العراقية
المجلات الاكاديمية العلمية
IRAQI Academic Scientific Journals
Al-Itqan Journal of Humanities
available online at
https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/575
ISSN: 3105-1073 (OnLine)
المجلة معتمدة بالترقيات العلمية حسب كتاب وزارة التعليم العراقية (46404-1410) في 2026/4/27

A Critical Study of Emotion and Belief in John Osborne's *Luther*

Hana Hussein Mohammad
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research,
Baghdad / Iraq
hhanaa911@gmail.com
المدرس الدكتور هناء حسين محمد
وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي

Abstract

This study is an attempt to understand John Osborn's *Luther* and to show how the dramatist has successfully created a new portrait of MartinLuther. Osborne, in this regard, tried to pepper his characters, especially the main ones, with a cultivated sense of maturity. However, his anticipating outlook has waned away throughout time even before his characters manage to attain the point of maturity and become able to disclose their anger, frustration and despair. Still, their motivating insistence to change the state in which they have no say to live apparently justifies the mask of anger that disguises the angry face of these characters. Therefore, the lack of ability which hypothetically made a character like Luther is quite unable to grasp the sense of revolt .Needless to say that most if not all of his characters are rather ironically un heroic since they are unable to maintain any footing of poetic justice that is needed for changing the course of events in his dramas. John Osborne's Luther (1961) is unique due to its historical setting at the beginning of the Reformation, its focus upon an historical personage, and it's in creased concern for questions of a spiritual nature. Thus, the dramatist has stressed that his intention was to create a dramatically effective work rather than reproduce an historical text on stage, and it is the effectiveness of Osborne1s *Luther* that makes this a valuable play.

الملخص:

هذه الدراسة هي محاولة لفهم مسرحية (لوثر) لجون أوزبورن ، ولعرض كيف ان الكاتب المسرحي قد استطاع وبنجاح ان يخلق تصويرا جديدا لمارتن لوثر. وفي هذا الصدد ، حاول أوزبورن أن يتفوق على شخصياته ، وخاصة الشخصيات الرئيسية ، مع شعور النضج المزروع. ومع ذلك ، فقد تضاءلت نظرته المتوقعة على مدار الوقت حتى قبل أن تتمكن شخصياته من بلوغ نقطة النضج وتمكن من الكشف عن غضبهم وإحباطهم ويأسهم. ولكن إصرارهم الدافع لتغيير الحالة التي ليس لديهم فيها رأي في العيش يبرر على ما يبدو قناع الغضب الذي يخفي الوجه الغاضب لهذه الشخصيات. لذلك ، فإن عدم القدرة قد جعلت من الناحية النظرية شخصية مثل لوثر غير قادر تماما على فهم الشعور بالثورة . وغني عن القول إن معظم شخصياته إن لم يكن كلها ، لا علاقة لها بطبيعتها ، لأنها غير قادرة على الحفاظ على أي أساس من العدالة الإلهية اللازمة لتغيير مسار الأحداث في أعماله الدرامية.ان مسرحية لوثر هي مسرحية فريدة وذلك بسبب احداثها التاريخية في بداية حركة الاصلاح وتركيزها على شخصية تاريخية وكذلك بسبب اهتمامها المتزايد للطبيعة الروحية. ولذلك فقد كان تركيزوقصدالكاتب المسرحي هو ان يخلق عمل درامي مؤثر اكثر من ان ينتج نصا تاريخيا على المسرح، مما جعل هذه المسرحية ذات قيمة عالية.

Introduction

Osborne once noted that the purpose of his writing is "'to make people feel, to give them lessons in feeling. They can think after wards. Like Osborne's other plays, "is intended to be a lesson in feeling," and the emotions that we "feel" the most are Luther's frustrations and anger. It is essential to briefly point out the importance of anger in Osborne's plays. He and many other writers of the fifties have been collectively called "angry young men"because an angry tone was evident in their works. It can be found in the novels of Kingsley Amis, John Wain, and John Braine, and in the poetry of such writers as Philip Larkin and Ted Hughes. Osborne's choice of Martin

Luther was logical and consistent with his other protagonists in that Luther was "perhaps the first Angry Young Man in modem time." The dramatist shows Martin as a man isolated from society and God, one who angrily rebelled against his alienation, and the play concerns "the growth of Martin as a man." Perhaps the conceptual perception of the revolt core in John Osborne's *Luther* does not easily conform to the assessment criteria of the criticism corpus written about it. Apparently, this is attributed to a variety of opinions related to the virtual reasons behind writing his plays themselves. In no other play this is more conspicuous than in *Luther*. Osborne, in this regard, attempted to generate conformity between the religious interpretation and the historical framework. He is once quoted to say that it is rather "difficult to pinpoint just how (it) started…It's brewing a long period. I wanted to write a play about religious experience…and this happened to be the vehicle for it in fact the historical character is almost identical."[1]

Since his well reputed *Look Back in Anger,* Osborne has tried to pepper his characters, especially the main ones, with a cultivated sense of maturity. Patricia D. Denison, in this respect, believes that:

Osborne's characters occupy the Beckett territory postmodern protest against a self limited by language, voice that ironically affirms what it speaks against. Again, it is the divided voice that demands attention, but the divisions are now situated epistemological and not just social space. As a consequence, issues of innovation and tradition acquire, in this different context, a different relationship and the divisions of the present recapitulate those of the past and foreshadow those of the future.[2]

This for him is appropriately necessary to cope with the driving impetus of revolt he has chosen as a communicative way to transfer his message. However, his anticipating outlook has waned away throughout time even before his characters manage to attain the point of maturity and accordingly become able to disclose their anger, frustration or revolt. Osborne's characters, especially Luther, are rather cognizant of the bluffing situation which they got entangled with and which accordingly was conducive to a fatal questioning of the reason why they revolt and whether it is better to abandon this revolt. However, their motivating insistence to change the state in which they have no say to live apparently justifies the mask of anger that disguises the angry face of these characters. It is therefore the lack of ability among other individual reasons which hypothetically made a character like Luther quite unable to grasp the sense of revolt and accordingly assumed a bulk of justifications. However, these justifications are hardly disclosed by Osborne who means to make everything else diminish before the charismatic personality of his major characters. Needless to say that most if not all of his characters are rather ironically un heroic since they are unable to maintain any footing of poetic justice that is needed for changing the course of events in his dramas. Perhaps, the tactical drop in fulfilling events is not apparently considered defective; rather it adds a new perspective or image to express the inner feelings of characters. In other words, these characters do not succeed well; instead, they fail well. Therefore, the playwright has managed to freeze the moment of revolt, after attaining an unclear climactic degree, in order to work out various perceptions that help audience to anatomize the multi-dimensional revolt. Contrary to that, this audience may miss to recognize this revolt if they only consider a usual linear evolution. Osborne, on the other hand, and due to his attempt to break down the monotonous dramatic and theatrical conventions, seems to leave an accessible space for such audience to meditate over interpretation of the revolt which has moved in his various dramas from the strategic phase into the tactical one. He, therefore, does not want to attain the climactic moment of revolt "explosion" in his plays as much as he wants to resort to undermine it; rather it is not a positive revolt, it is passive but still it is revolt ad hoc. In this regard, *Luther*, like his masterpiece *Look Back in Anger*, stipulates a reality or a facet of revolt and not a revolt by itself. His tools to uncover these tactics are his focus on a single frustrated character that seems to have lost the compass of his revolt-ship. Ronald Hayman believes that "*Luther* is just as much as one - man play as *Look Back in Anger*, with the difference that the one man does not emerge anything like so clearly".[3]At the outset of the play, the sense of anger is presented with lukewarm touch because it is rather contained within the main dramatis personae and their physical chronic defects and ailments. Critics implicitly agree that Osborne's revolting characters like Jimmy Porter or Martin Luther adhere to reveal a manner of immediacy in handling their uprising mood which clearly rejects the surrounding environment. They are depicted as different or alienated persons who are in search of identity. And this immediacy is, however, attired with an abundant sense of realism which is considered " a new germinal impulse" that has promoted the evolution of this different kind of plays.[4]Throughout the proceeding of *Luther*, spectators, on their part, abandon their indifference to the behavioral patterns of the main angry character. They become more realistically involved in finding out a sense of empathy with the main character. In the case of Luther, needless to say that it is not only Luther, the clerical-secular priest,

who wages a relentless and sometimes vindictive attack and criticism against the corrupt community around him; but almost all Osborne's anti-heroes are doing the same. And this hypersensitive indisposition towards the social justice which overwhelms all Osborne's plays is accountable for two facts : first, the over-rule of realism and second, the tendency of the unfulfilled act of reform though this is not meant to be a subject matter.[5] As for realism, Osborne was thought to be in continual search of ready-made molds to structure his dramas so he, in the case of Luther resorts to history. But the second fact leaves little doubt that Osborne apparently pushes his characters, after a short while of their existence on stage, towards a wider sense of bewilderment: they therefore exactly know why they revolt but they lose the sense of revolt direction in the middle of their struggle march. His characters, it is worth noting, sometimes miss the purpose of the revolt. John Russell Taylor, a drama critic, attributes this loss of direction to the playwright's reliance on the experimental tools. It is due to the "drying up…. of Osborne's inventive faculties, at least in so far as they concern the creation of new characters and plot-situation"[6] In like manner, Ronald Hayman feels that Osborne has managed to motivate his characters to revolt yet he did not furnish them with the right tools to take their revolt to the next level. He substantiates that Osborne's *Luther*, for instance, "has not established himself as a personality capable of doing what the historical Luther did."[7] This feeling of lack of achievement is conspicuously expressed by Luther himself when he said: "And you tell me this! What have I gained from coming into this sacred order? Aren't you still the same? I am still envious, I am still impatient, and I'm still passionate?" (Act I, Sc. 2, p. 27) Of course, this crippled situation and the prediction that he is incapable of implementing his mission as a rebel is justified by Katherine Worth when she said that "dramatic emphasis is strongly laid on those aspects of his life that point to a state of neurotic anxiety."[8] This is clearly shown not only in the frequent bouts of epilepsy Luther suffers from but through the tense relation he has with his father and even the indifference to his mother or his wife. So his continual tension or anxiety may be "an outlet for deep-rooted anal preoccupations"[9] Perhaps, Hans, Martin's father, is the first one who realizes the purposelessness of his involvement into the ecclesiastical activities of the Cloister Chapel of the Eremites of Saint Augustine. Indeed, it is a personal loss he feels now. He boisterously tells Lucas, his bosom-friend and Martin's father-in-law, that his loss is both unjustifiable and uncompensated:Lucas: It's surely too late for any regrets or bitterness, Hans. It obviously must be God's will, and there's an end of it.

Hans: That's exactly what it is – an end of it! Very fine for you, my old friend, very fine indeed. You're just losing a son-in-law, and you can take your pick of plenty more of those where he comes from.

(Act I, Sc. 1, P. 15)Of course, this pertinent veto persists as long as there is an occasion to express it. Perhaps, Hans is not a God-fearing character; therefore, he does not abide by the spiritual maxims of Christianity. His way of thinking is rather secular:

Lucas: Well, there it is. God's gain is your loss

Hans: Half these monks do nothing but wash dishes and beg in the streets. (Act I, Sc. 1, p. 16)This indeed has passively impacted the categorical value of the revolt that he plans to wage against the corrupted religious institution. In other words, this has made his revolt shrink even before it is born. Of course, he has felt that every texture of the Church was subject to collapse as everything at the hands of monks or spiritual agents such as Cajetan or Tetzel is merchandised:

Tetzel: ….for remember, as soon as your money rattles in the box and cash bell rings, the soul flies out of purgatory and sings. (Act II, Sc. 1, p.50) However, justifications of Luther's revolt do not necessarily wane, rather they yield to drastic transformations which expose a huge power of challenge. So early at his attempt to change the religious status quo, Martin Luther perceives that he is fighting a losing battle against the spiritual entity of the Church. But the density of his moral maxims becomes more concentrated with the passage of time. In other words, his opposition to the corruption of the German Church is no longer institutional; it gradually turns to be gradually individual. Charles Markowitz attributes this to some "commercial" reason the Catholic Church undertakes. He strictly points out that: The Church-sale of indulgences is put forward as it were a commercial advertisement, and the suggestion here is that the Catholic Church as its lowest moral ebb is an appropriate symbol for modern ad-mass culture. And who is the cleric Tetzel but a kind of bloated Arthur God fry pushing piety with the same unctuousness used to boast Lipton's tea?[10] This commercialism, on the other hand, is rather frame-worked by a deeply rooted skepticism which Osborne generally discloses in his various dramatic works. Yet, this skepticism is only partially peppered with a revolutionary taint ; and accordingly the revolt does not complete and remains lacking one more strategic step for fulfillment. This revolt is rather surrounded and becomes subject to

attrition by the institutional spiritual authority. It is apparently faced by the slowly brewed rage of the top ecclesiastical power, Pope Leo X Leo: ….but, should he persists in his obstinacy and you cannot secure him, we authorize you to outlaw him in every part of Germany; to banish and excommunicate him. As well as all prelates, religious orders, universities, counts and dukes who do not assist in apprehending him. As for the laymen, if they do not immediately obey your orders, declare them infamous, deprived of the Christian burial and stripped of anything they may hold either from the apostolic see or from any lord whatsoever. There's a wild pig in our vineyard, and it must be hunted down and shot. Given under the seal of the Fisherman's Ring, etcetera. That's all. (Act II, Sc. 5, P.77-78) Justified or unjustified, this cool rage is easily tracked in the ecclesiastical ladder and it is deeply rooted in many passive stances the Church figures have gathered against Luther. They all, including Pope Leo, think that Martin Luther is steadily developing a challenge to the ecclesiastical authority. In this regard, Ronald Hayman points out that "Luther was in love, as always, with the idea of defiance of authority, and the main attraction of Luther as a subject must have been his success in flouting that authority of the Establishment – one man who divided the world into two camps."[11] This naturally is conducive to unusual gathering or camping of the ecclesiastical power against Luther, which evidently led to guise - stripping off of Luther's revolt. And this particularly reveals the early seed of his passive anger against the religious order no matter how much sympathy Brother Weinand or Staupitz may show to his cause because these brothers are after all "mere papier-mâché figures".[12] Ronald Hayman, in this respect looks at them as "good television interviewers…who ask the right questions to cue in the best possible display of personality and they show the right sympathy".[13] This sympathy, furthermore, is ironically considered an auxiliary factor that deepens the alienated feeling of estrangement gap ever left to Luther. It accelerates his log-time brewed frustration, typical of all Osborne's main angry young characters. It even has left very little doubt that Luther's rebellion was born dead. Older characters with more veteran experience in life can easily realize this: Hans: But what am I losing? I'm losing a son; Mark a son

Lucas: How can you say that? Hans: How can I say it? That's how. Two sons to the Plague, and now another. God's eyes! Did you see that haircut? Brother Martin! (Act I, Sc.1 P. 15)Even Martin himself knows this fact. His early feeling involves greater sense of dissatisfaction that it is not the world that is corrupt only but also his soul as well:Martin: I confess that I have offended grievously against humility, being sometimes discontented with the meanest and worst of everything, I have not failed to declare myself to myself lower and lower and of less account than all other men, but I have failed in my most inmost heart to believe it. (Act I, Sc.1, P.22)Repercussions of such frustration seem to trigger an increasing sense of anger in him more than the sense of revolt. He, therefore, feels self-humiliated: " I am a worm and no man, a byword and laughing stock. Crush out the worminess in me, stamp on me." (Act I, Sc.1, P. 19) This propensity does not adhere to religious God-fearing character only but it discloses a feeling of ever increasing anxiety that is proportionate to the un clear issue he vaguely defends. Perhaps, his father is the only one who conceives this in him. And probably Martin understands then the reason why his father is outrageous to see his son enlisted in monkery. Martin, however, does not show any opposite impression: Martin: You are not understanding me, because you don't want to.

Hans: That's fine talk, oh yes, fine, holy talk, but it won't wash, Martin. It won't wash, because you can't ever get away from your body because that's what you live in, and it's all you've got to die in, and you can't get away from the body of your father and your mother. (Act I, Sc.3, P. 41) Falling in the same category, Jimmy Porter of *Look Back in Anger* is not a coherent individual, nor a consistent one, but he does at least have the virtue of standing up and shouting, and it is the gesture of defiance, coupled with essential decency that Cliff and so Martin like Porter, stands up and shouts as a gesture of defiance to the parental as well as the ecclesiastical authorities. However, such defiance stems from personal rather than religious roots. Luther is basically born a man of action. Unfortunately to him this dynamism is not easily grasped or conceived, not even by the closer people to Martin like his father. It is his personal decision to hold the responsibility to rehab the church and all its affiliate holy circles. But close people like Hans know beforehand that Martin is rather over-exhausted which resulted in physical ailments such as epilepsy, constipation, fever and bowels disorder. Apparently, these ailments have intensified his sense of frustration though they heightened the polished image of Luther in the eyes of others:" Bro. Weinand: Martin is a brilliant man. We are not as gifted as he is." (Act I, Sc. 3, P. 32)

Throughout the play, Osborne was keen enough to transfer the individual impetus or dynamic drive of Luther into a ruthless sense of frustration and cold dissatisfaction. Therefore, this desperate state has impacted Luther's clerical mission which come to an end and also left unforgivable imprints of his individual behavior. At the end of the play, he seems to regret everything he has done and anything he will do. Self-satisfaction is rather obliterated and it led Luther to change from a holy figure of reformation into a secular individual or rejection. This is because his revolt is lost in the middle way through, while he was trimming his self-image of piety that is made of "torment of…mind and conscience". Martin Banham says: The visual impact and blatantly symbolic nature of such a setting emphasizes the torment of Luther's mind and conscience, and contrasts with the unembellished naturalism of the flowering scene where Luther, having emerged from his baptism of fire, meets his father in the simple setting of the Convent refactory.[14]Perhaps, his physical agonies and aches ardently reflect the self-distracted image of a pathetic martyr who seeks self-realization through some early awareness of his sinful soul and his recurrent attempts to amend his acts. Martin: The birds always seem to fly away the moment I come out Staupitz: Birds, unfortunately, have no faith. Martin: Perhaps it's simply that they don't like me (Act II, Sc.2, P.52)

Or

Martin: Oh, Mary, Dear Mary, all I see of Christ is a flame and ranging on a rainbow. Pray to your son and ask Him to still His anger, for I can't raise my eyes to look at Him. Am I the only one to see all this and suffer ? (Act I, Sc. 2, P. 30)

Apparently, this concentration on self-agonized image emerges from the original Osbornian method of creating an "exercise in the dialectics and philosophy of reformation theology".[15] However, this exercise is effectively meshed with Luther's " acute sense of loneliness (and) his feeling of isolation as well as the inner struggle against the physical demands of the flesh."[16] Martin: I am a worm and no man, a byword and a laughing stock. Crush out the worminess in me, stamp on me. (Act I, Sc. 1, P. 19)

Resultantly, the anticipated sense of reformation adopted by Luther since the beginning is always coupled with a humiliation of the "self" that is diminished into a wormy speck. It accordingly generated too much idealism that colored Luther's deeds which are exposed to clerical criticism. Luther, indeed, who reveals a stubborn detestation of the flesh desires continuously attempts to have control over his conscious and unconscious worlds. This is part of his attempt to distinguish himself from the clerical circle of priests around him who are either corrupt or rather indifferent to the ecclesiastical requirements. Yet, some critics do not attribute his difference to any "superior intelligence", rather it is a group of individual traits such as his in-born stubbornness, keenness ad studious idealism which are all at some time acknowledged by the close people around him.

Hans: …..I see a young man, learned and full of life, my son, abusing his youth with fear and humiliation. You think you're facing up to it in here, but you're not: you're running away, you're running away and you can't help it. (Act I, Sc. 3. P. 43)

However, the trait of stubbornness which can be handled better to be a tool in the hands of a leader has been twisted, voluntarily or involuntarily, to impact his "physical obsession and consistent self-condemnation of what he regards as his own sinfulness". This thoroughly undermines attention required to be paid to the "social, political and historical contexts of the play which are reduced to mere incidents".[17] Part of the general perspectives of Luther's consciousness lies in his early understanding that the power of the Church accompanied by the naïve and brain-washed conviction of its validity by its followers has given Luther and early indication that his mission is not manageable nor is it accessible. This is clearly seen through the unavoidable psychological influence John Titzel on the Church followers who rash to purchase the Letters of Indulgences despite their poverty and daily hardships. Titzel, one can realize, is a professional auctioneer who largely depends in his mission success on the collective approval of the followers. This justifies why money rattles like rain in the coffer when he has finished his bombastic rebuking oration which carefully relies on four steps: repetition, exaggeration, justification and dramatic acting.

Luther, in fact, has gradually conceived that his revolt is not only against the corruption of the clerics who grouped against his calls but also against the simple conscience of illiterate people whose staunch loyalty to the Church is unshakable. These are even more difficult to change towards the pious path of Christianity. Osborne expressed this clearly when he depicted him in the Refectory where only

Johann Staupitz has supported him; others are rather indifferent. This is reflected in the many attempts of Staupitz to help him get more mature though maturity means undermining childhood innocence :

Staupitz:.My dear son, I' m not anyone or anything to be pleased with you anymore. When we used to talk together underneath that tree you were like a child. Martin: A child? Staupitz: Manhood was something you had to be flung into, my son. You dangled your toe in it longer than most of us could ever bear. But you're not a frightened little monk anymore who's come to his prior for praise or blame. Every time you belch now, the world stops what's doing and listens. Do you know, when I first came to take over this convent,

there weren't thirty books published every year. And now, last year it was more like six or seven hundred and most of those published in Wittenberg too. (Act III, Sc. 3, P. 97)

Frustration is lately comprehended to lead to apprehensive conviction which leaves Luther free to decide either to rid his obstinacy or abide by the law of leniency. He, nonetheless, feels rather reluctant to expose to anyone, not even in front of Staupitz who is always ready to understand him. He recalls :

Staupitz: Well, it's a house you have been able to unlock for a great many of us. I never dreamed when I first came here that the University reputation would ever become what it has, and in such a short time, and it's mostly due to you. (Act II, Sc. 2, P. 53) Staupitz's talk with Luther was not so far to disclose the latter's defects, hastiness, or lack of leniency as much as to shed light on the status quo without too much effort to change it. Rather, it ended ruthlessly in an eruption of civil strife; a rebellion of the peasants against the feudal system, which is tragically crushed harshly. Luther has virtually considered this rebellion and thought that its failure is due to its lack to leadership. So when he offers to lead them, they amazingly do not support him. He becomes rather despaired. Stage directions of Act III tell us:

Wiitenberg. 1525. A Marching hymn, the sound of cannon and shouts of mutilated men. Smoke of shattered banner bearing the cross and wooden shoe of the Bundschuhu, emblem of the peasants' Movement. A small chapel alter at one side of the stage opposite the pulpit . Center is a small handcart, and beside it lies the bloody bulk of a peasants' corpse. Downstage stands the knight, fatigued, despondent, stained and dirty. (Act III, Sc.2, P. 86)

Luther's despair at the end of the play is not based on what he has done to the Church but on what he has anticipated to be done. This is because of the nature of the Osborne's anger which, according to Luc Gilleman, "follows a similar phallic pattern, throbbing with excited conviction of its own sovereignty and invincibility only to suddenly tumble back into impotent despair. To distinguish itself from sterile literary devices and to qualify as the animating presence of life in art, anger had to sprout from reality."[18] Accordingly change does not occur and he has diagnosed the viral defect which lies in the followers of the Church more than in the Church ad hoc. He , therefore, resorts to his sole solace: God. Martin: In the teeth of life we seem to die. But God says no – in the teeth of death we live. If he butchers us, he makes us live. (Act III, Sc.2, p. 92) Perhaps, this is the final pretext he invokes for himself to intimidate the pain of loss and frustration that is conducive to his aimless revolt. He, nevertheless, attempts to assume the Phoenix-like character to sugar-coat his failure in converting people into the true path of virtue and Christianity. The world was conquered by the word, the Church is maintained by the word". (Act III, Sc. 2, p.90*)* So it is the word that can generate the collateral change of the nation as it is the reason for his abandonment of the clerical life.

Conclusion

As a playwright, Osborne's choice of Luther as the play's the subject matter for his play was proper in that he found a ready-made protagonist who possessed the same sort of personality found in his other major characters such as Jimmy, Archie, George, and Bill. Like the others, Martin longs for a past that is much simpler, and he wants to be able to communicate with those around him. Most importantly, he is angry about his situation in life, and he reacts angrily in both his writings and his verbal expression. He desires a response not only from other people, but from God as well. He sees what he believes to be wrong in the world, and he wants to change it. Osborne is also indebted to the psychologist for some of the language that is used in Luther, but

the dramatist has added his own unique means of expression throughout the play. At times he writes in twentieth-century to establish his point clearer.

In returning to the purpose Osborne maintains is at the heart of his plays, one must finally question what it is we are to "feel" as a result of becoming familiar with Luther, that is thefocal point of the play is Luther himself, who, like Jimmy Porter and Osborne's other protagonists, has the ability to move an audience in a number of ways. The readers sympathize with the young monk as he struggles physically and mentally to live with a decision, he has made in fear and doubt. It is the ambivalence which Osborne is capable of establishing in an audience through the language and actions of his central character that makes this play a success. Unlike the dramatist's other works, Luther is concerned with an actual figure whose achievements in religious history are well-known.

Osborne has consistently chosen a character who truly embodied the spirit of his other protagonists, and he has demonstrated a great degree of expertise in incorporating the information from the source material into his play. By creating vivid characters and carefully arranging the biographical information in order according to acts and scenes, Osborne has successfully portrayed Luther as a man who is quitedifferent and much more humanthan the Luther who ispresented in historical text. It is Osborne's ability to make Luther come alive that makes this play a worthy contribution to modern British drama.

Notes

1. Quoted in Maysoon Abdul Latif, The Concept of the Rebel in Selected Works by John Osborne and Ghassan Kanafani, (unpublished Thesis), College of Arts, 1978, p. 97
2. Patricia D. Denison, John Osborne: A Casebook. New York, London, 1997, p.12
3. Ronald Hayman, John Osborne. London: Heinemann, 1976, p. 42
4. John Russell Taylor (ed.) John Osborne: Look Back in Anger. London: The Macmillan Press, 1978, p. 101
5. Katherine Worth. "The Angry Young Man" in J.R. Taylor (ed.) John Osborne: Look Back in Anger. London, The Macmillan Press, 1978, p. 101
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid. p. 93
8. Ronald Hayman, John Osborne, p. 43
9. Katherine Worth, "The Angry Young Man", p. 113
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., p. 113
12. Charles Marowitz, "The Ascension of John Osborne" in John R. Taylor (ed.), Modern British Dramatists. New Jersey: Printice Hall Inc., 1988, p. 117
13. Ronald Hayman, p. 51, Ibid., p. 52
14. Ibid.
15. Martin Banham. Osborne. Edinburugh : Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1969, p. 22, Ibid., p. 96
16. Simon Trussler, John Osborne. Harlow: Longmans, 1969, p. 96
17. Maysoon Abdul Latif, The Concept, p. 99

18. Luc Gilleman, John Osborne: Vituperative Artist, A reading of his life and work. New York and London,

Bibliography

- Abdul Latif, Maysoon. The Concept of the Rebel in Selected Works by John Osborne and Gasssan Kanafani. Baghdad: M.A. Thesis (Unpublished), 1978
- Banham, Martin. Osborne. Edinburugh : Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1969
- D. Denison, Patricia, John Osborne: A Casebook. New York, London, 1997.
- Gilleman, Luc. John Osborne: Vituperative Artist, A reading of his life and work. New York and London, 2002.
- Hayman, Ronald. John Osborne. London : Heinemann, 1976
- Marowitz, Charles. "The Ascension of John Osborne" in John Russell Brown (ed.) Modern British Dramatists. New Jersey: Printice Hall Inc., 1988
- Trusseler, Simon. John Osborne. Harlow: Longmans, 1969
- Worth, J. Katherine. "The Angry Young Man" in J.R. Taylor (ed.) John Osborne: Look Back in Anger. London: the Macmillan Press, 1978.

□