

A Glimpse at the Life and Works of Sadeq Chubak

Hussain Abdulhay

Payam-e-Noor University of Qom, Iran

husainabdolhay@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study sets out to zero in on the works of Sadeq Chuback, Iranian naturalist writer, the late past master in the field of literature and translation studies. Chuback's works from rise to his demise is introduced and the aesthetic and stylistic nature of his writing is scoured in detail. Literarily, discursive practices in his writing will be especially dealt with and ideological and kaleidoscopic panoramas of his writing brought into focus.

Keywords: Discursive practices, language, content and style, naturalism, aestheticism

Introduction

Sadeq Chubak (August 5, 1916- July 3, 1998) is the author of short fiction, drama, novels and one of the leading 20th-century writers of Iran born in Busher where he first studied before moving to Shiraz and then to Tehran. Widely considered as the greatest naturalist writer in the Persian language, he wrote a large number of works including novels, short stories and plays. Chubak's first collection of his short stories is called *Kheymeh Shab Bazi* (The Puppet Show). Unlike Jamalzade's first work of fiction when the collection appeared in 1945, it was received quite favorably by critics (Farzane. M. F., 1997). *Kheymeh Shab Bazi* is indicative of Chubak's keen insight into the inner motives of human behavior. In 1949, Chubak published his second collection called *Antari Ke Lutiash Murdeh Bod* (The baboon whose buffoon was dead). The collected stories, *Puppet Show* and *The baboon whose buffoon was dead*, exerted profound

influence on modern Persian literature. Then there was a gap of fifteen years before Ruze Avvale Qabr (*The First Night in the Grave*) and (*The Last Alms*) were published in 1965 and 1966, respectively. After the publication of *The Last Alms* and *The First Night of the Grave*, Chubak wrote his novel *The Patient Stone*, which is a great modern novel in the Persian literature. Chubak also translated Shakespear's Othello, Roland's La Fin du Voyage, and Balzac's Le P Gorio Goriot, Pinokio (the wooden dummy), the work of Carlo Kuludy's, Lewis Carroll's book "Alice in Wonderland", the poetry of raven and (work of Edgar Allen poet), and Maahpareh; a Hindi love story into Persian. In his works, Chubak studies the lives of downtrodden people of the society who were victimized by iniquities and natural deterministic forces. Sympathetic to the sorrows and miseries of such people, he dispenses one single solution, combating corruption and injustice. Chubak's retirement coincided with the onset of the Islamic Revolution in Iran. An atheist since his early childhood, he found living in the Islamic Republic difficult. In 1974, ergo, he moved to London and then to the United States, where he picked up residency in California to write his memoirs. Chubak passed away on July 12, 1988 at the age of 82 in Berkeley, California. The novel "Shokontella" was the work which Chuback's death spared him from translation.

Review of the related literature

In 1316, Chubak succeeded to obtain his college diplomas from American college. As the American advisors were deployed in Iran, he got called up to that board and started to work as a translator. In 1324, his first book called "puppet" incorporating 11 short stories was released: "After reading my stories the great Allavi encouraged me to publish them and said to show them either to Iraj Eskandari or Khameie (Dorri, J., 2001). Chubak in this collection honored the story of "dis-respectfulness" to Sadegh Hedayat and the story of "autumn afternoon" to Masoud

Farzad, likewise. Despite the very popularity, this book was not permitted to be reprinted up to 10 years due to the story of “disrespectfulness”. It should be mentioned that Chubak published the first set of his collections at his own expenses in a circulation of 1000 version. In 1328, his second collection of stories called “The baboon whose buffoon was dead’ comprising three stories and a play was published. The same year, Chubak was employed at Iranian and British Oil Company as a translator. In 1329, the puppet was published for the second time. In this publication, disrespectfulness was removed and instead the story of “Oh man” was incorporated in the collection. One of his stories was translated into English. During these years, Chubak commenced his cooperation with literature magazines. He traveled to America to attend a seminar at Harvard University. In response to the invitation from the Soviet Writers Union, he also traveled to Moscow, Samarqand, Burkharat and Tajikistan. He translated the book “Pinocchio”, the work of Carlo Collodi’s (1991), entitled as, “wooden dummy”, into Persian. A few years later he translated the Lewis Carroll’s book “Alice in Wonderland” at the department of children literature. In 1336, the story of *baboon whose buffoon was dead* was translated by Peter Avery (1957) into English and published in the magazine of “New World Writing”. In 1338, he translated the Edgar Allan Poe’s poetry “raven” and got it printed at the leaflet of “exploring”. In 1341, Ebrahim Golestan began preparing the movie of “sea” based on the story of “Why the sea was stormy” from *The baboon whose buffoon was dead*’s collection ...by the casting of Forough Farrokhzad, but the film remained unfinished for some reasons. In 1342, the novel “Tangsyar”, which he dedicated it to his wife, the lady Qodsi, was released. The novel was translated into various languages. In 1343, the collection of “the first night in grave” which contains nine short stories and a play (which dedicated to his son Roozbeh) was released. In 1344, he printed the collection of “the last light”, comprising eight

short stories and a poem. In 1345, he released the novel “patient stone” which was dedicated to his residence Busher. This book is more like a collection of connected stories written in the structure of letter writing and monolog which its discourse has not the effect of cohesion and integrity that of a novel possesses. In 1346, Sadroddin Elahy’s interview with Natel Khanlari, Parviz (1946) about Chubak was published. In 1348, “the high time of three long-winded nights”, was published in the newspaper of *Ayandegan* about Chubak by Rahmani, Nosrat (1969). Chubak at that time, in 1349, taught as a visiting professor at the University of Utah. In 1351, he attended the conference of Asian and African writers in Almaty of Soviet Kazakhstan. Anthology of his works was published at Moscow into Russian by Osmanva, Z. N. (1960). In the Daily newspaper of *Ettellaalt* one page entitled as “specialized to Sadeq Chubak” was published. In 1353, the movie “Tangsyrr” (based on the Chubak’s novel), directed by Amir Naderi was put on screen. Story of “Monsieur Elias” by Professor William Hanoi (professor of the Persian language at University of Pennsylvania) was translated into English. Chubak retires himself this year and after a while makes his own way to England and then to America. In 1355, the stories “oily” and “Oh Man” were translated into English and were released in the literature magazine of *East and West* number 20 with an introduction by Michael Hoffmann. Osmanova, Z. N. (1960) translated oily story into Russian. In 1358, the novel *Tangsyrr* was returned to English by Qanoon-parvar M. R. (2005). This translation was published by Mazda publication in California. In 1359, the first night in grave was dubbed into English by Southgate, Minoo (1980). His selections were translated in 1361 with an introduction from Bagley. F. R. C. (1982). Chubak’s commemoration was held at 19 Farvardin by “Feather” organization at the centre of studies of Berkeley in California. In 1370, the translation of the book “Mahpareh” was published by Sadeq Chubak in Nillofarin publication located in Tehran. This book’s translation

from Sanskrit into English and Persian into English was done by Sadeq Chubak. Mahparh is the sixteenth section of the old detailed Sanskrit version that is known as essence of the ocean of the time. This book contains a contiguous collection of the 20 Indian romantic stories and its design is formulated like the style of the stories of “‘thousand and one nights’”. In 1372, a Chubak’s Vyzhenameh was released in the Iranshahi Journal (the universe Foundation) in an attempt by Sadredin Ellahy. In 1373, Sadeq Chubak’s Vyzhehnameh was published by the Office of art in the New Jersey. Six pages of Chubak’s diary entitled as “‘Yesterday’” and a piece of poet-like story “‘lest’” was published at the same office. In 1377, Mahpareh was reprinted.

Review of the historical context

Works of Sadeq Chubak was on the market in 1320. A time period when coinciding from one hand with outgoing Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and from other hand with great writers such as Hedayat, the great Alavy and Jamalzadeh trying to make evolution and development in Iran’s literature (Jazini, J., 1999). A time period in which authors’ conflict with the state and government was deemed as value and political parties were almost sticking to their literary exercises. Albeit some claim that wherever the policy is mingled with the aesthetic work, the result will be a work which has an expiry time. Chubak in his writings had nothing to do with politics. It does not mean that he was a courtier writer but Chubak cannot be entitled as a revolutionary writer. This caused his works attract less readers as recognizable as to expect his works not to be welcome. In the years of 20 up to 40, a writer’s values were those of which were much less visible in Chubak’s works. Like other writers, he neither fought publicly nor was flung into prison. It made the public not to emblem him as a committed writer. On the other hand, the state does not confront him directly, and this whittles away his popularity. In the period when each author had to possess at least one of the propping pillars, Chubak was not supported by any

clique. People knew him as “non-committed” and “non-political” writer. Government, however, doesn’t confront him directly but also doesn’t see him as an ally. Chubak himself publicly questions God and religion in his stories and wages war against religion. Then he is condemned to being lonely.

On the other hand, he deals with poverty and this brings about two consequences: When Chubak looks upon the downstream segment of society and talks about prostitutes, scoundrels, vulgarity and the poor and thieves; he is directly taking away from these groups the sacrament, since in this age the poverty and wealth were equivalent to holiness and oppression respectively. People didn’t like it. The government not wanting the Iranian society to be represented as a poor and dirty society to other countries then is not much happy with works of Chubak. However, Chubak loose his popularity. As Mahmoody, H. (2003) states, religious men believe that Chubak was undermining the religious values in society. Intellectuals, however, believe that to achieve, flourish and reach civilization, one of the very ways, is to destroy traditions. Modernist is dominated when traditions are eradicated. (In a general definition, tradition is a collection of beliefs, customs and beliefs which have no scientific justification).

People were gratified by Chubak within the years of 1335, coinciding with his third and fourth works; though in the decade of 50 he also releases some works. In the era of relative freedom, the method Chubak adopts for fighting is uncovering the truth. He tramples values of Iranians, especially an Iranian woman, and insists on putting forward the sexual orientations and describing the poor class of society. It should be mentioned that prior to him the first trace of this could be noticed in Hedayat’s story of “the lady Allavieh ” (Dorri, 2001) and then be noticed in Jalal Al-e-Ahmad’s “Samanoupazan” (Hillmann, M. C., 1982). But for the first time he dealt continuously with downstream segment and their problems in his works (Rastgar Fasaee, M.,

2001). Chubak tries to destroy the distance between poverty and ignorance and demonstrates that everywhere is poverty there will also be ignorance. Baraheni, Reza (1983) says, the Chubak's secret of triumph was that he realized the distance between poverty and ignorance which cannot absolutely be said that where there was the wealth there exists injustice and ignorance and everywhere was poverty, sacredness and manliness. Chubak has his own ideas and proceeds to divulge them and this leads to be eschewed by the press and be descended vituperation and opprobrium on him. His fight against deprivations, religious beliefs and superstitions is not pleasant to the press. People Party, somehow, boycotts Chubak's works for their looking of pessimism. The point which needs to be mentioned is that the most important party which has pursued the matter of literature in Iran has been the People party. The party dispenses with him and doesn't publish his works in its publications which destroys to some extent a significant part of the base for introducing his works because other newspapers and publications dealt less with literature. Chubak gives samples of his work to the "people's message" publications. The samples that are later published in the puppet show. The people's message also publishes his works until the story of "The Cage". But when the story of cage comes to these publications, they find the author's approach against the people Party's objectives and it is since then that they set him aside.

However, Chubak questions the weak class by dealing with their behavioral patterns and because a large part of this class's beliefs are related to religion and in the point of view of some people it can be said that Chubak in the name of fight against lower class and description of that class's lives sets out to fight against religion (Dastgheib, A., 1974). But it should be mentioned that as history reveals itself the untainted poor class and innocent is sympathized with as much as the prejudice and superstition is opposed with which this point is remarkable.

The creator of patient stone, a Naturalist writer

Although some critics refer to Chubak as a naturalist writer there it seems to be still others who believe that Chubak is not a naturalist. However, those who label him as a naturalist writer try to find the Western and Occidental naturalist writers' short-comings in Chubak's works to be able to create a vacuum for beating his works in this way. Baraheni, Reza (1983) writes in the book of fiction, Chubak's writings are not naturalistic. Despite that his works appear naturalist if they are dissected we reach a series of economic and social principles and rules that will be more categorized in the real domain.

The word that can be said here is that Baraheni, Reza (1983) is infatuated with Chubak and it is necessary to be brought other citations since stubborn and eagle-eyed critics with completely wide open eyes seize every opportunity to beat a work.

Borecky, Milos (1953), in his book "Persian prose" states that, Chubak instigates a lot of hope with his short tales in the collection of "puppet show", but his other three stories in the collection of "the baboon whose buffoon was dead" are disappointing because in these tales he employed a raw naturalism. The play "Rubber Ball" (Bagley, 1982) which is a biting satire of the Reza Shah's reign has a completely different style.

Mohammad Ali Sepanlou (1983), in the book called the Leading authors of Iran, introduces Sadeq Chubak as an extreme realist. He adds that he is the strongest Iranian writer in depicting minutes and details of the subject. Reality, the spirit of reality, uncloaked in his motivation and ambition, is goal for him. About Chubak's style, some critics insist on ascribing it to the "naturalism". It should be explained that naturalism, apart from violence and sometimes excitement in words, has a basic principle that is formulated contingent upon educational school

and science of criminology conventional in nineteenth century in Europe. This school believed in severe hereditary and genetic influences. For instance, they believed that alcoholism or syphilis generates inborn criminals or prostitution, infidelity and betrayal in the next generations. Such belief is never seen in Chubak's and it is wrong if we consider him as a naturalist for his low-key perspectives in his works which reflect pictures of his community.

Seyyed-Hosseini, Reza (1978) states, in the second volume of the book *literary schools* that apparently the nomination of School Naturalism took place on 16 April, 1877 at the Trap restaurant at the dinner table around which Gustave Flaubert, Admyn Dvgnkvr, Emile Zola and future Modan Group were convened and this title, which was derived from the language of science, philosophy and art criticism, entered the Literature. Since the seventh century at the Academy of Fine Arts in France, any belief that necessitated the imitation of nature in everything was called the naturalistic. The term was especially used in case of painting. In Philosophy, naturalism is the system of those who believe in nature as primary principle and ascribe all things to it (Seyyed-Hosseini, R., 1978). This word eventually takes an analogy sense in the lexicon of some critics and refers to the efforts of a writer, as said Victor Hugo, (Legend from Mediaval-1895), which endeavor to treat the social affairs as a scientist of natural science do with zoology.

Some characteristics of Naturalism works are as follow:

Naturalism embraces realism and realistic art is an introduction to naturalism. It abhors beautification. It seeks to patiently study the story of destitute. It uncovers the Humiliated Reality. It is the historian of the present time. It is real, vivid and bloodthirsty. It deals with the lower classes. It is documented. It is close to spoken language. It deals with presenting accurate and detailed account of the story. It prioritizes the analysis of personal spirit of the society. It

puts forward the anti-morals. Writers such as Freud see the love, regret and fear emerging from human's unsatisfied physical and sexual needs (Seyyed Hosseini, R., 1997). Another issue which naturalistic entered into their own novels and relied on insistently was the influence of inheritance on persons' mental status. Because they believed that each person physical and mental condition is inherited from his father and mother (Zola, E., 1885).

On the issue of inheritance, Zola got his inspiration from Lucas, P. (1847) and his book called natural inheritance and wrote, based on his theory, the collection of famous novel of Rogan Makar set in 20 volumes under the title of social and natural history of a family during the second empire. In this series of books, Zola (1885) expounds the life of a small family and arranges a family tree for the children of this family and divides them into distinct branches. The story of this series of books includes the growth and proliferation of branches of this family tree. In the first glance there may not be found any similarities between the members of this family but in within a strong bondage has connected and resembled them to one other. A Child born as a result of liaison from a prostitute mother who turns into an alcoholic and criminal and the same condition applies truly for others.

Zola (1885) says that let us study temperamental conditions of individuals not their ethics and habits ... the people are under the command of their nerves and blood.

Thus, the physical condition is accepted as a principle and the moral state should be considered as its consequence and a shadow of it. That means the spiritual manifestations are the results of physical conditions. Then, all the humans' feelings and thoughts are direct results of changes which occur in the physical structure and physical state, according to the law of inheritance passed by to him from father and mother, that means, if there exists a defect or

physical disorder in the ancestors, this defect gradually develops and passes by from generation to generation and causes next generations to turn into alcoholism or prostitute or find other spiritual defects.

Chubak's works, regarding the issue of inheritance and other features, are incorporated more in realism domain; a black realism.

Spacing

Chubak is very powerful, objective, and meticulous in spacing and scene making. Sometimes with his sharp-eyed look he describes the smallest components of the scene so that they are understandable, leaving a special impact on the audience; sometimes using metaphors and similes gives a general picture to the audience, but the second case is less visible in his works.

However we fail, somehow, to say that the most prominent, but undoubtedly one of the leading elements in the works of Chubak is spacing. Chubak tries more to give the audience the picture and involve her/him in the story until he forces her/him to accept her/his right or wrong analysis and understanding. It can be said that, in some cases, Chubak's stories are completely documentary.

Using personal metaphor, Chubak did successful picture drawing: thirsty soil, he moved up his lips and swallowed the sweat, the stone road, and slap and the sun penetrated into core of your brain, I was lying prostrate on the ground (Chubak, 1963).

Another point worth mentioning is that, Chubak's interest is to narrate his stories in cold, snow and winter which, of course, is a justification for that are using this spacing to serve

depicting poverty. In his fictions, space and content are completely aligned and act in one direction. Chubak's works are best prototypes of Iranian story-writing which are undoubtedly influenced by the theory of unified impact of Edgar Alen, the poet. For the first time, he in his stories expounded some spaces which no one did allow to himself dealing with. When Chubak talks about adversity, he puts the audience in the depth of content and this feature is related to the spacing in his fictions. After Chubak, the other writers tried the crude imitation of his way and artificial description of context in a way which is dark and filthy and insisting on monotony for describing nauseating and cynical scenes. Stories that begin with a description of a lavatory and, most of them, done clumsily, and only intend to create queasy in the reader, without taking a trace from Chubak's techniques which are accompanied with such descriptions (Dastgheib, A., 1974).

Content and personification

Chekhov (1964) has a short sentence with this content about story that such things don't happen in a real life. He believes that most of the writers, even those who are known as realist writers (realist), distort the life before using it in their works, and their writings are the result of such a distortion of reality. Because they have fallen far away from the reality of life and have limited themselves to write exclusively about murderers, insane, mental patients, suicide and ill people and settlers of ivory tower. Because exploiting these subjects and contents in the works of these authors is more than that which can have the possibility of occurrence and showing off. Showing filthinesses and social lowness until it intends on social awareness and diagnosis of pain, is necessary and useful. Dehbashi, (2001) maintained that Sadeq Chubak pictured the society as it was. Some object to him that he has pictured obscenities and filthinesses. Some say that works of Chubak are a kind of psychological and mental analysis of social realities, an

analysis devoid of any value beyond the framework of the mind of Chubak and undoubtedly his works (Dastgheib, A, 1974). Some of the socialist realist writers know Chubak as pessimistic, anti-social and mercenary and pro-imperialist (Yazdany-Khorram, M 1999). Some say that Chubak uses story as the lever for venting his melancholy and they don't accept that such pictures are real. However, Chubak is a realistic author. If one wants not to deny in a way every work of Chubak- like notes we should stick a piece of paper on the refrigerator and write with a red pencil on it: The Color of God, Children of Heaven, cooking Samano, child of others, Setar, the miss Alavyeh, mourners of Bill, Gillanie man and ... do not forget!. Chubak engages in hallucination and silhouette writing and describes the perplexed mentalities but does not go beyond reality. Chubak's stories have their own special concluding. This conclusion does not follow the traditional concluding and Chubak's stories basically don't seek to plan ideas and special slogan. In Chubak's stories there is no place for centrality of mercy and compassion and fear, brutality, and death. Chubak at the end of many of his fictions concludes that nothing can be done with the status quo and it should come along with it. That is, somehow predestination is dominating on Chubak's stories. In Chubak's stories there it is always seen either death or failure of deprived people who are in the story (Dastgheib, 1974). Characters in his fiction - mostly the poor segments of society – always reach a step down and descend at the end of the story (like the story of hubcap thief). It can be somehow said that all characters of Chubak's stories have a kind of special famine and are short of a series of things and this famine (financial, sexual, emotional, and ...) overshadow directly all aspects of their lives (The Man in the Cage). Chubak's characters always live in a poisonous climate, but still dare not give up that poisonous milieu. That is, they never come to this stage that release themselves from the sinkhole in which they are entangled. The people of the world of Chubak appear less physical and actively present.

Except Zaar Mohammad in the novel of Tangsy, they like more to talk. The most aware of them, after finding about the root of the pain just takes a sigh and curses. Women in Chubak's works have a common understanding of religion and are of the type of superstitious religious ones. And elsewhere, in the story of "under the red light", there is the audience witnessing a cycle of life and the fate of prostitutes who in spite of ethical problems, don't give up superstitions. Of course, it should be mentioned that in his fiction, either man or woman, good and positive, people are found. For example, the story of glass eye can be reminisced. Animals in Chubak's stories undertake special roles, sometimes as supplementary characters and even sometimes as main characters. In more places, the use of animals in the stories of Chubak has allegorical aspect. Mir- Abidiny, H (2004) says this way that the story of the baboon, whose buffoon was dead, is a figurative year of years after 1320 when the king was gone. Social psychology of mass was subjugated with tyranny from fear of habit and experienced freedom with uncertainty but the sovereignty pushes its strikes one after another and people deprived from an aware leader were driven from an event to another. The story of cage puts forward this situation, after 28 Mordad's coup d'etat, with a tiring and disappointing tone. On the one hand, the presence of animals and objects in story destroys the monotony of the presence of human figures and causes diversity and creates attractiveness. It should be mentioned that among writers, perhaps more than all, the naturalists grant animals and objects importance that this case is also one of the some reasons for proving Chubak as being naturalist. Symbolists also enjoy this way. On the other hand, realists (realistic) with the aim of increasing believability of story and showing more realism and with the psychological approach enter animals into their stories as fictional characters. According to Mahmoody, H. (2003), some believe that, Chubak uses animals wherever he is feeble in the expression of the human moods. This saying can be true to

some extent and of course only to some extent. Perhaps it is better to express this sentence in this way that, wherever any human can no longer reach in one characteristic to the extent desirable to Chubak, he uses animals. In the same vein, this could be noticed in the function of mice in toilet bowl in the story of man in the cage. However, Chubak like the most modern fiction writers of Iran and even more than all has engaged in animal's lives. Chubak is a powerful personification who carefully expresses details about his characters.

Language

Chubak's prose is a simple and satirical prose, along with harsh and violent terms and sometimes with common vulgar words (Dastgheib, A., 1974). A prose approximates to spoken language. Chubak, with his own special vision, often considers downstream segments of society and imbues recklessly and without any formalities the most dirty and offensive swearing from the language of his characters (Dastgheib, 1974). He has garnered a collection of the manner of folklore talks and the type of the prose full of hardship—either from the view of dialect or the view of writing- with recording and registering of conversational and broken prose with which common people talk - most people of south of the city which in its kind not only seems unique but to some extent matchless. Chubak's prose is a descriptive one. He, with an envyingly skill in use of language and the mission of words and verbs, creates beautiful and memorable interpretation and description. Baraheni, Reza (1983) writes on the fiction writing that, the most beautiful example of Chubak's descriptive prose should be searched in Tangsyar. Even the prose of Stone patient isn't sometimes homogeneous, beautiful and luminous to this extent. The prose of Tangsyar like a river flows from start to the end and goes on and on. It looks like that a story like this to that length has been written in one day. Mir-sadeghi, J (1987) reviewing Chubak's language writes in the book of fictional literature that one of the services which the school of

naturalism did to the literature was the breaking of the fake sanctity of words and concepts. Chubak also follows this rule, and in his stories he uses the words which the writers prior to him refused and declined from bringing in. He portrays with an admirable courage in his works the landscapes and the scenes which the writers passed them by briefly, or eliminated from their stories in general. Although before him, Hedayat, also in one or two of his works, especially “Ms. Alavyeh”, had used this rich culture of language of populace and had broken the sanctity of fake scenes and landscapes, but this feature was not common in his works (Farzane. M. F., 1997). Mir-sadeghi (1987) following the lingual reviews of Chubak’s works alludes to the violent and explicit style of the stories and brilliant and precise dialogues of the characters and adds that language of Chubak’s stories is a visual one. It means that he gets assistance from metaphors and similes more than explainable terms and anatomical sentences. He adds to the fluidity, clarity and incarnation power of prose with similes, metaphors and interpretation (Mir-sadeghi, 1987). Dialogues of the characters of the stories have settled in their places in such an accurate and precise way, as if the characters of the story cannot bring to their tongue anything else than what the author has put in their mouth. But spelled dictation and common writings of dialogues which are often accompanied with extremism tarnish the clarity and fluidity of dialogues and make problem for those people who are not familiar with language of Tehranian regular dialogues, and make the understanding of dialogue hard for them. Most of the dialogues of the stories of Chubak are indigenous Busherian than Tehranian and that’s the reason why some of the dialogues are unclear. Sepanlo, M. A. (1983) writes about the prose of Chubak in the Iran’s leading writers that Chubak’s prose in spite of compression and density of common interpretations flows smoothly and spreads the fragrance of the time and its age. Chubak’s prose is a reckless prose. A prose in which many obscene words are said from the tongue of prostitutes,

scoundrels, and street children and... . It should be mentioned that it was Hedayat who for the first time paid attention to the known people's values of curse and used curses in his stories, but Chubak did this fully and continuously. This caused the creation of a kind of literature in Iran, which is known as pornography, and it also opens another way to deal with the works of Chubak and consequently gives pretext to critics to look even superficially to his works. As said earlier about engaging in poverty or depicting poverty, after Chubak, of course, writers like Al-e Ahmad (1980) did put some efforts and delved into the weak depicting of literature continued until the 60th. Chubak chose a language for his stories which was pertinent to the Lower class that is a narration about them, an extreme simplicity of language, lack of formality, closeness to spoken language, a language close to external reality (than fictional story). About the closeness of Chubak's language to external reality some critics believe that speech patterns of Chubak's go beyond the fictional reality and proceeds even more than that the story requires. Chubak is the first one who has managed to do a new work in the form of fiction by breaking the language, that is, the spoken language (in Iran) and to utilize the language close to his spoken language in some formalistic work. Of course, he has done his best. However, after him the individuals like Al-e Ahmad tried to imitate him or continued his path. Chubak uses the main language of each character and chooses the tone appropriate to that character.

Chubak and Hedayat

Many believe that Sadeq Chubak was influenced by Hedayat and has imitated him. Chubak says at the beginning of his work that he has brought his stories and has given to Hedayat to read and give comments about them (Mahmoody, H., 2003). But it is completely clear that Chubak becomes independent after a while and when we look scrupulously we find out, in the second half of Chubak's writing, that the works of these two writers have many

differences. Chubak was under the influence of Hedayat but he does not follow him. However, these two persons have had so much camaraderie, communication and competition. It's said that Hedayat tells Chubak one day in the winter of 1324 at Ferdowsi café that he's gone to his fight. The night when they were going to the Mascot Café, he says again to him that he take the modern message book and look how he's gone to the fight of your "the afternoon of end of autumn. He gets the Journal and notices that Hedayat has written the story of "tomorrow" based on the technical copy of the afternoon of end of autumn (Mahmoody, H., 2003). Story "the afternoon of end of autumn" is the first step of a real story in which the narrator sees and narrates the exterior stories and event from his inner.

Some points on Chubak and Hedayat (URL, 2012):

- It's Hedayat and Chubak that create for the first time the enthusiasm for writing on the life of vagabonds and ruffians and prostitutes and engaged in this category.
- Chubak has more compression and brevity in the language to Hedayat.
- It expects using some kind of animal psychology either in the works of Chubak and Hedayat's works as well.
- Hedayat says in the story of tomorrow that life is a long icebound corridor. People of Chubak's stories are of this category.
- The 100-page play at the end of the patient stone is exactly the copycat of the legendary of Hedayat's rock's creation.
- The use of rich culture of the populace, in the works of Hedayat and Chuback.

– Decisive and unhesitant crossing the line of Hedayat’s short stories is seen in the puppet and the baboon whose buffoon was dead.

– Hedayat more narrates himself, but for Chubak its people of his stories who are narrated and character of the author himself is hidden in the underlying layers of the work.

– Chubak has had the power of the spacing between his works but Hedayat has not been so.

– Either two, bring either the pain in their stories so well and also beauty.

– Generally Hedayat’s modern works are written in the beginning of his work, and chubak’s modern works in the end of his writing.

– The most of these two authors’ works begin with the scene.

Sadeq Chubak (derived from News – Art website of Haftan): Hedayat was a perfect man, in all things, in humanitarian, in generosity, in patriotism and in impartiality, was a unique human.

Albeit Hedayat has a good command of foreign language and has sufficient knowledge of the works of his contemporary foreign authors, his works are also liable to criticism. All the writers in an era are under the influence of their language so that most of the writers of America are even not excluded from the effects of the Vietnam War.

Chubak had an eternal covenant and treaty with his people by the suffered animals of his stories, if he saw that an injustice was doing toward a horse of a carriage he rose against the oppression and he didn’t recognize the stereotyped slogans as a duty and mission.

Dehbashi (2001) states that, Chubak was one of the most modern and wise human being of the century. He adds that, to Chubak author is not always the only one expressing his mentally eroding inner pain, that, undoubtedly their pain has a common association with other afflicted people too. Writers should be aware of where they are standing. Standing against his own interests and class was his nature (Dehbashi, 2001).

Conclusion

Chubak's strong ties to folklore can be easily seen in his writings, a bond that was never lost in his entire literary life. His works are intermingled with people's everyday lives. He heeds attention to popular literature and people from all social classes. He endeavors to make a vivid picture of lives of laymen in his fictions through nature. Tangsyar is the best example of his popular realism fictions that was converted to movie and dubbed into English, helping Chubak and Iranian subsequently be introduced to the world. *Antari Ke Lutyash Murdeh Bod (The baboon whose buffoon was dead)* was found to be patently representing one of Chubak's works in which Hedayat's fiction writing impressed itself on its creation. However a naturalist writer he lived out his days, he also had his own critics. It is recommended that his works be read more profoundly to be able to discern and analyze the content of his works much better.

References:

Al-e Ahmad, Jalal (1980). The cursing of the land. Major Voices in contemporary Persian literature. *Literature East and West*, 20, 240-244.

Avery, Peter (1957). The baboon whose buffoon was dead. *New World Writing* 11, May, pp. 228-32.

- Bagley, F. R. C. (1982). *Sadigh Chubak: An Anthology*. Delmar: Caravan Books.
- Baraheni, Reza (1983). *Fiction writing*. Tehran: Nashre Noo publications.
- Borecky, Milos (1953). Persian prose since 1946. *Middle East Journal*, 2(2), 235-44.
- Chekhov, Anton (1964). *The Major Plays*. Trans. Ann Dunningan. New York: Signet Classics.
- Chubak, Sadeq (1963). *Tangsy novel*. Tehran: Tehran Publications.
- Dastgheib, Abdolali (1974). A critique on the works of Sadeq Chubak. Retrieved November 21, 2010 from [http:// www.tripleme.com/searchresult.aspx](http://www.tripleme.com/searchresult.aspx).
- Dehbashi, Ali (2001). In the Memory of Sadeq Chubak, *Tehran*.
- Dorri, Jahangir (2001). Satire in Chubak's works. in Ali Dehbaashi, ed., *Yade Sadeq Chubak, Tehran*, p. 68-78.
- Farzane. M. F. (1997). Jamalzade and Hedayat: Founders of modern Persian literature. *Iran name*. 61. 25-48.
- Flaubert, Gustave (1902). *Salammbô*. Oeuvres complètes de Gustave Flaubert. Paris: Conard.
- Hillmann, Michael. C. (1982). *An Anthology of Writings by Jalal Al-e Ahmad: Iranian society*. Lexington, Kentucky: Mazda Publishers.
- Jazini, J. (1999). *Morphology of minimalism stories*. Tehran: Hezareh Goghnu publication.

Lucas, P. (1847). *Traité philosophique et physiologique de l'hérédité naturelle dans les états de santé et de maladie du système nerveux*, 1850.

Mahmoody, Hasan (2003). Critique, analysis and selection of the stories of Sadeq Chubak. Retrieved from <http://www.aftab.ir/articles/art-culture>.

Mir-Abedini, H. (2004). *One hundred years of Iranian fiction*. Tehran: Cheshmeh publications.

Mir-sadeghi, Jamal (1987). *Fictional literature (1st edition)*. Tehran: Nasher Sokhan.

Natel Khanlari, Parviz (1946). *Kheyme-shab-bazi*. Tehran: Sokhan publications.

Osmanova, Z. N. (1960). *The Fruit of Misfortune*. Moscow: A Modern Persian Novella.

Qanoon-parvar M. R. (2005). *Reading Chubak*. Mazda Publishers.

Rahmani, Nosrat (1969). The high time of three long-winded nights. *Tehran: Ayandegan newspaper*.

Rastgar Fasaee, M. (2001). Types of Persian prose, Tehran: Samt publication.

Sepanlou, Mohammad Ali (1983). *Leading authors of Iran (Nevisandeganepishru Iran)*. Tehran: Ketabe Zaman Publications.

Seyyed-Hosseini, Reza (1997). *Literary Schools*. Tehran: Zaman Publications.

Southgate, Minoos (1980). *The First Day in the Grave*. Washington D.C.: Modern Persian Short Stories.

URL. (consulted May 2012): <http://www.Haftan.com/index/news>

Yazdany-Khorram, Mehdy (1999). The discovery of inferno: Chuback's idealism.
Shahrvand Weekly magazine (54).

Zola, Emile (1885). *Germinal*. Paris: Gallimard.