

TRIBHUWAN UNIVERSITY

Erosion of Heritage in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in English

By

Manju Aryal

Class Roll No. 13/062

Exam Roll No. 1072

TU. Regd No. 6-1-298-38-97

Department of English

Prithivi Narayan Campus, Pokhara

April, 2011

Tribhuwan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English

Letter of recommendation

This is to certify that Mrs. Manju Aryal with class roll no. 13/062, exam roll no. 1072 and T.U. regd. no. 6-1-298-38-97 has prepared this thesis entitled "Erosion of Heritage in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*" under my supervision, following the format as specified by the Research Committee, Department of English, Prithivi Narayan Campus, Pokhara. I, therefore, forward it to the Research committee for final evaluation.

.....

Homa Nath Sharma Paudyal
Teaching Assistant
Department of English
Prithivi Narayan Campus
Pokhara

Date : April, 2011

TRIBHUWAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled "Erosion of Heritage in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*"
submitted to the Department of English, Prithivi Narayan Campus
by Mrs. Manju Aryal
has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Advisor

External Examiner

Head

Department of English

Prithivi Narayan Campus,

Pokhara

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all those people who have helped me with the preparation of this thesis. I am grateful indebted to Mr. Homa Nath Sharma, teaching assistant of the English Department, for his valuable guidance and suggestions throughout the preparation of this thesis.

I am thankful to the research committee, English Department of Prithivi Narayan Campus for giving me permission to write the thesis in the area of my interest.

I would like to share my pleasure with Mr. Shikha Nath Sharma, my husband, Shrijal Sharma, my son, Deepak Gautam, my brother in law for their help to proceed with my research writing directly or indirectly despite many inconvenient situations. Mr. Manoj Shrestha of ACE Computer and Mr. Tara Nath Parajuli of Creative Computer deserve my special thanks for computer typesetting.

April, 2011

Manju Aryal

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Recommendation	i
Approval Letter	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1-13
1.1 Heritage	1
1.2 Causes the Erosion of Heritage	3
1.3 Chekhov and <i>The Cherry Orchard</i>	5
1.4 Literature Review	10
Chapter Two: Modernism and Cultural Change	14-33
2.1 Cultural Studies	14
2.2 Cultural Changes	19
Chapter Three: Erosion of Heritage in <i>The Cherry Orchard</i>	34-46
Chapter Four: Conclusion	47-49
Works Cited	

CHAPTER: ONE

Introduction

1.1 Heritage

This thesis is an attempt to explore the erosion of heritage, one of the major themes in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* because of cultural change that is brought about by modernity and multiculturalism.

Heritage is something we inherit from the past. It has historical and traditional value. Nature heritage is inheritance of fauna and flora, geology, landscape and land forms, and other nature resources. Heritage shows the identity of nation, society and family or person. Nature and culture are sources of heritage. Heritage is achieved from nature and culture. So, there are two types of heritage. Natural heritage has natural importance. Himalayas, rivers, ponds, forests and other natural resources which give the identity of nation or society are natural heritage. Cultural heritage is the achievement from knowledge, art, literature, religion and philosophy, which is the source of gratification to life. Ancient religious books, rituals, festivals, music, dances, religious value and norms are cultural heritage. Heritage has its importance, rareness, artistic beauty and national importance.

Heritage when gives identity of nations or person is a historical value, which is an important part of nation, society or person. It is not only the historical, traditional value but it is something inherited also. *Oxford Dictionary* defines heritage as "The history, traditions and qualities that a country or society has had for many years and that are considered an important part of its character." Thus, heritage is something of historical, traditional value which is inherited from the past, considered as the inheritance of present day society. Heritage may be inherited lot. It refers to something inherited from the past. The word has several different senses, natural

heritage, a group's inheritance of fauna and flora, geology, landscape and landforms, and other natural resources. Cultural heritage, the legacy of physical artifacts and intangible attributes of a group or society: Manmade heritage, food, industrial culture, tradition, customs and practices inherited from ancestors. Virtual Heritage dealing with cultural heritage.

Inheritance of physical and non-physical things after the death of an individual is called heritage. Heritage may refer to public property as well as individual assets. Mt. Everest, Fewa Lake, our Flora and Fauna, Pashupatinath Temple etc. are public heritage but an individual's property he/she gets from his/her father/forefathers is the private heritage. On this ground, heritage may be related to physical as well as non- physical things. So, heritage is inherited things. Heredity, that are biological inheritance of physical characteristics, birthright, something inherited due to the place, time or circumstances of someone's birth is also the heritage. These all show that the heritage of traditional value. Further to clarify the meaning of Heritage, Bouvier's *Law Dictionary* defines the term:

Heritage, by this word is understood, among the civilians, every specie of immovable which can be subject of property, such as lands, house, orchards, woods, marshes, ponds in whatever mode they may have been acquired, either by decent or purchase. (472)

All of above we know that the heritage is something that comes or belongs to one by reason of birth that is inherited lot. Property that is or can be inherited can be a type of heritage. Something handed down from one's ancestors or the past is also the heritage which is passed down from preceding generations. That's why Bouvier's *Law Dictionary* defines, as "It is something that can be inherited." (731)

Word Net gives the meaning of heritage in four ways:

1. Practices that are handed down from the past by tradition; a "heritage of freedom"
2. Any attribute or immaterial possession that is inherited from ancestors;" was my mother's blessing"
3. That which is inherited; a title or property or estate that passes by law to the heir on the death of owner
4. Hereditary succession to a title or an office or property

Thus, heritage is something inherited which has value of one's ancestral identity.

1.2 Causes the Erosion of Heritage

Modern society's thinking is different from that of the past. Because of fashion, economic concentration and other activities, human being wants to become rich and to win others. For this, he does everything although it is morally wrong. In modern society human beings are more concentrated on economic achievement they only want to earn more money and become rich. They want to have fashion, comfortable life for these activities they must have more money. So they do wrong work. They think only how to become rich and how to spend fashionable life. For instance, Idols are stolen from temples. It makes it clear that heritage is victim of modernity. As the people are modernized, they have less concentration on spiritual, religious and cultural importance of heritage. Transformation from traditional thinking to modern ideas and uses has brought change in people's attitudes if traditional heritage.

The increased interaction among modern societies does not generate common culture but it facilitates the transfer of techniques, inventions and practices from one

society to another with a speed and to a degree that were impossible in the traditional society.

Man himself is considered to be a creator and destroyer of heritage. Time is changeable. In ancient time, heritages were built by man. But due to the changing time, man destroys the heritages. Man creates heritage and destroys it because of the development of world. That is cultural change. Modernity is the factor of cultural change. Due to the cultural change, heritage also changes. While heritage is changed with economic value from spiritual value, there is degradation in heritage.

Today people are running after the artificial things blindly. They have forgotten all spiritual values of heritage. Ranevskaya, the master of cherry orchard in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* is influenced by modernity. She wants to live in France. She does not like to live in her ancestral home. She wants to spend fashionable life. That's why the cherry orchard estate is auctioned as she is in debts. Her slave bought her heritage and he changed it in summer villas. Lopahin builds his own heritage. Ranevskaya forgets her historical value of heritage cherry orchard belongs to both natural as well as cultural heritage. Natural in the sense that the trees, flowers etc. are not man-made; cultural in the sense that it has been designed by human mind and skills. Ranevskaya, greatly fascinate by the modern fashionable life style, forgets the traditional importance of the cherry orchard so she auctions it to get more money so that she can lead an urban life in France. On the other hand, the man who buys the orchard changes it into a summer villa to make money from it. This is a type of degeneration of the orchard. Because of modern thinking, the value of the orchard too changes.

1.3 Chekhov and *The Cherry Orchard*

Anton Pavlovich Chekhov was born in Russian Seaport Town of Tanganrog near the Black Sea on January 29, 1860. He was one of the most celebrated Russian playwrights and short story writers whose works were made popular in English. He was a son of grocer and grandson of a slave. Chekhov was well acquainted with the realities of nineteenth century lower middle class and peasant life and that acquaintance was reflected objectively and unsentimentally in his natural writing.

The attempt to blend the comic and the satirical with dramatic and tragic themes in a single artistic whole becomes a principle with Chekhov. His works merely represent the two sides, tragic and comic as one and the same phenomenon of life. So Chekhov worked out an aesthetic principle according to which the tragic and the comic are not divided by wall. Chekhov's genius was fed by his true love for common man, which cannot be exhausted. His characters always reveal themselves in action or at least in thoughts and sentiments immediately connected with action. So his characters are different. His characters are progressive, agile, revolutionary and significant. They have an urge to change their lives. They want to make their lives by struggling with the outside world. More vital, more heroic, more significant than the average people, his characters behave and talk as if they have to topple down the pre-eminence of the bourgeoisie. Meantime Chekhov was very aware of the change from one social environment to another. Talent and feelings are indissoluble for Chekhov. Talent never exists without feeling. Chekhov shows that dissatisfaction with oneself is one of the fundamental qualities of every true talent. He knew enough about common life to be able to write numerous tales about common life, country and small town with memorable realism.

Chekhov has a good genius in talking about such characters and showing their ambitions, their pain, and their successes. He is quite aware of important social changes taking place in Russia, especially changes that saw the old aristocratic classes that once owned serfs but now reduced to a fashionable impoverishment while the children of former slaves were beginning to succeed in business and real estate ventures. Chekhov's grandfather had been a slave who got his freedom later. So, it is probably that Chekhov was especially supportive to such social changes. His best plays provide large evidence of his concern for the changes taking place in Russia. Chekhov's approach to writing is direct, simple and effective. The characters he has chosen in *The Cherry Orchard* are exceptionally modern in one important way. They believe in social transformation. Each character has his/her own existence, but all of them strive for their better days. All of them burn with their intense desires. They are not disillusioned. They are all searching for a better quality of life emotionally and socially. His style of writing is remarkable for its modernity. Even his short stories have clear dramatic centre. Characters whom he chooses are neither heroes nor villains. Chekhov's characters are limited, recognizable, and in many ways completely ordinary. The characters dare to bring about any change in their lives and their society. They make significant efforts for their rise in social strata. They work hard and have dream for better lives than the present one.

As a writer, Anton Chekhov popularized social realism. He wrote short stories, one act plays, full length plays and other translation also. Chekhov wrote one act play *On the High Road* which is regarded his one of the greatest short plays. It is the only one play without any comedy. Whether in his short stories or his full length plays or short plays, he alternates with serious nature. This is one of the most important characteristics of his style and intent. His concern was with the banalities and

trivialities of everyday life and yet time passes, life slips by, opportunities are lost, and unhappiness and disappointment are poured out over a glass of tea. In Chekhov's plays, we don't see antagonists but the form itself is antagonist. Chekhov's concept of plot is best understood if we see the order of experience which is describing the dynamics of human wills in opposition. This is a major component of his famous revolt against dramatic theatre. If one examines carefully, his plays are laden with irony also. Chekhov's dramas are famous for indirect action. Indirect action is that which do not occur on stage. This involves action important to the play's plot occurring offstage. The audience learns about it by watching character's reaction instead of seeing such action occurring on stage. In this situation, recounting the sale of the Cherry Orchard estate is most important example of indirect action, but the audience does not see the sale. The entire play moves around this unseen action. That's why an important dramatic event takes place offstage and it is felt or seen through the reaction of the characters onstage. The reactions are recorded by means of inner dialogue. Persons conversing do not participate in a dialogue but rather in monologues. This is another technique of character revealing. In fact, in his plays, time appears postponed. However, the passage of time and the wasting of it are indicated by external action. The change of seasons, growth of children, and sale of the cherry orchard can be taken as the instances.

The ironic gap between expectation and fulfillment, pretense and fact, intention an action, the message sent and the message received are all seen in Chekhov's writings. He portrays individual and a society in a state of perpetual change. He makes a life-like representation of the individual as well as social transformation in his short plays.

In *The Cherry Orchard* (1904) Ranevskaya also called Lyuboff Andreevna, is the chief character who lived with her ineffectual brother, Gayeff. Ranevskaya and Gayeff represent the upper class society and bring calamity onto themselves by leading a spendthrift life aboard and by refusing to make the necessary adjustment of converting her estate into a summer colony. The play *The Cherry Orchard* becomes the masterpiece in the modern theater where we find multiplicity of individuals and social transformations. Lopahin who is the former slave of the orchard, works so hard and at last he is able to buy the orchard from his master Ranevskaya. Ranevskaya has adopted daughter Varya who manages the household for the practical economics. Her activities are insufficient to save situation, which is being constantly contradicted by Madame Ranevskaya's extravagance. She spurns the merchant Lopahin's endeavours to save the estate. She simply cannot consent to save her ancestral home, and to cut down her beloved Cherry Orchard. Eventually, the estate is auctioned off: and since classes come and go, it is bought by the former serf, but present merchant Lopahin.

The small play, *The Cherry Orchard*, has a wonderful plot that moves with characters' role. Main characters are Ranevskaya and Lopahin and the latter is also called Yermolay Alexeevich. Ranevskaya is owner of the cherry orchard estate. Lopahin is a former servant's son. Later he bought the cherry orchard estate and became owner of the estate. Gayeff, who is also called Leonid Andreevich, is with his sister but he cannot do anything to help his sister. Anya who is Ranevskaya's biological daughter, is seventeen years old. Ranevskaya has an adopted daughter named Varya. Trofimoff is another character who is also called Pyotr Sergeevich. He is a student of university.

The play opens in May, inside the Cherry Orchard estate. Friends, neighbours, and servants are preparing for the long awaited return of Madame Ranevskaya,

Mistress of the house, and her daughter Anya. Madame Ranevskaya is returning there now from France. Her Cherry Orchard is going to be auctioned as she is in debt.

Lopahin begins by telling the story of his own success; born a slave, he has managed to make himself a fortune. Finally, Madame Ranevskaya returns. Her friends and family are overjoyed to see her. The beginning of the drama introduces many subplots: a romance between the tutor Trofimov and Anya, another hopeful romance between her sister Varya and wealthy Lopahin, and a triangular love between the servants Dashenka, Yasha and Yepikhodov. The play, however, revolves around the Madame Ranevskaya's debt. Neither she nor her brother Gayeff has money to pay the mortgage on the Cherry Orchard estate that will be auctioned off in August.

Lopahin suggests to Madame Ranevskaya that she change the estate into summer villas, lease them, and use the money to pay the mortgage. Madame Ranevskaya and her brother Gayeff object to the idea, and prefer to remain passive on it. However, as spring passes into summer, Madame Ranevskaya only finds herself more in debt, with no solution in sight.

Strange romances between Anya and Trofimov, and Dashenka and Yasha continue, while nothing develops between Lopahin and Varya and Dashenka and Yepikhodov. Madame Ranevskaya is receiving letters from her lover, and Gayeff begins to consider a job at a bank.

On the night of the auction, Madame Ranevskaya holds a ball. Charlotte performs and guests and servants dance. Madame Ranevskaya is nervous about the outcome of the auction; she is still hoping for a miracle.

Lopahin has bought the Cherry Orchard. Varya is furious, Madame Ranevskaya is devastated, but Lopahin cannot hide his happiness; he has bought the estate where his family lived as slaves. Ironically, he encourages the party to

Continue, even though the ex- hosts are no longer prepared to celebrate. The last act shows Madame Ranevskaya leaving the cherry orchard for the last time. Lopahin and his friend Trofimov share a tender farewell. Madame Ranevskaya and Gayaff share a nostalgic moment alone before leaving but relatively optimistic note in the last moment. We hear axes cutting down the Orchard, and Firs stumbles on the stage.

1.4 Literature Review

The Cherry Orchard is one of the Chekhov's most famous plays. It has invited lots of criticisms and responses since its publication. The writer and most critics view this drama as a comedy that forecasts promising future for hard working serfs with the downfall of the aristocracy.

Jacqueline E. M. Latham has analyzed *The Cherry Orchard* as comedy minutely. To prove it as comedy, Latham assembles evidence for her contention and remarks, "*The Cherry Orchard* is not a tragedy, as it was commonly viewed, but rather a comedy, as Chekhov insisted"(21). For Latham, "In his revelation of the ludicrous in human nature Chekhov successfully achieves a very rare blend of sympathetic and judicial comedy in the play (23). Latham further states:

The passing of an era is favorite subject for sentimentalists and [...].

He did not write that play, although many producers have wished that he had. He wrote instead a comedy. The play formed out not a drama, but a comedy, in parts even a farce. He did not see the passing of the old order as tragic, and, in emphasizing the social uselessness of the aristocratic family, he treats the subject from a comic viewpoint. He seems in them no love, no sense of responsibilities; their deepest emotion is only sentiment. (22)

George Steiner in his book *The Death of Tragedy* stresses the fact that Chekhov lies outside a consideration of tragedy. He insists, "his plays were comedies and so they are regarded on native ground" (301).

Jams T. Farrel says that Chekhov's writing tries to bring out the hidden culture, traditional and living style or rural areas in Russia (93).

William Gerhardi in his *Anton Chekhov: A Critical Study* portrays Chekhov's writing as the real picture of life.

Chekhov literature is life made intangible by the discovers of form - the form that is invisible but which is seen when mentally you step aside to get a better view of life. Life because it has aspects innumerable seems blurred and devoid of all form. And since literature must have form, and life in the aggregate and preserve form and then saw fit express one aspect of life at a time. Until a wholly new aspect occurred to Chekhov that of life in the aggregate which aspect in truth is his form. (62)

Likewise, another critic Maxim Gorky discusses on Chekhov's tragic humor, especially his comedic conception of banality (107).

Similarly, John Tullock discusses the world of *The Cherry Orchard* and its characters within political scheme. *The Cherry Orchard* is confronted with the modern capitalist and the modern revolutionary. The question of choice, and with it the crises of identity, while remaining individual is subsumed within broader social movements. He comments:

Each character typified a social position in his response to the Orchard. Trofimov sees in the trees dead souls; [...]. To say, however, that Chekhov poses the question of individual choice within the framework

of social movements is not to interpret his play in the light of a straight forward class struggle. Chekhov is favoring neither an aristocratic, nor a bourgeois, nor a proletarian solution. (186)

To talk about *The Cherry Orchard*, many critics have analyzed the play from different perspectives. They have thoroughly analyzed the play from different dimensions. One critic John Carbin in his criticism *Review of The Cherry Orchard* analyses the play from the prospective of the balance of morality and freedom (565).

Chekhov and Stainslavsky have argued over whether *The Cherry Orchard* was tragedy. Chekhov steadfastly called it a comedy, but Stainslavsky saw the inevitable ruin of Madame Ranevskaya and the destruction of the cherry orchard as tragic. Chekhov perhaps saw it the same way but he also considered that its potential is the beginning of a new, more realistic life for Madame Ranevskaya and Gayeff. Their impracticality was an important cause of having lost their wealth and the estate.

All these different critics of Chekhov have examined Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* from different angles and different points of view. But none of them has mentioned the issue of erosion of individuality and heritage through the play *The Cherry Orchard*.

Anton Chekhov represents his ideas, especially, on the issue of the erosion of heritage. So, the researcher's assessment of the drama is to portray the erosion of heritage because of the tussle created by economic factor between two major characters Ravevskaya and Lopahin in *The Cherry Orchard*. Further, the tussle between the characters determines the role of individual, and individual's tussle with heritage portrays how the human beings utilize the heritage for financial upliftment. Their utilization of heritage shows the change of their communal, religious, cultural identity. Such utilization of heritage for financial upliftment shows how values and

uses of heritage have been degraded. It is redefined and reevaluated with the change in time.

The research has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents introduction including literature review. The second chapter tries to explain the theoretical modality that will be applied in the research work. The researcher will focus the discussion on the modernization, multicultural society, and globalization as the major causes to the erosion of heritage, creating a strong conflict between individual and heritage. On the basis of the theoretical tool established in the second chapter, the third chapter will be the application of the theoretical tool to the text and prove the hypothesis. Finally, the fourth or the last chapter will sum up the main point of the present research work and the finding of the research work.

CHAPTER: TWO

Modernism and Cultural Change

2.1 Cultural Studies

The word 'Culture' in English is derived from the Latin word 'Cultura' which means the act of cultivating the soul. Later the term has been applied to any custom, art, social institution, literature, music etc. It came to mean training, development and refinements of mind, taste and manners. *Oxford Dictionary* defines culture as "the customs and beliefs, art, way of life and social organization of a particular country or groups". The idea of culture as "a whole way of life" (qtd. in Graff) emerged in the late eighteenth century. The nineteenth century English writer, Mathew Arnold, described culture as "the best that has been known and thought in the world" (qtd. in Said xiii). Culture as the form of human civilization is to be counterpoised to the anarchy of the raw and uncultivated masses.

Culture, thus, is a phenomenon in social structure; it has come to be established in society because of the social structure of the people and their knowledge of lives. It becomes a tool to the people to intercept their life and guide their actions in the society. The social structure exists because of such social relations. Thus, culture, social structure and social relations come to refer to the same phenomena. It varies according to the social dignity, and depends upon social norms and values. Culture is a multi-faceted term which is open to history. It is also used to refer to intellectual and artistic works or practices which in their very forms and meaning define human society as socially constructed rather than naturally acquired. By its very nature, culture is a way or style of life of an individual, which plays a very active role in shaping human perspective and perception around the world. Culture comes to denote to the historically transmitted pattern of meaning codified in

symbols. The system of conceptions is expressed in symbolic forms by means of which people communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge and attitude towards life. Anyway culture is the people's whole way of life. According to Raymond Williams, the term culture in its most widespread use in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries, refers to the world of the arts (literature, music, painting, sculpture, theatre, film) (36). Williams here, thus, takes the term as being related to changing history, exposing different forms in different periods. Therefore, culture has been defined in relation to historic form of society, and the forms may oppose each other (36).

Manifested amidst the turmoil of late 1950s and the early 1960s, the approach, cultural studies was difficult to define as such for it had no reference to which we can point. Cultural studies is an interdisciplinary or post disciplinary field of inquiry which explores the production of maps of meaning. It is a set of practices constituted by the language games. It is not a tightly coherent, unified movement with a fixed agenda but loosely connected group of tendencies, issues and questions. According to Graff and Robbins:

The aim of cultural criticism is something more than preserving, transmitting, and interpreting culture or cultures. Rather, the aim is to bring together, in a common democratic space of discussion, diversities that had remained unequal largely because they had remained apart. (434- 35)

Cultural studies, in this sense, refuse the universality of culture.

Cultures, like texts, are seen as indeterminate site of conflict that cannot be saved to a single totalized meaning. Cultural studies is, and always has been a multi or inter disciplinary field of inquiry which blurs the boundaries between itself and other

subjects. There must be something at stake in cultural studies which differentiates itself from other subject areas.

According to Chris Barker, " what is at stake is cultural studies' connections to matters of 'Power' and 'politics' " (5). So, it's connections to power and politics are crucial. For Chris Barker, "cultural studies is a body of theoretical knowledge as a political practice" (5). Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler emphasize that the intellectual promise of cultural studies lies in its attempt to " cut across diverse social and political interest and address many of the struggles within current scene" (1).

Cultural studies does not speak with one voice and it cannot be spoken with one voice. Regarding its diversities, Womack writes, "Cultural studies manifests itself in a wide array of interpretative dimensions, including fields of inquiry as gender studies, [...] the politics of nationalism, popular culture, postmodernism and historical criticism, among a variety of other topics" (243). Those fields that focus on social and cultural forces either create community or cause division and alienation concerned with the exploration of a given culture's artistic achievement, institutional structures, beliefs, system and linguistic practices. Cultural studies highlights the interrelationship and tension that exists between cultures and their effects upon both the authentic texts and the literary works of our lives. Moreover, it highlights how the adoption of a different culture and situation harms heritage. A cultural studies not only explore the cultural codes of a given work but also investigates the institutional linguistic, historical and sociological forces that inform the work's publications and critical reception.

Cultural studies is a discursive formulation, which is a cluster of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about forms of knowledge and

conduct associated with a particular topic, social activity and institutional site in society. Cultural studies is constituted by a regulated way of speaking about the objects and unities around key, concepts, ideas and concerns. Cultural studies also center on cultural values and transformation in relation to heritage. So, it focuses on how the change in perspectives to handle heritage leads to cultural and religious transformation.

Cultural studies transcends the confines of particular discipline such as literary criticism. It is rather politically engaged, and a prominent endeavor in the cultural studies is to subvert the hierarchical distinctions between 'high' and 'low', or 'elite' and 'popular' culture. In its probability, it denies the autonomy of the individual in an actual person or work of literature. E .P. Thompson argues that conceptions of individuality have become fragmented in the post-war period and no longer restrict themselves to nations of shared cultural interest and value systems (qtd. in Womack 245). Guerin et al. explain that cultural studies committed to examining the entire range of a society is beliefs, institution and communicative practices, including arts (241). It remains difficult to pindown the boundaries of cultural studies as a coherent, unified, academic discipline with clear-cut substantive topics, concepts and methods which differentiate it from other disciplines.

The concepts of text suggest not simply the written words, but all practices which signify anything related to human life and human activities. This includes the generation of meaning through, images, practices objects and sounds. Such images, sounds, practices and objects are sign systems that signify with the same mechanism as a language, which we may refer to as cultural texts. These texts, as forms of representations of culture contain the possibility of different meanings which have to be realized by actual readers, who give life to words and images. Meaning is produced

in the interplay between the text and the reader so that the moment of consumption is also the moment of meaningful production. From the theoretical perspective one cannot assume a single, central culture that renders individual experience coherent and meaningful for it is inescapably different, divisive and dissonant. Later, culture happens to capture different fields of criticism. The emergence of postcolonial criticism and the postcolonial theory of discourse made culture borrow different terminologies.

The concept of culture is central to cultural studies, yet there is no "correct" or definite meaning attached to it. In describing it as one of the most complicated words in the English language, it can be called culture and cultural studies. Barker, in this regard, writes:

Culture is not 'out there' waiting to be correctly described by theorists who keep getting it wrong. Rather, the concept of culture is a tool which is of more or less usefulness to us as a life form. Consequently, its usage and meanings continue to change as thinkers have hoped to 'do' different things with it. We should ask not what culture 'is' but how the language of culture is used and for what purposes. (35)

Because of multiplicity of its meanings and vagueness of study the term "culture" has by now acquired a certain aura of negative phenomenon in socio- anthropological circles. The system of inherited conception is expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about attitude towards life. Culture is the fabric of meaning in terms of which human beings interpret experience and guide their actions. Such actions then take the forms of social structure and network of social relation that actually exist. Culture and social structure are then two different abstractions from the same phenomena.

Centrality of the concept of power is regarded as pervading every levels of social relationship in the cultural studies. According to Barker, "Power is not simply the glue that holds the society together, or coercive force which subordinates one set of people to another, though it certainly is this, but the processes that generate and enable any form of social action, relationship or order" (10). Such notion of power is closely related to cultural studies, which implies a situation where a 'historical block' of powerful groups exercise social authority and leadership over subordinate groups through the winning of consents.

In this sense, the proposition from these observations can be drawn to mean that cultural studies refers to a multi-stranded and cross- disciplinary intellectual movement. This movement places cultural analysis in the context of social formations, seeing society and culture as historical process unlike frozen artifacts, emphasizing the inextricable relations between culture and power and calling attention to social inequalities. Thus, always making a committed call for democratization. It is not discrete approach, rather a set of practices.

2.2 Cultural Changes

In the mid- twentieth century, culture has undergone a massive change. After the second world war, the cultural critic Raymond Williams comes to define culture going beyond the anthropological idea as people's whole way of life (36). Putting forward his normative meaning of culture, William says that culture still claims to represent the organic voice of people (36). Out of these conflicting view there emerged a third way of using the term, "one that refers neither to the people's organic way of life nor to the normative values preached by leading intellectuals but to the battle ground of social conflicts and contradictions" (qtd. in Graff 421). So, to draw a

single central meaning of culture in coherent and meaningful way is almost impossible.

In anthropology, culture is the integrated system of socially acquired values, beliefs and rules of conduct, which delimit the range of accepted behaviors in any given society. The cultural differences distinguish societies from one another.

In practice, culture refers to elite activities such as haute cuisine, high fashion or haute culture, museum caliber art and classical music, and the word culture describes people who know about and take part in these activities. So, someone who uses "culture" in the sense of cultivation might argue that classical music is more refined than music produced by working class people such as punk rock or than the indigenous music traditions of aboriginal people of Australia.

Culture - a building capacity has been perhaps the most important source of our strength. It has helped us to meet challenges and to keep us from problems. We have survived through culture, evolved with culture and acquired distinctiveness of our own because of culture. But our behaviors affecting culture, natural and monumental heritage have turned as the threat on culture itself. The imbalances and disharmonies of our culture because of our behaviors will prove our threat on heritage. There are a multitude of cultures, all rooted in history and tradition. Yet each living culture is dynamic requiring practice and renewal if it has to survive. It is this balance between maintaining a distinct identity and incorporating change that assures the robust vitality of cultures.

Culture has come to be understood and modeled as continuous, contingent, politicized process, in recent generations. So, it is understood and analyzed by the public almost in the same way. People link themselves with culture because it is the source of their identity. So, culture is one of the parts of human beings' life sometimes

culture may not be the part of human life as so many human quit their existing cultures and adopt new ones. Human kind indulges in culture in course of his life. His life begins with culture and ends in culture. He has transformed himself and culture with the change in time.

Modernity is also a factor that affects cultural heritage. People have changed with the name of modernity. Struggle against traditionalism is a process of creating modernity. The contemporary world has challenges which are so serious and it determines the structure of sociological change. It has also brought a change in every system. Modernization came with the process of urbanization and industrialization. Modernity took place in the society between the late 1950s and beginning of Second World War. For modernity Doshi writes:

There were some historical events also which intensified the process of modernity. [...]. The desire for mass production urged the mercantile community to find out new markets for the sale of their product.

Profiteering intensified the desire for building capital empires in other countries also. (22)

Modernity affects the heritage and culture because modernization is a reason to transfer culture. With the influences of modernization, the way of thinking and leading life has changed, and with this change social norms and values have change, and naturally there is a transformation of culture. Modernization breaks traditional bonds and relations. Modernity is the historical, political processes. In this regard Stuart Hall and others observe:

Modernity has had a long and complex historical evolution. It was constituted by the articulation of a member of different historical process, working together in unique historical circumstances. These

processes were the political [...] the economic [...], the social [...] and the cultural. (qtd. in Doshi - 23)

The emergence of modernization and globalization has also put a question mark on heritage. As the people are modernized, they have less concentration on spiritual, religious and cultural importance of heritage. Transformation from traditional thinking to modern ideas and their application in life has helped the world to develop in its speed of change. The roots of what we call modernity lie in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when several developments arose in the field of scientific research and technology. Industrial revolution in the field of technology and French revolution in the field of philosophy and politics changed the way of thinking, value system and perception of observing at heritage.

The definition of heritage is something of historic value. A particular object, garden, site or building related to heritage can be seen as simultaneously having, spiritual value, aesthetic value, communal or political value, educational value and of course economic value, which are all related to historical importance . So, analysis of heritage cannot be isolated from the historical value of something. Historical values may change in accordance with the economic values. David Throsby, in this case, Explains, "Realizing the economic values of particular historic building, for instance, might destroy its historical spiritual and aesthetic values" (134). Therefore, people have changed the spiritual aspect of heritage into economic value.

The impact of modernism in today's society is so overwhelming that it is difficult to imagine what the situation was like even a few decades ago. This is particularly obvious in the field of technology. We need only to think of the important systems of communication and travel, which have revolutionized the ways in which

we live and work, and which are associated with emerging value system and new way of thinking.

In post colonial era we happen to engage with culture as an uneven in complete production of meaning and value often composed of incommensurable demands and practices, produced in the act of survival.

Modernity is a term used to describe the condition of being related to Modernism. Since the term "modern" is used to describe a wide range of periods, we cannot confine ourselves to a particular period. Those periods are specially related to modernization industrialization. The industrial age of nineteenth century is called industrialization. The role of industrialization in sociology is also described in modern times. Modernity has noticed a lot of transformation in values and attitude from Pre-industrial to industrial period, sometimes considering events of the eighteenth century as well. The term "Modern Times" is used for the period since the Middle Ages. Anthony Giddens explains the modernity in terms of four main institutional aspects: Capitalism, industrialization, Coordinated and administrative power focused through surveillance military power are main aspects of modernity. (31)

Modernity is the situation of new and modern system from the existing established order. It seeks to subvert earlier practices and it is a break from the past. In this respect, Majorie Perloff quotes de Man, "Modernity exists in the form of a desire to out whatever came earlier, in the hope of reaching at last a point that could be called a true present, a point of origin that marks a new departure" (162). So, modernity influences the people's life style to a greater extent than any other movement. S.L. Doshi writes:

The real blow came to modernity in 1989. If modernity means freedom, progress, and emancipation of the poor and the down

trodden, the event of 1989-1990 has made ka radical change in the structure of the human society. 1989-1990 is the year of the disintegration of Soviet Russia. (25)

Modernity is a different term from modern times. It is derived from modernism. Modernism is a movement in art and literature based on the consciousness that emerged through the mechanical age of industrialism. In industrialism, mankind has evolved into something very new-what that would be, would have to be explored by art and literature and all previous concepts were questioned. Anthony Giddens writes about modernity:

As its simplest, modernity is a short hand term for modern society or industrial civilization. Portrayed in more detail it is associated with a certain set of attitudes towards the world as an open transformation by human intervention, a complex of economic institutions, especially industrial production and a market economic and a certain range of political institutions, including the nation state and mass democracy.(94)

Largely, as a result of these characteristics, modernity is vastly more dynamic than any previous type of social order. It is a society-more technically; a complex of institutions, which unlike any preceding culture is concerned more with the future rather than the past.

At the societal level, modernization enhances the economic, military, and political power of the society as a whole. In the same way at the individual level, modernization generates feelings of alienation and anomie as traditional bonds and social relations are broken and lead to crises of identity. Either, at the individual or social level, modernization transforms the people. Such transformation is dangerous

for heritage because modernization breaks traditional bonds and relations. In this regard, Samuel P. Huntington writes:

Modernization involves industrialization, urbanization, increasing levels of literacy, education, wealth and social mobilization and more complex and diversified occupational structures. It is revolutionary process comparable only to the shift from primitive to civilized societies. (68)

Modernization, urbanization, industrialization, help shift primitive society to civilized societies these transformations change the spiritual and religious bend of mind to capitalistic bend of mind which observes everything from materialistic viewpoint. Observing both material and spiritual assets from economic viewpoint is unfavorable for heritage.

The increased interaction among modern societies does not generate common culture but it facilitates the transfer of techniques, inventions and practices from one society to another with a speed and to a degree. These were impossible in the traditional society. Thus, the effect of multiculturalism not only the faith on heritage but also the existence of heritage.

Heritage comprises natural and cultural things such as monuments, archeological buildings, trees, caves, lakes, mountains and others which embody significant tradition. It also comprises movable including art works of every kind and every sort of material objects of archeological importance and those representing skills, perhaps vanished, and objects of daily life, such as utensil can be both tangible and intangible. The most visible element of the cultural heritage is the tangible heritage. Bouchenaki, writes about heritage:

To [heritage] must be added the intangible heritage comprising intellectual heritage: creations of the mind such as literature, scientific and philosophical theories, religion, rituals and music as well as patterns of behavior and knowledge embodied in skills, oral history, music and dance. Physical evidence may be preserved in writing, musical score, photographic images or computer databases, but a performance itself or historic evolutions of particular styles of presentation or interpretation are not only always so preserved. Although genetic structures, human or other biological are often now discussed as 'heritage', they are not 'cultural heritage'. (149)

Intellectual heritage, in this sense, can be preserved but physical heritage cannot be preserved from dynamic forces.

We can take an example of decreased of the faith in the heritage with the modernism. In Russia there was Bolshevik Revolution for desire to demolish all vestiges of past and to create a classless society. That Revolution's result was the collapse of communism. Tsar and his family were executed which created the Soviet Union, transformed serfdom, and forcibly modernized Mother Russia. In the same time, as the rural economy declined, industrialization and capitalism made great movement and Russia experienced most rapid waves in industrial growth in the 1890s. Such remarks clearly mention the rise of capitalism which evaluates everything in relation to money and by that taken it sees no cultural values of heritage.

Man himself is the creator and destroyer of heritage. he creates heritage even though development in the world diminishes its values and history, in course of his life. Human beings produce heritage and it lives within them. So, there is corollary relationship between human beings and heritage.

The threat on heritage can be seen from different areas. Technological advancement on information technology and communication, social/public works construction, mining industrial development and modernization of city centers have affected heritage on a high level. The effect is negative. Such effect of technological development and economic upliftment has almost ruined our heritage. As individual's impact on heritage changes, man is culturally transformed towards modern values. By the modernity human lean towards it. Bouchenaki states:

The information revolution and the globalized economy pose threats to heritage more immediate and widespread than any prior period, except for the menace of war. Threats to cultural heritage from the passive public works project made possible by modern engineering can affect any region. Road and airport construction, mining and industrial development, hydrological work and land reclamation, urbanization and town planning projects, slum clearance and modernization of old city centers, as well as changes in land use can all swiftly bring about damage to or total loss of important parts of heritage. (162)

The present development in any field seems unfavorable for heritage since the development works attack on the existence of heritage.

In the same way, threat on heritage can be also seen from multicultural society. In multicultural society, people are found irresponsible for the communication of heritage. They seem as if they do not belong to their heritage. In the same way, loss of faith in one's culture and alienation of young people from the traditions of their communist, deprive human beings of the range of choices which

might have been theirs if, equipped with a justified pride in the achievements of their own culture, they freely chose elements of others.

Globalization is a multifaceted process to draw countries, cities, and people closer together through increasing flows of goods, services, capital, technology and ideas. Considering such ideas. Fall states for this:

In a globalizing world, countries and cities are increasingly linked in interdependent and interlocking relationships where world cities are important in their own right in a world order in which national boundaries fail to stop cross border flows of capital, people and ideas sub-regional economic entities have merged. (148)

From the given ideas, it is clearly that national and international boundaries fail to exist because of the rapid development of technology.

Mass media, Information technologies have strengthened the ideology put forward by modernity and globalization. Globalization and modernity have interrelationship. Globalization is the direct consequence of modernization. For Wallerstein:

The transition from feudalism to capitalism involves first of all (first logically and first temporary) the certain of world economy. This is to say, social division of labour was brought in to being through the transformation of long-distance trade from a trade in 'luxurious' to a trade in 'essentials' or 'bulkgoods' which tied together processes that were widely dispersed into long commodity chains ... Such commodity chains were already there in the 16th century, and pre-dated anything that could meaningfully be called 'natural economics'. (qtd. in Doshi - 357)

This shows that globalization does not end up in the proliferation of capitalism only. It also integrates political and culture variables.

We see globalization as a process in which ideas and behaviors are scattered on a grand scale. We conceive this scale as being worldwide, or at least as encompassing large geographical areas. In debate about the subject, globalization is seen primarily from an economic or a cultural point of view. But the major concentration is on cultural dimension of the process. The effect of travel, migration and mass media intensifies communication between various parts of the world. In the information age, cities act as generators, processors, and depositaries of knowledge is generated by research, discovery and information. For Fall, "Knowledge industry, science parks, technological development zones, technologies and other will be further development in the cities of future" (149). So, the destruction rate of heritage will be higher in the coming future.

The loss of heritage can be seen from the beginning of colonial times. The colonizer took the cultural values and heritage of the colonized from economic perspective. And as the countries begun to indulge in the globalization, faith and belief on heritage changed due to the hybrid position of the colonized.

Globalization has the ability to widen human capacity by giving additional choices to communities and individuals, and communication gives unprecedented access to the culture of other societies. Though it gives them the access to the multicultural situation, the people find themselves in the dumb founded situation. Similarly, the poor in the society are also found in the decision to transform their heritage into economic value so as to make them better. Such decision has also come as the threat on heritage.

Further, the notion of globalization has been a lightning rod for debate and discussion about culture, economics, politics and society for the past generation. Globalization deterritorializes culture and makes material culture on all levels less central to social life. Sociologist Roland Robertson describes globalization as “the two fold process of particularization of the universal and the universalization of the particular” (qtd. in culture and heritage). What roles does heritage play in a globalizing society? Are they new? Such questions must be connected with the central political issue of globalization. In this connection, the critic Frederic Jameson states:

Is [globalization] a matter of transnational domination and uniformity or, on the other hand, the source of liberation of local culture from hidebound state and national forms? The tangle of processes associated with globalization presents the field with challenges so deep and transformative that they suggest the need for a new paradigm. (qtd. in culture and heritage-245)

Commercialization and development have threatened on the values of heritage. So, to say globalization of economy and worldwide import has threatened on the existence of heritage. Market forces are penetrating formerly remote areas of the world. Globalization of the economy has clearly changed the way of observing heritage.

Human beings have no identity in absence of cultural, historical and religious factors. Because of their cultural value they could find their cultural identity. They could put their ancestral remembrance with them, if they have religious and historical factors of their heritage. So, they give them identity in the world. One cannot exist in absence of the other. Human beings must give importance to heritage. So, there is a

supplementary relationship between individual and heritage right from the beginning of the development of human kind. The relationship between them constructs the face of the society. One form of government that comes in existence shows the different kind of heritage than that had been in the past. In the same way, lack of faith in God, material value of heritage, and financial crisis have degraded the value of heritage. Moreover the factor like hybridity, diaspora, multiculturalism, modernization, globalization have brought change in viewing our heritage. That's why; we can also find the tussle between struggle for existence and preservation of heritage.

In the modern and society modernization and globalization have appeared as the factors to change people from traditional bend of mind to modern, which ultimately change the manner of the people to treat the worldly values and things. Therefore, globalization and modernization has changed the healthy relationship between individual and heritage. Further, in the modern and post-modern time, a heritage item does have a direct value in use for individuals. So, it is better thought of as an asset. Spiritual value has been changed into material purpose.

If we analyze the relationship between individual and heritage from the very outset of human evolution, we can find the vast difference in values in the past and the modern and post-modern era. Before modernization, almost all the people had faith in God. In that time, different kind of heritage like cultural, natural and religious were totally safe. Different kinds of such heritage had more or less significance in relationship between individual and heritage. All rituals and rites of human beings had also close connection with the monument, temples, idols, theatres, etc. So, the heritage had more or less significance in relation to religion and the people had faith in God, there had been an inseparable relationship between individual and heritage.

Relationship between individual and heritage has undergone into a morbid situation due to modernization because people in modern era are found irresponsible for the conservation of heritage as they seem as if they do not belong to them. They are irresponsible but their ability and desire to perceive cross-culturally varies. One wants one and another wants others. They exposure to other cultures by the increasingly penetrative media and the invasion of foreign enterprise which inevitable influences local culture, unnecessarily, indeed seldom, giving a view of the best that the exotic culture can provide.

People in the past were aware of their heritage. If they disregarded their heritage, they would be burdened by moments of the past. People's perspectives on heritage have been changing over time. For Prott, "the loss of the old would seem to be the price of progress; this is only to be expected in future-oriented century" (225). They would also evaluate their past and appreciate their cultural heritage. In the past, there was no such sharp distinction between heritage and culture. Both of them were like the two parts of the same coin. Throsby says, "In most traditional communities a sharp distinction is not made between the cultural and natural: every part of nature is endowed with spiritual force and every myth is attached to nature" (13).

Power imbalances in the society are widening. So, the rapid change in power network is one of the major causes of threat on heritage. Clashes between differing heritage values constitute a major issue practically, politically and conceptually. In this regard, Vinson states:

Speaking of 'value' suggests a certain allegiance to subjectivity but this does not necessarily point the way toward radical subjectivity of values is more prosaic: mobility, markets and cultural mixing increase the pace and intensity of changes in all sectors of life (economic, cultural and political). (239)

Above all, the condition of heritage has come to the point where past, present and future of individual are united. We can see the heritage with the situation how it was evaluated in the past, how it is evaluated in the present and how it will be evaluated in the future of individuals. Therefore, cultural, natural and religious heritage is today at the cross roads where identity, memory and the future conjoin. It means that today heritage erosion by many factors.

Cultural studies, focusing on heritage in relation with culture and discourse, globalization, multicultural society and modernization are chosen to show the transformation of heritage. It is hypothesized that tension between individual and heritage reveal the diverse areas of transformation in the cultural values with the tick of clock. The cherry orchard in *The Cherry Orchard* comes under the rubric of heritage. The cherry orchard is auctioned at the end of the drama, after the tussle between Madame Raneveskaya and Lopahin. Such a struggle shows their attitude on handling their heritage which presents their religious, cultural and historical identity. Sale and purchase of the Orchard shows their change of heritage. Overall, attempts will be made to examine how the cultural influences contribute to the transformation of heritage.

In a few words, this cultural studies focusing culture, heritage, modernization, globalization, relationship between individual and heritage have paved the way interpret *The Cherry Orchard* in depth . Every activity of the individual is related to culture. So, attempts have been made to study the relationship between individual and heritage under cultural studies. In this way, my attempt is to analyze how different factors like modernization, globalization and discourse affect fruitful relationship between individual and heritage, resulting to diverse transformation and how individual activities Cause heritage to erode.

CHAPTER THREE

Erosion of Heritage in *The Cherry Orchard*

Chekhov has rightly dramatized the tussle between individual and heritage in his drama *The Cherry Orchard*, signifying how that tussle causes heritage to erode. Such a relationship of individual and heritage is portrayed through the dialogues of Lopahin and Raneveskaya:

LYUBOFF ANDREEVNA. Cut down? My dear, forgive me, you don't understand at all. If there's one thing in the whole province that's interesting-not to say remarkable-it's our cherry orchard.

LOPAHIN. The only remarkable thing about this cherry orchard is that it's very big. There's a crop of cherries once every two years and even that's hard to get rid of Nobody buys them. (238)

Given dialogue shows their own view about cherry orchard.

Lopahin quests for material possession and Ranevskaya quests for spiritual possession. The cherry orchard estate is the heritage of Ranevskaya and she pretends that she loves it very much because she did not accept the suggestions of Lopahin. She refused to change the cherry orchard in summer villa. Lopahin plans to change it into summer villa with the economic view. Her quest is ironic in the sense that she does not have any plan to save the orchard as it is going to be auctioned. Lopahin wants to get cherry orchard and Ranevskaya wants to sell it. She has been in Paris for five years after her husband died and son drowned. She gets into the exposure of multiple cultures in Paris although her visit seems to calm down her miseries. She is fond of leading a wasteful French life. That's why her hybrid identity in relation to modernization makes her unsuccessful person as her attempt turns into a failure. She does not want to live in her ancestral home. The cherry orchard is auctioned to pay off her

debts. She returns back to Paris with her family after the heritage loses all its historical, familiar and communal identity.

In the same way, Lopahin who comes from the poor background. His father and fore-father had worked as the slaves in the cherry orchard. Reneveskaya is in favor of heritage and Lopahin is in favor of economic betterment. The following text supports the claim:

LYUBOFF ANDREEVNA. Is it really me sitting here? (*Laughing*) I'd like to jump around and wave my arms (*Covering her face with her hands*) But I may be dreaming! God knows I love my country, love it deeply, I couldn't look out of the car window, I just kept crying. (236)

LOPAHIN. I tell you everyday. Every day I tell you the same thing. Both cherry orchard and the land have got to be leased for summer cottages, it has to be done right now, quick-The auctions is right under your noses. Do understand! Once you finally decide that there are to be summer cottage, you will get all the money you want, and then you'll be saved. (254)

The relationship between individual and heritage gets its exposure through the tension between Ranevskaya and Lopahin. *The Cherry Orchard* presents the period of change in Russia. It conveys the decline of the gentry on the one hand and the rise of capitalism on the other. Thus, the people who once worked as slaves were emancipated and after all they included themselves in the mainstream. It shows the downward mobility of the feudal, and the upwards mobility of the slaves. So, it shows the change in status. The degraded condition of the feudal shows not only the change in class but also the transformation of culture. Both the condition makes them

confused to deal with their heritage. Lopahin gives importance to the material value. He loves ex-master's heritage. For economic upliftment. In this regard, he suggests to Ranevskaya that she change the orchard into summer villas to pay off the debts. Thus, the threat to heritage comes out with tussle between Reneveskaya and Lophin. It is Lopahin who discards the historical, religious and other values that are attached to the cherry orchard. He does not care for the values as he does not belong to that culture. Lopahin does not relate the cherry orchard with past and memory since he observes it from material perspective. For him, its familial and communal identity does not help Reneveskaya to pay off the debts. He only advises her to change cherry orchard into summer villas. He repeatedly requests her to think on his proposal from the very outset of the drama. The ideas of changing the cherry orchard into summer villas or auctioning it to pay off the debts are both at the cost of heritage. Later Lopahin bought cherry orchard. Slave becomes master. Risk on feudal heritage because the change in power relation valorizes the heritage of existing power and diminishes the former values. The power network has shifted from feudalists to capitalists.

Ranevskaya (Lyuboff Andreevna) rejects Lophin's proposal to change the orchard into summer cottages this remark makes us clear that Ranevskaya's attempt to save the orchard is only a situational comedy. The conversation between Ranevskaya and Lophin clearly reveals it:

LYUBOFF ANDREEVNA. Summer cottages and summer residents--
it is so trivial, excuse me.

LOPAHIN. I'll either burst out crying or scream or faint I can't bear it!

You are torturing me! (*TO GAYEOFF*) You're a perfect old woman!

(254)

Here, Lopahin comments that she has tortured him. Chekhov portrays the loss of everything including Ranevskaya's son, husband, villa near Mentone, and the orchard in *The Cherry Orchard*. Ranevskaya whose estate was sold to pay debts, portrays her extreme material attachment. Moreover, she has been totally modernized as she prefers economic survival to spiritual quest after all.

Modernization in relation to economic survival is portrayed in the drama. This analysis centers on how the people have changed spiritual value of heritage into economic value. Ranevskaya wants to save the orchard as a parental legacy relates the cherry orchard to past and memory where as Lopahin comes out of it and gives material value to it. The tussle between economic survival and spiritual quest is the major thrust of the play. Ranevskaya relates the cherry orchard to past and memory. The nostalgic tone is reflected in the following excerpt:

Oh, my childhood, my innocence! I slept in this nursery and looked out on the orchard from here, every morning happiness awoke with me, it was just as it is now, then, nothing has changed. (*Laughing with joy*)
All, all white! Oh [...] If I only could lift the weight from my breast, from my shoulders, if I could only forget my past! (243)

Ranevskaya, the main character of the drama longs for past but only in the ironic sense. The cited extract clearly shows that she memorizes her beautiful past, describes the present condition of the orchard and at the same time she finds those reminiscences as heavy burden so she wants to lift the weight from her breast and shoulders. Her inherited identity has become the obstruction for her. It shows that her attempt to save the orchard is only in words not in deeds. The factors like modernization focusing on capitalism, multicultural society, post-modern discourse

can be seen as the major factors influencing the individual tussle with the heritage regarding *The Cherry Orchard*.

Not only the main characters of the drama, Ranevskaya and Lopahin almost all the characters represent modernist trend. They are all irresponsible for their own culture but they are busy for making money. The characters like Trofimoff and Pishtchik have also modernist trend. For this fact, they converse:

PISHCHIK. Nietzsche- the philosopher – the greatest- the most celebrated- a man of tremendous mind-says in his works that one may make counterfeit money.

TROFIMOFF. And have you read Nietzsche?

PISHTCHIK. Well - Dashenka told me. And I'm in such a state now that I could make counterfeit money my-self - day after tomorrow three hundred and ten roubles must be paid- one hundred and thirty I've on hand- (*felling in his pockets, alarmed*) the money is gone ! I have lost the money! (*Tearfully*) where is the money? (*Joyfully*) Here it is, inside the lining - I'm all in a sweat. (267)

In the modern world people are longing for material possession, not for the conservation of past, identity and their heritage. Above cited extract of the drama reveals this sense. Counterfeit money is one of the badly popular evils. Pishtchik, is strongly in favor of counterfeit money and clearly reveals his real identity. He is one of the representatives of modern man.

The tussle between individual and heritage can be analyzed from the perspective of a multicultural society. People in the multicultural society are found irresponsible for the conservation of heritage as they pretend as if they do not belong to it. In the same way, loss of confidence in one's culture, alienation of young people

from the tradition of their communities, deprived human beings of the range of choices, which might have been theirs, if equipped with justified pride in the achievement of their own cultures. In modern time, human beings freely choose elements of others. Lopahin does not belong to Ranevskaya's culture but to the capitalistic and slave society. His father and forefathers worked as the slave in Ranevskaya's orchard. Lopahin's work is not to analyze the orchard from spiritual perspective. So, he says her to change the cherry orchard into the summer cottages to pay of her debts. The conflict between Lopahin and Ranevskaya regarding the orchard is the outcome of the multi-cultural tension, as reflected in the text:

LOPAHIN. I want to tell you something very pleasant, cheerful.

(Glancing at his watch) I'm going right way. There's no time for talking. Well, I'll make it two or three words. As you know, your cherry orchard is to be sold for your debts; the auction is set for August 22nd, but don't you worry, my dear, you just sleep in peace, there's a way out of it. Here's my plan. Please listen to me. Your estate is only thirteen miles from town. They've run the railroad by it. Now if the cherry orchard and the land along the river were cut up into building lots and leased for summer cottages, you'd have at the very lowest twenty-five roubles per year income.

LYUBOFF ANDREEVNA. I don't quite understand you, Yermolay Alexeevich.

LOPAHIN. At the very least you will get from the summer residents twenty-five roubles per year for two-and-a half acre lot and if you post a notice right off, I'll bet you anything that by autumn you won't have a single patch of land tree, everything will be taken. In a word,

my congratulation, you are saved the location is wonderful, the river's so deep. Except, of course, it all needs to be tidied up, cleared - For instance, let's say, tear all the old buildings down and this house, which is no good anymore, and cut down the old cherry orchard. (237-38)

Lopahin does not understand the spiritual value of the cherry orchard although he was once a slave in the orchard. He suggests Rnevsckaya to tear down all the buildings, cut down the cherry orchard and change it into summer villas. Lopahin does not know the value of cherry orchard. He, on the one hand, he observes each and everything of the cherry orchard from economic perspective and on the other, he does not belong to feudal culture, past and memory of cherry orchard. So, he fails to see values attached to the cherry as he only sees the buildings and the cherry orchard in bloom. To change the form of heritage, to sell, to construct buildings and road etc. are against the conservation of heritage. In short, multiculturalism is the cause of menace on heritage and its ruin.

In the modern era, heritage has turned out to be the subject matter of gossip and joke. All of neighbors and Rnevsckaya's relatives think that the cherry orchard is valuable and it is important for her. However, to the contrary of their expectation, the orchard is auctioned off before their eyes. It is the aftermath of modernization, which paved the ground for material possession at the cost of cultural erosion. She has been immensely influenced by French way of life, culture and society, that's why she is a hybrid in a sense she neither speaks strongly for conservation nor against it. So, such a personality is the outcome of the multicultural situation which results in either ruin of heritage or threat on heriage. Ranevsckaya and Firs have their say like this:

LYUBOFF ANDREEVNA. Firs, if the estate is sold, where will you go?

FIRS. Wherever you say, there I'll go. (275)

Therefore, as the people are modernized, the way of evaluation of heritage should be redefined. Now there is no such a relationship between natural and cultural or heritage and daily life. For people, heritage does not affect their life as they analyze everything from the scientific point of view because they do not relate their daily life with heritage. Technological advancement is the component for the threat to heritage and ruin of it.

Cultural studies refers to a multi-stranded and cross disciplinary intellectual movement that places cultural analysis in the context of social formations, seeing society and culture as historical process. Lopahin makes his own identity by buying feudal land cherry orchard. The feudalistic land changes into summer villas. It means that Lopahin has bought the feudal land and made it what he wants, which shows his capitalistic mood. The fate of culture is decided on the basis of power network as society and culture go together. Anton Chekhov dramatizes such changes in the structure of society. He shows the decline of feudalistic power and the rise of capitalistic one. The change in power network surely affects the Hitherto existing society, as society and culture go together. The way of analyzing earlier culture is redefined. Consequently, the heritage of earlier culture crumbles, remains under the shadow of the existing power network. After the rise of capitalistic power, aesthetic values and culture of the feudal society were undermined where the new peasants were unable to value the feudalistic past of the cherry orchard, they evaluated it from the materialistic view point instead. Lopahin's activities promote the existing power network that is why he observes the cherry orchard through monetary perspective

from the very beginning of the drama. Lopahin contrasts the situation of peasants in post-capitalistic period from pre-capitalist era. He states that these people will multiply enormously in another twenty years period. Considering such arguments Lopahin says:

Up to now in the country, there have been only the gentry and the peasants, but now in summer the villa people too are coming in. All the towns, even the last big ones, are surrounded with cottages. In about twenty years very likely, the summer resident will multiply enormously. He merely drinks tea on the porch now, [...] and then your cherry orchard would be happy rich, splendid. (239)

Lopahin states how the condition of the peasants in the new society have moved to the town from the countryside. He presumes that the number will be multiplied enormously in another twenty years. Saying of Lopahin, we understand that he comes from slavery and he is able to buy feudalistic heritage the cherry orchard. After buying such feudalistic heritage he becomes proud. Lopahin as shown the plot of the drama changes and Proudly boasts how peasants are representing Russia, and whatever they say becomes truth as they possess the power mechanism.

Lopahin suggests saving form of the orchard from the very outset of the drama. To change the form is to change the structure totally, not past and memory. He uses all his strength and power to diminish the value of the orchard, for economic growth. The cultural value carried by the orchard is nothing for him. The following saying make the argument clear:

LOPAHIN. We must decide definitely, time doesn't wait. Why, the matter's quite simple, Are you willing to lease your land for summer

cottages or are you not? Answer in one word, yes or no? Just one word! (252)

LOPAHIN. Excuse me, but such light-minded people as you are, such odd, unbusiness like people I never saw. You are told in plain Russian that your estate is being sold up and you just don't seem to take it in. (254)

Lopahin wants to know whether she wants to change the form of the cherry orchard or not. So, he questions her repeatedly. To him, she is an odd frivolous and unbusiness like woman because she is dull regarding the orchard. Ranevskaya's inability to save the cherry orchard results in the auction of her heritage on 22 August. Lopahin appears as the new master as he has bought the orchard. After all, he becomes successful to reduce the value of the cultural dignity of the cherry orchard. He plans to cut down all the cherry trees, tear down outbuildings and change it into summer villas.

Lopahin utilizes his discourse from the beginning of the drama. Since the serfs were in power, they created a kind of discourse on heritage. They privileged material value over spiritual quest. Therefore, Lopahin plays as the member of the network of power. Lopahin in this way supports the so-called of inferior rank discourse in course of the play, and elaborates how peasants have risen into power and how they will multiply enormously. He totally tramples the cultural aspects inherent in the orchard. Lopahin is the representative of all peasants in Russia. For it Lopahin states:

I bought it. [...] The cherry orchard is mine now. Mine! (*Guffawing*)
My God, Lord tell me the cherry orchard is mine! I'm not drunk, out of my head, that I'm imagining all this –(*Stamps his feet*) Don't laugh at me! If only my father and grand father could rise from their graves and see this whole business, see how their Yermolay, beaten, half- illiterate

Yermolay, who used to run around bare foot in winter, how that very Yermolay has bought an estate that nothing in the world can beat. I bought the estate where grandfather and father were slaves, where you wouldn't even let me in the kitchen. I am asleep, it's only some dream of mine, its only seems so to me- That's nothing but the fruit of your imagination, covered with the darkness of the unknown- (*picking up the keys with a gentle smile*) she threw down the keys [...] Hey, musicians play, I want to hear you! Come on, everybody, and see how Yermolay Lopahin will swing the axe in the cherry orchard, how the tress will fall to the ground! We are going to build villas and grandsons and great- grandsons will see a new life here- Music, play! (280-81)

Lopahin enjoys here with the capitalistic mode of power. He is rich to buy the feudal land. He bought the cherry orchard so he is able to make his ancestor's dream come alive. He is able to pay the musicians too. At last he plans to cut down the trees and build summer cottages where his grandsons and great-grandsons or his future generations will see a new life. The change in power is one of the causes of ruin of heritage of the earlier power possessor Lopahin is the new master who created his own truth which becomes the discourse to rule the people.

The acts of bargaining of the cherry orchard on auction and mortgaging it to borrow money represent how careless people are on heritage. It portrays the people in the exposure of modernization, which has totally transformed their views oh heritage. Lopahin says, "We arrived at the auction, Deriganoff was already there. [...] He forty-five I fifty – five. That is to say he raises it by fives, I by tens- So it ended" (280). Auction and mortgage, these words themselves are unfavorable for heritage conservation. They show how the people have been transformed as they have no eyes

of observing spiritual, familial, and communal values. Auction and mortgage related to heritage portray the people's way of life in the modern world.

In *The Cherry Orchard* Madame Ranevskaya and Lopahin tussle on the issue of heritage. Lopahin is in favour of changing the cherry orchard into summer villas. That's why Ranevskaya is in favor of heritage and Lopahin, Yermolay Alexeevich is in favor in economic betterment. Lopahin suggests Ranevskaya in the sense that she has nothing to do with the orchard's importance as she is in debts. She cannot decide to use her orchard to come out of her debts. Lopahin again and again alerts her that her cherry orchard is going to be auctioned if she doesn't decide to change it into the summer cottages. She asks Lopahin to give her suggestion about what to do. But when Lopahin suggests that she change cherry orchard in to summer villas, she does not care about it. So, she seems ironical on the issue of the conservation of the orchard and at the same time she pays no heed for its conservation. That's why, her presence is ironic. She seems to have accepted the dynamism of time and situation, which brings changes on each and every thing. But, Lopahin doesn't relate the cherry orchard with the past and memory since he observes it from material perspective. Its familial and communal identity doesn't help Ranevskaya to pay off the debts. Lopahin requests her to think on his proposal from the very beginning of the drama. Both changing the cherry orchard into summer villas and auctioned it to pay off these debts are at the cost of heritage. These reasons clearly portray the situation of heritage under danger. Lopahin focuses on land which represents his identity in a true sense.

In Chekhov's drama, *The Cherry Orchard*, Lopahin and Ranevskaya come from different cultures. So, Lopahin doesn't care for the conservation of feudal heritage. He does not help her to pay off the debts but changes the cherry orchard into summer villas. He tells her to remove the buildings and cut down the orchard so that it orchard can be changed into summer villas. At the end of the drama, Lopahin wins the

auction and begins to cut down the cherry trees. This action shows the complete destruction of the cherry orchard, that is the ruin of feudal heritage.

In the lower level, discourse plays a role in *The Cherry Orchard* for the ruin of the heritage because Lopahin, the new master, uses all his strength and power for the destruction of feudal heritage. Anton Chekhov presents the influence of French life on the Ranevskaya's family. This reason transforms their attitudes towards heritage. And *The Cherry Orchard* presents the complete destruction of the orchard. Ruin of heritage shows how the people are culturally transformed.

The Cherry Orchard dramatizes the relationship between "individual" and "heritage". This relationship has unsound since modern to the present time. The tussle between the characters prepares ground for the tussle between individual and heritage. Imbalances and disharmonies in culture and behavior prove threat on heritage. Multicultural society priorities economics value over sentimental value. Dialogue, new attitudes on religion, free and open sex determine people's situation of mind. And their condition of mind determines what they should do. Such factor clearly portrays their relationship with heritage. Such factors lead to the auction of the cherry orchard in *The Cherry Orchard*. In doing so, Chekhov reveals the diverse areas of cultural transformation with tick of clock.

CHAPTER : FOUR

Conclusion

The meaning and importance of heritage has gone through several transformations. So, its meaning and importance is different in different times. In the classical time, it was the source of historical and religious identity, but in the modern and post-modern eras, values of heritage have been redefined and used in different ways. It has become the scene where past, present and future are attached. Such social and cultural transformations are reflected in literary texts. By the same virtue the cultural and social transformations have been dramatized in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*. Therefore, transformation is based on a tussle between individual and heritage between Madame Ranevskaya and Lopahin in *The Cherry Orchard*.

In modern and post-modern times, the cultural values are eroded. People prefer economic values of heritage to its cultural values. People are longing for material possession, not for the discourse of heritage. That's why; heritage now has turned out to be the subject matter of gossip and joke. Today, people do not believe each other. In the past, there was no such a sharp distinction between heritage and culture, but now such a relationship seems to have dissolved. It is so because people disregard their connection with nature.

Threat to heritage can be seen from multi-cultural society. In a multi-cultural society, people do not seem responsible for the conservation of heritage. They behave as if they do not belong to it. Lopahin in *The Cherry Orchard* comes from slavery so he does not care for the conservation of the feudalistic heritage. He suggests Ranevskaya change the cherry orchard into summer villas, further suggesting that if she does so, it is easy to pay off her debts. He only suggests but he does not help her

financially. At last, he accepts the auction of cherry orchard of Raneveskaya and he buys it. He begins to cut down the cherry trees to change it into summer villas. This instance shows that one does not know the value of other's religious and historical values of heritage. They only see that material value, which is the big threat to the existence of heritage. A struggle between Raneveskaya and Lopahin for the cherry orchard, Lopahin looks cherry orchard in material value with modernize view that slaves are able to make their position. Raneveskaya also looks it in material value but she is impressed by French life. She is modernized. She does not want to live in Russia. She is not interested with her cherry orchard. She wants to live in France. Therefore, the tussle between Lopahin who finds his identity on heritage and the Raneveskaya who is modernized. This is unfavorable for heritage within the same race.

Lopahin's treatment of the cherry orchard portrays the rise of capitalistic discourse. Capitalistic discourse replaces all feudalism's heritage. Society and culture go together because the form of culture is decided on the basis of power network. Power network is the form of society. Slave becomes powerful or Lopahin who was slave is ultimately able to buy cherry orchard.

Lopahin has been working on the cherry orchard since it does not belong to his society. It doesn't belong to his culture. He projects his modernized personality that the serfs also have the high position if they work hard. With this modernized thought, he views the cherry orchard from material perspective but not from spiritual value. It is the heritage value of Ranevskaya. She is also the projection of the modern personality. She seems to show the attention to preserve her heritage in the surface, but in the deeper level, she seems to be modernized. She seems worried for auction of

her heritage but she doesn't make any plan to preserve her heritage. It shows she is careless about auction of cherry orchard, her heritage.

Cultural globalization, industrialization, worldwide communication, technological advancement, economic development etc. are the factors of modernization. These factors set the bend of mind of the people. Ranevskaya and Lopahin are influenced by such factors. Ranevskaya's and Lopahin's culture is different. Their individual behavior and their thought also differ from each other. Ranevskaya asks Lopahin what to do about saving the orchard but she has not any idea to save her cherry orchard. Lopahin does not distinguish between the cherry orchard and summer cottages. Ranevskaya distinguishes between them. She surfacely gives more importance and is more the value of interested in heritage. She seems to save it. She doesn't agree to change the cherry orchard into summer villas. She does not accept the Lopahin's suggestion. Lopahin does not care for historical value. He only cares for present material value. The orchard is put for sell at auction. Lopahin is able to buy it and he changes it into summer villas. He destroys its historical value. Ranevskaya cannot preserve it. She cannot accept Lopahin because she wants to enjoy in France.

Anton Chekhov shows the transformation of cherry orchard. Cherry orchard is transferred to Lopahin from Ranevskaya. It means all of these activities show the erosion of heritage. Erosion of the heritage is portrayed in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*. Two folds of erosion can be seen here: erosion of traditional feudalism and erosion of heritage.

Works Cited

- Anton, Chekhov. *The Cherry Orchard. Plays by Chokhov*. Ed. Stark Young, New Delhi: Rupa, 2007. 226-296.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Bouchenaki, Mounif. "An Outline of Heritage". *Culture and Heritage*. 4 (2000): 146-63.
- Bouvier's Law Dictionary*. Revised 6th ed. Oxford UP, 1856.
- Brook, Peter "On Chekhov." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. Lee A. Jacobs 4th ed. Boston: Bedford/ St. Martins, 2001.
- Carbin, John. "Review of *The Cherry Orchard*." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. Lee A. Jacobs. Boston: Bedford/ St. Martins, 2001. 565-66.
- . *Culture and Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO Press, 1998.
- Doshi, S.L. *Modernity, Post modernity and Neo - Sociological Theories*. New Delhi: Rawat, 2003.
- Fall, Yorok. "Culture, Ethics and Globalization." *Heritage and Globalization*. 3 (1998):147-52.
- Farell, James T. *The League of Frightened Philistines and Other Papers*. New York: Vanguard, 1952.
- Garhardi, Willam. *Anthon Chekhov: A Critical Study*. London: Duffeld and Co., 1922.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self- identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. New York: Dutton, 1991.
- Gorky Maxim. *Reminiscences of Tolstoy, Chekhov and Andreev*. Trans. Katherine Mansfield, S. S . Koteliansky and Leonard Woolf. London: The Hogarth Press, 1948.

- Graff, Gerald and Bruce Robbins. "Cultural Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992.419-36.
- Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson and Paul Treichler, eds. *Cultural Studies*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Gurien, Wilfren L. et al., eds. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Hornby, A.S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary: of current English*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Viking, 1992.
- Latham, Jacqueline E. M. "The Cherrry Orchard as Comedy." *Educational Theatre Journal*. 5 (1958): 21-29.
- Perloff, Majorie. "Modernist Studies." *Redrawing the Boundaries: Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992.154-78.
- Prott, Lyndel V. "Cultural Heritage." *Heritage and Globalization*. 3 (1998):224-34.
- Robertson, Roland. "Cultural Heritage." *Heritage and Modernization*. 4 (2000): 240-50.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Steiner, George. *The Death of Tragedy*. London: Faber and Faber, 1982.
- . "The Question of Cultural Identity". *Modernity and Its Futures*. Ed. Hall, London: Polity Press, 1999. 273-326.
- Throsby, David. "Playing for the past: The Economics of Cultural Heritage." *Culture and Heritage*.4 (2000): 134-36.

Tulloch, John. *Chekhov: A Structuralist Study*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Vinson, Isabelle. "Heritage and Cyber Culture." *Heritage and Globalization*. 3

(1998):185-188.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture*. London: OUP; 1981.

Womack, Kenneth. "Theorizing Culture, Reading Ourselves: Cultural Studies."

Introducing Literary Theories: A Guide and Glossary. Ed. Julian Wolfreys.

Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. 243-54.