

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

**Dramatization of Relationship Between Individual and Heritage: A Comparative
Study of Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and August Wilson's *The Piano
Lesson***

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in the Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts in English

By
Bed Nath Sharma

Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
December 2007

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

The thesis entitled “Dramatization of Relationship between Individual and Heritage: A comparative study of Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and August Wilson's *The Piano Lesson* by Bed Nath Sharma has been submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. It has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date _____

Acknowledgements

The present form of the dissertation is possible because of the continuous help and encouragement by my respected teachers, colleagues and friends. At first, my words of gratitude go to my thesis supervisor and teacher Mr. Sharad Chandra Thakur for the successful completion of the research work. His suggestions and inspiration played a pivotal role for the existence of the present research work in this form.

Likewise, I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head, Central Department of English, for the approval of this research. In the same way, my sincere gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Abhi Narayan Subedi, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Sanjeev Upreti and Mr. Bishnu Sapkota who introduced me to the broad area of literature and philosophy. I am equally indebted to Dr. Shiva Rijal who encouraged me to take up on the burning issue of heritage.

In the same line I am also grateful to my parents Mr. Bhanu Bhakta Sharma and Mrs. Tulasi Paudel who have helped me in each and every step of my life. Plus, I would like to thank my sister Mrs. Sita Pahari and brother Yagya Raj Paudel who always encourage me to take a leap.

Last but not the least, I would like to thank my friends Pashupati Baral and Sundar Raj Shrestha for their continuous encouragement to complete the research work.

December 2007

Bed Nath Sharma

CONTENTS

	Page No:
Chapter I: Introduction	1-16
Chapter II: The Encroached Value of Heritage: A Study	17-35
Chapter III:	36-60
A. Dramatization of Relationship Between Individual and Heritage in <i>The Cherry Orchard</i>	36
B. Dramatization of Relationship Between Individual and Heritage in <i>The Piano Lesson</i>	46
C. Dramatization of Relationship Between Individual and Heritage: A Comparative Reading of Anton Chekhov's <i>The Cherry Orchard</i> and August Wilson's <i>The Piano Lesson</i>	56
Chapter IV: Conclusion	61-63
Works Cited	

Chapter I

Introduction

Heritage, by definition, is something of historic value. But analysis can not stop there: values are plural and heritage is multivalent. A particular heritage object, garden, site or building can be seen as having simultaneously historical value, spiritual value, aesthetic value, community or political value, education value, and of course economic value. Similarly, the word "Individual" refers to the person who has a direct relationship with heritage. Plus, during his/her life he/she comes in close contact with it. Influenced by different modern and post-modern factors he/she tussles with heritage. In the past, there had been an inseparable relation between Individual and Heritage but in Modern and Post-Modern time, such relation seems to have dissolved as people do not want to relate their culture with nature.

Though Anton Chekhov and August Wilson represent different periods of styles on drama writing, the researcher has seen a sort of similarity in the presentation of ideas, especially on the issue of heritage. So, the researcher's assessment of the dramas is to portray the tussle between individual and heritage through the dialogues of Ranevskaya and Lopakhin in *The Cherry Orchard* and Berniece and Boy Willie in *The Piano Lesson*. 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 their communal, religious, cultural and identity transformation. Such utilization for financial upliftment shows how values and uses of heritage have been redefined and reevaluated with the change in time.

Towards mid of the nineteenth century, the old order in Russia was crumbling away. Political institutions were out of line with actual development and the agrarian,

aristocratic society was increasingly yielding to an urban bourgeoisie and new capitalist class. At the turn of the twentieth century, developments affected class distinctions like at no other time. The responses of the classes in the new social milieu are therefore an area of interest for Chekhov.

The endeavour to blend the comic and the satirical with dramatic and tragic themes in a single artistic whole becomes a principle with Chekhov. Chekhov worked out an aesthetic principle according to which the tragic and the comic are divided by no wall, but merely represent the two sides of one and the same phenomenon of life, which has its tragic and comic sides. Chekhov's genius was fed by his inexhaustible love for the common man. His characters always reveal themselves in action or at least in thoughts and sentiments immediately connected with action. Meanwhile he was very aware of the change from one social environment to another. For him, talent and feelings are indissoluble; the former never existing without the latter. Moreover, he stated 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 and the country and small town with memorable realism.

Chekhov regarded the Russian soul, whether of a peasant or a landlord, an intellectual or a casual laborer, as the receptacle of both good and evil, strength and weakness, degradation and rebirth. As a psychologist, Chekhov particularly valued moments of insights and of the sudden awareness of a wasted life. In spite of many human weaknesses and vices that he saw so clearly and so ruthlessly exposed, Chekhov had faith in individuals.

Chekhov's style is remarkable for its modernity. His approach to writing was direct, simple, and effective. Even his short stories have a clear dramatic center, and the characters he chose to observe are exceptionally modern in one important way.

They are neither heroes and nor villains. The dramatic concept of a hero who, like Oedipus, is larger than life, or a villain, like De Flores in *The Challenging*, who is essentially a devil, is nowhere to be seen in his work. Chekhov's characters are limited, recognizable, and in many ways completely ordinary.

Chekhov's genius was in taking such characters and showing their ambitions, their pain, and their successes. He was quite aware of important social changes taking place in Russia, especially changes that saw the old aristocratic classes, who once owned serfs, being reduced to a genteel impoverishment while the children of former slaves were beginning to succeed in business and real estate ventures. Chekhov's grandfather had been a serf who bought his freedom in 1841, so it is likely that Chekhov was especially supportive of such social change. His best plays provide ample evidence of his concern for the changes taking place in Russia.

In 1884, while his contact with drama had not yet graduated from the Vaudeville stage, he wrote one act play *On the High Road* which remains his greatest short play. It is the only play without any comedy. Whether in his short stories, his full length plays, or short plays, he alternates 'the serious with the trivial'. 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. Though we do not see antagonists in Chekhov's play, the form itself is antagonist. His plays are, if one examines carefully, laden with irony, Chekhov's concept of plot is best understood if we see that the order of experience he is depicting has little to do with the dynamics of human wills in opposition. This is a major component of his famous revolt against dramatic theatre. Chekhov's dramas are known for indirect action. This involves action important to the play's plot occurring

offstage. Instead of seeing such action occurring onstage, the audience learns about it by watching character's reaction onstage. In this respect, recounting the sale of "The Cherry Orchard", is the most important example of indirect action, although the audience does not see the sale, the entire play moves around this unseen action. Thus, 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 two monologues. This is another character revealing technique. Time, in fact, in his plays, 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.

Chekhov's popular play *The Seagull* (1895) marks the beginning of a phase in which Chekhov showed himself to be a dramatist of genius. In this play, he expresses his most profound thoughts on the difficult path of the artist, of what makes the essence of artistic talent, of what human happiness consists. Again in this play we meet his constant theme that happiness is to be found, not in love, but in truth. Here, he insists that love becomes ugly and loses all its beauty if it is the only thing in one's life. Similarly, the theme of *Uncle Vanya* (1899) is about the life of a little man with his hidden suffering and self-effacing toil for the happiness of others. In fact, it is a theme of beauty wasted in vain. Chekhov indicates by the very title of the play the simplicity and workday ordinariness in both of his characters and their suffering. As always with Chekhov, the conception of beauty is blended with that of truth and creative effort; the aesthetic principle is merged with the ethical. Truth and work are the foundations, the ever flowing sources of beauty. Both *Seagull* and *Uncle Vanya* represent a new kind of dramatic art, in deeply thought-out symbolism. Chekhov

opines that things should be just as complex and at the same time as simple on the stage as they are in life.

The search for happiness was next dramatized with enriched vitality in his popular play *The Three Sister* (1901). Here, Chekhov's writing not only deepened but also became affirmative through the resolve of his unhappy characters to dedicate themselves to a fruitful way of life even if they themselves were not to enjoy any of the fruits. This again presents a familiar picture of lives that seek but do not find the successful result.

In Chekhov's writings there are the ironic gaps between expectation and fulfillment, pretense and fact, intention and action, the message sent and the message received. There is a gap between the things, thought and their reality. In *The Cherry Orchard* (1904) the chief character Madame Ranevskaya, who with her ineffectual brother Gayev represents the upper class bring calamity on to themselves by leading a spendthrift life abroad and by refusing to make the necessary adjustment of converting her estate into a summer colony. The practical economics of her adopted daughter Varya who manages the household are insufficient to save the situation, which is being constantly contradicted by Madame Ranevskaya's extravagance. Accustomed to a life of pleasure and liberty, she simply cannot stop herself. Possessing no understanding of the practical world and having an unsurmountable for business owing to her background, she spurns the merchant Lopakhin'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, the merchant, Lopakhin. A lovely but useless world comes to an end, and those who helped to support it are also doomed.

Thus, the whole story of *The Cherry Orchard* unfolds between two ordinary events: the arrival of Ranevskaya, and her departure.

A brief synopsis of *The Cherry Orchard* is presented in the following way. The play opens in May, inside the cherry orchard estate, friends, neighbors, and servants are preparing for the long awaited return of Madame Ranevskaya, the mistress of the house, and her daughter Anya. Madame Ranevskaya has two daughters. She is returning there now from France. Her Cherry Orchard is going to be auctioned as she is in debt.

Lopakhin begins by telling the story of his own success; born a serf, 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 Lopakhin, a triangular love between the servants Dunyasha, Yasha, and Yepikhodov, the debt of neighbor Pischchik, etc. The play, however, revolves around on Madame Ranevskaya's debt. Neither she nor her brother Gayev has money to pay the mortgage on the Cherry Orchard estate, and unless they find a solution, the state will be auctioned off in August.

Lopakhin suggests Madame Ranevskaya to change the estate into summer villas, and lease them and use the money to pay the mortgage. Madame Ranevskaya and her brother Gayev 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 Dunyasha and Yasha continue, while nothing develops between Lopakhin and Varya and Dunyasha and Yepikhodov. Madame Ranevskaya is receiving letters from her lover, and Gayev begins to consider a job at a bank.

On the night of the auction, no solution has arrived. 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.

Finally, Gayev and Lopakhin return: Lopakhin has bought the Cherry Orchard. Varya is furious, and Madame Ranevskaya is devastated, but Lopakhin cannot hide his happiness; he has bought the estate where his family lived as serfs. Ironically, he encourages the party to continue, even though the hosts are no longer prepared to celebrate.

The last act shows Madame Ranevskaya leaving the Cherry Orchard for the last time. Lopakhin and Trofimov share a tender farewell: Trofimov will return to the university. Charlotte complains that she no longer has a position; Yepikhodov has a new position with Lopakhin. Pishchick is able to pay off some of his debts. Gayev has a job at a bank, and Yasha will stay on with Madame Ranevskaya, who is returning to France.

Madame Ranevskaya and Gayev share a nostalgic moment alone before leaving on a relatively optimistic note in the last moment, we hear axes cutting down the Orchard, and Firs stumbles on to stage, forgotten, locked in the house. He lies down to rest and presumably dies.

The Cherry Orchard is one of 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 a promising future for laborious serfs with the downfall of the aristocracy. Some of them are enumerated below. Jacqueline E.M. Latham has analyzed *The Cherry Orchard* as comedy. To prove it as comedy, Latham assembles evidence for her contention that *The Cherry Orchard* is not a tragedy, as it was commonly viewed, but rather a comedy, as Chekhov insisted. For Latham, in his

revelation of the ludicrous in human nature Chekhov successfully achieves a very rare blend of sympathetic and judicial comedy. 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 sees in them no love, no sense of responsibility; 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 himself insisted that "his plays were comedies, and so they are regarded on native ground" (301). To us, these grave, lyric portrayals of the failure of human beings to master their condition or communicate with each other, convey an utterable sadness. So, for Steiner, Chekhov's dramas are rooted in a specific historical circumstance and contain a strong element of political irony and social satire" (301).

In the same way, Chekhov and Stainslavsky 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 its potential is the beginning of a new, more realistic life for Madame Ranevskaya and Gayev. Their impracticality was an important cause of their having lost their wealth and the estate.

John Tulloch discussed the world of the Cherry Orchard and its characters within a political scheme. *The Cherry Orchard* is confronted with the modern

capitalist and the modern revolutionary. The question of choice, and with it the crisis 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)

August Wilson, on the other hand, was the author of cycle of plays, each set in a different decade of the 20th century about black American life. Having won many prestigious national awards and Pulitzer Prize for his art, he has achieved the status of theatrical historiographer. He won Pulitzer Prize for *Fences* and *The Piano Lesson*. In the 1960s and 1970s Wilson became involved in the Civil Rights Movement and began to describe himself as a black nationalist. He joined the black aesthetic movement in the late 1960s and became the cofounder and director of Black Horizons Theatre in Pittsburgh. Wilson won New York Drama Critics Circle Award for *Ma Rainey's Black Bottom*, *Fences*, and for Joe Turner's *Come and Gone*. Wilson's writing is rooted to a large extent in music, specially the blues. As a poet, writing over several years Wilson found himself interested in the speech patterns and rhythms that were familiar to him from black neighborhoods, but the value of those patterns became clearer to him when he grew older and moved from Pittsburgh to Minneapolis. From a distance, he was able to see more clearly what had attracted him to the language and begin to use the language more fully in his work. Wilson believes in what we have wrought is what we have learned about life and what we have

learned is always pointed towards moving harbourless parts of our being closer to home. He further believes that to write is to forever circle the maps. So, he chooses Afro-American history as a context in his plays. He further believes only people don't realize the value in what they are doing because they have accepted their victimization, they have marked themselves as victims. Once they recognize that they can begin to move through society in a different manner from a stronger position and claim what is theirs. Most of August Wilson's dramas are about Afro-American suffering, pain, frustration in a white dominated society.

His mission in writing plays set in the 20th century is to re-write that history to tell the stories of the forgotten, misrepresented, and silenced masses. He concentrates on bringing the past into the present as a healing measure for all Americans today. His cycle of plays is intended to illuminate the shadowy past of Afro-American by focusing on black issues. Wilson, through his drama, encourages people to never forget who they are and where they come from. His plays deal with common people and are created with elements of mysticism, ritual, and story telling. All of these elements, which are often found in African culture, are prominent in Wilson's plays.

Wilson's plays are about history in order to present the history on the stage, where his characters could come to life and share their revelations with audiences across the country. His plays interpret periods of history through the stories of ordinary people. For each decade of the 20th century, Wilson has focused on a representative group of characters whose struggles and dreams reflect the events and attitudes of the large society.

By using historical frame, August Wilson gives us something of the past and something of the present. Wilson also shows us individuals engaged in a struggle to gain control of their own lives and to make connections with others that will sustain

them. The struggle of course continues today and includes all of us. The past is a crucial factor in his plays particularly the past of slavery. The relationship of the present with the past is very much important in order to change the future in Wilson's plays. His plays are intense, emotionally draining and painfully real in their depiction of people who feel stuck in their given roles, due to the innate racism and classicism of American society. Past is very much important in Wilson's plays particularly the past of slavery. Past shapes the present and in turn the future. According to Wilson, people shouldn't forget their past because it determines who they are and where they are from.

Wilson's plays are almost classically well-made with strongly individualized characters and realistic settings and action. His plays depict the experience of black Americans who have migrated from South to the urban centers of the Northern U.S.A. All of his plays present characters who are forced to confront the consequences of a double historical trauma: the brutalities of the Southern heritage and the injustice and inequalities of the North as they struggle to make a home for themselves, to achieve an identity and to lead free and dignified lives in their own way.

Wilson's plays depict black Americans struggling sometimes successfully and sometimes not to escape from their psychological or spiritual confinement in a white dominated society. His plays evoke both the conditions that they struggle against and in moments of intensely theatrical action that embrace the mythic and ritualistic and which are always associated with the power of music and song-the forces by which cultural emancipation and empowerment may be achieved. Thus, his drama suggests black Americans must rediscover to achieve their full emancipation from racial subordination. Anyway, his drama tells about pain, frustration, anger, anxiety in a white dominated society. By doing this, Wilson wants to change the society or he

wants to break the hierarchy existing between white and black people in America. Most of his dramas suggest black people should recreate their identity in a white dominated society. His plays deal with common people and are created with elements of mysticism, ritual, spiritualism and story telling. All of these elements, which are found in African culture, are prominent in Wilson's plays.

Wilson's project to chronicle the Afro-American experience through each decade of the 20th century that the series, which now includes seven plays-*Jitney*, *Ma Rainey's Black Bottom*, *Fences*, *Joe Turner's Come and Gone*, *The Piano Lesson*, *Two Trains Running* and *Seven Guitars*. Traditionally in Wilson's plays the protagonist's personal past is the lens through which the present situation is seen. His authentic sounding characters have brought a new understanding of the black experience to audiences in a series of plays, each one addressing people of color in each decade of the 20th century. Although Wilson's decade plays have not been written in the chronological order, the consistent, and key theme in Wilson's drama is the sense of disconnection suffered by the blacks uprooted from their original homeland. Each of the eight plays, he has produced to date is set in a different decade of the 20th century, device that has enabled Wilson to explore, often in very subtle ways, the myriad and mutating forms of the legacy of slavery.

Wilson's first commercial success, *Ma Rainey's Black Bottom* won New York Drama Critics' Circle Award. *Ma Rainey's Black Bottom* tapped the playwright's interest in the blues and its importance in American black history. The play deals with how black singers were exploited by whites.

His next play *Joe Turner's Come and Gone* is set in a rooming house in Pittsburgh in 1911 and is a study of the children of former slaves. They have come North to find work and some of them have been found by the legendary bounty hunter

Joe Turner. As a study of people in Transition, the play is a quiet masterpiece. It incorporates a number of important African traditions, especially religious rituals of healing as performed by Bynum, the "bone man", a seer and a medicine man. In this play and others, Wilson makes a special effort to highlight the elements of African heritage that white society strips away from blacks.

His another play *Fences* is about a garbage collector whose dreams of playing professional baseball were frustrated by white racism. Maxson's bitter experience leads him to deny his son the athletic success that was not possible for blacks in the past.

Seven Guitars takes place during the post-world war IInd years. It features the story of a blues guitarist, who is murdered, and his circle of friends. The friends gather at the wake and their stories are told in a flashback form.

Two Trains Running, the latest play in the series, is set in 1969, in the decade that saw the Vietnam War, racial and political riots, and assassinations of both Kennedys, Malcolm X, and Martin Luther King, Jr. The characters remain in Memphis Lee's diner-scheduled for demolition-throughout the play. The two trains in the title are heading to Africa and to the old South, but the characters seem indifferent to both of them. Wilson moved away from the careful structure of the well-made play in this work and produced an open-ended conclusion, leaving the racial and philosophical tensions unresolved.

A brief synopsis of *The Piano Lesson* is presented in the following way. *The Piano Lesson* is a play that revolves around how past events may provide a foundation for the present. Berneice and her bother Boy Willie are descendents from a family of black slaves in Mississippi. Their forebears had been traded by a slave owner in exchange for a piano, which now gathers dust in the parlor of Berneice's Pittsburgh

home. Boy Willie lives in the South and comes with his friend Lymon to Pittsburgh to visit his sister. Boy Willie dreams of buying the land where his family had been slaves, but he needs money to do it. As such, his plan is to sell the piano, of which he is a half-owner.

Berneice, however, is unwilling to let him sell the piano because it is an icon of the family's sacrifice and a tangible reminder of the suffering of her ancestors. Wilson skillfully contrasts Berneice's obsession with the past and her brother's futuristic perspective. To Boy Willie, the proceeds from the sale of the piano offer him the best chance to escape economic and social oppression that has burdened his family since slavery.

Boy Willie is a livewire. Berneice, on the other hand, is cautious. She has lost a husband and has a daughter to raise. The central conflict between the two is what they are going to do with their heritage. More importantly, Wilson puts forth the subtle question of: Do material pursuits really mean so much that we are willing to give up our legacies for future wealth? The play does not provide clear-cut answers.

Wilson's *The Piano Lesson* has received numerous critical responses from the very outset of its publication. The researcher has tried to include some of the critical responses in the succeeding paragraphs.

Boy Willie's residence in North is temporary because he wants to recreate his new identity by purchasing the same land where most of his ancestors were once enslaved. Using the family's piano in order to buy Sutter's land in South is an effective means to recreate a new identity for Boy Willie. Modern critics Brian Crow and Chris in this regard state:

Unlike most of Wilson's characters Boy Willie's residence in the North is only temporary, he has no desire to stay and will leave as soon as he

acquires the money to buy Sutter's land. For him, the sale of the piano and acquisition of the property are the most appropriate and effective use of their inheritance and he is critical of his sister's attitude towards the piano. (54)

Similarly, the piano shows slave identity of Charles family in the sense that two sold slaves' body is carved into the piano. The piano bears the past slave identity of Charles family. It shows what sort of identity the Charles family had. Boy Willie wants to use family's piano for economic and social emancipation. Boan Devon, regarding it, says: "The call in the play consists of the slave narrative that has been carved into the body of the piano and the response is seen by Boy Willie's improvised effort to translate that myth into the reality of his own economic and social emancipation" (264).

In the same way, sense of Africanness is prevalent in *The Piano Lesson*. The presence of Sutter's ghost makes us think about the presentation of supernatural elements in the drama which remains the powerful factor to postpone Boy Willie's plan to sell the piano and buy Sutter's land. Amadou Bissiri, in this connection, opines:

Sutter's ghost also allows Wilson to dramatize such other aspects of the African sense of the supernatural as its ubiquity and omniscience. The ghost dwells everywhere in the house and makes himself felt in the air whenever someone touches the piano. The presence of the ghost makes Boy Willie to rethink his plan. (100)

Similarly, Yusef Salaam opines that "*The Piano Lesson* is a powerful depiction of the nasty clashes and beautiful fusion of black rural and urban life" (23). Alan Nadel, another critic, explains that, "Wilson explains the piano provided a link

to the past Africa to who these people are" (105). He further says "piano is a means to link present with the past and hopefully changing the future" (7). For him, Piano is a metaphor of their identity which shows their familial, communal, religious and cultural identity.

Chapter II

The Encroached Value of Heritage

Cultural studies, focusing on heritage in relation to globalization, multicultural society, culture and discourse, and modernization is chosen to show the relationship between individual and heritage. It is hypothesized that tension between individual and heritage is portrayed by Chekhov and Wilson, and in doing so they explore the diverse areas of transformation in the cultural values with the tick of clock. The Cherry Orchard in *The Cherry Orchard* and the Piano in *The Piano Lesson* come under the rubric of heritage. The Cherry Orchard is auctioned at the end of the drama, after the tussle between Madame Ranevskaya and Lopakhin, and Boy Willie returns back to the North with the threat to sell the piano when he visits again. Such a tussle shows their attitude on handling their heritage which presents their religious, cultural and historical identity. Threat on the Piano and the sale of the Orchard show their cultural, historical, religious and communal transformation. Overall, I will try to examine how the tussle between individual and heritage is dramatized, comparing Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and August Wilson's *The Piano Lesson*.

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

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 such intersection 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 achievements, institutional structures, beliefs and systems and linguistic practices, cultural studies highlights the interrelationship and tension that exist between cultures and their effects upon both the literary works and the authentic texts of our lives. Moreover, it highlights how the adoption of a different culture and situation harms heritage. Cultural studies not only explores the cultural codes of a given work but also investigates the institutional, linguistic, historical and sociological forces that inform the work's publication and critical reception.

Cultures, like texts, are seen as indeterminate site of conflict that cannot be pinned to a single totalized meaning. Cultural studies is, and always has been a multi or interdisciplinary 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 Barker, "what is at stake is

cultural studies' connections to matters of "power" and "politics"(5). So, its connections to "power" and "politics" are crucial. For Chris Barker, "cultural studies is a body of theory generated by thinkers who regard the production 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 interests and address many of the struggles within the current scene"(1).

Cultural studies in this sense 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 extremity, it denies the autonomy of the individual whether an actual person or work of literature. E.P. Thompson, in his text *The Making of the English Working Class* (1964) argues that conceptions of individuality have become fragmented in the post-war period and no longer restrict themselves to nations of shared cultural interests and value systems (qtd. in Womack 245). "Cultural studies", Guerin and others explain, is committed to examining the entire range of a society is beliefs, institutions, and communicative practices, including arts"(241). It remains difficult to pin down 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.

Cultural studies is a discursive formation, that is, a cluster of ideas, images and practices, which provides ways of talking about forms of knowledge and conduct associated with a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society. Cultural studies is constituted by a regulated way of speaking about objects and coheres around key concepts, ideas and concerns. Cultural studies also centers on

cultural values and transformation in relation to heritage. So, it focuses on how the change in perspective to handle heritage leads to cultural and religious transformation.

The concept of text suggests not simply the written words, but all practices which signify. This includes the generation of meaning through images, sounds, practices and objects. Such images, sounds, practices and objects are sign systems that signify with the same mechanism as a language, we may refer to them as cultural texts. Texts, as forms of representations 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.

Centrality of the concept of power is regarded as pervading every level 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). In this sense, power while certainly constraining, is also enabling. Such notion of power is similar to Antonio Gramsci's concept of "hegemony", 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. So, such a discipline called cultural studies has the centrality of the Foucauldian concept of "power".

In this sense, the proposition from these observations can be drawn that 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 processes 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 a discrete approach, rather a set of practices.

The concept of culture is central to cultural studies, yet there is no correct or definitive meaning attached to it. In describing it as one of the two or three 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 referents and vagueness of study with which it has all too often been invoked, the term "culture" has by now acquired a certain aura of ill-repute in socio-anthropological circles. The system of inherited conceptions 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 relations that actually exist. Culture and social structure are then two different abstractions from the same phenomena.

Etymologically, the word "culture" was derived from the Latin word 'cultura' as a noun of process connected to growing crops, that is, cultivation. Subsequently, the idea of cultivation was broadened to encompass the human mind or "spirit" giving

rise to the idea of the cultivated or cultured person. The idea of culture as "a whole way of life" emerged in the late eighteenth century (qtd. in Cultural Criticism).

Mathew Arnold, the nineteenth century English writer, described culture as "the best that has been known and thought in the world" (qtd. in Said, Culture xiii). Culture as the form of human "civilization" is to be counterpoised to the 'anarchy' of the raw and 'uncultivated masses'. Along Arnoldian line, famous English anthropologist E.B. Tylor defined culture as the "Complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (qtd. in Mitchell). In this sense, Tylor seems more original in his definition of culture.

Culture has undergone a massive change by the mid twentieth century.

Raymond Williams, perhaps the leading social critic of his time in England, contrasts this anthropological meaning of culture with the normative meaning of culture. Out of this conflict between culture in the anthropological sense, "the whole way of living of people and culture in the normative sense, representation of the organic voice of the people", there emerged a third way of using the term, "one that refers neither to a people's organic way of life nor to the normative values preached by leading intellectuals but to a battleground of social conflicts and contradictions" (qtd. in Cultural Criticism). Thus, the term "culture" itself is dissonant. So, to draw a single central culture rendering individual experience in coherent and meaningful way, is almost impossible.

In recent generations, culture has come to be understood and modeled as a continuous, contingent, politicized process. So, it is understood and analyzed by the public in the same way. People link themselves with culture because it is the source of their identity. 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. As Stavenhagen (1998) observes:

There is [...] a danger [...] which is to treat culture as an object, a 'thing' which exists separately from the social space in which various social actors interrelate. Anthropology reminds us that the ethnic identity of any group depends not so much on the content of its culture as on the social boundaries that define the spaces of social relationship by which membership is attributed to one or the other ethnic group.

(224)

So, culture is one of the parts of human being's life and vice versa. Dube writes, "The capacity of humankind to build and inculcate culture lies at the root of its ascending and explains its success in changing the face of the planet" (12). Humankind indulges in culture in course of his life. His life begins with culture and ends in culture. He has the ability to change the face of the planet by accepting certain cultural transformations with the change in time.

Culture-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 a distinctiveness all our own because of culture. But our behaviors affecting cultural, natural and monumental heritage have turned as the threat on culture itself. The imbalances and disharmonies of our culture will prove our threat on heritage, our foibles self annihilate us.

Heritage, by definition, is something of historic value. But analysis can not stop there: values are plural and heritage is multivalent. A particular heritage object, garden, site or building can be seen as having simultaneously historical value,

spiritual value, aesthetic value, community or political value, education value, and of course economic value. Throsby, in this case, opines, "realizing the economic values of a particular historic building, for instance might destroy its historical spiritual or aesthetic values" (134). In doing so, people have changed the spiritual aspect of heritage into economic value.

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 uses helped the world to develop its pace. 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 systems and perspective of observing at heritage.

The impact of modernism in contemporary 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 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 systems and new ways of thinking.

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, modernity must be understood in its context, the industrial age of the nineteenth century, and its role in sociology, which since its beginning in the era examined the leap from pre-industrial to industrial society, sometimes considering events of the

eighteenth century as well. For the period since the Middle Ages, the term "Modern Times" is used.

Modern can mean all of Post-Medieval European history, in the context of dividing history into three large epochs: Ancient History, the Middle Ages, and Modern Times. In the context of contemporary history, politics and other subjects, it is also applied specifically to the period beginning somewhere between 1870 and 1910, through the present, and even more specifically to the early twentieth century, though the early Modern times would be marked by the Renaissance.

Modernity is a different term from Modern times. It is derived from modernism, a movement in art and literature based on the consciousness that through the mechanical age of 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. Darwin's *Origin of Species* and Lyell's *Principles of Geology* revolutionized the perception of time and race, and that of mankind in particular. Anthony Giddens writes about modernity:

At 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 economy; 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 about the future rather than the past.

Modernity is the condition of new and modern from the existing established order. It is a break from the past and it seeks to subvert earlier practices. In this regard, Marjorie Perloff quotes de Man as writing, "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). Thus, modernity influences the people to a greater extent than any other movement.

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 societal 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 a revolutionary process comparable only to the shift from primitive to civilized societies. (68)

Industrialization, urbanization, modernization, shift from primitive to civilized societies and so on change the spiritualist 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 unfavourable 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 that were impossible in the traditional society. Thus, the effect of multiculturalism not only lessens the faith on heritage but also threatens the existence of heritage.

Taken to an extreme, the desire to demolish all vestiges of the past and to create a classless society, resulted in the collapse of communism following the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, which executed the Tsar and his family, created the Soviet Union, transformed serfdom, and forcibly modernized Mother Russia. Meanwhile, as the rural economy declined, capitalism and industrialization made great strides and Russia experienced most rapid surges in industrial growth in the 1890s. Such remarks clearly mention the rise of capitalism which evaluates everything in relation to money and by that token it sees no cultural values of heritage.

The most visible element of the cultural heritage is the tangible heritage. It comprises immovable such as monuments, buildings, archeological and other sites, historic such as trees, caves, lakes, mountains and others which embody culturally significant traditions as well as movables including art works of every kind and of every sort of material objects of archeological importance and those representing skills, perhaps vanished, and objects of daily life such as utensils can be of both tangible and intangible. Regarding heritage, Bouchenaki writes:

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 sense, photographic images or computer databases, but a performance itself or historic evolutions of particular styles of presentation or interpretation are not 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 can not be preserved from dynamic forces.

Man himself is considered the creator and destroyer of heritage. In course of his life, he creates heritage even though development in the world diminishes its values and history. Serageldin in this regard writes:

Heritage is that which was produced by myself and others and that lives with me and within me. 'Others' is not necessarily limited to humans, the natural beauty of landscapes, and our fellow creature are also part of our common human legacy. (16)

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, public works, construction, mining, industrial development modernization of old city centers have affected on heritage on a high level. The effect is negative. Such effect of technological advancement and the question of economic upliftment has almost ruined our heritage. As individual's impact on heritage changes, he is culturally transformed towards modern values. 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 projects 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 the heritage. (162)

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

In the same way, threat on heritage can also be seen from a multicultural society. People in multicultural society are found irresponsible for the conservation of heritage as they are seen not belonging to them. In the same way, loss of confidence in one's culture, alienation of young people from the traditions of their communities, deprive human beings of the range of choices which might have been theirs if, equipped with a justified pride in the achievement of their own culture, they freely choose elements of others.

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

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 clear that national and international boundaries fail to exist because of the rapid development of technology.

We see globalization as a process in which ideas and behaviors are disseminated 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 influence of travel, migration and mass media intensifies communication between various parts of the world. I presume that the denser international communication becomes, the more ideas and beliefs a given country will adopt from other cultures on, stated differently the more important the process of cultural transmission will be. In the information age that has begun, cities act as generators, processors and depositaries of knowledge. Knowledge is generated by research, discovery and information. For Fall, "knowledge industry, science parks, technological development zones, technologies and others will be further developed in the cities of the future" (149). So, the ruin rate of heritage will be higher in the coming future.

The pace of technological change has increased dramatically- from fifty years over a range of key technologies in 1900 to about fifteen years in the 1950s to around three years in the informatics today. While spiritual freedom may be an absolute value and an undisputed blessing, economic freedom, in the form of the free market, has proved to be a curse.

The loss of heritage can be seen from the beginning of colonial times. The colonizers took the colonized's cultural values and heritage from the economic

perspective. And as the countries begun to indulge in the multicultural scenario, faith and belief on heritage changed due to colonized's hybrid position.

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. Globalization of the economy has clearly changed the way of observing heritage. Market forces are penetrating to formerly remote areas of the world.

If globalization of the economy and communication gives unprecedented access to the cultures of other societies, it has the ability to widen human capacity by giving additional choices to communities and individuals. Though it gives them the access to the multicultural situation, the people find themselves in the dumbfounded 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, globalization deterritorializes culture and by extension makes material culture on all levels central to social life. The notion of globalization has been a lightning rod for debate and discussion about culture, economics, politics and society for the past generation. Even defining the term is an adventure. Sociologist Roland Robertson describes globalization as "the twofold 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 paired with the central political issue of globalization, as framed for instance by the critic Frederic Jameson:

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)

There is a corollary relationship between individual and heritage right from the beginning of the development of human species. Human beings are always in a close link with heritage. Human beings have no identity in absence of cultural, historical and religious factors. So they give them identity in the world. One cannot exist in absence of the other. Human beings must give importance to heritage. The relationship between them constructs the face of the society. One form of government that comes in existence valorizes the different kind of heritage than that had been in the past. In the same way the factors like hybridity, diaspora, multiculturalism, modernization, and globalization have brought changes in viewing our heritage. Moreover, lack of faith in God, valorization of material value of heritage, and financial crisis have also degraded the value of heritage. Thus, we can also find the tussle between struggle for existence and conservation of heritage.

If we analyze such 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 before modernization; almost all the people had faith on God. Different kinds of heritage like cultural, natural and religious were totally safe in that time. As such heritage had more or less significance in relation to religion and the people had faith on God, there had been an inseparable relationship between individual and heritage. Likely, rituals and rites of human beings had also close connection with the monument, temples, idols, theatres, etc.

Further, 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 a future – oriented century" (225). They would also reevaluate their past and appreciate their cultural heritage. In the past, there was no such sharp distinction between natural and cultural. Both of them were like the two parts of the same coin. Throsby says that "In most traditional communities a sharp distinction is not made between the cultural and the natural: every part of nature is endowed with spiritual force and every myth is attached to nature"(13).

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. Plus, in the modern society, modernization and globalization have appeared as the factors to change the 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.

Relationship between individual and heritage has undergone into a morbid situation due to multicultural society because people in multi-cultural society are found irresponsible for the conservation of heritage as they are seen not belonging to them. Of course, the ability and desire of people to perceive cross – culturally varies, but exposure to other cultures by the increasingly penetrative media and the invasion of foreign enterprise inevitably influences local culture, without necessarily, indeed seldom, giving a view of the best that the exotic culture can provide.

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.

Vinson, in this regard, 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)

After all, the condition of heritage has come to the point where past, present and future mingle. Heritage can be seen 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.

Therefore, religious, cultural and natural heritage is nowadays at the crossroads where identity, memory and the future conjoin.

In a nutshell, my dissertation of cultural studies focusing culture, heritage, multicultural society, and globalization, relationship between individual and heritage and modernization has paved the way for me to analyze *The Cherry Orchard* and *The Piano Lesson* comparatively. Every activity of the individual is related to culture. So, the researcher has tried to study the relationship between individual and heritage under cultural studies. The Parochial way of viewing heritage has put a big question mark on its value. In this way, the researcher's attempt is to analyze how different factors like multicultural society, modernization, globalization and discourse affect on the fruitful relationship between individual and heritage, and results into diverse transformations

Chapter III

Dramatization of Relationship between Individual and Heritage in the Cherry Orchard and Piano: A Comparative Study

Anton Chekhov, in his seminal drama *The Cherry Orchard* dramatizes the relationship between individual and heritage. Such a relationship is portrayed through the dialogues of Lopakhin and Ranevskaya. The former longs for material possession and the latter spiritual quest, but such a quest is ironic in the sense that she does not have any plan to save the orchard as it is going to be auctioned. She had been in Paris for five years after her husband died and son drowned. Though her visit seems to calm down her miseries she gets into the exposure of multiple cultures in Paris. She indulged in the extravagant French life. So to say, her hybrid identity in relation to modernization makes her ambivalent as her attempt turns into a fiasco. She seems ambivalent in the sense that no one can deny the dynamism of any culture. Ultimately, the cherry orchard is auctioned to pay off the debts. She returns back to Paris with her family after the heritage loses all its historical, familial and communal identity.

In the same way, Lopakhin is also a seminal character of the drama. He comes from the background whose father and fore-fathers had worked as the serfs in the cherry orchard. The relationship between individual and heritage gets its exposure through the tussle between Ranevskaya and Lopakhin. First and foremost, *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 entrepreneurial capitalism on the other. Thus, the people who once worked as serfs were emancipated and after all they included themselves in the mainstream. It presents the upward mobility of the serfs and the downward mobility of the feudals. In this sense, it portrays the change in status-quo. The degraded condition of the feudals shows not only the change in class but also the

transformation of culture. Both the conditions make them confused to deal with their heritage. Thus, coercion on heritage is also due to the change in the class and transformation of culture. It is Lopakhin who gives the material value to his ex-master's heritage. In this regard, he suggests Ranevskaya to change the orchard into summer villas to pay off the debts. So, the threat on heritage here is multicultural. Lopakhin discards the historical, religious and other values that are attached to the cherry orchard. He does not care for the values as he is not belonging to that culture. The power network has shifted from feudalists to capitalists. Risk on feudal heritage is because the change in power relation valorizes the heritage of existing power and diminishes the former values.

We can relate modernization in relation to economic survival to show how the tussle between individual and heritage is dramatized in the drama. Such analysis centers on how the people have changed spiritual value of heritage into economic value. Further, the tussle between economic survival and spiritual quest is the major thrust of the play. Ranevskaya relates the cherry orchard to past and memory whereas Lopakhin comes out of it and gives material value to it. Since Ranevskaya relates the cherry orchard to past and memory, her opinions on it do not mean so. She says:

Oh, my childhood, my innocence! I used to sleep in the nursery, I looked out from here into the orchard, happiness awoke with me each morning, it was just as it is now, nothing has changed. All, all white! Oh, [...] If I could cast off this heavy story weighing on my breast and shoulders, if I could forget my past! (714)

Ranevskaya longs for past but only in the ironic sense. The cited extract clearly shows that she memorizes her past, describes the present condition of the orchard and at the same time she wants to cast off the heavy stone weighing on her breast and shoulders.

Her inherited identity has become the obstacle for her. It portrays that her attempt to save the orchard remains only on words not on deeds.

Ranevskaya rejects Lopakhin's proposal to change the orchard into summer villas. Likely, she does not manage the "sum of money" (716) sent by her great aunt, but she plans to spend the sent amount in Paris. Such a remark makes us clear that Ranevskaya's attempt to save the orchard is only a situational comedy. The conversation between Ranevskaya and Lopakhin furthers it:

RANEVSKAYA: Cottages, summer people-forgive me, but it's so vulgar.

LOPAKHIN: I'll burst into tears, start shouting, or fall into a faint! I can't stand it! You've worn me out! (*To Gayev*) You're an old woman! (717-718)

Lopakhin comments that she has "worn him out" (718). Chekhov dramatizes the loss of everything in *The Cherry Orchard*; loss of Ranevskaya's son, husband, villa near Mentone, loss of the orchard, etc. Ranevskaya says that "the villa near Mentone was sold to pay debts" (718). Such a task portrays her extreme material attachment. Moreover, she has been totally modernized as she prefers economic survival to spiritual quest after all.

The characters like Trofimov and Pishchik have the modernist trace.

Considering such fact, Pishchik and Trofimov converse:

PISHCHIK: Nietzsche ... the philosopher ... the greatest, most renowned ... a man of tremendous intellect ... says in his works that it is possible to forge banknotes.

TROFIMOV: And have you read Nietzsche? Pishchik! Well ...

Dashenka told me. I'm in such a state now that I'm just about ready for

forging ... The day after tomorrow. I have to pay three thirty ... (*Feels in his pocket, grows alarmed.*) The money is gone! I've lost the money! (*Tearfully.*) Where is my money? (*Joyfully.*) Here it is, inside the lining ... I'm all in a sweat ... (722)

Forging banknotes is one of the notoriously popular evils. Pishchik, in favor of forging banknotes reveals that in the modern world people are longing for material possession, not for the conservation of past, identity and memory.

Heritage in the modern era has turned out to be the subject matter of gossip and joke. It is the aftermath of modernization, which paved the ground for material possession at the cost of cultural erosion. Ranevskaya's indifferent attitude goes on and on till the end of the drama. She has been immensely influenced by French way of life, culture and society that is why she is a hybrid. Neither she totally speaks for conservation nor against it. So to say, such a personality indulges in the multicultural situation which results in either ruin of heritage or threat on heritage Ranevskaya and Firs have their say like this:

RANEVSKAYA: Firs, if the estate is sold, where will you go?

FIRS: wherever you tell me to go, I'll go (724).

Thus, as the people are modernized, the way of evaluating heritage has been redefined. Now there is no such a relationship between natural and cultural or heritage and day-to-day life. People do not relate their day-to-day life with heritage. For them, heritage does not affect their life as they analyze everything from the scientific point of view. As a result, technological advancement is the component for the threat on heritage and ruin of heritage.

Moreover, the tussle between individual and heritage can be analyzed from the perspective of a multicultural society. Thus, the coercion on heritage can be seen from

the multicultural society. People in the multicultural society are found irresponsible for the conservation of heritage as they are seen not belonging to them. In the same way, loss of confidence in one's culture, alienation of young people from the traditions of their communities, deprive human beings of the range of choices which might have been theirs if, equipped with a justified pride in the achievement of their own cultures, they freely choose elements of others. All such activities are affected by Modernization. Lopakhin does not belong to Ranevskaya culture. He belongs to the capitalistic society. His father and fore fathers worked as the serfs in Ranevskaya's orchard. Analyzing the orchard from spiritual perspective is not his job. So he suggests Ranevskaya to change the cherry orchard into the summer villas to pay off her debts. The tussle between Lopakhin and Ranevskaya further the multi-cultural tension like this:

LOPAKHIN: I wish I could tell you something very pleasant and cheering. (*Glances at his watch*) I must go directly, there is no time to talk, but ... well, and I'll say it in a couple of words. As you know, the Cherry orchard is to be sold to pay your debts. The auction is set for August twenty-second, but you need not worry my dear, you can sleep in peace, there is a way out. This is my plan. Now, please listen! Your estate is only twenty versts from town, the railway runs close by, and if the cherry orchard and the land along the river were cut up into lots and leased for summer cottages, you'd have, at the very least, an income of twenty five thousand a year.

RANEVSKAYA: I don't quite understand you

LOPAKHIN: You will get, at the very least, twenty-five routes a year - and - for a two-and -a-half-acre lot, and if you advertise now, I

guarantee you won't have a single plot of ground left by autumn, everything will be snapped up. In short, I congratulate you, you are saved. The site is splendid, the river is deep. Only, of course, the ground must be cleared ... you must tear down all the old outbuildings, for instance, and this house, which is worthless, cut down the old cherry orchard. (712).

Though Lopakhin was once a serf in the orchard; he does not understand the spiritual value of the cherry orchard rather he suggests Ranevskaya to tear down all the outbuildings, cut down the cherry orchard, and change it into the summer villas. He, on the one hand, observes each and every thing of the cherry orchard from economic perspective and on the other he does not belong to feudal culture, past and memory so he fails to see values attached to the cherry orchard 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 tips of heritage. In short, multiculturalism is the cause of menace on heritage and its ruin.

Lopakhin, from the very outset of the drama, suggests Ranevskaya to save the form of the orchard. 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. He inherently does not belong to the feudal society. The cultural value carried by the orchard is nothing for him. The following dialogues make the argument clear:

LOPAKHIN: You must make up your mind once and for all-time won't stand still. The question, after all, is quite simple. Do you agree to lease the land for summer cottages or not? Answer in one word: Yes or no? Only one word!

LOPAKHIN: Forgive me, but I have never seen such frivolous, such queer, unbusinesslike people as you my friends. You are told in plain language that your estate is to be sold, and it's as though you don't understand it. (717)

Lopakhin questions her repeatedly whether she wants to change the form of the orchard or not. For him, she is a queer, frivolous and unbusinesslike woman as she is lethargic regarding the orchard. Ranevskaya's inability to save the cherry orchard results in the auction of her heritage on 22 August. Lopakhin appears as the new master as he has bought the orchard. He, after all, becomes successful to devalue 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. In brief, multi-cultural society is one of the affecting factors on heritage and its ruin.

Centrality of the concept of power is regarded as pervading every level of social relationship. In this sense, 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. 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. As society and culture go together, the change in power network surely affects the hitherto existing society. 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 see the feudalistic past and memory in the cherry orchard, they evaluated it from the materialistic viewpoint instead. Lopakhin'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.

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

There used to be only the gentry and the peasants living in the country, but now these summer people have appeared. All the towns, even the smallest ones, are surrounded by summer cottages. And it is safe to say that in another twenty years these people will multiply enormously.

Now [...] and then your cherry orchard will be a happy, rich, luxuriant-
(713)

Lopakhin elaborates the condition of the peasants in the new society. More, he states how they have moved to the town from the countryside. He presumes that the number will be multiplied enormously in another twenty years. Lopakhin with the changed scenario boasts how peasants are representing Russia, and whatever they say becomes truth as they possess the power mechanism.

From the very beginning of the drama, Lopakhin utilizes his discourse. Since the serfs were in power, they created a kind of discourse on heritage. They privileged material value over spiritual quest. So, Lopakhin plays as the member of the network of power. Lopakhin in this way supports the so-called subaltern 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. Lopakhin is the representative of all the peasants in Russia. Regarding it, Lopakhin states:

I bought it! Kindly [...] the cherry orchard is mine! Yermolai has bought an estate, the most beautiful estate in the whole world! I bought the estate where my father and grandfather were slaves, where they weren't even allowed in the kitchen. I'm asleep, this is just same dream of mine, it only seems to be ... It's the fruit of your imagination, hidden in the darkness of uncertainty ... (*Picks up the keys, smiling tenderly.*) She threw down the keys [...] key, musicians, play, I want to hear you! Come on, everybody and see how Yermolai Lopakhin will lay the ax to the cherry orchard, how the trees will fall to the ground! We're going to build summer cottages and our grandsons and great-grand-sons will see a new life here ... Music! Strike up! (726)

Lopakhin here entertains the capitalistic mode of power. He is rich enough to buy the feudal land. Buying the cherry orchard, he is able to make his ancestor's dream come alive. He is able to pay the musicians too. After all, he plans to cut down the trees and build summer cottages where his posterity will see a new life. Moreover, the change in power is one of the causes of ruin of heritage of the earlier power possessor. Lopakhin is the new master who creates his own truth which becomes the discourse to rule the people.

Mortgaging the cherry orchard to borrow money and bargaining on it on auction represent how careless people are on heritage. It also portrays the people in the exposure of modernization, which has totally transformed their views on heritage. Lopakhin says "we arrived at the auction, Deriganov was already there [...] He bid forty-five-I bid fifty five. In other words, he kept raising it by thousand, and I by ten" (726). The words "auction" and "mortgage" 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. Moreover, the words "auctio.. and "mortgage" related with heritage portray the people's way of life in the modern world.

Presenting a conflict between Berneice and Boy Willie, Wilson dramatizes the relationship between individual and heritage in *The Piano Lesson*. On the one hand, Berneice is in favour of preserving the piano, which reflects her and her familial and communal identity. On the other hand, Boy Willie uses all his strength and power for changing the piano into material value, which helps him to buy Sutter's land where he can plant crops and uplift his situation. Boy Willie comes to the South to sell the piano which is in his and his sister's possession. Throughout the drama, he wrestles with Berneice on the sale of the Piano. So the tussle here is intra-racial. It means that Boy Willie is influenced by the globalized scenario where as Berneice the primitive bend of mind.

Globalization is one of the major factors for the threat on heritage. Worldwide communication, media, broadcasting system, technology, public works, industrial development, economic development etc. are the major contributions of globalization. Such contributions erase national and international boundaries on economy, culture, etc. Cultural exchanges take place everywhere. Consequently, every society becomes multi-cultural; cultural boundaries are erased. In such a situation one culture contributes some of its traces to other culture and gets influenced by it. Boy Willie comes back to the South to sell the piano. He is a black boy who moves from one place to another place looking for better opportunities. He has already been freed from bondages like slavery and discrimination. He is in course of economic freedom for he does not relate himself with past and memory. By that virtue, he does not turn back to past for his identity and future. He prefers material value to sentimental value. He

attempts a desperate flight to freedom through the acquisition of James Sutter's land upon which his family had worked as slaves, and which would offer him, the substantial degree of material achievement.

From the very outset of the drama, Berneice and Boy Willie tussle on heritage, i.e. "Piano". They have no compromising lines. Both of them have totally set up their mind on their respective belief. The drama begins with Boy Willie's arrival in the South. He has an infectious grin and a boyishness that is apt for his name. He is brash and impulsive, talkative and somewhat crude in speech and manner. When he arrives, he knocks at the door, "hey, Doaker ... Doaker! [*He knocks again and calls.*] Hey, Doaker! Hey, Berneice! Berneice! (1546). The lines show how hasty he is to call Berneice and Doaker and talk about the sale of the Piano. Berneice at the same time replies that "what are you doing all that hollering for? (1548). Berneice and Boy Willie's such remarks set the tune of the play.

Boy Willie wants to live economically and psychologically free life. It is possible only by selling the piano. Selling the piano results into the ruin of heritage. Boy Willie realizes that it is only through material worth one's identity is secured. It is the influence of globalized scenario on him. He comes to the South with watermelons to raise money for buying Sutter's land. He also gives the message that the piano is like watermelons. For him, everything has a material value. So, he steps ahead to change the piano into material value, but Berneice is against his idea. Regarding it, Boy Willie protests "What she gonna do with it? She ain't doing nothing but letting it sit up there and rot. That piano ain't doing nobody no good" (1509). Use everything you have for your material prosperity, it is Boy Willie's motto. So, he advises Berneice not to let the piano rot. In this sense, Boy Willie, by selling the piano, would be asserting the pre-eminence of his own narrative even that of the piano and its

carvings—present over past, utility over tradition and freedom over community. He compares watermelons with the piano. For the researcher, it is an uncanny comparison. He is so much influenced by the globalized scenario that Berneice's metaphor of identity is like a watermelon for him. In this way, she prioritizes utility over tradition. Boy Willie, in this sense, posits:

You can't do nothing with that piano sitting up here in the house. That's just like if I let them watermelons sit out there and rot I'd be a fool. Alright now, if you say to me, Boy Willie, I'm using that piano [...] Berneice using that piano. She building on it. Let her go an and use it. I got to find another way to get Sutter's land. See, you just looking at the sentimental value. But I ain't gonna be no fool about no sentimental value. You can sit up here and look at the piano for next hundred years and its just gonna be a piano. You can't make more than that. But that's why I'm gonna take that piano out of here and sell it. (1548)

He continuously valorizes material value of the piano as he compares it with watermelons. For him, the piano must be used to solve the present situation so storing it for a long time provides nothing. So, everything should be used in its respective place. He further states that if Berneice is going to use it, he will find another way to buy Sutter's land. In short, the piano should be used; nobody should let it rot.

Comparing the piano with the watermelons shows that Boy Willie has no concentration on the piano's significance. So, in the present scenario there is no relationship between culture and community. People are trying to depart themselves from cultural, religious and communal values attached to their identity. They analyze such values scientifically which leaves this kind of a relationship in danger. It can be said that there is an unsound relationship between individual and heritage now.

Exposure to multiple cultures makes people ambivalent. They find their culture and religions without proper values for they observe their culture with other homogeneous and heterogeneous cultures existing in the world. As market and media forces have penetrated into the community religions and cultures have lost their importance. Such a situation has made men without emotions and feelings for their cultural and religious values. Boy Willie advises Berneice to replace the piano with guitar for Maretha in the sense the guitar is more important than the piano for him. So, he suggests Berneice that "Maretha don't need to be playing an no piano. She can play on the guitar (1551). He means that the piano is not important for the new generation too i.e. Maretha. Boy Willie is much more influenced by the carvings on the piano, not in the sense that it represents his identity but he can get nice price for it as it is nicely polished. Boy Willie and Lyman regarding the material value of the piano converse:

BOY WILLIE: I told you. see how its polished? My mama used to polish it every day. See all them pictures carved on it? That's what I was talking about. You can get a nice price for that piano.

LYMON: That's all Boy Willie talked about the trip up here. I got tired of hearing him talk about the piano. (1551)

Boy Willie assures Lyman that he will get a nice price for the piano as it is highly decorated. Lyman states that he got tired of hearing him talk about the piano. It also shows that ruin of heritage is seen not only from outer forces but also within the same caste and race.

Boy Willie continuously reminds Berneice and Doaker about his plan. He informs him that Sutter's brother is selling land to him. He has got one part; selling the piano he makes the second part and watermelons the third part. Since Berneice

valorizes sentimental value of the piano, she rejects his plan to sell it. She also suggests Boy Willie to leave up the idea of selling the piano. The following remarks clearly show how they differ in values:

BOY WILLIE: Sutter's brother say he selling the land to me. He waiting on me now. Told me he'd give me two weeks. I got one part. Sell them watermelons get me another part. Then we can sell that piano and I'll have the third part.

BERNEICE: I ain't selling that piano [...] a lot of mouth. If he come up here thinking he gonna sell that piano then he done come up here for nothing. (1561)

Though Berneice firmly rejects his plan, he is bold enough to sell the piano. He says that "... Berneice don't want to sell that piano ..." I'm gonna cut it in half and go on and sell my half (1561). The proposed sale of the piano represents a bizarre situation of heritage in the globalized scenario. Even the half of the piano is sellable in the market. Such historical and communal identity has been the component of interior, fashion in the skyscrapers building. Claiming the half of the piano also shows how hurried, haste and curious he is to crumble the piano.

Doaker informs Boy Willie about history of the piano. He tells him how he and Winning Boy brought it from the Nolander residence which resulted into the murder of Charles. Boy Willie's father. But Boy Willie does not want to relate himself with the past. For him, past is past, we should try to live on the demand of present scenario. Boy Willie, regarding the past and piano says:

All that's in the past. If my daddy had seen where he could have traded that [...] he could build on. His daddy ain't had nothing to give him. The only thing my daddy had to give me was that piano. And he died

over giving me that. I ain't gonna let it set up there and not without trying to do something with it. If Berneice can't see that, then I'm gonna go ahead and sell my half. And you and winning Boy know I'm right. (1571)

According to Boy Willie, his father had not known anything about trade, if he had seen where he could have traded the piano; it would have been already sold. For him, his father had to give him something and he passed away giving him the piano. So, he should not let it rot, and should be able to sell even the half of it. Boy Willie repeatedly requests Berneice to sell the piano but Berneice reminds him about incomparability of piano and land. But he urges that it must be used in relevant purpose. The following dialogues make it clear:

BOY WILLIE: I'm trying to get me some land, woman. I need that piano to get me some money so I can buy Sutter's land.

BERNEICE: Money cannot buy what that piano cost. You can't sell your soul for money. It won't go with the buyer. It'll shrivel and shrink to know that you ain't taken on to it. But it won't go with the buyer.

BOY Willie: Land the only thing God ain't making no more of you can always get you another piano. I'm talking about some land. (1575)

What is important for Boy Willie is land not the piano for the another piano can be made but no more land can be added. So to say, he ignores piano's relationship with its history.

Berneice realizes that Boy Willie is totally different from her as he is in search of economic upliftment. For her, he gets his mind fixed on the piano and nobody can turn him from it. In this regard, she says:

You can't talk to Boy Willie. He been that way all his life. Mama Ola had her hands full trying to talk to him. He don't listen to nobody. He just like my daddy. He get his mind on the piano and nobody can turn him from it. (1585)

Boy Willie's fixed bend of mind tortures everyone since he follows nobody and follows his own vision on ideas and values. As Berneice rejects Boy Willie's plan, he proceeds forward to sell even the half of the piano. His mission to come to the South with the truckload of watermelons is to sell them and return back to the North with the piano. After all he becomes ready to take back the piano. So, he sends Lyman to bring rope and board to take the piano out of the building. Anyway he wants to take it out of the house. In this sense, he wants to lead an individual life selling the piano. It is the way to put the mark on the road. He is in favor of what his heart says for he says that "my heart say for me to sell that piano and get me some land so I can make a life for myself to live in my own way" (1598). Leading a free life really harms cultural values because the individual does what his heart says. He is unable to complete his task in his first visit so he returns back to the North suggesting Berneice to play the piano. For him, the piano has the utilitarian purpose and no one should let it rot. While returning back to the North, Boy Willie suggests, "hey Berneice ... if you and Maretha don't keep playing on that piano ... ain't no telling ... me and Sutter both liable to be back" (1606). After all, Boy Willie bids farewell to the South with the big threat on the piano because he suggests Berneice to use the piano otherwise he will come back to sell it. Anyway, Boy Willie is successful to change Berneice's psyche to use the piano as he believes on the method that resources must be used according to situation, time and necessity.

New attitudes towards religion, desire for personal freedom and desire for sexual freedom are highly prevalent in the globalized scenario. More, there is no such a relationship between natural and cultural in the society. People do not want to relate themselves with nature. For them, nature has nothing to do with their luck and fate as they analyze everything scientifically. Boy Willie does not believe on the existence of ghost and influence of religion on him. He thinks he is bold enough to defeat the ghost easily. It shows that people in the globalized scenario are ready to overpower spiritual power. Boy Willie says, "Don't be scared. Here, I'll go up there with you. If we see Sutter's ghost, I'll put a whupping on him. Come on, uncle Boy Willie going with you" (1594). As people discard natural power, they get ready to defeat such power. Boy Willie does not have cultural, religious, communal and familial belief and vision so he does not recognize ghost and natural power. After all, he gets ready to whup the ghost. He further opines that ghost and other spiritual power doesn't exist, it is only in the traditional people's mind. Boy Willie says that "ain't no ghost in this house. That's all in Berniece's head. Go on up there and see if you see him. I'll give you hundred dollars if you see him. That's all in her imagination" (1599). He jokes that he will reward Avery if he finds ghost in the house. It makes crystal clear that he has nothing to do with Afro-American heritage. The house needs no blessing for him; it is Berniece's mind that needs blessing. So to say, for Boy Willie people should come out of their tradition if they want their individual freedom. He furthers that "ain't no ghost in this house. He needs to bless Berniece's head. That's what he need to bless" (1604). Thus, he sheds light on the globalized scenario.

Open sex in the Charles residence and the piano in the apartment are incompatible. Free sex and heritage don't go together. Lymon and Boy Willie's each and every activity puts an enormous question mark on heritage. They visit the city in

search of beautiful girls. Lymon's expression "come on, Boy Willie ... let's go find some women" (1581) makes it clear. After all, Boy Willie comes back to the residence with Grace, who is a notorious sex worker. Berneice totally rejects such stuff inside the house because it is a holy place for her. But Boy Willie wants to continue romancing inside it. He leaves the house not because Berneice scolds her but because there is only a couch and it is not favourable for their romance.

In the same way, threat on heritage is also realized in the multi-cultural society. The white people pay no attention to the piano's importance. So, they analyze the Afro-American heritage and identity only from the material point of view, as they do not belong to it. As a result, they prefer their cultural heritage to be the goods of interior design. Avery and other white people had already visited the Charles residence to buy the piano. Doaker in this regard says:

Some white fellow was going around to all the coloured people's houses looking to buy up musical instruments. He'd buy anything Drums, Guitars, Harnionicas, Pianos. Avery sent him past here. He looked at the piano and got excited. Offered him a nice price. She turned [...] two weeks. He seen where she wasn't gonna sell it, he gave her his number and told her if she ever wanted to sell to call him first. Say he'd go one better than what anybody else would give her for it.
(1552)

Doaker presents the instance of white people visiting coloured people's houses for buying their heritage. Such instance portrays their attempt to meddle the coloured people's culture and identity. In other words, the white people do not pay heed for the conservation of their heritage. Since they do not belong to their culture and identity, pianos, drums etc. are no more important than the goods available in the market. Such

goods are important for them only to decorate their houses. So to say, no cultural and communal values are attached to such heritage for white people. In the same way, the use of words "heritage" and "bargain" are incompatible in the sense that the words like "sale" and "bargain" put a question mark on the existence of heritage. The use of such words by the people portrays the degraded situation of heritage.

In a nutshell, heritage now has appeared as such a phenomenon where memory, identity and future merge. Moreover, it portrays the condition where past, present and future mingle.

Chekhov and Wilson have rightly dramatized the tussle between individual and heritage. Although the time of their writing differs, they show different key figures to depict how the cultural heritages are at stake. Influenced by such circumstances, human beings tussle with heritage. The factors like modernization focusing on capitalism, multicultural society, discourse can be seen as the major factors influencing the individual to tussle with the heritage in *The Cherry Orchard*. In the same line, globalization focusing on industrialization, information technology and capitalism and multicultural society are the prominent figures to influence individual to tussle with heritage in *The Piano Lesson*.

Both the dramas deal with the common question-what to do with the heritage? So, they dramatize the tussle between search for economic upliftment and spiritual quest. Madame Ranevskaya and Lopakhin in the *The Cherry Orchard* and Berneice and Boy Willie in *The Piano Lesson* deal with spiritual quest and question of economic upliftment respectively. Either it is modernization or globalization, capitalism is the principle factor which influences everyone. In *The Cherry Orchard*, Madame Ranevskaya and Lopakhin tussle on the issue of heritage. Madame

Ranevskaya is in favor of her past and memory but Lopakhin is in favor of changing the cherry orchard into summer Villas. Thus Ranevskaya is in favor of heritage and Lopakhin in economic betterment. Lopakhin suggests Madame Ranevskaya in the sense that she has nothing to do with the orchard's importance as she is in debts. She must have to use it to come out of an impasse, but no decision comes from her side, Lopakhin time and again alerts her that the cherry orchard is going to be auctioned if she does not decide to change it into the summer villa. Either she lets it auctioned or changes it into the summer Villa; it is at the cost of heritage. She seems ambivalent on the issue of the conservation of heritage. She longs for the conservation of the orchard and at the same time she pays no heed for its conservation. Thus, her presence is ironic in the drama. She seems to have accepted the dynamism of time and situation which brings changes on each and every thing. On the other hand, Lopakhin 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 her to pay off the debts. So, he suggests her to change it into the summer villas. He repeatedly requests her to think on his proposal from the very outset of the drama. Changing the cherry orchard into summer villas or auctioning it to pay off the debts, both are at the cost of heritage. Such circumstances clearly portray the situation of heritage under danger.

In the same way, Boy Willie from the very beginning of the drama talks with Berneice, regarding the sale of the piano. Like Lopakhin, he does not relate the heritage with familial and communal identity. The piano is only the piano for him as it does not represent his family. It is no more important than watermelons. In this context, Boy Willie realizes that it is only through material success one's identity is secured. Regarding material possession, he gives the instance of watermelons. He

further says that he is a fool if he lets watermelons rot. It is valuable only if it is changed into currency. Similarly, for Boy Willie, Berniece is a fool as she hesitates to sell it. In this sense, he is in favour of using resources as much as possible. For him, she should not let it rot as it does not benefit her if she goes on looking at it. In this sense, he valorizes utility over tradition. Lopakhin in *The Cherry Orchard* and Boy Willie in *The Piano Lesson* both focus on land which represents their identity in a true sense. Boy Willie is highly influenced by carvings on the piano in the sense that it can be sold in the high price. He furthers that he can get a nice price for it. Though Berniece time and again rejects his proposal, Boy Willie is seen bold enough as he plans to sell even the half of it. He seems to have followed the demand of time as he states that if his father had known how to trade it, he would have traded it. He left the piano for him to use it into the considerable value. Therefore, he is willing to sell it to buy Sutter's land. What is important for Boy Willie is land not the piano for another piano can be made, but no more land can be added in the existing land. Thus, he ignores the piano's relationship with history. More, he says that he will find another way for buying Sutter's land if Berniece uses it, but it should be used anyway. Se, he suggests Berniece to play the piano. After all, he leaves the South with the threat to return back and sell the piano if she does not play it.

Multicultural society is also the major factor for the threat on heritage and ruin of heritage. Such a factor can be seen in both the dramas. Lopakhin and Madame Ranevskaya come from different cultures. So, Lopakhin does not pay heed for the conservation of feudal heritage. Though he is financially sound, he does not help her to pay off the debts rather he suggests her to change the cherry orchard into summer villas. Moreover, he suggests 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, Lopakhin

accepts the auction and begins cutting down the cherry trees. Such a phenomenon shows the complete destruction of the cherry orchard, i.e., the ruin of feudal heritage. In *The Piano Lesson* threat on heritage is both intra-racial and multi-cultural. Threat is intra-racial in the context that Boy Willie belongs to the same race. Boy Willie's perception, activities and personality put a threat on heritage as he disregards the communal, familial and religious values attached to the piano. In the multi-cultural context the white people try to buy whatever they get in the coloured people's houses. The drama reveals that people like Avery and others have already started their campaign to buy the piano. They are so much influenced by the carvings on the piano in the sense that it will be the cutest souvenir for them.

In the lower level, discourse plays a role in *The Cherry Orchard* for the ruin of heritage because Lopakhin, the new master, uses all his strength and power for the destruction of feudal heritage. Unlike discourse, intra-racial tussle prevails in *The Piano Lesson*. What matters for the ruin of heritage here is the influence of globalization on Boy Willie. August Wilson shows new attitudes towards religion, free and open sex, etc. through the dialogues of Boy Willie and Lymon. On the contrary, Anton Chekhov presents the influence of French life on the Ranevskaya family. Such circumstances transform their attitudes towards heritage. Similarly, *The Cherry Orchard* presents the complete destruction of the orchard but *The Piano Lesson* ends with the threat on the piano, an Afro-American heritage if it is not used properly. Either threat on heritage or ruin of heritage, such action shows how the people are culturally transformed.

The Cherry Orchard and *The Piano Lesson* both dramatize the relationship between "individual" and "heritage". Such a relationship has been unsound since modern to the present time. The tussle between the characters prepare ground for the

tussle between individual and heritage. Disharmonies and imbalances in culture and behavior prove threat on heritage. Multicultural society, prioritization of economic value over sentimental value, discourse, new attitudes on religion, free and open sex determine people's bend of mind. And their bend of mind determines what they should do. Such phenomena clearly portray their relationship with heritage.

Moreover, such phenomena lead to the auction of the cherry orchard in *The Cherry Orchard* and the threat on the piano in *The Piano Lesson*. And in doing so, Chekhov and Wilson reveal the diverse areas of cultural transformation with the tick of clock.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

The meaning and importance of heritage now has gone through several transformations. 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 venue where past, present and future mingle. Such social and cultural transformations are reflected in literary texts, and by the same virtue they are dramatized in Anton Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and August Wilson's *The Piano Lesson*. Therefore, the ground of transformation is based on a tussle between individual and heritage, between Madame Ranevskaya and Lopakhin in *The Cherry Orchard* and Berneice and Boy Willie in *The Piano Lesson*.

In the modern and post-modern eras, the cultural values are eroded. On the contrary, people prefer economic values of heritage to cultural values of heritage, by that virtue people are longing for the material possession, not for the conservation of heritage. In this sense, heritage now has turned out to be the subject matter of gossip and joke. Unlikely, in the past there was no such a sharp distinction between natural and cultural, but now such a relationship seems to have dissolved. It is because people disregard their connection with nature.

Lopakhin in *The Cherry Orchard* comes from the capitalistic society so he does not pay heed for the conservation of the feudalistic heritage. He time and again advises Madame Ranevskaya to change the cherry orchard into summer villas to pay off the debts. At last, he accepts the auction and begins to cut down the cherry trees to change it into summer villas. In the same way, Avery and other white people in *The Piano Lesson* march on the door to door campaign to buy whatever they find in the coloured people's houses. Such instances show that people in the multicultural society

do not see the historical and religious values rather they see the material value, which is the big threat on the existence of heritage. Apart from the multicultural threat, a tussle between the people of the same race is also the big threat on heritage. In *The Piano Lesson*, Berneice longs for the conservation of heritage but Boy Willie prefers material value to sentimental value. So to say, the tussle between the people who find their identity on heritage and the people who are modernized is unfavourable for heritage, within the same race.

The fate of culture is decided on the basis of power network as society and culture go together. The rise of capitalistic discourse diminishes all feudalists' heritage. It is portrayed by Lopakhin's treatment of the cherry orchard.

Lopakhin attacks on the cherry orchard since it does not belong to his society, and in doing so he projects his modernized personality. Because of his modernized personality he views the cherry orchard from material perspective. Madame Ranevskaya, on the other hand, is also the projection of the modern personality. On the surface, she seems to show the attention to preserve her heritage, but in the deeper level she seems to be modernized as she does not make any further plan to preserve her heritage rather she takes part in music, fun, joke and gossip.

Cultural globalization, industrialization, worldwide communication, technological advancement and economic development, etc. set the bend of mind of the people. Boy Willie is influenced by such factors as he comes to the South to sell the piano and buy Sutter's land. He does not relate himself to past and memory of the piano since he prefers material value to sentimental value. Therefore, he does not distinguish between watermelons and piano. In this sense, he valorises utility over tradition, freedom over community and present over past. For him, storing something for a long time provides nothing. Therefore, storing piano and watermelons is to let

them rot which hampers their material value. As market and media forces have penetrated into the community, religions and culture have lost their importance. Boy Willie's activities clearly portray such a situation. He is influenced by piano, not in the sense that it represents his identity but he can get a nice price for it as it is highly carved and decorated. Boy Willie is ready to sell even the half of the piano. Claiming the half of the piano shows how hurried haste and curious he is to crumble the piano. In this sense, he leads himself on the demand of present. He says that if his father had known how to trade the piano, he would have traded it. So, he passed away giving him the piano. He furthers that another piano can be made but no more land can be added in the existing land, which shows that he is totally influenced by the globalization and finds no difference between piano and land and piano and watermelons.

New attitudes towards religion, desire for personal freedom and desire for sexual freedom are really harmful for heritage. Open sex between Boy Willie and Grace beside the piano in the Charles residence teases the identity carved on the piano. He takes the sex worker in the residence so as to ridicule the value attached to the piano.

Hence, the hypothesis of this dissertation-tension between heritage and individual is portrayed by Chekhov and Wilson and in doing so they reveal the diverse areas of transformation in the cultural values with the tick of clock; is proved.

Abstract

Heritage, by definition, is something of historical and cultural value. There have been continuous attacks on heritage since the people have already divorced their cultural relationship with nature. So to say there is no such relationship between natural and cultural now, and heritage has become the venue where past, present and future mingle. The factors like globalization, modernization, multicultural society and discourse have transformed the people's psyche totally. Such transformations are reflected in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and Wilson's *The Piano Lesson*. The tussle between Madame Ranevskaya and Lopakhin in *The Cherry Orchard* and Berneice and Boy Willie in *The Piano Lesson* determines the individual's role. By that virtue, Chekhov and Wilson have dramatized the relationship between individual and heritage, and shown diverse kinds of transformation on cultural values with the tick of clock.

Works Cited

- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Bissiri, Amadou. "Aspects of Africanness in August Wilson's Drama." *African American Review*, xxx. 1990:99-103.
- Boan, Devon. "Call and Response: Parallel Slave Narrative in August Wilson's The Piano Lesson." *African American Review*, xxxii. 1998: 263-70.
- Bouchenaki, Mounir. "An Outline of Heritage." *Culture and Heritage*. 146-63, 2000:4
- Chekhov, Anton. *The Cherry Orchard In Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Ed. A Lee Jacobus. Boston: Bedford, 1993.
- Fall, Yorok. "Culture, Ethics and Globalization." *Heritage and Globalization*. 147-52, 1998:3.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. New York: Dutton, 1991.
- Graff, Gerald and Bruce Robbins. "Cultural Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* Eds. Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 419-36.
- Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler, Eds. *Cultural Studies*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Gurien, Wilfren L. et. al, Eds. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Viking, 1992.
- Latham, Jacqueline. "The Cherry Orchard as Comedy." *Educational Theatre Journal*. 21-29, 1958:5.
- Nadel, Alan. "Piano as a Metaphor of Identity." *New York Times* 6-8 (1994): 77.

- Perloff, Majorie. "Modernist Studies." *Redrawing the Boundaries: Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 154-78.
- Prott, Lyndel V. "Cultural Heritage." *Heritage and Globalization*. 224-34, 1998:3.
- Robertson, Roland. "Cultural Heritage." *Heritage and Modernization*. 240-50, 2000:4.
- Schwartz, Benjamin. *The Sign and Experience of Modernity*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Smith, Karl R. "Cultural Heritage." *Culture and Heritage*. 180-96, 2000:4.
- Steiner, George. *The Death of Tragedy*. London, Faber and Faber, 24 Russel Square, London. 1982.
- Throsby, David. "Playing for the Past: The Economics of Cultural Heritage." *Culture and Heritage*. 146-63, 2000:4.
- Tulloch, John. *Chekhov: A Structuralist Study*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980: 185-188.
- Vinson, Isabelle. "Heritage and Cyber Culture." *Heritage and Globalization*. 237-46, 1998:3.
- . *Culture and Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO Press, 1998.
- Wilson, August. *The Piano lesson In A Companion to American Literature*. Ed. Arthur C-Danto. New York: Dutton, 1990.
- Womack, Kenneth. "Theorizing Culture, Reading Ourselves: Cultural Studies." *Introducing Literary Theories: A Guide and Glossary*. Ed. Julian Wolfreys. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. 243-54.
- Yusef, Salaam. "Wilson's The Piano Lesson Plays at Black Spectrum." *The New York Amsterdam News*. Vol 23. New York, 2002.14-20.