

Hegelio-Aristotelian Nexus in Dr. Faustus and Tughlaq

Farhan Ahmad

Dr. Ahmad Naeem

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, Gomal University, D.I.Khan.
(KPK).Pakistan at- Farhan420274@gmail.com

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Gomal University, D.I.Khan.
(KPK). Pakistan at- anaeemk@hotmail.com

Abstract

The study is based on the two famous tragic heroes who are chronologically and culturally poles apart but share certain similarities and differences in their flaws and downfall. The current study keenly analyzes the tragic flaws of Dr. Faustus and Tughlaq which lead them to their downfall. The tragic flaws and the catastrophic end of both these characters have been examined in the light of the Aristotelian theory of the tragic hero and the Hegelian views regarding the ideal tragic hero. The current research brings forth two gigantic tragic heroes face to face in a comparative study to evaluate their literary stature and to examine the difference in approaches of their respective authors.

Keywords: Tragic Flaw, Dr. Faustus, Tughlaq, Aristotle, Tragic Hero, Hegel

Introduction

The present study deals with two of the most celebrated tragedies, namely Dr. Faustus and Tughlaq. Dr. Faustus is a sound scholar having great knowledge of various fields, but he is much driven by his unwished desire to acquire sublime powers. For that, he sells his soul to Lucifer, but, in the end, he meets his eternal damnation. On the other hand, Tughlaq is a man of complex nature. The people are divided in their support towards Sultan. The course of the story reveals the idealist nature of the Sultan that leads toward the drastic downfall of his kingdom. Both the characters fell from a high standing owing to their inherent hamartian tendencies conveying the sense of collision of two positions. Moreover, Aristotle believes that in order to obtain maximum tragic effect of a tragedy the protagonist should be from the upper strata of the society. He should be a man of great fortune and his fall should be from prosperity to depravity. He should not be utterly bad or extremely pious; his downfall should be a result of error of judgment. On the other hand, Hegel believes that tragedy arises when there is a clash between two justified positions. In ideal Hegelian tragedies, the hero asserts courageously and consistently a justified position and neglects the authenticity of the opposite position and meets a terrible end. The

present study aims at discovering the relevancy of Aristotelian and Hegelian views of tragic downfall in the two widely known protagonists each belonging to a different age, class, and society.

Literature Review

Dr. Faustus is a fine blend of Marlowe's artistic genius and the vital prevalent characteristics of the renaissance spirit. The play reveals multiple colors and aspects from where it could be interpreted and analyzed. Multiple scholars and men of vision have focused and observed the color in it according to their lens and all these colors are strongly woven into each other. Religion plays an important role in the entire play. Indeed, it is the violation of religious restrictions that the protagonist has fallen into misery. The pursuits of Dr. Faustus raise questions against his religious beliefs, and his religious thoughts become ambiguous after the arousal of such desires, although, Dr. Faustus abjures the trinity, resorts to necromancy, and becomes guilty but cannot be regarded as an atheist because of his later strong desires and urges for redemption (Karim, Fathema, & Hakim, 2015, p. 145). Dr. Faustus has also been compared with Hamlet in terms of their religious themes whether the beliefs presented are mainly Protestant or Catholic (Sel & Latre, 2017, p. 18). Moreover, the only female character in the entire tragedy has played an important role in the downfall of the protagonist. Dr. Faustus tries to repent but again he is tempted by the beauty of Helen and met a tragic end. The scene when Faustus seems to enjoy the bliss of heaven on the lips of Helen presents that Faustus' hubris is evident when he negates the beauty of God as compared to the beauty of Helen (Faheem, 2022, p. 5). The tragedy of Faustus also shares a striking resemblance with the other prominent tragedies of various ages. The flaws responsible for the downfall of

Dr. Faustus are similar to Don Juan. Furthermore, they do share the theme of ever-delayed repentance (Lopez, 1994, p. 110). The existence of God has been the recurring theme of the play and it has also been contrasted in this regard with *Waiting for Godot*. Moreover, the themes of both plays are also been analyzed (Wahab, Aziz, & Iqbal, p. 30). The renaissance elements in the play have also been highlighted because they also shape the tragedy to some extent and Dr. Faustus has been contrasted in this regard with Hamlet because both plays are prone to renaissance tendencies (Hüseyin, 2014, p. 15). The entire play revolves around the idea of magic and the ultimate goal of Faustus is to achieve divinity through magical practices. His aim is not the attainment of magic but divinity through magic and the reason behind his downfall is his inability to contemplate the world beyond the physical state (Matthews, 2006, p. 41). Furthermore, to investigate the reasons behind his flaws and downfall, psychological insight into the character's conscience is quite rudimentary and the psychological insights has revealed that Faustus is an Id-ridden character who is having great tendencies towards thirst and urges of Id and it ultimately contributes to his flaws (Mili Rahman & Rahman, 2019, p. 50).

Tughlaq is replete with complexities and contradictions. It is the demand of his character to be analyzed through different lenses for a better insight into the protagonist. In this regard, a thorough analysis with an existentialist lens has revealed that Tughlaq is not just a

historical figure but an existentialist hero, who has contradictions and shortcomings (Pandey, 2018, p. 12). Tughlaq cannot be openly termed as a realist because his personality is composed of idealist tendencies. His transgression from the religious tenets to political greed and his actions affected the orthodox audience which turned them against him are all marks of his downfall (Agrawal, 2013, p. 5). After the bleak episode of colonialism, the allegorical aspects of Sultan's character can be seen as a shift from spiritual leadership like Gandhi and Nehru to more practical and power-based leadership like Indra Gandhi (Panneerselvam, 2010, p. 35). Apart from that, for a better understanding of Karnad's protagonist insights into the real historical figure are also important. In this regard, Saini (2013) has depicted the multi-faceted personality of the Sultan from a historical perspective and he also covers the main events of the Sultan leading him toward his downfall. He highlights the fictional representation of not only the policies of the real Sultan, but also the contradictory and existential personae as well (p. 30). Tughlaq is also considered paradoxical. His adequate importance to the prayer in the initial stages of the play has revealed his hideous intentions to kill his father and brother later on (Kaushal, 2013, p. 4). The tyrannical nature and the symbols of violence act as fuel for the downfall of Tughlaq, along with his kingdom.

The rumor of the murder of Sultan's brother and father by him is also a symbol of violence, which is responsible for the lack of trust of his subjects (Solayan & Gowri, 2014, p. 110). Tughlaq shares striking similarities with Ali Ahmed Bakathir's *Sir Al-Hakim bi-Amr Allah*. Both the characters share a similarity in hollow values, their unfair means to achieve something. The struggle of their people to get rid of both of these leaders and the way they have killed innocent people to save their kingdom. Although these rulers belonged to the religion of Islam their actions are completely against it (Al-Moghales, 2014, pp. 31-34). The recurring symbol of chess reveals multiple aspects of Sultan's personality and it emphasizes the relations between human beings and the politics of life where a common man checkmates the highly intelligent leader of the time (Dasaradhi & Nimsarkar, 2016, p. 65).

Theoretical Framework

The theory and the views of Aristotle and Hegel regarding the tragedy and tragic hero have been utilized as the theoretical framework. The first characteristic on which Aristotle lays great emphasis is the goodness of the character. At that time goodness was not confined to moral values or attitudes, but it also meant that a tragic hero should be from the upper strata of society. The idea of goodness was not only confined to virtuousness or moral uprightness, but it also pointed toward the class (Nouri, 2016, p. 9). Secondly, a tragic hero, according to Aristotle, is consistent. For him, a true and a better tragic hero does not change his behaviour rapidly after the outcome of some of his actions. Thirdly, the action responsible for the downfall of the protagonist has been termed as the tragic flaw or hamartia, and the downfall should be a result of it. Moreover, another important aspect is the element of discovery which he defines in chapter XI of *Poetics* that it is, "a change from ignorance to knowledge" (Butcher, 1898, p. 41). Among all these aspects the concept of reversal of fortune also occupies a great place in the theory of

Aristotle. It is also known as peripeteia. Aristotle defines it as, "a change by which a train of action produces the opposite of the effect intended, subject always to our rule of probability or necessity" (Butcher, 1898, p. 41).

On the other hand, the views of Hegel are greatly different and they occupy an equally great place in the realm of tragedy. Roche (2006) defines Hegel's concept of tragedy that it arises, "when a hero courageously asserts a substantial and just position, but in doing so simultaneously violates a contrary and likewise just position and so falls prey to a one-sidedness that is defined at the same time by greatness and by guilt" (p. 11). According to Hegel's views, tragic heroes are the trend changers. Initially, their opinion is not given enough value, but with the sacrifice of the hero trend changes and "through them new world dawn" (Roche, 2006, p. 13). The Hegelian theory asserts that the heroes of tragedy are behaving in favor of the right and against the right; they are both good and bad because they act according to their justification and intentions, but they also violate an equally just position as well. They are innocent as well as guilty. Hegel states, in this regard, "it is the honor of these great characters to be culpable" (Roche, 2006, p. 14). According to Hegel, the actions which the tragic hero performs not only bring the downfall of the other character but also bring his downfall as well. Hegel's Phenomenology gives great attention to the consistency of the tragic character. He asserts that the tragic hero should remain consistent even if he realizes the validity and the justification of the opposite force. The Hegelian concept of tragedy states that the downfall of the hero is not the result of fate acting against him rather it is purely the outcome of his deeds.

Unveiling the Flaws and their Repercussions

Although the tragedies of Dr. Faustus and Tughlaq culturally and historically are poles apart but they share some striking similarities as well as differences in the tragic flaws of their heroes. These tragic flaws lead the tragedy towards catharsis which is the ultimate objective of a tragedy as suggested by Aristotle. In the initial scenes of Dr. Faustus, the protagonist talks about the myth of Icarus who like Faustus tries to go beyond human limitations and melts his wings made of wax to escape prison as it goes, "His waxen wings did mount above his reach," and it leads him towards his downfall (Marlowe, 2007, p. 8)¹. He wants to achieve supreme powers "A sound magician is a mighty god; Here, Faustus, try thy brains to gain a deity! (p. 12). These lines exhibit Faustus' hubris which turns the providence to work against him. As Tom McAlindon (1995) states that the start of the play is marked by the Icarian pride of the protagonist and its end is marked by the divine punishment of it (p. 8). Furthermore, from the beginning, the sufferings of Faustus include, "spiritual misery in self-created hell followed by intermittent ecstasies of carnal enjoyments" (Singh, 2006, p. 128). To quench his insatiable thirst for knowledge and power, he decides to sell his soul to Lucifer to have worldly pleasures and powers. It shows Faustus' vaulting ambition and excessive pride.

¹ All the subsequent references are given from this source: Marlowe, C. (2007). *Doctor Faustus*. Broadview Press and furthermore, only the page numbers will be mentioned.

The ultimate flaw of Faustus is the over-ambition that prompts him to sell his soul to Lucifer for worldly pleasures (Majeed, 2020, p. 7). He conforms to the demands of Lucifer. His dedication is apparent when he dedicates himself to Mephistopheles "Had I as many souls as there be stars, I'd give them all for Mephistopheles" (p. 26). He acknowledges that there is no chief except Beelzebub "this word 'damnation' terrifies not him, For he confounds hell in Elysium" (p. 24). Dr. Faustus's pride makes him blind to the outcome of his current endeavors. His previous knowledge and logic all seem to have disappeared from his mind where the ideas of necromancy and black magic reside henceforth. He is very egocentric. In his eyes either he is the greatest of all men or the greatest sinner of all time (Kirschbaum, 1943, p. 231). His transgression is not light or simply a result of his impulsive nature, but it is grave and with total deliberation (McAlindon, 1995, p. 215). There are also some similarities between the tragic flaw of Satan from Paradise Lost and Faustus. As Satan says in Paradise Lost, "Till pride and worse Ambition threw me down" (Riggs, 1970, p. 40). Faustus subconsciously wants to achieve the level of omnipotence with the help of the devil. This idea is a challenge to the supreme might of God (Habib, 2022, p. 7). It is the clash of the protagonist's pride and despair that leads the way toward his eternal downfall (Snyder, 1966, p. 15). The recurring flaws of an unquenchable thirst for power and vaulting ambition are also quite striking in the course of the play. His unending urge for knowledge and fantasy in the initial stage lead him to an unbounded thirst for power which is not possible to quench (Orgel, 2005, p. 44). Bas (2014) says, "Throughout the play, it is possible to observe that his internal ambition evolves into an infernal failure" (p. 11).

Thus, Faustus who is portrayed as a great scholar and a well-learned man in the initial portion of the play gradually loses his intellectual spirit. He tries to achieve power in any possible way, regardless of right or wrong, and resorts to necromancy. His ambition and thirst for power attracted the devil to manipulate his desires to achieve what he wanted and to make him "another pawn for amusement and another soul to put in hell" (Habib, 2022, p. 9).

Downfall of Dr. Faustus

Dr. Faustus has been familiar with his drastic end after signing the pact with Lucifer. When Mephistopheles returns to officially bind the pact and Dr. Faustus asks certain questions to him Mephistopheles' answers point towards the terrible outcome of the deal. "Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris" (p. 31) which means it comforts the wretched ones to have friends in pain. The scene about the Good and Bad angels also highlights the extremity of his action in which the Good angel tries to make Faustus repent, but he is temporarily blinded by his pride and ambition. Apart from that, the scene of signing the pact also shows some issues in signing the pact because Faustus' blood congeals and he is not able to write what he is supposed to. These can be evident warnings from God but Faustus does not pay any considerable heed to them. Faustus after signing the pact states, "Consummatus est" (Borchert, 1996, p. 40), these are the last words of Jesus Christ before his death which means it is finished. These lines do have an ironic significance because it closes the last door of repentance for Faustus.

The entire play revolves around Faustus' changing attitude towards the pact and the hereafter. In scene XIII with the arrival of the old God-fearing man who tries to make Faustus repent "Break heart, drop blood, and mingle it with tears," after hearing the soothing words of the old man, he condemns his decision of selling his soul to Lucifer and finally decides to repent. At the same time, he is threatened by Mephistopheles, "I arrest thy soul, For disobedience to my sovereign lord: Revolt or I'll in piece-meal tear thy flesh" (p. 68). And to get rid of this situation and despair Faustus indulges himself deep into all these carnal desires and ecstasies coupled with guilt (Singh, 2006, p. 125). Faustus, in the end, laments his decision of selling his soul and calls to Jesus Christ to save him from the hell but this has been quite late and his urges have gone in vain. The play ends with the cries of Faustus, "Ugly hell, gape not! come not, Lucifer! I'll burn my books! _ Ah, Mephistopheles!" (p. 75). Rudasill (1992) believes "Here Marlowe gains sympathy for his protagonist and without this sympathy, the audience would be viewing no real tragedy" (p. 3). The ending scenes of it are "the most pathetic and most grandiose in Renaissance drama. They are unsurpassable even by Shakespeare" (Akhtar, p. 39).

Kinney (2022) beautifully states the responsible reasons behind the downfall of the protagonist. It is his intellectual heresy and the intellectual pride in his blackened soul (p. 196). His endless urge for knowledge and fantasy in the initial stage increase the intensity of his thirst which is unable to be satisfied (Orgel, 2005, p. 48). He is the perfect representation of the renaissance man whose extreme urge to excel beyond human limitations prompts him to present his life accompanied by reason and intellect to Lucifer in exchange for temporary power to pursue his goals which befallen outside the boundary of human limitations. It reveals Faustus' inner desire to become a demi-god which is the result of his god complex (Abrams et al., 1997, p. 745).

Judging by Aristotelian Standards

Dr. Faustus partially fulfills the criteria of a tragic hero by Aristotle in his famous work Poetics. Faustus is a learned scholar but does not have traits of eminently good character. On the other hand, he occupies a prominent place in society having great knowledge regarding various fields of life. Singh (2006) notes "Faustus is a highly distinguished person in his respective social groups" (p. 124). The plot of the play reveals his downfall from prosperity to adversity as it is presented by Aristotelian thoughts. It is quite evident that Faustus is an Aristotelian tragic hero.

Some scholars believe that Faustus cannot be justly termed as an Aristotelian tragic hero because he willingly and knowingly decides to go on the path which is replete with horrors of ultimate damnation. However, Baş (2014) shares the opinion that Faustus along with some other characters of Marlowe and Shakespeare fulfills the need for an ideal tragic hero although their tragic flaws are mingled with their tendencies of the Renaissance age (p. 16). The play reflects the spirit of the Renaissance as it stands for the thirst for power and beauty. Moreover, the supreme knowledge inevitably leads to pride which is Faustus' major flaw that leads him toward his damnation (Ragab, 2016, p. 37). Therefore, it is clear that Dr. Faustus cannot be cast out of the realm of Aristotelian tragic heroes because he shares some of the inclinations of his age

and time. These tendencies are woven into the literature produced at that time because it has been the prevalent taste of the time. Apart from that, the concept of discovery and recognition also seems to be pointing fingers at the authenticity of Faustus being an ideal Aristotelian tragic hero because the audience has been pre-informed about the expected outcome of his bargain that is his eternal damnation. Dr. Faustus may not be fulfilling all the subtle elements of the Aristotelian theory but the character arouses feelings of pity and fear. Mishra (2017) states in the favor of Faustus, “Dr. Faustus deserves our sympathy to some extent because of his innate human weakness” (p. 46). To conclude, Faustus may not be the ideal Aristotelian tragic hero but cannot be termed as a non-Aristotelian tragic hero.

Evaluating through Hegelian Theory

Dr. Faustus, after considering multiple fields, is justified in his consciousness that the study of necromancy will be the perfect fit to attain his desires. To justify his position against the opposite position is of religious restrictions which prohibit a man to enter into the realm of necromancy. He asserts “why, then, be like we must sin, and so consequently die: Ay, we must die an everlasting death” (p. 12). Moreover, he also affirms the inevitable nature of fate that what is supposed to happen, will happen and humans cannot change it “Che sera, sera,” (p. 12). Consequently, he decides to achieve his ideals regardless of all the religious restrictions and boundaries. This marks the start of his tragedy according to the theory of Hegel because he asserts a position in his consciousness while altogether ignoring the equally just opposite side that clearly says whosoever will try to transcend the boundaries laid down by the supreme might of God will have to face harsh consequences of unending punishment for the deeds. Although like Hegelian theory, Faustus upholds the principle and makes it clear for everyone that whosoever will try to cross the limits of this world will have to meet a drastic end.

The actions of Faustus may not be rightly justified for the audience, but they are justified in his conscience. Moreover, the character of Faustus has not been innocent up to the extent as it is stated by Hegel. It is because the two sides of Faustus’ consciousness are not equal enough. Thus, the tragic effect has not been achieved up to the possible extent. Viewers lack sympathy for Faustus and his punishment appears to be justified. In addition to it, the tragedy of Faustus is also driven not by the unjust turns of fate, but it is purely by the outcomes of his deeds as presented by Hegel. It conforms to the theory of Hegel in which fate remains outside the boundary of tragedy and the downfall of the hero is purely the result of his actions.

In the case of Faustus, in scene V, when he is making a pact with the devil, his blood congeals which is the first sign of warning for him and Mephistopheles also informs him about the dreadful condition of all the devil but he does not pay heed. As the plot of the tragedy progresses, he gradually realizes the outcomes of his pact with Lucifer. After certain appearances of the Angels and the Old Man, he tries to repent and undo whatever has been done so far. As a result, he makes up his mind to repent, but he is threatened by the Mephistopheles. It shows that Faustus is not consistent enough after the process of realization. Furthermore, the

tragic flaw in Faustus is completely rational and the downfall is completely the result of his actions.

Tragic Flaws of Tughlaq

The play Tughlaq revolves around the protagonist known as Sultan Muhammad Bin Tughlaq. Girish Karnad himself presents his views about the character that he is the most idealistic and the most intelligent king who has received the biggest failure as well "this seemed to be both due to his idealism as well as the shortcomings within him, such as his impatience, his cruelty, his feeling that he had the correct answer" (Karnad, Enact, 1971). This points towards his idealistic nature, pride, and ambition behind his great downfall. Moreover, Ghosh (1999) states that the tragedy of Tughlaq "lies in his failure to reconcile his idealism with the historical imperatives of the situation in which he finds himself" (p. 114).

In the initial phase of the play, the protagonist has been presented as a just king who openly accepts the ruling of the court and allows compensation along with "a post in the Civil Service to ensure him a regular and adequate income" to the Brahmin from the state treasury whose land has been confiscated by the state previously (Murthy, 1975, p. 3)². He has been doing all this to fulfill his ambition of having an idealistic kingdom. He also delivers the speech shedding light on the working of justice in his kingdom and then he shares the news of changing the capital from Delhi to Daultabad, but the crowd seems to be unwilling and unprepared. He also shares that the reason behind this change is also that Daulatabad is a city of Hindus, so it will strengthen the ties between Hindus and Muslims. The writer skillfully presents the lack of trust of the people in their king. Moreover, in the very first scene, it has been communicated by the people standing there that Sultan achieves this throne by murdering his father. The ambitious nature of Sultan is gradually revealed.

In scene two, the stepmother of Sultan inquires about his inability to sleep. His reply depicts his idealistic nature when he shares that he thinks of eradicating all the sufferings of his subjects and that he wants to call out to his people from a prominent place, "I am waiting for you. Confide in me your worries. Let me share your joys. Let's laugh and cry together and then, let's pray" (p. 10). As it is evident, initially he has been an idealist but over time his idealism has vanished and he becomes "a shrewd politician, a callous and heartless murderer and intriguer who employed religion for his political motives and even hurled the country into turmoil and troubles" (Agrawal, p. 3). Sarangi (2004) has been quite harsh in describing Tughlaq, but his statement does possess obvious factual touch that Tughlaq has been depicted by the writer as a "monomaniac, as a man dominated by his whims, as a cynical tyrant, as a feelingless, inhuman ruler" (p. 273).

¹All the subsequent references will be given from the mentioned source and only the page numbers will be given: Murthy, U.R. (1975). Tughlaq by Girish Karnad [Translated Version]. Retrieved from <http://arvindguptatoys.com...PDFtughlaq.pdf>-ArvindGuptaToys

Tughlaq considers himself all-aware. Shihab constantly tries to stop Sultan from changing the capital because he is aware of the dreadful condition of his kingdom, but he does not pay heed to his suggestions and decides on his own to change the capital. For him, people are unable to comprehend his farsightedness as it will change the destiny of his kingdom. For him, they are thoughtless subjects who know nothing regarding the world as it goes “how can I explain tomorrow to those who haven't even opened their eyes to the light of today? (p. 39). The actions of Sultan might be beneficial for his empire, but the question arises whether it is the right time to impose such changes.

Tughlaq refused to acknowledge the presence of others and his inclination toward what is different truly reflects his violence on his people (Panerselvam, 2010, p. 36). Moreover, Chelliah (2017) adds in this regard, “In the single-minded and ruthless aspiration for absolute power, Muhammed totally disregards others around him or just uses and exploits them as mere tools to further his purpose” (p. 52). Muhammad kills all these people to gain power and control over the rest of the subjects and to fulfill his ambitious needs. In the concluding scenes, during his conversation with his mother, he admits that all those people who are previously killed are unjust. Furthermore, her Stepmother pleads for mercy but he does not show any and confesses in front of his mother about the unjust murders of all those people that he has committed and regarded his mother as “worse than an adulteress” and announces “I want her stoned to death publicly tomorrow morning” (Pp. 66-67).

Krishna (2020) believes that the rule of Tughlaq goes against the saying that the philosopher king is the ideal king. There can be a debate as well whether Sultan can be counted in the lists of philosophers or not. Moreover, the pursuit of his ideals turns him blind to the means “this moral ineptitude, his tragic flaw, leads him to utter failure disintegrating his personality” (p. 2).

Downfall of Tughlaq

The downfall of his great idealistic state is reflected in the initial scenes in which the people are not having faith and trust in their king. The opening scenes show the distrust of the Hindus toward the Muslim ruler when a Hindu states that he is happy to be kicked by a Muslim ruler and it gives him a sense of security but gets afraid when a Muslim says, “I know you are a Hindu, but you are also a human being'---well, that makes me nervous” (p. 2). The lack of trust is further increased by his idealistic thoughts. The strict decision of changing the capital costs a great loss to the people of Delhi at that time and it also turns them against Sultan, but they remain silent before him because of his tyranny and their lack of power. The Amirs has planned to kill Sultan during the prayer but are failed and are caught. Therefore, the ban on the prayer shows Tughlaq's least concern with Islam. It clearly shows that he has used Islam just for some utilitarian aspects and has no strong emotional bond with it. This can also be a sign of Muslims' mistrust of Sultan.

The effects of the sudden shift from Delhi to Daultabad cause the death of people which is mentioned in scene VII when all the people are migrating according to the orders of Sultan. On the route, Aziz, who is a disguised Brahmin official, meets a man with his family who are quite late and he interrogates them about their late arrival. The man narrates an incident where a few miles back there, they have found two dead bodies and he has been busy burying them (p. 48). It shows the miserable condition of the people who are losing their lives fulfilling the orders of Sultan. When Aziz asks about his profession, the same person shares that he works in the palace and his job is to guard dozens of the dead bodies of the people killed by Sultan and then their relatives also have to pay some money to retrieve the dead bodies of their relatives but due to lack of financial means they mostly try to steal the dead bodies of their loved ones (p. 48). The speech of this man points at the tyrannical nature of Sultan that he uses to kill dozens of people in a single day and whosoever does not act according to his wish has to die, it has also pointed toward the disgusting and dreadful condition of the entire kingdom.

Furthermore, Sultan admits that his hands are stained with the blood of many people and now he is unable to face himself in the mirror because he sees their faces in it. Their faces are still haunting him, but he thinks that he has killed them for an ideal reason (p. 65). This points out the devastated condition of Sultan and his kingdom. Now, he is realizing the fact that he has ruined his entire kingdom with his own hands. The bursts of Sultan's inner guilt in the final speech and his unparalleled pain and regret are dashed in front of the audience. This final cry may not wash away all the filthy crimes that he has committed for his ambitious desires, but it arouses a sense of sympathy for the character. Although, the end of the protagonist is not as pathetic as the usual tragic characters undergo. In this speech from the concluding scenes, the writer has tried to evoke feelings of pity and fear. He pleads in front of God for help and compares himself with a pig rolling in mud and tries to evoke the mercy of God as it goes "I can only clutch at the hem of Your Cloak with my bloody fingers and plead. I can only beg—have pity on me. I have no one but you now. Only you. Only you ... you... you ... you" (p. 67). Agrawal (2013) calls this speech "a Faustian cry of anguish". This marks a sound similarity between the two protagonists both are driven by their extreme ambitions and pride but comparatively Faustus meets a terrible end as compared to Sultan. He falls into the ditch of guilty conscience, whereas, Faustus falls into the everlasting fire of Hell.

Application of Aristotelian Canons

Tughlaq is quite contradictory in terms of the concept of goodness. His attitude towards his mother and subjects is not pleasant. If Aristotle means moral uprightness by the concept of goodness, then the protagonist is devoid of it to a larger extent, but if it means a man of a prominent position or class, as mentioned by Nouri (2016), then Tughlaq fulfills it properly as he is the king of Delhi. Moreover, Tughlaq has been consistent in his actions. He continued to maintain his behavior which is quite evident in the final scenes when he is quite aware that the change of currency is leading his kingdom toward a catastrophic end, but still he refuses to go against his own words because he thinks that "the new copper coins would have the same value

as the silver dinars. Now I can't go against my own orders" (p. 63). The idea of tragic flaw is slightly ambiguous and requires vivid explanations regarding Tughlaq because his intentions are sometimes projected as noble. He states that whatever he has done, it is for the sake of the prosperity of his kingdom, but in the final scenes he also admits that the murders he has committed are unjust and the intention behind is to attain the power. It is quite clear in the text that Tughlaq's moral deficiencies, his treatment of religion, his tyrannical nature, his thirst for power, and his ambitious nature to attain his ideals contradict the entire concept because Aristotle gives special importance to the moral side of the protagonist. Owing to moral deficiencies, the tragic effect is not attained to the highest degree because the audience is convinced that this downfall is completely deserving. Initially, Tughlaq has also been unaware of the aftereffects of his actions, but in the course of the play gradually he realizes that all his acts to attain prosperity in his kingdom go in vain. In addition to it, the concept of discovery is also present in Tughlaq. Tughlaq also due to his tragic flaws of abrupt decision-making, tyrannical nature, and ambitious idealism comes to discover that his actions have turned against him and the downfall of his kingdom is inevitable.

Analyzing through Hegelian Perspective

Tughlaq also asserts a justified place. He decides to change his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad and change of currency from silver to copper. This decision has been quite against the mindset of the people at that time, but the decisions of Sultan are quite justified as his capital flourishes. On the other hand, the condition of his people is quite worse. There is a lack of trust and the people are skeptical regarding all the decisions of their king. Tughlaq conforms to the theory of Hegel, the character of Tughlaq, in the end, like Creon, is drowning in the ocean of guilt and the kingdom, like Antigone, has been burnt into ashes. In addition to it, Tughlaq is also a trend changer of his time. Through him, a new world dawns, and all his tyrannical actions, the strict orders, and the prohibitions have turned him into ashes but the principle that he has brought with all these actions remained.

Tughlaq also acts in favor of right and against the right. He tries to uplift his kingdom and wants the people of his kingdom to be prosperous and he also wants his kingdom to be safe from all sorts of attacks. Therefore, he decides to change the capital from Delhi to Daulatabad. On the other hand, his decisions have also caused havoc in his kingdom as the decisions are not according to the need of the time. Furthermore, the actions of Sultan are not only destructive to the opponents, but they are also destructive to himself as well. Following his mindset, he kills the dearest people to him, the stepmother, Najib, and Shahab Ud Din. Moreover, Tughlaq remains consistent in the course of the play. His ideas and dreams collapse in front of his eyes, but his actions remain consistent as has been quite evident after the change of currency. His decision goes completely against his favor, but he decides to be true to his words as well as the

downfall of Tughlaq is also the result of his actions and not the result of any external forces of fate working against him.

Conclusion

Dr. Faustus is replete with excessive pride, vaulting ambition, and a supreme thirst for power. These are the dominant inherent flaws present in his character from the start of the play and these flaws lead him toward eternal damnation. As far as, Tughlaq is concerned, he does possess the flaw of being over-ambitious and his thirst for power is also quite obvious at various stages of the play. Moreover, his character is mostly composed of idealistic and tyrannical tendencies. He also owns the flaw of impatience. Dr. Faustus conforms to the Aristotelian theory of the tragic hero mostly but it has some aspects which are not according to the theoretical perspective. For instance, his inconsistency, lack of discovery and recognition along with the reversal of fortune. On the other hand, the concept of goodness in the context of moral uprightness remains lacking in Tughlaq's personality. Both of these characters mostly conform to the theory of Aristotelian tragedy, but can never be termed as purely Aristotelian tragic heroes like Oedipus.

Faustus remains caught in a clash in the realm of consciousness where he is justified by both sides to some extent and both sides try to attract him. As a result of this clash, he meets his tragedy. The evil side of his personality makes him sell his soul to Lucifer to have the pleasures of life. He asserts a position and neglects the other equally justified position which marks the start of his downfall according to the views of Hegel. In Tughlaq, the two justified positions are external, on one hand, the character of Tughlaq stands with all his innovative ideas for the betterment of his people, and on the other hand, the people and their condition stand. Tughlaq has also been a trend changer of his time. Moreover, he also works for and against good, in his pursuit of ideals for the betterment of the state. To conclude, both the characters almost conform to the Hegelian views but Tughlaq remains closely related to the Hegelian theory of tragic character. Dr. Faustus also reflects striking features of Hegelian thoughts.

References

- Abrams, et al (1997). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*: R.S. Means Company.
- Agrawal, S. (2013). *The Portrait of a Visionary: Girish Karnad's Tughlaq*. *The Criterion*, (4).
- Akhtar, Md. Ejaz. (2020) "Tragedy and Spirit of Major Shakespearean Tragic Hero," *International Journal of Recent Research and Review*, vol. XIII, no. 3, pp. 36-40.
- Al-Moghales, M. A. (2014). *Girish Karnad's Tughlaq and Ali Ahmed Bakathir's Sir Al-Hakim bi-Amr Allah: A Study of the Inhuman Faces of Tyranny*. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(2), 30.
- Bas , H. (2014). *Self-Interest as a Reason Behind the Tragedy in Dr. Faustus and Macbeth*. *Karabuk University*, 39.
- Borchert, G. L. (1996). *John I-II (Vol. 1)*: B&H Publishing Group.
- Chelliah, S. (2017). *Indian English Drama and Girish Karnad's Portrayal of Muhammad and Padmini as Existential Figures Respectively in His Tughlaq and Hayavadana: A Brief Analysis*. *Language in India*, 17(1).

- Dasaradhi , K., & Nimsarkar, D. (2016). Symbolization of 'Chess' in Girish Karnad's 'Tughlaq'. IJELLAH International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities, II(IV), 54-66.
- Faheem, A. (2022). Critical Analysis of Marlowe's Women's Frailty under the Patron of a Queen. Zauq-e-Tahqeeq, 4(1), 1-14.
- Ghosh, N. (1999). Girish Karnad's Tughlaq: History in the. Writing in a Post-colonial Space, 107.
- Gowri, A., & Solayan, M. (2014). Portrayal of Violence in Girish Karnad's Tughlaq and Tagore's Natirpuja. Literary Endeavour, 0976-299X(V), 110-112.
- Habib, M. S. (2022). Damnation: The Downfall of Marlowe's Dr. Faustus and his Intellectualism. Journal of English Language, Literature and Education, 3(4), 1-10.
- Karim, S. M. S., Fathema, F., & Hakim, A. (2015). Dr. Faustus: Theist or Atheist? Journal of Education and Practice, 6(6), 144-149.
- Kaushal, U. (2013). Juxtaposed Paradoxes: Re-Interpreting Girish Karnad's Tughlaq. Taking Action: Contemporary Indian Drama. Sarup Book Publishers, New Delhi.
- Kinney, A. F., & Katz, D. A. (2022). Renaissance drama: An anthology of plays and entertainments: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kirschbaum, L. (1943). Marlowe's Faustus: A Reconsideration. The Review of English Studies, 19(75), 225-241.
- Krishna , D. N. A. (2020). Girish Karnad's Play Tughlaq: A Critical Note. Journal of Critical Reviews, ISSN-2394-5125(07), 2811-2814.
- López, M. M. (1994). Overreaching Flesh and Soul: The Theme of Damnation in Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Tirso de Molina's Don Juan. University De Granada, 107-116.
- Majeed, W. A. (2020). Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and the Islamic Moral Implications. PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17(7), 13297-13309.
- Marlowe, C. (2007). Doctor Faustus: Broadview Press.
- Matthews, M. M. (2006). Magician Or Witch?: Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus. Bowling Green State University,
- McAlindon, T. (1995) Doctor Faustus: The predestination theory, English Studies, 76:3, 215-220, DOI: [10.1080/00138389508598968](https://doi.org/10.1080/00138389508598968)
- Mili Rahman, M., & Rahman, M. (2019). Psychoanalytical Analysis of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus. Barrister Shameem Haider Patwary, 11(2), 47.
- Mishra, R. (2017). Pre Deterministic Catastrophes in the Life of Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: An Analytical Study in Indian Vedic Perspective. In: JSTOR.
- Muhammad, I. Y., Wahab, M. N. A., Aziz, N. A. B. A., & Iqbal , M. (2016). Existence of God: Antithetical Themes in "Dr. Faustus" and "Waiting for Godot". The National Conference for Postgraduate Research, University of Malaysia Pahang, 22-33.
- Murthy, U. R. (1975). Tughlaq by Girish Karnad [Translated Version]. Retrieved from <http://arvindguptatoys.com...PDFtughlaq.pdf>-ArvindGuptaToys
- Orgel, S. (2005). Magic and power in Doctor Faustus. Marlowe, Christopher, Doctor Faustus, ed. David Scott Kastan, WW Norton & Company, New York, 390-396.
- Pandey, K. (2018). Theory of Corporeal Dominance in Karnad's Dramatic World With Special Reference to Yayati, Tughlaq, Hayavadana, Nagamandala and The Fire and the Rain. The Criterion: An International Journal in English, 0976-8165(9), 9-19.

- Panneerselvam, N. (2010). *Karnad's Violence: Writing in the Aftermath of Colonialism*. National University of Singapore, 80.
- Ragab, N. H. K. (2016). The Linguistic Features of Pride In Marlow's Dr. Faustus. *مجلة بحوث الشرق الأوسط*, 1(36), 31-64.
- Riggs, W. G. (1970). The Poet and Satan in "Paradise Lost". *Milton Studies*, 2(1), 59-82.
- Rudasill, M. C. (1992). *A study of the significance of Marlowe's use of the unforgivable sin as a plot device in " Dr. Faustus": Florida Atlantic University*.
- Saini, D. A. (2013). *Historico-Mythical Analysis of Girish Karnad's Tughlaq and Swarajbir's Krishna*. Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, 80.
- Sarang, J. (2004). *A Study of Tughlaq*. *Indian Writing in English: Past and Present*, 270.
- Sel, A., & Latre, G. (2017). *Reading the Afterlife in the Renaissance: A Theological Reading of Christopher Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and William Shakespeare's Hamlet*.
- Singh, B. (2006). The Primeval Dilemma: Ethical Conflict in Portnoy's Complaint and Doctor Faustus. *Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 121-134.
- Snyder, S. (1966). Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus" as an Inverted Saint's Life. *Studies in Philology*, 63(4), 565-577. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4173538>