



AUB American
University
of Beirut
الجامعة الأمريكية في بيروت



**Center for interdisciplinary Research
Studies and research in the humanities
An internally peer-reviewed
quarterly scientific journal**

search title:

**Alexander the Great between History
and Theater in the works of:
Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud**

Submitted by:

**Dr. Nermin Yousuf Al-houty
Associate professor-Higher Institute of
Dramatic Arts - Kuwait**

Issue (twenty-fifth), January 2026



**AMERICAN
UNIVERSITY
OF BEIRUT**

Studies and research in the humanities

Specialized version

The Journal of Studies and Research in the Human Sciences is a peer-reviewed scientific publication vessel issued by the American University of Beirut periodically. It is concerned with publishing all that is new, original, and solid from Arab studies and research in the scientific humanities disciplines and their related general and sub-fields.

The magazine seeks to:

Publishing scientific research in the fields of: (art education, music education, media, theater sciences, motherhood and childhood, educational technology, home economics, English language teaching, classroom teacher and community education, educational and psychological sciences) conducted or in which faculty members at universities participate. Egyptian, Arab, and foreign researchers in research centers, research bodies and others.

Studies and research in the humanities

Objectives and scope:

The Journal of Studies and research in the humanities Non-profit, peer-reviewed, issued by the Center for Research and Specialized Studies at the American University of Beirut.

It also targets the Journal of the Studies and Research in the humanities the following:

- Contributing to the development and dissemination of knowledge, through the publication of original, sound, peer-reviewed and innovative scientific studies and research, and scientific reviews in various disciplines related to the sciences and fields of humanities.
- Consolidating scientific and intellectual relations between the Center and the rest of the governmental and private university institutions, research centers and relevant specialized bodies, and exchanging scientific publications between them inside and outside Lebanon.
- Addressing contemporary societal issues within the framework of scientific research trends in the fields that the magazine specializes in publishing and employing them in community service and environmental development.
- Monitoring and following up on the trends and paths of scientific research in the sciences and fields of human sciences, by examining the scientific results of all research issued by educational institutions and local, Arab and international research centers.
- Emphasizing diversity, openness, and methodological and scientific discipline to contribute to the knowledge industry and raise the university's ranking locally, Arably, and internationally.

Studies and research in the humanities

List of magazine topics:

- 1) Art education.**
- 2) Music education.**
- 3) New media.**
- 4) Theater sciences.**
- 5) Motherhood and childhood.**
- 6) Multimedia.**
- 7) Educational technology.**
- 8) Teaching languages.**
- 9) Artificial intelligence.**
- 10) Educational and psychological sciences.**

Studies and research in the humanities

Peer review process:

- When a researcher is published in the journal from inside or outside the university, the head of the editorial board or his delegate (editorial director or editorial secretary) assigns the research preparer to upload it to the Knowledge Bank (journal link) and deliver an electronic copy of it on C.D. to the journal's editorial secretary, in addition to delivering three A paper copy in case some arbitrators request paper arbitration first and then write reports electronically according to the evaluation form designed for this purpose or according to the knowledge bank.
- The research author writes a declaration that the research will not be published in any other publishing outlet.
- Two arbitrators are nominated from among expert professors and specialists in the field of each research submitted for publication in the journal. To determine its suitability for publication in the journal through the Knowledge Bank, in addition to judging it according to the journal evaluation form attached to the reviewers.
- In the event of disagreement in opinion between the arbitrators, the research will be referred to a third arbitrator chosen by the head of the editorial board, and his report on the research will be the decisive factor in weighing the extent to which the research will be accepted for publication or rejected for publication, provided that the author of the research will bear the arbitration expenses.

- When the arbitrators agree to publish the study or research after making the necessary amendments, the research is sent to its owner, accompanied by a copy of the arbitration reports, so that he can make the amendments himself.
- If the researcher does not commit to making the amendments required by the reviewers or withdraws the research before publishing it; He must bear the arbitration fees, postage and other expenses incurred by the magazine.
- When the arbitrators agree to refuse to publish the research, the research will be returned to the researcher with a copy of the arbitration reports attached, provided that the researcher bears only the arbitration and correspondence costs.
- All materials accepted for publication in the journal are presented to an English language expert for linguistic review before publication, and the research author must bear the cost of linguistic review.
- Once the referees' reports indicate that the research has been accepted for publication, the author of the research can request the journal's editorial board to issue a certified letter stating that the research has been accepted for publication in the journal. This is done within a maximum period of one month from the date of receipt of the research.
- Research authors are informed that their research will be submitted to the journal within two weeks from the date of submission, provided that they are informed of the decision on the suitability of the research for publication or not as soon as the referees' responses arrive. The editor-in-chief notifies the research authors of the final opinion of the reviewers regarding their research.

Studies and research in the humanities

Rules for confirming acceptance of publication in the journal:

- 1) The authors of research accepted for publication shall be notified of the approval for publication, date of publication, issue, and volume.
- 2) Research to which the arbitrators deem it necessary to make some modifications or additions before publication shall be returned to their owners with specific notes, so that they may work on preparing it finally for publication.
- 3) The authors of rejected research are informed that it has not been accepted for publication without giving reasons for the rejection.
- 4) When the journal is published, an issue (10 copies) and a copy of the journal are delivered to the author of each research published in it, and the researcher can obtain additional copies of the journal by paying the prescribed fees for that.
- 5) The head of the journal's editorial board or his delegate determines the number of scientific contributions, such as articles, working papers, and research published in each issue, according to the number of pages.
- 6) The researcher signs an acknowledgment of receipt of the documents and an electronic copy.
- 7) Peer-reviewed research shall be published in the journal according to the priority of its receipt and registration in the relevant register.
- 8) Research expresses the opinions of its authors, and they are responsible for the views they contain, and the accuracy of the information or data contained therein.

Studies and research in the humanities

Authors Guide:

These rules and instructions are written in a prominent place in the journal or scientific bulletin, or placed on the website of the journal, the center, and the university. Both the Scientific Publishing Authority and research providers must adhere to them, and they include the following:

- The editorial board has the right to initially examine the research, decide its eligibility for arbitration, or reject it before commencing the arbitration steps.
- The arbitrator will be notified of the completion of the research evaluation within a maximum period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the research to the journal.
- The head of the journal's editorial board may choose a third reviewer if the research is rejected by one of the reviewers, and he apologizes to the researcher for not publishing the research if it is rejected by all the reviewers.
- When necessary, the editor-in-chief may provide the author of a research that has not been accepted for publication with the reviewers' opinion or its conclusion, upon his request, without mentioning the names of the reviewers.
- The research will be considered withdrawn if the researcher delays making the required amendments to the research for a period of more than three months from the date of receiving the response from the journal, unless there is a compelling excuse estimated by the head of the journal's editorial board.
- The research may not be published in a scientific journal or any other publishing outlet after its publication in the journal has been approved.

- The journal has the right to republish research, whether on paper or electronically, that it has previously published, without the need for the researcher's permission, and it has the right to allow others to include its research in various databases.
- The researcher may republish his research published in the journal in a book by the researcher three years after its publication in the journal, provided that he obtains permission from the head of the journal's editorial board and indicates the source when re-publishing.
- If it is proven to the journal that the researcher published the research in any other medium, whether paper or electronic, [before, at or after] submitting it to the journal, the journal has the right to hold him legally accountable by informing his employer - and prosecuting him if necessary - in addition to depriving him of future publication in the journal for a period Not less than three years, according to the opinion of the magazine's board of directors.
- The originals of research that reach the journal are not returned, whether they are published or not.

A study titled:

**Alexander the Great between
History and Theater in the works
of:
Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud**

Dr. Nermin Yousuf Ibrahim Al-Houti

2026

Introduction.

Historical figures represent fertile ground for dramatic arts, given their human dimensions and psychological and intellectual conflicts, which are open to reinterpretation and reshaping. Alexander the Great (356–323 BCE) is one of the most controversial and artistically inspiring historical figures in world and Arabic literature, due to his political, military, philosophical, human, and literary dimensions. He embodies the qualities of a military leader, an ambitious conqueror, and a human symbol who reflects human capabilities and boundless ambition. This figure has inspired writers, historians, and artists throughout the ages, becoming a rich source of material for drama and theater, both in classical Europe and in modern Arabic theater.

This figure has provided rich material for the theater, moving from the pages of history to the stage, transforming from a conquering leader into a dramatic symbol open to interpretation and rich in meaning. While history presents a narrative of the life of an ambitious conqueror whose empire stretched from Greece to India, the theater utilizes this figure to re-examine the ambitious human being, the relationship between power and conscience, and the methods of exercising authority. Both world and Arab theater have drawn inspiration from this figure to re-examine the conflict between human ambition and absolute power, and the impact of power on the psyche and relationships.

In theater, the playwright does not merely present Alexander as a military conqueror, but rather reinterprets him as a complex dramatic figure imbued with psychological, philosophical, and moral dimensions. Through the study of theatrical texts, it becomes clear how a historical figure can be transformed into a tool for analyzing

human conflicts, ethical challenges, and the individual's struggle with authority and conscience.

This research seeks to examine the image of Alexander between historical fact and theatrical interpretation, and to analyze how theater employs this figure to generate contemporary meanings.

By studying the character of Alexander, the Great in history and theater, and analyzing its psychological, symbolic, and moral dimensions in three different visions in the classical French theater of Racine, the modern Arab theater of Sheikh Sultan Al Qasimi, and the analytical and philosophical theater of Mustafa Mahmoud, and comparing these theatrical visions with historical facts.

Research Problem:

The research problem revolves around the following question:

How did the figure of Alexander the Great transition from history, as a documentary narrative, to the stage, as an aesthetic and interpretive discourse?

- Several related issues stem from this question, including:
- To what extent did the stage adhere to historical facts?
- What symbolic and intellectual dimensions did the theatrical treatment of Alexander's character add?
- How did the dramatic structure contribute to reshaping the character?

The importance of this research lies in:

1. Highlighting the interactive relationship between history and theater.
2. Analyzing how historical figures are employed in theatrical discourse.
3. Uncovering the political and intellectual significance of Alexander the Great in theatrical performances.

4. Enriching critical studies that examine historical figures from a dramatic and semiotic perspective.

Research Objectives:

1- To study the character of Alexander the Great in primary historical sources.

2- To study the character of Alexander the Great within its historical context and analyze the differences between historical fact and theatrical representation.

3- To uncover the psychological, symbolic, and moral dimensions in the portrayal of Alexander.

4- To analyze the dramatic transformation of the character in texts and theatrical performances.

5- To uncover the intellectual and aesthetic symbols and connotations associated with the character.

6- To employ analytical and semiotic methods in reading the theatrical text.

7- To analyze the character of Alexander in Racine's text, focusing on internal conflict, poetic language, and dramatic structure.

8- A study of the representation of Alexander in modern Arabic theater, through al-Qasimi's text, highlighting its political and social symbolism.

9- An analysis of Mustafa Mahmoud's philosophical and dramatic text, focusing on the character's internal moral and philosophical conflict.

10- A comprehensive comparison between the three texts to reveal their similarities and differences.

Research Methodology:

This thesis employs the following methods:

- 1. The historical method:** to study the image of Alexander in historical sources.
- 2. The analytical method:** to analyze the dramatic structure of the theatrical character.
- 3. The comparative method:** to compare historical and theatrical accounts.
- 4. The semiotic method:** to analyze theatrical signs (body, space, dialogue, costumes).

Scope of the research:

- 1. Thematic scope:** The figure of Alexander the Great in history and theater, as portrayed in the writings of Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud.
- 2. Artistic scope:** Theatrical texts that have addressed the figure or drawn symbolic inspiration from him.
- 3. Temporal scope:** From the Classical era to modern theater.
- 4. Spatial scope:** World and Arab theater.

Research Organization:

Chapter One: Alexander the Great Historically.

Section One: Alexander the Great in Historical Discourse.

Section Two: The Image of Alexander in Western Historical Discourse.

Chapter Two: Alexander the Great in Theater.

Section One: The Transition of the Figure from History to Drama.

Section Two: Alexander in World Theater.

Section Three: Alexander in Arab Theater.

Section Four: A Comparison Between Alexander in World and Arab Theater.

Chapter Three: The Dramatic Treatment of the Character of Alexander: Globally, in the Arab World, and Locally.

Section One: Alexander in Racine's Theater.

Section Two: Alexander in Al-Qasimi's Theater.

Section Three: Alexander in Mustafa Mahmoud's Theater.

Section Four: The Character of Alexander in the Works of Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud.

Conclusion and Research Findings:

Chapter One:
Alexander the Great
Historically.

First topic:

**Alexander the Great in historical
discourse.**

Historical discourse provides the primary framework for understanding the figure of Alexander the Great, as it seeks to record facts and analyze events using a documentary methodology based on multiple sources and narratives. However, this discourse was neither singular nor neutral; rather, it was shaped by diverse perspectives, ranging from mythical glorification to moral and political critique. Hence, the importance of studying Alexander's image within historical discourse lies in its role as a gateway to understanding the subsequent transformations his character underwent when it transitioned to the stage.

First: The Concept of Historical Discourse:

Historical discourse is a narrative construct that aims to reconstruct the past based on: documents and accounts, the historian's ideological interpretations, and the cultural and political context of the time of writing. Therefore, the image of Alexander is not a fixed fact, but rather the product of multiple historical discourses that contributed to shaping it.

Second: Sources of the Historical Discourse on Alexander the Great:

1- Classical Sources: The most important of these are:

Plutarch: Presented Alexander as a moral hero, focusing on his personal qualities.

Arrian: Relied on a detailed military narrative, highlighting Alexander's combat genius.

Curtis Rufus: Focused on the dramatic and emotional aspects of the character.

Diodorus Siculus: Presented a comprehensive narrative combining history and legend.

These sources contributed to building a complex image that combined heroism and arrogance.

2- Eastern Sources:

In some Persian and Eastern sources, Alexander is presented as a conqueror and destroyer, a symbol of the collapse of ancient empires. These accounts reveal differing perspectives depending on the author's position relative to the events.

3- Alexander in Arab-Islamic Tradition:

In Arab tradition, Alexander appears as Dhul-Qarnayn (in some interpretations) and as a just and wise king striving to spread good. The historical figure has been intertwined with myth and religion, giving him a symbolic and moral dimension.

Fourth: The narrative structure of the historical discourse:

The historical discourse in presenting Alexander relies on: a linear narration of events, a focus on wars and victories, and a reduction of psychological aspects in favor of the political event. This differs radically from the dramatic structure in theater.

Fifth: Problems of the Historical Discourse Controversy Surrounding Alexander the Great:

No historical figure in the ancient world has been the subject of as much disagreement and contradiction in historical assessment as Alexander the Great. His image has ranged from that of a legendary hero to that of a bloodthirsty tyrant, from a civilizing leader to a psychologically troubled individual. This controversy stems from the multiplicity of sources that have written his history, the diverse backgrounds of historians, and the intertwining of fact and myth. This study aims to review the most prominent trends in the

historical debate surrounding Alexander and analyze the motivations behind this divergence in perspective.

1. Conflicting historical accounts.
2. The blurring of reality and myth.
3. The influence of ideology on historical writing.
4. The silencing of the voices of defeated peoples.

Historians have differed in their views of him:

- The legendary hero and bearer of a civilizing mission.
- The military tyrant seeking personal glory.
- The psychologically troubled man, especially in his later years.

A historical dilemma: whether he was a brilliant conqueror or an ambitious despot with boundless power.

1. Was Alexander a brilliant leader or a reckless adventurer?
2. Did his policies aim at cultural unity or domination?
3. Was his political project sustainable?

These questions highlight the complex nature of his personality.

Analytical Note: Historical accounts demonstrate how Alexander combined military ambition with administrative ability, making him an ideal figure for theatrical portrayals, where the internal conflicts of ambition and the struggle for power can be explored.

Sixth: Reasons for the Historical Debate Surrounding Alexander the Great:

1. The scarcity of contemporary sources.
2. Historians' reliance on later accounts.
3. The influence of ideology on historical writing.
4. The intermingling of historical biography with myth.
5. The multiplicity of cultural and political contexts in historical writing.

This study concludes that the historical debate surrounding Alexander the Great not only reflects ambiguity in the facts but also reveals the multiplicity of historical discourse itself. Alexander is not a closed historical figure but rather an open structure for reinterpretation and re-reading, which explains his seamless transition into theatrical discourse as a dramatic symbol capable of embodying the crises of power and human ambition.

Section Two:

The Image of Alexander in Western Historical Discourse

Early Life and Intellectual Background:

Alexander the Great was born in 356 BC in Pella, the capital of Macedonia, the son of King Philip II and Queen Olympias. He was raised in a royal environment steeped in Greek culture and philosophy, with Aristotle taking charge of his education from the age of thirteen. This provided him with a broad knowledge of Greek culture and philosophy. He studied philosophy, science, medicine, and literature, which honed his analytical mind, strategic thinking abilities, and political and military vision. He assumed the throne of Macedonia after his father's death and embarked on a series of military campaigns that expanded his empire to encompass most of the known world of his time. Alexander led his campaigns from Greece to Asia Minor, Egypt, Persia, and India. He succeeded in conquering the Persian Empire and founded several cities that bear his name, most notably Alexandria in Egypt.

Alexander died in Babylon in 323 BC at the age of 40. The cause of death is believed to have been either a sudden illness or poisoning, according to various historical accounts. He left behind a tremendous legacy: expanded conquests, the spread of Greek culture, the founding of new cities, and the inspiration of literary and artistic movements for centuries to come.

Alexander the Great is remembered in historical discourse as a brilliant military leader and an exceptional statesman who, in a short period, established one of the largest empires in ancient history. However, his genius was not limited to the battlefield; it extended to the political and administrative spheres, where he pursued policies aimed at consolidating his rule and ensuring the continuity of his imperial project.

This study seeks to analyze Alexander's personality as a military and political leader, highlighting the features of superiority and controversy that surrounded his experience.

The Significance of Alexander's Image in Historical Discourse:

The image of Alexander in historical discourse reveals: the archetype of the exceptional leader, the crisis of absolute power, and the complex relationship between power and morality. These implications form the foundation upon which subsequent theatrical treatments have been built.

An analysis of Alexander the Great in historical discourse confirms that this figure was not a static entity, but rather a fluid narrative construct subject to political, cultural, and ideological considerations. This multiplicity of historical images has allowed theater to reshape Alexander as a dramatic figure open to interpretation.

First: Alexander as a historical military leader:

He led extensive military campaigns that stretched from Greece to Asia Minor, to Egypt, Persia, and India. He succeeded in conquering the Persian Empire and established a vast empire in record time. He founded several cities that bore his name, most notably Alexandria in Egypt. These conquests spurred the spread of Greek culture and influenced the development of local civilizations. He adopted a policy of cultural integration between East and West.

1. Military Formation:

Alexander received his military training under his father, Philip II, who reorganized the Macedonian army on modern foundations, most notably: developing the Macedonian Phalanx formation, emphasizing coordination between infantry and cavalry, and establishing military discipline. This formation enabled Alexander to possess a highly efficient army from the moment he assumed power.

2. Military Strategy:

Alexander's military strategy was characterized by: surprise attacks rather than defense, tactical flexibility in the face of numerically superior armies, direct field command where he fought in the front lines, and exploiting geographical knowledge of the open terrain. This was evident in major battles such as the Battle of Granicus, the Battle of Issus, and the Battle of Gaugamela.

3. Leadership and Charisma:

Alexander possessed outstanding leadership qualities, including the ability to motivate soldiers, build a personal relationship with the army, and present himself as a model of heroism and courage. This charisma is a key element in explaining his army's loyalty to him despite the long campaigns.

4. Warfare:

For Alexander, wars were not merely military confrontations, but rather a means of expanding political influence, a tool for imposing symbolic dominance, and a mechanism for constructing the image of a legendary hero. He embarked on a series of military **campaigns that changed the face of the ancient world. The most important of these campaigns were:**

- Greek and Eastern Greek Campaign: Alexander waged significant battles against the Greeks to conquer independent cities and consolidate Macedonian influence in Greece.
- Asia Minor Campaign: He defeated the Persians at the Battle of Issus (333 BC), enabling him to advance into Syria, Lebanon, and the Eastern Mediterranean.
- Egypt Campaign: He entered Egypt and founded the city of Alexandria, considering himself a hero of the Egyptian people and associating his name with Hellenistic culture.

- Persia Campaign: He invaded Persia, achieving victory at the Battle of Gaugamela and overthrowing King Darius III.
- India Campaign: He reached the Indus Valley, where he fought the Battle of the Hydaspes and faced fierce resistance from local tribes before deciding to return.

Second: Alexander as a Political Leader:

1- The Concept of Governance and Empire:

Alexander did not view his empire merely as a military conquest, but as a political project based on:

Unifying peoples under a central authority, integrating local elites into the government, and adopting Eastern governance traditions.

2- The Policy of Cultural Integration:

Among his most prominent policies were:

Marriage to Eastern princesses, integrating Persians into the army and administration, and respecting local religions and customs.

This policy aimed to establish political stability, but it provoked opposition from the Macedonians.

3. Administration and Governance:

Alexander relied on: maintaining some local administrations, appointing loyal governors, and establishing new cities bearing his name, as a means of cultural and political control.

4. Absolute Power and its Crisis:

As the empire expanded, Alexander moved towards: concentrating power in his own hands, politically deifying himself, and severely punishing opponents. This raised questions about his transformation from a liberator to an absolute ruler.

Third: Alexander as a Legendary and Civilizational Hero:

1- The Image of the Conquering Hero:

A number of Greek and Roman historians presented Alexander as:

An exceptional leader who was never defeated in battle, the heir to the heroism of Achilles, and an example of courage and ambition. This image highlights Alexander as a symbol of military genius and human excellence.

2- Alexander the Civilizational Hero:

Some historians believe that Alexander: spread Hellenistic culture, opened up avenues for cultural interaction between East and West, established a new era of cultural exchange, and paved the way for the Hellenistic period. His conquests are presented here as a civilizational project, not merely military expansion.

Fourth: Alexander as a Tyrant and Despot:

1- Alexander the Military Tyrant:

In contrast to the idealized image, other historians present him as a bloodthirsty leader who destroyed resisting cities, killed rivals and opponents, and was excessively cruel in suppressing rebellions. Alexander is portrayed here as a bloodthirsty leader driven by a lust for power, an example of absolute authority that corrupts its possessor.

2- Inflated Ego and Megalomania:

Some historians argue that Alexander's ambition exceeded the bounds of reason, his quest for self-deification revealed a psychological flaw, and that absolute power corrupted his moral vision. This interpretation sheds light on the darker side of his personality.

Fifth: Alexander Between Heroism and Tyranny:

This approach attempts to reconcile the two images, arguing that:

Heroism and tyranny are products of political and historical circumstances. His military successes contributed to the aggrandizement of his personality, and violence was a tool of governance in his era. Thus, Alexander is understood as a complex, rather than singular, figure.

Sixth: A Psychological Reading of Alexander's Character:

1- Alexander the Man in Crisis:

Recent studies have focused on analyzing the psychological aspects of Alexander's character from a psychological perspective, pointing to:

His constant feeling of incompleteness, his sense of isolation, his anxiety about betrayal, and his loneliness despite the vastness of his empire. He also experienced an identity crisis between East and West. This humanistic reading paved the way for theatrical portrayals of the character.

2- The Influence of Upbringing and Education:

Some researchers attribute this crisis to:

His strained relationship with his father, Philip, the intellectual influence of Aristotle, and the weight of the ideal hero image imposed upon him from a young age.

Seventh: Alexander in Eastern and Islamic Narratives:

In contrast to Western narratives, some Eastern sources present a different image:

Alexander as a conqueror and destroyer, or as a just king in the Arab-Islamic tradition (Dhul-Qarnayn). This contrast reveals the role of culture in shaping historical memory.

Implications of Alexander's Leadership Character:

A study of Alexander as a military and political leader reveals:

The model of the charismatic leader, the dialectic of power and wisdom, and the fragility of absolute power in the face of boundless ambition. An analysis of Alexander the Great's personality as a military and political leader shows that he combined genius with controversy, strategic vision with unbridled ambition. This contradiction has contributed to his enduring presence in historical discourse as a problematic model of leadership, making him fertile ground for theatrical adaptations that have deconstructed his character and highlighted his internal crises.

Chapter Two.

Alexander the Great on Stage.

Section One.

The Transition of Character from History to Drama.

The transition of Alexander the Great from history to drama represents a qualitative shift in the nature of representation. He is no longer presented as a historical record, but as a human figure. The character is transformed from an object of documentation and linear narration into an artistic construct subject to the mechanisms of selection, intensification, and interpretation. Theater does not aim to reproduce historical events as they occurred, but rather to deconstruct and reshape them in a way that serves the aesthetic and intellectual vision of the text and the performance. Internal conflicts are highlighted, moments of doubt, pride, and defeat are intensified, and events are reshaped to serve the artistic vision. Therefore, studying this transition reveals the fundamental differences between historical discourse and dramatic discourse.

First: The Difference Between Historical and Drama References:

1- The Historical Reference:

History is based on: collecting and documenting facts, adhering to chronological order, and interpreting events within a causal framework.

In this context, Alexander is presented as a public figure representing his era and his political and military achievements.

2- The Dramatic Reference:

Drama, on the other hand, relies on: imagination and interpretation, focusing on conflict, and reconstructing time and events. Here, Alexander becomes an artistic figure representing a human crisis that transcends the boundaries of historical time.

Second: Mechanisms of Dramatic Character Transformation:

1- Selection and Intensification:

The playwright deliberately chooses pivotal moments from Alexander's life, omits non-dramatic historical details, and condenses events into a limited theatrical timeframe. This leads to a focus on the conflict and highlights the human dimension.

2- Reconstruction of Conflict:

In history, conflict is often embodied in wars, but in drama: External conflict transforms into internal conflict, psychological and moral questions come to the fore, and power becomes a dramatic burden.

3- Reshaping the Character:

Alexander is dramatically reconstructed through: deepening the psychological dimension, highlighting internal contradictions, and creating a critical distance between the character and the audience.

Third: The Shift in Function from Documentation to Meaning:

1- Alexander as a Historical Figure:

Drama is often based on real historical events, such as his military campaigns, his conquest of Egypt, his relationships with commanders and soldiers, and his campaigns in Asia as far as India. However, dramatic texts do not focus solely on narrating facts, but rather utilize them as material for character development and internal conflict. The historical Alexander appears as a powerful and boundlessly ambitious hero, while drama gives him a human and psychological dimension, revealing the impact of his power on himself and others. His primary function is to record the event, and his presence is tied to a specific time and place.

2- Alexander as a Dramatic Figure:

Alexander the Great, a famous and prolific Macedonian leader, represents the model of the complex hero in theater, poetry, and drama, as he can be presented on several levels: historical, psychological, moral, and symbolic.

The dramatic character of Alexander is not merely a retelling of historical facts, but a reinterpretation of human conflict and moral and political meanings. His function is to produce meaning, transforming him into a symbol of power, ambition, and alienation, open to multiple interpretations.

Fourth: The Dimensions of Alexander the Great's Character:

1- The Psychological Dimension: In drama, Alexander is often portrayed as a psychologically complex figure, embodying contradictory conflicts: ambition and the desire to dominate the world; self-esteem and the arrogance stemming from military and political superiority; and a moral conflict between power and responsibility, between ambition and compassion towards the peoples he conquers. This psychological dimension is evident in his internal monologues and dialogues with other characters, making Alexander more human and tragic, and allowing the audience to empathize with him or recognize his psychological fragility

The Symbolic Dimension:

In theater, Alexander becomes a symbol of absolute ambition, power, and dominance, or of human arrogance in the face of history. In some texts, he also becomes a symbol of nationalism or of the hero confronting the great powers.

This symbolic dimension allows the playwright to employ the character to convey philosophical, moral, and political messages to

the audience, whether through classical texts like those of Racine or modern Arab theater such as that of Mustafa Mahmoud and Al-Qasimi.

3- The Dramatic and Structural Dimension:

The dramatic construction of Alexander's character relies on: intense dialogues and internal monologues to reveal psychological conflict; relationships with surrounding characters (leaders, advisors, enemies, lovers) to highlight the moral and social dimensions; and historical events as a tool to emphasize psychological tension and moral dilemmas.

As for the linguistic style, it varies according to the text: in classical theater (Racine) the language is poetic, while in modern Arab theater (Mustafa Mahmoud and Al-Qasimi) the language is analytical, philosophical or realistic, but all of them aim to highlight the complex character and the dramatic conflict.

Alexander the Great, as a dramatic figure, is:

- A psychologically complex hero embodying power, ambition, and vanity.
- A tragic figure due to the conflict between power and responsibility, and between ambition and conscience.
- A human, philosophical, and political symbol whose actions can be interpreted on multiple levels: individual, social, and historical.
 - Theater transforms Alexander from a mere historical conqueror into a dramatic figure open to reflection, symbolic representation, and critical analysis, thus granting him depth and appeal to the audience.

Fifth: Alexander as a Dramatic Symbol:

1- A Symbol of Absolute Power:

The character of Alexander is used to reveal:

The mechanisms of control, the struggle and corruption of absolute power, its disastrous consequences, and the price of political ambition.

2- A Symbol of Civilizational Conflict:

Alexander represents the dialectical relationship and the point of convergence between East and West, allowing the theater to address: The dialectic of hegemony and interaction, and the problems of cultural identity.

3- A Symbol of Alienation and the Human Being in Crisis:

In many texts, Alexander appears: alone, despite his victories, anxious about his fate, and in crisis with himself. This highlights the tragedy of humanity in the face of its boundless ambition.

Sixth: The Impact of Directorial Vision on Dramatic Transformation:

The transformation is not limited to the text but also encompasses the theatrical performance. The actor's physical presence deepens the meaning, the theatrical space visually reshapes history, and lighting and music contribute to constructing meaning.

Seventh: Alexander in Light of Dramatic and Semiotic Analysis:

- Alexander's theatrical body is presented as a symbol of power and dominance.
- Costumes and weapons point to the mythical dimension.
- Internal dialogue reveals psychological tension.

- The theatrical space reflects the vastness of the empire or the narrowness of the self.

A study of Alexander the Great's character between history and theater reveals a fundamental shift in function. While history seeks documentation, theater works to deconstruct and reconstruct.

Reconstruction. On stage, Alexander becomes a mirror reflecting the crises of power, ambition, and identity, making his dramatic presence ever-renewing and reinterpretable in every era.

Eighth: The Limits of Historical Commitment in Drama:

Theatrical works vary between:

A relative commitment to facts, and a complete liberation from history in favor of symbolism. This variation remains part of the freedom of theatrical creativity. The transfer of the character of Alexander the Great from history to drama confirms that theater does not seek to replicate the past, but rather to question it. The dramatic Alexander is not a carbon copy of the historical Alexander, but an artistic construct that expresses the crises of humanity and power in every time and place. Hence, drama's ability to transform a historical figure into a symbolic sign open to interpretation is evident.

Here, the researcher summarizes the differences between the historical Alexander and the theatrical Alexander in the following elements:

- **Reference:** In the historical Alexander, facts and sources; in the theatrical Alexander, imagination and interpretation.
- **Purpose:** In the historical Alexander, documentation; in the theatrical Alexander, the production of meaning.
- **Character:** In the historical Alexander, a conquering leader; in the theatrical Alexander, a complex protagonist.

- **Time:** In the historical Alexander, linear; in the theatrical Alexander, fluid and fragmented.

- **Function:** In the historical Alexander, historical; in the theatrical Alexander, symbolic and aesthetic.

Section Two.

**Alexander in World
Theatre.**

Alexander the Great has enjoyed a prominent presence in world theater, as one of history's most adaptable figures for dramatic interpretation. He appeared in Greek theater (as an extension of the tragic hero). European theater has invoked him throughout different eras, not to retell his historical life, but to employ him as a dramatic symbol reflecting the complexities of power, ambition, and human conflict. The image of Alexander in world theater varies according to theatrical schools and the intellectual and political contexts in which the texts were produced. In European theater, he has been used as a symbol of absolute power, while in epic theater, he serves as a tool for critiquing colonialism and imperial ambition.

First: Alexander in Classical European Theatre:

1- Alexander in Classical French Theatre:

Jean Racine's play *Alexandre the Great* is considered one of the most prominent works to address this character in the seventeenth century. Racine presented Alexander as:

a tragic hero subject to the laws of psychological conflict, a figure torn between passion and power, and a model of a ruler facing a moral test. Here, Alexander adheres to the conventions of classical theatre in terms of the unity of time, place, and action, which necessitates a highly dramatic intensity in the character.

2. Alexander in Classical Spanish Theatre:

In the works of Calderón de la Barca, Alexander appears within a philosophical and ethical framework:

as a symbol of unbridled human will, an example of the struggle between freedom and fate, and an embodiment of the question of glory and its meaning. This approach is predominantly symbolic and reflective.

Second: Alexander in Romantic Theatre:

Romantic theatre viewed Alexander as:

an exceptional hero, a dreamy figure striving for immortality, and a symbol of individual genius. Emphasis was placed on emotion and passion, with an amplification of the mythical aspect of the character.

Third: Alexander in Modern and Contemporary Theater:

1- Alexander as a Political Symbol:

In modern theater, the character of Alexander has been transformed into:

A dramatic mask for criticizing authority, a symbol of colonialism and hegemony, and a projection onto modern tyranny. He is stripped of his historical context in favor of contemporary meaning.

2- Alexander in Epic Theater:

According to the epic (Brechtian) vision, Alexander is not presented as a hero to be emulated, but rather as:

A model to be questioned, a tool for deconstructing the concept of heroism, and a means of engaging the audience in critical thinking.

3- Alexander in Experimental Theatre:

In experimental theatre, the character is fragmented into multiple voices, time is reconstructed non-linearly, and the biography is transformed into semantic fragments. Here, Alexander becomes more of a theatrical sign than a complete character.

Fourth: Dramatic Transformations in the Image of Alexander:

Several fundamental transformations can be observed:

1. From historical hero to dramatic symbol.
2. From victorious leader to man in crisis.
3. From linear narrative to deconstruction and experimentation.

Fifth: The Intellectual Significance of Alexander's Presence in World Theater:

Alexander's presence in world theater reflects:

Human anxiety regarding absolute power, the crisis of boundless ambition, the dialectic of power and morality, and the conflict between the individual and history.

Tracing the image of Alexander the Great in world theater reveals the theater's ability to reinterpret historical figures in a way that resonates with the questions of each era. Alexander is no longer merely a conquering leader; he has become an open-ended dramatic symbol reflecting the crises of modern humanity, and affirming that history in theater is not an end in itself, but rather material for reflection, critique, and rethinking.

Section Three.

Alexander in Arab Theater.

Alexander the Great did not enjoy the same direct and extensive presence in Arab theater as in Western theater. However, his presence manifested itself through symbolic and historical inspiration, whether by explicitly invoking his character or through dramatic models that refer to him as a symbol of conquering power or absolute ruler. Arab theater has approached the figure of Alexander from different intellectual, political, and cultural perspectives, making him a critical tool for interpreting contemporary Arab reality. Arab theater has explored Alexander from various angles: as a symbol of the conquering ruler, a political allegory for the Arab reality, and the dialectic of the hero and the tyrant. Among the most prominent Arab texts that have invoked historical figures similar to Alexander in their symbolism are the works of Alfred Farag and Abdel Rahman Sharqawi.

First: The Unique Arab Approach to the Figure of Alexander:

1- Alexander Between History and Heritage:

In Arab-Islamic culture, the image of Alexander is sometimes linked to that of Dhul-Qarnayn, which imbues him with a religious and moral dimension, the image of a just king in some texts, and a mythical character that transcends history. This intertwining is reflected in theatrical treatment, where history blends with symbolism and myth.

2- Limitations of Direct Approach:

Arab theater tends to draw inspiration from the archetype rather than the figure itself, using Alexander as a dramatic mask, and avoiding direct historical representation in favor of allegory.

Second: Alexander as a Dramatic Symbol in Arab Theater:

1- A Symbol of Power and the Absolute Ruler:

The character of Alexander has been used to represent: the despotic ruler, the overreach of power, and the inflation of the political ego. Alexander appears here as a leader who is invincible externally but defeated internally.

2- Political Allegory:

In many modern Arab texts:

The writer applies the character of Alexander to a crisis-ridden Arab reality, transforming conquest into internal colonialism, and raising questions of legitimacy, power, and justice.

Third: Alexander in Contemporary Arabic Dramatic Texts:

1- Indirect Use:

Alexander's characteristics appear in the figures of the conquering leader, the warrior king, and the hero who transforms into a tyrant. It is noteworthy that this use serves a critical perspective more than historical documentation.

2- Intersection with Arab Historical Drama:

The treatment of Alexander intersects with the traditions of Arab historical drama, as seen in:

- Alfred Farag's reinterpretation of history.
- Abdel Rahman Sharqawi's questioning of power and justice.
- Saadallah Wannous's use of history as a tool for contemporary critique.

Even if these playwrights did not write about Alexander directly, their dramatic treatment mechanisms intersect with his symbolic use.

Fourth: The Semiotic Dimension of Alexander's Character in Arab Theater:

1- The Theatrical Body:

- Stern stances → Significance of dominance.
- Broad horizontal movement → Symbol of authoritarian extension.

2- Costumes:

- Military uniform → Marker of power.
- Crowns and royal symbols → Legitimacy of rule.

3- Theatrical Space:

- Palaces → Center of power.
- Desert or emptiness → Isolation and alienation.

Fifth: Language and Dialogue:

The theatrical discourse of Alexander in Arabic is characterized by: Direct, rhetorical language, commands and a declarative tone, and monologues that reveal the fragility of the self behind its power.

Sixth: The Significance of Alexander's Presence in Arabic Theater:

This presence reflects the crisis of authority in the Arab world, the fear of reproducing tyranny, the conflict between the ruler and the people, and a critique of false heroism.

The presence of Alexander the Great in Arabic theater—whether direct or symbolic—affirms theater's ability to repurpose history as an effective critical tool. The Arab Alexander is not merely a conquering hero, but a symbol of problematic power, a mirror reflecting the crises of governance, ambition, and identity in contemporary Arab reality.

Section Four.

A Comparison Between Alexander in World Theatre and Arab Theatre.

Comparing the portrayal of Alexander the Great in world and Arab theater is an important critical approach to revealing the differing aesthetic and intellectual perspectives on this historical figure. While world theater has tended to present Alexander as a central dramatic character, Arab theater has often resorted to using him as a symbol or dramatic mask to address contemporary issues. This study aims to identify the similarities and differences between the two experiences and analyze the reasons for this divergence.

First: Alexander: Direct and Symbolic Presence

1- In World Theater:

Alexander appears as a pivotal figure bearing his name, a dramatic hero subject to psychological and philosophical analysis, and the object of tragic conflict. World theater tends to construct the text around this character.

2- In Arab theater:

Alexander often appears indirectly, through the character of the conquering leader or absolute ruler, as a dramatic mask rather than a specific historical figure.

Second: Historical and Artistic References:

1- World Theatre:

Based on Western classical texts, it reinterprets history within different theatrical schools and allows for broad artistic freedom in reinterpretation.

2- Arab Theatre:

Influenced by the Arab-Islamic heritage, it blends history and myth, and is sometimes subject to political and censorship considerations.

Third: The Dramatic and Psychological Dimension of the Character:

1- In World Theatre:

The focus is on internal conflict, deepening the psychological dimension, and questioning heroism and power.

2- In Arab Theatre:

The focus is on the symbolic and political dimension, the conflict between ruler and ruled, and prioritizing symbolism over individual psychological analysis.

Fourth: The Intellectual Function of Alexander the Great:

1- World Theatre:

Deconstructing the concept of the hero, posing ethical and philosophical questions, and critiquing imperial ambition.

2- Arab Theatre:

Criticizing despotism, warning against absolute power, and alluding to contemporary political and social realities.

Fifth: Semiotic Means in the Portrayal of Alexander the Great:

1- World Theatre:

Diversity in directorial styles, experimentation with the body and space, and deconstruction of the traditional form of the character.

2- Arab Theatre:

Reliance on clear signs (clothing, sword, throne), the presence of rhetorical language, and a focus on symbolism rather than physical experimentation.

Sixth: Reasons for the Divergence Between the Two Theaters:

1. Differences in cultural contexts.
2. Disparities in artistic and political freedom.
3. The differing relationship between theater and authority.
4. The nature of the audience and its expectations.
5. The diversity of theatrical schools in the West compared to the Arab world.

A comparison between Alexander in world and Arab theater reveals a fundamental difference in the function of the historical figure. While Alexander is reconstructed globally as an independent dramatic character who deconstructs notions of heroism and power, in Arab theater he is often employed as a critical symbol reflecting the crises of governance and political reality. This divergence confirms that theater, despite its historical inspiration, remains a mirror to the questions of the present more than a mere revival of the past.

Chapter Two.

**The Dramatic Portrayal of
Alexander the Great
Globally, in the Arab World, and
Locally.**

Section One.

Alexander in Racine's Theater.

Jean Racine (1639–1699), a leading figure in French classical theater, crafted the character of Alexander in a classic tragedy, adhering to the principles of French classical theater (unity of time, place, and action). This reflects the profound psychological conflict of ambition, love, loyalty, and power, as well as the protagonist's inner turmoil. The play focuses not only on precise historical events but also on the development of the protagonist's psychological character, his handling of the immense responsibility he bears, and the moral dilemmas he faces as a result of his great ambition.

Alexander emerges as a tragic hero, experiencing an internal conflict between the ambition for conquest and his human nature. His monologues and dialogues reveal his psychological anxieties, emotions, and commitment to moral values. Alexander symbolizes the human struggle with oneself, the pursuit of glory at the cost of sacrificing human values.

Alexander the Great: Between History and Theater in Racine's Works:

- 1- **The Historical Dimension:** Alexander the Great is a real historical figure, a Macedonian military leader (356–323 BC) who founded a vast empire stretching from Greece to India. History describes him as a conqueror without limits, characterized by courage, military acumen, and great ambition, but at the same time, he possessed human qualities and sensitivity towards some of the peoples he conquered. Historical accounts focus on his military campaigns, strategies, wars, and alliances, as well as his management of the empire and its peoples.

2- The Dramatic Dimension:

Jean Racine reintroduces the character of Alexander in a classic dramatic play, but he is not concerned with strict historical accuracy. Instead, he crafts a psychological and moral conflict that makes the character more human and relatable to the audience.

The play explores: the internal conflict between ambition and glory on one hand, and compassion or moral questioning on the other; human relationships that reveal the tension between military duty and personal or emotional desires (such as feelings of friendship or love, if present in the text); and symbolism, where Alexander becomes a symbol of human ambition and absolute power, and his internal conflict reflects the human dilemma between power and responsibility.

The Difference Between History and Theater:

- 1- Content: Throughout history, historical events and conquests are recounted, focusing on military and political biographies. In Racine's theater, the emphasis is on psychological and moral conflicts, highlighting internal and human struggles.
- 2- Character: Throughout history, the protagonist is a conqueror, a strategic leader, sometimes merciful towards the people. In Racine's theater, the protagonist is a tragic hero, embodying both ambition and human weakness—a complex character with whom one can empathize.
- 3- Objectives: Throughout history, the focus is on political expansion, military domination, and empire building. In Racine's theater, the emphasis is on psychological conflict, moral and philosophical messages, and eliciting dramatic sympathy.

- 4- Style: Throughout history, the narrative is historical and documentary. In Racine's theater, there is intensive dialogue, internal monologues, symbolism, and classical poetic language.

The Dramatic Structure of Alexander's Character:

Racine's play Alexander the Great is one of the most prominent classical texts that addressed the character from a tragic perspective. Alexander appears as a complex, multifaceted tragic hero, where the desire for conquest intersects with his sense of human responsibility. This is what establishes Alexander's central role; he is the driving force behind the events, and all conflicts revolve around his decisions and stances. He is torn by an internal conflict between his military ambition and his yearning for humanity and justice. In his relationships with other characters, generals, and advisors, he demonstrates his shrewdness and leadership, but at times, he displays inner tension resulting from the pressures of power. The development of his character can be divided into key axes:

First: The Psychological Dimension:

The text portrays Alexander as anxious about losing control, fearful of betrayal by those close to him, and troubled by the imposed image of the ideal hero. Racine highlights what could be termed megalomania, where ambition becomes a psychological burden. Ambition is Alexander's primary motivation; he strives to expand his empire and achieve historical glory. The conflict between reason and emotion reveals his occasional wavering between his military choices and his human relationships. The play also highlights his contradiction between absolute power in war and mercy towards conquered peoples, a crucial element in building empathy for the character.

Thus, Racine relies on internal conflict as the primary driving force of the drama, manifested in the tension between passion and duty, the conflict between power and love, and the wavering between mercy and violence. Alexander here is not an absolute epic hero, but a tragic figure subject to the laws of human frailty. In his dialogues with his advisors and friends, torn between the ambition of conquest and human compassion, his military ambition clashes with his feelings of mercy towards the conquered peoples.

In a famous monologue, Alexander asks, "I have won the land, but have I won the hearts?"

This reflects the inner tragedy of the classical hero, who achieves great victories but faces inner isolation and moral anxieties.

Second: The moral dimension: In Racine's play, Alexander is not merely a military leader, but a human being with fears, ambitions, and inner conflicts. His military and political decisions are presented as moral and psychological tests, and every action or choice has a dramatic impact on the surrounding characters. This approach makes Alexander more relatable to the audience, transforming him into a classic tragic hero, akin to Aristotelian figures, where power and ambition clash with conscience, love, or justice.

For Racine, theater draws inspiration from history, but he reinterprets events to highlight humanity and its inner conflicts. Alexander here represents absolute human ambition, but his human and moral dimensions make him a tragic figure, not merely a historical conqueror. In this way, the play becomes a bridge between historical reality and contemporary human values, allowing the audience to reflect on timeless values and struggles. In the text, Alexander symbolizes the conflict between human ambition and the sense of justice. This conflict unfolds through his dialogues with other characters, and Racine employs poetic and rhetorical language to

illustrate the hero's moral dilemma: "Power without wisdom is mere tyranny; greatness without mercy is mere absurdity."

The text demonstrates how the hero's moral conflict is translated into dramatic language consistent with the foundations of classical theater.

Third: The Social Dimension:

The social conflict is also evident in his relationship with the female protagonist, who represents the human and emotional aspects of his life.

The dialogue with the queen or lover reflects the tension between military duty and personal passion, a central tragic element in classical theater.

Cultural Symbols and Meanings in Racine's Portrayal of Alexander:

Alexander represents human ambition and absolute power, but he is also a symbol of the moral conflict between power and conscience. The events of the play are often more symbolic than historically accurate, reflecting the inner struggle of the ambitious, all-powerful individual. The play employs intense dialogue to express this psychological conflict, a hallmark of Racine's classical style.

This is Racine's classic style. In Racine, Alexander is a symbol of man's struggle with himself, and the pursuit of glory at the cost of sacrificing human values, which gives him tragic dimensions that evoke the audience's sympathy.

Alexander thus becomes a symbol: of the ruler who pays the price for his ambition, of power that empties a person of their true self, and of the hero who is defeated from within before being defeated by others. In Racine's play, Alexander illustrates how great power does

not exempt a person from moral and psychological conflicts. The character represents a balanced human experience between personal glory and moral duty, making the play both dramatic and poetic. The audience's interaction with Alexander stems from admiration for his heroism and historical ambition, while simultaneously reflecting on his human weakness and inner struggle.

Dialogue Style and Language:

Racine's language is poetic, precise, and emotionally charged, characterized by a high degree of eloquence that reveals the human soul. He employs repetition and stylistic parallelism to deepen the dramatic rhythm. Alexander's monologues often begin with personal reflection, then evolve into a moral or philosophical discourse addressed to the audience and other characters, giving them a tragic and human dimension simultaneously.

Counsel: "Sir, the people need you more than your armies."

Alexander: "But the army is the way to the heart, the way to truth."

"Every victory I achieve makes me more alone, and every step toward glory brings me closer to my merciless self."

Scene Structure Analysis:

Scene 1 – Preparing for War:

Alexander appears as an optimistic and ambitious hero, but he begins to grapple with a sense of moral responsibility toward the battle.

The language of the scene is tense, filled with introspective questions, and employs metaphors representing the land and its people.

Scene 2 – After Victory:

The internal conflict becomes more pronounced as the hero begins to reflect on the consequences of his actions and poses philosophical questions about justice and power.

A lengthy monologue reveals the tragic aspect of his victories.

Scene 3 – The Conflict Between Love and Duty:

Alexander emerges as a tragic hero balancing love and military duty. The dialogue is highly symbolic, with the heroine representing the human side that opposes absolute power.

Section Two.

Alexander in Al-Qasimi's Theater.

Modern Arab theater serves as a mirror to cultural and political reality, employing historical figures as symbols for understanding social and political forces. In Al-Qasimi's text, Alexander is presented as a symbol of hegemony and control throughout the ages, and is used as a tool for analyzing political conflicts, without focusing on individual psychological struggles. The character represents historical power and political dominance, and is highlighted through his relationships with his surroundings and the broader historical event.

Theater and Cultural Identity: Modern Arab texts are characterized by a tendency to link historical events to contemporary issues. Modern Arab theater serves as a mirror to cultural, political, or social reality, employing historical figures as symbols for understanding social and political forces.

Theatrical and Cultural Background:

Sheikh Sultan Al Qasimi's works in modern Arab theater offer a space for presenting historical figures as social and political symbols. Al Qasimi blends historical events with a contemporary dimension, making the characters a mirror to current human and political values and attitudes in Arab societies.

In his play about Alexander, Al Qasimi presents a historical figure oscillating between power and dominance, highlighting his influence on those around him. Unlike Racine's play, which focuses heavily on internal psychological conflict, Al Qasimi's work emphasizes:

The political and historical analysis of power, the role of the individual as a symbol in society, and the conflict between tyranny and justice within a symbolic framework.

The character of Alexander the Great in Al-Qasimi's play:

The character represents historical power and political dominance more than a psychological hero. He emerges through his relationships with his surroundings and the broader historical events, making him a symbolic figure rather than a tragic or psychological one. He appears within the context of the overall historical struggle between powers, not as a purely individual conflict.

1- Alexander as a Representative of the Historical and Contemporary Struggle for Power:

In this historical play, Alexander is presented not only as an ancient military leader but also as a symbol of the struggle for power, both ancient and modern, everywhere. The play's text is based on an extensive historical reading of Alexander's character, which Al-Qasimi uses to illuminate contemporary issues, particularly the conflicts between major powers and their pursuit of hegemony.

Al-Qasimi employs history as a mirror reflecting contemporary reality and highlighting the parallels between the expansion of ancient powers (Alexander) and the expansion of modern powers. Thus, Alexander becomes a symbol of tyrannical power that seeks to control and expand without limits, reflecting an intellectual and political anxiety about the dominance of major powers on the international stage in our time.

2- Ambition, Domination, and the Desire for Control:

Alexander's character displays immense ambition for glory and world domination. The play recounts his conquests against Persia and India, and his expansion to the coasts of the Arabian Peninsula, Egypt, and Babylon, as examples of his boundless ambition. This ambition is used dramatically to illustrate the limits of human power

and its consequences, not only in ancient history but also in our contemporary reality.

In the Arabic text, Alexander appears as a powerful figure who controls the destinies of nations. Dialogues with secondary characters demonstrate his ability to persuade and control:

Counsel: "We have doubled our strength, but have we doubled our justice?"

Alexander: "Justice is achieved through strength, and strength is our path to peace."

This highlights the symbolic and political nature of the character, where power becomes the central focus of the events.

3- Alexander as a Revealer of the Weaknesses Around Him:

The play touches upon an important aspect of Alexander's character: his interactions with those around him, from commanders to allies and even enemies. It shows how some of them clash with his ideas or attempt to undermine his goals. This is evident in the discussions with commanders about whether to release prisoners in exchange for money or to focus on the war. These discussions reflect an internal struggle between the pursuit of glory and cold political calculations. This conflict highlights the tension between personal ambition and the common good, making the characters surrounding Alexander a mirror of himself and of the power dynamics in history.

4- Alexander between reason and control:

On the level of semiotics (signification), the character of Alexander is transformed into a symbolic sign of the relationship between power and man. Alexander does not stand only as a conqueror, but as a representative of the image of power in which the value of humanity is absent in favor of hegemony and expansion. The theatrical text, as

in its introduction, links what he did in the past with what he is doing now in terms of the hegemony of the great powers and their policies. This gives Alexander a supra-historical dimension that connects the times. The internal conflict in Al-Qasimi's text is less focused than in the classical text, but it highlights the conflict between principles and power, between freedom and control. Alexander is used as a symbolic character to express the political challenges in modern societies.

5- The Moral Dimension and the Call for Reflection:

In the play, Alexander is linked to the complex relationships between ruler and ruled, and between power and society. The text also demonstrates how power is balanced by law and cultural symbolism, a distinctive feature of modern Arab theater.

Although the play is historical, it invites the viewer/reader to think critically. Al-Qasimi does not present Alexander as an unquestionable role model, but rather as a powerful leader whose actions reflect contemporary ideas about power, conflict, and relations between states.

For Al-Qasimi, Alexander is not merely an individual hero, but a symbolic figure representing power, defiance, and social conflict. The focus on political and social dimensions allowed for a reinterpretation of history in light of contemporary Arab values. Furthermore, the direct, realistic language enabled the audience to understand political and social symbols without resorting to complex internal psychological analysis, as was the case in classical French texts.

Thus, Alexander's character in the play becomes more of an intellectual tool than a mere dramatic figure, used to raise questions about how we deal with power and control in our world today.

Therefore, the researcher sees the symbolism as representing the power of dominance and the expansion of influence throughout

history and in the present day. Ambition and control appear as central traits in his character, used for a political interpretation of hegemony. The internal and external conflict reflects the tension between the desire for glory and morality and the common good. The ethical dimension, meanwhile, opens the door to critical reflection on the motives behind power and conflict.

Analysis of the dramatic structure of the scenes:

Scene 1 – The Announcement of the Conquest:

Alexander is presented as a leader who controls the battle and achieves victory, highlighting his impact on the people and his advisors. The text also emphasizes the political and social consequences of the conquest, rather than the internal psychological conflict.

Scene Two – Confronting the Opposition:

Alexander's symbolic persona is revealed through dialogue with figures representing the opposition or the people. The scene highlights his ability to balance power and justice, employing strong and clear language that allows the audience to understand the political dynamics.

Scene Three – Governance and Control: The final scene illustrates how a historical figure can be a symbol of dominance and power, and how an individual deals with political and moral responsibilities. This scene includes short monologues that reflect the philosophy of governance and control, emphasizing the symbolic dimension of the figure.

Dialogue Style and Language: Al-Qasimi's language is realistic, direct, and sometimes reflective, but less poetic than Racine's. It

relies on social and political dialogue to convey symbolic messages, using historical symbols to express contemporary values.

Alexander: "You have conquered the world, but have you conquered minds?"

A soldier: "You have shown strength, but the people want justice, not just victory."

This dialogue illustrates the confrontation between power and social awareness and justice, giving the audience an opportunity to reflect on the moral values associated with power.

1- Dialogic Language and Symbolic Meanings:

In the play's introduction, Al-Qasimi clarifies that his work is not merely a historical narrative but a vivid portrayal of the ancient and modern struggle for power. In other words, the dialogue is designed to reveal the psychological and logical conflict within Alexander's character, as well as within the broader issues he represents.

The dialogue here relies on:

A rising style in expressing ambition and dominance: The language highlights words of power and ambition, such as "world," "control," and "glory," reflecting the centrality of these motivations in Alexander's character.

The use of political and historical symbols helps to broaden the meaning from the individual to a symbol of historical power, which aligns with Al-Qasimi's vision for the play.

2- Character Development Through Internal and External Dialogue:

When a play is historical in form, Alexander's character is not built solely through military actions, but also through dialogue that reflects

his internal struggles between his ambition for dominance and his awareness of the painful consequences. The dialogue reveals him as a man with a clear strategic vision, speaking of conquering numerous countries and reaching the borders of India and the Levant, demonstrating language imbued with determination, analysis, and goal-setting.

Conversely, language is used to uncover ethical questions or a conflict between logic and ambition, such as: Is Alexander's power for the service of humanity or for domination? This is what typically occurs in texts like these when he engages in dialogue with his advisors or adversaries.

3- Linguistic and Symbolic Conflict within the Dialogue:

The play utilizes history as a mirror to the present. Therefore, the dialogue is not merely an exchange of sentences between characters, but rather dialogues with political dimensions that reflect the global power struggle and the contemporary present, presenting Alexander as the symbolic head of this conflict. The language intertwines symbols between past and present, with words like "control," "power," and "dominance" recurring in the dialogues, giving Alexander a deeper significance than simply being a leader.

4- Dramatic Development Through Dialogue:

On a dramatic level, the dialogue begins by highlighting Alexander's strength and great ambition, using impassioned and forceful language that showcases his fighting prowess. The language then evolves to question the moral and political implications of his actions, giving the dialogue a human and psychological dimension. This technique is used in classical and Arabic theater to present multiple perspectives within a single character.

Alexander: I have approached every corner of the world... and all that remains is for me to redraw the map of power. I do not seek glory for its own sake, but so that the world may see what a person can achieve if they muster their will.

Language that emphasizes ambition and control.

Advisor: But, my lord, does not the empire you are building now kill our humanity? Is there no need to stop at a limit?

Language that reflects moral conflict.

Alexander: Might alone cannot defeat, but if we do not push our boundaries, when will we have the chance to live as we deserve?

A dramatic tone that combines decisiveness and questioning.

This type of dialogue reflects character development through conversational language that includes:

The manifestation of ambition as a primary motivation, the internal dialogue evident in questioning responses, and symbolic language that expresses a broader struggle, extending from the individual to society and history.

Here, the researcher observes that the language of the characters in the play is not limited to recounting historical events, but is a language of conflict and meaning that reflects the vertical and horizontal struggle of power between ambition and consequences. The dialogue constructs Alexander as a symbol of historical dominance and reflects ethical questions about power and authority. The play uses Alexander as a linguistic and semiotic tool that connects the past with the present, to deepen the lesson about political and cultural forces in the world.

Here, the researcher draws a comparison between the character of Alexander in Racine's work and in al-Qasimi's, in terms of:

1- The Historical Framework of Alexander: For Al-Qasimi, it is based on ancient history, but the text reinterprets Alexander as a symbol of power and control, linking history to contemporary reality (the dominance of powers, the struggle for influence). For Racine, it is also based on ancient history but with a dramatic twist. The events focus on his personal conflicts and specific actions such as military campaigns and human relationships.

2- The Psychological Dimension: For Al-Qasimi, it is an internal conflict that focuses less on individual emotion and more on interaction with surrounding forces and the struggle for power. He is a symbolic figure representing contemporary historical power. For Racine, it is an internal conflict between ambition and glory on one hand, and mercy or moral values on the other. He is a classic tragic figure reflecting the human struggle between power and responsibility.

The Ethical Dimension: In Al-Qasimi's work, the decisions often reflect a political or philosophical analysis, with Alexander symbolizing absolute power and dominance, highlighting the repercussions of his actions on history and society, relying less on direct emotional empathy. In Racine's work, however, the decisions present a moral tension (such as the conflict between military duty and human desires). The viewer empathizes with Alexander's character and feels the tragic dimensions of his story.

Dramatic Dimension/Performance: In Al-Qasimi's play, dialogue is used for political and historical reflection. The language is less poetic and more analytical. The surrounding characters act as a mirror to Alexander's ambition and power struggles, and the play expands the scope of the conflict to include the symbolic dimension and political

allegory. In Racine's play, however, the dialogue is intense, the language poetic, and the internal monologues reveal the psychological conflict. The events focus on the internal conflict and have limited interactions with the main characters.

Presentation of the Surrounding Characters: In Al-Qasimi's play, they represent political forces and historical influence, expanding the meaning of the conflict. In Racine's play, however, the characters highlight Alexander's internal struggle.

3- Language and Style: Al-Qasimi employs an analytical and realistic language linked to symbolic and historical meaning, while Racine uses poetic language and monologues that reveal the tragedy.

Symbolism: For Al-Qasimi, Alexander is a symbol of power, historical hegemony, and contemporary modernity. He is used as a political model reflecting power struggles in the present and becomes a transhistorical figure. For Racine, however, Alexander is a symbol of absolute human ambition and individual heroism, but he remains tragic due to the conflict between power and moral values.

4- The text's objective: For Al-Qasimi, the aim is to connect history with contemporary reality, highlighting the conflict between historical and modern powers and political symbolism, analyzing the authority of power and control, and prompting the audience to critically reflect on hegemony and the conflict between states and powers. For Racine, the aim is to highlight internal conflict, present a tragic and dramatic figure, and evoke sympathy, interest, and reflection on human tragedy.

The researcher also summarized the similarities between Racine's and Al-Qasimi's.

treatment of Alexander the Great as follows:

1- **Reliance on ancient history:** Both texts draw on history for Alexander, but in a flexible manner to serve the text's objectives.

2- **Alexander's ambition:** Power, ambition, and glory are central to Alexander's character in both texts.

3- **The conflict between power and responsibility:** This appears in both texts, although its nature differs (psychological and internal in Racine, political/symbolic in al-Qasimi).

4- **Racine:** Alexander is a tragic hero who balances power, ambition, and mercy. The play's focus is on the internal and human conflict.

5- **Al-Qasimi/Modern Arabic Text:** Alexander is a symbol of power and control. The play's center is the historical, political, and symbolic conflict, while also evoking the repercussions of his actions on the present.

Thus, it can be said that the character of Alexander transforms from a tragic, human figure in classical theater to a symbol of power and political analysis in the modern Arabic text, despite ambition and power remaining as fundamental characteristics.

Section Three.

Alexander in Mustafa Mahmoud's Theater.

Mustafa Mahmoud portrays Alexander as a dramatic, philosophical figure, grappling with his vanity and delusions of grandeur, and facing moral and social challenges. The play highlights Alexander's transformation from a conquering leader to a tragic figure as a result of his vanity and embrace of divinity, and shows the impact of this transformation on those around him. The dialogue blends intellectual analysis with dramatic monologue, reflecting the character's inner conflict and philosophical reflections.

Philosophical and Intellectual Background: Mustafa Mahmoud's plays are characterized by their exploration of the philosophical and psychological dimensions of their characters. In his play about Alexander the Great, he presents the character as a symbol of human ambition and moral arrogance, grappling with his pride and belief in his own divinity, and facing ethical and social challenges. Every action and deed is analyzed from a philosophical and ethical perspective, not merely as a historical narrative. For Mustafa Mahmoud, Alexander appears as a great leader, yet tragic in his own right, as his idea of self-divinity clashes with his sense of human responsibility. The conflict is highlighted by the tension between the ambition that drives him to great conquests and the ethical consequences of these conquests on others.

The Problem of Similarity and Difference Between History and Mustafa Mahmoud's Text:

First: Similarities:

Mustafa Mahmoud's text converged with history in presenting the character of Alexander, with his ambition and power, portraying him as a strong hero, an ambitious military leader, not easily defeated, with extensive conquests, and during his presence in Egypt. The text focuses on the period of his entry into Egypt and the founding of

Alexandria, and the influence of the priesthood on him, as well as his death and end. He died young in Babylon after a sudden illness, and the text gives a dramatic ending linked to inner pride, with the addition of a fictional burial place in the Siwa Oasis.

Secondly: Points of Difference:

In historical accounts, the primary focus has been on a factual narration of conquests and historical events. However, Mustafa Mahmoud's dramatic text presents a philosophical dramatization of the struggle between the ego and vanity, and a symbolic representation of human power. Similarly, the final outcome and ultimate form in historical accounts is a natural death from a historically uncertain cause, while in the text, death is linked to paying the price for vanity and a misguided belief in divinity. Furthermore, regarding the human and moral dimension, historical accounts place less emphasis on the character's moral conflict, whereas the text focuses on ethics, vanity, and the psychological transformation evident in the dialogues. Finally, the symbolic interplay is observed in historical accounts, which focus on facts, while the text presents a symbolic embodiment of the conflict between humanity and its pursuit of deification and absolute power.

The dramatic structure and character of Alexander in Mustafa Mahmoud's play:

The play, in four acts, recounts the period preceding Alexander's death, highlighting events after his entry into Egypt and his relationship with his commanders, such as Perdiccas and Aridaeus. The character is presented on stage as a powerful and compelling hero, rich in dramatic events, not merely a historical figure, but a character stripped of his deification and vanity. The playwright reveals how Alexander initially believed in his divinity through the priests of Amun in Egypt, a fact used dramatically to expose the character's arrogance and subsequent decline.

This belief in his divinity became one of the reasons for his victories, although it actually negatively impacted his relationships with those around him, even leading him to kill his opponents who tried to enlighten him about the truth. Alexander's end, as depicted in the text, is linked to arrogance and self-importance, not solely to illness or historical fate. The text also suggests his burial site as being in the Siwa Oasis in Egypt.

1- **The Historical and Realistic Dimension:** Alexander in the play is based on the real historical figure: the Macedonian leader (356–323 BC) who founded a vast empire stretching from Greece to India. Historical events are utilized in the play to present a powerful and ambitious character, such as his conquests of Egypt, his interactions with other leaders, and his expansion into Asia. However, the play does not merely recount historical facts; it reinterprets them to highlight the psychological and political conflicts of the character.

2- **The Psychological Dimension and Internal Conflict:** Mustafa Mahmoud presents Alexander as a psychologically complex character, revealing his internal struggle between: his personal ambition to achieve glory and world domination, and his descent into delusion, especially after meeting the priests in Egypt who proclaim him “the son of God.” He also grapples with his moral and political reflections on the impact of his actions on the people and nations he conquers.

This internal conflict makes Alexander more human and dramatic, as the text shows how excessive ambition can lead to psychological isolation and danger to those around him.

3- The Philosophical Dimension:

The character is full of contradictions: ambition versus morality, power versus mercy, personal glory versus public responsibility. In a lengthy monologue, Alexander expresses his feelings of alienation and isolation despite his victories:

"Every land I have conquered has become too small for me, and every people I have subdued has made me more alone. Is glory worth losing my heart?"

This reflects Alexander's inner conflict and provides the philosophical dimension of the play.

4- The Social Dimension:

Alexander interacts with his commanders and advisors, highlighting the impact of his vanity on those around him. His fateful decisions (such as claiming divinity for himself or dealing with his adversaries) demonstrate the influence of ambition on morality and on personal and political relationships. This aspect transforms the play into a study of power and human influence, rather than simply a historical narrative.

Thus, the researcher observes that Mustafa Mahmoud presents Alexander as a complex figure embodying historical power, human ambition, and moral arrogance. The play merges history with human tragedy, transforming Alexander from a mere conquering leader into a symbol for reflecting on the limits of power and ambition, and the consequences of arrogance. The text invites the audience to contemplate the conflict between power and conscience, between authority and responsibility, and between humanity and its impact on others. The dialogue with his advisors and soldiers reveals the character's struggle to balance authority with listening to others, though he often leans towards absolute rule.

Advisor: "You have uplifted nations, but has their suffering ended?"

Alexander: "Life and battles know no mercy, and I live at their heart."

Here, the text highlights the tension between individual power and moral responsibility.

1- The Ethical and Symbolic Dimension:

Mustafa Mahmoud possesses a clear philosophical and spiritual perspective: he doesn't merely portray Alexander as a hero, but rather shows how the hero becomes a victim of his own vanity and self-worship. The play connects power with the irrationality of deification, and raises questions about the relationship between humanity and religion when deification lacks a logical basis. It also explores the stance of the priest's assistant, who opposes making Alexander "the son of God" in defense of values and principles.

In the text, Alexander represents absolute human ambition and absolute power. His arrogance and belief in his own divinity are portrayed as symbols of the dangers of unchecked power, an arrogance that leads to his personal tragedy. The text focuses on Alexander's psychological transformations as a result of his awareness of his power and its influence on those around him (such as priests or leaders). This awareness acts as a mirror to his flaws and inner conflicts, reflecting the tension between individual power and collective authority. The play's ending, while not entirely historical, reveals the consequences of Alexander's arrogance and psychological struggles, transforming him into a symbolic and tragic figure.

2- The Dramatic and Linguistic Dimension:

The dialogue combines intellectual analysis and dramatic monologue. The play employs an analytical and philosophical language, less poetic than that of classical French theater, filled with reflections and lengthy monologues. This reflects the character's internal conflict and philosophical contemplations, but it powerfully highlights power, ambition, and vanity. Alexander's monologues reveal his reflections and strategies, both on an individual level and in relation to the forces surrounding him. The language of the dialogues also reflects a balance

between historical action and symbolic analysis, enabling the viewer or reader to grasp the multifaceted nature of the character.

The dialogue includes existential and ethical questions, allowing the audience to reflect on the nature of power, justice, and responsibility.

"Am I a god among men, or just a man lost amidst his victories?"

The soldier: "We have fought wars, but what about our hearts?"

Alexander: "Hearts are weak, but strength makes history."

Scene Structure Analysis:

Scene 1 – Announcing the Conquests:

This scene presents Alexander as a powerful and confident hero, but allows for philosophical reflection on the consequences of his victories, focusing on his internal conflict, where the tension between personal pride and moral responsibility is evident.

Scene Two – Interior Monologue:

A lengthy scene depicting the character's psychological and philosophical struggle. The text reflects the protagonist's psychological isolation resulting from his arrogance and his understanding of human limitations in the face of glory and ambition.

Scene Three – Confrontation with Those Around Him:

The conflict between ambition and moral principles is evident in the dialogue with his advisors and soldiers. This scene also reflects the external and internal pressures the character faces, further enhancing the tragic and philosophical dimensions.

The Semantic Interpretation of Mustafa Mahmoud's Text:

The character of Alexander in the play can be read as a complex symbol illustrating: the intersection of power and arrogance; how ambition can corrupt a person when linked to the principle of

unjustified deification; the conflict between reason and sanctity: when the priest convinces Alexander that he is the son of God, this becomes a political exploitation of religion that leads to the destruction of the hero's own rationality instead of genuine human development; and the role of personal relationships: Alexander's killing of his opponents who tried to enlighten him symbolizes the breakdown of the relationship between a leader and his surroundings when criticism and self-awareness are suppressed.

History portrays Alexander as a military and expansionist leader with great cultural influence on civilizations, while Mustafa Mahmoud presents him as a symbolic tragic figure who transcends historical facts to embody humanity's struggles with its arrogance and absolute power.

The play also adds philosophical, religious and critical elements that transform Alexander from a mere historical figure into a figure of contemplation on the vanity of power and its consequences.

Section Four.

The Character of Alexander Between:

Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud.

First: The Character of Alexander in the Texts of Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud:

The character of Alexander the Great appears in world and Arab theater in multiple forms, each reflecting the writer's vision and the temporal and cultural context in which the text exists. Although all the texts rely on the historical figure as a reference, the dramatic approach differs in its focus on the psychological, moral, or symbolic dimensions.

1- Alexander in Racine's Play:

In classical French theater, Racine presents the character of Alexander within a classic tragic framework. Ambition and world domination are central to the character, but the greatest emphasis is placed on the hero's internal conflict between his power and ambition on one hand, and compassion and humanity on the other. The language of the text is poetic, and its dialogues are characterized by internal monologues that reveal deep psychological conflicts. Alexander here is not merely a military leader, but a symbol of human heroism and individual tragedy, demonstrating how absolute ambition can clash with moral values. The play aims to evoke empathy for the hero and present a human experience that transcends mere history, as the audience becomes involved in the character's internal struggle, not just the historical events.

2- Alexander in Mustafa Mahmoud's Play:

In Mustafa Mahmoud's text, the character of Alexander becomes a symbol of vanity and unbridled ambition, with a clear blend of history and philosophy. While the text retains historical references such as his entry into Egypt and his relationships with leaders and advisors, the play focuses more explicitly on the psychological and moral aspects than on mere historical narrative. Alexander's vanity

and his belief in his divinity after meeting the priests in Egypt become the central theme of the text, where the writer demonstrates how excessive ambition can lead to self-destruction and the breakdown of relationships with those around him.

The dialogue in Mustafa Mahmoud's text is less poetic than Racine's, but it is analytical and philosophical, revealing the protagonist's moral and political reflections. Alexander here is a symbolic, tragic figure who allows the reader to consider the limits of power and human vanity, while highlighting the impact of his actions on history and the surrounding social and political environment.

3- Alexander in Modern Arabic Texts (such as al-Qasimi):

In modern Arabic texts, such as al-Qasimi's, Alexander is presented as a symbol of historical and political power and hegemony. The focus of this text is not so much on internal psychological conflict as it is on the relationship between the individual, authority, and contemporary history. The language of the text is analytical and realistic, utilizing historical events to highlight Alexander's political symbolism in light of the struggles of the great powers. Here, Alexander is not merely a historical figure or a tragic hero, but a symbol of absolute power and historical dominance. The text allows the audience multiple interpretations of power and historical influence.

Second: Dialogic and Structural Dimensions:

1- Dialogic and Structural Dimensions in Racine (“Alexandre le Grand”)

In Racine’s play, considered a classic tragedy in the Old French style, the aim is not merely to recount historical events, but to explore the depths of the human psyche through poetic dialogue and dramatic situations. The play revolves around Alexander’s relationships with

figures such as his lover Cleophile and his adversaries in India. It draws upon historical sources such as the historian Quintus Curtius Rufus, but it presents them dramatically in the form of intense dialogues.

In a dialogue scene between Alexander and Axiane, an Indian queen:

Did you support my desire to destroy what I loved? And did he cross the borders of Greece?

Here, the dialogue is not merely functional, but a psychological and linguistic struggle that reveals Alexander not simply as a conqueror, but as a hero questioning his motives and actions through emotionally charged language. The dialogue conveys a tension between power and love, duty and desire, giving Alexander psychological dimensions deeper than that of a mere military leader.

Therefore, the dialogue lacks lengthy historical monologues, but it is rich with radical questions that portray Alexander in an internal confrontation, a duality between his human pride and his military ambition. The fundamental implication is that the play expresses the character as a tragic hero in whom human motives clash with the ambitions of power, through eloquent and poetic dialogue.

2- Dialogic and Structural Dimensions in Mustafa Mahmoud's Work:

The play's material itself is presented through group dialogues and a rhetorical formulation about the character of Alexander. This constitutes an important model for character development based on the statements and testimonies of other characters in the text.

"And today our victorious leader Alexander dies... and places his vast empire in your hands... every inch of that land is the body, flesh, and blood of Macedonia." This passage is not an internal monologue

by Alexander, but rather a dialogue/speech delivered by another character on his behalf, a distinctive dramatic technique in Mustafa Mahmoud's work. Here, the text uses praise and boasting as tools to construct the image of Alexander as a national hero, then presents themes encompassing ambitious grandeur and a mythological death.

Here, heroism is shaped by the echo of collective speech rather than by direct quotes from Alexander himself, which places the individual in a strong collective lens.

3- The Dialogic and Structural Dimensions of Sultan bin Muhammad Al-Qasimi:

The text reveals that the play evokes historical events through narration, dialogue with characters, and their connection to contemporary history. The play employs narrative interludes between acts, encouraging the audience to interpret the text as a struggle for power, not merely a heroic biography. Alexander is presented here through his relationships with his surroundings, such as betrayal, expansion, and domination, and within the broader historical context, rather than through sentimental or spiritual monologues.

The theatrical vision in modern Arabic texts tends toward external commentary and historical symbolism rather than focusing on the internal dialogue of the characters, making Alexander a symbol for interpreting the present through the lens of the past. The text relies on a narrative and descriptive language of history, and brief dialogues between Alexander and his commanders or enemies reflect a struggle for power and dominance rather than a personal psychological conflict.

Analytical Summary of the Three Sections:

1- Racine:

He employs internal dialogues and emotional conflicts that reveal the human psyche through Alexander and his conversations with other characters. The dramatic structure is based on classical poetic language and psychological monologues.

2- Mustafa Mahmoud:

The text presents Alexander's character through the words of other characters and collective speeches, highlighting him more through the collective scene than through individual monologues. The focus is on heroism, ambition, and death, within a framework that adopts a popular and motivational dramatic style.

3- Sultan bin Muhammad Al-Qasimi:

The dramatic structure relies on dialogue and a historical narrator, linking historical events to contemporary symbolic and political meanings. The character of Alexander is presented more abstractly, allowing for an internal reading of the overall historical conflict.

Third: The Dramatic Structure of the Scenes:

- 1- Racine: Coherent, based on unity of time, place, and action; intense internal conflicts; central monologues.
- 2- Al-Qasimi: Short scenes focused on political and symbolic dialogue; fewer internal monologues; emphasis on social relations and dominance.
- 3- Mustafa Mahmoud: Lengthy monologues; philosophical analyses; internal conflict and moral tragedy at the heart of each scene.

Fourth: The Intellectual Dimension:

1- Racine: The audience reacts to the tragedy of a great figure, understanding the psychological and human conflict.

2- Al-Qasimi: The focus on political and social symbolism gives the Arabic texts their cultural and political dimensions.

1- Mustafa Mahmoud: Philosophical and ethical reflection makes Alexander a tool for understanding the nature of power, ambition, and human vanity.

Fifth: The Psychological Dimension and Internal Conflict:

1- Racine:

He focuses on Alexander's internal psychological conflict between his ambition for conquest and his desire for mercy and justice. The monologues reveal inner anxiety, the tension between personal and moral duty, and the emotional turmoil resulting from the immense responsibility.

"You have conquered the land, but have you conquered the hearts?"

This highlights the classic tragic dimension of the character.

2- Al-Qasimi:

He focuses more on the symbolic and political dimensions than the psychological ones. Alexander represents power and dominance in society, and internal conflict is less prominent, while the struggle between power, justice, and society is presented symbolically.

"Justice is achieved through power, and power is our path to peace."

Here, the character transforms into a political and social symbol, not a psychologically tragic hero.

3- Mustafa Mahmoud:

He combines psychological and philosophical conflict, as Alexander confronts his vanity, self-deification, and boundless ambition. The lengthy monologues reveal his moral and existential struggles, offering the audience material for philosophical reflection:

"Am I a god among men, or merely a human lost amidst his triumphs?"

The psychological and philosophical dimensions reach their zenith in this text.

Psychological conclusion: Racine presented Alexander as an internal human tragedy, while Al-Qasimi presented him as a political and social symbol. Finally, Mustafa Mahmoud presented him as a philosophical and moral tragedy.

1- Racine:

His language is poetic and rhetorical, relying on repetition, linguistic balance, and theatrical rhythm, employing highly precise language to convey internal conflict and tragedy.

2- Al-Qasimi:

His language is realistic, direct, and sometimes reflective, focusing on conveying symbolic and political messages. He connects historical and contemporary events in his dialogue to make symbols more accessible to the Arab reader.

3- Mustafa Mahmoud:

His language is philosophical and analytical, filled with reflections and lengthy monologues, aiming to guide the audience toward ethical and philosophical thinking about power and ambition.

Each text uses language to serve its purpose: Racine for poetry and tragedy, Al-Qasimi for symbolism and politics, and Mahmoud for philosophy and moral analysis.

Seventh: The Symbolic and Tragic Dimension:

1- Racine: A classic tragedy; the protagonist suffers due to the conflict between his ambition and human values.

2- Al-Qasimi: A symbolic figure representing power, dominance, and authority; his struggle is more social and political than internal.

2- Mustafa Mahmoud: A philosophical tragedy; the conflict between ego and moral ambition, transforming the character into an instrument of philosophical thought.

Eighth: The Dramatic Objective:

1- Racine: Exploring the psychological and tragic dimension of the protagonist.

2- Al-Qasimi: A political and social analysis of the character and history.

3- Mustafa Mahmoud: A philosophical and ethical study of the protagonist's psychological transformations.

Ninth: Cultural Significance of Alexander the Great:

1- Racine:

Alexander is presented as a tragic figure with universal human dimensions, making him open to interpretation across eras and cultures.

His psychological tragedy and inner conflict reflect the nature of human ambition and the struggle between power and mercy, granting him a universal symbolic quality that transcends time and place. The audience recognizes the human and existential dimensions of Alexander, who becomes a model for studying the human psyche and moral decisions under pressure.

2- Al-Qasimi:

In modern Arabic texts, Alexander the Great becomes a symbol of authority, politics, and power, reflecting the relationship between the individual and society, and between the ruler and the ruled. The symbolic struggle with justice and freedom reflects contemporary social and political challenges in the Arab world. The text also highlights the responsibility of the leader and the balance between power and justice, and allows for the interpretation of historical events as a political lesson.

3- Mustafa Mahmoud:

For Mustafa Mahmoud, Alexander becomes a philosophical and moral symbol, reflecting humanity's struggle with its vanity and moral ambition. He raises questions about power, self-deification, and the impact of ambition on those around him. These philosophical questions prompt the audience to engage in moral and intellectual reflection, transforming the character into a dramatic tool for studying human nature.

Tenth: The Political Implications of the Character of Alexander:

1. Racine: Focuses on the internal conflict of individuals, while politics is presented as a backdrop to this psychological struggle. Alexander's character carries psychological and tragic dimensions, with politics playing a secondary role.

2. Al-Qasimi: Highlights the relationship between power and the people, reflecting the dangers and challenges facing rulers, thus giving the text a clear political dimension. Alexander's character embodies symbolic and social politics, resulting in less internal conflict.

3. Mustafa Mahmoud: Links politics to moral and philosophical conflict, viewing politics as part of ethical reflection. He demonstrates how absolute power affects the ethics of the individual and those around them.

Eleventh: The Social Implications of Alexander's Character:

1- Racine:

Alexander appears as a hero detached from the people, with the conflict centered on his inner self, while the audience witnesses his psychological struggle.

2- Al-Qasimi:

The relationship between Alexander and the other characters (soldiers, people, advisors) highlights the social dimensions of power.

The text reflects the conflict between the individual and society, and demonstrates the impact of power on social relations.

3- Mustafa Mahmoud:

The social conflict is connected to the moral dimension, as those around Alexander are affected by his psychological and philosophical transformations, and human relationships are studied within the context of moral responsibility and philosophical values.

Similarities between the three texts:

Despite their differing approaches, the three texts share common elements:

1. All three draw on historical references to Alexander as an ambitious military leader.
2. Ambition, control, and power are the essential character traits in all three texts.

3. The conflict between power and ambition on the one hand, and responsibility or moral values on the other, appears in all three texts to varying degrees.

Differences between the three texts:

1. Psychological and moral focus: Racine focuses on internal conflict and human tragedy, while Mustafa Mahmoud focuses on Alexander's arrogance and analyzes its moral and symbolic dimensions. Al-Qasimi focuses on power and dominance as a political symbol rather than a tragic one.

2. Language of dialogue and style: Racine uses poetic and classical language, Mustafa Mahmoud uses analytical philosophical language, and Al-Qasimi uses realistic language linked to political and historical symbolism.

3. The text's purpose: Racine presents a compelling human tragedy for the reader; Mustafa Mahmoud offers a philosophical and ethical lesson on the vanity of power; while Al-Qasimi seeks to present a symbolic model of power and domination, linking history to the present.

4. The symbolic dimension: In Racine, Alexander is a symbol of heroism and human tragedy; in Mustafa Mahmoud, a symbol of vanity, excessive ambition, and its moral consequences; and in Al-Qasimi, a symbol of power, historical control, and political symbolism.

It can be said that the character of Alexander ranges between the classical tragic hero in Racine, the symbolic moral hero in Mustafa Mahmoud, and the political symbol and historical power in Al-Qasimi. All the texts share the emphasis on ambition and power, but they differ in their focus on psychological, symbolic, or political conflict.

This diversity reflects the ability of the theater to reinterpret the historical figure according to the consciousness of the writer and the time in which he lives, and shows how a single historical figure can be transformed into multiple dramatic experiences with human, philosophical and political dimensions.

The Cultural and Social Impact of Theater:

Here, theater becomes a cultural mirror reflecting human values, political values, and ethical challenges. The character of Alexander becomes a tool for understanding: the nature of human ambition, the impact of power on the individual and society, the relationship between power and justice, and the conflict between personal duty and moral principles.

Classical theater (Racine) focuses on the psychological and tragic aspects, while Arab theater (Al-Qasimi and Mustafa Mahmoud) connects historical figures to contemporary ones, whether from a political or philosophical perspective.

Therefore, the researcher believes that Alexander the Great is a multi-dimensional figure in theater:

The cultural and political dimensions of each text reveal the extent of theater's flexibility in reproducing historical figures and transforming them into analytical dramatic tools.

Alexander the Great represents a model of human ambition and the individual's struggle with power and conscience, allowing for a reinterpretation of history through philosophical, ethical, and political lenses.

Alexander as a Universal Hero:

He represents a model of: absolute power, boundless human ambition, and the individual's struggle with themselves and society.

Alexander as a Contemporary Arab Hero:

In Arab theater, Alexander transforms from a mere historical figure into a symbol of power struggles, authority, and living history.

Conclusion and Research Findings:

A study of Alexander the Great's character in historical and theatrical interpretations by Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud reveals the multifaceted dramatic dimensions of this historical figure. Different texts can reinterpret this character from psychological, political, or philosophical perspectives. Each text offers a distinct vision of the figure, according to its artistic and intellectual aims, and through:

The Historical Dimension:

Alexander the Great was a real historical figure, born in Macedonia in 356 BC. He was tutored by Aristotle and led extensive military campaigns from Greece to India.

History portrays Alexander as a great conqueror, a shrewd politician, and the founder of a vast empire. However, he is also a complex figure in terms of morality and leadership, making him fertile ground for theatrical adaptation.

1. The Dramatic Dimension:

Alexander the Great is a multifaceted figure: historical, dramatic, philosophical, and symbolic. The dramatic Alexander is more human and complex than his historical counterpart.

- Classical and modern theater utilize this figure to highlight the protagonist's internal and external conflicts.

- Comparing the three texts allows us to understand how a historical figure is transformed into a dramatic tool that enables the analysis of the human psyche, power, and the moral and political dimensions of society.

2. The Dramatic Dimension in Racine's Text:

- Alexander's character is a central tragedy; his internal psychological struggle between ambition and compassion highlights the human tragedy.
- The language of the text is poetic and rhetorical, with monologues and intense dialogues that illustrate the protagonist's internal conflict.
- The play adheres to the principles of classical French theater (unity of time, place and action), and transforms history into a psychological experience.

3- The Dramatic Dimension in Al-Qasimi's Text:

- Alexander becomes a symbol of authority and power in the modern Arab context.
- Internal conflict is less prominent, while symbolic, social, and political conflict is more pronounced.
- The language is realistic and direct, and the dialogue connects history to contemporary political and social reality.

4- The Dramatic Dimension in Mustafa Mahmoud's Text:

- Alexander's character is philosophically tragic, grappling with his vanity and moral ambition.
- The text relies on lengthy monologues and philosophical analysis, presenting the internal moral conflict and philosophical reflection on power and ambition.
- The language is philosophically analytical, making the text a tool for moral and intellectual thought.

5- The dramatic pluralism of the writer: Through the texts of Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud, we see:

a shift in perspective from human tragedy to philosophical analysis to political symbolism, and a multiplicity of styles ranging from

poetic eloquence and philosophical analysis to political commentary. This is further enhanced by the presence of complex characters with universal and Arab resonance. This is evident in:

- **Racine:** He presents Alexander as a tragic hero whose internal struggle between ambition and mercy highlights the psychological dimension of humanity, using poetic and rhetorical language that makes this internal conflict palpable to the audience. Here, classical drama transforms history into a tool for exploring the human psyche.

Al-Qasimi: Reinterprets Alexander as a symbolic figure of authority and power, focusing on the social and political dimensions and presenting the challenges facing the leader and the relationship between the ruler and society. The modern Arabic text connects history with the present and highlights the role of theater as an analytical tool for social and political issues.

Mustafa Mahmoud: Portrays Alexander as a tragic philosophical figure, grappling with his vanity and moral ambition, and raising questions about self-divinity, responsibility, and justice. The text reflects the philosophical dimension and moral analysis, transforming the historical figure into an object of philosophical and human reflection.

1- Comparison of the dimensions of Alexander's character in the texts:

- Psychological dimension: from Racine to Mustafa Mahmoud to Al-Qasimi (from most focused on the self to least).

- Symbolic dimension: from Al-Qasimi to Mustafa Mahmoud to Racine (including social and political dimensions).

- Language of the texts: Racine is poetic, Al-Qasimi is realistic, Mahmoud is philosophical and analytical.

- Dramatic objective: Racine presents a human tragedy, Al-Qasimi offers political and social analysis, and Mahmoud presents a philosophical and moral tragedy.

2- Cultural and political implications:

Theater transforms the historical figure into a multi-dimensional symbol: psychological, social, political, and philosophical. That is, the figure is used as a symbol of power and civilizational conflict.

- The texts of Racine, Al-Qasimi, and Mustafa Mahmoud demonstrate the theater's ability to reinterpret history to offer humanistic, ethical, and intellectual lessons.

- The character becomes a tool for understanding the conflict between power and justice, ambition and conscience, the individual and society.

3- Symbolism and Interpretation: In theater, Alexander the Great becomes a symbol for reflecting on power, ambition, and justice. Therefore, theatrical signs contribute to deepening the symbolic meaning of the character.

4- The Impact of Language and Style: Poetic, realistic, or philosophical language determines how the audience interprets the character's internal or symbolic conflict.

5- Theater as a Cultural Tool: Through the re-enactment of history, theater allows for reflection on human, political, and philosophical values. Theater reshapes historical figures according to its aesthetic and intellectual needs. These examples confirm that:

Theater does not resurrect Alexander but reinvents him; the figure is transformed from a historical event into a symbolic sign; and the theatrical Alexander is more capable of expressing the crises of contemporary humanity.

In conclusion, the figure of Alexander the Great in theater is not merely a historical reenactment, but a multi-dimensional dramatic

device, a symbolic structure open to interpretation. It can be employed to analyze the human psyche, power, and society, expressing issues of authority, ambition, civilizational conflict, and human alienation, while imbuing the theatrical text with philosophical and ethical dimensions. This transformation underscores theater's capacity to reproduce history through a contemporary lens that transcends mere documentation, embracing critique and deconstruction from a psychological, philosophical, or political perspective. This reflects theater's ability to transform historical figures into instruments of contemplation and aesthetic expression. Alexander the Great, therefore, is a figure who transcends history, encompassing all theatrical and human dimensions.

References:

- 1- **Sultan bin Muhammad Al-Qasimi**, *Alexander the Great: The Duality of History and Theater and its Dialectic in Sultan bin Muhammad Al-Qasimi's Work*. An academic analytical study discussing Al-Qasimi's historical plays, including Alexander the Great.
- 2- **Abdul Aziz, Jihad Al-Sayed**: Historical and Non-Historical Figures in the Play “Heroes of Mansoura.” *Journal of the Faculty of Arts, Benha University*, Volume 64 (2025), pp. 111–132.
- 3- **Al-Malham, Nihad Ahmed**: The Use of Historical Figures in Shawqi's Theater: An Applied Study in “The Death of Cleopatra,” “The Princess of Andalusia,” and “Ali Bey Al-Kabir.” *Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts*, Issue 7, Year 5 (Al-Ahsa).
- 4- **Jaber, Diaan Abdul-Ridha**: The Performance Style of Historical Figures in Iraqi Theater Productions. *Lark Journal of Philosophy, Linguistics, and Social Sciences*, Iraq (2020).
- 5- **Adawi, Abdullah Mahmoud**: Character Portrayal in Historical Drama: A Critical Analytical Study. *Afaq Cinema Journal*, Issue 8 (2021), pp. 284–297
- 6- **Ismail Ibn Asfiya**: The Evocation of Historical Figures in Algerian Theater. *Al-Tawasul Al-Adabi Journal*, Volume 2, Issue 2 (2008), pp. 171–193.
- 7- **Jad Al-Mawla, Tariq Mukhtar Saad**: The Use of Historical Figures Between Narrative and Dramatic Structures: Akhenaten as a Model. *Journal of the Service Center for Research Consulting*, Volume 25 (2023), pp. 1–67.
- 8- **Racine, J.** (1665). *Alexandre le Grand*.
- 9- **Alexandre le Grand.**” Wikipedia, English edition.
- 10- **Racine, J.** *Alexander the Great* (translated) – LibriVox edition
- 11- **Nathaniel Lee** – **The Rival Queens** or the Death of Alexander the Great.

- 12- **Terence Rattigan – Adventure Story.**
- 13- **Amy Drake – Alexander the Great: In Love and War.**
- 14- **Campaspe (Play) – John Lyly.**
- 15- **Heinze, Eric.** “‘He’d turn the world itself into a prison’: Discourses of Empire and Nation in Racine’s Alexander the Great,” *Law and Humanities* 4(1):63–89 (2010).
- 16- **Alexander the Great in Early Modern English Drama.**
- 17- **Grogan, Jane.** Alexander the Great in Early Modern English Drama. In *Beyond Greece and Rome: Reading the Ancient Near East in Early Modern Europe*. Oxford University Press (2020).
- 18- **Theatre, Religion, and Politics at Alexander’s travelling Royal Court, Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C**
- 19- **Green, P.** (1991). *Alexander of Macedon, 356–323 B.C.: A Historical Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 20- **Heckel, W.** (2008). *The Conquests of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.