the old family. [. . .] If so, you couldn't stay here.

(47)

Such remarks in the play appear as the Brecht's anti-religious idea because Aniko's behaviour to Grusha later compel her to accept her brother's following purpose, "Of course. That's all been considered. You don't need a man in bed, but a man in a paper. And that's the very man I have found. The son of the woman I spoke to is dying. Isn't that wonderful? He's just at his last gasp" (48).

It's religious consequences that make Grusha, a victim. She has now been a person to break her promise and confirmation to Simon but her kindness of humanity to Michael's safety allows her to accept the mother. This event follows the sixth sacrament of Christianity of 'Holy order.'

'Holy order' is recognized in the Christian society as the part of social order. Church and religious people like monk do keep order. Here, Brecht pasteurizes of a corrupt monk who agrees to perform the rituals to the weddings ceremony between Grusha and Jessup:

The mother in law: (quoting monk) I shouldn't have hired such a cheap one. That's what you would expect. An expensive one knows how to behave. In such, there's one who is even in the odour of sanctity but of course he charges a fortune. A fifty piaster priest like this one here has no dignity. And as for piety, he has precisely fifty piasters' worth, and no more. And when I fetched him from the tavern, he was just finishing a speech and shouting. (52)

Here, this remark is very powerful to support Brecht to his mocking to the so-called holy orders. If the priests of monks themselves are like the present one, then the question arises that how they could mention the holy order in the society or to say if there is no control to themselves, how they could control others.

The seventh sacrament that Brecht mock upon is on 'holy order'. This mocking though take place frequently in the development of drama,, it appears strongly in the fourth act and even to the final act. The drunkard, Adzak has been made the judge of the Caucasian village and he gives the fair decisions and orders to the people how are long suffered. The 'Holy order' has been again mocked at the very time of Adzak's appointment as the judge. A drunkard, to be a judge is very paradox because the monks or religious celebrity were used to be appointed to this post. This brings together another sacrament of matrimony. The orders or holy orders are no longer to be under working rather disorder off holiness has been assumed in the play.

Regarding this issue Michael morley remarks:

It is, however, the characters of Grusche and Adzak who provide the focal point of the play are them and in this respect, the Caucasian Chalk circle is something of a rarity in Brecht's work. In no other play has he created to such dominating protagonists, so similar in their

vitality and conviction. Grusche, in assuming responsibility for the child, performs an isolated act which cannot have any great impact to society. But Azdak, the good/bad judge, is in a position where his judgments can redress the balance of society, if only for a short time. Azdak embodies Brecht's fondness for paradox and contradiction in amore extreme from than Grusche. For she is the only character in Brecht's dramas for whom goodness pays off. Yet it requires the assistance of a most unlikely dens or rather advocates to see that she wins the case. (83)

This idea of Morley is very supportive to Brecht's technique of Sarcasm to the 'Holy orders' and matrimony. Which supports following lines:

Great houses turn to ashes
 And blood ruins down the street
 The Thugs and the blasphemers
 Lounge by the attar-store:
 Now, now, now, Azdak
 sits on the judgment throne. (73)

This mocking at the religious idea of judgment or early mentioned sacraments even continue to the last act in which Brecht mimics to Solomonic judgment. The reference of the Solomonic judgment here comes to be opposite from the ancient assumption of finding real mother. Solomonic judgement of finally real mother refers to the ancient story of Solomon in which, Solomon had made the 'Chalk circle', put the baby in it and pretended to cut it, but the real mother didn't like to hurt the baby so is the case in the play. In which Grusha and the governor's wife claim the baby to be their own so

Azdak makes a chalk circle and asks those both mothers to pull from the hands, the real mother becomes ready to pull the baby but Grusha doesn't. So, Azdak gives the baby to Grusha. This idea is very parodic to the ancient story since the rearing mother gets the baby instead of bearing mother:

Adzak (rising): And in this manner the court has established the true mother. To Grusha: Take your child and be off with it. I advise you not to stay in town with him. To the Governor's wife: And you disappear before if in you for Frail. Your estate fall to the city. A playground for children will be made out of them. They need one and I have decided it shall be called after me. The Garden of Azdak. (74)

This remark is very remarkable since it parodizes the solomonic way of judgement and another symbolic parody rises here. The symbolic parody here is about 'solomonic garden' or to the Eden Garden. Azdak instead of the God's name or to Solomon, twists the name of the Garden to the 'Garden of Azdak.' Here, Brecht's concept of making a good character is also opposite to the concept of earlier concept of characters to be from a noble birth or the religious people so, it's also his another attitude to discarding or mocking to religious concept. Since, Brecht makes Grusha and Azdak his good characters, he prefers seeing them striving. IF we watch or read another drama by Brecht, 'The Good woman of setzuan', we find Brecht making a prostitute woman as the good person. Similarly, Grusha is one of the Good character in this present play the Caucasian chalk circle, who has been the victim of social and religious evils. So, Grusha always strives up with the values to human life rather than listening to the advise:

The cook: They will be more after the baby than to this mother. He's the heir. Grusha, you are a good soul. But you know you are not too bright. I tell you, if he had the plague it couldn't be worse. Better see to it that you get away. (23)

Grusha analyzes this advice and decides herself to save the baby for the sake of humanity and replies, "Brecht's does not only wishes to show the goodness of Grusha but also show the kindness of a human being rather than the mercy of God. "He hasn't got the plague. He looks at you like a human being" (23). He doesn't show any reincarnation to save the innocent baby but the human being itself so, it seems to be Brecht's poke to the idea of Easter Sunday, on which the innocent baby has been in threat.

Since Brecht offers the development steps to his good characters, Grusha also goes through ten development steps. Grusha's first step occurs when she gives up her money for the child. Grusha here becomes ready to pay two piaster, a heavy amount for a mug of milk, but she gets ready to pay because of her kindness to the baby. It's Brecht's cleverness that he shows the clarity and kindness of common people rather than of the rich and the religion, "Grusha: Don't slam the door again. Here are two piasters. But this milk has got to last. We still have a long journey ahead of us. These are cutthroat prices. It's a sin" (27).

The second step of Grusha is when she decides to go back for Michael after leaving him with the peasant woman. Grusha returns to claim the baby to the peasant's house because the baby was in problem, "Officer it's mine. It's not the one you're after" (39). This step of her now brings her another step of hitting the Ironshirts and save the baby. Though it was supposed as the sin to break the order, she hits the Ironshirt and flees away with the child. This step again follows the another step was

musicians say, "The musicians: the helpers girl became the mother of the helpless child" (39). It's her fourth step she adopts Michael as the child. This is another remarkable denouncement of Brecht that a virgin girl has been the mother for the sake of humanity not by the rituals. Her fifth step on the human ground is that she doesn't give the baby to the merchant lady before crossing the bridge and save herself rather she moves to another step of taking risk of her life, while crossing the bridge with the baby, "The merchant woman: I wouldn't try to cross that even if the devil himself were after me. It's a suicide" (40). In these remarks 'devil' and 'suicide' are the symbolic terms that Brecht seems to have used very consciously in order to show his good character able to take action. The Ironshirts are symbolically the devils and suicide is thought as crime in Christianity but Grusha becomes ready to face those both challenges.

Gruisha's seventh step is that she denies to Laverenti her brother that she cold though she has been feeling very cold and suffering herself, she takes this step so that she could stay there some days longer. It's Brecht's anti idea of 'penance'. Grusha has long been suffering not to purify her sin but for humanity. The following remark on this step by Grusha's brother are innerly the tones of religious 'Aniko' who doesn't like Grusha to stay there any longer but Gruahs doesn't mention it though she suffers of cold, "Laverenty: If it's too cold, you oughtn't to sit here, with the child. Aniko would blame herself. I hope the priest didn't question you about the child" (47). Grusha, as a good character of Brecht has been fallen to the conspiracy of her sister-in-law but Brecht produces her as an able one to protest from her inner power. The Eighth step of Grusha is that now she has been victim of the religious assumption that a child should have father's name so Grusha's brother arranges her marriage with a dying man. Grusha again agrees this matter thinking that here would be no more question

regarding the father of the child. Here, it's significant to remember that Joseph had married pregnant Mary but a dying man marries a lady with a child. The other fact of this step is that Grusha has been going to break the promise and confirmation with Simon in Act 2. The confirmation of the cross chain has been turned now as light. This step follows another step that Jusup, the dying man asks for the wifely duty to Grusha and now her virginity is going to be lost. And lastly she gets the option to choose either the baby or Simon and she chooses Michael so that she could save the child.

So, Brecht has produced Grusha as his good character and later Azdak as his mouthpiece who always gives the decision to the sides of commoners and suffered rather than the religious assumptions. Similarly, Brecht here states his idea oppositely to the Christianity that women are not the cause of fall rather they work as the arousing forces of human consciousness for the social transformation. If we place Grusha in the place of 'Eve', an image from Christianity, Grusha appears to be bright and radical to celebrate humanity and individuality.

The other character that Brecht makes equally important and given movement is from the poor class whom Christianity thinks as the enemy of the state as a whole. Azdak, a drunkard has been chosen as the judge in the fourth act. This seems to have been done very purposefully that to show the differences in the level of wealth between the various social classes and even to mock at the so-called social orders. So, we can regard Azdak as the 'Robin Hood' figure and the mouthpiece of Brecht who takes from the rich and gives to the poor.

Now it's very essential to see how his judgements held and how his steps move on: Firstly, he protects the Grand duke and says:

The singer: Listen now to the story of the judge: How he turned judge,
how he passed judgement, what kind of judge he is.

On Easter Sunday of the great revolt, when the Grand duke was
overthrown

And his Governor Anashvili, father of our child, lost his head

The village clerk Azdak found a fugitive in the woods and hid him in
his hut. (51)

This remark is very supportive to prove the idea that Azdak did this action to get economical benefit since he had long been suffered from the crisis and it later brings him to other steps. The second step of him is that he denounces himself its related to the sacrament 'penance', "[. . .] And he was Ashamed of himself, he accused himself and ordered the policeman. To take him to Nukha, to court, to be judged" (64).

Though Azdak tries to surrender, he is not brought to the court for any charges and how he is 'resurrected' in the third step, he is made the judge of the state. After being judge, he begins to work as the 'mouthpiece' of Brecht himself. The fourth step of him is occurred or as he judges the case of Doctor and the Invalid. Azdak fines 1000 piastres to the invalid. It's very opposite to the Christian ideas because the borrower should get the borrowed money back:

[. . .] the court consider to blackmail proved. And you to the invalid –
are sentenced to a fine of 1000 piaster. To the limpling man: As
compensation, you will receive a bottle of embrocating ! to the
blackmailer: to keep the landowner's name secret. You are advised,
moreover, to study medicine. You seem well guited to that profession.
And you doctor, are acquainted because of an inexcusable professional
mistakes. (75)

Such judgement in those upper remarks are the parodic form to the Christian churches which charge the cash amount but it's different that Azdak here supports the side of poor and changes the rich only. Similarly he gives baby to Grusha and threatens the governor's wife to charge.

The plot is circulatory since the ending again returns the beginning. The last line of the play. "The valley to the waterers, that it yield fruits is a return to the prologue that the delegate in the first act also decide to give the land that could give the better production, "Don't get angry" (97). It is true that we have to consider a piece of land as a tool with which one produces something useful" (5). This circulatory or rather continuity is present in the final act. Brecht may trying to make the audience realize that the evil-deeds can be change through regime, though the personnel are the same. It's also a mimicry to the holding system under the Christian society.

Since Brecht strongly presents the Christian images in the opening act, frequently uses in other acts, and his character Azdak is the source to mimic Christi in the final act even. Azdak mimics Christi throughout this act. He is first shown being beaten and then lying "dead" on the ground. The arrival of messenger is a form of resurrection' for him. It's mimicry to the idea of "resurrection of Christ" in the time of need but Brecht here again makes his plot circulatory in order to mock on the religious images again and again. His celebration of humanity is the idea of human resurrection for the need of poor and helpless rather than to the rich. It's also the mockery to holy orders. Brecht takes the religious connection even further by having Azdak represent "solomonic wisdom" (8). The case of Grusha and governor's wife is to be judge. This story and Solomon where he must choose the real mother of a baby. As Solomon says to cut the baby into two parts and give each help part to both,

the real mother becomes ready to give the baby to the false one put the case in twisted here as, Azdak decides each so-called mother to pull the baby by hands from the chalk circle, Grusha doesn't become ready because she afraid of hunting the baby. He chooses the mother who doesn't like to worm the baby. The final parody here is about the 'Biblical Garden of Eden' by naming the present Garden as the Azdak's garden.

Songs play a very vital role in the play which Brecht seems to have used to echo the humanity and individualism rather than the celebration of unseen entity. There are twenty-four songs sung in the play most of the songs are used to echo the human voice but Brecht doesn't give any particular songs and to any personal characters rather the singers sing them so that the collective voice of the human voices would echo. Among the songs, the song sung at the opening of scene two has been used to mimic on the beliefs regarding 'Easter Sunday', the day supposed as the day for 'resurrection to Christ' in which 'insurrection' takes place.

No other governor in Grusinia
 has many horses in his stable
 As many beggars on his doorstep
 As many soldiers in his service [. . .]
 on Easter Sunday morning
 The Governor and his family went to Church
 Once upon a time. (9)

This abstract from the book shows the gap between the rich and the poor and shows the poor helping for the kindness of those higher class people like the governor, but it's very absurd. So, Brecht here wishes to show that Brecht wishes the individuals to move to action rather than wishing to get help.

The fourth song in the play is also parodic since Grusha makes a confirmation to Simon for their future relationship but later she breaks it because of the social pressures. Brecht makes fun of confirmation made in the term of rituals such as by confirming with cross chain, "My mouth will be unknissed. The pillow will be empty beside me. [. . .] you will be able to say: all is as it was" (19).

This song is also Socratic in the sense later it twists. The very short son in scene three help us to know Brecht's idea of making a character good, here the shows Grusha as the protector of 'Humanity' again, "In the bloodiest times. There are still good people" (36). The tenth song in the same scene makes fun of religion through the concept of Baptism in which Grusha promises to the baby that she will Christian him with the glacier water. It's mockery because to make Christening is thought as the Church duty not of the glacier water, "I will wash you and Christian you with glacier water. You will have to bear it" (40).

Similarly, the opening song of scene five is very remarkable in which Brecht mocks at the idea of 'Holy orders' of Christian society. Azdak, a drunkard has been chosen as the judge of the village. It's also the Brecht wish of twist in the matter, "Listen now the story of judge. How the turned judge, how he passed the judgment, what kind of judged is" (61). The another song in the very scene is symbolic to the judgment of Azdak which gives the symptoms of judgment to be the side of marginalized or oppressed, "Now the great houses turn to ashes And blood runs down the street . . ." (73). The opening song of scene six is also very parable which refers to the way Solomon gave judgment regarding the real mother to a child, here Brecht makes fun of this story and mock at it so that he later decides Michael to be the child of Grusha, "Now listen to the story of the trial concerning the child of the Governor

Avashvili, to establish the true mother. By the famous test of the chalk circle" (83). Again, the very last song of the play turns circulatory to the prologue which breaks the Christian trend of inheriting to property or anything as possession rather Brecht here twists the matter with the concept that things to the hand of best users. ". . . the children to the maternal, that they thrive; The carries to good drivers, that they driven well; And the valley to the waterers, that it shall bear fruit" (96)

In this way, Brecht strongly presents the songs in order to support the concept of anti-religious, anti-bourgeoisie and prefers them to be the collective voices of the marginal celebrating individualism and humanity.

Summing up, *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* explores various ideas. The play has brought anti-Aristotelian themes on one hand and it gives Marxist, anti-bourgeoisie direction to the other side. The main issue that the researcher has stated is about the anti-religious or Christian theme and thought that Brecht mocks and makes fun of Christianity.

IV. Conclusion

The Caucasian Chalk Circle in epic convention, does not only question the convention of classical drama with an epic drama with communist overtones but also equally mocks at the religion by parodizing the various Christian images, assumptions and sacraments. The play defines morality in terms of social 'use'. So, Brecht strongly presents various elements of drama which again and again echo the mind of the audience from its critical examination. If we see at the characters development, the previously rewarded, the so-called religious, rich or from the upper class society are shown to have fallen down where as the Grusha like servants are rewarded at present due to their celebration of humanity rather than religion. So, Brecht has been able to establish some characters to be good and they move with the needs of social transformation.

Another idea that Brecht deals with in the play is undermining religion and mocking at religiosity by bringing various images from Christianity. Similarly, Brecht makes fun of the catholic rituals and sacraments by producing the opposite ideals or the evidences like 'Baptism', Holy Eucharism, Penance, Extreme unction, Holy orders etc. This concept of Brecht of mocking at religious matters help to establish the play as anti-religious.

Brecht's idea in the play is similar to say that 'we create God and God doesn't create us' because the characters in the play don't look for fate rather Brecht makes them taking action. We don't see nay elite action of those supernatural entity also. If we see the Christian History it defines poor as the enemies of star and the females as the enemy of human race, but, Brecht here presents the street man as the judge of the valley and a servant lady as the hero celebrating humanity and showing kindness so,

Brecht seems, to prove the idea of religion as the fake concept maintained by the capitalists. So, religion for Brecht is the source of arousing 'false consciousness.'

Similarly, Brecht uses many songs in the play and creates circulatory plot. The songs are either are anti-religious or celebrating individualism. The songs don't echo the Christian sounds as the Christian society hopes for the Cherishing hymns or players rather they are about the rags of suffered or about oppressed. Brecht has strongly established those songs for the sake of humanity rather than any of the non-existing entity that Marxists don't believe on. Similarly, Brecht's development of plot as circulatory is significant due to his echo to the moral of the play. The idea 'things to the best users' at the prologue and Marxist's overtone at the end "children to the motherly, carts to good drivers, that they be driven well, the valley to the waterers, that it yield fruit." This very ending is also significantly an anti-religious concept that echoes to raring and bearing mother as the real one rather than the biological mother. This way, Brecht has been able to parodize Christianity in the play *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*.

Works Cited

- Bentley, E. et al. *Seven Plays by Bertolt Brecht*. New York: Grove Press, 1961.
- Bentley, Eric . *Bentley on Brecht*. London: Appalus Press, 1988.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*. London: Methuen and Co.Ltd., 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Notes to the Rise and fall of Mahogany*. Trans. John Poet. Ed. Hubert Witt. Berlin: Seven Seas Publishers , 1922.
- Byfield, Ted. *Spirituality: God does not Create Us; We Create God*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd, 2001.
- Corrigan, Robert. *Theatre in the Twentieth century*. New York: Grove press, 1965.
- Esslin, Martin. *Brecht: A choice of Evil*. 3rd ed. London: Eye Methuen, 1980.
- Ewen, Fredric. *Bertolt Brecht: Hislife, His art and his times*. New York: The Citadel Press, 1967.
- Feugi,John. *The Essential Brecht*. Los Angles: Hennessey and Inglors, 1972.
- Haymann, Ronald. *Brecht: A biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Helfand, Jessica. *Reinventing The wheel*. New York: Princeton Architectural press, 2002.
- Hey, Peter. *American Dramaturgy: A Critical Appraisal*. New York: Peterlang, 1995.
- Innes, Christopher. *Bertolt Brecht: The Cambridge Guide to World Theater*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Leiter, L. Samuel . *From Stainslavsky to Barrault. Representative Directors of the European Stage* . New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Lyons, Charles R. *Bertolt Brecht: The Despair and Polemic*. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press, 1968.

Morely, Michael. *Brecht: A Study*. London: Heinemann, 1977.

Smith, J.N. *Grade Saver : The Caucasian Chalk Circle Study Guide*. London: Grade Saver, 2007.

Thomas, P. Adler. "Brecht and Method." *Magill's Literary Annual* (1999): 16-21.

Trotsky, Samuel. *Brailsford and Marxism*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Weideli, Walter. *The Art of Bertolt Brecht*. Trans. Daniel Russell. London: Merlin Press, 1963.

White, Alfred D. *Bertolt Brecht's Great Plays*. New York: The Citadel Press, 1978.

White, John.J. *Bertolt Brecht's Dramatic Theory*. New York: Comedian House, 2004.

Wilkinson, Eric. Review on Brecht's Technique *A Curtain up Review*.10.4, 2007:13-15

Willet, John. "Brecht on Theatre" *The Development of an Aesthetic*. Ed. New York : Hill And Wang, 1964.

Williams, Raymond, *Drama from Ibsen to Brecht*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Woods, Alan. *Marxism and Religion*. New York: The Citadel Press, 2001