TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ

ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI

(AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI) ANABİLİM DALI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND POSTWAR LITERATURE: THE STUDY OF FORM AND CONTENT IN *THE GREAT GATSBY*, *TENDER IS THE NIGHT* BY F.SCOTT FITZGERALD AND *A FAREWELL TO ARMS, THE SUN ALSO RISES* BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Esin KORKUT

Tez Danışmanı

Prof. Dr. Belgin ELBİR

Ankara – 2006

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND POSTWAR LITERATURE: THE STUDY OF FORM AND CONTENT IN *THE GREAT GATSBY*, *TENDER IS THE NIGHT* BY F.SCOTT FITZGERALD AND *A FAREWELL TO ARMS, THE SUN ALSO RISES* BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Esin KORKUT

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment towards the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Ankara University

ANKARA

AUGUST, 2006

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ

ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI

(AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI) ANABİLİM DALI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND POSTWAR LITERATURE: THE STUDY OF FORM AND CONTENT IN *THE GREAT GATSBY*, *TENDER IS THE NIGHT* BY F.SCOTT FITZGERALD AND *A FAREWELL TO ARMS, THE SUN ALSO RISES* BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Belgin ELBİR

Tez Jurisi Üyeleri

Adı ve Soyadı	İmzası
Prof. Dr. Belgin Elbir	……
……	……
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Trevor Hope	……
……	……
Doç. Dr. Meldan Tanrısal	……
……	……

Tez Sınavı Tarihi: 07/ 11/ 2006

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to study two authors in the modernist tradition, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Ernest Hemingway, in terms of their fiction's relation to war and power. The works chosen for the study are Tender is the Night (1934) and The Great Gatsby (1925) by F. Scott Fitzgerald and A Farewell to Arms (1929) and The Sun also Rises (1927) by Ernest Hemingway. The fact that they are post- war novels is their common denominator. In that respect the novels are chosen deliberately so as to explore the idea that peace time does not reflect a complete break with war time experience; it is the continuation of war by other means. We consider the peacetime in which the novels are written a pseudo peacetime during which war is inscribed in the institutions, in the individual and in its literature and other cultural domains. Even where war is the ostensible subject of art, it is present in certain formal effects such as a kind of muteness or the repetition of an event that is pleasurable or through certain images recurring in the novel. In that respect the trauma of the war is not repressed. On the contrary, it recurs; the recurrence of the event renders the traumatic experience the new identity of a pleasurable experience or the traumatic event appears in the consciousness as unities to be achieved. Therefore the trauma of the war also organizes the senses of "lack" and "whole" in the consciousness.

The object of this study is neither to show that there is a mimetic relation between war and literature nor to reach at a direct cause and effect relationship between war and its effects on literature, because war's effects are too diverse to render an easily identified formula for postwar literature. Therefore rather than making formulas based on a distinct cause and effect relationship between war and literature, the object is to study the features of these postwar novels.

The study is grounded in the theories of two twentieth century theoreticians, M. M. Bakhtin and Michel Foucault whose works exhibit an incongruity in terms of both the fields they studied and their approach. While Bakhtin identifies distinct boundaries and binary oppositions, which are also central to his explanation of the formation of language as an interaction between centrifugal and centripetal forces,

Foucault rejects the existence of these polarities and the idea of finding a central point where discourse proliferates. Therefore the basis of this study is the points at which Bakhtin and Foucault intersect and oppose each other, rather than their parallelisms.

As a consequence of their having studied in different fields, Bakhtin focuses on literature and Foucault directs his attention to the diverse fields of society in which power exerts itself in a variety of forms. With a view to drawing the outline of one of the basic discrepancies between Bakhtin and Foucault we will refer to their approach towards the Renaissance. According to Foucault the application of less amount of physicality in the punitive systems paved the way for the proliferation of discourses which took not the direct exhibition of sovereignty but the creation of the individual as its primary object. Foucault detects a direct spectacle of power of sovereignty in torture as a public scene in the Renaissance. The aim of punishment is the further acknowledgement of sovereignty by the spectators. In this case punishment is not a corrective for the punished but a reinforcement of power. However, in the 19th century the mechanism of punishment alters and it acquires a less physical quality. In other words punishment ceases to be a public spectacle. Although this new kind of punishment does not inflict physical pain, it invents more complicated mechanisms and higher aims. A corrective feature is ascribed to the mechanism of punishment. From the nineteenth century onwards in addition to the reinforcement of power, preventing the recurrence of the same kind of "crime" was within the objectives of punishment. To put it in Foucault's terms, it was "an execution that affects life rather than the body." Therefore, there is a transition from physicality towards a sort of control that makes itself explicit in the behavior of the individual. In other words the objectives of punishment change so as to produce long-lasting effects with a deeper and a wider application in the social body. Therefore, the loss of physicality in the strategies of power does not lead to a requisition of power, or it does not aim at a more humane treatment of the criminal but it seeks to impinge the mechanism in the individual "before the crime occurs". It treats the individual as a "to- be- criminal"; it detects a potential tendency towards criminality. With a view to detecting a potential criminality in the individual the

punitive system puts scientific discourse into its service. In other words, the punitive system, reinforced with the discourse of psychiatry and criminology, does not punish the criminal but creates the individual. In order to insert the working of power mechanism within the individual and the social body, the punitive system creates a discourse through constant observation and the treatment of the to-be-criminal. (Foucault, 1991a)

Then our next question would be how that discourse proliferates after the First World War, what kind of a new scheme it procures and how this relates to the novels we will be studying. To rephrase this in Foucauldian terms we must ask what kind of discursive regularity the novels imply and, if the twentieth century individual is strictly conscious of being observed, as Foucault argues, what kind of a post-war observation mechanism the discursive regularity of the novels reveal. If punishment is no more a spectacular event proving the distance to which the power of the sovereign can reach, and if pain is not directly inflicted to the body, therefore in the twentieth century watching the procedure of punishment is no longer considered a corrective on those who watch, and inflicting physical pain is no longer a means of correction. That is to say, the disappearance of physicality from the system of punishment also eliminates the idea of an all-powerful punisher and erases the connection between punishment and physical pain. The individual can be trained without the existence of an all powerful agent; he /she can be trained in his/her private sphere without being directly observed by the audience. According to Foucault the criminal is not the one on the scaffold but the one at home; the execution hour is not to be waited but is made to pervade into an individual's life-time and the executioner is the individual herself/himself.

> What is now imposed on penal justice as its point of application, its "useful" object, will no longer be the body of the guilty man set up against the body of the king; nor will it be the juridical subject of an ideal contract; it will be the disciplinary individual [….] The ideal point of penalty today would be an indefinite discipline: an interrogation without end, an investigation that would be extended without limit to a meticulous and ever more analytical observation, a judgment that would be at the same time be the constitution of a file that was never closed, […..] (Foucault, 1991a:227)

Bakhtin also deals with the issue of loss of physicality in literature. He detects the same kind of decrease of physicality in the literature after Renaissance. However, according to Bakhtin this loss of spectacle and physicality stems from the loss of human's unity with his/her environment. Contrary to Foucault, who argued that increasing privacy is a stronger way of contributing to the creation of the image of the human, Bakhtin argues that through "participation in the mute and invisible spheres of existence" the individual also lost his/her integrity and wholeness. For Foucault this transformation from public to private re-created the image of man and it did not break the individual's connection with society. On the contrary, the more private the human became the more externalized and exhibited he/she was. Power mechanism made him the object of constant observation and within this relation he/she was both the observed and the observer; he/she both exerted power and was subjected to power.

While Bakhtin argues that the operation of power has a single direction passing from those who rule towards the ruled, Foucault suggests that the operation of power occurs not only in the court or in the prison but in every sphere of life, and not only between the ruler and the ruled. There is not one possessor of power; on the contrary, the locus of power alters constantly through diverse mechanisms much more complicated than the one Bakhtin suggests.

Why we put this dichotomy between Bakhtin and Foucault at the centre of our argument is a question to be answered both in terms of the books we will be studying and in its relation to war itself. In other words why the disagreement between Bakhtin and Foucault serves as the theoretical background of our study largely depends on the fact that we see in each post-war novel we are studying an implicit thematic concern that can be traced both in Bakhtin's and Foucault's thinking. Therefore the conflict between the basic assumptions of Foucault and Bakhtin finds a resonance in the novels we will be dealing with. For instance it is easy to detect both a quest for the Bakhtinian idea of heteroglossia (unity within plurality) and a Foucauldian sense of fissure and discontinuity underlying the thematic concerns of The Great Gatsby. In addition to this, we also argue that

Tender is the Night can provide a suitable setting for exploring the incompatibility between Bakhtin's idea of the existence of original forms and Foucault's idea of the existence of a discourse that forms itself on the basis of supposed originals. Moreover Tender is the Night has a very close resemblance to Foucault's symbol of the *panopticon* in offering a variety of settings that stage the Foucauldian *disciplinary mechanisms*. On the other hand, we will study Hemingway novels displaying themes and symbols that are central to the Foucault- Bakhtin disagreement. For example, A Farewell to Arms depicts a post-war scene where a seemingly Bakhtinian dialogism disintegrates and turns into an individual fragmentation.

The First World War and the aftermath of the war introduced many shifts and changes into the social and literary scene. According to Bradbury and Mc Farlane, the aftermath of the First World War was an era characterized by "capitalism and industrial acceleration" which brought the reinterpretation of the world in terms of the "disestablishing of communal reality" and giving up "conventional notions of reality". "All realities have become subjective fictions" argue Bradbury and Mc Farlane. The aftermath of the World War marked the end of a universe of "reality and culture", and modernist art cherished the decomposition of "old frames of reference".(Bradbury,1976:19-55) The controversy between Bakhtin and Foucault is essential to an interpretation of post-war texts within modernist tradition since postwar era in literature marks the disintegration of old unities, and Foucault's rejection of traditional cause and effect relationship, his disavowal of the linear development of history and his rejection of the idea of origins and unities are all strictly in coherence with a modernist interpretation of the world. Bakhtin, on the other hand, affirms the unities, bases his argument on the existence of first and prior forms and recognizes a dialectical struggle in the formation of the self which can only exist in relation to others. In other words, the subjectivity of the individual must be affirmed and converted into the objectivity of the world. The sole way of self-affirmation, according to Bakhtin, is to come to terms with the other's gaze. The novels we will be studying manifest the general characteristics of the modernist era, and they cherish quite a relative interpretation of the world along with the

disintegration of the ready-made wholes. In that respect the novels are in accord with a Foucauldian outlook.

Another significant dichotomy between Bakhtin and Foucault is related to method. Bakhtin's approach to a text is within the post-structuralist tradition in the sense that he studies a text not as a finished piece, he considers it as a dialogue between the author and the hero and between the characters, and most importantly for him a text includes manifold voices, including that of the reader. Bakhtin uses two terms to explain muti-voicedness in language and in texts. A text is both dialogic, for there is not a single voice in it and it contains heteroglossia with the traces of ages in it. Dialogism refers to a kind of intertexuality within a text and a language. According to Bakhtin every word and every piece of writing enters into a dialogic relation with words preceding it and with words that would follow it. Therefore every word and every unit within language is both a call and a response at the same time.

> Dialogic relationships are possible not only among whole (relatively whole) utterances; a dialogic approach is possible toward any signifying part of an utterance, even toward an individual word, if that word is perceived not as the impersonal word of language but as a sign of someone else's semantic position, as the representative of another person's utterance; that is, if we hear in it someone else's voice. Thus dialogic relationship can permeate inside the utterance, even inside the individual word, as long as two voices collide within it dialogically (microdialogue, of which we spoke earlier). (Bakhtin, 2002a, 104)

In that respect Bakhtin poses a stance against Russian formalism; literature can not be studied solely through the form and language but must be considered in relation to its connection with life. However, this is not a complete split from formalism. It exhibits a similarity with the method of Propp who identified similar characters in Russian fairy tales and attributed roles to each character and argued that the pattern involved is repeated in every text (Yüksel, 1995:54). What Bakhtin focuses on is not the repetition, for he suggests that the pattern changes in relation to history. However the roots of folklore tradition can be traced in the text regardless how close the text is to folklore historically. Bakhtin identifies three roles such as

the rogue, clown and the fool and posits them as forces opposed to authority. Bakhtin argues that these roles appearing in different characters are repeated in eighteenth - century literature. In that respect he categorizes the texts and looks for its roots and origins in folklore.

Bakhtin's attitude is contrary to Foucault's analysis whose approach does not focus on a long-term transformation based on a cause and effect relationship and questions of origin but on diverse manifestations of power which must be considered in terms of discontinuity and rupture. In one of his interviews entitled "Powers and Strategies", Foucault suggest that his preoccupation is not studying ideas in their evolution and form a theory of power but to discern between them in order to understand how one object, that is disregarded previously, became an object of knowledge and how scientific discourse is built upon that object.

> The role for theory today seems to me to be just this: not to formulate the global systematic theory which holds everything in place, but to analyses the specifity of mechanisms of power, to locate the connections and extensions, to build little by little a strategic knowledge. (Foucault, 1980: 145)

Another source of Foucault's opposition to Bakhtin's way of giving a role to the rogue, clown and the fool as characters which are in constant struggle with authority can be his idea that power does not have a distinct object. There is no agent that is outside of the power structure. The reversal of this structure through parody can only be a way of recreating the struggle, but this time with different roles ascribed to the one who was previously holding the power. That is, for Foucault power is a mechanism which constantly renews its means and discourse, which does not determine stable, permanent roles for the ruled and the ruler. Thus power relations, according to Foucault,

> […..]are not localized in the relations between the state and its citizens or on the frontier between classes and that they do not merely reproduce, at the level of individuals, bodies, gestures, and behaviour, the general form of the law or government; that, although there is continuity (they are indeed articulated on this form through a whole series of complex mechanisms), there is neither analogy nor

> homology, but a specificity of mechanism and modality. Lastly, they are not univocal; they define innumerable points of confrontations, focuses of instability, each of which has its own risks of conflict, of struggles, and of an at least temporary inversion of the power relations (Foucault, 1999: 27).

One of the most important points of disagreement between Foucault and Bakhtin is Bakhtin's definition of the *carnivalesque.* One of the basic features of carnival is the fact that stable forms of social roles are effaced; the structure of society is turned upside down. Carnival signifies a release from social order and reverting to a pre-class society in which the individual becomes a part of the unity and is renewed by being a part of it. It is possible to compare Bakhtin's idea of carnival with Foucault's image of the *panopticon*[1]. According to Foucault both the panopticon and carnival can share the same features, and with respect to the observation mechanism they exhibit, they have similar features. Foucault argues that the role of the ancient carnival is taken over by the private sphere of the individual. In that respect the carnival and panopticon both offer possibilities of close and constant observation which is a modern disciplinary mechanism forming the individual. Thus carnival does not promise independence from the authority; on the contrary, modern forms of carnival inscribe authority within the individual. Bakhtin identifies carnival as an independence from power; however, the panopticon for Foucault is a modern means of generating discourse and a re-creation of the individual according to the discourse. In short, what Bakhtin identifies as carnival and associates with freedom is for Foucault the panoptican in which power is reinforced through the constant surveillance of the individuals, and it is a modern means of keeping all subjects in a state of life-long imprisonment. In that sense, if panopticon is taken not in the literal sense but as an image symbolizing the power mechanism pervading all through society, as a means of forming the knowledge

[1] Bentham's Panopticon, which is an architectural form, is the image used by Foucault in order to visualise the new system of power based on observation of the individual and the creation of discourse. It is "an annular building at the centre of which there is a tower pierced with wide windows that open onto the iner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other, on the outside, allows the ligh to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schhol boy."
(Foucault, 1991a: 200)

about the individual and shaping him/her accordingly and as a method of offering the most fearful as the most pleasurable or vice versa, or not as an institution but as a general system, then it approximates to Bakhtin's definition of carnival in which the individual merges with the community and overcomes authority. For Bakhtin carnival involves

> a) The suspension of hierarchical structure and forms of fear, reverence and etiquette connected with it;
>
> b) Collapsing of distance between people, leading to their free and familiar contact;
>
> c) The flowering of eccentricity as a departure from the "rut of life";
>
> d) a free and familiar attitude towards values, thoughts, phenomena and things leading to contacts and combinations of sacred and profane, high and low and so on;
>
> e) Profanation and blasphemy, obscenities and bringing down to earth by highlighting the reproductive powers of the earth and the body;
>
> f) Ritual mock crowning and uncrowning of a carnival king, based on the trope of perpetual death and renewal;
>
> g) Celebrating the relativity of symbolic order (Brandist, 2002: 139)

According to Bakhtin merging with the community and carnival does not signify the loss of uniqueness; on the contrary, the more one participates in the unity the more unique one becomes. However, for Foucault, if there even is such a unity, merging with the unity is not a way of protecting uniqueness; on the contrary it is a process of normalization and adjusting oneself into the knowledge built around one.

A Farewell to Arms provides us with examples of this normalization process by initially presenting its protagonist as deeply attached to a communal cause and showing his gradual separation from the commune as he is attached to seemingly private family sphere. Even in a world of two people, even in an apparently private life that draws a strict boundary between the protagonist and the war, Henry (the protagonist) is not exempt from an inclination towards being immobile and forming a family. Even though the protagonist separates himself from a communal life and is attached to a more private family sphere, the protagonist is under the influence of post-war discourse. Therefore the incompatibility between

Foucault and Bakhtin regarding the issue of individual and society relations is central to the books we will be studying.

Foucault, in his analyses of how discourse maintains the working of power mechanisms ascribes a primary role to psychiatry and the process whereby it became a science in the nineteenth century. It was insanity, through which psychiatry claimed an important role in legal machinery and formed its discourse. In short, this change in the definition of the criminal was achieved not through the changes the nature of crime went over in the concrete sense, but through forming a criminal psychology. In that sense it was this mythification of the criminal that gave psychology a primary role in legislation.

Bakhtin underlined a move away from concrete physicality to idealism that is identified with romanticism in the nineteenth century literature. According to Bakhtin certain concepts such as death and sexual activity are treated as concepts not beyond themselves; they are taken as phenomena which acquire no meaning beyond their literal meanings in the Renaissance novel. Sexuality and death do not acquire significance beyond themselves; they are associated with renewal in this life in their concrete sense in Renaissance novel. However, Bakhtin criticizes Romanticism and Symbolism for presenting death and sexuality not as a part of this life but as concepts that designate to the existence of another life. In short Bakhtin and Foucault are in agreement with each other in identifying a similar element of mythification in nineteenth century literature and psychiatry and they both have the same de-mythifying attitude in their approaches. Therefore post-war novel and the phenomenon of war will be considered in the light of this de-mythifying tendency common in Foucault and Bakhtin.

For Foucault forming of a discourse around sexuality has been achieved through the time-honoured method of confession in Christianity and in Psychoanalysis in the nineteenth century. Through confession both the idea of "sin", "crime" and the notion of a to-be-achieved "whole" is defined. Confession, the repetition of the occasion that harmed the ego, or the idea of "guilt" that distanced

the individual from the "whole" in his mind strengthened both the ideas of "perfection" and the "imperfection". According to Foucault confession is "one of the main rituals we rely on for the production of "truth", and literature also has complicity in fixing the role of confession by ordering "according to the infinite task of extracting from the depths of oneself, in between the words, a truth which the very form of the confession holds out like a shimmering mirage" (Foucault, 1998: 59). Thus confession in both literature and in scientific and religious fields confides in the animation of "some forgotten knowledge, or in a certain primal trace" and giving shape to the forgotten knowledge or the experience that is confessed. Therefore post-war literature, although it is not always the experience of the war that is dealt with, also shapes the experience through the course it takes in the plot and through the memory it animates. In that respect post-war novel in the modernist tradition is the recurrence of the fixation in the past and, although the form of the narrative may not be confessional, is thematically confessional in the sense that it casts a retrospective glance to the characters' lives. Therefore, in coherence with the role of confession previously in the religious practice and later on in the field of psychology, post-war novel is the re-shaping of the traumatic event and the pleasure that resides in the act of repeating.

Bakhtin's approach to the tradition of confession is completely different from that of Foucault, who claimed that confession is the production of truth. Bakhtin ignores the role of confession in forming the discourse and the knowledge around the individual. Bakhtin does not consider confession a truth making process. Instead, he takes it as a form of "an accounting rendered to oneself" by ignoring the complicity of an immanent second party in the act of confession, whereas he acknowledges the existence of an "ethical ought to be" in which "the other with his special, privileged approach is excluded" and whose main principle is "the pure relationship of the "I" to itself", he does not question what determines this "ethical ought to be" (Bakhtin,1990:142,143) In that sense he does not only disregard the motive behind confession, which is the idea of "sin" in religion or the individual's endeavour to cope with the unpleasurable elements of the past, he also, contrary to Foucault, does not question the "ethical ought to be". Therefore while accepting it as

a morally shaping event, rather than questioning the idea of morality underneath the act of confession, he takes it as the product of a "morally acting consciousness"; as an event between one's own consciousness and oneself. However, if it is not another human being or god that one is addressing during confession, the confessor confesses something that reveals the idea of "guilt" and "sinfulness". Therefore in every act of confession, either in the presence of second party or not, there is an "ethical ought-to-be". Foucault questions the formation of a morality that makes confession a necessity, and the formation of knowledge through confession. For him confession is an act of knowledge making. The questionability of the concept of morality that reveals the sense of "wholeness" and the fragmentation of that "wholeness" is missing in Bakhtin's theory.

Postwar novel is concerned with the idea of past as consisting of fissures and unresolved events. Therefore retrospective telling within postwar novels is a way of coping with the fragmentedness and the meaninglessness of the event itself. In that sense retrospection and confession, both as elements of theme and form, is the activity of reshaping the event. We can consider retrospection in postwar literature as a confessional act that aims to give meaning to an unresolved event. The study of modernist novel requires coping with the questions of what the post war idea of a "unity" in the national mind was and how it was formed in the literature and through the literature of that specific era. Therefore if postwar literature is a way of coping with the past it assumes the role of a fictitious confession as a shaping act. So Foucault's approach, which takes confession as a method of re-creation, is more applicable to postwar novel in the modernist tradition.

A common point in Foucault's and Bakhtin's theories is their refusal to reach for a holistic, all-inclusive cause in their explanations. They point out the diverse manifestations of discourse and focus on the example rather than the cause. For example, rather than "Linguistically observable and fixable markers" Bakhtin's method is based on studying the utterance where it manifests itself, where it is applied to real life.

> To study the word as such, ignoring the impulse that reaches out beyond it is just as senseless as to study psychological experience outside the context of that real life toward which it was directed and by which it is determined. (Bakhtin, 2002a: 292).

A similar method is adopted by Foucault, especially in dealing with the working of power. For Foucault power should be studied in terms of its "external manifestations"; its "field of application" rather than finding out the causes of why people want to dominate, and a distinct strategy they follow in order to reveal how discourse proliferates and what other kind of knowledge uses that specific kind of discourse.

> [….] Instead, it is a case of studying power at the point where its intention, if it has one, is completely invested in its real and effective practices. What is needed is a study of power in its external visage, at the point where it is in direct and immediate relationship with that which we can provisionally call its object, its target, its field of application, there- that is to say- where it installs itself and produces its real effects (Foucault, 1980: 97).

The stylistic and thematic characteristics of the modernist novel can be the field of such "external manifestations" of power and the discourse it generates. The fact that the modernist novel implies fixations in time, its being a backward glance reveal that post-war novel can be a part of the external manifestations of power by contributing to the creation of the myth of postwar, by determining a specific meaning for the rendering of the war experience. In other words postwar novel would specify a certain way of experiencing the war, a certain way of putting war into discourse and create the conditions of being affected by the war. In other words, the modernist novel can contribute to the creation of the truth of war.

According to Foucault the repeated discourse, including those of the initiators of a scientific discourse such as psychoanalysis, also transforms the original one; repetition never ceases to modify the original one in order to adjust it to the studies of another field. For example, when criminology refers back to Freud and uses the discourse of psychoanalysis in order to apply it in its own field, changes it. In his essay "What is an Author", Foucault argues that a reexamination of Marx's

texts would modify the shape of Marxism. Thus every new repetition, every reexamination in scientific discourse brings with it the transformation of the original. Therefore the endeavour to return back to an original state transforms the original and renews the discourse.

> This return (to the origin), which is part of the discursive field itself, never stops modifying it. This return is not a historical supplement that would be added to the discursivity, or merely an ornament; on the contrary, it constitutes an effective and necessary task of transforming the discursive practice itself (Foucault, 2000a:219)

If we apply Foucault's argument into the field of literature we can conclude that the repetitive characteristic of modernism, with respect to both its form and content, while repeating an urge towards returning back to earlier, original forms also transforms the earlier. Then one of our central questions is why the modernist novels we will study articulate an urge to rely on repetitions and a quest for the original.

Walter Benjamin, in his essay "Thesis on the Philosophy of History", draws the image of history as follows by referring to a Klee painting named "Angelus Novus". The painting illustrates an angel who proceeds into the future while looking at the "wreckage" of the past.

> This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to say, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed (Benjamin, 1969: 257)

Benjamin defines history not as an ongoing juxtaposition of events but as a pile of moments, fixations that "flashes up at a moment of danger". If the past is unresolved (unredeemed) in the consciousness, the unresolved, which is the wreckage in Klee painting, will be repeated. According to Benjamin the repetition also modifies the event: "To articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it the way it really was". The modification occurs at a moment of danger,

post-war era in our case, as a flash of memory in order to sustain it and prevent its extinction.(Benjamin, 1969:255) Benjamin's argument reinforces Foucault's contention that transforming the event in a modified form into the sphere of language and the discourse of history makes it usable in a moment of danger. Therefore, both the memory and the moment it is used are transformed.

Similarly Freud in his discussion in "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" deals with the "compulsion to repeat". According to Freud dreams that occur after the traumatic experience repeat the occasion during which the trauma occurred. When traumatic neurosis is concerned the dreams repeat the moment of the trauma.

> "Now dreams occurring in traumatic neuroses have the characteristic of repeatedly bringing back into the situation of his accident, a situation from which he wakes up in another fright…….the patient is, one might say, fixated to his trauma." (Freud, 1984: 282)

By repeating the unpleasurable experience throughout life the ego gains mastery over it. And yet every repetition is at the same time the renewal of the accident. If we liken the formation of a literary text to the occurrence of a dream, the former occurring as a result of the unconscious of the individual, the latter is affected by the collective unconscious, we can conclude that post –war literature is the repetition of the trauma of the war in symbolic forms, and it is also the renewal of this experience. This is for Foucault the creation of discourse, and for Bakhtin it is heteroglossia. As Foucault and Bakhtin suggest every utterance creates a new discourse, every literary text includes heteroglossia, so post-war literature renews the war experience by altering it, by putting it into discourse and adding it to the heteroglossia of language.

The aftermath of the trauma and post-war experience is a process of whole-making which itself makes use of the shattered pieces of an ideal state, which is the supposed perfection of the pre-war. In other words, postwar stage can be considered a recuperation of the lost wholeness that was associated with the years preceding the war. In his study entitled The Great War and Modern Memory (1977) Paul Fussell

draws attention to an irony of situation in the expression of prewar and postwar stages.

> Here the irony of situation arises from a collision between innocence and awareness [….] The contrast between before and after here will remind us of the relation between, say, the golden summer of 1914 and the appalling December of that year [….]. (Fussell, 1977:5)

Therefore prewar is associated with a mythic perfection and wholeness whereas the aftermath of the war introduces the shattering of the idea of "whole". Here it must be emphasized that the pretrauma stage or prewar stage may not be ideal states at all. We cannot talk about the existence of an original, naïve and a preferable stage that coincides with the pretrauma or prewar. In that respect the pre-war stage that is associated with a kind of "innocence" and "wholeness", a stage which serves as the model of perfection that was be reachieved in the aftermath of the war, is also transformed into a myth during an ongoing whole-making process in postwar era. Therefore, both the idea of "whole" to be achieved and the reminiscence of a "perfection" that is peculiar to prewar stage are transformed so as to retain their continuity. Therefore when creating a new discourse post-war novel makes use of a shattered idea of "whole" that is supposed to be a state of perfection that resided in the years preceding the war, and it might present that how impossible it is to achieve an earlier form of perfection in a modern context. While doing this the modernist novel transforms both the earlier state of "perfection" and the present state of absurdity and incompatibility.

*Bakhtin's and Foucault's attitudes towards making of unities and wholes are quite different. For Bakhtin entities relate to each other so as to make up a whole; a whole is a consummation in which each part within the whole may remain unique and original. According to Bakhtin, a whole is achieved through the struggle of parts. For example, *heteroglossia* – a term Bakhtin employs to signify the diversity of speeches - is achieved through the interaction of centrifugal and centripetal forces. One is impossible without the other. (Bakhtin, 2002b:75) Thus, there is an opposition reaching towards a state of being together. Bakhtin explains

this process as *architectonics*[2] which is the experience of making an aesthetic whole out of concrete parts. This experience of making a whole is not given but achieved, and during this process of whole making each part that will take part in the unity can retain its uniqueness. When considered in terms of post-war literature the parts of an earlier ideal form can remain original while taking part in a new discourse. Foucault on the other hand is more concerned with the disintegration of this unity. According to him, a unity is a given – it is formed as a basic tendency- and what should be achieved is the disintegration of this unity. The ordering of meaning by making up unities, "architectonics" in Bakhtin's terms is conceived by Foucault as a restricting, obliterating act rather than a freeing achievement contrary to the one Bakhtin suggests. Foucault's criticism aims at studying whole-making processes, architectonics in Bakhtin's terminology, and what these processes over-emphasize or diminish for the sake of creating the whole, in short, how the whole is formed in such a way that the objects upon which it is shaped are recreated. Foucault does not think in terms of unities that are "given". Foucault thinks in terms of heterogeneities which are misrepresented as unities. Contrary to Foucault, the stability of parts making the whole is central to Bakhtin's analysis. He argues that, "no whole should homogenize the variety of its parts-it should not, in other words, reduce their heteroglossia to the level of a monologue." (Bakhtin 2002b) For Foucault the whole-making procedure substitutes every part to a kind of re-shaping, and the procedure itself alters constantly. There is a constant interaction of each part in order to make itself meaningful in the ever created whole. In this process every item shapes every other one; every one is in a constant relation to the other. This recreation process of each item and the whole-making procedure are limiting. Bakhtin also is in agreement with Foucault in the sense that "there are no things in themselves, no possibility of an actual object understood as it- itself". However Bakhtin explains this interaction between the entities and the whole as a positive process on the part of the subjects which are not constraints to each other but "possibilities".

[2] Architectonics is intended to describe an activity : the relations it orders are always in a state of dynamic tension. Architectonics is like architecture insofar as it is about building a whole through the manipulation of relations between parts. (Bakhtin, 1990: 23)

> "[….] the dialogic subject, existing only in a world of consciousness, is free to perceive others not as a constraint, but as a possibility: others are neither hell nor heaven, but a necessary condition for both." (Bakhtin, 1990:38)

Thus the basic conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault emerges when their approaches to whole-making, in Bakhtin's terms, and meaning-making, in Foucault's terms, are considered. Foucault deals with the same process of whole-making in negative terms as a restricting process and strives to disintegrate the whole into its parts contrary to Bakhtin who deals with it in positive terms, as an activity making each item unique and unified at the same time.

In the light of all what has been explained so far the basic conflict between Foucault's and Bakhtin's approaches to warfare can be defined more easily. Although Foucault does not make a direct reference to literature in his analyses of power, he suggests in his lectures that there are no distinct boundaries between the war process and peace time. According to Foucault power mechanism can be likened to war in its concrete sense, and peacetime, during which the struggle for power continues, is not the termination of war but the continuation of war by other means:

> Then again, there is a second reply we might make: if power is properly speaking the way in which relations of forces are deployed and given concrete expressions, rather than analyzing it in terms of cession, contract or alienation, or functionally in terms of its maintenance of the relations of production, should we not analyze it primarily in terms of struggle, conflict and war? One would then confront the original hypothesis to the effect that power is war, a war continued by other means. (Foucault, 1980: 90)

Therefore, postwar literature, although it may not relate the war experience directly, can be a means of reshaping the war experience, integrating war into the pseudo-peace time during which the struggle for power continues. In other words, literature is a means to find out secure and stable points to cope with the trauma of the war through which it gives a form to this trauma. That is, literature shapes the idea of postwar experience, and re-shapes the supposed stability in history.

One important difficulty in studying modernist texts in relation to Bakhtin is the fact that Bakhtin does not refer to modernist texts. He starts with the epic tradition of the Greeks and ends up in an argument revealing the difference between the novel in Renaissance and Romanticism. Therefore the application of his theory to modernist literature necessitates some revision. However this alteration does not diminish the significance of some basic concepts such as carnivalesque, heteroglossia and dialogism in the texts. On the contrary the study will be developed on the basis of these central concepts of Bakhtin's theory.

Another obstacle is Foucault's avoidance of the use of literary texts as one of the fields, such as psychology and scientific discourse, to which he directs his criticism. However, if scientific discourse is so influential in creating the reality, literature and cinema are also influential in shaping a reality as mediums of mass media. This study concerns itself chiefly with the creation of postwar reality through literary texts and Foucault will direct us in choosing the appropriate points in the texts so as to make them usable in this study.

The novels of Hemingway and Fitzgerald imply a Foucauldian discontinuity in the perception of history, and a fixation in the past both with respect to their content and form. On the one hand we see descriptions of time going on as a natural process concretized with images of a stream or an elevator especially in Hemingway's novels. But on the other hand there are images of displacement within a linear flux such as pebbles in a river, exploded bridges over the rivers, destroyed and evacuated farm houses on the roads, which are signs of unresolved events challenging continuity. If the former are serial, the latter are disruptive. With respect to form, although the novels seem to follow a traditional plot line initially, they never resolve in a traditional way. There is a compulsion to repeat the traditional plot line in which the character is constantly prevented from achieving a task that is required for the fulfillment of his/her idea of perfection. However, the plot does not offer a traditional resolution in which the character reaches his/her goals. The novels conclude with the exhibition of the catastrophe of an old form of ideal within a

modern context. For example in A Farewell to Arms the death of Catherine during childbirth when the novel is about to be resolved with the conclusion of Henry's achieved ideal of finding a home is the failure of a previous traditional resolution in a modernist context. On the other hand Gatsby's failure to fulfill the model of Benjamin Franklin is again a good example of the failure of the model of perfection in a postwar modernist context. In Tender is the Night, the reader is tempted to perceive the psychiatrist Dick as a character modeled after his father the priest. However, Dick, as a modern figure, fails to achieve the model of traditional completeness and perfection, which is represented by the figure of father. Therefore both with respect to their form and thematic concerns the novels disrupt linearity and unity.

Although Fitzgerald and Hemingway are both in the modernist tradition they differ significantly with respect to their dissimilar ways of dealing with the trauma represented by the war. First of all their syntax- Fitzgerald's use of long sentences, Hemingway's use of simple sentence structure- reveals a dichotomy in their approach to the same experience. Hemingway's focus on the details of the setting, his description of even the petty movements of characters and particulars of every day language, the repetitive structure of both the plot and the speeches of the characters follow the common traits usually associated with modernism. Hemingway differs significantly from Fitzgerald's way of presenting the characters, setting and the plot. Fitzgerald does not adhere to the movement's formalistic features. Although Fitzgerald and Hemingway deal with the same subjects on the thematic level, their method of dealing with them changes.

The most obvious dissimilarity stems from the number of characters presented in the novels of these two writers. Fitzgerald's novels are abundant in characters whereas Hemingway uses a limited number of characters. However, the diminution in the number of characters does not necessarily influence the polyphony in the novel. Polyphony, according to Bakhtin, is the multivoicedness within one character. Bakhtin uses the term in order to describe Dostoevsky's characters which exhibit the possibility of a variety of voices within one character and variety of

themes at one moment. The term polyphony should not be confused with the word heteroglossia, because heteroglossia always designates to a struggle between centrifugal forces and centripetal forces. In the idea of heteroglossia there is a dialectic struggle that ends up with a higher unity and a higher consciousness. Reaching at heteroglossia is never the issue with the modernist novel, because the modernist novel does not draw a struggle between two easily distinguished and differentiated struggling forces such as official and unofficial. In order for a heteroglossia to happen there must be a belief in the unities and there must be a dual perception giving alternatives for one another, such as the oppressive authority against freeing carnival, the realm of official language against the realm of folk's humour. This kind of a dual perception and reliance on unities never exist in Foucault and the modernist novels we have studied.

Polyphony, contrary to heteroglossia, does not define a dialectic (dialogic) struggle between two forces such as centripetal forces and centrifugal forces. Polyphony defines a variety in one character and manifold possibilities at one moment. Bakhtin explains polyphony by referring to Dostoevsky's characters:

> This stubborn urge to see everything as coexisting, to perceive and show all things side by side and simultaneous, as if they existed in space and not in time, leads Dostoevsky to dramatize, in space, even internal contradictions and internal stages in the development of a single person-forcing a character to converse with his own double, with the devil, with his alter ego, with his own caricature (Ivan and the Devil, Ivan and Smerdyakov, Raskolnikov and Svidrigailov, and so forth). [….]This trait finds its external expression in Dostoevsky's passion for mass scenes, his impulse to concentrate, often at expense of credibility, as many persons and themes as possible in one place at one time, that is, his impulse to concentrate in a single moment the greatest possible qualitative diversity. [….] But none of these contradictions and bifurcations ever became dialectical, they were never set in motion along a temporal path or in an evolving sequence an eternal harmony [….]. (Bakhtin, 2002b:91-92)

When we apply this definition to the modern novel, we can conclude that stream of consciousness, as a modernistic technique, also includes polyphony. We do not require a huge number of characters for polyphony to occur in the novel,

because even in the novels, which include a great many characters – such as those of Fitzgerald's – the genesis of dialogue is not formed by the variety of characters but from a postwar discourse which exhibits an intertwinement of scientific and mythological elements. Therefore the discourse is not created by the characters; on the contrary the characters are created by the discourse. What we see in Hemingway novels is not a polyvocality that is the result of a variety of characters but a variety of discourses within one character. It is a contradictory discourse of post-war America that creates Nicole both as the object of psychological treatment, and as a woman of mobility. It is in Dick, the narrator of Gatsby, that we see a polyphony containing the claims of nineteenth century transcendentalism and twentieth century commercialism. Therefore the excess of characters in Fitzgerald's novels does not signify a variety in numbers but the positions held within the power structure. Thus, although there are many characters in Fitzgerald's novel, what we must concern ourselves with is their shift of roles and positions. Therefore we can detect polyphony in the modernist novels where each character is created by a multiplicity of discourses and where settings offer possibilities of more than one way of perception.

As suggested earlier, modernism does not signify a break from the war. It is a protraction of the trauma that compels repetition and retrieval of the secure points in the past. The modernist novel and particularly Hemingway's and Fitzgerald's novels present a sort of hauntedness by the past as their common feature. However similar their concern is, the points they focus on and the way they deal with it vary in some respects. In both Fitzgerald's and Hemingway's novels the themes "going back home", " a search for earlier forms" can be considered as "centripetal forces"- a term Bakhtin uses in explaining the formation of language- where all movement, the aim of action is concentrated. However, in Fitzgerald's novels the idea of searching for roots assumes a more concrete meaning. The characters in both *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night* are all presented in their connection to their ancestral past; there is no character that is illustrated out of its connection to the past in the concrete sense. That is one of the most distinguishing feature of the concept of past in Fitzgerald's novels which means that the fixation occurs in youth or in childhood, in

a more recent past, in father figures. However, when the novel in its entirety is considered this fixation to childhood acquires a symbolic meaning implying fixation on the national ideals. For example Gatsby's fixation occurs in his poverty-stricken youth during which he was attached to the figure of Benjamin Franklin as a model. Gatsby's fixation clearly represents fixation to the national ideals in this case. What differentiates Hemingway from Fitzgerald on this point is Hemingway's way of presenting the characters not in relation to their ancestral ties but in their relation to the new setting that breaks their connection from the family. In that respect Hemingway also deals with the theme of the alienation of the character from its near surroundings and recent past but with more emphasis on the American ideals as the criteria of "wholeness", and the universal ideals such as the achievement of the heroic deed. As opposed to attachment to a setting Hemingway characters are attached to a group that would represent an idea of wholeness. That distinction leads to the supposition that Fitzgerald concerned himself more with the themes that are peculiar to America than Hemingway who dealt with the same issues but with a more universal approach. Therefore the centripetal (official) element in Hemingway novels has a universal aspect, such as the recognition of the group identity, attachment to the group, the institution of marriage and the necessity to be settled. Regardless of the slight differences between them, both Hemingway and Fitzgerald testify to Foucault's concept of historicity which argues that history is discontinuous, arbitrary and is characterized by "absence" which is at work in all discourse. Because both of the seemingly clashing elements of heteroglossia (a wholeness formed by the struggle of two parts) are negated, nullified and there remains the patchy, contradictory discourse of postwar era, which does not follow the rules of a dialogic struggle.

One of the most distinguishing features of Bakhtin and Foucault is their approach to power. Where Bakhtin identifies carnival as opposed to power and authority and where he draws attention to binary oppositions in the working of power, Foucault's definition of the panopticon, which is similar to carnival as a mechanism providing permanent visibility in the character, assures the automatic functioning of power and explains the functioning of power not in terms of binary

oppositions but "multiple separations" (Foucault,1991b:198) Therefore, this basic distinction between Bakhtin and Foucault with respect to power will form the basis of this study. The study will focus on the modern techniques of power and settings where a certain discourse is created and the ways each character is defined according to his/her relation to the mechanism. As a matter of fact, neither the power mechanism nor the character remains stable in this relation. At some points in the plot, in the narrative technique and in the roles of the characters there is a certain kind of shift and re-definition that makes these novels of modernism prone to an analysis based on shifting roles and subjection to a re-defined power mechanism in various ways. However, as has been pointed out earlier, although Hemingway and Fitzgerald deal with similar themes, they have dissimilar ways of dealing with them. The novels to be studied exhibit the same features with respect to character roles within the power structure; the settings chosen by each writer to exhibit this are different. Fitzgerald's focus is concentrated on forms of modern "panopticon" such as party scenes, psychiatric hospitals, cinema parlors where power mechanism works in pleasurable and scientific spheres. In short Fitzgerald points towards more modern settings; more modern means of forming an observation mechanism where the individual is both shaped by others and shapes others. In the modern panopticons there is not a repressive, punitive force that requires acknowledgement from those who submit. The characters take part in it willy-nilly without the existence of an omnipresent authority figure. In that respect it is easier to identify Foucault's concept of power in Fitzgerald's novels in which "power is not exercised simply as an obligation or a prohibition on those who do not have it; it invests them, is transmitted by them and through them." (Foucault, 1991b:27) On the other hand, Hemingway focuses on more traditional settings of power struggle. In that respect he emphasizes the incongruity between modern forms of power struggle and the traditional ideals. The characters have an idea of wholeness, but this cannot be achieved in a modern context. In Hemingway's novels the settings where a power struggle takes place in its traditional forms are the war and the bullfighting scenes. That kind of a physical struggle between two forces is presented in parallelism with power struggle in the modern sense which does not exhibit an apparent struggle

between two forces but the intrinsic workings of struggle in a hotel room or in fiesta scenes.

The idea of war requires traditional ideals and commonly-held beliefs to reinforce it; war becomes a unifying force as far as a common enemy is created and challenged in terms of a unifying, all – pervading discourse that is recognized by the members of a society. But how does this common antagonist reshape the idea of war with a view to sustaining its role as a centripetal force in peacetime. The discourse that the war depends on requires new images, new objects, and what it creates as the common evil at one moment may not have the appearance of an antagonist but something that is looked for, something that is to be fulfilled, a whole to be achieved at another moment. Therefore the study will focus on the creation of new images of "the whole" and the idea of unity which transforms the former images of the common "antagonist" of war time into something pleasurable in peacetime in order to implement it within the mechanism of power as a new way of struggle in which every individual assumes a constantly changing role. In short, the question will be how a discourse, that defines and creates the opponent, can re-define it as a proponent. What sort of mechanisms does it implement to re-define its central antagonists and protagonists and how the goal of panoptican is achieved in scenes of carnival. Literary texts are both the fields in which a discourse is represented and one of the tools of creating post war discourse. While Hemingway and Fitzgerald concentrate on the pseudo peacetime as their temporal setting and depict the way it is experienced, they also form the rules of experiencing a post-war trauma. In that case, in accordance with Freud's idea that every repetition of trauma in memory leads to the renewal of the experience, Hemingway's and Fitzgerald's texts become tools for the creation of a post-war reality.

As we have so far discussed Bakhtin and Foucault offer conflicting answers to the question of power and creation of discourse. Their point of departure regarding the question of power will form the study's theoretical background, and the four novels in the modernist tradition - *A Farewell to Arms*, *The Sun also Rises* by Hemingway and *Tender is the Night* and *The Great Gatsby* by Fitzgerald- will be

studied in terms of this conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault. The study will focus on the images that have significance in the texts, the settings where power struggle is redefined and take a new course, the characters' changing relation to a renewed power mechanism and their re-definition at some points in the plot. Therefore rather than the reading of the plot in its relation to time as a continual flux of events and spaces following one after the other, the texts will be analyzed in relation to fixations in time and space.

CHAPTER 1

THE GREAT GATSBY

1-1 Fragmentation and dialogism

The novel by F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby is of concern to this study in terms of its having been written in 1925, the post-war period, and for the fact that it is one of the novels that illustrates modernist concerns in the American literary scene in the first quarter of the century. The temporal setting of the novel (1922) is an era in which a transformation is observed in cultural formations due to rapid developments in the scientific and technical fields. The novel represents a clash between the nineteenth century transcendentalism, which offers an idea of unity concerning the place of the humans in the universe and a coherence of nature and society in matters of time and space, and the idea of fragmentation in the modernist era. Thus as a novel written in the aftermath of the war and in the heyday of technological development, its argument is centered on the negation of a transcendentalist unity of the nineteenth century as opposed to the idea of fragmentation in the twentieth century: the collapse of values that are peculiar to the pre-war society and the individual's endeavor to regain integrity and a coherence that would offer and create a new kind of selfhood and achieve a secure place for the individual. In other words, The Great Gatsby is a novel which tells the story of a twentieth century selfhood that aspires to create an order out of the chaotic with a view to forming a new unity that would secure the tradition of the prewar era by integrating it into the modern context. In this regard the content of The Great Gatsby coincides with the novel's form, which presents an intentional repetition of a traditional form, by integrating it with the modernist demands of the novel as a genre. However modernist novel follows two distinct trends with respect to its form. The traditional components of modernist novel are distinguished with its attempt to unify the demands of other artistic forms such as painting with literature. According to Murray Roston this was the period of experimentation manifested in the works of Faulkner, Joyce, Eliot and Woolf. The second trend exhibits the elimination of experimental innovations and pursues instead a return to more traditional forms of

narrative. The works of Hemingway and Fitzgerald can be included in the second trend whose goal was an experimentation limited to the possibilities of each art form's qualities "intrinsic to its specific art form" (Roston 1999: 242).

In order to depict this difference of form between the two trends in Modernist novel, Faulkner's nonlinear narrative technique and his use of stream of consciousness in The Sound and The Fury (1929) can be compared to Fitzgerald's use of a linear time sequence and his way of employing a single narrator for all the chapters of The Great Gatsby. Although both authors have similar thematic concerns, fragmentation and the primary importance of the subjective concept of time rather than calendar time, Hemingway and Faulkner differ in the way they present the dilemma of the modern individual. For instance, Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury is divided into four sections - namely April Seventh, 1928, June Second, 1910, and April Sixth 1928, April Eighth, 1928 - each of which is narrated by different narrators, reflecting the pre-dominance of time in the mind rather than the time of the clock or the calendar. On the other hand, Nick, Fitzgerald's narrator in The Great Gatsby presents the events in a linear time sequence, although with flashbacks going back to prewar era. Each character's perception of that era is presented in the novel retrospectively, and prewar era is projected onto postwar era, which is the temporal setting of the novel. In other words the present and the past do not merge into each other inseparably within the narrative as is the case with Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury, but separated from each other distinctly; the reader reads the whole narrative with the awareness of the existence of a calendar time. Therefore, although both trends deal with the priority of time in the mind and the disjuncture between the concept of time in the mind and time according to watch or calendar, Fitzgerald projects the characters' incoherent sense of time onto the official calendar time and implies the existence of an acknowledged, numerical concept of time that flows seamlessly on the calendar as opposed to fathers and Daisies who change the direction of seamless flow of the numbers. Therefore as well as characters' perception of time, there exists a numerical sense of time as an opposing temporal dynamic within the narrative.

Faulkner's use of stream of consciousness marked by unpunctuated sentences and grammatically incorrect sentences in characters' speeches implies the fact that Faulkner in particular and the first trend of modernist novel in general ignore an acknowledged sense of "normality" as a criterion and as a justification of characters' dilemma and their fixation in time. In other words, characters' fixation in time is given within the the novels' juxtaposition of events, which is non-linear. For instance, if the narrative does not follow a linear sequence, this nonlinearity is so arranged that it is in coherence with the character's rupture. The sole reality is the characters' reality with respect to time and space. The parts in which stream of consciousness are used in The Sound and the Fury exemplify this. The shift of the narrative to stream of consciousness is generally abrupt and is reflected in the novel in the same way as it is experienced by the characters.

> I found the gasoline in Shreve's room and spread the vest on the table, where it would be flat, and opened the gasoline.
> *the first car in town a girl Girl that's what Jason couldn't bear smell of gasoline making him sick then got madder than ever because a girl had no sister but Benjamin Benjamin the child of my sorrowful if I'd just had a mother so I could say Mother Mother* It took a lot of gasoline[….] (Faulkner 1995:171).

On the other hand, characters' fixation in time in The Great Gatsby and the flashback sections are not indicated by unpunctuated sentence structure, or the shifts are not abrupt; their connection with calendar and with grammar is not abandoned. In other words, the consciousness in the characters of The Great Gatsby sustain its activity in the punctuated and grammatically correct sentences although the characters, and especially Gatsby, lead their lives in pursuit of an unconquered past ideal. A paragraph from The Great Gatsby reveals this difference between the first trend of the modernist novel and the second trend in their use of stream of consciousness:

> His (Gatsby's) life had been confused and disordered since then, but if he could once return to a certain starting place and go over it slowly, he could find out what the thing was…
> …One Autumn night, five years before, they had been walking down the street when the leaves were falling, and they came to a place where there were no trees and the sidewalk was white with

> moonlight. They stopped here and turned toward each other ….. (Fitzgerald, 1994:117).

Even the fact that Gatsby's past is narrated through the agency of the narrator Nick justifies the idea of the presence of another consciousness, eliminates the subjectivity of the character and introduces a level of objectivity into the narration of the past, which is the point of fixation for the character. Therefore, there is incoherence with respect to form and the use of modernist devices between two trends of modernist writing. However, irrespective of their using different devices in order to present the rupture and the inclination to repeat in the modern consciousness, these two trends both have similar concerns with respect to the thematic concerns of the novel.

Paul Fussell in his study The Great War and Modern Memory argues by referring to Sasoon's poetry that the process of the war imposes binary oppositions on the individual's perception process. The process of war experience marked by binary oppositions led to a dualistic categorization in perception of time. The binary oppositions of war such as "his ground and ours; the enemy and "us"; invisibility and visibility; his dead and ours; day rest and night labour; the knowledge born of the line and the ignorant innocence at home" are transferred into the postwar era through which the perception of the individual is tempted to categorize things in terms of binary oppositions (Fussell, 1977:104). Fussell refers to Siegfried Sassoon's poetry in order to exemplify the underlying sense of duality in war memoirs.

> Even theory of narrative technique comes under the binary vision, as we learn in *Sherston's Progress*: "There are two ways of telling a good story well-the quick way and the slow way" (61). And of course there are the larger structural contrasts dominating the trilogy: sane, innocent Aunt Evelyn at home, Bapaume abroad; the past Sherston acting, the present Sasoon writing. For Sasoon "the line" divides everything and always will (Fusell, 1977:105).

Similarly in the novel The Great Gatsby, the division of characters has a dualistic quality; between an ideal state that offers a whole and a fragmented state that signifies the disintegration of a whole. Nick, the narrator is caught between an

ideal exemplified by the father's sayings and the image of a "pathfinder" who perceives everything with an innocent eye peculiar to that of the first settler. The binary opposition is between Nick's quest for the moral integrity of an imaginary past and his complicity, which he never acknowledges, in a chaotic present. Gatsby, on the other hand, who took a figure as Benjamin Franklin as a model, or, as his house suggests, a sense of nobility peculiar to feudal times, ends up as a bootlegger, a condition forced upon him in order to reach the glorious ideal embodied by Daisy. In Gatsby's mind, even the ideal form is fragmented between being a man of great success who fulfills a myth created by history and being with Daisy. Therefore there are two incompatible ideals in Gatsby: One is embodied in the image of Daisy, to reach whom wealth obtained through illegal means is required, and the other form which is associated with the image of Benjamin Franklin which connotes the idea of a "self-made" man and can be reached through a military career as the extract from the book suggests:

> "He knew that when he (Gatsby) kissed this girl, and forever wed his unutterable visions to her perishable breath, his mind would never romp again like the mind of God." (Fitzgerald, 1994: 118)

Daisy's fragmentation has this dualistic form; between a state of consciousness that teaches her the security of the past and the ability to fit herself easily into the scene of romance by waiting for Gatsby and a contrary path that offers her the safety of the marriage with the son of a well-to-do family. Sharon Ouditt in her study entitled Fighting Forces, Writing Women argues that the image of the "angel in the house"is reinforced by the propaganda of the war. Thus the romance of women as angels waiting for the return of the solider was created in order to sustain the war which took its force from the patriarchal order. For that reason in order to sustain the continuity of war, the roles that are determined by the patriarchal order were to be kept secure.

> Images of the war and images of femininity are thus organized in such a way as to reflect upon each other as part of a natural order. The magazines emphasized the moral equity of woman's subservience: loyalty to the country was thus equated with loyalty to the patriarchal order (Ouditt, 1994: 90).

Daisy is divided between two states; a contradiction which is the consequence of an incompatibility between the class conscious social code and the romance created by war-time propaganda. Daisy on the one hand adheres to romance, which offers a sense of wholeness, by waiting for the return of Gatsby from the war and on the other adheres to the social code by marrying Tom Buchanan thereby securing her identity by submitting to the socially accepted. However, it is emphasized in the novel that by flirting with Gatsby she breaks the code. The narration of events that are related to Daisy's life during the war, which she herself calls "our white girlhood", reveals the contradiction that the years during the war were not void of conflict for Daisy although they are associated with the colour white:

> She was just eighteen, two years older than me, and by far the most popular of all the young girls in Louisville. She dressed in white, and had a little white roadster...
> When I came opposite her house that morning her white roadster was beside the curb, and she was sitting in it with a lieutenant I had never seen before. They were so engrossed in each other that she didn't see me until I was five feet away 'Hello, Jordan,' she called unexpectedly. 'Please come here.'
> I was flattered that she wanted to speak to me; because of all the other girls I admired her most. She asked me if I was going to the Red Cross and make bandages. I was. Well, then, would I tell them that she couldn't come that day? The officer looked at Daisy while she was speaking, in a way that every young girl wants to be looked at sometime, and because it seemed romantic to me I have remembered the incident ever since. His name was Jay Gatsby… (Fitzgerald, 1994: 81).

According to Ouditt, the romance created by war time propaganda, and which in turn perpetuated the continuity of war through obedience to patriarchal codes, such as marriage, led to a postwar disillusionment that contradicts with the discourse of the war. The propaganda of the war that gives women a freedom and identity outside home (in the hospital and munitions factories) turned out to be oppressive after the war.

> In Three Guineas Woolf was to explain how the war allowed women and the girls out of the confines of the private house into field hospitals and munitions factories, even if it did mean that that their ticket depended on unconscious support for an institution that outside wartime inevitably oppressed them (Ouditt, 1994:201)

As for the female characters of The Great Gatsby, this situation finds its counterpart in Daisy's relationship with Gatsby, which is replete with war-time romance and her marriage with Tom which she does not want but consents to because it offers the security of convention, although this marriage shatters the romance created by the wartime propaganda. Similarly Jordan Baker, as her name suggests, is drawn with a slight tinge of masculinity; she is a sportswoman associated repetitively with the word "haughty" and illustrated as an embodiment of a masculine and feminine identity:

> "I enjoyed looking at her. She was a slender, small breasted girl, with an erect carriage, which she accentuated by throwing her body backward at the shoulders like a young cadet." (Fitzgerald, 1994:17)

Sharon Ouditt, while narrating the activities of VAD Nurses, describes the role of a nurse's uniform in forming a new female identity which is coherent with war-time propaganda and suggests that,

> Uniform had a certain mystique – it was a prize, a symbol of one's coming of age, of having entered the symbolic order….. Rather than symbolizing a fixed order, this nurse sends out messages which are received variously as repressed animal passion, sanctified self-sacrifice, mystery, flirtation and vain self-possession (Ouditt, 1994: 19)

The character Jordan Baker is drawn so as to manifest such an over-emphasized femininity strengthened by a masculine attitude. The definition of Jordan Baker as a self -possessed and "haughty" female character underlines the conflict that lies behind the feminine integrity that is symbolized with a uniform. There is a conventional idea of femininity that shares the characteristic of the era. Nick the narrator, associates Jordan Baker with a sort of maturity and strength by

comparing her to Daisy, "But there was Jordan beside me, who unlike Daisy was too wise ever to carry well-forgotten dreams form age to age." (Fitzgerald, 1994: 142)

But as readers we have already been informed by Nick that behind all her self- integrity there lays a degradation that renders her capable of cheating in a golf tournament and relying on others not to cause an accident as the conversation between Nick and Jordan reveals:

> "You are a rotten driver,' I protested. ' Either you ought to be more careful, or you oughn't drive at all.'
> 'I am careful.'
> 'No, you're not.'
> 'Well, other people are,' she said lightly.
> 'What's that got to do with it?'
> 'They'll keep out of my way,' she insisted. 'It takes two to make an accident.' (Fitzgerald, 1994:65)

The Great Gatsby, as well as presenting the self- dispersion of characters, also employs a dualistic dispersion in concepts time and space. There is a fragmented concept of time between prewar and postwar and references to a 17th century land of wilderness, East / West in general and East Egg / West Egg in particular and an in-betweeness in terms of space that is characterized by a waste land between East Egg and West Egg. An underlying concern in the novel is the in between state of the characters between a state of innocence that is associated with the past, and a chaotic present in which the supposed innocence is replaced with illegal mafia activities and a mechanical movement that presents the characters in their movement between the West and the East. Even the narrative point of view has its share of duality. For instance, although he can not see the details of the parties from the point where his house is located, Nick narrates even the smallest details of these parties in Gatsby's mansion prior to his participation in them. To give another example, Nick's narration of Gatsby's past with all its details shows that Nick's narration, in some points in the book, transforms from a first person's narrative into a third person's narrative.

The loophole of narrative is a phase that is not mentioned. The gap of the book in other words, stems from the fact that neither Gatsby nor Dick, although they both took part in the war, talks about it. When we think in terms of space and find the counter-part of this unmentioned time (the loophole, the gap) in terms of space, the time of the war has its spatial parallel, which is the "waste land" in the book. Wasteland, like the unmentioned time of the war between prewar and potwar era, is an unvisited piece of land between the East Egg and the West Egg. Just like the grotesque image of the wasteland, which is a location not visited by the characters but only observed as they drive, war time, a state between pre-war that is characterized with innocence and a post-war that is characterized with a state of hauntedness and chaos, is not mentioned. Therefore we can compare the wasteland, which is not visited by the characters, in the book with the unmentioned war in the sense that they serve as the boundary between cleanliness, innocence (prewar) and chaos and filth (postwar). In that respect the novel's pattern relies on a binary opposition with respect to the opposition between two settings, West egg and East Egg, and the opposition between prewar years and postwar years. The war, on the other hand, is unmentioned although both Gatsby and Nick took part in it. The unmentioned war has its symbolic counterpart in the wasteland in the novel. Therefore the war's existence is like the existence of the wasteland in the novel: an undeniable and equally annoying fact for the characters.

The narrative structure has its share of binary oppositions: the fact that Nick is both the narrator of the story and one of the characters who is complicitious in the events gives the narrative the "whole" of the art form; an aesthetic whole that Bakhtin defines as architectonics[3]. When The Great Gatsby is considered architectonics is achieved through the loophole in the narrative form; it is due to the contradictory and fragmented role of the narrator both as a character directly related to the events and his role as a narrator whose supposed task is to relate events on an objective plane. Nick cannot fulfill his task as an objective narrator, and it is due to the fact that the narrator fails in this role that the reader is tempted to create his/her own whole out of the unreliable and contradictory bits of Nick's story. The

[3] Architectonics can be understood as concerned with questions of building, of the way something is put together. It is the general study of how entities relate to each other (Bakhtin1990:10).

fragmentation of the narrator between a so-called objective observer, who supposes himself to be too controlled to take part in what he considers immoral, and a character who has a primary role in the circumstances he finds corrupt leads to the artistic consummation of the narrative as fiction, which testifies to Bakhtin's conviction that the whole is created out of the potential chaos of parts, a relation which is theorized in Bakhtin's terminology as *architectonics.* Architectonics names the technique through which fragments, which never achieve their ultimate meaning, can be consummated in a whole by interacting. In Bakhtin's terms,

> The novel's form, having become the expression of the author's attitude, creates the architectonic form, which orders and consummates the event, independently of the unitary, invariably pure event of being (Bakhtin, 1990:315).

Therefore, in The Great Gatsby the existence of an unfamiliar present, which is the setting of the characters' endeavour to find a place within the chaotic, and the existence of a narrator, who feigns non-complicity in the events and who associates himself with the past makes the novel a whole, because the voice behind the narrator's voice is ironic; it reminds the reader the fact that neither the past, which the characters consider pure and innocent, nor the present, which is associated with corruption and confusion are, what the characters perceive them to be. Therefore the novel aims at reaching aesthetic consummation through the defamiliarization of the narrator by making him an unreliable narrator. The discrepancy between what Nick says and what he does falsifies Nick's conviction and makes him an unreliable narrator. Therefore the novel's meaning relies on the duality of the narrator who argues that he is "one of the few honest people that" he "has ever known" and the fact that Nick's feigned objectivity. In that respect the novel's general structure based on dualities and binary oppositions seems to fulfill what Bakhtin defines as architectonics because the outcome of the contradiction is a discrepancy that occurs due to the unreliability of the narrator. The unreliability of the narrator helps the reader consummate the novel.

Foucault's approach to structures defined through binary oppositions is quite different from Bakhtin's. Contrary to Bakhtin, who emphasizes the primary

importance of the duality between "the other" and "I", and who maintained that "I" can only be possible so far as it can be seen as a part of a unity by "the other", Bakhtin's "dialogic consummation" is for Foucault a negative activity. According to Foucault the tradition of creating dualities has a Christian root and it is a means to "order the disorder of our thoughts"; because, he argues, it would be bewildering not to consider the existence of a negative double.

> But what if, on the contrary, the Devil, the Other, were the Same? And what if the Temptation were not one of the episodes of the great antagonism but the subtle insinuation of the Double? What if the concept unfolded in a mirror space? What if eternal History (of which our own is but the visible form, soon to be effaced) were not simply always the same, but the identity of that Same, both an imperceptible displacement and an embrace of the nondissociable? There was a whole Christian experience that knew this danger well- the temptation to experience temptation in the form of the indistinguishable (Foucault, 2000a:123-124).

When we turn to the argument in the The Great Gatsby which gives us dualities in terms of characters' locating themselves between prewar and postwar, their movement between East Egg and the West Egg can be considered to be a way of coming to terms with the chaos of the present through fitting it into a familiar bipolar pattern rather than a whole-making activity as Bakhtin would suggest. What Foucault offers, as opposed to Bakhtin, who portrays the existence of other and thinking in terms of bipolarities, is the idea that the other is a simulacrum of the self and it is a way of securing the self through the existence of the other which simulates the self. This simulation is based on the reversal of the same: good becomes evil, the dead comes back to life, and rivals become accomplices. Therefore rather than a whole-making genuine "other" in Bakhtin's argument, Foucault argues that the other we believe to have existed is nothing but an imaginary reversal; it is nothing but a pattern of thought that leads not to the occurrence of another entity but the strengthening of the very same one. Therefore in The Great Gatsby the fragmentation of the characters between two states, between what is supposed to be a past-time romanticism and what seems to be its contrary; a highly commercial and a chaotic present are not opposites but variations. In other words, in Foucault's terms we are not to perceive the duality in The Great Gatsby as two opposites reinforcing

each other and making a whole but the reversal of the same thing. In that respect the characters' new state, which seems to contradict their past states, such as Gatsby as a pauper in love in the past and Gatsby as a romantic mafia leader in the present, is the repetition of their previous state after an instant of reversal. In the beginning of The Great Gatsby the reader is initially introduced to Nick the narrator who starts the narrative by quoting his father:

> In my younger and more vulnerable years my father gave me some advice that I've been turning over in my mind ever since.
> 'Whenever you feel like criticizing anyone,' he told me, 'just remember that all the people in this world haven't had the advantages that you've had.' (Fitzgerald, 1994: 7)

At the beginning of the narrative, both Nick's position as a narrator and his aspiration towards the moral integrity of his father is affirmed; he is a flawed narrator relying on the past for the protection of the self. However, as readers we also know that after his participation in the war he strives to see the world as an unbroken unity: "When I came back from the east last autumn I felt that I wanted the world to be in uniform and at a sort of moral attention forever" (Fitzgerald 1994: 8). Instead of following a traditional path and going to the west, Nick goes to the east in order to learn the bond business since, he thinks, "instead of being the warm center of the world, the Middle West now seemed like the ragged edge of the universe" (Fitzgerald 1994:9). Thus Nick follows a reverse path to the westward movement in American history and goes to east in order to learn the bond-business which is connected with money-making. Therefore his message is quite conflicted: Is his reason for going east to re-capture a lost unity that he could not find in the west, or is it money-making? Thus Nick as a character is in coherence with the rest of the characters who, while claiming to follow idealized paths and reach glorified ends, like Daisy who constantly refers to "her white girlhood" with Gatsby and marries Tom to guarantee her future, they, on the other hand, are highly commercialized. This conflict between coping with the practical matters of life and keeping attached to ancestral ties is underlined when Nick identifies himself with the original when a stranger asks him direction in West Egg:

> ‘How do you get to West Egg village? He asked helplessly.
> I told him. And as I walked on I was lonely no longer. I was a guide, a pathfinder, an original settler. (Fitzgerald, 1994:10)

However as we move further in the story, Nick as a character gains priority over Nick as narrator; in other words the more Nick’s complicity in the events of the story increases, the clearer and the better articulated becomes Gatsby as a character in the novel. That is, the more Nick looses contact with the moral integrity he strives to achieve, the more he is connected to the events of which he does not approve and the closer becomes his relation with Gatsby, who represents everything Nick is opposed to. In that respect, Gatsby represents the other of the story, and as Nick moves away from the father as the symbol of the past, he wants to define himself through the existence of the other, Gatsby “who represented everything for which” he has “an unaffected scorn”. Therefore the novel presents a binary opposition while drawing the characters Nick and Gatsby. They are drawn as opposites both in terms of their position in the society and their position within a common setting in the novel.

With respect to Gatsby’s otherness, his occupation, his status in society and his unclear, rather notorious past, Gatsby is in the sphere of the illegal. He is both defined by the state as the other since he is involved in the illegal; on the other hand he is also the other for the group by which he wants to be accepted. His position in his own parties as an outsider is described by the narrator Nick as follows:

> The nature of Mr. Tostoff’s composition eluded me, because just as it began my eyes fell on Gatsby, standing alone on the marble steps and looking from one group to another with approving eyes (Fitzgerald, 1994:56).

And Gatsby’s inability to perceive the codes of the group is explicit in the sixth chapter of the book in which a party of three people on horseback, including Tom, call on Gatsby’s house. When they are about to leave,

> ‘Please don’t hurry,’ Gatsby urged them. He had control of himself now, and he wanted to see more of Tom. ‘Why don’t you- why

> don't you stay for supper? I wouldn't be surprised if some other people dropped in from New York.'
> 'You come to supper with me,' said the lady enthusiastically. 'Both of you.'
> This included me. Mr. Sloane got to his feet.
> 'Come along,' he said – but to her only.
> 'I mean it,' she insisted. I'd love to have you lots of room.'
> Gatsby looked at me questioningly. He wanted to go, and he didn't see that Mr. Slaone had determined he shouldn't (Fitzgerald 1994:110)

This contrast between Gatsby and Nick is also strengthened by the use of certain images. For example the opposition of Gatsby's and Nick's houses can be associated with two contrary figures in American history. On the one hand there is Gatsby's house which is not even fully American and which be considered to be the symbol of ostentatious exhibition of wealth; on the other hand we have its counterpart, Nick's house, a modest cottage with a small lawn. This opposition between houses is described by Nick as follows:

> The one on my right was a colossal affair by any standard – it was a factual imitation of some Hotel de Ville in Normandy, with a tower on one side, spanking new under a thin beard of raw ivy, and a marble swimming pool, and more that forty acres of lawn and garden. It was Gatsby's mansion…..My own house was an eyesore, but it was a small eyesore, and it had been overlooked, so I had a view of the water, a partial view of my neighbour's lawn, and the consoling proximity of millionaires-all for eighty dollars a month (Fitzgerald, 1994:11)

Gatsby's house recalls a colonial mansion with its huge lawn, its servants and rooms each named after an epoch such as Marie Antoinette music-room and Restoration salons and its library with real books. Its counterpart, Nick's house, on the other hand recalls Thoreau's house in the woods by the Walden Pond. Gatsby's house represents a pseudo procession of history stuck within an equally pseudo-colonial mansion that belongs nowhere in history. In that respect Gatsby's house represents a sense of historical procession located in a setting that has no place in history, because Gatsby's house is not a genuine colonial mansion; "it is an eyesore", in Nick's terms, pretending to have a reality and a real setting in history.

Although Nick and Gatsby are each other's opposite and counterpart, they have common features; they are both haunted by the past and they are both parodies due to their taking part in the incongruous endeavour to re-build the past in the far-fetched setting of twentieth century America. Within the context of the book the existence of the other (Gatsby) or the creation of the other (since it is the narrator Nick who gives the reader details concerning Gatsby's past) and the attempt to overcome the other strengthens the idea of unity and order in Nick's mind. The character Nick has a primary role not only as a narrator but as a key character in giving shape to events. For instance although Nick says to Gatsby that "you can't repeat the past" it is he who strengthens Gatsby's conviction that he can repeat the past in an indirect way since Gatsby's encounter with Daisy takes place in Nick's house and thanks to Nick's arrangement. Moreover it is again Nick who introduces Gatsby to Tom, who causes Gatsby's death. Nick is also the only one who takes part in Gatsby's funeral; a participation justifying Nick's moral integrity in his own eyes and excusing himself from his active participation in what he considers immoral. Therefore Gatsby is a counter-agent strengthening Nick's values and his belief in the past. This counter positioning of Nick the narrator and Gatsby is made deliberately so to show that the antagonist (Gatsby in this case) is created by the narrator Nick so as to strengthen his belief in his own originality. We have emphasized that Nick is an unreliable narrator whose convictions are questionable. Therefore this counter-positioning between Gatsby and Nick is the creation of Nick the narrator. Nick announces that Gatsby represents everything that he is opposed. So, it is not the author that draws Gatsby and Nick as opposite characters but the narrator Nick that draws Gatsby as his own opposite. As the extract below shows, Nick creates his antagonist on a belief (wish) that he represents everything that is the genuine and Gatsby represents everything that is the fake.

> [….] I was lonely no longer. I was a guide, a pathfinder, an original settler. (Fitzgerald, 1994:10)
> [….] He [Gatsby] looked at me sideways – and I knew why Jordan had believed he was lying. He hurried the phrase 'educated at Oxford,' or swallowed it, or choked on it, as though it had bothered him before. And with this doubt, his whole statement fell to pieces, and I wondered if there wasn't something a little sinister about him after all. (Fitzgerald, 1994:71)

Thus it is the narrator Nick that draws himself as opposed to Gatsby and it is the author Fitzgerald that dissipates this opposition drawn by Nick between Gatsby and himself. The author Fitzgerald underlines the fact that Nick is as unoriginal as Gatsby by drawing Nick as a narrator who is unreliable, who takes the moral integrity of his father as his model but who, on the other hand, takes part in a conspiracy he thinks immoral.

The book follows a cyclic order starting with Nick's father's saying as follows: "In my younger and more vulnerable years my father gave me some advice that I've been turning over in my mind ever since" (Fitzgerald 1994: 7). And it ends with the recognition of a past that is to be repeated ceaselessly:

> It eluded us then, but that's no matter- tomorrow we will run faster, stretch our arms farther …And one fine morning-
>
> So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past (Fitzgerald, 1994:188).

Therefore Nick, who wants to convince Gatsby that there will be no repetition of the past, himself concludes that there is a constant endeavour to capture the past, a sense of loss, which affirms a cyclic continuity running over and over and repeating itself. Therefore although Nick presents himself as "original" as opposed to Gatsby's "fakeness" the author presents both of the characters in uniformity with respect to their endeavour to capture the "wholeness" the "originality" that is supposed to reside in the past. Both Gatsby and Nick are parodied figures projected onto a fragmented, restless postwar era. In an era which offers a parodied image of god on an advertisement of "Dr. T.J. Eckleburg's eyes", which people take a glimpse of while driving their cars, Gatsby can only be a bootlegger wearing the mask of Benjamin Franklin, and Nick, whose house is reminiscent of Thoreau's house by the Walden lake, can only be a stockbroker wearing the mask of Thoreau. Therefore the novel negates the binary oppositions in characterization on the deep structure.

Other pair of characters who seem to be opposed on the surface structure and united on the deep structure are Daisy, Nick's cousin and Tom's wife, and Myrtle

Wilson, Mr. Wilson's wife and Tom's girlfriend. They are two female figures who are introduced to the reader as opposing figures at the beginning of the novel. Daisy and Myrtle seem to be one another's opposite in terms of the class they belong to. Daisy is a member of the upper middle class and Myrtle Wilson is a member of the lower middle class. Even the setting in which they are introduced for the first time testifies to their opposed positioning in the book. Daisy is introduced in the realm of wealth and hygiene signifying a kind of naivety and enchantedness that a noble atmosphere can endow. She is a ghost-like figure coming from the past recalling the existence of an innocence that is associated with a feudal female character:

> The only completely stationary object in the room was an enormous couch on which two young women were buoyed up as though upon an anchored balloon. They were both in white and their dresses were rippling and fluttering as if they had just been blown back in after a short flight around the house. I must have stood for a few moments listening to the whip and snap of the curtains and the groan of a picture on the wall (Fitzgerald, 1994:14).

Daisy is, for Gatsby, the embodiment of wealth and nobility, everything that is out of reach for Gatsby in the years of war, and the female figure of the romance of postwar era. The excess of hygiene and wealth in which Daisy is located is in contrast with the existence and the reality of a 'waste land' that is illustrated rather grotesquely in the book.

> This is a valley of ashes- a fantastic farm where ashes grow like wheat into ridges and hills and grotesque gardens; where ashes take the forms of houses and chimneys and rising smoke and finally, with a transcendent effort, of ash-gray men, who move dimly and already crumbling through the powdery air (Fitzgerald, 1994: 29).

The wasteland is also where Mr. Wilson's garage is located [which is the home of Myrtle Wilson.] Thus the book opposes two locations associated with two figures; on the one hand there is the garage as the symbol of technology and its wastes associated with Myrtle Wilson, and on the other hand there is the hygienic atmosphere of mansions, gardens, horses associated with Daisy and an illusory past and an illusory security. The narration of Daisy as a celestial object wrapped up in whites amidst fluttering objects and a "haunted" atmosphere can be contrasted with

Mr. Wilson's garage which partakes in the grotesqueness and harshness of a wasteland:

> The only building in sight was a small block of yellow brick sitting on the edge of the waste-land, a sort of compact Main Street ministering to it, and contiguous to absolutely nothing. One of the three shops it contained was an all-night restaurant, approached by a trail of ashes; the third was a garage- *Repairs.* George B. Wilson. *Cars bought and sold* (Fitzgerald, 1994:30)

In addition to the setting in which they are located, the speech and behaviour of these two female characters can also be regarded as opposites. Daisy's romantic naivety expects male affirmation,

> '……There's a bird on the lawn that I think must be nightingale come over on the Cunard or White Star Line. He's singing away- 'her voice sang: 'It's romantic, isn't it, Tom?' (Fitzgerald, 1994: 22)

As opposed to Daisy's childish and romantic naivety there is Myrtle's conduct expecting an affirmation from the opposite sex on the basis of her sexuality. As opposed to Daisy's sterile immobility among fluttering objects, Myrtle Wilson is presented as a flirtatiously energetic figure among the filth of wasteland:

> [….] and in a moment the thickish figure of a woman blocked out the light from the office door. She was in the middle thirties, and faintly stout, buy she carried her flesh sensuously as some women can. Her face, above a spotted dress of dark-blue crepe-de-chine, contained no facet or gleam of beauty, but there was an immediately perceptible vitality about her as if the nerves of her body were continually smouldering. She smiled slowly and walking through her husband as if he were a ghost, shook hands with Tom, looking him flush in the eye. Then she wet her lips, and without turning around spoke to her husband in a soft, coarse voice (Fitzgerald, 1994:31)

However, although they represent two different aspects of female conduct, just like Gatsby and Nick, Daisy and Myrtle are similar in certain aspects. They are both conditioned to fulfill the demands of a patriarchal order which derives its force from a feudal, "glorious" past, in Daisy's case, and a fake atmosphere of freedom that modernity seems to offer for Myrtle. They are both economically dependent on

Tom; both Daisy's and Myrtle's relation with Tom are economic compromises claiming to provide security for women in a patriarchal order. A relationship that is defined on the basis of "oppositions" reveals a similarity between the two parties of that polarity. In that respect the novel does not define a struggle between two opposing realities but between the patchy elements that constitute the characters and a power mechanism that creates discourse-driven characters who think that they can capture and experience a supposed "originality" and "innocence". By negating a struggle between seemingly opposed characters the novel does not recognize a power mechanism that has two poles, the ruled and the ruler, the book strengthens Foucault's notion that there is, instead of an easily defined mechanism of repression and oppression that is bi-polar, the strategies of power work according to a complex mechanism that re-inscribes codes in the individual's minds to which, regardless of their class, they submit. Therefore it does not have to be through repressive methods that the power mechanism should work but by producing knowledge, producing secure and pleasurable points that the individual can stick to when faced with pseudo risks that credit a sense of danger and fear such as the inevitable loss of purity and innocence.

> What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than a negative instance whose function is repression (Foucault 1980:119)

Therefore the book, rather than presenting a power mechanism that is displayed in the form of one class exerting power over the other, offers a mechanism that manifests itself within a discourse hidden in the characters' speech and in their acts and working insidiously regardless of the class they belong. It is in their conflicts, in their obsessions, in their fragmentation between the past and the present, between a state of ideality and reality we come across the working of power structure. Thus the book cannot reach its fullest significance when considered in terms of a bi-polar conflict, one party exerting power over the other or one class oppressing the other. We can not trace the working of power in the relations between

two seemingly incongruous set of codes (Gatsby's / Nick's, Myrtle's/ Daisy's) but within Myrtle's speech that associates making choices with having an affair with Tom.

> '…….I was so excited that when I got into a taxi with him I didn't hardly know I wasn't getting into a subway train. All I kept thinking about, over and over, was "You can't live forever; you can't live forever"' (Fitzgerald, 1994:42)

Power works through creating a sense of loss, a pseudo-risky atmosphere which implies that past really existed as a delightful experience and there is the risk of not being able to experience it again as it was experienced for the first time; things will never be as innocent and as pure as they were in their initial state. That sort of a discourse driven sense of insecurity is displayed through Tom's speech which is replete with racist discourse:

> '…..Nowadays people begin by sneering at family life and family institutions, and next they'll throw everything overboard and have intermarriage between black and white.' (Fitzgerald, 1994:136)

Moreover we can trace power relations in the fragmentation of Gatsby and Nick, both trying to stick to the security offered by the image of the past when they find their present experience chaotic and unreliable. What makes the present fragmented and chaotic for the characters is the fact that there is a fictional conflict created by war-time propaganda. As Ouditt argues, war-time propaganda enhanced the idea of a romantic love-affair between soldiers and a specific typology of women as "angel in the house".

> Many of the popular songs, posters and postcards of the war reveal that romance was necessary as a life-enhancing counter to the brutalities and degradations of war: if women were to keep the home fires burning, that fire was to be alive in their hearts as it was in their hearths (Ouditt, 1994:89).

Daisy's relation with Gatsby is very close to what Ouditt describes as an ideology -driven love affair. Before her marriage with Tom she could happily conceive of herself as a woman who can passionately wait for her soldier lover to turn back from the war. Therefore the conflict for Daisy is between waiting for

Gatsby and conforming to the romantic fiction of the propaganda or marrying Tom and being sheltered by the institution of marriage. Therefore Daisy and Myrtle, although they are drawn as dissimilar characters, unite as female characters who have romantic, ideology driven dreams and who would not reject the security that would be offered by rules and roles of patriarchy.

The book presents two kinds of fragmentation: First, within the individual, as a state of in-betweenness between the past and the present, between a state of ideality and reality and second, the positioning of characters each assuming a position interchangeable with the "other" and the unity with the other; the seemingly difference of the "other" turning out to be a sameness as is presented most obviously in the case of Gatsby and Nick, who, while opposing each other on the level of speech, partake in a similar anxiety; the anxiety that things will never seem as complete and as pure as they were initially.

The fragmentation in The Great Gatsby presents a diversity of speeches, what Bakhtin defines as heteroglossia. In our context we can as well put modernist fragmentation in the category of Bakhtinian heteroglossia. If we take fragmentation as the proliferation within one character's discourse, then when modernism is concerned dialogism and variation is not intrinsic to the multiplicity of individuals and characters each representing a specific variation, but an opposition and conflict and sometimes a sort of coherence within only one character. Therefore heteroglossia is not attained through multiplicity of characters but through the diversity of discourses within one character or, to the contrary, a unity of the discourses of various characters.

In his elaboration of the concept of heteroglossia Bakhtin identifies two poles; the unofficial and the official, and heteroglossia as the struggle of these two poles. According to him every speech act can be the arena in which these forces are unified and language is stratified:

> At any given moment of its becoming, language is stratified not only into linguistic dialects in the strict sense of the word (according to

> formal linguistic markers, especially phonetic), but, and this is fundamental for us, into socio-ideological languages: languages if social groups, 'professional languages, 'generic' languages, languages of generation and so on (Bakhtin, 2002a:271-272).

Thus for Bakhtin there are two forces at work in the formation of language: centripetal forces unifying and centralizing "the verbal-ideological world" and the centrifugal forces opposing the firm, and stable form of language that is officially recognized. Therefore,

> [A]unitary language is not something given (dan) but is always in essence posited (zadan)-and at every moment of its linguistic life it is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia. But at the same time it makes its real presence felt as a force for overcoming this heteroglossia, imposing specific limits to it, guaranteeing a certain maximum of mutual understanding and crystallizing into a real, although still relative unity – the unity of the reigning conversational (everyday) and literary language, "correct language" (Bakhtin 2002a: 270).

When we consider heteroglossia in terms of The Great Gatsby, it is hard to recognize such a clash between two distinct features of language namely centrifugal and centripetal. Rather than presenting an opposition that has two distinct identifiable poles - the official and the unofficial- The Great Gatsby presents an intermingling of a variety of voices, which cannot be easily categorized as the official and the unofficial, within one character. What is implied by the fragmentation within the character is the fact that the past, which is supposed to offer the security of a vision of wholeness and continuity, is in fact just a make-believe that each character re-creates with every new utterance, just as Gatsby re-creates his romantic dream. In Bakhtinian terms Gatsby's dream might as well be categorized within the official because this is, as we have just argued, what is given to Gatsby as an alternative to his poverty-stricken life before he became "The Great Gatsby".

> It had gone beyond her (Daisy), beyond everything. He (Gatsby) had thrown himself into it with a creative passion, adding to it all the time, decking it out with every bright feather that drifted his way.

> No amount of fire or freshness can challenge what a man can store up in his ghostly heart (Fitzgerald, 1994: 103)

Therefore instead of a strict separation between freedom and oppression in the formation of characters as individuals, what the book implies is the fact that everything that seems as an alternative are within the power structure. Moreover, the bi-polar positioning of characters does not signify such a conflict between centripetal and centrifugal forces. It is the sameness of the other, the sameness of Gatsby and Nick or the sameness of Daisy and Myrtle or even the sameness of Gatsby and Tom, when we consider their attachment to the past that is suggested throughout the novel. Thus the basic concern of the novel does not exhibit a struggle between two parts but the questionability of the "wholes" and images of "perfection" in the characters' mind. Because the more the characters are convinced in the "wholeness" and reliability of the "security" of the past the more fragmented they are.

The symbolic overcoming of the boundary between these two forces within language is embodied in the image of Gatsby's house which is stratified into the historical periods that are prescribed by official history. Although Gatsby's mansion is concrete, with all its hugeness, with all its stratification into eras of history, we know that it is a creation, a kind of make-believe gathered artificially together to make the image of wholeness. Gatsby's house represents the fictional history in which characters in the story take part, adding their image to the others that occupied it once with their short presence and contributing to the hauntedness of the house. In that respect the house represents the fiction of history that can be demolished easily if one stratum, one acknowledged period of the official is separated from the accumulated unity as one of the guests, man with the "owl-eyed spectacles" of the party suggests in his comments about the library:

> He waved his hand toward the book shelves.
> 'About that. As a matter of fact you needn't bother to ascertain. I ascertained. They are real.'
> 'The books'
> He nodded.

> ‘Absolutely real-have pages and everything. I thought I thought they’d be a nice durable cardboard…….’
> He snatched the book from me and replaced it hastily on its shelf, muttering that if one brick was removed the whole library was liable to collapse (Fitzgerald, 1994:52)

Thus it is suggested that what seems so concrete and real, like the past the characters create or the official history, can easily be destroyed. It is thanks to their well-knitted structure that is renewed or parts of which are used and strengthened as they are used that the past can be so well-built. Therefore the book, instead of offering “the exactness” of the material and already- given form, gives priority to the form in the individual’s mind. Therefore the novel doesn’t present us the clash of the official and the unofficial as Bakhtin prescribes in his definition of the heteroglossia, but the questionability of the past and present. Rather than the binary oppositions between characters or between the past and the present as they appear on the surface, the novel negates them on the deeper level on the basis of their inseparability and their fictitious quality.

Therefore fragmentation in The Great Gatsby coincides with Bakhtin’s definition of dialogism, which is intertexuality. However the idea of heteroglossia cannot be recognized in the novel since the novel negates the boundaries between official and unofficial, centrifugal and centripetal; the novel overcomes the separation between the official and the unofficial, centrifugal and centripetal, the forces it recognizes on the surface level are cancelled on the basis of unreality on the deeper level. Thus the binary oppositions of the surface structure are effaced in the deep structure.

When we have a look at the basic plot line of The Great Gatsby we can define it as a flux breaking up at certain parts. We can separate the plot into two: namely, the events happening within the present context of the novel, and those outside the “present” of the novel narrated as a part of the retrospective narrative. Those outside the “present” of the novel are the events within a period previous to the marriage between Tom and Daisy. During that period, Daisy is involved in a romantic love affair with Gatsby and she marries with Tom. We classify these two

events as an affair outside the institution of marriage and the strengthening of the official marriage with Tom. Prior to the present of the novel there are two basic events that can be defined as a divergence from the officially acknowledged marriage (the relation between Gatsby and Daisy) and adherence to the officially acknowledged (the marriage between Tom and Daisy) these two past events are connected to the present of the novel through the strengthening of marriage at the last stage of the novel. Thus the plot line follows a pattern that can be identified as a divergence from the order and restoring of the order. The divergence in the present time of the novel starts with the accident and the death of Myrtle, the divergence in the past starts with the war for Gatsby which provides him with an identity as a soldier, but which at the same time distances him from Daisy, and for Nick all the events starting from his arrival, all can be interpreted as a divergence from the prescribed order of events. In the end the characters that remain, Daisy, Tom, Nick, and Mrs. Baker all go on with their lives. In other words the order is restored. After the accident the compromise between Daisy and Tom is strengthened:

> Daisy and Tom were sitting opposite each other at the kitchen table, with a plate of cold fried chicken between them, and two bottles of ale. He was talking intently across the table at her, and in his earnestness his hand had fallen upon and covered her own. Once in a while she looked up at him and nodded in agreement.
> They weren't happy, neither of them had touched the the chicken or the ale – and they weren't unhappy either. There was an unmistakable air of natural intimacy about the picture, and anybody would have said that they were conspiring together. (Fitzgerald 1994: 152)

Nick remains even more faithful to the innocent eye of the forefathers and returns back to where he comes from:

> After Gatsby's death the east was haunted for me like that, distorted beyond my eyes' power of correction. So when the blue smoke of brittle leaves was in the air and the wind blew the wet laundry stiff on the line I decided to come back home. (Fitzgerald, 1994: 184)

Therefore the accident and Myrtle's death, the death of Gatsby, Daisy's relation with Gatsby, which is repeated twice, Tom's involvement in an "illicit"

relationship with Myrtle, which is experienced twice by Tom with another woman previous to the "present" of the novel-an occasion narrated by Jordan Baker- and which also concluded in an accident are occasions that represent divergence from the order:

> A week after I left Santa Barbara Tom ran into a wagon on the Ventura road one night, and ripped a front wheel off his car. The girl who was with him got into the papers, too, because her arm was broken – she was one of the chambermaids in the Santa Barbara Hotel. (Fitzgerald, 1994: 83-84)

And the order of events beginning with Nick's arrival to the East and Gatsby's death, the events all remain in the category of "divergence", are also the events that help the restoration of the previous order. Therefore the divergence from the order perpetuates the restoration of the order. In that respect although the book is not about the war, irrespective of publication date's closeness to the date of the war, it presents a cylicity that is similar to the prewar period, war and the post-war era. The process of war and the idea of a lost unity during war perpetuate an endeavour to recapture the lost unity that is supposed to be in the pre-war stages. Thus the plot of the novel is modeled on the cyclicity of the war by following a cyclic pattern consisting of repeated events; presenting an order at the beginning, diverging from the order and a return to the previous order. As Fussell in his study entitled The Great War and Modern Memory suggests, by quoting from Memoirs of an Infantry Officer, that the experience of the war is marked with "penetration and withdrawal: repeated entrances into the center of trench experience, repeated returns to the world of home" (Fussell 1977: 96). In The Great Gatsby, we are presented with a chain of events that goes back to the initial stage of the novel in the end. Nick who comes from the West returns to the West. The institution of marriage between Tom and Daisy is strengthened at the end of the novel. That kind of a cylicity that returns to the beginning is similar to what Fussell describes as the pattern of war consisting of repetitions.

In that sense, we can conclude that the novel is the narration of a war in a symbolic pattern. Therefore the novel justifies Foucault's idea that war has no distinct time limits, a beginning and an end and the fact that peace time is a

continuation of war by other means. Fussell also argues that the idea of a continuous war was inscribed in the minds of the twentieth century people and quotes from Alfred Kazin, who argued that there were

> so many uncovered horrors, so many new wars on the horizon, such a continued general ominousness, that "the war" (that is the Second) soon became War anywhere, anytime-War that has never ended, war as the continued experience of twentieth century man. (Fussell, 1977:74)

In that respect, the novel exhibits the characters' divergence from the order and breaks the continual flux of events by introducing a climax such as an accident and strives to restore the previous order. While restoring the previous order preceding the accident it converts the meanings of several symbols. For instance, the novel converts the meaning of symbols that connote mildness and tenderness into symbols of harshness. For example Daisy and Myrtle, two flower names, are not associated with delicateness but with a sort of cruelty and restlessness. Likewise Myrtle is killed by Daisy. Therefore the images are stripped off their common connotations and gathered within the text in order to form new connotations. Thus, although The Great Gatsby is not concerned with war thematically, it is the reanimation of the war on the symbolic level, but symbols on the level of reanimation take on different connotations. In other words the order is restored however with altered elements after the crisis takes place. War continues in peacetime on the symbolic level in a dream-like fashion as a quotation from Fussell's study asserts:

> The happenings in the dream suggested that the war, which in the outer world had taken place some years before, was not yet over, but was continuing to be fought within the psyche. (Fussell, 1977:113)

1-2 Time in *The Great Gatsby*

When we consider The Great Gatsby in terms of its temporal setting, the plot of the story clearly follows three separate time lines. The first, which is in the foreground, is composed of the main events, following a linear sequence, in which events are connected to each other. That time line is linked to an actual calendar time, which starts with Nick's arrival to the east "in the spring of 1922" and moves onwards. Another time line is the time of narration which is about the events of the main time line from another sphere retrospectively. This time line cannot be connected to an actual calendar because the reader does not know the time of narration. Therefore the time of the narration is about the events that took place in the main time-line of the story that starts in 1922. Nick's preoccupation with the past, the events he narrates, does not follow a sequence that is connected to the calendar time. The third time line narrates the events preceding the main time line, the events happening before 1922, comprising an era going back to 1917, the year The United States entered the First World War. The third time line does not follow calendar time; this time it is arranged according to the order of events that are in the mind of the characters and their preoccupation with the past. Therefore both the time of narration – the past as Nick conceives it- and the third time line – the characters' and Nick's perception of the characters' past- are nonlinear, following not an order that is characterized by numbers and dates but a nonsequential ordering of events. The events starting with the date 1922, the main time line, also follow a cyclic pattern characterized by ruptures and continuities. Therefore it is possible to conclude that the novel The Great Gatsby gives priority to "adventure time" rather than "biological time" or "historical time", a classification made by Bakhtin in his analyses of "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel". Adventure time in The Great Gatsby is characterized by accidents at the end of which "the secrets" are revealed, that is they are things which present a divergence from the normal course or continuity of events. In that sense they are consistent with Bakhtin's definition of adventure time:

> Thus all of the action in a Greek romance, all the events and adventures that fill it, constitute time-sequences that are neither

> historical, quotidian, biographical, nor even biological and maturational. Actions lie outside these sequences, beyond the reach of that force, inherent in these sequences, that generates rules and defines the measure of a man. In this kind of time, nothing changes: the world remains as it was, the biographical life of the heroes does not change, their feelings do not change, people do not even age […] This, we repeat, is an extratemporal hiatus that appears between two moments of a real time sequence, in this case one that is biographical [….] Moments of adventuristic time occur at those points when the normal course of events, the normal, intended or purposeful sequence of life is interrupted. (Bakhtin, 2002a: 91, 95)

We can therefore detect the same divergence from the normal course of events in The Great Gatsby. At the end of the novel (and the conclusion of this divergence), the book's main characters Daisy, Tom, Nick and Jordan Baker, who are the characters introduced during the dinner at Daisy and Tom's house at the beginning of the novel return back to their normal course of life; Nick makes his decision to return back home, Daisy and Tom go on with their marriage with the addition of a stronger bond of conspiracy between them. Therefore the events within the initial stage —the dinner —and the last stage —Tom and Daisy sitting at the table with "an unmistakable air of natural intimacy" — (Fitzgerald, 1997:152) are those that can be recognized as an interruption outside the "purposeful sequence of events".

In addition to this Bakhtin argues that *chance* has an important initiatory role in the adventure time of the Greek novel.

> All moments of this infinite adventure time are controlled by one force-*chance*. As we have seen, this time is entirely composed of contingency-of chance meetings and failures to meet. Adventuristic "chance time" is the specific time during which irrational forces intervene in human life; the intervention of Fate (Tyche), gods, demons, sorcerers [….] (Bakhtin, 2002a: 94).

The Great Gatsby is also fraught with the play of chance. All the events are initiated by Nick's moving to a house near Gatsby's, which is an event of chance followed by Nick's meeting with Gatsby during the party and his role in the re-union of Gatsby and Daisy which takes place at his house. However, when applied to the

modernist novel one more element, which is more influential in shaping the events, takes the place of the "demons and sorcers"of the Greek novel. Behind all the activities of the characters, including those based on chance, there is a basic drive that controls the events, which is a tendency to repeat the past and reach towards a naivety and an integrity that the past is supposed to offer. It is not an event of chance that makes Gatsby so intent upon meeting Daisy and re-capturing the romance of the past. Behind the chance element that locates Nick next to Gatsby there is Nick's enedeavour to achieve a unity and be freed from restlessness by going to the East, because the Middle West, seeming "like the ragged edge of the universe", is far from offering the unity he seeks. Therefore in addition to the chance element, "past hauntedness" reigns in the lives of the characters; it is the common drive of the characters to re-gain something that is supposed to have been lacking. Therefore when The Great Gatsby is concerned, the plot of the novel is based on adventure time rather than the calendar time or what Bakhtin names as "historical time" and the "biographical time". However, although the characters' present state is marked with the occasions of the past, although all of them have a secret that remained in the past and each character's secret is revealed by another character —Gatsby's past is revealed by Nick through inserted paragraphs into the main time line of the story — Daisy's past and her relation with Gatsby preceding her marriage is revealed by Jordan Baker, Jordan Baker's past, the event of cheating in the golf tournament, is revealed by Nick or Tom's past is revealed by Nick, Myrtle's past is revealed by her sister Catherine— and although these secrets are the agents which give shape to their present, the plot does not altogether present a total break from the calendar time. For example we can keep track of the years through occasional references to date, and for example the reader knows that Nick has turned thirty by the end of the novel. Therefore, the historical time and biographical time go in parallel with the adventure time which dominates The Great Gatsby.

Another important characteristic of the novel's chronotope[4] is the fact that it includes a reversal of spatial movement that can be termed as a movement that

[4] …Chronotope (literally, "time and space") is the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationship that are artistically expressed in literature….. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied (Bakhtin 2002a: 84, 250).

moves in a direction contrary to American history that is characterized by a movement to the West. In the larger context of the novel Nick, the narrator comes from the West and goes to the East due to the fact that "Instead of being the warm center of the world, the Middle East now seemed like the ragged edge of the universe". (Fitzgerald, 1997:9) And on a smaller scale, the movement towards the East is repeated through Nick's traveling from West Egg, where he lives, to East Egg, where he was invited to have dinner at Tom's and Daisy's house. This is a movement contrary to the westward expansion experienced in the beginning of the nineteenth century in America, a period that marks the beginning of romantic literature. Nick alludes to the image of "pathfinder" of James Fenimoore Cooper's novels when a stranger asks him the direction:

> It was lonely for a day or so until one morning some man, more recently arrived than I, stopped me on the road.
> 'How do you get to West Egg village?' he asked helplessly.
> I told him. And as I walked on I was lonely no longer. I was a guide, a pathfinder, an original settler (Fitzgerald, 1997:10).

However, contrary to the movement of the nineteenth century settlers, who went to the West in order to be a pathfinder, Nick goes to the East in order to be a pathfinder in twentieth-century America. This contrary movement in time – going to the East from the West in the twentieth-century contrary to the movement that was from the East to the West in the nineteenth century- is also concretized through images such as the man who, after having an accident, suggests reversing the car whose wheel is missing:

> 'What's the matter?' he inquired calmly. 'Did we run out of gas?'
> 'Look!'
> Half a dozen fingers pointed at the amputated wheel
> -he stared at it for a moment, and then looked upward as though he suspected that it had dropped from the sky.
> 'It came off,'someone explained.
> He nodded.
> 'At first I din' notice we'd stopped.'
> A pause. Then, taking a long breath and straightening his shoulders, he remarked in a determined voice:
> 'Wonder'ff tell me where there's a gas'line station?'

> At least a dozen man, some of them a little better off than he was, explained to him that wheel and car were no longer joined by any physical bond.
> 'Back out,' he suggested after a moment. 'Put her in reverse.'
> 'But the wheel's off!'
> He hesitated
> 'No harm in trying,' he said. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 62)

Thus The Great Gatsby, as far as the chronotopes of the novel are concerned, presents a willingness of reversibility and a sense of obliterated reverse direction, a willingness to move contrary to future. The characters also look backwards when they move in their cars to the future. Nick, when looking at the land that stretches before him tries to see it with the eyes of the first settlers:

> And as the moon rose higher the inessential houses began to melt away until gradually I became aware of the old island here that flowered once for Dutch sailors' eyes- a fresh, green breast of the new world. Its vanished trees, the trees that had made way for Gatsby's house, had once pandered in whispers to the last and greatest of all human dreams; for a transitory enchanted moment man must have held his breath in the presence of this continent, compelled into an aesthetic contemplation he neither understood nor desired, face to face for the last time in history with something commensurate to his capacity for wonder (Fitzgerald, 1997:187-188).

Just like Nick who contemplates the green land with the first settlers eyes, Gatsby contemplates the green light as the image of a long-lost past that, when re-captured, would give back what is supposed to be lacking, "the unity of the past".

> He stretched out his arms toward the dark water in a curious way, and, far as I was from him, I could have sworn he was trembling. Involuntarily I glanced seaward – and distinguished nothing except a single green light, minute and far away, that might have been the end of a dock (Fitzgerald, 1997: 27-28).

Therefore while the story presents a cyclicity that follows a pattern of continuity and a divergence that is symbolic of the wars' being a divergence from the order, the characters are all attached to what Walter Benjamin calls "cultural treasure" when they are faced with the chaos of an unredeemed past, which is

symbolized by the "waste land" in the story. Just as the "valley of ashes" lies between the West Egg and New York, which is a place which people have to see on their way to New York, because "there is always a halt there of at least a minute" (Fitzgerald, 1997:30), the first World War is an in-between state between the present (1922) and the distant past, the time of first settlers. The war is the loophole of narrative, which is never mentioned explicitly by the characters, but which makes itself felt by stamping its existence in the thought pattern of the characters—through a sense of binary oppositions between the past and the present, East and West, or in the cylicity of the plot, which is that of order and divergence from order. Therefore the war has a symbolic existence in the text which is concretized through the image of the "wasteland", "the valley of ashes" which the characters stop and see only to go on their way with the knowledge that it exists. The "valley of ashes" is a chronotope that symbolizes a veil that makes the identity of people obscure:

> […..] ashes take the forms of the houses and chimneys and rising smoke and, finally, with a transcendent effort, of ash-gray man, who move dimly and already crumbling through the powdery air….and immediately ash-gray men swarm up with leaden spades and stir up an impenetrable cloud, which screens the obscure operations from your sight.(Fitzgerald, 1997: 29)

The wasteland, in other words "the valley of ashes" is also a chronotope giving a false identity to Gatsby. It is here that Myrtle becomes the victim of her mis-recognition in which she confuses Gatsby and Tom and tries to stop the car Daisy is driving. Similarly it is during the wasteland of war that Gatsby acquires a new identity as a soldier because we know that he had no clothes other than the uniform that he wore during his meeting with Daisy. It is thanks to the uniform he could hide the class he really belonged to and convince Daisy that he was the member of the same class as herself:

> However glorious might be his future as Jay Gatsby, he was at present a penniless young man without a past, and at any moment the invisible cloak of his uniform might slip from his shoulders. So he made the most of his time […..] he let her believe that he was a person from much the same strata as herself – that he was fully able to take care of her. (Fitzgerald, 1997:155)

Therefore like the "valley of ashes", the spot where the passengers should stop on their way to New York, the war is also suspended between the "innocent past" and the chaotic present. The war is a divergence within the continuity of history affecting insidiously what is perceived as continuity, manifesting its existence through the repetition, which becomes unreal as it is repeated more and more. In fact Nick and Gatsby's common feature is not only their constant backward glance but also the fact that they both participated in the First World War, which is a fact they do not talk about. Perhaps the experience of the war, which is a wasteland, "a valley of ashes" on the road to twentieth century that shattered the nineteenth-century sense of the unified trajectory of history, giving way to a sense of historicity closer to that described by Foucault in The Archeology of Knowledge .

The existence of both the chronotope of the war and the "valley of ashes" as discontinuities justify Foucault's method of historicity he describes in the introduction to Archeology of Knowledge. Foucault privileges the identifying of discontinuities out of already organized series which he defines as "a place of rest, certainty, reconciliation, a place of tranquilized sleep" (Foucault, 2004:16).

> It is as if it was particularly difficult, in the history in which men retrace their own ideas and their own knowledge, to formulate a general theory of discontinuity, of series, of limits, unities, specific orders, and differentiated autonomies and dependences. As if, in that field where we had become used to seeking origins, to pushing back further and further the line of antecedents, to reconstituting traditions, to following evolutive curves, to projecting teleologies, and to having constant recourse to metaphors of life, we felt a particular repugnance to conceiving of difference, to describing separations and dispersions, to dissociating the reassuring from the identical. (Foucault, 2004:13)

Therefore Foucault celebrates a historicity whose task is to dissociate already formed unities, which ignored the different and the dispersed element in order to protect the secure point and an acknowledged form of rationality, recognizing the fact that there are dispersed events, "a hidden layer of diffuse", "different types of time spans" that are hidden beneath the formalized continuity, and he thus provides a

perspective of the kind of compensatory search for a unity that he saw emerging in the wake of the First World War. In his essay "Return to History", Foucault explains the kind of historicity he favours as follows:

> History, then, is not a single time span (durée): it is a multiplicity of time spans that entangle and envelop one another. So the old notion of time should be replaced by the multiple time spans [….] At the root of historical time, there is not something like a biological evolution that would carry away all phenomena and all events. In reality there are multiple time spans, and each one of these spans is the bearer of a certain type of events. (Foucault, 2000a:430)

In that respect there is coherence between Bakhtin and Foucault both of whom detected the same dispersion in the perception of time, the former in his analyses of the novel genre, the other in his analyses of history. According to Bakhtin there is a multiplicity of times such as biographical time, historical time and adventure time within a novel uniting or disintegrating through chronotopes. Bakhtin also recognizes a reversal of time, which he calls "historical inversion", within the novel genre similar to the reversion that is presented in The Great Gatsby.

According to Bakhtin "historical inversion" is outside the recognized order of time; it is characterized by a preference for the past rather than the future:

> From the point of view of a present reality, historical inversion (in the strict sense of the word) prefers the past-which is more weighty, more fleshed out-to such a future. And these vertical, other worldly structurings prefer to such a past that which is eternal and outside time altogether, yet which functions as if were real and contemporary (Bakhtin, 2002a:148).

Thus although Bakhtin does not specifically address to modernist novel, what he is describing in this quotation as past, that is "outside time altogether", is the sense of past we find in the modernist novel. This kind of a past is also what Walter Benjamin describes as the image of the past. Foucault, on the other hand, argues that history that is searched and documented is itself eternalized. Foucault also dissociated himself from the idea of a continuous unity of time that the traditional historians formed and followed. That is the reason why he provides a useful

theoretical approach to a modernist text which gives priority to time in the mind or which presents a disintegration in terms of time.

Randall Stevenson, in his study entitled Modernist Fiction, also justifies our conclusion that modernist fiction ignores the time on the clock, which is the symbol of mechanization of the industrialized world.

> Memory becomes for modernist narrative a central, structuring device in the creation of a 'time in the mind' which moves, through the randomness of recollection, away from 'mechanical succession' and the control of the clock (Stevenson, 1992: 93).

The beginning of the twentieth century was an era in which a universal standard in the perception of time and space was created. In that respect the Greenwich observatory, dividing world into separate locations and separate spans of time by drawing ordering lines around the globe can be seen as the concrete image of a *panopticon*, which Foucault describes as the symbol of a power mechanism. Just as a panopticon, an architectural figure, is separated into cells "like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible", the Greenwich observatory located people into controllable spheres, submitted their actions to a universally recognized time system. Therefore, just like a panopticon, twentieth century spaces offered "a visibility that is a trap"; an observation mechanism that controlled the individual through defining him/her, like the Greenwich observatory, which created boundaries and divisions to find a constant location for the people.

Although Bakhtin and Foucault would agree on the issue of time, they are not in agreement with each other in terms of spaces. Bakhtin argues that the removal of the individual to a more private location, "deprived him of" an externalization that is required for the individual to form a unity with his/her environment. According to him removal to a private sphere deprived the individual from the "other's gaze", public exteriority in other words, which is indispensable and preferable for the individual to preserve his/her integrity.

> The human begins to shift to a space that is closed and private, the space of private rooms where something approaching intimacy is possible, where it loses its monumental formedness and exclusively public exteriority [.....] it is as if the old public and rhetorical unity of the human image had been drenched with fragments of a future, thoroughly private man (Bakhtin, 2002a:144).

Contrary to Bakhtin's idea that associates the end of externalization with private locations, Foucault asserts in his work Discipline and Punish that man's shift into private spheres led to more externalization and more control on his /her behaviours. It is with private locations that man's submission to a constant observation and externalization mechanism increased. The model of the panopticon is based on the division of individuals: locating them in different cells and maintaining a constant watch over the individual. This is an observation whose aim is to create and define the individual by forming different fields of knowledge which would be necessary in categorization of the information.

> Each individual, in his place, is securely confined to a cell from which he is seen from the front by the supervisor; but the side walls prevent him coming into contact with his companions. He is seen but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication (Foucault, 1991a:200).

Therefore punishment and discipline starting from the nineteenth century are exercised through techniques that give the individual a private sphere, but the same mechanism made him/her the object of information. Therefore modern forms of the panopticon work in a manner which contradicts Bakhtin's argument that by living in his/her private sphere the individual becomes alienated from the communal bonds and loses the unity that can liberate him/her. This issue is the source of one of the most important disagreements between Bakhtin and Foucault on the workings of power. Bakhtin defines carnival as a process through which hierarchical structure is turned upside down, figures of authority are parodied, the official order is destroyed and, most importantly, as a festivity peculiar to the pre-class society which, by making the individual a part of a social unity, liberates her/him. Therefore for Bakhtin public exhibition of the individual during a carnival connects the individual

to the society and liberates him from the restrictions of the hierarchical order that is experienced during the normal course of life.

> As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions (Bakhtin, 2002b:199).

Thus Bakhtin is in disagreement with Foucault on three issues in his description of carnival: First of all, life is separated into two distinct realms, namely the official and unofficial, and in addition to this society is divided into two: those who hold authority and the others who are subjected to authority. Foucault, on the other hand, rejects a bi-polar distribution (dominant/dominated) in his analyses of power.

> In short this power is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the 'privilege', acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic position –an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated (Foucault, 1991a:26).

A second disagreement is on the issue of how authority is exercised: Bakhtin perceives authority not as an agent working also in the pleasurable sphere of life but as a medium of oppression whose field of activity is restricted to the official sphere of life. Foucault, contrary to Bakhtin, does not limit the exercise of power to the "state apparatuses" nor does he argue that authority should be oppressive.

> Furthermore, this power is not exercised simply as an obligation or a prohibition on those who'd not have it'; it exerts pressure upon them; just as they themselves, in their struggle against it, resist the grip it has on them. This means that these relations go right down into the depths of society, that they are not localized in the relations between the state and its citizens or on the frontier between classes and they do not merely reproduce, at the level of individuals, bodies, gestures and behaviour, the general form of the law and or government; that although there is continuity(they are indeed articulated on this form through a whole series of complex mechanisms), there is neither analogy nor homology, but a specifity of mechanism and modality (Foucault, 1991a:27).

And a third dichotomy between Bakhtin and Foucault is on the issue of carnival. Bakhtin argued that the individual who is involved in the communal activity of carnival is liberated through union with his/her surroundings. Therefore the carnival festivity has a liberating role as well as a "whole making" role both for the individual and those who are subjected to authority. However, according to Bakhtin the "unity" that had been provided through carnival in the medieval age and Renaissance, was, at later stages lost due to individual's involvement in the private sphere of life.

> In following epochs, man's image was distorted by his increasing participation in the mute and invisible spheres of existence. He was literally drenched in muteness and invisibility. And with them entered loneliness. The personal and detached human being – the man who exits for himself'-lost the unity and wholeness that had been a product of his public origin (Bakhtin, 2002a:187).

As opposed to Bakhtin, Foucault argues that moments like a carnivalesque chronotope is in fact not a realm that liberates the individual but rather one that subjects him to a more intricate control in which roles of the authoritative and the subject are not stable. Therefore a carnival is, in fact, a panopticon in the sense that there does not have to be a visible, concrete agent of authority for power to be exercised and there is no realm that is outside the power structure, because even the reversal of the hierarchical order, even parody creates a counter discourse that may simply enhance the working of power, and it is through the most pleasurable that power creates a discourse which defines the subject. For example it is through confessions about sex that sex is transformed into a policing force: a discourse that defines the individual. Therefore externalization (all sorts of public exhibition) is not a liberating agent as Bakhtin argued, but a kind of control mechanism. Thus Foucault negates Bakhtin's idea that

> In fact, carnival does not know footlights, in the sense that it does not acknowledge any distinction between actors and spectators. Footlights would destroy a carnival, as the absence of footlights would destroy a theatrical performance. Carnival is not a spectacle

> seen by the people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all the people (Bakhtin, 2002b:198).

There may not be a distinct group of spectators in a carnival, but from Foucault's point of view the spectators may as well be the players or vice versa; they constantly observe and define each other, sustaining the control mechanism through internal laws applied to each one of the participators. While describing "power" Foucault describes a similar scene and calls attention to an internal regulatory system:

> Moreover, in speaking of domination I do not have in mind that solid and global kind of domination that one person exercises over others or one group over another, but the manifold forms of domination that can be exercised within society. Not the domination of the King in his central position, therefore, but that of his subjects in their mutual relations. Not the uniform edifice of sovereignty, but the multiple forms of subjugation that have a place and function within the social organism (Foucault, 1980:96).

Therefore, carnival can well be "regional or local forms and institutions" working not according to a single regulatory system but through complex mechanisms varying at each point of application. Or it may not appear in the form of punishment but in the form of a pleasure-inducing agent, as is exemplified in the case of sexuality and discourse on sexuality.

Thus, when The Great Gatsby is concerned, we can say that each of its spatial chronotopes have the features of a carnival that serves as a panopticon. For example Gatsby's house has two functions in the novel. It functions as a panopticon during the parties which have, on a superficial level, the qualities of a carnival to which not only those who are invited and who can be included within the higher classes of the society, but also those who do not have an invitation and who are the members of the lower stratum of the society can be admitted.

> I believe that on the first night I went to Gatsby's house I was one of the few guests who had actually been invited. People were not invited –they went there. They got into automobiles which bore them out to Long Island, and somehow they ended up at Gatsby's

> door. Once they were introduced by somebody who knew Gatsby, and after that they conducted themselves according to the rules of behaviour associated with an amusement park. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 47)

We also know that among the guests there is such diversity that it can include both people of upper class, such as Tom and Daisy who are the settlers of East Egg, and guests belonging to lower-middle class such as Catherine, Myrtle's sister. On the other hand Gatsby's party is a setting in which there are no limitations on decorum; everyone acts according to the rules of an "amusement park". In that respect the house as the setting of the parties may fit into Bakhtin's definition of carnival which has its roots in the "past popular-festive culture" peculiar to a pre-class society. However it also has the qualities of a panopticon because during the parties everyone exercises a constant watch over the other. In this regard the house exhibits the qualities of a film-set, a modern form of panopticon, defining the participants, and most of all Gatsby. It is during the party scenes that a variety of speculations on Gatsby spread among the guests regarding his past and present pre-occupations; among them are suppositions about his being a murderer or a spy:

> It was testimony to the romantic speculation he inspired that there were whispers about him from those who had found little that it was necessary to whisper about in this world. (Fitzgerald, 1997:50)

On the other hand Gatsby has the role of the observer in the party. He is the one who identifies Nick and Jordan among the guests, two possible agents who can connect him to a romance-ridden past which he is trying to repeat. Therefore Gatsby is in the position of both an observer and observed, two interchangeable roles connected to each other in Foucault's prescription of power mechanism:

> In the Panopticon each person, depending on his place, is watched by all or certain of the others. You have an apparatus of total and circulating mistrust, because there is no absolute point. The perfected form of surveillance consists in a summation of malveillance. (Foucault 1980:158)

Therefore Gatsby's house is a chronotope which justifies the fact that a carnival is also a panopticon: a carnival, the site of pleasure, the setting which also exhibits, neither in the form of an explicit punishment or a juridical agent nor in the form of a power mechanism that defines two distinct, constant roles such as those who dominate and who are dominated but in the form of surveillance having its intrinsic alterable rules, defining no stable position for the individual and gaining strength from that instability.

Therefore Gatsby's house, when its central position as a chronotope is concerned, is both a panopticon in itself and a part of a larger surveillance mechanism including Nick's house. When Nick's relation to Gatsby and to other characters is considered, he is also in the position of the powerful, observing other characters and mainly Gatsby, making a selection of events, ordering and narrating them. Therefore as the narrator, Nick is also observed by the reader because his narration is of a contradictory nature. This relation between Gatsby and Nick, Nick and the reader is repeated on the level of chronotopes in the novel. Nick's house is in an elevated position to Gatsby's so that he can narrate all the details of the party scene. However, his description of Gatsby's house is implausible because he can describe even the interior of the house even before his participation in the party.

> Every Friday five crates of oranges and lemons arrived from a fruiterer in New York – every Monday these same oranges and lemons left his back door in a pyramid of pulpless halves. There was a machine in the kitchen which could extract the juice of two hundred oranges if a little button was pressed two hundred times by a butler's thumb. (Fitzgerald, 1997:45)

Nick's role as the narrator and numerous other contradictions within the narrative both make him the observer of Gatsby and subjects him to the closer scrutiny of the reader. That observer – observed relation between the characters within the story and the sense of unreliability the narrator invokes in the reader sets a mechanism of surveillance between the reader and the characters and among the characters which is of a pyramidal nature including the reader located at the top.

Such a concrete form of a surveillance mechanism is in conformity with Foucault's analyses of power.

> It's obvious that in an apparatus like an army or a factory, or some other such type of institution, the system of power takes a pyramidical form ……The summit and the lower elements of the hierarchy stand in a relationship of mutual support and conditioning, a mutual 'hold'(power as a mutual and indefinite 'blackmail') (Foucault, 1980:159)

As a conclusion, the chronotopic relations in the book – both on the level of relations between the characters and literary work's relation to the reader – demonstrates that the pleasurable sphere, in other words the carnival (the party and the novel), is where power is most intensively exercised, and this relation is neither in the form of repression or nor in the presence of a visible authority. Thus the power relations within the modernist text we have studied refute Bakhtin's idea of carnival arguing the possibility of a process during which all that is oppressive can be parodied and in which only a pleasurable domain remains. When applied to modernism a carnivalesque chronotope exceeds Bakhtin's definition and turns out to be a panopticon in which the bi-polar definition of the power mechanism loses its validity and power turns out to be a web of relations which can easily be modified and re-define its object according to rules formed anew at every stage.

Moreover the text also presents chronotopes which negate Bakhtin's claim that humans have lost the unity they attained as a consequence of their immersion into the private spheres of life, that in the modern ages, as humans get more detached from the public, as they get more involved in "the mute and invisible sphere of existence", that human's image was transformed into "the personal and detached human being" and that "he was drenched in muteness and invisibility". Every spatial chronotope, every inward space in the novel implies that it is not loneliness and detachedness but a kind of revelation, a disclosing of a secret, a discourse that the "private" and seemingly "mute" sphere introduces. Therefore The Great Gatsby introduces a paradox: the more private the character is, the more publicized he becomes. In other words, the more Nick speaks to himself in a

detached position in a hut the more contradictory we find him. Therefore contrary to what Bakhtin argues, every seemingly inner speech takes the presence of an audience for granted in the modern age. Every private house is in fact a stage like Daisy's and Tom's house in the novel. The existence of such an externalization (publicizing) is shown on two levels parallel to each other. On the first level, the externalization (publicizing) of the characters takes place within the plot of the novel, through the revelation of past secrets by the characters themselves in private settings such as a house or a hotel, or through the projection of the past onto the present through the narrator. Another level of externalization (publicizing) of the characters takes place through the media. For example the news of Gatsby's death is not revealed through the speech of one of the characters. The narrator Nick tells the story as if he read it from a newspaper.

> Someone with a positive manner, perhaps a detective, used the expression 'madman' as he bent over Wilson's body that afternoon, and the adventitious authority of his voice set the key for the newspaper reports next morning. Most of the reports were a nightmare-grotesque, circumstantial, eager, and untrue [……] So Wilson [Gatsby's murderer, Myrtle's husband] was reduced to a man 'deranged by grief' in order that the case might remain in its simplest form. And it rested there. (Fitzgerald, 1997:58)

The common denominator of both levels is the fact that at neither level is the discourse based on reality. The unreality of the event, that is supposed to be real by the characters or by the reader is either implied or explicitly said by the narrator.

The first level of externalization, the revelation of a secret belonging to a character is deployed in the first chapter of the book in which Nick goes to East Egg in order to visit Daisy and Tom, his cousin and her husband. In Daisy's house he learns that "Tom's got some woman in New York" from Jordan Baker who, at some points in the story, has the role of revealing secrets in the form of gossip. Another significant point in these disclosures of the personal information is that they come after a sudden interventions, such as a telephone conversation or a car accident as we see in the case with Myrtle's death which is published in the newspapers as an

outrage which loses its reality as it is repeated in the newspapers and by people who witnessed the events.

> [….] and some garrulous man telling over and over what had happened, until it became less and less real even to him and he could tell it no longer [….] (Fitzgerald, 1997:162)

Another secret, Daisy's relation with Gatsby and the fact that their relation depends on an encounter in the past is revealed to Tom in a hotel room:

> Tom turned to Daisy sharply.
> 'You've been seeing this fellow for five years?'
> 'Not seeing,' said Gatsby.' No, we couldn't meet. But both of us loved each other all that time, old sport, and you didn't know. I used to laugh sometimes'-but there was no laughter in his eyes-'to think that you didn't know.' (Fitzgerald, 1997:137)

And the fact that Tom and Daisy's marriage has another facet that Gatsby is unable to grasp is revealed to Gatsby by Tom in the same hotel room: "Why –there's things between Daisy and me that you'll never know, things that neither of us can ever forget" (Fitzgerald, 1997:139). In that respect what Bakhtin argues about Stendhal's and Balzac's novels in particular and the nineteenth century- novel in general , the fact that "salons and parlors" serve as chronotopes where there is intrigue, is transformed in the case of The Great Gatsby's settings. Instead of public places, In The Great Gatsby private spheres, hotel rooms or houses become chronotopes where an intrigue is disclosed. Therefore Bakhtin's notion that the private settings of modernity detached human from the society and rendered him/her mute and lonely is reversed in the sense that modern man is created in the private settings through revelation of secrets.

Another feature of the revelations is their unconfessional character; they are never revealed in the form of confessions by the person who is involved in the event. In fact there is a third party either in the form of technology or a human agent disclosing the secrets. On the other hand, even if the character talks about his/her past, even if he/she confesses, this confession is made in order to conform to an image of himself/herself. Whenever the character makes a confession about

himself/herself, it is made in order to reinforce an idea of himself/herself. Therefore in The Great Gatsby both the confession of the character about himself/herself and the other's speech about the character is shown to be unreal. The following is an example of Gatsby's speech about himself based on an idea of himself:

> 'I was brought up in America but educated at Oxford, because all my ancestors have been educated there for many years. It is a family tradition ……My family all died and I came into a good deal of money…..After that I lived like a young rajah in all the capitals of Europe- Paris, Venice, Rome-collecting jewels chiefly rubies, hunting big game, and trying to forget something very sad that had happened to me long ago. (Fitzgerald, 1997:72)

Even Gatsby's own definition of himself, such as his being a graduate of Oxford University, is formed according to an image that conforms to norms that the society finds valuable, and they are untrue just like others' supposition that he were a spy or a murderer is untrue.

The second level of externalization (publicizing) is through the mediatic discourse to which the author gives priority especially in the narration of accidents. For example the car accident after which Daisy is killed, the climatic event of the novel, is narrated for the first time as if it were extracted from a newspaper:

> The 'death car' as the newspapers called it, didn't stop; it came out of the gathering darkness, wavered tragically for a moment, and then disappeared around the next bend. (Fitzgerald, 1997:144)

The event loses its reality as it is repeated over and over

> […..] and some garrulous man telling over and over what had happened, until it became less and less real even to him and he could tell it no longer, and Myrtle Wilson's tragic achievement was forgotten. (Fitzgerald, 1997:162)

When the present becomes the past in the memory it is formed anew. When the past is narrated it is no more an event but a discourse. In the same fashion Daisy acquires an enchanting quality as she is renewed in the memory of Gatsby. When Gatsby and

Daisy's encounter takes place in Nick's house, Daisy is not the real Daisy for Gatsby but the woman he fell in love with in the past. The image takes the place of the concrete reality. For example, Gatsby can't believe the existence of Daisy's child; he can not think of Daisy in her present, real state as a mother:

> Gatsby and I in turn leaned down and took the small reluctant hand. Afterward he kept looking at the child with surprise. I don't think he had ever really believed in its existence before. (Fitzgerald, 1997:123)

The image's taking the place of reality can best be exemplified in Mr. Gatz's (Gatsby's father) arrival to Gatsby's mansion for his son's funeral. Although the father is in the house, the photo of the house has more reality for him than the real one:

> 'Jimmy (Gatsby) sent me this picture.' He took out his wallet with trembling fingers. 'Look there.'
> It was a photograph of the house, cracked in the corners and dirty with many hands. He pointed out every detail to me eagerly.' Look there!' and then sought admiration from my eyes. He had shown it so often that I think it was more real to him now than the house itself. (Fitzgerald, 1997:179)

Therefore the photo of the house has a twofold unreality. First of all its origin, the house itself, is unreal because it is an imitation of a feudal mansion and yet it has no connection to a feudal past in the real sense of the word; it is obviously a new building constructed in order to re-capture a "lost and glamorous" past:

> A brewer had built it early in the 'period' craze, a decade before, and there was a story that he'd be agreed to pay five years' taxes on all the neighbouring cottages if the owners would have their roofs thatched with straw. (Fitzgerald, 1997:95)

Therefore it is just an image (the photo) of an imitation (the house constructed as if it were a feudal mansion) that evokes admiration for Mr. Gatz, an image of an image. In addition to this, Daisy, the enchanting object of Gatsby's life, is also grounded on a two-fold unreality. First of all she is, in her present state, no more the Daisy of Gatsby's "romantic past", and on the other hand it is to be

questioned if Gatsby's "romantic past" was really romantic. Obviously not, because 1917 is the year America entered the war. Therefore Bakhtin is right in the sense that the subject is muted in modernity, but the reasons of this muteness lie neither in the private sphere in which he/she is located nor in the loss of communal activity. It is the communal activity in the form of parties, the cinema industry and forms of media that publicizes the character and infuses into the most private spheres of life through a constant surveillance, a control system working within the individual. In the twentieth century the emergence of technology reinforced the working of power by inscribing the system within the individual, a system one of whose agents was mediatic discourse infused into the private realm. Thus the chronotope of home in The Great Gatsby serves as a realm in which the character is most externalized in his /her private sphere. Even in their most private condition the characters are defined as an object of gossip (Gatsby) or figures of official history (Gatsby, Tom, Nick) or characters in a film (Myrtle, Daisy). The definition of the character goes hand in hand with the definition of the past, mediatic discourse and war-time ideology. The characters can only exist within a discourse, and they do not have to be in the public square, in the literal sense of the word, in order to be defined. The characters are in the public square even in their own home.

It is suggested by Ouditt in her study entitled Fighting Forces, Writing Woman, that war propaganda derived strength from the idea of "returning back home". By treating the idea of "home" as a centripetal force, an organizing idea that reinforced both the patriarchal order at home and the continuation of war on the front, wartime propaganda implied that the chaos of war would come to an end and the soldier would go back home where he would be welcomed by "angel in the house". However, in The Great Gatsby the chronotope of home shows that daily life and life at home do not show the suspension of warfare and the suspension of control and surveillance mechanism that is peculiar to war. All the chronotopes of home negate the idea that war comes to an end and that at home the characters have peace. A war-like control mechanism, that manifests itself in all the characters' action, testifies to the fact that a surveillance mechanism reigns within the private sphere however by means of an interior control that is shared between the characters.

For that reason the character Daisy can only be understood as part of a discourse that defined women as "angels in the house", Gatsby can only be defined in his in-between state between myth of success and the illegality that is associated with the mafia or Tom in his relation to a feudal past and racist discourse, and Nick in his conflict between the myth of "pathfinder" and being a "bondsman"; in short all the roles they give to each other and images in terms of which they define themselves manifest the existence of a surveillance and knowledge mechanism that determines their roles. Therefore the text, by showing the war-fare of peace time, justifies Foucault's claim when he asks,

> …isn't power simply a form of warlike domination? Shouldn't one therefore conceive all problems of power in terms of relations of war? Isn't power a sort of generalized war which assumes at particular moments the forms of peace and the State? Peace would then be a form of war, and the State a means of waging it. (Foucault, 1980:123)

CHAPTER 2

TENDER IS THE NIGHT

One of the most significant discrepancies between Bakhtin and Foucault stems from their methodology in their approaches to history and literature. Bakhtin's methodology is based on looking for antecedents by tracing a single historical line, a method which is conspicious in his essay entitled "The Folkloric Bases of Rabelaisian Chronotope" in which it is argued that a Rabelaisian chronotope is rooted in the popular-festive culture of the past; it has its roots in the folkloric tradition. Bakhtin also traces the historical roots of the novel as a genre and looks for its original forms in the Hellenistic and Roman epochs.

> It is significant that even today one cannot read St.Augustine's *Confessions* "to oneself"; it must be declaimed aloud-to such an extent is the spirit of Greek public square still alive in it, that square upon which the self-consciousness of European man first coalesced. (Bakhtin, 2002a:134,135)

Such a method is not acceptable to Foucault because he concerns himself not with the question of antecedents but the methods through which the antecedents are traced, how the series of information is accumulated, and according to what principle the data to be included in the series are chosen. In short it is with the method of gathering and accumulating information that Foucault concerns himself; unlike Bakhtin Foucault's method is not an excavation made in order to find an underlying principle or an original antecedent. The following extract from his essay "Foucault"[5] illuminates his methodology on the basis of analysis of "power":

> Obviously, it is a matter not of examining "power" with regard to its origin, its principles, or its legitimate limits, but of studying the methods and techniques used in different institutional contexts to act upon the behaviour of individuals taken separately or in a group, so as to shape, direct, modify their way of conducting themselves, to impose ends on their actions or fit into overall strategies, these being multiple consequently, in their form and their place of exercise,

[5] The essay was written by Foucault but it was signed pseudonymously "Maurice Florence" (Foucault 2000:459).

> diverse, too, in their procedures and techniques they bring into play. (Foucault, 2000a: 463)

Contrary to Foucault, who questions historians' and scientists' endeavour to reach an original cause, Bakhtin's method of criticism takes it for granted that there is an original myth or a fundamental knowledge reactivated in different forms-in the form of a contrary argument or a form that is an alteration of the original form- at certain stages in the development of the novel as a genre.

Tender is the Night, a later post-war novel by Fitzgerald published in 1934, presents the disintegration of the original myth and the collapse of the archetypal forms. The disintegration of the "original" gives the reader the clue that what is supposed to be the original is itself a fictionalized form, a make- believe that can easily be converted into a commercialized, contemporary form. Therefore Tender is the Night does not look for an original self, a past that is true to reality but presents, on the contrary, the non-existence of such a core from which "the present" might be supposed to emanate. Therefore as one of the most injured characters of the novel, Abe North, suggests the past becomes the past in the present; the original becomes original in the present: "The drink made past happy things contemporary with the present, as if they were still going on, contemporary even with the future, as if they were about to happen again" (Fitzgerald, 1997:191). Thus the novel coheres with Foucault's idea that the "original" is make-believe, a created, fictional past that is usable in the present. Tender is the Night reveals the collapse of the past as an image of safety and the disintegration of the present that seeks for a unity by relying on the safety of the past. Tender is the Night gives us a disintegrated form of a fictionalized past which can be made usable when adapted into a commercialized post-war present.

Tender is the Night presents this dispersal through more concrete images than that of The Great Gatsby, in which the untruth of the "golden past" or the "white girlhood", in Daisy's terms, can be understood through the contradictory revelations of one of the characters in the novel. Therefore what The Great Gatsby

achieves through narrative form is achieved in Tender is the Night through concrete images.

2-1 Past as Fiction

This section will deal with the ways the novel Tender is the Night implicitly refers to the fictional structure of the past, and how the "past" is recollected as a unity true to reality in the character's mind. With a view to implying the artificial unity of the past, spatial setting is used as a marker to indicate the characters' relation to the past. Therefore the symbolic use of spatial setting in the novel reveals the characters' relation with time. In this respect, the time and space relationship in the novel connects the novel to modernistic themes and underlines one of the most important concerns of the modernist novel: the individual's externality in chronology and their asymmetrical stance against the formal, sequential ordering of history.

The use of spatial setting in the novel so as to suggest characters' relation to the past and present connects us to a Bakhtinian understanding of the space-time relationship, which he calls the *chronotope* in the novel. While theorizing the idea of chronotope in the novel, Bakhtin considers the idea of chronotope as a category "that determines the image of human in literature."

> We will give the name *chronotope* (literally, "time space") to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial setting that are artistically expressed in literature.[….] Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. [….] The chronotope as a formally constitutive category determines to a significant degree the image of man in literature as well. The image of man is always intrinsically chronotopic (Bakhtin, 2002a:84-85).

For example Gatsby's house does not only determine the character Gatsby as a man outside the chronological order of time, as a man compiled and incongruous to the time he is living; the house also signifies the book's occupation with time. The house is like a cardboard house; it seems unreal. Moreover, it is hard to place the house in the sequence of history; nor is it a genuine colonial mansion made in feudal times; neither is it a house that can easily be placed in the present. The house stages the fiction of history, each room representing a different historical era within a

cardboard “eyesore”. In this respect Gatsby’s house may fit Bakhtin’s definition of the chronotope. It binds time and space to each other and determines the character.

The presentation of spatial chronotope in Tender is the Night indicates a sort of dispersal and a sense of dislocation rather than evoking a sense of belonging or a kind of centralization. It does also underline a sense of insecurity in characters’ occupation with the idea of time. For example, although Dick Diver and Nicole are Americans, they are expatriates living in France, Switzerland and in Italy. Dick Diver goes to America only once to bury his father, a visit which symbolizes his permanent break from his roots.

> Dick had no more ties here now and did not believe he would come back. He knelt on the hard soil. These dead, he knew them all, their weather beaten faces with blue flashing eyes, the spare violent bodies, the souls made of new earth in the forest- heavy darkness of the seventeenth century. “Goodbye, my father –good-bye all my fathers.” (Fitzgerald, 1997:258)

The death of Dick’s father also symbolizes the loss of the past as a secure point in Dick’s life. His father was a clergyman who was a “moral guide” to him and who taught Dick “all he knew about life, not much but most of it, true, simple things, matters of behaviour that came within his clergyman’s range.” (Fitzgerald, 1997:256) The father who is associated with a religious morality and who is the symbol of a sacred past vanishes with his burial. The existence of such a symbol implies that the idea of home or a sacredness that is associated with the past are no more the forces which work as central goals that the characters feel obliged to attain: they too have been buried. The past does not offer purgation or safety but a treachery that is symbolized by Nicole’s father, who raped Nicole when she was a child. Therefore in the novel the past does not offer the safety and moral integrity, that is embodied by Dick’s father who dies, but a sense of guilt and darkness that are symbolized by the survival of Nicole’s father.

In addition to this, we can also see Dick’s occupation as a psychiatrist as a modern version of his father’s occupation as a clergyman. However, we must also

take the difference into consideration that psychiatry is represented as a commercial institution as opposed to what the father represents as a figure associated with moral integrity. The book depicts psychiatry as an institution that has, more than anything else, commercial ends, as Dick suggests when Franz offers him the chance to be the shareholder of a psychiatric institution in Switzerland "This young Privat-dozent thinks that he and I ought to launch into big business and try to attract nervous break-downs from America." (Fitzgerald, 1997:222) Therefore modernity brings the transformation of certain old patterns and projects them into a commercial sphere. Dick's commercial psychiatry, as an extension and modern version of his father's clerical job, symbolizes the moral integrity of the past for Dick. Even Dick's marriage with his patient Nicole, presenting a professional dilemma for Dick at the beginning, turns out to be a marriage that has commercial aims. Dick's marriage to Nicole can be characterized as a business relation arranged by Nicole's sister Baby Warren. On the one hand Nicole's marriage with Dick seems to fill an emotional lack that is created by Nicole's father's withdrawal from her life as a consequence of the rape that caused Nicole's breakdown. On the other hand, this marriage gives Dick the opportunity to become the man of perfection which is his ultimate quest throughout his life.

> …..he used to think that he wanted to be good, he wanted to be kind, he wanted to be brave and wise, but it was all pretty difficult. He wanted to be loved, too, if he could fit in it. (Fitzgerald, 1997:26)

Dick and Nicole's marriage, which seems to be founded on an emotional tie filling the gaps in their lives, can be deemed as a marriage that is grounded on a commercial principle similar to the one that pervades into Dick's professional life. When considered this way, the marriage can also be perceived as an arrangement made by Baby Warren:

> A burst of hilarity surged up in Dick, the Warrens were going to buy Nicole a doctor – You got a nice doctor you can let us use? There was no use worrying about Nicole when they were in position of being able to buy her a nice doctor, the paint scarcely dry on him. (Fitzgerald, 1997:49)

After the marriage it is “Warren money” (Nicole’s money) that they use in constructing the house and the clinic they buy, in exchange for which Dick becomes a vehicle in Nicole’s treatment and her normalization process.

In that respect the traditional social form of marriage, which seems to be “romantic” in the beginning of the novel is once again transformed and shaped so as to be adjusted into the commercial order of postwar era. Therefore we turn to Foucault’s argument that,

> The moment a kind of thought is constituted, fixed or identified within a cultural tradition, it is quite normal that this cultural tradition should take hold of it, make what it wants of it and have it say what it did not mean, by implying that this is merely another form of what it was actually trying to say. Which is all a part of cultural play. (Foucault, 1990:32)

As well as exposing the transformation of a past institution and its re-adjustment to the present, as we see in the case of psychiatry making use of the same confessional tradition that religion uses, the book also negates the idea that the image of the past was based on a reality, on an original state. In this respect the Divers’ beach in the French Riviera has a symbolic quality. Once a locality to which only a limited number of people of a certain quality could enter, it has now been transformed into a club: “Now the swimming place was a ‘club,’ though, like the international society it represented, it would be hard to say who was not admitted” (Fitzgerald, 1997:350). However the beach, whose present transformation into a club is observed by the Divers with disapproval, is in fact an artificial beach constructed by Dick. Therefore the setting symbolizes the idea that the past is not only re-shaped and transformed but it is also created just like Divers’ beach:

> Let him look at it –his beach , perverted now to the tastes of the tasteless; he could search it for a day and find no stone of the Chinese wall he had once erected around it, no footprint of an old friend……. Many inventions of his, buried deeper than the sand under the span of so few years. (Fitzgerald, 1997:350)

There are other settings that have a symbolic significance implying that the past is just a creation which seems to be real only if it becomes the present. For instance, the first setting in the book is Switzerland; a geographical location between the enemy countries and a country that did not take part in the war. Therefore Switzerland is like a No Man's Land, a place that is supposed to be secure for Dick Diver.

> In 1917 he laughed at the idea, saying apologetically that the war didn't touch him at all. Instructions from his local board were that he was to complete his studies in Zurich and take a degree as has planned. (Fitzgerald, 1997:3)

However secure it might seem, Zurich was not exempted from the effects of war, as is suggested by the narrator: "Switzerland was an island, washed on one side by the waves of thunder around Gorizia and on the other by the cataracts along the Somme and the Aisne" (Fitzgerald, 1997:3). Therefore the indirect effect that the war has on Zurich can be compared to the state of Dick Diver who, although he does not take part in the war as a soldier, carries with him the vulnerabilities and illusions of the past during his arrival to Zurich. The writer suggests Dick's vulnerability by using the metaphor of "Achilles' heels":

> Dick got up to Zurich on fewer Achilles' heels than would be required to equip a centipede, but with plenty – the illusions of eternal strength and health, and of the essential goodness of people – they were the illusions of a nation, the lies of generations of frontier mothers who had to croon falsely that there were no wolves outside the cabin door. (Fitzgerald, 1997:6)

Thus, as well as the past which is full of illusions and which is supposed to be safe, the present is also deprived of security even in a country that did not enter the First World War. Therefore Tender is the Night, as a modernist novel written after the war, challenges what Bakhtin defines as "The Idyllic Chronotope" which is "a model restoring the ancient complex and for restoring the folkloric time." The Idyll, according to Bakhtin, represents the unity of place in which several generations follow the cyclicity of life; a pattern reminiscent of the unity that folkloric, communal time presents.

> The unity of place brings together and even fuses the cradle and the grave (the same little corner, the same earth), and brings together as well childhood and old age (the same groove, stream, the same lime trees, the same houses), the life of the various generations who had also lived in that same place, under the same conditions, and who had seen the same things (Bakhtin, 2002a:225).

Tender is the Night disintegrates both the idyllic forms that might exist in the present and those which might appear in the past. In the present, the characters lead a life of constant emigration between Switzerland, France and Italy. There is not a central point that can be characterized as a root. As is implied in Dick's visit to America to bury his father, connection with a secure past is broken. What the characters have, on the contrary, is a past that is characterized by a sense of insecurity symbolized by the survival of the father - Nicole's father who raped her in her infancy- who is sick to death. Even the family idyll is depicted as an economic enterprise based on an exchange of "Warren money" since Dick is recruited as a husband to provide professional assistance for Nicole. Therefore both the past and the present are characterized as the reverse of an idyll and the idyll is revealed to be an illusory projection.

The illusory quality of the past is concretized by certain images repeated several times in the novel whose common feature is the colour yellow. One example is the party scene at Divers' house in the French Riviera during which Nicole gives a yellow bag to Mrs Speers, Rosemary's mother. Nicole's gift is a yellow bag stuffed with many different articles having the same colour yellow. The yellow bag and the yellow articles in it represent the idea of the past which is a recollection of several events; in spite of being various and diverse in quality, the events of the past have coherence in the subject's mind like the colour yellow as the articles in the bag bear.

> Rosemary watched Nicole pressing upon her mother a yellow evening bag she had admired, saying, ' I think things ought to belong to the people that like them' – and then sweeping into it all the yellow articles she could find, a pencil, a lipstick, a little notebook, 'because they all go together.'(Fitzgerald, 1997:105)

The yellow bag and the yellow articles in it bear no other relation to each other than their common colour just as the events that are recollected as the past perform an arbitrary unity that is the consequence of the individual's associative ability. Therefore the book underlines the idea that the past is an arbitrary unity consisting of remnants gathered forcefully together and tied to each other by chance.

The colour yellow is associated with an illusory quality similar to that of the colour green in The Great Gatsby. Yellow is sometimes the colour of an imagined past that is to be captured and sometimes a future that has the features of an idyll. The colour yellow as a symbol of the past that is to be re-captured and re-united is repeated twice in a section in which Nicole escapes from her children and Dick during their visit to Agiri Fair.

> Far ahead he (Dick) saw her (Nicole's) yellow dress twisting through the crowd, an ochre stitch along the edge of reality and unreality, and he started after her. Secretly she ran and secretly he followed. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 238)

This escape, Nicole's attempt to be free, is the point after which Dick starts to see the past as having a fairy-tale quality, the sole object of which is the recovery (normalization or socialization) of Nicole, his patient and his wife. After Nicole's attempt to escape she once more submits to the authority of Dick and says: 'Help me, help me, Dick.' (Fitzgerald, 1997:240) After Nicole once more recognizes Dick's authority, another image of yellow appears in the same chapter.

> Somewhere around Zug, Nicole, with a convulsive effort reiterated a remark she had made before about a misty yellow house set back from the road that looked like a painting not yet dry, but it was just an attempt to catch at a rope that was paying out too swiftly. (Fitzgerald, 1997:241)

However this time it is not Dick's but Nicole's eyes that capture the yellow. The house is not like a real one but a painting not dry. The house is "set back from the road" they drive. It is so far away from reality, as the adjective "misty" suggests that it can only be perceived in an instant from a moving car that is about to hit the

wall of reality. A car accident takes place just after the images of wholeness appear. A wholeness, to which the characters aspire, is associated with the yellow house, and an imaginary past that is about to vanish, are symbolized by Nicole's yellow dress. In this respect this chapter presents us with the repetition of another scene in Tender is the Night and one in The Great Gatsby. The event in Tender is the Night is the party organized in Villa Diana, Nicole's and Dick's house in France, after which Nicole collapses for the first time in the book. The party acquires an enchanting quality as the table rises as a "dancing platform":

> The table seemed to have risen a little toward the sky like a mechanical dancing platform, giving the people around it a sense of being alone with each other in the dark universe, nourished by its only food, warmed by its only lights. (Fitzgerald, 1997:104)

A sense of detachment, a feeling that makes every member the center of the world reigns in Dick and Nicole's parties. Therefore, like the yellow house, the parties have an enchanting quality after both of which a car accident or the collapse of Nicole takes place. Thus Fitzgerald makes use of images that evoke a sense of unreality and enchantment in the illustration of the parties, and the parties usually end with occasions that happen in the sphere of reality such as accidents. This juxtaposition of enchantment and reality one after the other serves to emphasize the incongruity between characters' sense of reality and the rigidity of the events that are symbolized by car accidents or nervous breakdowns. Similarly in The Great Gatsby, the accident that causes Myrtle's death occurs in front of the eyes of a parodied god (The eyes of Doctor T.J. Eckleburg in The Great Gatsby) which the eyes of the passers-by's capture as they move along the road in their cars. The real and the painful, such as accidents, follow enchanting social gatherings such as parties. In The Great Gatsby it is after a social gathering in a hotel room that the car accident happens. The hotel section in The Great Gatsby is followed by a revelation. Gatsby made the following explanation to Tom and Tom definitely noticed the fact that his wife, Daisy, is having an affair with Gatsby: "'Your wife does not love you,' said Gatsby. 'She's never loved you. She loves me'". (Fitzgerald, 1997:137)

Similarly there is a party scene in Tender is the Night before Daisy's collapse which gives the clues of Daisy's mental disorder. The party before Daisy's breakdown in Tender is the Night has an unrealistic, imaginary quality that makes everyone feel self-conscious. All these parties are replete with an imminent danger; something unseen but felt, and they all make the reader wait in suspense because they serve as moments in the text in which a secret unknown to other characters is revealed and the dramatic irony that has continued until that point is resolved. So, social gatherings that precede the accident foreshadow the accident with a sense of awaiting danger. Therefore we have argued that the parties that take place prior to the accidents have a forceful unifying character that is dissolved with the event of the accident. On the other hand, they signify an unreality replete with a magical force that can serve the participant's wishful thinking — Gatsby really thinks that Daisy is in love only with himself like the old days, and people in Divers' party think that the table they are sitting at is central to the world — until they are blasted with an accident that reveals the secret. The flux of events leads from the supposed unity of the cheerful and beautiful to the one that is realistic and agonizing.

Fussell detects a similar sequence in the perception of the First World War, and he defines the difference between the account of pre-war "perfection" and the war time pain as "irony of situation".

> [….] Here the irony of situation arises from a collision between innocence and awareness. The contrast between before and after here will remind us of the relation between, say, the golden summer of 1914 and the appalling December of that year. (Fussell, 1975:5)

What concerns us here is a similar pattern both in the perception of the war and in the arrangement of a post-war novel: Catastrophe is preceded by sheer enjoyment. Therefore the preceding entertainment is not there because it is really entertaining but this is just a pattern that compels one to make a catastrophe follow the entertainment or to recount the events according to that order. Therefore neither are the parties in the novels very enjoyable, as suggested by Fitzgerald, nor was the summer before the war "golden", and it is a conditioned thought pattern that makes the event entertaining or catastrophic. In other words the individual is conditioned to

describe specific events as entertaining or catastrophic, and he/ she is also conditioned to name the preceding event as entertaining and the following one as catastrophic.

Foucault in The Archeology of Knowledge, while explaining archeology, refers to discourses as "a practice that has its own forms of sequence and succession."

> Instead of following the thread of an original calendar, in relation to which one would establish the chronology of successive or simultaneous events, that of short or lasting processes, that of momentary or permanent phenomena, one tries to show how it is possible for there to be a succession, and at what different levels distinct successions are to be found. (Foucault, 2004: 186-187)

Therefore, while talking about pastwar novel, notwithstanding the difference between the text that claims to be historical and the one that is fictional, there is a definite system of categorization that establishes the rules of chronology, gives a sequence to the recounting of the events, and this pattern of categorization is renewed continually, diminishing the importance of some features at some moments and exaggerating the importance of some others.

In addition to the fiction of the past, Tender is the Night presents the fiction of the present which is replete with modern forms of panopticon. In the next section we will be dealing with the way Tender is the Night forms the present, an era that is approximately between the year nineteen-nineteen and nineteen-twenties. In this section we will compare the resemblance between Foucault's disciplinary mechanism, which he calls panopticon, and the institutions presented in the novel.

2-2 Present on the Screen

Foucault in Discipline and Punish explains the modern soul as a constantly renewed production shaped and reshaped according to a constituted knowledge which is rearranged by the power relations.

> There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not pre-suppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Foucault, 1991a:27)

The constitution of this body of knowledge and of new disciplinary mechanisms constructs the human by turning him/her into an object of knowledge building the discourse around him/her. Moreover those who are subjects of knowledge are, as well, the objects of it by being the determining element in the constitution of knowledge. The objects of knowledge alter as they are involved in an observation mechanism which both constitutes and is constituted. Therefore the modern soul,

> […..] exists, it has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished- and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madman, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives (Foucault, 1991a:27).

The power mechanism works on the principle of the interchanging roles of the observer and the observed. Therefore one can both be the observer and observed at the same time within the system of the panopticon, which, Foucault suggests, is the model of the disciplinary mechanism. In this respect the individual has manifold roles both as the creator of certain knowledge and the one around whom knowledge is constituted.

While Foucault emphasizes that the other's gaze is a technique among other discipline mechanisms, Bakhtin argues that "other's gaze" is indispensable in the creation of the individual as a whole; it is the most important element in the recognition of oneself as a whole. According to Bakhtin other's gaze is a positive

constitutive element which can give us a whole picture of our constitution, one that is impossible to achieve by our own image of ourselves. Therefore our own images of ourselves should be intertwined with others' image of ourselves.

> I am incapable of feeling *myself* in my own exterior, of feeling myself encompassed and expressed by it, since my emotional and volitional reactions attach to objects and do not contract into an outwardly finished image of myself. My exterior is incapable of becoming *for me* a constituent in a characterization of myself. [….] It is only in the category of the other that it is thus experienced, and I have to subsume myself under this category of the other in order to be able to see myself as a constituent in the unitary pictorial-plastic external world (Bakhtin, 1990:35)

Therefore the "other's gaze", which has negative connotations for Foucault, gains a positive meaning in Bakhtin's theory. Therefore according to Bakhtin the "other's gaze" "consummates", it intertwines "I" with the "other", making a whole that the subject's own vision of himself/herself can not achieve by itself.

> And what is lacking, moreover, is precisely external unity and continuity; a human being experiencing life in the category of his own *I* is incapable of gathering himself by himself into an outward whole that would be even relatively finished….In this sense, one can speak of a human being's absolute need for the other, for the other's seeing, remembering, gathering and unifying self activity-the only self-activity capable of producing his outwardly finished personality (Bakhtin, 1990: 35-36).

Foucault's objection to Bakhtin's argument would focus on especially the position of the observer and the fact that watcher himself/herself is also a constituted being who is at the same time positioned and "consummated" by another observer. According to Bakhtin the watcher has a stable, permanent position; however, according to Foucault it is thanks to the instability and temporality of his/her position that the individual can both be watched and watch at the same time. Therefore the watcher can never see the watched as a whole. What he/she sees changes according to his/her position. In addition to this there are other factors that are active in the watcher's decision concerning where to look and how to look at the object of his/her scrutiny. For example scientific discourse directs the perspective of

the watcher and the position of the watched. Therefore the "consummated" object is, according to Foucault, at the same time a consummating one positioned according to the demands of the watcher for him/her to watch himself from a certain angle. Therefore the observer's position changes according to the perspective of the one who observes himself/herself and who is in turn observed by the other, and what they all see is determined according to both the observed's position and the observer's position. Therefore the outcome is not a "consummated" human being but a constituted knowledge that is gathered out of separate parts of separate subjects like a cubist painting. Thus the constituted or "consummated" knowledge does not give a whole picture but a fragmentary one. According to Foucault this is the way discourse is constituted and the way it constitutes the subject.

In modern times the advent of technology dislocated this observation mechanism from the panopticon and re-located it in the carnival. Disciplinary mechanisms are not only associated with the inside, with an institution, with the ward. In other words disciplinary mechanism works within panoptical carnivals; an occasion which is claimed to be liberating by Bakhtin has turned out to be a sphere that intertwines inside with the outside and various discourses from traditional to modern.

Tender is the Night, more than The Great Gatsby , presents us with panoptic carnivals such as the cinema industry and a mental hospital in the shape of a golf club, warders of which pose according to the demands of the watcher who themselves behave with the knowledge that they are watched. All the characters are created selves of a modern panopticon; rather than being consummated wholes, the characters are fragmentary constitutions expecting to be whole in the other's gaze.

The characters in Tender is the Night, independently of their gender or class, are presented as constituted individuals shaped in modern panopticons. The book presents us with characters who are subjected not to the punitive power of a juridical system but to a kind of system that makes them apparent or make them appear willingly in their private scaffolds on which there is no need of a crowd or a person

who will judge them. They are the judges or the torturers of themselves. However the code according to which they judge themselves is not a self- made moral consciousness or a freely chosen code. For example in Nicole's (Dick's wife) case, although she is a member of an upper-middle class bourgeois American family, she is brought up according to an accumulated knowledge descending from tradition and shaped by the "modern techniques" of the twentieth century psychiatry which "normalizes" her.

> Sometimes she [Nicole] speaks of "the past" as people speak who have been in prison. But you never know whether they refer to the crime or the imprisonment or the whole experience. (Fitzgerald 1997:23)

She is the product of a patriarchal discourse, subjected to a "normalization" process in the mental hospital which is as oppressive and as influential as the system of education according to which she is brought up. Therefore she is an object both in the house she grows up, which imposes marriage as the sole object of a female's life as is implied in the section she talks about an event that happened when she was younger, and in the mental hospital she was taken to after a nervous break-down.

> I was twelve; it was just before Mother died. My sister was going to a court ball and she had three of the royal princes on her dance card, all arranged by chamberlain and everything. Half an hour before she was going to start she had a side-ache and high fever. The doctor said it was appendicitis and she ought to be operated on. But Mother had her plans made, so Baby went to the ball and danced till two with an ice pack strapped on under her evening dress. She was operated on at seven o'clock next morning. (Fitzgerald, 1997:131)

Nicole has a family background that compels her to answer the demands of a patriarchal order similar to that of the eighteenth century in which it is the task of women to develop skills, learn several languages, play a musical instrument and teach them to their children as Nicole suggests: 'Oh I think that's fine for a man,' she said quickly. 'But for a girl I think she ought to have lots of minor accomplishments and pass them on to their children.' (Fitzgerald, 1997:38)

Therefore Nicole is a character who is constituted by a patriarchal discourse in her childhood and taught to be submissive, "normalized" and socialized later on according to the criteria of twentieth-century psychiatry, where she has learned how to be normal and sociable as is revealed in a party scene during which Nicole is disturbed by the loud music but tries to be sociable:

> 'I don't want to do anything anti-social – I've caused everybody enough trouble. But tonight I wanted to get away.'
> It occurred to Dick suddenly, as it might occur to a dying man that he had forgotten to tell where his will was, that Nicole had been 're-educated' by Dohmler [the psychiatrist who was responsible for Nicole preceding Dick's arrival] and the ghostly generations behind him. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 50)

Later in Nicole's life, following the years in the mental hospital, where she meets Dick as her doctor, she enters another phase, and this phase seems to offer her freedom but in fact restricts her in a new role as the wife of Dick. Dick seems to want Nicole to break from the restrictions imposed upon her by Dr. Dohmler and "generations behind him" of the mental hospital and moreover he wants to see Nicole help herself in her own recovery. However, his parental attitude towards Nicole is a repetition of Nicole's relation with her father in the socially recognized form of marriage. In this phase of marriage the boundaries of her freedom depend on Dick's approval.

> He [Dick] tried honestly to divorce her [Nicole] from any obsession that he had stitched her together –glad to see her build up happiness and confidence apart from him…… (Fitzgerald, 1997:31)

Therefore Nicole's life with Dick is another stage in her normalization during which the traces of her vulnerability and fragility are erased. However, what Dick imposes on her is the obligation to adjust to social life. Dick gives her an independence whose boundaries are drawn by him. In that respect the way Dick calls the garden of their house "Nicole's garden" symbolizes the limited freedom granted to Nicole by Dick. Nicole can be independent on the condition that she does not break her connection with society and does not deviate from what is accepted as "normal" form of behavior. After Nicole attempts to run away, in which she is

prevented by Dick, Dick's authority is once more affirmed by Nicole with her words, 'Help me, help me, Dick!". Dick's comments on Nicole justify our conclusion that Nicole has a freedom defined by the codes of patriarchy:

> A schizophrenic is well named as a split personality – Nicole was alternately a person to whom nothing need be explained and one to whom nothing could be explained. It was necessary to treat her with active and affirmative insistence, keeping the road to reality always open, making the road to escape harder going (Fitzgerald, 1997: 242).

However, this reality does not even make small escapes possible and so the one attempted by Nicole fails. It is a reality that recognizes only one alternative for Nicole which is, as opposed to her previous role as the fragile and beautiful patient of the psychiatric institute, to maintain social contact with her children, husband and family friends. Therefore Nicole is not a "consummated whole" but a constructed fragmentary self who is the child of her husband and the wife of her father; a split personality who is brought up according to the codes that imitate the traditional values of a European aristocratic family and judged, normalized and identified according to the criteria of twentieth- century psychiatry.

> Talk is men. When I [Nicole] talk I say to myself I am probably Dick. Already I have even been my son, remembering how wise and slow he is. Sometimes I am Doctor Dohmler and one time I may even be an aspect of you, Tommy Barban. Tommy is in love with me. (Fitzgerald, 1997:64)

Thus there is a heterogeneity of discourses intersect upon Nicole. However, a closer look will reveal the fact that neither the discourse of twentieth century psychiatry nor the traditional codes of a previous century differ in the restrictions they impose upon women in general and Nicole in particular. Both the father and Dick, as the psychiatrist and the husband of Nicole, fall in love with the same image of Nicole; they both describe Nicole as an innocent child who is constantly in need of their parental support to be an individual. Her father's feeling of pity in the face of their daughter's innocence turns out to be an incestuous relationship after the death of Nicole's mother: "After her mother died when she was little she used to

come into my bed every morning, sometimes she would sleep in my bed. I was sorry for the little thing." (Fitzgerald 1997:20) It is a similar kind of feeling that makes Nicole attractive for Dick:

> Dick sighed 'she was such a pretty thing – she enclosed a lot of snapshots of herself: And for a month there I didn't have anything to do. All I said in my letters was be a good girl and mind the doctors.'"
> 'That was enough –it gave her somebody to think of outside. For a while she did not have anybody – only one sister that she doesn't seem very close to……' (Fitzgerald, 1997:22)

The book reveals the fact that two different phases, an earlier one represented by the father and a later generation represented by Dick, and the two seemingly disparate discourses, the traditional represented by the father and the scientific by Dick, have similar goals and conflicts. Although both the father and Dick are motivated by this mythic task of being the protector of innocence, they turn out to be oppressors: the father is the raper of his daughter in the father's case and the husband, Dick, is a commercialized psychiatrist who is offered "Warren money" in order to play the role of husband.

> 'Dick was a good husband to me for six years,' Nicole said 'all that time I never suffered a minute's pain because of him and he always did his best never to let anything hurt me.'
> Baby's [Nicole's sister] lower jaw projected slightly as she said:
> 'That's what he was educated for.'(Fitzgerald, 1997:388)

Therefore although they mythify their role as "protectors", the father rapes Nicole and leads to her breakdown and Dick "normalizes" and helps her adjust to the society. A time-honoured mythic task, the task of protecting the innocence, becomes the basis of the twentieth-century commercialism represented by Dick. Dick is a character that symbolizes the conflicts of both the traditional tasks of a patriarchal society and modern psychiatry. The contradictory aspect of Dick is between being a protector and an individual that is protected. In parties he is the one who is at the centre, arranging how and what people should feel:

> But to be included in Dick Diver's world for a while was a remarkable experience: people believed he made special reservations about them, recognizing the proud uniqueness of their destinies. He won everyone quickly with an exquisite consideration and a politeness that moved so fast and intuively that it could be examined only in its effect. Then, without caution, lest the first bloom of the relation wither, he opened the gate to his amusing world. So long as they subscribed to it completely, their happiness was his pre-occupation, but at the first flicker of doubt as to its all inclusiveness he evaporated before their eyes, leaving little communicable memory of what he had said or done.
>
> At eight-thirty that evening he came out to meet his first guests, his coat carried rather ceremoniously, rather promisingly, in his hand, like a toreador's cape. It was characteristic that after greeting Rosemary and her mother he waited for them to speak first, as if to allow them the reassurance of their own voices in new surroundings. (Fitzgerald, 1997:97)

On the other hand Dick is protected and supported by Warren money. The fact that Dick depends on Warren money is implied through the image of a gold-headed stick Dick carries: "his small brief-case in his hand, his gold-headed stick held at a sword-like angle". The gold- headed stick is the symbol of the abundance of Warren money that Dick supports himself with. In other words Dick has both the mythic task of being a protector and a contrary task of being a hired husband and a psychiatrist.

Therefore myth is one of the micro-technologies of power directed towards disciplining not only the body of Nicole but also those of the father and Dick reigning in their consciousness. In that respect the representation of characters in The Tender is the Night is in coherence with The Great Gatsby which presents tragic figures such as Gatsby who aspires to be one of those historical figures such as Benjamin Franklin, and Nick whose similarity to a nineteenth-century transcendentalist is implied through the symbol of the house he inhabits. Both Gatsby as the member of the mafia and Nick as a stockbroker are the fractured figures of twentieth- century postwar America who look at the glorified past but are in fact in the wreckage of present which, when it becomes past, will be mythified for the present to seem tragic. Therefore the novel implies that the present can be considered tragic and ruinous in the presence of the myth.

This kind of mythification that concludes in the break-down of individuals and a general catastrophe reminds us of the discourse that the war depends on in order to sustain its continuity. In his study The Great War and Modern Memory, Fussell, gives the example of the leaning statue of Virgin Mary with her child in her arms at the top of the ruined Basilica at Albert.

> A memorable instance of the prevailing urge towards myth is the desire felt by everyone to make something significant of the famous leaning Virgin and child atop the ruined Basilica at Albert. No one wanted to it to remain what it literally was, merely an accidental damaged third rate gilded metal statue now so tenuously fixed to its tower that it might fall at any moment. Myth busily attached portentous meaning to it. Mystical prophecy was first. The war would end, the rumor went, and when the statue finally fell to the street [….] others saw her action not as a sacrifice but as an act of mercy: she was reaching out to save her child, who- like a soldier – was about to fall. (Fussell, 1975: 131, 133)

Fussell gives us a concrete image of collapsed myth and sacredness during the war and the tendency of those who are traumatized to stick to the myth, however broken and invalidated it might be. The image can also concretize the conclusion we drew about the characters Gatsby, Nick of The Great Gatsby, and Nicole's father and Dick of Tender is the Night. Gatsby and Nick in The Great Gatsby, Dick and the figure of the father in Tender is The Night are the people of postwar America whose eyes are focused on the myths of past when they cannot cope with the present. The more they are fragmented, the more they come to realize their separation from the envisioned state of perfection and the more they confront their ordinariness, the stronger the myth becomes just as the leaning statue of Virgin Mary's has a new mythic meaning for the soldiers at war even in its literally ruined form. The myth is renewed according to the weaknesses and demands of the postwar society. Therefore the origin, the myth, which was itself a constituted form at the time of its creation, is broken and reconstructed so as to adjust to a new order of demands.

Based on our reading of Fitzgerald, we might argue that there is no such wholeness as an origin. Every supposed origin and wholeness is a transformation of a preceding

myth which has, like statue of Virgin Mary, keeps its existence not in its original form, like statue of Virgin Mary in the biblical sense, but takes on new meanings such as a woman struggling to save her falling child.

Tender is the Night is a novel in which settings and characters are the embodiments of parodied myths showing the disintegration of the supposed wholeness and origin. For example the character Tommy Barban embodies the disintegration of a mythic origin as a soldier who defies the myth of war and the identity of the glorious, courageous soldier. To him war is an occupation; it is a job stripped of its mythic character. Like Dick, who is the parodied version of a priest and protector but in fact a commercialized psychiatrist, Tommy Barban is, on the one hand attached to the image of a courageous soldier and glorifies a conventional, mythic form of war- he has duello guns-, but on the other he is a character to whom war is a job, as is revealed in the extract below:

> 'Going home!'
> 'Home? I have no home. I am going to war.'
> 'What war?"
> Any war. I haven't seen a paper lately but I suppose there's a war- there always is.'
> 'Don't you care what you fight for?'
> 'Not at all-so long as I'm well treated. When I'm in a rut I come to see Divers, because then I know that in a few weeks I'll want to go to war. (Fitzgerald, 1997:100)

It is Tommy Barban's job to kill. However, Barban argues that he kills because he is a European. He justifies his killing by being the member of a group. He justifies his killing, which is his occupation, by being the member of a group and sharing the values of that group.

> 'Well, I'm a soldier,' Barban answered pleasantly. 'My business is to kill people. I fought against the Riff because I am a European, and I have fought the communists because they want to take my property from me.' (Fitzgerald, 1997:106)

Like Dick's job, Barban's job is justified by the cause of communal identity; contemporary phenomena- killing as a job- is explained with the traditional cause of

group attachment- being a European. Therefore both Dick and Barban are the parodies of archetypes: In Dick's case we see the commercial psychiatrist as the modern version of the devoted priest, and in Barban's case we see the soldier killing to make a living without knowing even the cause of it as a modern version of the archetypal soldier who dies for the sake of national ideals. Both the psychiatrist Dick and the solider Barban present the opposite forms of Nicole's case in which a conventional phenomena, an inhibited contemporary woman brought up according to traditional, patriarchal codes, is explained and diagnosed by the contemporary method of twentieth century psychiatry. Therefore the concepts of traditional and modern are mixed up; they merge into each other in such a way that we can not distinguish one from the other as there are no distinct boundaries between them. Therefore the formation of definitions in the novel is made through displacements; sometimes an identity that has a traditional form is explained in terms of a contemporary cause, or what is supposed to be a contemporary formation can be understood within a conventional mythical context. Thus what constitutes the present are not transformations that derive from a common origin and subjected to a similar kind of modification but a kind of mechanism that follows a diversity of paths and determines what should be projected from which angle so as to be identified in the present.

In that respect the characterization of the novel can be understood in terms of Foucault's explanations in his essay entitled "Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History". In this essay Foucault refers to Nietzsche while arguing against the tradition of looking at history as if it was following a linear development. Foucault dissociates history from three Platonic modalities: memory, reality and identity because, according to Foucault history can never require a reliable memory that struggles to reach the reality that would form and fix an identity, and for that reason history is independent of all of these modalities. Foucault alternates Platonic modalities with three uses of history: parodic and farcical use, systematic dissociation of one's identity and the sacrifice of the subject of knowledge.

> In a sense, genealogy returns to the three modalities of history that Nietzsche recognized in 1874. It returns to them in spite of the

> objections that Nietzsche raised in the name of the affirmative and creative powers of life. But they are metamorphosed: the veneration of monuments becomes parody; the respect for ancient continuities becomes systematic dissociation; the critique of the injustices of the past by a truth held by men in the present becomes the destruction of the man who maintains knowledge by the injustice proper to the will to knowledge (Foucault, 2000a:389).

Tender is the Night provides us with an example of what Foucault calls "three uses of history" because it parodies, dissociates, and it is destructive for those who rely on the "safety of history" and for those who look for the universal truths because the novel breaks "illusory defenses". It parodies historical archetypes by creating characters such as Dick and Tommy Barban both of whom are the parodies of the archetypal patterns such as "devoted priest" and " the glamorous solider".

The novel presents two relationships which have the common characteristic of being "illegitimate". The actress Rosemary's relationship with Dick seems to be contrary to the institution of marriage and contrary to the prescribed order of society because Dick is married to Nicole. However, Rosemary chooses Dick because, even the first time she sees him on the beach, Dick offers to be her protector:

> The theory is, said Dick, arranging an umbrella to clip a square of sunlight off Rosemary's shoulder, 'that all the northern places, like Deauville, were picked out by Russians and English, who don't mind the cold […] (Fitzgerald, 1997:84)

Rosemary, by making such a choice, seems to be acting outside of conventions. However, by having a relationship with Dick —a figure who promises to protect— Rosemary wants to see her leading role in the film *Daddy's girl* actualized.

As the title of the film *Daddy's girl* suggests Rosemary is more under the influence of a modern control mechanism-cinema- that, by saying "women should be protected by their fathers and husbands" and must keep on being "daddy's girls", makes use of a traditional discourse. Rosemary chooses to be with Dick, a figure that protects, and becomes Daddy's girl in her actual life. Therefore she projects the film scenario into real life. On the other hand the opposite of this relation can also be said when Rosemary is concerned; she also wants to see what she really experiences in

her life on the cinema screen and arranges a screen test for Dick. “I thought if the test turned out to be good I could take it to California with me. And then if they liked it you’d come out and be my leading man in a picture.” (Fitzgerald, 1997:153) she says to Dick who is already her leading man in actuality. Just like she projects the film scenario into her real life by being daddy’s girl Rosemary wants to project her real life experience onto the cinema screen by making her actual leading man, Dick, her leading man on the screen as well. Therefore Rosemary is not only identified as the “Daddy’s girl” by the cinema industry but identifies and constructs the cinema audience by encouraging their keenness for innocence. In that sense the cinema industry, as it is represented in the novel, can well be considered as a panoptic institution in the Foucauldian sense. Foucault defines Panoticon as a structure in which the inhabitants can both be defined and define:

> He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. (Foucault, 1991a:202-203)

The fact that Rosemary and her mother are in harmony with the current ideological constructions is further underlined by the use of the railroad symbol; a symbol used also in The Great Gatsby as the setting where Myrtle lives. Myrtle is another character who, like Rosemary, makes seemingly unconventional choices that diverge from the dictates of convention, but for both Rosemary and Myrtle, their choices take them closer to an order they want to alternate. Therefore, in both of the novels, the symbol of railway signifies the existence of a pre-determined path that cannot be changed once the journey is taken. Rosemary and her mother Mrs Speers never diverge from the path of a railway:

> A mile from the sea, where pines give way to dusty poplars, is an isolated railroad stop, whence this June morning in 1925 a victoria brought a woman and her daughter [Rosemary and her mother] to Gausse’s hotel. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 66)

Mrs. Speers, Rosemary's mother wants her daughter to be economically independent. Therefore, her claim on her daughter is a modern claim compared to the demand of a prewar discourse which allocates only the family sphere to women. Mrs. Speers encourages her daughter with these contradictory remarks:

> 'You were brought up to work – not especially to marry. Now you've found your first nut to crack [She is talking about Dick] and it's a good nut - go ahead and put whatever happens down to experience. Wound yourself or him - whatever happens it can't spoil you, because economically you are a boy not a girl.' (Fitzgerald, 1997:112)

Being economically independent as a woman is a modern claim in a postwar society. However the idea of man as a "nut to crack" is a traditional claim because Rosemary is encouraged by her mother to seduce Dick. We find here a merging of two disparate claims: one a modern one of being economically independent and a traditional one of taking advantage of a love relation. Rosemary by following her mother's advice "cracks" her "first nut" and makes Dick fall in love with her by being "daddy's girl". And, again by following her mother's advice advances in the film industry thanks to her childish beauty reminding the audience that they are to remain as protectors of that naiveness. Thus there are the audiences as protectors in front of the screen and naiveté shown on the screen. However behind the screen there is the fact that Dick Diver makes money by being the *protector* of public "sanity" and there is Rosemary who makes a living by being *naïve,* so myth sustains its existence through commerce. On the other hand these roles determined on the screen are actualized in real life. Just like her role on the screen as an object of purity to be protected, in reality Rosemary is the celebrity who should not be exposed to sun for too long as Dick Diver warns her on the beach before knowing Rosemary personally: "I was going to wake you before I left. It's no good to get too burned right away." (Fitzgerald1997:75) So, myth is protected and maintained by commercial institutions such as psychiatry and cinema, which are at the same time panoptic, and modern panopticons are protected and maintained by the myth as the novel provides us with a clear picture of myth projected onto real life (Rosemary's transforming her role into an actual life experience) and real life projected onto myth

(Rosemary's attempt to project Dick's role as a protector in real life onto the screen as her leading man). What we consider as myth here is the discourse kept by the film industry and psychiatry, because as we have shown they are represented as the continuation of a tradition. Traditional and mythic roles ascribed to characters do not clash with, or even enhance, their commercialization. We see the ironic congruency of myth and commerce in Rosemary's, Dick's and Tommy Barban's cases.

Foucault argues in his study entitled The Archeology of Knowledge that several discursive strategies that appeared at some moments in history deploy *points of diffraction. Points of diffraction* refer to a kind of incompatibility between discourses. According to Foucault two discrepant elements may come together in the same discursive formation.

> These points are characterized in the first instance as *points of incompatibility*: two objects, or two types of enunciation, or two concepts may appear, in the same discursive formation, without being able to enter — under pain of manifest contradiction or inconsequence— the same series of statements. They are often characterized as *points of equivalence*: the two incompatible elements are formed in the same way and on the basis of the same rules. (Foucault2004:73)

Although Foucault is referring to scientific discourse, we can apply his idea of *points of diffraction* into the intermingling of several discourses in order to shape the idea of "realities", regardless of how different they seem on the level of their application, since we see a merging of scientific discourse, popular culture and myth in the case of Tender is the Night. Although there seems to be an incompatibility between myth, commerce and psychiatry in terms of their goals and objects, they form a unitary force when they are considered a part of disciplinary mechanisms. In Foucault's words, "[…..] the dispersions studied at previous levels do not simply constitute gaps, non-identities, discontinuous series; they come to form discursive sub- groups." (Foucault, 2004: 73) In other words, it is a strategy in the formation of disciplinary mechanisms that previously incompatible objects or goals complement one another.

While post-war policy converted the image of "submissive woman" and while it seemed to encourage the mobility of women and give them a considerably more amount of freedom on the one hand, it, on the other hand, initiated a process of commodification. This kind of a change in the "image of women" and their commodification is carried into the book through the characterization of Rosemary and the symbol of espadrilles. Espadrilles signify the mobility of female characters, but they are also the symbols of their oppression and restricted freedom. Buying espadrilles is a sign that initiates mobility and lack of freedom, which is symbolized by the train. "She [Rosemary] liked the people on the streets and bought herself a pair of espadrilles on the way to the train." (Fitzgerald, 1997:93)

Mrs Speers wants her daughter to be "independent". However she can only be independent on the condition that she remains in the sphere of cinema industry; she can walk alone but must act according to her mother's advice: 'I like you to go to places and do things on your own initiative without me-you did much harder things for Rainy's publicity stunts.'(Fitzgerald 1997: 122) Even in her independence, Rosemary is dependent on her mother who works as the mouthpiece of twentieth century myth of individual success. In that respect the relations between Rosemary and her mother can be likened to Dick and Nicole's relation. Dick encourages Nicole to do things without his assistance and forces her to be sociable on the one hand, but on the other hand, he obliterates her symbolic attempt to run away and follow a path other than the one imposed by Dick during their visit to the Fair.

Women of postwar America are independent in the sense that they do not have to wear high-heeled shoes anymore as is symbolized in the act of Rosemary's buying espadrilles. Therefore postwar discourse on women includes the negation of an image – "the angel in the house"- that is peculiar to the prewar period. However most contradictorily it makes women submit to a discourse that advises them to offer their femininity as a product to be consumed.

> "If her person [Rosemary] was a property she [Rosemary] could exercise whatever advantage was inherent in its ownership." (Fitzgerald, 1997: 91)

Therefore while the twentieth century signifies the collapse of the moral codes and woman image of the previous century, it also re-defines morality and the image of women: it fashions "strong", mobile woman who will appear "naïve and vulnerable" on the screen.

The image of espadrilles is used twice in the book. In its first use it signifies Rosemary's unobstructed walk of "success", and in its second use espadrilles appear in a hotel room where Nicole is having an "illicit" relationship with Tommy Barban who, like Dick, equally encourages Nicole to be "herself". "Why didn't they leave you in your natural state?" Tommy demanded presently. "You are the most dramatic person I have known." (Fitzgerald, 1997:364) However Tommy also restricts her freedom as is revealed in the last chapter of the novel, after Nicole divorces Dick. Tommy Barban and Nicole meet Dick on the beach:

> 'I'm going to him,' Nicole got to her knees.
> 'No, you're not, said Tommy, pulling her down firmly.
> 'Let well enough alone.'(Fitzgerald, 1997:390)

The image of espadrilles is used to signify that Nicole, by being with Tommy Barban, adjusts to the new codes, characterized not by the image of a vulnerable, fragile woman but by that of a mobile woman. However both the vulnerable that needs to be protected and the image of the determined, strong woman are pseudo-identities. Both Rosemary and Nicole are like commodities trying to answer the new demands, which require a certain kind of "robustness" to be achieved: Therefore Nicole's transformation takes place in a similar way to her daughter Topsy's, "She was seven and very fair and exquisitely made like Nicole, and in the past Dick had worried about that. Lately she had become as robust as any American child" (Fitzgerald, 1997:323). Thus we can read Nicole's wearing of espadrilles as a symbol of her stripping off an identity as a fragile figure and assuming a new one that seems to overcome the conventional restrictions imposed upon woman. This new self-definition of hers eliminates Dick the protector and cherishes Tommy Barban who claims to offer her an independence that was previously withheld by

Dick. However, we cannot consider this choice of hers as an outcome of free will. When the causes and outcome of her choice are considered it is far from being an attempt at independence:

> All summer she [Nicole] had been stimulated by watching people do exactly what they were tempted to do and pay no penalty for it- moreover, in spite of her intention of no longer lying to herself, she preferred to consider that she was merely feeling her way and that any moment she could withdraw. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 363)

> For the first time in ten years she [Nicole] was under the sway of a personality other than her husband's. Everything Tommy said to her became part of her forever. (Fitzgerald, 1997:365)

Therefore, irrespective of the difference between their ages and family backgrounds, both Rosemary and Nicole are objects of a new discourse which offers a contradiction: mobility as opposed to stability, woman of strength as opposed to women as vulnerable objects. However, it reaches an outcome that projects women as objects of knowledge in Nicole's case and their commodification within the newly developed cinema industry in Rosemary's. Thus the discourse offers coherence between how they perceive themselves as women in their private spheres and how they are perceived on the curtain of the newly evolving industries such as cinema and psychiatry.

> I [Nicole] can remember how I stood waiting for you [Dick] in the garden – holding all myself in my arms like a basket of flowers. It was to me anyhow –I thought I was sweet – waiting to hand that basket to you. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 52)

> The first time when she [Rosemary] and Dick danced together and she felt her beauty sparkling bright against his tall, strong form as they floated, hovering like people in an amusing dream – he turned her here and there with such a delicacy of suggestion that she was like bright bouquet, a piece of precious cloth being displayed before fifty eyes. (Fitzgerald, 1997:162)

Thus Tender is the Night does not offer varieties but already formed identities. That is, we do not see the characters that are varied; to the contrary what is underlined is the characters' submission to an order that permits no space for a

variety to appear. It is a process of the elimination of distinctions that all the characters undergo within the plot as they become patients in a psychiatric hospital or as they become the commodities of the cinema industry or as they become doctors, sisters and mothers.

While revealing the working of a normalization process, the novel does not make the claim that the characters were original selves before their subjections to these processes. In short theirs is the production of self as an image. For example in Dick's case it is the transformation of the image of the priest into that of a psychiatrist. Or in Rosemary's case it is the transformation of a naïve, fragile image into a woman of "independence", who is still a commodity when her role as a film star is concerned, and the projection of a "naïve", "submissive" girlhood onto the screen. Or in Nicole's case, she is transformed from fragile patient into a woman who makes choices. However, her choice is again made for Tommy's sake who also restraints her. Therefore in all these instances it is revealed that the "ideal" state that one can be is kept constant through mediatic discourse. However, the actual state the characters experience in reality changes; all these ideal states are roles whose actors and actresses are paid in order to keep the ideal state constant. Therefore what we find is an illusion whose actors and actresses are paid to keep the illusion stable, to determine its demands and to fix its definitions, and the illusion is in fact contradictory in its demands and claims.

Therefore both the idea of an original and the idea of a whole "consummated" by the variety of voices are negated when we consider the fact that the original is an image kept in mind and recollected in times of crisis and what seems as a whole is a bunch of contradictory images that is projected on the screen. For example, Nicole can only be a whole when she looks at her image reflected in the mirror:

> He was enough older than Nicole to take pleasure in her youthful vanities and delights, the way she paused fractionally in front of the mirror on leaving the restaurant, so that the incorruptible quicksilver could give her back to herself. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 31)

Or Rosemary acts constantly and strengthens her image on the screen as daddy's girl when she is with Dick:

> 'When you smile –'he had recovered his paternal attitude perhaps because of Nicole's silent proximity, 'I always think I'll see a gap where you've lost some baby teeth.'
> But he was too late – she came close up against him with a forlorn whisper.
> 'Take me.'
> 'Take you where?'
> Astonishment froze him rigid […]
> She was astonished at herself – she had never imagined she had read, seen dreamed through a decade of convent hours. Suddenly she knew too that it was one of her greatest roles and she flung herself into it more passionately. (Fitzgerald 1997: 146)

Therefore the characters cling fast to their images on the screen. Thus we can not talk about the originality of a self in Tender is the Night; what is demonstrated is the character's attachment to her/his contradictory image; contradictory because it is not an ideal state as it is represented to be, but a practical state through which they earn a living. Foucault, in defining genealogy refers to Nietzsche who refutes the idea of tracing an origin on the grounds that,

> […..] He [Nietzsche] finds that there is "something altogether different behind things: not a timeless and essential secret but the secret that they have no essence, or that their essence is fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms. (Foucault, 2000a:374)

Tender is the Night negates the tracing of an omnipresent origin both with respect to its themes and its form. Contrary to The Great Gatsby, which has a single temporal setting as the main one and which narrates the past in a retrospective manner from the "present" time of the novel, The Tender is the Night is divided into five books which narrate the events of fourteen years; events that are not narrated retrospectively but happen at the time of their narration. Therefore the past and the present are united in the novel. Thus the novel negates the idea of a past as an ideal state of being; there is no past but the past is made in the present out of contradictory images and discourses emerging at the same time. The narrative is not the contradictory confessions of one character, as in The Great Gatsby, but the

omniscient narrator's bringing out contradictions that are inherent within the discourse of the post-war era. It is through the contradictions within the discourse that the novel's architectonics is constructed. The reader must participate in decoding certain symbols that disclose the conflict inherent in that discourse; she/he must detect how these symbols acquire new meanings and how they are transformed as the book proceeds historically. For example the automobile, along with espadrilles, is a symbol that signifies the changing role of each character within the power relations. In the beginning it is Dick who drives the car and who is efficient within the power relations and later on, as she adjusts more to the new idea of mobility and as she becomes more restricted, it is Nicole who drives the car, but this time she is inhibited not by a discourse that emphasizes the idea of "vulnerable woman" but that of the "mobile woman" which is equally submissive:

> 'Where's the car?' she [Nicole] asked?
> I [Dick] left it in Arles. I didn't feel like driving any more. (Fitzgerald1997:372)

> She [Nicole] returned sharply to Dick. 'I'm going to take the car home. I'll send Michelle and for you and the children.'
> 'You haven't driven for months,' he protested.
> 'I haven't forgotten how.'(Fitzgerald, 1997:360)

The image of authority is thus reversed so as to emphasize the fact that gaining authority is another kind of submission. This submission is not only to a voice that is limited to that of the husband's, which demands vulnerability, naivety and purity, but to that of Tommy's, which represents submission to an order that points to a state of moral exaltation as its highest achievement, but which is at the same time very commercial and profit-oriented in practice.

With respect to characterization Fitzgerald draws characters that are constituted along with the changing aspects of the scientific and mediatic discourses. All the characters of the Tender is the Night are parodies of myths: they are both mediums of commercial relations and the continuation of myth and tradition; they both come out of a cinema screen and get into a screen. In that respect, the

characters create the power relations they submit, because they are both watchers in the panopticon and the ones that are watched.

2-3 Representation of War

In his essay entitled *Rabelais and His world* (1965), Bakhtin traces the origins of folk humor and the carnival tradition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance and concludes that carnival is a kind of reversal which turns the official into the unofficial, the religious into the worldly, soul into body, celestial into earth-bound. In other words carnival is a worldly laughter that mocks authority and conquers fear; it is the loosening of the taboo on the bodily and cherishing of everything physical that are held to be "offensive" by the official. In short carnival is a zone that is outside the recognized system of hierarchical order. It is considered of as "the other" of "the authority" in a binarily opposed system.

> We have already said that during carnival there is a temporary suspension of all hierarchical distinctions and barriers among men and of certain norms and prohibitions of usual life. We added that an ideal and at the same time real type of communication, impossible in ordinary life, is established (Bakhtin, 2002b:203).

Tender is the Night, as a novel in the modernist tradition, presents us with carnivalesque scenes that show the panoptical workings of power. The novel does not recognize the Bakhtinian differentiation between official and carnivalesque because every carnivalesque scene does in fact illustrate a disciplinary mechanism that organizes power relations in the book. In other words where Tender is the Night is concerned, chronotopes are arranged so as to reveal that all carnivalesque scenes are transformed into panopticons in which power relations are experienced on a microcosmic level. Thus, rather than a Bakhtinian opposition between carnival (a temporary suspension of all "hierarchical distinctions") and the rigidity of the oppression practiced by an oppressor, the novel recognizes the fact that no chronotope, no matter how carnivalesque it seems, is exempted from the power relations in a variety of forms. In that sense what the novel represents is closer to the Foucauldian idea of the panopticon.

For example we have both an artificial garden of a film set, a panoptical setting that creates realities and identities, in which Rosemary is one of the objects and also settings like "Nicole's garden", a natural garden as opposed to the artificial film set garden of Rosemary, in which similar rules are observed: Nicole might be in a much more pleasurable space than Rosemary, but she is also directed by Dick in the same way as Rosemary is directed by the film directors. The juxtaposition of the two settings, Nicole's natural garden and Rosemary's film-set garden reveal the fact that the imaginary and the real; the seemingly pleasurable and the oppressive are both panoptic, because both of them require the close observation of the subject and in both of them the subject is fully aware of the fact that he is being watched. In Chapter 7 of the book two, Rosemary, following her mother's advice and her instructions enters a film set, which seems like an artificial garden.

> As she stood by the grilled entrance waiting for an answer on her card, she might have been looking into Hollywood. The bizarre debris of some recent picture, a decayed street scene in India, a great cardboard whale, a monstrous tree bearing cherries large as basket-balls, bloomed there by exotic dispensation, autochthonous as the pale amaranth, mimosa, cork oak, or dwarfed pine. There were a quick –lunch shack and two barn-like stages and, everywhere about the lot, groups of waiting, hopeful, painted faces. (Fitzgerald 1997:90)

Rosemary's submission takes place within an imaginary setting. The film set is a locality she is restricted to, and the mother is the unseen agent that makes her stay within that setting in which she can identify herself only by following the mother's advice, submitting to the directors' instructions according to whose demands she constructs her identity. At the end of the chapter, after speaking to the director in the way she was told to do, she " bought herself espadrilles on the way to the train"[……] "Her mother was pleased that she had done so accurately what she was told to do, but she still wanted to launch her out and away." (Fitzgerald, 1997:93) Thus Rosemary is involved in a panoptic relationship in which direct interference with the observed is not necessary. Although there is no apparent oppressive agent Rosemary acts in the way she is thought to; her mother acts as an indirect agent of authority in Rosemary's life. Foucault suggests that power relations

do not involve a direct agent that oppresses the subject but a system that inculcates the codes within the subject and makes her act according to an expected pattern. In Rosemary's case the mother is both the unseen agent and also the beloved; the mother is both the pleasurable and the observer in whose absence the subject acts as she is expected to act. This is very close to Foucault's idea of power mechanism which is basically a surveillance mechanism to which the individual willingly submits. Foucault refers to Bentham's text to explain this system of surveillance:

> 'It is necessary', he [Bentham] writes, 'for the inmate to be ceaselessly under the eyes of an inspector; this is to lose the power and even almost the idea of wrong-doing'. [….] preventing people from wrong-doing, taking away their wish to commit wrong. In a word, to make people unable and unwilling. [….] There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against himself. (Foucault, 1980:154-155)

In Chapter Eight of the same book, a similar relation is experienced by Nicole, but this time in a real garden given to Nicole by Dick. Therefore Rosemary's film set and Nicole's garden are identical in the sense that both characters are restricted to these places by an authority. Nicole's garden is spared by Dick for Nicole as a part of her treatment. Just like Nicole who is watched and directed by her mother even in her absence, Nicole is constantly observed and directed by Dick and the normalizing psychiatric discourse he represents.

> For a moment Nicole stood looking down at the Mediterranean, but there was nothing to do with that, even with her tireless hands. Presently Dick came out of his one- room house carrying a telescope and looked east toward Cannes. In a moment Nicole swam into his field of vision, whereupon he disappeared into his house and came out with a megaphone. He had many light mechanical devices.
> 'Nicole,' he shouted, 'I forgot to tell you that as a final apostolic gesture I invited Mrs. Abrams, the woman with white hair.'[……]
> 'Yes.' He lowered the megaphone and then raised it stubbornly. 'I'm going to invite some more people too. I'm going to invite the two young men.'
> 'All right, 'she agreed placidly. (Fitzgerald, 1997:96)

Dick takes the place of a film director with his megaphone and other mechanical devices. In a pleasurable setting such as a garden and in a setting which is supposed to be hers, Nicole is directed by Dick, and compelled to be sociable just like Rosemary who is directed by her mother and the directors and compelled to remain on the film set. Therefore power relations are at work both in the private space, in the garden, and in a public space like the film set. And the practice of power relations do not only appear in a fictitious setting in which the actors and actresses are involved in putting into stage a scenario but also in a garden where Nicole is by herself. When the garden's role in Nicole's treatment is concerned it is a part of her psychiatric treatment: a kind of imposed privacy used for her socialization. In that respect the garden is not so different from the parties Dick organizes at their home, during one of which Nicole's nervous breakdown takes place. Therefore pleasure- inducing spaces, both in their private forms and in their public forms, are the settings where Nicole, as the patient, is constituted and Dick is also constituted in his role as the protector and the organizer. In that respect Bakhtin's definition of carnival and the depiction of Nicole's garden and Rosemary's artificial garden bear a strong resemblance to each other. Bakhtin associates carnival as a zone that determines the identity of the participator. Carnival designates to a communal becoming that gives the individual an identity within the community. Carnival requires participation in the whole of the people.

> In such novels as [Rabelais's] *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, [Grimmelhausen's] *Simplissimus* and [Goethe's] *Wilhelm Meister*, the becoming of the person ….is no longer a private affair. He becomes together with the world, reflecting in himself the historical becoming of the world itself, he is no longer within an epoch but on the threshold between epochs, the point of transition from one to the others. (Brandist, 2002:133)

In that respect a carnival is like Nicole's where parties are held and Nicole is forced to be social. In Nicole's garden where the parties are held, just like the carnival, Nicole and the other participators assume different roles, and they are given the chance to pretend as if they were some other person of higher rank. Therefore Nicole's garden is the space where the fixity of social roles is effaced. A carnival is also described as a zone which challenges the fixity of social roles.

> [….] The individual feels that he is an inseparable part of the collective, a member of the people's mass body. In this whole the individual body to a certain extent ceases to be itself; it is possible as it were, to exchange bodies, to be renewed (changes of costume and mask). (Brandist, 2002:140)

The fact that the carnival does not depend on the permanence of roles and the use of words related to a stage in the description of carnival endows carnival with a representative function; a function that makes it closer to Rosemary's film-set garden. Both with respect to the way a carnival defines the individual within the community and the temporality of the social roles within the community makes carnival a proper setting for the working of power relations. Thus we can argue that the form of carnival that has folkloric roots and ancient basis has its counterpart as the panopticon in the modern context.

As Foucault pointed out, power relations do not require the existence of an authoritarian figure; both the subject and the object of power are constituted according to the order of knowledge power requires. Therefore both Nicole and Dick are the elements of the age's psychiatric discourse. All through the book, in most of the settings Dick tests himself as to his superiority; a test to see whether he still fulfills the criteria of the idea of superiority inculcated in him.

> It reminded him of a scene in his childhood when everyone in the house was looking for the lost key to the silver closet, Dick knowing he had hid it under the handkerchiefs in his mother's top drawer; at that time he had experienced a philosophical detachment, and this was repeated now when he and Franz went together to Professor Dohmler's office (Fitzgerald, 1997:33).

Another panoptic element in the book is the fact that the figure of authority, Dick is constantly tested, and as will be further examined in the later parts of this study, the roles of Nicole and Dick, the roles of the subject and the object, are not stable. For example Dick, who is the central figure is also controlled and directed by other agents such as the parents of the patients in the institution. Moreover, the normalization and social adjustment of Nicole makes her break the rules of moral codes by having a relationship with Tommy Barban although she is married to Dick.

Therefore social adjustment follows a contradictory course in Nicole's case; it is not through submission to moral codes but by opposing them that Nicole adjusts to society. In other words Nicole does not become a-social when she breaks the norm that is valid, to the contrary she becomes well-adjusted. Therefore neither the rules the power relations impose nor the object that is identified and constituted are permanent. Consequently what we observe in the book is the fact that even the principle rule of the carnival as a "reversed system" is negated. In other words the existence of a behaviour that can be considered an alternative to relations of authority does not mean that the person who acts in opposition to order will be in the realm of carnival. The person who behaves in opposition to order will still be attached to a power mechanism. So even if there is carnival, this carnival, however different it might be as a system, will form its own intrinsic power mechanism. Foucault explains this relation as follows:

> [….] that there are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised; resistances to power does not have to come from elsewhere to be real, nor is it inexorably frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It exists all the more by being in the same place as power; hence, like power, resistance is multiple and can be integrated in global strategies. (Foucault, 1980:142)

In the post-war setting of the book every carnival is a panopticon enhancing the authority which does not appear in the form of a punishing agent; but as a power structure, a network of relations to which the subject submits and which she/he preserves within himself/herself. Therefore authority lies within the subject; it is not an agent outside the subject exerting its force in the form of a punishment. Within this power structure a rule or an object that is defined as "normal" can follow a contradictory course either with the transformation of the rule or with the transformation of the object, or a new order whose primary force is derived from its contrary nature can be formed. Therefore Foucault leaves nothing outside power relations; even an alternative to the current system forms power relations through a new discourse. Thus carnival as an alternative order can turn into a new set of power relations according to Foucauldian thinking. An alternative system is never void of

power relations. In that respect every carnival is a panopticon. During an interview with Michelle Perrot published under the title of "The eye of power" Foucault suggests that a counter –reaction against the authority or hierarchy would not create a system outside power relations.

> Perrot: In other words coming back to the Panopticon Bentham does not merely formulate the project of a utopian society; he also describes a society that actually exists.
> Foucault: He describes, in the utopian form of a general system, particular mechanisms which really exist.
> Perrot: And there's no point for the prisoners in taking over the central tower?
> Foucault: Oh yes, provided that isn't the final purpose of the operation. Do you think it would be much better to have the prisoners operating the Panoptic apparatus and sitting in the central tower, instead of the guards? (Foucault, 1980:164)

Another significant and carnivalesque scene in the novel is a parodied war organized in the form of a duel. We take this duel to be carnivalesque because it parodies a sense of glorified war and mocks a duel: a very traditional form of fighting between two twentieth-century figures, Tommy Barban a soldier whose "job is to kill" and who later on tries his hand in the stock broking business and Albert McKisco a self – important "tragic clown" at the beginning of the novel, and a second-rate writer whose pastiched novels achieve a great popularity later on. The duel in the book is a parodied form of war organized by Tommy Barban due to Mrs. McKisco's attempts to spread rumours of Nicole's break-down which she witnessed by chance at the party in the Divers' garden. Tommy Barban, who actually never cares about what he fights for in the war, wants to prevent Mrs Mc Kisco from telling others what he witnessed in the bathroom of the Divers'. The duel is held by Barban and Albert Mc. Kisco with Barban's dueling pistols which are symbols of a glorified idea of war preserved by Tommy Barban. At the end of the duel neither Tommy Barban nor Albert Mc Kisco shoots each other:

> They fired at the same moment. Mc Kisco swayed but recovered. Both shots had missed.
> 'Now, that's enough!' cried Abe.
> The duelists walked in, and everyone looked at Barban inquiringly.

> ‘I declared myself unsatisfied.’
> ‘What? Sure you are satisfied,’ said Abe impatiently. ‘You just don’t know it.’
> ‘Your man refuses another shot?’
> ‘You are damn right, Tommy. You insisted on this and my client went through with it.’
> Tommy laughed scornfully.
> ‘The distance was ridiculous,’ he said. ‘I’m not accustomed to such farces –your man must remember he is not now in America.’ […….]
> ‘Wait a minute!’ Abe said. ‘Tommy wants his pistol back. He might need it again.’
> […….]
> ‘Well, I did it,’ cried Mc Kisco, as they went along. ’And I did it pretty well, didn’t I? I wasn’t yellow.’(Fitzgerald, 1997:124)

As the narrator suggests the duel is a parody whose only casualty was Campion, one of the two spectators of the duel, who was kicked by Rosemary while she was “hysterical with laughter” during the duel. Therefore the duel represents the myth war relies on; a myth which can only appear in parodic forms in the post-war era. Within the novel this scene is a carnivalesque scene because it overturns the authority of the myth; it mocks the idea of a glorified war. In that respect the duel scene is a carnival that produces a panoptic effect. It creates the kind of individual that the system for the time being requires. It creates Albert McKisco anew as a prominent writer whose pastiched novels become best-sellers. A clownish character like Mc Kisco can turn out to be a popular writer thanks to the fear and a sort of spiritual woundedness he experienced after this parodied form of battle.

> Indeed, his [Mc Kisco’s] success was founded psychologically upon his duel with Tommy Barban, upon the basis of which, as withered in his memory, he had created, afresh, a new self-respect. (Fitzgerald, 1997:259)

Therefore the scene of the duel is a carnivalesque scene that has panoptical consequences which is one of the disciplining functions of the panopticon as Foucault explains in Discipline and Punish that disciplinary mechanisms create individuals:

> It (the disciplinary mechanism) lays down for each individual his place, his body, his disease and his death, his well being, by means

> of an omnipresent and omniscient power that subdivides itself in a regular, uninterrupted way even to the ultimate determination of the individual, of what characterizes him, of what belongs to him, of what happens to him (Foucault, 1991a:196).

War is represented in the novel in several forms. The one we have mentioned above is the parodic form.

Another representation of war in the novel focuses on the fictional aspect of the war just as the one we have shown previously. However this time the war is not transformed into a comic theatrical scene but represented in its commemorated form. Book Three is entitled "Casualties" and starts with a chapter including Abe North, Rosemary and Dick's visit to trenches. Among the party Dick speaks the most about the war although he is the one who is the most distant from the war. He makes comments on the war and tries to determine the way the others feel about the war. Everyone in the party perceives war in relation to their own life.

> They came out of the neat restored trench, and faced a memorial to the Newfoundland dead. Reading the inscription Rosemary burst into sudden tears. Like most women she liked to be told how she should feel, and she liked Dick's telling her which things were ludicrous and which things were sad (Fitzgerald, 1997: 137).

The scene reveals the artificiality of war as it is represented to those who never witnessed it; it becomes ironic and parodic as the characters try to define it and identify themselves within the scene of the war. Rosemary needs her mother to make things meaningful to her, Nicole bites her lips and reads the inscriptions, and Dick makes ridiculous comments on the war although he didn't take part in the war at all.

> Nicole was abstracted, biting her lip restlessly and reading over the guidebooks to the battlefield Dick had brought along –indeed, he had made a quick study of the whole affair, simplifying it always until it bore a faint resemblance to one of his own parties. (Fitzgerald 1997:139)

The parody reaches its peak when the red-haired girl from Tennessee, who has been looking for the grave of her brother and crying because she could not find the grave, changes her mood and "forgot her sorrow and enjoyed herself, even began flirtations of tropical eye-rollings and pawings, with Dick and Abbey" along with the other members of the party including Rosemary who, "remembered all the hours of the afternoon as happy." (Fitzgerald 1997:138-139) When considered in its form as a commemoration the war is like a play after which the audiences return to their own lives just after the curtain falls. The battle field in its new form is a stage where clichés are enacted and myths are ennobled.

Another important incident we will deal with in the context of war's representation in the novel takes place in another section within the same book entitled "Casualties". However, this kind of representation is differentiated from the previous representations in the sense that it does not stage the war explicitly. The occasion at the station can be considered a representation of war with respect to its results' resemblance to the results of the war. That is, the feeling of fear and frustration that the occasion evokes is in some ways similar to the frustration that the war evokes. Just as the war is considered a rupture within continuity, the occasion at the station is both a rupture for the characters in the story and a rupture within the plot. The characters are again involved in a communal activity in a public space, the station. This section is no more identical with the previous two sections we dealt with because it is neither the battle in its mythic form nor the enactment of battle on the stage: the characters experience real violence in their daily lives, the battle is experienced by all of the characters, and the section also reveals the personal battle between the characters. In this scene, which takes place in the train station, Abey North is leaving for America and the others, Dick, Nicole, Rosemary and Mary North are saying goodbye to him. However, just about the time the train begins to move the scene turns chaotic with the sound of revolver shots:

> Nicole seized Dick's arms, crying, and 'Look!' Dick turned in time to see what took place in half a minute. At a Pullman entrance two cars off, a vivid scene detached itself from the tenor of many farewells. The young woman with the helmet–like hair to whom Nicole had spoken made an odd dodging little run away from the

> man to whom she was talking and plunged a frantic hand into her purse; then the sound of two revolver shots cracked the narrow air of the platform. (Fitzgerald, 1997: 169)

Maria Wallis, a woman they know, shoots an English man through his identification card. This event leads to further conflict between Dick and Nicole who, from this event onwards, exchange their roles as the leader, and the led. The scene is a challenge to Dick's authority because Nicole finds a much more sensible alternative to Dick's proposed course of action. The incident also signifies the disintegration of the group Dick, as the central organizer, has gathered around himself. Abe North leaves Paris and Mary North departs for Salzburg. Therefore such an unexpected event leads also to the modification of roles, and the disintegration of Dick as the central figure. It is on this occasion that it occurs to Dick that "Rosemary had her hand on the lever more authoritatively than he" (Fitzgerald 1997: 171).And it is because of this event that Dick is challenged by Nicole:

> They were walking quickly from the train, swayed along with the crowd. ' I found out what poste de police they're taking her to so I'll go there____'
> 'But her sister lives in Paris,' Nicole objected. 'Why not phone her [Maria Wallis's sister]? Seems very peculiar nobody thought of that. She is married to a Frenchman, and he can do more than we can.'
> Dick hesitated, shook his head, and started off.
> 'Wait!' Nicole cried after him. 'That's foolish – how can you do any good- with your French?' [……] Dick was unconvinced – also he was showing off for Rosemary. (Fitzgerald, 1997:170)

Therefore the event is a battle both because of the literal violence it contains, and it is the beginning of Dick's yielding as his authority dwindles with the disintegration of the group on whose acknowledgement it mostly depended. Thus Dick's powerful position does not derive from his inherent capabilities. He is powerful among the group because he is a doctor. He is more powerful than Nicole because Nicole is his patient. He occupies a central position in the parties: he is the one who supervises, who determines what others should feel, what their positions must be, if they must be helped, in what ways they must be helped. In short, he is the director of moods and feelings. Therefore the pleasurable events he organizes, such

as the parties, enhance his power, as he is the supervisor at the top of the tower of panopticism. The group which has so far fed his superior position as the "supervisor" disintegrates, and with its disintegration Dick does not occupy the central position he has occupied so far. Therefore in this panoptical scene the supervisor's own fate is tied up with those whom he observes. The others, Rosemary and Nicole, expect him to make a comment on the occasion and turn it to something reasonable, but he is unable to make his reason dominate; the event is no more under his control:

> She laughed, Rosemary laughed too, but they were both horrified, and both of them deeply wanted Dick to make a moral comment on the matter and not leave it to them. [……..] For the moment, Dick was too shaken by the impetus of his newly recognized emotion to resolve things into the pattern of the holiday, so the women, missing something, lapsed into a vague unhappiness. (Fitzgerald, 1997:171)

Therefore the event marks the loosening of Dick's authority within the group, in which his judgment was the principle driving force. Thus, as Foucault suggests, authority has no existence by itself and the supervisor is bound to the disciplinary mechanism:

> And, in any case, enclosed as he is in the middle of this architectural mechanism, is not the director's own fate entirely bound up with it? [….] '"By every tie I could devise", said the master of the Panopticon, "my own fate had been bound up by me with theirs"' (Bentham, 177) (Foucault, 1991a: 204)

Dick's authority depends on his ability to find solutions, making appropriate judgments and define things that are not easily identified for the others. When he fails, his authority fails. It is after this event that Dick's incompetence increases. He is incapable even of making "reasonable" judgments. Let alone making things reasonable for others, he cannot define things clearly even for himself; his role as the "definer" comes to an end with the collapse of the authority of his reasoning.

> When Dick could no longer play what he wanted to play on the piano, it was an indication that life was being refined down to a

> point. He stayed in the big room a long time, listening to the buzz of the electric clock, listening to time (Fitzgerald, 1997:213).

The chapters following this are characterized by the constant repetition of the phrase "Do you mind if I pull down the curtain?" eight times by Dick. The phrase originates from the narration of an event that happened in the past by Collis Clay concerning Rosemary. Collis Clay is a character who appears as Rosemary's suitor and reveals her past as he follows her chapter by chapter. The phrase "Pull down the curtains" refers to a problem Rosemary was confronted with when she was with a boy, one of Clay's friends, in a train compartment. The blinds of the compartment were pulled down when Rosemary was inside with the boy Hillis.

> – she had a compartment with a cousin of mine but she and Hillis wanted to be alone, so in the afternoon my cousin came and played cards in our compartment. Well, after about two hours we went back and there was Rosemary and Bill Hillis standing in the vestibule arguing with the conductor- Rosemary white as sheet. Seems they locked the door and pulled down the blinds and I guess there was some heavy stuff going on when the conductor came for the tickets and knocked on the door. They thought it was us kidding them and wouldn't let him in at first, and when they did he was plenty sore. He asked Hillis if he and Rosemary were married that they locked the door, and Hillis lost his temper trying to explain there was nothing wrong (Fitzgerald, 1997: 175).

This is an event Dick cannot resolve and explain, because he has an obsessive attachment to the phrase "pull down the curtain". The narration of the occasion makes Dick confused, because for him thinking of Rosemary with a boy in a compartment represent the destruction of the image of Rosemary as the symbol of childish innocence he has formed in his mind. Rosemary as a grown up woman capable of experiencing adult sexuality is opposed to the image of Rosemary he formed in his mind. For this reason the narration of the event about Rosemary by Hillis can be considered an intrusion upon Dick's privacy, which is the image of Rosemary as the symbol of childish naivety. In that respect the event can be perceived as the breakdown of Dick. Thus he is just like Nicole, whose breakdown happens when somebody uses her bathroom-figuratively she collapses when somebody intrudes upon her privacy-

> ‘It’s you she [Nicole] cried, ‘- it’s you come to intrude on the only privacy I have in the world […..] ‘I never expected you to love me – it was too late – only don’t come in the bathroom, the only place I can go for privacy, dragging spreads with red blood on them and asking me to fix them.’(Fitzgerald, 1997:202)

But what makes Dick’s and Nicole’s privacy a privacy? As we consider what Dick and Nicole call privacy we see that “privacy” is associated with a certain kind of innocence in Dick’s case and purity in Nicole’s case. Nicole’s bathroom symbolizes purification, and so does Rosemary for Dick; for him she is the innocent, childish girl.

> ‘When you smile –’ he had recovered his paternal attitude perhaps because of Nicole’s silent proximity, ‘I always think I’ll see a gap where you’ve lost some baby teeth.’(Fitzgerald, 1997:146)

The association between privacy and purity reveals the fact that privacy is not a sort of privacy that is formed by the individual; it is a privacy formed by society which associates purity and innocence with privacy. Therefore neither Nicole nor Dick is alone in their privacies. Dick’s “privacy” is constituted by Dick’s southern background and Nicole’s privacy is determined by the traditional education she was brought up with; an education that draws the image of women as “pure commodities”. Therefore Bakhtin’s claim that *I* is dissociated from *the other* in modern times is negated in the case of this novel. As opposed to what Bakhtin argues, *I* is not dissociated from *the other*; *I* is created by the other.

> In antiquity, the body was not divorced from the bodily unity of outside world of others, for the self-consciousness of one’s own *I for myself* had not yet secluded itself from others, and man had not yet attained the pure relationship to himself which differs in principle from the relationship to others. (Bakhtin, 1990:58)

All things considered, the novel gives us a clear representation of what Foucault claims regarding the individual’s privacy in modern times; a privacy that is determined by power relations and that is the playground of contradictory discourses of both modernity and tradition. Thus contrary to Bakhtin’s argument that in modern times the individual is detached from his/her social milieu the novel testifies to

Foucault's opinion that the individual is in her/his most externalized and exposed condition within his/her so called "private sphere".

All these three sections in the book are related to each other with respect to their relation to war. The first one, the duel, is a parodic projection of the war's mythic concepts into the post-war era. The second one which deals with war in its commemorated form projects war into the present as a theatrical performance within which all the characters partake in the act of performance. It is revealed that the characters are far from perceiving war as a reality; they all try to understand it in relation to their own lives. However the last section we dealt with is differentiated from the former two in the sense that it depicts war in a post-war era. In that respect it depicts a war that is not the theatrical representation of the First World War, but a sort of violence in the literal sense of the word and a kind of symbolic battle between the characters. The scene in the station is significant because it illustrates how the power relations between the characters start to disintegrate. However, this is not the reversal of authority in the Bakhtinian sense; it is just the end of Dick's role as the supervisor because he can no longer see what he is expected to see. For Dick the occasion at the station marks the beginning of his loss of authority, and it is at this point where his struggle to return to his "privacy" starts; it is his endeavour to return to a privacy that has already been shaped; a privacy that was valid as far as things can still be meaningful within it; a privacy within which Rosemary can still be the innocent child and he can still be the central figure, the definer. The occasion at the station is significant as a threat to Dick's privacy as the repeated phrase "pull down the curtains" suggests. In other words, the occasion at the station is an intrusion to Dick's idea of himself and his idea of the others.

Another common point between these three events is their communal character; they are communal performances in which the characters participate. The entire characters act with a shared idea common to all: duel as a form of individual battle or the idea of war as a concept that should be associated with pain and identified as a painful experience in the history. Therefore the scenes we have mentioned reflect the features of a modern carnival because they stage a duel as the

parody of an ancient chivalric code and war as communal activities. On the other hand the scene defines each participator in their relation to the event. For example during the duel Rosemary and Campion are the watchers of the scene. Therefore although the scene is the repetition of a traditional idea-it is organized by Barban for the sake of keeping Nicole's breakdown as a secret- it is transformed into a modern spectacular with the intrusion of Rosemary and Campion as spectators. On the other hand, the duel is at the same time a commercial event after which the doctor demands money for being there. Thus, although the duel seems to be a departure from the ordinary course of events, it in turn participates in the normal course of life. It strengthens Mc Kisco's role as a clownish figure as the conversation between Rosemary and Campion reveals:

> 'I saw you go upstairs,' he said excitedly. 'Is he all right?
> When is the duel going to be?'
> 'I don't know.' She resented his speaking of it as a circus, with Mc Kisco as the tragic clown.
> 'Will you go with me?' he demanded, with the air of having seats.
> 'I've hired the hotel car." (Fitzgerald 1997:121)

Therefore such a carnivalesque scene- carnivalesque because it is a departure from the ordinary course of life, because it is based on a traditional idea and because it is a communal activity- is opposed to Bakhtin's claims as to carnival's libratory role:

> As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions. (Bakhtin, 2002b:199)

The event is not libratory because Rosemary participates in it as an audience upon her mother's demands, Tommy Barban goes unsatisfied because the symbolic battle does not conclude in a killing, Mc Kisco is still the clown, and the event is a spectacular for Rosemary and Campion and commercial for the doctor who earns money although there are no casualties. Therefore although the scenes we have mentioned can be considered carnivals because they aim to be libratory, they diverge from the normal course of life and they represent a communal event, the characters

are still within the panopticon due to the fact that they represent the existence of power relations within one group, and the post-war discourse that is contradictory in its demands. Thus as Foucault suggests:

> It seems to me that power is 'always already there' that one is never "outside" it, then there are no 'margins' for those who break with the system to gambol in. But this does not entail the necessity of accepting an inescapable form of domination or an absolute privilege on the side of the law [.....] resistance to power does not have to come elsewhere to be real, nor is it inexorably frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It exists all the more by being in the same place as power; hence, like power, resistance is multiple and can be integrated in global strategies. (Foucault, 1980:142)

Foucault uses Bentham's panopticon as the symbol of the surveillance mechanism. He argues that panopticism, constant surveillance, is applied in the modern institutions on a micro-cosmic level. The modern institution is non-identical to its predecessors in the sense that visibility is its basic feature: no more dungeons which are kept dark and surrounded with high walls in which the inmate is hidden.

> In short, it reverses the principle of the dungeon; or rather its three functions – to enclose, to deprive of light and to hide-it preserves only the first and eliminates the other two. Full lightning and the eye of a supervisor capture better than darkness, which ultimately protected. Visibility is a trap (Foucault, 1991a:200).

The individuals within the panopticon are separated according to their different characteristics as objects of knowledge. When taken individually the inmates are separated from each other but when taken as a whole they each serve as wheels feeding the overall mechanism. No one, including the supervisor, is in a fixed position; the panopticon rearranges and identifies roles as it keeps on working. It rearranges unities, forms variety of discourses about the observers and the observed. It separates already -formed unities and forms new sequences according to ever-renewed criteria. Therefore supervision, creation of knowledge about the individuals and definitions of new roles for the individuals are the mechanisms

according to which the panopticon works. Not permanence but temporality is its principle.

Foucault defines a variety of modern institutions with respect to the resemblance of their working mechanism to that of a panopticon. In all these institutions such as hospitals, workshops, schools and prisons the rule of general surveillance is implemented whenever a multiplicity of individuals- who must be re-defined, given certain roles and regulated- are concerned.

The working of a panopticon can be observed on a micro-cosmic level within the psychiatric hospital in Zurich whose ownership is shared between Franz, a friend of Dick's, and Dick. Dick takes over the hospital upon Franz's offer and Baby Warren's, Nicole's sister, agreement to make an investment with the money they inherited from their mother because she thinks "if Nicole lived beside a clinic she [Baby Warren] would always feel quite safe about her" .(Fitzgerald 1997:223) The psychiatric hospital is arranged so as to apply "modern treatment methods" for each group of patients who are separated and grouped according to the features of their illnesses. It has a central building similar to the one found in a panopticon which sustains permanent visibility and control over each group of patients. Dick's room is in this central building.

> Like Dohmler's it was of the modern type-no longer a single dark and sinister building, but a small, scattered, yet deceitfully integrated village. Dick and Nicole had added much in the domain of taste, so that the plant was a thing of beauty, visited by every psychologist passing through Zurich. With the addition of a caddy house it might very well have been a country club. (Fitzgerald, 1997:230)

The building is organized and decorated with a view to controlling a multiplicity of individuals by a small number of supervisors and it is not gathered in a single unit of building but a group of buildings each serving as a workshop in which a different activity is regulated, an activity that is prescribed for each group of patients according to the nature of their illnesses.

> The carpentry shop, full of sunlight, exuded the sweetness of sawdust, of a lost age of wood; always half a dozen men were there, hammering, planning, buzzing-silent men, who lifted solemn eyes from their work as he passed through.[…..] Adjoining was the book bindery, adapted to the most mobile patients, who were not always, however, those who had the greatest chance for recovery. The last chamber was devoted to bead work, weaving, and work in brass. The faces of the patients here wore the expression of one who has just sighed profoundly, dismissing something insoluble-but their sighs only marked the beginning of another ceaseless round of ratiocination, not in a line as with normal people but in the same circle. Round and round and round. Around forever. But the bright colours of the stuffs they worked with gave strangers a momentary illusion that all was well, as in a kindergarten. (Fitzgerald, 1997:230)

The treatment methods have an illusory quality that gives the onlooker the feeling that they are in a pleasurable atmosphere and the patients are the happy members of that working community. Although there seem to be no bars or grills apparently, they are concealed within the flowers, and the furniture is immobile. Even the name of the section "Eglantine and Beeches", in which those hardest to cure are kept, recalls pleasure. However, in contrast to its name this section is the least pleasurable because it is separated from the other sections of the hospital and the patients are located individually within rooms.

> The Eglantine and Beeches, houses for those sunk into eternal darkness, were screened by little copses from the main building, camouflaged strong-points […..] Exteriorly these houses are as cheerful as the others; […..] that no instructed visitor would have dreamed that the light, graceful filigree work at a window was a strong, unyielding end of a tether, that the pieces reflecting modern turbular tendencies were stancher than the massive creations of Edwardians- even the flowers lay in iron fingers and every casual ornament and fixture was as necessary as a girder in a skyscraper. (Fitzgerald 1997:230, 231, 232)

However, in principle the hospital regulates the normalization processes that are also regulated in a prison where the prisoners are involved in mechanical works in order to be integrated into a clock-work mechanism. Therefore the method

applied there is similar to the one Dick applies on Nicole forcing her to be social by organizing parties in their garden.

> When the body is agitated, when the mind applies itself to a particular object, importunate ideas depart, calm is born once again in the soul. If, in the final analyses, the work of the prison has an economic effect, it is by producing individuals mechanized according to the general norms of an industrial society: 'Work is the providence of the modern peoples, it replaces morality, fills the gaps left by beliefs and is regarded as the principle of all good .
> (Foucault 1991a:242)

Moreover the hospital is a setting where power relations that pervade into the society and the novel are re-experienced, but this time between the patients, Nicole, Dick and Franz.

Foucault takes power not as a centralized, repressive force. Therefore deciphering it does not require us to know in whose hands it is gathered as a force to be exercised upon those who are dominated. In other words rather than as a relationship between the authority and the subject, power can be understood in terms of the changeability of these roles. If the panopticon works on the principle of visibility then every observer is observed. As Foucault suggests, we can not determine an agent for whom it is a privilege to hold power but we can decode the way it is exercised:

> In short this power is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the 'privilege', acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic position – an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated. (Foucault 1991a:26)

For example within the mental hospital although Dick is in the position of the shareholder of the institution and although, as a doctor, he observes the patients, diagnoses their illnesses and treats them, he is also observed by the patients. To put it specifically, the parents of one of the patient's want to take their son, who was brought there because he was an alcoholic, away from the hospital, claiming that their son smells alcohol in Dick's breath.

> He came up menacingly to Dick, who kept his hands loose enough to drop him if it seemed necessary.' My son is here for alcoholism, and he told us he smelt liquor on your breath. Yes, sir!' He made a quick, apparently unsuccessful sniff. 'Not once, but twice Von Cohn says he has smelt liquor on your breath […..] We hand Von Cohn to you to be cured, and within a month he twice smells liquor on your breath! What kind of a cure is that there?'(Fitzgerald, 1997:318)

Not only the patients but Franz and his wife, Frau Kaethe Gregorovius, are also observers of Dick after his alcoholism emerges. Frau Gregorovius keeps on judging Nicole and Dick and comes to the decision that "Dick is no longer a serious man" (Fitzgerald1997:303) Franz's warnings, which are not mispronunciations, are taken by Dick as a kind of malapropism because of his not being a native speaker:

> '…..- Dick I must say frankly that I have been aware several times that you have had a drink when it was not the moment to have one. There is some reason. Why not try another leave of abstinence?'
> 'Absence,' Dick corrected him automatically. 'It's no solution for me to go away. (Fitzgerald 1997:321)

When considered in terms Foucault's definition of power this section concretizes the way power is exercised and the way even the powerful is subjected to the same supervision. Therefore it is possible both to be observed and to observe and both to be strong and weak at the same time. Foucault suggests that power does not have to be in the shape of a repressive agent as the jurisdiction or police. It induces itself within the individual in the shape of an acknowledged, "normal" process of reasoning like a certain logicality that is accepted by every individual. Therefore we can not only associate power with a disciplinary agent which the subject is forced to obey. It is implanted within the individual through certain discourses, and forms of knowledge. Therefore the individual submits to it, forms it in different spheres of life and preserves it both by being the object of knowledge and the generator of knowledge. It is in Nicole's symbolic act of decorating the hospital the working of power can best be exemplified.

> "……Nicole had designed the decoration and the furniture on a necessary base of concealed grills and bars and immovable

> furniture. She had worked with so much imagination……" (Fitzgerald, 1997:231)

Although Nicole is treated as a patient in the hospital because she is prone to break down, she is the one who decorates the hospital. In other words she builds her own cell by being the decorator of the hospital. If we take Nicole as a product of power relations she is also the one who is the generator and the protector of that power. She carries out her submission, and all through her relationships, and in every phase of her life she forms the same kind of relationship. For example, even in her "recovered" state she submits to the will of Tommy Barban: she is both the producer and the product of power.

> The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle. (Foucault, 1980:98).

Therefore the hospital can be deemed as a microcosm in which submission to a similar normalization process is experienced by all of the characters in the novel. The relations that pervade the whole book are re- experienced here in the hospital by the patients and doctors on a micro-cosmic level.

As we have seen the characters in the novel are the embodiments of various contradictory discourses. For example Dick is the merging of an ancient patriarchal discourse that gives the role of a protector, decision maker to the males. On the other hand he contradicts with this role when he is commercialized as a psychiatrist. In addition, Tommy Barban is also the merging of two contradictory discourses one is the mythified soldier who, like Dick, has to protect and take part in a war because "he is a European", because he has to protect the causes of a community. The other is his occupation of making war as a soldier. We know that Tommy Barban does not know what he fights for insofar as he suggests clichés as to the reasons of his fighting. Rosemary is, on the other hand, brought up by her mother to be economically independent. However, hers is an economic independence that depends on her physical beauty that is to be consumed. In that respect Rosemary is a commodity which is in conflict with the aimed economic independence for which

she is brought up. Nicole is also brought up to submit to the demands of the patriarchal society; she is in the role of a female character that is to be protected, socialized and normalized at the same time. However she is expected to eliminate her fragility, which is also a role imposed on her. Nicole, after her "recovery", makes her choice for a man like Tommy Barban who, like Dick, does not let her exercise her own will. Therefore, the book does not let us detect every single utterance, every single character as a representative of authority or as an agent contrary to authority. Rather than determining for each character a domain they represent within the society, we can find contradictory discourses within one character. However, can we decode these various and contradictory voices merged within one character as a battle between centrifugal and centripetal forces[6] , two principle conditions of heteroglossia to emerge? Do all these conflicting voices reinforce each other in order to form a unity? Is this unity formed by heteroglossia a liberatory one as Bakhtin suggests?

> The importance of struggling with another's discourse, its influence in the history of an individual's coming to ideological consciousness is enormous. One's own discourse and one's own voice, although born of another, will sooner or later begin to liberate themselves from the authority of other's discourse (Bakhtin, 2002b:79).

Or is it some other kind of unity having the characteristic that none of the constituents of dialogism within one character can be deemed as a centrifugal, one that opposes monolithic discourse? In other words, is the dialogic nature of the novel the battlefield of official and unofficial languages or, when Tender is the Night is concerned, do all the conflicting voices, rather than being the signs of a conflict that is liberator and rather than being the representatives of unofficial and official languages, signify the fragmentary discourse of the novel that form the characters. The answer to the second question is "yes" because within this conflict there is no libratory voice. Even the one that seems to be libratory at first view is a part of a role out of which the characters are constituted. The heteroglossia created by contradictory voices within each character is not liberation of the character but the

[6] Every utterance participates in the 'unitary language' (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces). (Bakhtin2002b:75).

further submission of him/her. All the varieties are constituents towards building a huge cell. Therefore in Tender is the Night the battle is not within one individual or between centripetal and centrifugal forces, but it is a battle of domination which will not free the one that wins but encapsulates him the more he/she wins. It is a battle for further domination which requires more submission from the winner. In Nicole's voice there seems to be a duality between the tradition that expects women to be fragile and a modern one that seems to liberate women and impose them to develop "stronger, independent selves". In the end both Nicole and Rosemary are mobile, symbolized with their attachment to technology – Nicole drives the car and Rosemary drives the boat-, however the more "powerful" they get the more mobile and visible they become. Rosemary becomes more visible thanks to her role in the cinema industry and Nicole gets more dependant due to her "powerful" position because both the traditional demands and the seemingly modern ones require her submission. In short both Rosemary and Nicole can be mobile and much more "liberated" because all the roads they will follow are defined on the map. When all the microcosms within the novel are considered - the hospital, the duel, Divers' garden, the train station in Paris- their common denominator is the fact that there is a battle for domination going on within each microcosm. However, as opposed to Bakhtin's claims according to which there is a battle between authority and the dominated within each microcosm, this is not a battle that will provide them with a genuine, liberated voice, but a battle which alters and strengthens its rules as it is repeated and which will force the winner to submit to its own rules. Therefore Tender is the Night concerns itself with a warfare that goes on in peacetime; a warfare whose contradictory rules constitute both the winner and the loser. Therefore Foucault's inversion of Clausewitz's argument that "war is politics continued by other means" is a true statement when Tender is the Night is concerned because the novel reveals the silent battle that is going on within the institutions and fragmentary selves in the post-war era.

> […..] That none of these phenomena in a political system should be interpreted except as the continuation of war. They should, that is to say, be understood as episodes, factions and displacements in that same war. Even when one writes the history of peace and its

> institutions, it is always the history of this war that one is writing (Foucault, 1980:91).

In the first part of our study we have examined two novels by F. Scott. Fitzgerald, Tender is the Night and The Great Gatsby as post-war novels within the modernist tradition. The study has taken as its theoretical background the contradictory attitudes of two theoreticians, Bakhtin and Foucault, who pose different approaches towards similar issues such as authority and power. The study has shown that although we can detect heteroglossia in the fragmentation of individual voices in the novel, this fragmentation does not have a dichotomous nature in the Bakhtinian sense between the centrifugal and centripetal forces. We have come to the conclusion that different voices form a network in the sense that they do not consummate the character with the existence of other's look and other's gaze but they do constitute the character as objects of knowledge that prescribe and enhance the rules of domination. Therefore in these novels carnival's libratory role is reversed and they are transformed into modern panopticons whose main principal is to constitute the individual through constant supervision. And finally we have come to the conclusion that that kind of power mechanism is the continuation of warfare by certain discourses in peace-time. Therefore peacetime is not the requisition of war; it is a war going on not in the battle field but in the institutions, in the households and not between two enemy forces but in the relation of fragmentary selves and within contradictory discourses creating the character. In the second part of this study we will deal with two modernist novels namely *A Farewell to Arms* and *The Sun also Rises* by Ernest Hemingway in relation to First World War.

CHAPTER 3

A FAREWELL TO ARMS

3-1 Henry's Confession

Published in 1929, A Farewell to Arms is a modernist text that has its setting in the First World War unlike The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night, which are mainly focused on the post-war era. Yet, having been set in the war does not differentiate A Farewell to Arms as a war narrative from the novels of Fitzgerald in terms of theme and characterization. Although Hemingway is stylistically closer to Gertrude Stein and William Faulkner, since he uses stream of consciousness, short sentence structure void of adjectives and adverbs, as opposed to Fitzgerald, who provides lengthy descriptions of space and character using long sentences, both modernists, Fitzgerald and Hemingway deal with similar themes. They both deal with fragmented selves seeking to become a whole; a whole that is an image consisting of contradictory and patched elements of modern and archaic discourses. However, in Tender is the Night and The Great Gatsby, Fitzgerald represents fragmentation through dialogues and characterization or through an opposition between settings, characters and the contradictory elements within the discourse of one character as we see in the speech of The Great Gatsby's narrator. On the other hand, in A Farewell to Arms this fragmentation is conveyed through images that reign throughout the whole novel as the character Frederick Henry narrates past events in a retrospective and introspective manner. The accumulation of images of brokenness throughout the narrative provides hints as to how Henry perceives the world, how he expresses it, what remains in his memory. The novel is both an integrated story of events narrated linearly in a retrospective manner and a series of impressions such as the reflection of lights, shapes that are perceived unconsciously, broken bridges, deserted houses, natural imagery such as fallen leaves, rain…..etc. These images of brokenness are intruders in a narrative that strives to be whole by following a sequential narration of events. In other words, although the book's plot confirms to a linearly sequenced sense of time, the characters' obsession with time

and their sense of alienation within the linear logic of calendar time is conveyed through images.

The novel conveys a sense of fragmentation through the juxtaposition of two kinds of imagery: the images of fluidity, such as a streaming river, symbolizing the flux of events following one after the other within the process of war, and images of brokenness, such as pebbles in a river that causes deviation in the flow, the reflection of lights in the rain, and broken bridges, symbolizing ruptures, discontinuities or fixations which fragments as they are, are perceived and reflected by a disconcerted, fragmented mind like that of Henry who strives to be a whole through the utterance of his own narrative. In the first paragraph of the novel the narrator describes a stream with stones in it and a white road which is covered with fallen leaves as images conveying sense of continuity and rupture:

> In the bed of the river there were pebbles and boulders, dry and white in the sun, and the water was clear and swiftly moving and blue in the channels [….] the road bare and white except for the leaves. (Hemingway, 2004:3)

At some points within the plot the objects of brokenness turn out to be the signifiers of an imperfection and distortion such as the blown up bridges, lights reflected on a wet surface or deserted farm houses that would be idyllic if they were occupied. Therefore each image has its own imperfection in itself in addition to the fact that they signify a discontinuity within continuity. This is to say, the images reveal a kind of imperfection within rupture: A bridge is both imperfect because it is blown up and a rupture when thought of as a cessation within the whole road. Or a deserted farm house: It is imperfect in itself because the houses are in a state of ruin and a deserted farm house is at the same time a symbolic rupture to the ideas of "safety", "family" and "tradition" it evokes. Or like the reflection of light on a wet surface at night, a recurrent image taking place in Henry's narrative, a twofold reflection that signifies a kind of distortion in the perception of reality. Henry's idea of wholeness and completeness and his constant perception of imperfection and sense of rupture within the continuity (war) do not signify security but illusion (like lights), fragmentation (like the bridge) or insecurity (like the blown up walls).

Therefore what is supposed to be a place of security such as family, home, social connection and settledness does not imply security because these are themselves illusions that can easily collapse like a bridge or a house; they can easily lose their protective connotations. In that respect there is a homological relationship between images of continuity and brokenness and the plot. At the level of the images we find symbols of a fragile stability and a disrupted continuity such as rivers and roads disconnected by pebbles or blown up bridges while, at the level of the plot, we see the continuity of the war which is always in the background of all events and ruptures such as Henry's location in a hospital or a hotel with Catherine.

Just as the images of brokenness and rupture signify the collapse of "safety" and the collapse of an untainted "wholeness", Henry's stay with Catherine, a rupture within the continuity of war, is far from being safe and protective; the ruptures on the level of the plot do work as a challenge to the family and other institutions. The plot follows a sequence of mobility, associated with the insecurity of the war, and a phase of retreat and stability in a hospital or a hotel that is associated with the supposed security of home that is sought both by Henry and Catherine throughout the plot. However, like the broken bridges, Henry's retreat with Catherine lacks security and the idyllic quality of family. In vain they try to make hotels or wards look like home. Within the context of the war every place of security, such as family or house, is disrupted as happens with the death of Catherine and her still-born baby after their retreat to Switzerland in the end of the book.

Henry's repeated description of reflected lights is a sign of his sense of alienation, his constant insecurity and fragmented perception:

> There were two caribinieri standing under the light just out of the rain. The light shone on their hats. (Hemingway2004:142)
> The lights from the hotel shone on the wet pavement. (Hemingway2004:137)
> The leather was dark and oiled smooth as a used saddle. The electric light made high lights on the dull oiled leather. (Hemingway 2004:133)

Thus Henry's perception is directed towards perceiving refractions on a wet surface. It is not the whole real image he sees but the reflection of a light. The images signify both the fragmented perception of Henry within the narrative and the fragmentedness of the whole novel, from beginning to the end, breaking and transforming scenes that might denote a mythic romance or bravery. For example the first extract above takes place just before Catherine and Henry leave each other, and lends the scene an obscurity, for the reader can no longer define it as "romantic" or "sad". It shows Henry's distractedness and alienation, and in addition to this it also alienates the reader. The second extract is taken from a section in which Henry and Catherine go to a hotel. Henry is expecting some romance; however, Catherine says, "I never felt like a whore before" and Henry looks out of the window and says, "I had not thought it would be like this". (Hemingway2004:137) Therefore the description of a reflected light again implies the alienation of the characters from each other and the alienation of Henry from the previously imagined form of this scene:

> Because we would not wear any clothes because it was so hot and the window open and the swallows flying over the roofs of the houses [….] we would drink the capri and the door locked and it hot and only a sheet and the whole night and we would both love each other all night in the hot night in Milan. That was how it ought to be. (Hemingway 2004:36).

The ideal situation Henry creates shatters when the scene actually takes place, and Henry's perception of broken reflection of lights designates to a situation that breaks the image of perfection in Henry's mind and the obscurity of the scene for the reader. The hotel scene reflects a sense of insecurity and lack of clarity for the reader just as the reflected lights on a wet surface prevents the definition of the image clearly.

The third extract is taken from a section in which Henry's departure for the front is narrated. This scene has again the quality of an intruder both with respect to its literal and thematic value. Henry's perception of lights "on the dull oiled leather" takes place when he is together with Catherine just before his farewell. After the

description of the lights, Henry stops in front of an armourer's shop and says that he has to buy a gun. Therefore the event symbolizes the loosening of his connection with Catherine and the tightening of his connection with another reality: the reality of the war. Henry buys a second-hand gun that used to belong to another officer "who was an excellent shot":

> 'It is used,' the woman said. 'It belonged to an officer who was an excellent shot.'
> 'Did you sell it to him?'
> 'Yes.'
> 'How did you get it back?'
> 'From his orderly. '(Hemingway, 2004:134)

Henry's purchase of another officer's gun symbolizes his involvement in male comradeship with someone who is unknown to him, an attachment to a chivalric code. However, as a symbolic enactment of his losing his connection with the fact of war and male comradeship, Henry, later in the novel, loses the gun. He is alienated from both of the distinctly defined sets of realities: the one depicting his experience with Catherine as her faithful lover because Catherine dies while she is giving birth, and the other concerned with war as the patriotic comrade in the troop. Therefore although the book seems to define two kinds of realities and presents them as if they were opposed to each other, it invalidates both of them in the end. Catherine dies in the end and the family idyll is shattered and the gun, as a symbol of the myth of courage, is proved to be fatal after Henry's friend is killed by the ally forces. These two forces, war and family, seem to alternate each other at the beginning of the novel, because Henry gives up one for the sake of another. However, both forming of the family and going to the war are defined as parts of an official discourse (centripetal forces in Bakhtin's terminology) that leads to the destruction of humanity and they are both negated. Henry suggests this negation at the end of the novel:

> Now Catherine would die. That was what you did. You died. You did not know what it was about. You never had time to learn. They threw you in and told you the rules and the first time they caught you off base they killed you. Or they killed you gratuitously like Aymo. Or gave you the syphilis like Rinaldi. But they killed you in

> the end. You could count on that. Stay around and they would kill you. (Hemingway, 2004:289)

Thus the novel initially juxtaposes two stages in Henry's life —his life with Catherine and his life on the front — and presents them as two realities opposing each other, and then it negates both of them as forces that causes destruction. For instance, first the romance that is expected from lovehood is eliminated in Henry's relationship with Catherine. The scenes of romance Henry imagines with Catherine do not turn out romantically when realized, and then the book closes with the death of Catherine and the baby. On the other hand, it is implied that the war propaganda that strengthens mythic qualities such as courage and heroism is falsehood because Henry is decorated after he is wounded. However when he is wounded he is not fighting but eating cheese with the other soldiers. Or when the war police want to kill him, because they think he is a run-away soldier, Henry is not running away, he is simply lost. As a conclusion both Henry's reward and his punishment are not based on a real exhibition of courage or guilt; they are chance elements enhancing the ideology of the war. Therefore both love and courage remain within the ideological, official sphere of life and can be included within the centripetal forces; forces that signify a verbal and ideological centralization in Bakhtin's definition of heteroglossia.

> Every utterance participates in the 'unitary language' (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces) (Bakhtin, 2002b:75)

However, although these two stages in Henry's life seem to oppose each other, they are unified thematically as two facets of a created reality. Thus Henry's fragmentation is not between two seemingly distinct realities. On the contrary, Henry's fragmentation derives from his state of alienation from these centralized and official spheres of lives which are the only alternatives offered to him within the setting of the war and which are at the same time destructive. Therefore mythified forces such as courage and love are those that put the individual under the lights; in other words they are the forces that offer to define and construct him/her.

Thus the images of broken lights transform and break the mythic pattern of a unity. Therefore, they serve as breaks both in the literal sense as broken lights, and in the figurative sense as signifiers of Henry's broken perception and as breaks that give the narrative a fragmented form. In this respect the state of Henry the narrator is similar to that of the characters' in The Great Gatsby, who, instead of god, must face Dr Eckleburg Eyes on an advertisement as the parodied image of a holistic reality. In other words both of the novels exhibit the nonexistence of unites both on the level of plot and the images. There is no unitary god that would keep the world stable around a belief system or a perception of the world as a unified reality. In A Farewell to Arms the narrator's perception of broken lights is the symbolic re-staging of the narrator's fragmentation. The association between broken images and fragmented characters in A Farewell to Arms is similar to Fitzgerald's association of refraction of light with the character's fragmentation in Tender is the Night:

> In an inhabited room there are refracting objects only half noticed: varnished wood, more or less polished brass, silver , and ivory, and beyond these a thousand conveyors of light and shadow so mild that one scarcely thinks of them as that, the tops of picture frames, the edges of pencils or ash trays, of crystal or china ornaments; the totality of this refraction – appealing to equally subtle reflexes of the vision as well as to those associational fragments in the subconscious that we seem to hang on to as a glass-fitter keeps the irregularly shaped pieces that may do some time[…] (Fitzgerald, 1997:198-199)

As Fitzgerald in Tender is the Night suggests, what Henry keeps in his mind and expresses even in a narrative that strives to be a whole are not the unified quality of an event but objects and events that retain their broken form within the narrative.

We will further study the importance of images in relation to plot and themes. At this stage of our study the significance of the images is mentioned because both the plot and the images reveal the fact that what Henry perceives as images and what he experiences and reflects as events are identical in the sense that ruptures and retreats are the signs of a stability on the level of institutions such as family and marriage, and the whole journey of Catherine and Henry with the war on

the background is the staging of an insecure mobility, a mobility that is in quest of stability and settledness of institutions Then how can a whole be captured or how can Henry "consummate" a meaningful whole out of his fragmented way of experiencing life? Is his retrospective narrative of events a way for the modern individual to constitute an image of wholeness? Henry's written verbal confession made in the presence of the other is a modern form of confession that seeks to reach "architectonics", an artistic whole in the Bakhtinian sense. Henry's confession is directed towards making a whole out of fragmentedness and giving things objectivity in the presence of another's consciousness. In A Farewell to Arms architectonics is sought not in the unification of polyphony within the text but the unification and objectivity of a single fragmented utterance in the text. When considered in this way, what Bakhtin defines as architectonics turns out to be a term that connotes an aesthetic wholeness that can only be achieved when Henry's confession becomes a novel and reaches the reader. In other words, the characters' endeavour to become a whole- which is the act of confession- can only be an unfulfilled task, and as an unfulfilled aim of the character's it can only fulfill its task as a novel. Therefore if a confession such as Henry's remains fragmentary, it nevertheless can be a whole for the reader.

The character's futile attempts at consummation in the act of confession and the reader's consummation of the character through the gaps in the narrative reminds us of a relationship what Foucault defines as "pastoral power" which derives its force from institutionalized Christianity and which is practiced through the confession of the individual and closely connected to the production of the truth about the individual. The truth in this case is produced according to the individual's inclination towards "sin" that is supposed to be latent in him/ her. Therefore, as Foucault maintains, this kind of power does not subject the individual to a sovereignty but looks after the individual with the promise of salvation by giving him/her knowledge about himself/herself, in other words by producing self-knowledge according to the Christian sense of "sin" or "guilt".

> It is a form of power that looks after not just the whole community but each individual in particular, during his entire life. […..]

> Finally, this form of power cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people's minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their innermost secrets. It implies knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it. (Foucault, 2000b:333).

In another essay entitled "Technologies of the Self" Foucault traces the tradition's roots back to Hellenistic and Roman periods and explains that self was based on an activity that requires the individual to fulfill two prerequisites which can be summed up in two principle phrases: "Take care of yourself" and "Know yourself", which are linked to each other in terms of a constant questioning of and caring for the self. However, while in Roman and Hellenistic periods that kind of self-examination and self-definition was an activity that had its objectives in this life, Christianity, although it is a confessional religion which requires the constant control over the self, changed self's relation to this life and located the objectives of self-examination in another world. Therefore, in the case of Christianity, confession served as a catharsis whose limits are determined by the scripture and which aims at reaching at a "purified" state by keeping a check over the latent "impurity". And these prerequisites are part of "this life" which will bring the salvation in "another life". In short, it was a constant process of self- interpretation that the sinner was subjected to, and both self-examination and renunciation were preparations for another life.

> Christianity belongs to the salvation religions. It is one of those religions which are supposed to lead the individual from one reality to another, from death to life, from time to eternity. [….] Each person has the duty to know who he is, that is, to try to know what is happening inside him, to acknowledge faults, to recognize temptations, to locate desires; and everyone is obliged to disclose these things either to God or to others in the community and, hence, to bear public private witness against oneself. (Foucault, 1997:242)

Foucault, in his study The Will to Knowledge, explores what kind of a transformation the confessional tradition of pagan and Christian culture endured in the twentieth century, and argues that in the twentieth century it is neither the subject's well-being in society nor his salvation that was promised with the act of confession, but self-confession created a kind of discourse that constituted the subject. It became a ritualized practice which did not come from above as an

obligation but was ingrained in the confessor as the principal condition of his/her definition within a specified corpus of knowledge. Confession was a discourse which claimed to achieve a scientific solidity; it was a means of gathering and decoding certain signs that was supposed to reveal the utmost secrets of the self. Thus confession turned out to be a means of unifying and constituting the fragmented and undefined aspects of the self.

> If one had to confess, this was not merely because the person to whom one confessed had the power to forgive, console, and direct, but because the work of producing the truth was obliged to pass through this relationship if it was obliged to be scientifically validated. The truth did not reside in the subject who, by confessing, would reveal it wholly formed. It was constituted in two stages: present but incomplete, blind to itself, in the one who spoke, it could only reach completion in the one who assimilated and recorded it (Foucault, 1998:66).

Therefore Henry's confessional narrative can be consummated in the reader.

In its twentieth-century form confession was distinct from its previously practiced forms. In other words confession became a practice that was included in the domain of psychiatry, and is accepted as a true narrative which must be decoded and made meaningful according to new criteria.

According to Foucault confession was a part of truth-making process which is similar to what Bakhtin defines as "architectonics"; an aesthetic whole- making that requires the existence of the other's gaze – the listener according to Foucault- whose consummation of the utterance is a prerequisite.

> If there is only one unitary and unique participant, there can be no aesthetic event. An absolute consciousness, a consciousness that has nothing transgredient to itself, nothing situated outside itself and capable of delimiting it from outside – such a consciousness can not be "aestheticized"; one can commune in it, but it can not be seen as a *whole* that is capable of being consummated. An aesthetic event can take place only when there are two participants present; it presupposes two non-coinciding consciousnesses (Bakhtin, 1990:22).

The underlying difference between Foucault and Bakhtin becomes very clear. Bakhtin relies on the integrity of the two consciousnesses that are involved in the whole- making process of confession. Foucault, on the other hand, is skeptical about both the confessor's identity and the listener's criteria, because, on the one hand, the confessor is the one who is the subject of an inquisition and from whom a mass of codes are supposed to be gathered. Moreover, the listener is involved in the act of confession and consequently decodes the sign according to a pre-determined structure. According to Foucault, the listener and the confessor are two constituted characters both of whom know where the emphasis of scientific discourse is. Thus both the elements of the whole and the whole itself are constituted, and we can not talk about a Bakhtinian sense of original, stable entities out of which a whole is consummated. Therefore the basic distinction between Foucault and Bakhtin on the issue of confession is that the former regards confession as a step towards knowledge making and the latter takes it as a procedure of whole-making.

According to Foucault, in its modern context the confessional tradition has taken on a role in the construction of the individual; within this mechanism there does not have to be an oppressive, concrete power that makes confession an obligation to reveal the crime and sin, but it works through inculcating an incitement in the self to see his /her own potential for "delinquency" or "perversity" and follow its causes and latent forms through schemes. Thus confession does not see the individual as a whole to be decoded as was practiced in Hellenistic and Roman periods or Christianity, but as fragmented elements that become a whole under a scheme during the practice of confession. Foucault's objections emerge on the point of the scheme's construction and renewal, and the individual's construction during the process of confession. Bakhtin's approach, on the other hand, is closer to the Christian conception of confession. Bakhtin sees the construction of the self in positive terms. According to him the other's gaze and other's consciousness is indispensable in the "consummation" of the self as a whole. The definition of the self by another agent is a must, the only way to gain objectivity:

> And, similarly, there is an equally profound difference between my inner experience of my own body and the recognition of its outer value by other people –my right to the loving acceptance or recognition of my exterior by others: this recognition or acceptance descends upon me from others like a gift, like grace, which is incapable of being understood and founded from within myself. And it is only in this case that certainty of my body is possible, whereas an immediately intuitable experience of that value is impossible (Bakhtin, 1990:49).

Therefore when this claim is applied to the issue of confession, what matters for Bakhtin are not the position of the interpreter or listener and whether the other already exists even in my inner experience of myself. Unlike Foucault, who focuses on the scheme or the values according to which self is constituted; Bakhtin does not deal with the rationality behind that entire scheme which is also adapted to other spheres such as law or science. Therefore self-confession (not confession that is made in the presence of another party) is for Bakhtin a means of purgation. Self-confession for Bakhtin is not a stage in the whole-making process because making a whole requires the existence of another consciousness.

> The essential, constitutive moment of this form is the fact that it is a self-objectivation, that the other with his special, *privileged* approach is excluded; the only principle that organizes the utterance here is the pure relationship of I to itself.[…..] Outside God, outside the bounds of trust in absolute otherness, self-consciousness and self-utterance are impossible, and they are impossible not because they would be senseless practically, but because trust in God is an immanent constitutive moment of pure self-consciousness and self expression (Bakhtin, 1990:141-144)

However, when we return to the novel, we see that Henry's confession is not addressed to god. God exists in his dialogue with the priest or with the others as a heteroglot element and most of the time within these dialogues the "sacred" turns into the" profane" or atheism is cherished in the dialogues between the priest and the other members of the troop:

> 'Priest not with girls,' went on the captain. 'Priest never with girls,' he explained to me. He took my glass and filled it, looking at my eyes all the time, but not losing sight of the priest.

> ‘Priest every night five against one.’ Every one at the table laughed.
> […]
> ‘Did you ever read the “Black Pig”?’ asked the lieutenant. ‘I will get you a copy. It was that which shook my faith.’
> ‘It is a filthy and vile book,’ said the priest. ‘You do not really like it.’
> ‘It is very valuable,’ said the lieutenant. ‘It tells you about those priests. You’ll like it,’ he said to me (Hemingway2004:7).

Therefore within the setting of the war and the context of the book we can not talk about a religious confession made out of repentance. Henry addresses god not in a repentant tone but only when he is too afraid that Catherine would die:

> Don’t let her die. Oh, God, please don’t let her die. I’ll do anything for you if you won’t let her die. Please, please, please dear God don’t let her die. Dear God don’t let her die. Please please, please don’t let her die. (Hemingway, 2004:291)

Thus Henry’s confession or his utterance does not have other-worldly objectives; it is an utterance that aims to achieve wholeness out of fragments. In the Bakhtinian sense, it is a confession that aims to achieve wholeness through the participation of the reader. Architectonics, aesthetic unity, is sought in the polyphony that is intrinsic to the novel. A Foucauldian reading on the other hand would tell us that Henry’s confession is knowledge – making process within the power structure. According to Foucault, it doesn’t matter who confesses what to whom, or what the tiniest and earliest form of the message that is conveyed is through confession, but how the confessor is determined in terms of what he/she confesses, and how and why that specific material is confessed and how it paves the way for the formation of a specific discourse. Therefore according to Foucault confession is a phase of knowledge-making and not a revelation that would unveil the message that is hidden between the words as Bakhtin would argue.

Henry’s is a confession that can achieve wholeness only as a novel in the Bakhtinian sense, because only the novel form can provide it with other’s consciousness that is indispensable for wholeness to be achieved. And in the

Foucauldian sense, only as a part of discourse can it inscribe its codes into disciplinary mechanism.

Therefore a Foucauldian reading would approach the novel not as an aesthetic unity that is consummated but as an element that buttresses a discourse that is prevalent at the time it was written. When considered this way, it is easy to detect that Henry's alienation and fragmentation go in parallel with the invalidation of the truth of an archaic idea. The more Henry's awareness increases as to the destructiveness of the centripetal ideas (belonging to official state propaganda) the more alienated he becomes. Henry's loss of belief in the centralizing (centripetal, official) ideas such as marriage and war is revealed by acts such as cutting off the stars on his sleeves and losing his gun while he is trying to run away from the war police in order to reach Milan:

> Before I put on my coat I cut the cloth stars of my sleeves and put them in the inside pocket with my money […..] They had taken my pistol at the road and I put the holster under my coat. (Hemingway, 2004:202)

Henry contends that the centripetal has so seductive a glamour that it attracts one into the centre, into the realm of official discourse, and while pulling one into the centre it destroys. The idea that the centripetal idea, such as the necessity of an "honorable" war, is at the same time destructive is dealt with through images in certain separate sections of the book. For example the dialogue that takes place between Henry and Catherine while Henry is buying a gun is the narration of how a centralizing force works destructively on a symbolic level:

> 'What are those little mirrors set in wood for?'
> 'They're for attracting birds. They twirl them out in the field and larks see them and come out and Italians shoot them.' (Hemingway, 2004:135)

The birds that are attracted by the light of a mirror can be likened to Henry and other soldiers who are pulled into the front hoping that they are going to be defined as heroes in the war but who, by doing so, bring their own destruction. In

that case the struggle within the book can not be interpreted as the struggle of two clearly defined poles of centrifugal and centripetal as Bakhtin prescribes. Rather than the struggle of two non-reconciling but at the same time whole-making forces the book presents two centripetal tendencies which are at the basis of a settled society-Henry's endeavour to marry and to find a home and to be immobilized, and the war which is basically made in order to protect a territory and to invade more territories- and the negation of both tendencies as both of them are presented as two reliable tenets whose collapse causes Henry's fragmentation. The novel rejects the archaic idea of war and symbolizes it as a mirror which is illusory and destructive. Therefore the novel destroys the illusion but does not offer a new set of "truths" that would offer a secure point of attachment to the individual. Although Henry's attachment to Catherine seems to be an alternative or a temporary break from the war it partakes in the illusory quality because they can never fulfill the idea of home-coming which is something they try to find throughout the novel. Henry calls the hospital in which he is treated "home": "It was a hot summer and I knew many people in Milan but always was anxious to get back home to the hospital as soon as the afternoon was over."(Hemingway, 2004:107) Or both Catherine and Henry try to feel at home in a hotel room in Milan, where they stay before Henry leaves for the front:

> After we had eaten we felt fine, and then after, we felt very happy and in a little time the room felt like our own home. My room at the hospital had been our own home and this room was our own home in the same way. (Hemingway, 2004:138)

Looking for home or being settled can be considered as one of the centripetal forces that society relies on; home is also one of the central themes of the novel. However like the idea of war, looking for home and the idea of being settled are also treated as destructive forces in the novel. It is for the sake of being settled and finding home that Henry and Catherine are mobilized; Henry runs away from the war and returns to Milan in order to find Catherine, and then they cross the Italian border on a boat in the rain in the fear that they may be arrested by the Italians. In other words, they flee and risk their lives for the sake of being settled. On the other hand by running away from Milan they contradict the codes in which they used to

believe. Henry feels like a schoolboy who neglects a duty— "I had the feeling of a boy who thinks of what is happening at a certain hour at the schoolhouse from which he has played truant" — (Hemingway 2004:219) and Catherine has to give up her duty as a V.A.D nurse and contradict with her friend Ferguson and the moral codes she represents:

> 'If you [Catherine] had any shame it would be different. But you're God knows how many months gone with child and you think it is a joke and are all smiles because your seducer's come back. You have no shame and no feelings.' (Hemingway2004:220)

In this respect the novel is based on a contradiction because both fighting and being settled with Catherine are centripetal, official, centralizing forces. Or when we think in terms of Catherine, both being a V.A.D nurse and running away from her duty in order to be settled are centralizing forces; they do not signify an independence from the social order. Therefore, however much the novel seems to represent these two stages of their lives as contradictory phases alternating one another, both Henry's flight and Catherine's pregnancy are acts that require being settled which is equally within the order, destructive and risky. In this sense the novel underlines two contradictions: War for the sake of peace and mobility for the sake of immobility. We discover the validity of the first contradictory statement through the conversation between the soldiers. As the war continues the soldiers do not fight to gain victory any more, but they fight in the hope that the war will one day come to an end.

> 'Tenente,' Passini said. 'We understand you let us talk. Listen. There is nothing as bad as war. We in the auto-ambulance cannot even realize at all how bad it is. When people realize how bad it is, they can not do anything to stop it because they go crazy. There are some people who never realize. There are people who are afraid of their officers. It is with them the war is made.'
> 'I know it is bad but we must finish it.'
> 'It doesn't finish. There is no finish to a war.'
> Passini shook his head.
> 'War is not won by victory. What if we take san Gabriele? What if we take the carso and Monfalcone and Trieste? Where are we then? Did you see all the far mountains to-day? Do you think we could take all them too? (Hemingway, 2004:48)

Therefore as Passini suggests the end of war does not initiate peace. War and peace are not opposed to each other. Victory will lead to another war.

Catherine's and Henry's endeavour to be settled is for the sake of forming a family, an institution which is recognized and approved by the official order. However Henry's and Catherine's endeavour to form a home does not conclude in the way that the ideology propagandized it should be. After giving birth to a still-born baby Catherine is depicted as a victim of the Inquisition:

> I thought Catherine was dead. She looked dead. Her face was gray, the part of it that I could see. Down below, under the light, the doctor was sewing up the great long, forcep-spread, thick-edged wound. Another doctor in a mask gave the anesthetic. Two nurses in masks handed things. It looked like a drawing of the Inquisition. (Hemingway, 2004:287)

But when we think in terms of Foucault's definition of the power mechanism the subject is involved within the power mechanism by constituting himself/herself within it. Just like Catherine who judges herself according to the codes of middle class sense of femininity and who wants to be a "perfect darling" and a wife for Henry:

> 'I [Catherine] look too big and matronly now. But after she's born and I'm thin again I'm going to cut it and then I'll be a fine new and different girl for you' [……] ' Oh, you're so sweet. And maybe I'd look lovely, darling, and be so thin and exciting to you and you'll fall in love with me all over again....' (Hemingway, 2004:270)

or like Henry who chooses to become heroized – and at the same time victimized- by going to war, the subject is policed not by the intervention of a powerful agent but through a certain kind of rationality he / she assumes. Therefore as Foucault points out:

> In the end, we are judged, condemned, classified, determined in our undertakings, destined to a certain mode of living or dying, as a function of the true discourses which are the bearers of the specific effects of power. (Foucault, 1980:94)

Therefore Catherine's and Henry's state of centralization characterized by their choice of being a soldier and a nurse and later on their endeavour to be settled as loyal and perfect lovers is the consequence of a "true" rationalization that the subject is pre- constituted to adopt. The idea that man is constituted to conform to a certain kind of rationality is implied within the text through the choices of Catherine and Henry. However, the text contradicts itself when Henry explains his predicament and despair by referring to the instinctual behavior of birds, which are trapped by a mirror's reflection and killed by hunters, and the behavior of ants which go through the fire and die:

> Once in a camp I put a log on top of the fire and it was full of ants. As it commenced to burn, the ants swarmed out and went first toward the centre where the fire was; then turned back and ran toward the end. When there were enough on the end they fell off into the fire. Some got out, their bodies burnt and flattened, and went off not knowing where they were going. But most of them went toward the fire and then back toward the end and swarmed on the cool end and finally fell off into the fire. (Hemingway, 2004:289)

In the extract it is evident that Henry refers to his own predicament. He also goes to the centre (he becomes the product of official discourse) by joining the war as an ambulance driver and, after confronting the destructiveness of the war, runs away, but this time he again follows a deadly path and ends up in another fire which causes the death of Catherine. In that sense Henry can be likened to the ants which survive the fire with flattened and wounded bodies and do not know where to go. In the case of the ants and birds it is a mechanical drive that attracts them to the fire or to the mirror, and the novel by giving examples from biological phenomena in order to define a social, learned behaviour- because in Henry's and Catherine's case looking for a settlement is a learned behaviour- generalizes an assumption that human beings go into the centre (they form settlements and families) instinctually like ants and birds, and by being settled they prepare their own catastrophe because they have to make war in order to protect their settlement. However, the fact that Catherine and Henry want to be settled and look for a home is not due to their

instincts but their learned behaviours. That is, Catherine and Henry become centralized by submitting to the demands of a settled society and it is because of this quest and submission that they destroy themselves like ants and birds which go to the centre and let themselves be destroyed.

Thus on the one hand the novel presents the deconstruction of ultimate values in the context of war, as Henry suggests:

> I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and the expression in vain. [……], and I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like stockyards at Chicago. (Hemingway, 2004:165)

Yet on the other hand, it introduces another ultimate fact that the human beings have a natural tendency to prepare their own catastrophe. And catastrophe is not the outcome of exclusion from a system but integration into it. Thus Henry's and Catherine's position as run aways or as the outsiders does not make them independent outcasts but strictly integrated dependants. Therefore as Foucault points out in his essay "The Risks of Security", exclusion from a system does not offer independence:

> We can see that dependency results not only from integration, but also from marginalization and exclusion [….] There are in certain forms of marginalization what I could call another aspect of phenomena of dependency. Our systems of social coverage impose a determined way of life that subjugates individuals. As a result, all persons or groups who, for one reason or another, cannot or do not want to accede to this way of life find themselves marginalized by the very game of the institutions. (Foucault, 2000:367)

In Henry's and Catherine's case we can not talk about an independence that is caused by their "marginalized" position as the run-aways of war, because regardless of their exclusion they still conform to the social rules in their wish to get married and form a family. In Catherine's and Henry's case, finding a geographical location, occupational validity and sexual identity are still tasks to be fulfilled, notwithstanding how excluded they are from the order of the society.

> ‘Let’s get married now,’ I said
> ‘No,’ Catherine said. ‘It is too embarrassing now. I show too plainly. I won’t go before any one and be married in this state.’
> ‘I wish we’d gotten married.’
> ‘I suppose it would have been better. But when could we darling?’
> ‘I don’t know.’
> ‘I know one thing. I’m not going to be married in this splendid matronly state.’
> ‘You’re not matronly.’
> [….]
> ‘When will we be married?’
> ‘Any time after I’m thin again. We want to have a splendid wedding with every one thinking what a handsome young couple.’(Hemingway, 2004:261)

Therefore the conflict between the war and the characters’ externalized relation to the war is negated on the thematic level by Henry’s recognition that these seemingly opposed spheres of life (marriage – immobility / war - mobility) are identical to each other because thay are both centralizing and destructive.

In this respect A Farewell to Arms is similar to Tender is the Night and The Great Gatsby which negate two seemingly clashing world views by initially presenting a conflict between the mythic values of the past, to which the characters are attached, and the commercialized twentieth century as a challenge to the image of the past. Both in Tender is the Night and the Great Gatsby these two opposing images of the past and the present are negated; the past is revealed to be treacherous, as we see in the example of Nicole’s father, and the present is represented in disguise making use of past in a new context with renewed values and norms. Therefore The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night negate a struggle between two seemingly opposed spheres, because they are both proved to be illusory.

A Farewell to Arms presents the conflict between two seemingly opposed values-the war (mobility and courage) and settledness (Immobility and love) - within the context of the war and negates both of them as officially acknowledged, centralizing tendencies that deceive and destroy the individual, because Henry and Catherine are destroyed on the way to being a family- Catherine dies in child-birth.

Therefore the book merges two forces into each other as destructive: war, a force that is destructive, and the idea of rootedness which is supposed to be generative in its relation to child-birth and family. However within the context of war the latter, which is recognized and encouraged by the official, discourse, turns out to be destructive. Moreover, we must also take Catherine's giving birth to a still-born baby as an image of destructiveness in nature. Thus making war and giving birth— regardless of its being generative — are considered instinctual drives which can equally be destructive. Hemingway also reinforces this idea by depicting nature in relation to arms: "…..the long barrels of the guns covered with green branches […..]….there was snow on the guns." (Hemingway 2004:3, 6). In that respect natural imagery is intrinsic to the theme of war in the novel. Hemingway also connects motherhood with soldiership at the beginning of the novel by describing soldiers with their rifles who seem like pregnant women.

> […..] gray leather boxes heavy with the packs of clips of thin, long 6.5 cartridges, bulged forward under the capes so that the men, passing on the road, marched as though they were six months gone with the child. (Hemingway, 2004:4)

Therefore two seemingly irreconcilable images; - a soldier that is destructive and a mother who is generative- are inseparable because motherhood, a natural phenomenon, can be destructive when the cruelty of nature plays its part in motherhood as we see in the example of Catherine. If we think in terms of soldiership, soldiership can assume a protective role especially when we consider the relationship between Rinaldi and Henry or between Piani and Henry:

> 'You see we don't believe in the war anyway, Tenente.'
> 'Why didn't you go?' I asked.
> 'I didn't want to leave you.'(Hemingway 2004:193)

Another set of discrepancies, the natural (leaves) and the industrial (arms) are merged through imagery at the beginning. It is the characteristic of the novel that it makes pre-conceived discrepancies cohere. It transforms the generative into the abortive, like the transformation of motherhood as a generative force into destructive, and sometimes the destructive is transformed into the protective as

Henry and his friends are not in the war to destroy the enemy but to protect each other and avoid death.

In addition to the transformation of discrepancies into coherences, the novel intertwines seemingly incoherent ideas with respect to their conclusions. For instance both the love relationship between Henry and Catherine and the comradeship between Henry and the others in the troop lead to a mobility that is insecure; they try to attain an unknown destiny when Henry and his comrades are lost in the wood, and Henry and Catherine jeopardize their lives by deciding to get across the river in a boat. In that sense the novel presents ideas of both marriage and that of war as two coherent experiences; they are not alternatives to each other but similar experiences since they are ready-made unities that cause destruction. In other words, the book recognizes no difference between "having a place of one's own" (marriage) and having a territory and expanding the boundaries of that territory (war), because the former initiates the latter.

Thus the novel follows a path contrary to what Bakhtin asserts concerning historical novel's treatment of the issue of war. According to Bakhtin, war and love are interwoven within the narrative as two subjects opposing each other, but they do not fuse into each other. However the modern novel attempts to historicize the personal life and history is presented in its connection to private life.

> This fundamentally historical theme [War]-which has other motifs attached to it, such as conquest, political crimes and the deposing of pretenders, dynastic revolutions, the fall of kingdoms, the founding of new kingdoms, courts, executions and so forth-is interwoven with personal life narratives of historical figures (with the central motif of love), but the two themes do not fuse. The major task of the modern novel has been to overcome this duality: attempts have been made to find an historical aspect of private life and also to present history in its "domestic light" (Bakhtin, 2002a:217).

When we consider Bakhtin's statement on the modern novel and its treatment of history in relation to A Farewell to Arms, it is true that the novel represents the theme of war and the theme of love in relation to each other. However A Farewell to

Arms has another concern, which is to negate both the idea of war and love, and to depict the fragmentation of the individual who loses the solidity and the security of belief after confronting the fact that both the idea of war and love are the given orders according to which the individual must regulate his/her life. They are the created realities within the sphere of disciplinary mechanisms and they are destructive, because they have an initiatory role on the way to form a society as well as being the initial stage of a destructive process. Therefore we can say that A Farewell to Arms deals with the war and love not as love within a historical context or history in connection with private life but as two social phenomena that initiates the construction and at the same time the destruction of society. Henry's retrospective confession starts as a unifying attempt at a moment when his experience as a soldier and a lover are resulted in disbelief. Henry's confession is an attempt of meaning-making out of the fragments of a shattered belief in the already-made unities. Thus the novel underlines the dissolution of already-made unities such as marriage, family, settledness and relies on confession as a meaning-maker. Therefore as opposed to the traditional idea of confession as the product of "guilty consciousness", Henry's confession reveals the collapse of the moral values according to which a consciousness is made "guilty and sinful".

3-2 Henry's Struggle and the Priest's Dream

The novel A Farewell to Arms assumes a demythifying stance both towards myth-ridden ideas of "courage and love" and towards the novel as a genre by presenting minor characters in a way that they enter into the main plot, appear and disappear without sustenance. Only the lives of main characters, Catherine and Henry, have a story with a beginning and an end following a linear sequence. The minor characters such as the priest, Rinaldi, Piani, Bonello, Aymo and Ettore only appear as characters that have a temporary existence within the story of Catherine and Henry; they don't have a story with a beginning and an end that is followed through the novel. Therefore the characterization also has a fragmentary structure; the characters are depicted not within a continuous existence but as instantaneous photographic images that assume a polyvocal quality when the text is considered as a whole. Thus the novel achieves what Bakhtin calls architectonics not by moving from one stage of life to another by establishing a sequential and cyclic relation but by moving from instant to instant within the context of different life stories. For example the story of the girls other drivers and Henry pick up on the retreat is an open- ended story; they appear and disappear as images:

> They [the girls] did not understand but they held the money tightly and started down the road. They looked back as though they were afraid I might take the money back. I watched them go down the road, their shawls close around them, looking back apprehensively at us. (Hemingway, 2004:184)

We are not informed where the Italian girls are coming from or what happened to them. Therefore it is not through the causality or the cylicity of the plot that the novel achieves artistic consummation but through the collection of life instants that appear as visual images. Along with the basic plot line- Henry's meeting with Catherine, his going to the front, his returning back from the front and arriving at the hospital where he meets Catherine again, his going to the front and Catherine's and Henry's flight from the war and their arrival in Switzerland- the novel largely depends on a collection of fragmentary human images such as the girls posing for an old man:

> An old man was cutting silhouettes under an arcade. I stopped to watch him. Two girls were posing and he cut their silhouettes together, snipping very fast and looking at them, his head on one side. The girls were giggling […] The girls went away looking at their silhouettes and laughing. (Hemingway, 2004:121)

The cut-out silhouettes have a symbolic significance in the sense that they represent a lack of intrinsic wholeness. We see the shadowy representation of a cut-out image like a cut-out silhouette which is not a mimetic representation of "reality" but a representation of a sense of reality that is fragmentary and obscure like the novels' way of representing its characters. Therefore the novel presents its way of rendering of human being through the symbols of cut-out silhouettes; not linear, not mimetic, and not holistic, not like the exactness of a photograph but the obscure fragments of a patchy, incongruous sense of wholeness.

Although the novel consists of events sequentially one after the other, what comes into the foreground is the visuality that pervades the novel. In that respect, rather than presenting the plot or the story of each character connected within a linear plot, as in Tender is the Night or The Great Gatsby, the novel portrays the ongoing movement of fragmentary images of people and nature which have an existence independent from Catherine's and Henry's story. Although their common setting is the war, the novel does not posit the idea of war as a collective struggle against an enemy. As opposed to the myth in which heroism and communal struggle is emphasized, the novel presents us with the private struggles of various people for survival. Therefore the idea of war loses its connection with the myth, and collectivity does not give way to myth but to separate open-ended stories. We cannot know if Rinaldi has syphilis —an illness which he diagnosed in himself — or if he survives the war, and we do not know if the priest will be able to go to Capracotta, a place he recalls positively as a part of an idyllic dream belonging to a mythified sense of past.

> At Capracotta, he had told me, there were trout in the stream below the town. It was forbidden to play the flute at night. When the young man serenaded only the flute was forbidden. Why, I had asked.

> Because it was bad for the girls to hear the flute at night. The peasants all called you 'Don' and when you meet them they took off their hats. His father hunted everyday and stopped to eat at the houses of peasants. They were always honored. (Hemingway, 2004: 67)

And we do not know what happens to the prostitutes who are jam-packed in a truck in order to leave the town in a hurry, and who appear instantly like one of the photographic images that the book presents.

> As we came up the street they were loading the girls from the soldier's whorehouse into a truck. There were seven girls and they had on their hats and coats and carried small suitcases. Two of them were crying. Of the others one smiled at us and put out her tongue and fluttered it up and down. She had thick full lips and black eyes. (Hemingway, 2004: 168)

Therefore Henry's struggle is separate from a sense of collectivity and what is implied all through these fragmented lives and images of human beings is the fact that although the war connotes a collective movement, a collective aim, a collective struggle, the novel does not present war as part of a sense of collectivism but as separate individual struggles for survival. Therefore although Henry's aim of being there on the front with the Italian army was a part of sense of collectivity at the beginning of his struggle, it mutates and turns out to be a separate individual struggle; it does not aim at rescuing lives or glorifying a country. His struggle turns out to be an individual one, aiming to realize another supposedly "collective dream of human kind", which is being settled and forming a family. Henry, while he and Catherine are crossing the lake in order to reach Switzerland border, rows for hours under the threat of being captured and killed by the Italian forces. However, he risks his own and Catherine's life in order to realize his dream of having a life of tranquility and solitude with Catherine; he sacrifices himself in order to realize a private dream. Therefore, Henry's ends are not in coherence with the officially recognized objectives of war, but conform to the officially approved movement of human-kind, which is being settled. There is no martyrdom that aims to rescue a whole community of people.

> Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the numbers of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and the dates (Hemingway, 2004:165)

When considered this way, when war is detached from its mythic connotations and treated in its connection to a private struggle for survival like that of Henry, who runs away from it, and when considered in the context of images and open-ended stories that are not related to the main plot line, consisting of Henry's flight with Catherine and their arrival to Switzerland, the idea of war deviates from its officially recognized form and turns out to be a private struggle. Henry's struggle takes place within its own privacy. Henry's heroism is dedicated to realizing a private—yet at the same time collective and officially recognized— dream of settledness; it is not a part of the collective attempt of glorifying a land. In that respect, although the war ideology inculcates a sense of collectivism, each attempt at survival is directed towards achieving a private goal, which is, ironically, an officially recognized one. Henry can only be the Christ of himself and Catherine. After rowing for hours to reach the Swiss part of the river Henry refers to Christ:

> 'I'm so soggy I don't know,' I said.
> 'Let me see your hands.'
> I put them out. They were both blistered raw.
> 'There's no hole in my side,' I said.
> 'Don't be sacrilegious.' (Hemingway, 2004:253)

In that sense there is dialogism between the priest and his sense of love, which is a collective love and Henry's sense of love, which is an individual love addressed to a single person. Although there is a dialogue between Henry and the priest in the literal sense, and although there is no apparent contradiction between them, the clash between what Henry represents and what the priest represents leads to dialogism in the Bakhtinian sense. In this respect, Henry is the modern human who perceives his/her existence in terms of alienation and a break within a continuous, flowing life. On the other hand, the priest belongs to the cylicity of a feudal life; he is attached to a communal life like the others within the community. The priest does not exist as an outsider; he belongs to a community and his ends are in coherence with that of the community's, as opposed to Henry, who can only

distinguish between day and night thanks to his sleep and who can only perceive life in terms of unconnected stages; day and night like two separate stages, and it is sleep not the activity that differentiates them.

> We [The priest and Henry] were talking while the others argued. I had wanted to go to Abruzzi [Priest's town]. I had gone to no place where the roads were frozen and hard as iron, where it was clear cold and dry and the snow was dry and powdery and hare-tracks in the snow and the peasants took of their hats and called you Lord and there was good hunting. I had gone to no such place but to the smoke of cafes and nights when the room whirled and you needed to look at the wall to make it stop [……] I tried to tell about the night and the difference between the night and the day and how the night was better unless the day was very clean and cold and I couldn't tell it; as I can't tell it now. (Hemingway, 2004:13)

Not only the life that Henry and the priest led preceding the war, but also the sense of love these two figures represent are also in a dialogic relation to each other. While conversing about love and loyalty, the priest is talking about a communal love that is characterized by labour and devotion to the community. The priest's is a love that is associated with responsibility to others within the community. In that respect, as opposed to Henry's love, which is a part of the endeavour to constitute and define the self, the priest's love requires the renunciation of the self. Therefore the priest is an embodiment of what Foucault defines as Christian asceticism, and he belongs to a mythical past because the "beautiful" pre-war Abruzzi can retain its existence only in the dream of the priest.

> In Christianity, asceticism always refers to a certain renunciation of the self and of reality because most of the time the self is a part of that reality that must be renounced in order to gain access to another level of reality. This move to attain the renunciation of the self distinguishes Christian asceticism. (Foucault, 1997:238)

On the other hand Henry's love for Catherine is a part of his attempt to find a stable position and definition. In that respect Henry's love characterizes the modern antihero's attempt to find a new reality in order to construct himself anew, to grow stronger out of the broken parts of the body.

> ‘Yes’ he [the priest] said. ‘You do. What you tell me about in the nights. That is not love. That is only passion and lust. When you love you wish to do things for. You wish to sacrifice for. You wish to serve.’
> […….]
> ‘No. Don’t go. How about loving women? If I really loved some women would it be like that?’
> ‘I don’t know about that. I never loved any woman.’(Hemingway 2004:66).

Therefore dialogism occurs between two different belief systems: between that of the priest, who defines himself in terms of the idea of a communal life and Henry who experiences the collapse of the certainty the war propaganda offers, and attempts to define himself by finding a new set of truths. There is also dialogism with respect to the dream of Henry, who looks for settledness and solitude, and the dream of the priest who looks forward to going to Abruzzi and cherishing a life of communal activity and being respected. Therefore dialogism occurs not through the dialogue between the Priest and Henry in the literal sense but through the two separate identities the priest and Henry represent. It is not the disagreement between two people but two colliding images of human beings that creates dialogism.

> One can not, on the other hand, understand dialogic relations simplistically and unilaterally, reducing them to contradictions, conflict, polemics, or disagreement. *Agreement* is very rich in varieties and shadings. [……]
> Dialogic relations are thus much broader than dialogic speech in the narrow sense of the word. And dialogic relations are always present, even among profoundly monologic speech works. (Bakhtin, 2004:125)

Therefore the disagreement between Henry and the priest is in conformity with Bakhtinian dialogism. The polyphony is between two irreconcilable world-views: on the one hand there is the priest’s communal love, a sense of belonging to a community; on the other hand there is the strictly modernist character Henry, fragmented and alienated.

However separate and contradictory these two figures may seem, Henry’s and the priest’s contradiction is resolved on the basis of the fictitious quality of their

dreams. Hemingway implies that neither Henry's struggle, which can be considered to be a centripetal struggle to find a stable position and settledness within the sphere of an acknowledged, officially approved system, nor the dream of the Priest, which is an aspiration for a celebrated and glorified idea of a pre-war "golden age", can be presented as alternatives to the generalized struggle of war. Therefore the struggle of war —Henry's dream of being settled and the priest's struggle to satisfy his wish for a sense of community—unite on the basis of their being a part of the discourse of disciplinary mechanisms. The struggle of war, the priest's dream and Henry's endeavour towards self-constitution are not contradictory when the mythic and the fictional quality common to all are considered.

The repetition of the priest's dream of going to Abruzzi by Henry is an estrangement; the more it is repeated the further and stranger it becomes as a long-lost image. Henry's and Catherine's quest for home is also repeated whenever they go to a hotel, which foreshadows the fact that they will never be settled. Even in the hotel in which they find shelter while waiting for the birth of the baby, they try to build a sense of belonging.

> 'No. I [Catherine] have to try and make this room look like something.'
> 'Like what?'
> 'Like our home.'
> 'Hang out the Allied flags.'(Hemingway2004:273)

At the end of the novel the baby and Catherine die in the hospital, and their dreams of becoming a family and being settled cannot be realized. Finally, although the priest's sense of an idealized past, in which the human can be a part of a whole and achieve "respectability" by devotion to the well-being of the community and Henry's sense of a future replete with images of love and homecoming are seemingly two incompatible visions in a dialogic relation to each other they basically unite on the basis of falsehood because neither will the priest be able to repeat the past, or rather his idea of the past, nor will Henry realize his dream of being settled and forming a family in the future. Therefore the novel implies that both Henry's sense of the future and the priest's sense of the past are fictions that are

created during the process of narration. These fictitious realities that are re-created during narration incessantly impose the necessity of finding a permanent location and feeling privileged because of one's sense of belonging.

The symbols representing past and future that are used at the beginning and at the end of the novel testify to the conclusion we have reached. The hospital in which Catherine works and where she is visited by Henry is a building decorated with marble busts belonging to the ancestors of the original settlers who were German.

> There were many marble busts on painted wooden pillars along the walls of the room they used for an office. The hall too, that the office opened on was lined with them. They had the complete marble quality of looking alike. Sculpture had always seemed a dull business - still, bronzes looked like something. But marble busts all looked like a cemetery. […..] This has been the villa of a very wealthy German and busts must have cost him plenty. (Hemingway, 2004: 27)

Thus at the beginning of the novel the only image that refers to the past appears in the form of marble busts belonging to a wealthy German; it is both estranged and alienated. Therefore Henry's connection to the past is an estranged experience. Unlike in Tender is the Night or The Great Gatsby, the past in A Farewell to Arms is represented not through characters or vivid memories in the form of the figure of a father or the description of an event; but through marble busts implying the fact that the past has a frozen, stable quality. Likewise, the characters in A Farewell to Arms are not presented as having family ties; we do not know who the father of either Henry or Catherine is. As opposed to the characters in Tender is the Night or The Great Gatsby, whose lives are largely shaped by their connection to the past, Henry in A Farewell to Arms writes rarely to an unknown grandfather from the front. As readers we also know that he receives economic support from the grandfather. However, Henry's life is not shaped by the existence of ancestry or, in other words, he is not shaped by his past like the characters in The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night. The characters are not presented in connection with their families. They are in an unfamiliar setting —Italy— as two English-speaking

characters among unfamiliar people. Therefore the idea of the past and family ties as shelters is eliminated. The past does not appear in a concrete form but as an idea represented by characters such as the priest or Count Greffi, a ninety-four year-old diplomat, who is just as alienated as Henry because, although their native tongue is English, they both prefer to speak Italian when they are tired.

> 'Yes. Do you want to know one? It is easier for me to talk Italian. I [Count Greffi] discipline myself but I find when I'm tired that it is so much easier to talk Italian. So I know I must be getting old.'
> 'We could talk Italian. I am a little tired, too.' (Hemingway, 2004: 230)

In addition to the state of alienation from his country and mother tongue, Count Greffi is a fragile figure as the symbol of a past to which one can only experience an enfeebled attachment like Henry's. As Count Greffi suggests, he does not represent a past which makes itself felt in the present but a past which can be broken and dispersed like a piece of chalk: " ' It is the body that is old. Sometimes I [Count Greffi] am afraid I will break off a finger as one breaks a stick of chalk. And the spirit is no older and not much wiser' " (Hemingway 2004: 232). Another image representing a weak connection to the past is a figure, Catherine's father, who suffers from an osteological disease, gout.

> 'It's lovely,' said Catherine. 'But it's given my father gout very badly.'
> 'Have you a father?'
> 'Yes,' said Catherine. 'He has gout. You won't ever have to meet him. Haven't you a father?'
> 'No' I said. 'A step-father.'
> 'Will I like him?'
> 'You won't have to meet him.'(Hemingway 2004:139)

As opposed to Fitzgerald, who uses the past as quite an active element in the characters' present lives —Tender is the Night and The Great Gatsby are based on the idea of the past moulding the present — Hemingway eliminates the idea of past as a shelter or as a force dominating the present. The characters who represent the past all suffer from an illness that is related to bones. Therefore the past is not treated as an idea but as a solid, brittle structure, and like a bone, it is enfeebled. No

matter how obsessed the priest is with realizing his idea of the past it is implied that all family connections and all ancestral ties, all the things that are connected with the past can be swept away literally with the war. Therefore the past is not a notion like the priest's dream but it has concreteness like a house which is devastated by war, and like the enfeebled bones of the count. For example, we do not know how Catherine remembers her father or in what terms she describes him we only know that he is suffering from a bone disease, which is to say that time is not a notion but a changing reality which can only be manifested through enfeebled bones and changing nature.

In addition to this, the idea of future is obliterated as well. Like the marble busts of the hospital illustrated at the beginning of the novel, both Catherine, who dies and is described as a statue by Henry at the end of the novel, and their stillborn baby indicate that a generative force is obliterated.

> But after I had got them out and shut the door and turned off the light it wasn't any good. It was like saying goodbye to a statue. After a while I went out and left the hospital and walked back to the hotel in the rain. (Hemingway 2004:293)

Therefore the future, like the past, turns out to be a frozen moment offering no continuity. If the retrospective manner of narration is considered, the time-span of the novel does not go beyond the limits of the narrated time of the novel. Unlike Tender is the Night or The Great Gatsby there is no emphasis on the characters' past which has a shaping influence upon the present (the time narrated). For example, a story like Gatsby's past must be known in order to make his present meaningful. And Nicole's past (the fact that she was raped by her father) must be known in order to figure out the present condition of the character. Therefore unlike Fitzgerald who presents the past, the present and the future as a continuous flux of time – no matter at what stage of this process the characters remain- and in its relation to characters' biography, Hemingway presents time in a broken form, not as the flux of events following each other until the present time of the novel. The characters of Hemingway remain only in the present, and we are reminded of the passage of time not through events that extend to the present time of the novel but by natural

imagery, the change of seasons and the mutation in nature, and this is the passage of time that human is alienated from. Therefore in A Farewell to Arms past of the characters is not essential in making meanings.

However, all that remains in the "present" of the novel is in fact the past experiences of the narrator, because the novel is narrated retrospectively. Therefore what is in fact the "present" is the act of narration of the past. In other words, not his present deeds but the narration of the past is a process of self-constitution for the character Henry. Therefore the constitution of the present for Henry takes place within the fictionalized form of the novel. In that respect the past is more influential in its indirect form; the past is not the narration of each character's experience prior to the "present" of the novel nor is it a significant element in the present of the characters; rather it consists merely of the act of narration. Therefore the novel conforms to the idea that the present is a form of creation; the constitution of the character Henry in the act of narrating his past. In A Farewell to Arms the deeds of the characters are limited to the past; there is narration in the present. When considered this way the images of stability such as stones, the worn out parts of the carpet on the stairs, the blown out bridges and the deserted farm houses on the road and the cut-out silhouettes of the girls can all be associated with the inactivity of the present which is limited to the act of narration. The narration is like looking at a long continuity—the rivers, the change of the nature, the bridges, the roads and carpets—and detecting the different, the imperfect elements, the rupture and the discontinuities. Henry's vision is arranged so as to see and narrate the rupture, and his position is like a threshold between the past and an obliterated future. In that respect Henry's position and his inactivity can be associated with the image of Gatsby's corpse lying in the swimming pool, preventing the movement of the water, in other words breaking the continuity and the natural movement of the stirring water.

> There was a faint, barely perceptible movement of the water as the fresh flow from one end urged its way toward the drain at the other. With little ripples that were hardly the shadows of waves, the laden mattress moved irregularly down the pool. A small gust of wind that scarcely corrugated the surface was enough to disturb its accidental

> course with its accidental burden [Gatsby's corpse]. (Fitzgerald, 1994:169)

This is also an indication of how the postwar individual perceived himself/herself and an indication disclosing how they positioned themselves in terms of time and space. In The Great Gatsby or Tender is the Night time moves on according to the order of events. We associate the past with the events that follow Gatsby's meeting with Daisy and his going to the war and his breaking off with Daisy and Daisy's marriage; the past is perceived in terms of events that follow one after the other. On the other hand, in Tender is the Night the passage of time is again associated with the flux of events, although the book conforms to calendar time with its sections separated according to years. Therefore the death of Gatsby, as we see in the above extract obliterates the passage of time which strictly follows the movement of characters. In the passage that is in Tender is the Night, it is implied that time is moving on because Dick keeps on moving with his bicycle from one part of the country to the other.

> In the last letter she [Nicole] had from him he told her that he was practicing in Geneva, New York, and she got the impression that he had settled down with someone to keep house for him. She looked up Geneva in an atlas and found it was in the heart of Finger Lakes section and considered a pleasant place. (Fitzgerald, 1997:391-392)

In other words the passage of time and the change of setting follow the movement of the characters and the space they occupy. Therefore Fitzgerald's two novels lay emphasis upon the individual and his/her movement as the criteria of space and time. However in A Farewell to Arms, the idea of time is treated as phenomena that are independent from the individual's deeds and his/her activity. Time has its independent existence as it is made explicit in the detailed illustration of nature and the mutation in nature as the seasons change. The book is replete with the images of flowing water which can be regarded as the passage of time: "The water was running in the gutter" (Hemingway 2004: 141).

> The river was high and the bridge had been blown up in the centre; the stone arch was fallen into the river and the brown water was

> going over it [….] Down below the gaps in the ties the river ran muddy and fast. (Hemingway, 2004:186-187)

Therefore, just like the stone arch over which the water runs, wherever Henry may be and at whatever stage of time his rupture and fixation may occur, the water runs and time runs on; the passage of time is not determined according to Henry; it is not Henry's sense of time but the change of nature or the flowing waters that are indicators of time.

Bakhtin in his essay entitled "Time and Space in Goethe's Works", while explaining Goethe's sense of time, identifies time as an organic phenomenon whose clearest manifestation resides in nature and in the body of the human being. Therefore for Bakhtin time is not connected to human being's ruptures and fixations but his /her harmony with nature, which has its own flow and human, is attached to this cyclic pattern. In this respect Bakhtin's perception of time is close to the way Hemingway treats time in A Farewell to Arms, which implies that the individual might have been traumatized or might experience a suspension in the process of war or might have been raped like Nicole; in other words he/she might live according to her/his subjective sense of time, but time has its own organic flow.

> Time reveals itself above all in nature: the movement of the sun and stars, the crowing of the roosters, sensory and visual signs of the time of the year. All these are inseparably linked to corresponding moments in human life, existence, and activity (labor)-the cycles of that are marked bye degrees of intensity of (labor). The growth of trees and livestock, the age of people are visible signs of longer periods. (Bakhtin, 2004:25)

In addition to emphasizing the existence of a Bakhtinian sense of time, in which the present has an organic connection to the past and the future and in which time is treated as a natural phenomenon to which humans submit as the nature of their existence requires, Hemingway is also close to a Foucauldian sense of time which does not follow a continuity in which stages follow one after the other and each stage discloses the secrets of a previous stage and each stage foreshadows a future one. Foucault's sense of time rejects such cause and effect formations because

the cause and the effect relationship involves taking the past for granted as a stable unit and confirms to the idea of the future as a sort of prophecy of which the traces are already to be found in the past. Foucault's idea of history is based on a method which, instead of tracing the acknowledged uniformities that traditional history looks for, aims to find what is divergent, heterogeneous and discontinuous. Nor does he look for roots or seek an identity in the future, a completed form deriving from a past in its monumental form. In his essay "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" Foucault explains his method not as historical but genealogical:

> Genealogy does not pretend to go back in time to restore an unbroken continuity that operates beyond the dispersion of oblivion; its task is not to demonstrate that the past actively exists in the present, that it continues secretly to animate the present, having imposed a predetermined form on all its vicissitudes. Genealogy does not resemble the evolution of species and does not map the destiny of a people. On the contrary, to follow the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things which continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being lies not at the root of what we know and what we are but in the exteriority of accidents. (Foucault, 1991:81)

Therefore Foucault's genealogy as a method is distinct from Bakhtin's sense of time within a literary text in the sense that Bakhtin, rather than seeing things in their dispersed, accidental condition, tries to include the divergence within the process of continuity. As his essay "Forms of time and Chronotope in the novel" suggests, although he recognizes the fact that the literary text is constantly changing, Bakhtin tends to formulate the ways they change by tracing the text back to its folkloric roots.

> But Rabelais is already adding to the folkloric base of his major heroes various features essential to his idea of a monarch and a humanist, embellishing them with certain realistic historical gestures. Nevertheless through all these features the folkloric base remains visible and is responsible for the profound realistic emblematic constituted by these figures. (Bakhtin, 2002a:242)

When we turn to the novel, Hemingway, although he demonstrates the organic unity of time through the image of streams, dissociates his characters from organic time by obliterating their connection with the past as suggested again by broken bridges. Henry and Catherine are aliens in the present; they have no relatives in relation to whom they can be defined, they have no ancestral ties, they are estranged from an Anglo-Saxon background, and even the use of language testifies to our conclusion. Henry, through the end of the novel speaks Italian with Count Greffi who is an old English diplomat and who is equally estranged from his mother tongue. On the other hand Catherine's and Henry's dialogue, although it is conducted in English, consists of mere repetition; they can only repeat non-generative patterns:

> 'It's a fine room,' Catherine said. 'It's a lovely room. We should have stayed here all the time we've been in Milan.'
> 'It's a funny room but it's nice.'
> [….]
> 'You are a grand girl.'
> 'I only feel hungry. I get terribly hungry.'
> 'You are a fine simple girl,' I said.
> 'I'm a simple girl. No one ever understood it except you.'(Hemingway, 2004:138).

Along with the characters' break from the past, the novel itself breaks from the norms of the past in the way it treats ideas such as loyalty to a country, love, being settled and forming a family. It does not evaluate the characters in terms of past norms but questions these norms and invalidates them. Henry's and Catherine's attempts to become settled conclude in destruction, and it is not their inability that prevents them from realizing the idyll but the invalidity of the pseudo-identities through which they try to define themselves. The farm houses Henry sees on the road testify to the idea that such mythical forms can easily be lost.

> The plaster of the broken houses was gray and wet [….] There were many iron shrapnel balls in the rubble of the houses [….] (Hemingway, 2004: 165-166). [….] The door of the house was open and I went in. Bonello and Piani came after me. It was dark inside. I went back to the kitchen. There were ashes of a fire on the big open

> hearth. The pots hung over the ashes, but they were empty. (Hemingway, 2004: 191)

In addition the novel also questions ideas such as loyalty and soldiership. It is only because of chance Henry is dressed and praised as a man of courage, and chance also plays its role in Henry's treatment as a runaway soldier by the Italian Army. It is again because of chance that Aymo is killed by the ally forces for which he fights. Therefore the heroic and the treacherous are not essential elements of character; they are realized at random, not as identities the characters choose. Thus these concepts are stripped of their mythic values.

The novel presents a Foucauldian sense of time, which dismantles the already recognized and is based not on the continuity but on divergence, alongside a Bakhtinian understanding of organic time which is manifested in the transformation of nature. When the treatment of time is considered the novel is situated at the point where Bakhtin and Foucault meet and contradict each other; a sense of time privileging nature in its flux, and a kind of causality that sticks with the excavation of earliest forms [which is a Bakhtinian method of literary analyses] and a sense of time that refutes an organic continuity, privileging divergence and discontinuity in accordance with a Foucauldian methodology that breaks itself loose from the earlier and the later. However although Hemingway presents two ways of perceiving time, as revealed in the images of broken bridges and pebbles in the stream, time as a continuous flux and time as it is retained in the memory, the continuous sense of time is associated not with the chronological, mechanical order of a watch but with the natural flux of time symbolized by streaming waters and changing nature. Therefore Hemingway, while implying the existence of continuous time, makes use of natural imagery that has its own independence from the time in the mind. In both cases he refrains from the use of the calendar time or chronological time of the modern world. Hemingway's is a sense of time that presents a break from the manifestation of time according to the clock.

Hemingway does not only rely on characters' conception of time and their choice of fragmentary images but he also makes use of the unconscious workings of

the text on the reader while forming a sense of time in the novel. This is realized through the repetition of several sounds such as “click”, which sets up a chain of associations between the moments in which the sound “click” is used. The “click” appears in two scenes: In the former one Henry imagines going to a hotel and, with Catherine by his side, they get on the lift to go upstairs, and the sound “click” is the sound of the lift. In this section Henry dreams of a night replete with romance. The scene is repeated when Henry and Catherine actually stay in a hotel, and when they actually get on the lift the lift resounds “click”. However the actual hotel section is nowhere near as romance-ridden as the phantasy. The mechanical sound “click” connects a phantasy with a reality in the reader’s mind and it implies the existence of a mechanical, pre-determined destination of a lift clicking at each floor as it goes upstairs; a mechanical rupture. The moments that are associated with “clicks” are arrested moments for Dick. The phantasy preceding the real is narrated through stream of consciousness:

> […..] I would stop at the concierge’s desk and ask for the key and she [Catherine]
> would stand by the elevator and then we would get in the elevator and it would go up very slowly clicking at all the floors and then our floor and the boy would open the door and stand there and she would step out and I would step out and we would walk down the hall […..] (Hemingway, 2004:36)

Therefore clicks take place in moments of rupture for Henry, and on the other hand the “clicks” also imply the fact that Henry is following a path that is predetermined and the destiny of which is home or a location, the hotel room, that would take the place of a home giving a sense of belonging to Henry. Therefore going home is a mechanical impulse that is associated with the sound “click”. The actual form of this scene, following the one that is phantastical, is not as rapturous as Henry imagined it to be. Whenever the sound “click” is repeated, the reader is mechanically connected to Henry’s disillusionment in the hotel where he resides prior to going to the front. And whenever this specific sound is repeated, the reader is made aware of the discrepancy between Henry’s phantasy and his real experience, which is directly connected to his futile struggle to feel at home. If Henry’s

endeavour to find a home is a mechanical impulse [like the sound of a click] which is bound to fail, then in vain does the reader expect a resolution that will provide Henry with home. Therefore the click works as an alienating force: on the one hand it reflects Henry's alienation from a scene that is "homely" and on the other hand it alienates the reader from his/her expectation of a conventional homecoming.

> The elevator passed three floors with a click each time, then clicked and stopped […..] we walked down the corridor. The carpet was worn. There were many doors. The manager stopped and unlocked a door and opened it. (Hemingway, 2004: 137)

Therefore it is implied that the thing that is a work of phantasy is not the free-play of the imagination but a mechanical repetition, a learned response; Henry is not free from the clicks even in his phantasy, which come true only as a part of a mechanical process. Therefore there is again a homology between the plot line of the book, which consists of going to the front, coming back from the front and coming together with Catherine. In this respect, the plot line follows the pattern of a rupture and continuity like the clicks of a train journey which will reach a pre-determined destiny or the "clicks" of a lift which will travel up or down. It is again while Henry is trying to reach Catherine-reaching settledness- on a freight train loaded with rifles after his flight from the war-police that the "click" is repeated. Therefore it is implied that his quest for home is a mechanical process and a mechanical destiny characterized by a train journey which follows the railway tracks clicking each time as the car goes forward.

> I would not think about her, only about her a little, only about her with a car going slowly and clickingly, and some light through the canvas and my lying with Catherine on the floor of the car. (Hemingway, 2004: 205)

Therefore both the ruptures and continuities within the plot are like the mechanical ruptures of a train moving upon the tracks so as to reach a mechanical destiny. The homology between a clicking plot consisting of going to the front and coming home and the image of rupture of the train and lift that clicks and carries the passengers to a definite destination is also a reflection of the text's relation to the

reader. Through the sound of the click the reader is automatically connected to the scenes that represent the ruptures of the plot; scenes that are connected to Henry's "homecoming" or scenes that are a part of Henry's quest for home, which is the central theme of the novel, and which is just as destructive and mechanical as his going to the front. Thus the novel arranges time through the unconscious perception of the reader, who, by connecting the "clicking" parts of the novel, will figure out the central concern of Henry and will empathize with Henry. However this sense of connection between the reader and the character is not the consequence of shared feelings between Henry and the reader but an automatic one formed through a mechanical sound. There the irony occurs when sense of connection between the character and the reader is formed not through a shared, common feeling or identification with the character but through mechanical devices and the repetition of several scenes. In that respect the reader and the character are like passengers sharing the same car; clicking at the same point of the track and at the same time although they are not identical in their feelings and thoughts.

Hemingway addresses the book to the twentieth-century reader who is automatically positioned so that he /she can be regulated according to time-tables and reach determined destinations on the map. Although Henry and Catherine realize the idyll by running away from the war, sheltering in Switzerland and settling there, their place is determined; their earth-bound condition is symbolized by their hob-nailed boots:

> But we did not mind the hardness of the road because we had nails in the soles and heels of our boots and the heel nails bit on the frozen ruts and with nailed boots it was good walking on the road and invigorating. But it was lovely walking in the woods. (Hemingway, 2004:257-258)

Therefore Henry and Catherine might be realizing a dream, but this dream is still a part of the quest for a location, a quest for which humankind is made to struggle collectively and a quest that can determine every individual's whereabouts in space and time. Therefore Henry's and Catherine's location in Switzerland, although it is a dream come true, is only one of the clicks of the train. In that sense

although Henry narrates the events that are retained in his mind in the form of disorganized reflections that do not follow a systematic chronological pattern, what is narrated as a part of his quest is not separated from the strictly time-bound and space-bound aspiration of humanity. Although the characters are disconnected from ancestral, lingual and spatial ties, they are within the system in their quest for settlement and sense of belonging. Hemingway constantly reminds us of this spatial and temporal definition (restriction) of the individual by using images of trains and lifts which follow a defined track always seeking a spot to stop.

A Farewell to Arms, as a post-war novel, is connected strictly to modernist claims in its rendition of time and the definition of humans in the setting of war. As a part of modernist discourse it relies on a subjective sense of time. The novel defines two different senses of time. The first one is a cyclic pattern of time as is manifested in nature and the other is a sense of time that is characterized by ruptures and continuities. The rupture is also characterized by the mechanic movement of the trains and lifts which ironically connect the members of a community to each other. In other words, the members of the community are not connected to each other through common goals, common feelings, common traditions and a common plan for future. Hemingway never recognizes such a feeling of community and a common myth that connects individuals to each other. The novel offers instead a connection that is provided by the timetables, clocks, technological vehicles that have mechanical sounds which direct the movement of humanity. Settings in this novel are far from offering a sense of belonging; on the contrary they are replete with feelings of insecurity and alienation. Mobility that is forced by the war and enlargement of space in the novel is not the enlargement of liberty; on the contrary widening of space means the extension of confinement for the modern individual.

3-3 Metal and the Body

3-3-1 Fragmentation and Technology in *A Farewell to Arms*

In the novels we have so far studied, characters' alienation and fragmentation are dealt with in terms of their connection to technology. Technology is presented through reference to the swiftness of life and an ongoing massive flux of people, and technology is, at the same time, an emphasis on the dichotomy between swiftness of movement and individual's suspension of perception and memory. The technological developments of the twentieth century are concretized in the image of trains, cars in Fitzgerald's novels and as gas masks, helmets and all other war ammunition that are destructive in A Farewell to Arms.

Hemingway and Fitzgerald dealt with fragmentation and alienation in connection with technology, but each in his own way, and each placed the emphasis on different aspects of technology in the books we have so far studied.

Fitzgerald imbued technology with connotations of moral corruption, the collapse of a system of values, and myth in Fitzgerald's novels retained its effectivity on the characters along with technology. The post-war era, according to Fitzgerald, was highly commercial and at the same time mythical; it was an era that made different value systems cohere. The strength of myth in characters' life is represented as a compensation for a lack; myth grows stronger as the characters are detached from what they aspired to. Therefore a character's proximity to a new set of orders and to technology as the concrete symbol of moral corruption determines the dimensions of myth's infusion into her or his life. Gatsby moves away from the ideal of B. Franklin by entering the domain of illegality.

In Tender is the Night and The Great Gatsby technology is symbolized by cars and trains. For example in The Great Gatsby technological breakdown, often in the form of car accidents, symbolizes both an annihilation in the literal sense –

Myrtle's annihilation after the car accident in The Great Gatsby – and, as the accident is placed at the climatic point of the book, it takes on a role in resolving the tightly knit plot of the novel; it is after the climatic accident that Wilson realizes the fact that his wife is having a love affair with someone else and kills Gatsby. Therefore the use of technology also signifies a moral degradation in both The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night. Characters' closeness to technology designates how far they are from the idea of wholeness in their minds.

Those who use cars at the beginning of the twentieth century are the members of the wealthiest section of the society. For example, Gatsby has a car and a hydroplane and he is also the figure who is involved in illegal activities.

> With fenders spread like wings we [Gatsby and Nick] scattered light through half Astoria – only half, for as we twisted among the pillars of the elevated I heard the 'jug –jug-spat!' of a motorcycle, and a frantic policeman rode alongside.
> 'All right, old sport,' called Gatsby. We slowed down. Taking a white card from his wallet, he waved it before the man's eyes.
> 'Right you are,' agreed the policeman, tipping his cap. 'Know you next time, Mr. Gatsby. *Excuse me*!'
> 'What was that?' I inquired the picture of Oxford?'
> 'I was able to do the commissioner a favor once, and he sends me a Christmas card every year.'(Fitzgerald, 1994:74)

Therefore Gatsby with his car is the embodiment of the moral degradation of the postwar era. The establishment of analogies between B. Franklin and Gatsby follows the path of moral corruption from the eighteenth century to twentieth century; Gatsby who aspires to a national celebrity ends up as an illegal figure.

Tender is the Night, although not as explicitly as The Great Gatsby, also deals with technology in its relation to morality. In Tender is the Night the development of the cinema industry is associated with moral corruption. The young actress Rosemary earns a living and, ironically achieves economic independence thanks to her role as the naïve feminine figure. By means of cinema industry Rosemary sells "naivety".

When we consider A Farewell to Arms in terms of its approach to technology, what becomes obvious is the novel's distinction from those of Fitzgerald's. Fitzgerald deals with technology and its relation to the human through images that work as explicit signifiers such as cars in which people have accidents. It is through an accident that the "morally adverse" reaches its culminating point. When Fitzgerald and Hemingway are compared in terms of their attitude towards technology we cannot say that Fitzgerald's ethical criticism appears also in Hemingway. In A Farewell to Arms technology is not extrinsic to the individual, causing him/her to have accidents or turn him into an "immoral being"; on the contrary it is intrinsic to him/her. Hemingway does not question whether technology is good or bad or whether it should be eliminated from peoples' lives or not. Hemingway's characters in Farewell to Arms are presented to the readers in a bodily state that has already adjusted itself to the demands of technology. Hemingway does not draw an opposition between a life with technology and a life without it. Technology can both be the cause of characters' fragmentation and their consummation. Technology, in A Farewell to Arms requires the adjustment of the body.

Hemingway concretizes abstract concepts of modernism such as fragmentation and alienation by using the body and its relation to metal as symbols. For example Henry the narrator after depicting the hospital decorated with busts "all looking alike" describes, in the following paragraph, the soldiers who have to wear steel helmets that eliminate the difference between them and who are like strange ornaments in a town which is not evacuated. Free bodily movement is prevented with the gas masks and automatic pistols, the differences are eliminated with a steel helmet in an unfamiliar setting.

> I sat on a chair and held my cap. We were supposed to wear steel helmets even in Gorizia but they were uncomfortable and too bloody theatrical in a town where civilian inhabitants had not been evacuated. I wore one when we went up to the posts and carried an English gas mask. We were beginning to get just some of them. They were a real mask (Hemingway, 2004:27).

Henry at this stage of the book is trying to get used to his alienated position. He is still alien to his position as a soldier as the word "theatrical" signifies; he perceives himself as if he were on a stage playing a role by eliminating his real self: "It [the war] seemed no more dangerous to me myself than war in the movies" (Hemingway2004:35). The feeling of unreality and estrangement continues all through the plot. Catherine also shares the same feeling of being the spectator of her own death and Henry's death in the rain.

> 'All right.' I'm afraid of it [The rain] because I [Catherine] see me dead in it [The rain].'
> 'No'
> 'And sometimes I see you dead in it.'
> 'That's more likely.'(Hemingway, 2004:114).

Thus the novel confirms what Fussell detects as the pervading psychic experience of soldiers during the war. According to Fussell, perceiving warfare as stage acting was one way of retaining the idea that there is a real world with completely different experiences awaiting and providing a temporary sense of security for the soldier in times of anxiety.

> "Our own death is indeed, unimaginable," Freud said in 1915, "and whenever we make the attempt to imagine it we can perceive that we really survive as spectators." It is thus the very hazard of military situations that turns them theatrical. [……] Seeing warfare as theater provides a psychic escape for the participant: with a sufficient sense of theater, he can perform his duties without implicating his "real" self and without impairing his innermost conviction that the world is still a rational place." (Fussell, 1975:192)

Therefore Henry's alienation during the war is symbolized through his attempts to adjust himself bodily to the metallic objects of war-fare such as guns, gas masks and helmets, and the degree of Henry's alienation increases as he gets closer to the metallic objects of warfare: The closer he is the more alienated he becomes. At the beginning of the novel a gun is something Henry is not used to carrying: he is not used to the metallic object he is carrying, and he constantly feels its existence:

"I felt it [a gun]against the back of the chair: You were liable to arrest if you did not have one worn in plain sight." (Hemingway, 2004:27).

Henry's estrangement reaches its peak when he is wounded by a trench mortar shell, pieces of which become embedded in his legs, and this is also the section which presents Henry in his closest relation to war ammunition: a closeness that can only happen most destructively through the smashing of his leg. "'They [Henry's legs] are full of trench- mortar fragments, old screws and bed springs and things.'"(Hemingway 2004:78) Before being wounded, what Henry considers the worst outcome of the warfare is defeat, as this heated conversation between Henry and Passini reveals:

> 'I believe we should get the war over,' I said. 'It would not finish if one side stopped fighting. It would only be worse if we stopped fighting.'
> 'It could not be worse,' Passini said respectfully, 'There is nothing worse than war.'
> 'Defeat is worse.' [Henry]
> 'I don't believe it,' Passini said still respectfully. 'What is defeat? You go home.' (Hemingway, 2004:47).

But after Henry is wounded and his legs are full of shell fragments he experiences a gradual detachment from the cause of the war. First he hopes that the war will come to an end as is revealed in his conversation with the priest who visits him at the hospital after he is wounded, and in the last stage of his estrangement Henry declares his "separate peace".

> 'Have they ever been able to stop it?' [Henry]
> 'They are not organized to stop things and when they get organized their leaders sell them out.' [The priest]
> 'Then it is hopeless?'
> 'It is never hopeless. But sometimes I cannot hope. I try always to hope but sometimes I cannot.'
> 'Maybe the war will be over.'
> 'I hope so' (Hemingway, 2004:66).

However, although the novel presents Henry's gradual detachment from war in a reverse relation to his proximity to warfare technology symbolized by helmets,

gas masks and guns, it does not represent a life without the use of technology and a technology- driven life as opposed realities. Hemingway describes an existence, in every case, that is involved with technology; at every instant, both in peace and in war, technology is intrinsic to Henry's life. Hemingway presents both the destructiveness and alienating aspect of technology and its restorative effect. The machine can both appear as a reality incongruous to the human existence and it can also restore and reunite. While Henry is running away from the Italian war police with his operated knee; the operated knee prevents him from being shot by the war police and assures his survival.

> My knee was stiff, but it had been very satisfactory. Valentini had done a fine job. I had done half the retreat on foot and swum part of the Tagliamento with his knee. It was his knee all right. The other was mine. Doctors did things to you and then it was not your body any more. The head was mine, and the inside of the bell. It was very hungry in there. I could feel it turn over on itself. The head was mine, but not to use, not to think with, only to remember but not too much to remember. (Hemingway, 2004: 205)

The knee on the other hand is the symbol of Henry's fragmentation; it shows how Henry feels the existence of every part of his body as separate entities, not as a whole. In this respect the survival of Henry with an operated knee also advances another theme that the book deals with: the fact that in the face of a fragmented personality one develops a stronger sense of self [than the original one]; in other words the encounter with the collapse of a belief that the self confides in concludes in the formation of a stronger self, just as Henry is able to survive the threat of being killed or being drowned with his new knee. Therefore Henry's connection with the technology that breaks him apart and recuperates him so strongly that he can survive the war with an operated knee is a symbolic re-enactment of the fact that Henry survives the war by developing another sense of reality: a sense of reality that connects him more to individual goals such as forming a family and being settled rather than the communal claims such as being the member of a group that share the same goals during the war. In this respect Henry's proximity to technology that initially destroys him and subsequently redeems him is in homology with the destruction of his identity among a group of war comrades at the beginning and his

introduction into a new set of truths, which is his wish to get settled and to form a family. In other words, the fact that he was wounded separates him from group ties and his operation and survival with an operated knee initiates him into a new stage that can be termed as the forming of blood ties by producing offspring. In that sense Henry abandons war, which is one aspect of civilization that is associated with destruction - this is a "civilized" war with its improved techniques of massive killing, with its trains that can carry loads of man to the front as Henry says about the trains that carry soldiers to the front: "That train was always crowded" (Hemingway 2004:144). Therefore in the initial stage, Henry runs away from the destructive aspect of civilization that wages war, mobilizes soldiers and annihilates them, and in the latter stage he is attached to another aspect of civilization that encourages the production of progeny, forming a settled family life and being immobile. In the latter stage, he feels himself "civilized" as he suggests after his flight from the war:

> The sandwiches came and I ate three and drank a couple more martinis. I had never tasted anything so cool and clean. They made me feel civilized. I had had too much red wine, bread, cheese, bad coffee and grappa. I sat on the high stool before the pleasant mahogany, the brass and the mirrors and did not think at all (Hemingway, 2004: 219)

It is civilization and technology that annihilate and re-generate human beings at the same time. As the recurrent images of broken bridges and houses suggest, war is waged by civilization against itself, and technology takes an active role both as a destructive medium against civilization and as a positive element because it makes up and re-forms what it breaks.

Hemingway, as opposed to Fitzgerald, does not associate moral degradation with technology, but presents human existence along with technology, and while negating the war and the causes it depends as the destructive forms of technology, A Farewell to Arms does not offer an idyllic life in nature as an alternative to war and technology. Because if the "civilized" war destroys and fragments Henry the other form of civilized life – Henry's life in Switzerland with Catherine after his flight form the war police- is mechanical and not at all devoid of the intrusion of

technology. Life in idyllic Switzerland, as the repetitive character of Henry's conversation with Catherine suggests, is non-generative, because the baby and Catherine die as the symbol of obliterated generation.

Henry's retreat to Switzerland breaks his communal bond with the other male members of the group in the "mess" where they carried the rituals of eating as a communal activity and storytelling as a significant part of their communication. In Switzerland, although he evades the violence of the war, he experiences a break from a communal sharing he experienced while he was on the front. In Switzerland oral communication gives its place to a more privatized form of communication, paper reading.

> There was a fine coiffeur's place where Catherine went to have her hair done. The woman who ran it was very cheerful and the only person we knew in Montreux. While Catherine was there I went up to a beer place and drank dark Munich beer and read the papers. I read the *Corriere della Sera* and the English and American papers from Paris [….] everything was going very badly everywhere. I sat in the corner with a heavy mug of dark beer and an opened glazed paper package of pretzels and ate the pretzels for the salty flavor and the good way they made the beer taste and read about disaster.
> (Hemingway, 2004: 260)

Henry, while getting away from the war and its destructive technology, is connected to another aspect of civilization that is equally mechanical. Nature, with which Henry and Catherine seem to merge in Switzerland, neither promises freedom nor is it disconnected from civilization. What characterizes both stages of the novel — the former phase that includes Henry's life on the front and at the hospital as quiet oppressive phases and the latter that includes Henry's peace, solitude and tranquility with Catherine in Switzerland— is the all-pervading sense of lack; in the former Henry wants to make love with Catherine, he looks for a home and finds life in the mess as dull: "The priest was good but dull. The officers were not good but dull. The King was good but dull the wine was bad but not dull."(Hemingway 2004:37) In the latter phase, his life with Catherine is equally mechanical although Henry does not say it explicitly; he misses the comradeship that the mess offers. In Italy, the first stage of their retreat, during which Catherine and Henry stay in a hotel

in Italy, Henry goes fishing with the barmen and he plays billiard with Count Greffi, in Switzerland, the second phase of their retreat, Henry takes up boxing and talks about their life in Switzerland using a short, mechanical and repetitive sentence structure as a sign of the mechanical monotony that pervades their life:

> The electric train was there waiting, all lights on. There was a dial that showed when it left. The clock hands pointed to ten minutes after five. I looked at the station clock. It was five minutes after. (Hemingway, 2004:262).

Two settings prior to Henry's retreat to Switzerland with Catherine— the hospital in Italy where he is taken to be treated, and the front— are characterized by Henry's closer proximity to technology and the closer surveillance that technology offers. Both at the front and at the hospital Henry is caught under Austrian searchlights.

> I looked outside, it was dark and the Austrian searchlights were moving on the mountains behind us. It was quiet for a moment still, then from all the guns behind us the bombardment started (Hemingway 2004:49). [On the front]

> I could see the beams of the search light moving in the sky. I watched for a while and went to sleep. (Hemingway, 2004:81). [At the hospital]

Henry also suffers from military control, which allows him to have closer relations between the war comrades but forbids him to get in touch with the family or with a woman. The censorship that they have to obey while writing letters to the family is the explicit sign of control.

> 'Don't write anything that would bother the censor'
> 'Don't worry. I only write about what a beautiful place we live and how brave the Italians are.' (Hemingway, 2004:23).

> "I sent a couple of army Zona di Guerrra post-cards, crossing out everything except, I am well."(Hemingway, 2004:35).

The front is equally restrictive. For example, sex is permitted in a regulated manner. There is an official whorehouse where the soldiers are allowed to go and have sex. Therefore official discipline is arranged so as to enhance war comradeship and prevent any kind of emotional attachment either to family, to a friend or a girlfriend.

Thus Henry's proximity to metal determines the degree of his fragmentation and the degree of his separation from a communal cause. Therefore the moment he is shot —his closest proximity to metal— starts another phase in Henry's narrative, which is his attachment to family institution and his attempt to form a family. We have agreed that the narration of this second phase with Catherine in Switzerland is the beginning of alienation for Henry. This second phase of the novel is full of repetitions in the dialogues between Henry and Catherine which sounds like a sort of mechanization when supported by images of clocks and trains. Thus, although Henry is separated from group movement by running away from war in the first phase, he is involved in the restrictions of a settled life with Catherine, which is associated with the clocks, newspapers and trains. The second phase of the novel is replete with bucolic imagery of mountains, mountain houses and lakes as Henry suggests with these words:

> We lived in a brown wooden house in the pine tress on the side of the mountains and at night there was frost so that there was thin ice over the water in the two pitchers on the dresser in the morning (Hemingway, 2004:257).

Switzerland is a place where people can exist not through their connection to nature but through their connection to societal classification as Catherine suggests in her comments on chamois hunters.

> [Catherine] 'Did you see the man with the tiny gold earrings?'
> 'He's a chamois hunter,' I [Henry] said. 'They wear them because they say it makes them hear better.'
> [Catherine] 'Really?' I don't believe it. I think they wear them to show they are chamois hunters. Are their chamois near here?'(Hemingway, 2004: 269)

At the beginning of this section we referred to Fussell's study of war memoirs, which argued that pastoral imagery is intrinsic to war memoirs for the sake of the sense of familiarity they provide in the alienating setting of the war. Pastoral imagery was, for the soldier, a means of connecting one's self to the "uncanny" atmosphere of the war by turning it into something familiar. When we consider A Farewell to Arms as a post war novel in the light of Fussell's claim we come to a contrary conclusion. Technology in A Farewell to Arms is not treated as a totally alienating element. On the contrary, it is something that helps Henry's survival. It is thanks to the operation he has that Henry can survive. Hemingway does not transform the existence of warfare ammunition into something natural and familiar; he deals with war ammunition literally and depicts the existence of warfare ammunition side by side with nature, speaking of […..] the long barrels of the guns covered with green branches and green leafy branches and vines laid over the tractors. (Hemingway 2004:3)

Technology leads both to Henry's fragmentation and his survival and unification because his smashed leg is operated on and Henry recovers thanks to the operation. Therefore the novel depicts nature in its connection to technology.

If we consider the second part of the book that deals with Henry's life with Catherine in Switzerland, we showed that it is replete with natural imagery. However instead of providing a sense of relief and familiarity, natural imagery serves to emphasize Henry's alienation and the clockwork regulation of his life. Hemingway creates mechanical and repetitious dialogues between Henry and Catherine within the pastoral beauty of mountains in Switzerland. Therefore, rather than creating a sense of relief and familiarity, the pastoral imagery in Switzerland sections highlights Henry's alienation. As opposed to what Fussell argues in terms of war memoirs, A Farewell to Arms, as a post-war novel uses pastoral imagery without mythification and in order to emphasize Henry's alienation and the mechanical movement of life. Thus, unlike the war memoirs Fussell studies which seeks to attain familiarity through the use of pastoral imagery, A Farewell to Arms seeks to attain defamiliarization through the use of pastoral imagery. In other words,

pastoral imagery is not dealt with in their mythic connotations in order to provide familiarity, but used with a view to demythifying and increasing the sense of alienation.

3-3-1 Retrospection and Displacement

The novel A Farewell to Arms relies on the repetition of several parts in the plot, several sounds, and several phrases in the dialogue. One of the scenes that are often repeated in the novel is Henry's farewell and his retrospective look. Farewell scenes and Henry's retrospective gaze are generally an indication of leaving a secure place and departing for an insecure place. A farewell, in other words, is the end of familiarity and the initiation of alienation. If we consider Henry's quest for a sense of belonging as the underlying theme in the novel, departure from a space or a person is an indication of a sense of lack and the loss familiarity.

Henry has to separate from those to whom he is attached at different points in the novel. Thus the sense of incompleteness and lack are associated with looking back and scenes of farewell that are repeated in the plot. The narrator says goodbye to Rinaldi, one of his closest friends in the mess: "I looked and saw Rinaldi standing watching me and waved to him." (Hemingway2004:39) While leaving for the front, Henry looks back and sees Catherine waving to him:

> I looked back and saw her standing on the steps. She waved and I kissed my hand and held it out. She waved again and then I was out of the driveway and climbing up into the seat of the ambulance and we started. (Hemingway, 2004:41)

The other ambulance drivers along with Henry look back at their cars stuck in the mud during the retreat. They have to leave the vans and, looking back, go on: "Through the trees I could see our two big moving-vans of cars stuck in the field. Piani looked back too" (Hemingway 2004:184). While they are leaving the hotel in Italy in order to reach Switzerland the barman, with whom Henry goes fishing and who helps them run away from the war police by lending them his boat, looks at them and waves: "He bent down and shoved us off. I dug at the water with the oars, then waved one hand. The barmen waved back deprecatingly" (Hemingway 2004: 240-241). Both parts of the novel, the parts prior to Henry's flight from the war and

those that follow it in Switzerland and Italy, indicate that Henry is moving towards an unpredictable future; he moves from security to insecurity, from a determined location towards an unpredictable location. In the first and second extracts Henry is going to the front; he goes from security to insecurity. In the third extract, in which Henry narrates how they are stuck in mud, they are lost in the woods so there is again a geographical displacement and a sense of insecurity. In the last extract, in which Henry and Catherine are leaving the Italian border and try to reach Switzerland, they do not know if they are going to be shot or if they will be able to find the right route to the Swiss part of the river. All these scenes (parts) are replete with suspense and a sense of incompleteness. Wherever Henry goes he feels incomplete and looks back in order to compensate for the sense of lack. It is a rifle, a helmet, a gun that are the symbols of Henry's alienation and shell fragments embedded in his legs are the signs of his fragmentation. The sense of incompleteness is enhanced through farewells to friends by looking back at the deserted houses that signify the settledness and security which Henry is looking for throughout the entire plot. Therefore on the level of theme the novel presents the disintegration of old unities. Henry and Catherine cannot feel complete by being a part of an already-defined unity such as the family; they are neither attached to their families nor can they form a new family. On the other hand male comradeship between the soldiers who tell each other stories and eat together in the mess disintegrates. Henry cannot be a part of the community of soldiers in the mess, and his best friends are the peaceful priest and doctor Rinaldi, who carries a holder stuffed with toilet paper instead of a gun. Attachment to a group does not provide Henry with a sense of completeness either with Catherine or with the soldiers in the mess. The fact that Henry seeks integrity and unity by being a part of already defined forms of solidarity makes him the more vulnerable. Therefore, as opposed to taking group identity as the determining factor of the individual, Hemingway disintegrates the group and invalidates the group codes. He focuses on the individual instead, which is contrary to a Bakhtinian sense of carnivalesque unity that can promote renewal and growth: "The material bodily principle is contained not in the biological individual, not in the bourgeois ego, but in the people, a people who are continually growing or renewed" (Bakhtin, 2002b:205)

The unity in the mess disintegrates because the people in the mess all leave for different places.

> The villa was empty. Rinaldi was gone with the hospital. The major was gone taking hospital personnel in the staff car […..] I went out then through the dining- room and the hall and up the marble stairs to the room where I lived with Rinaldi. (Hemingway, 2004: 169,171).

It might be thought that it is within the nature of war that such a unity disintegrates. However, it is not only in the war but also in the other groups with which Henry is involved that solidarity comes to an end. While disuniting the communal, Hemingway also invalidates the privatized life that civilization offers. In Switzerland, as opposed to the "feast" in the mess, Henry experiences a privatized form of life; he eats alone or with Catherine, and the storytelling in the mess is replaced by newspaper reading. However a life in its "private" form is also negated by Hemingway, and in the end, after the death of Catherine and the baby, there remains only Henry, who returns to the hotel after turning the lights off. The novel ends with these sentences: "I went out and left the hospital and walked back to the hotel in the rain."(Hemingway 2004:293). Therefore the novel moves from the group and communal eating towards a smaller group of two people having a private form of family life and ends with Henry, just one individual. The novel negates all kinds of societal forms such as family and the war which make use of the contradictory claims of civilization and myth. In this sense the novel presents the dissolution of "the civilized" and "the mythic" at the same time. It moves from community to solitude, and the emphasis is on the fact that Henry is broken while he is trying to realize a fictional dream, a dream which is highly contradictory, destructive in the form of war and the ensuing annihilation and restrictive even in its generative forms such as family and giving birth. In this sense the novel is in accordance with the modernist demands which contradict Bakhtinian sense of wholeness and communality. Modernism cherishes the relativity of individual perception; there is no absolute truth as an alternative to individual perception and

according to which the individual's sanity or insanity and his proximity to reality could be evaluated.

An attitude like Hemingway's — especially in his disuniting approach towards ready-made realities and myth and his re-uniting them under different categories so as to emphasize the contradiction and deceptiveness of the unity of "the civilized" — is close to Foucault's claims regarding modernity. Although modernism and modernity do not refer to the same periods —the latter is more encompassing — we can easily adopt Foucault's notion of the modern human — which he fashions with reference to Baudelaire — to the modernist novel.

> Modern man, for Baudelaire, is not the man who goes off to discover himself, his secrets and hidden truths; he is the man who tries to invent himself. This modernity does not "liberate man in his own being"; it compels him to face the task of producing himself (Foucault, 1991b:40).

The novel deals with the fragmentation of Henry, which is enhanced by his activity. Attempts at some act of centralization leads to his fragmentation and, as the metaphors of ants that go into the fire and die and the birds that are attracted by the light of the mirrors and killed suggest, Henry's centripetal activity — going into the war and looking for a home in Switzerland — leads to his alienation and fragmentation, and it is through the utterance Henry is consummated. Thus it is through the act of centralization that Henry is fragmented and through utterance that he is consummated. We have argued that confessional narrative in the novel does not underline a sense of guilt but implies fragmentation and the attempt of consummation. Whereas Henry's central activity directed by official discourse— such as his going to war and his attempts of forming a family— causes his physical and psychical fragmentation, his retrospective narrative consummates the idea of the past.

3-4 Paradox

The novel A Farewell to Arms is based on a paradox. On the one hand it deals with the formation of a settled society by depicting Henry's and Catherine's quest to forming a family by giving up mobility in order to attain immobility, and on the other hand it deals with war, which is a threat to the settled life and which devastates civilization as evoked by the images of abandoned settlements and evacuated towns. This paradox is underlined by two contrasting sense of space in the plot line: Henry's constant movement during the war with the other ambulance drivers, which initiates the novel, and Henry's settled life with Catherine in Switzerland, which terminates the novel. The main conflict is the fact that Henry engages upon a centripetal movement which is in accordance with the official ideology that wages war to protect the settlement. Henry's movement is directed towards putting these two basic elements of civilization into practice. His first movement is towards the war, which is made for the sake of protection and the enlargement of the settlement, and his second movement is towards Catherine, which is for the sake of being settled. Therefore Henry's movement between war and to Catherine is directed towards achieving the two elements of civilization: being settled and the protection of the settlement. Hemingway, by turning Henry into a fragmented self at the end of the war and by making him alienated at the end of his settlement with Catherine, opposes these two basic elements of civilization. Therefore the novel deals with civilization as a contradictory phenomenon that includes both the barbarism of the war and a sort of mythic romance, which is marriage and being settled. This duality between the destructive and generative, mythic glorification and crude barbarism is resolved within the novel and negated as Henry keeps on moving towards the centre in order to create each time his fiction anew.

Franz Kuna, in his essay on the "Janus-face" of modernist fiction, refers to Nietzsche and deals with modernist novel in terms of a paradox that inheres in it: the civilized that turns upon itself and the omni-presence of the "will to power" beneath the surface of the modern which is, in fact, a sublimated barbarism. Kuna detects a

parallelism between modernist claims and a Nietzschean sense of morality as a sign system, which is, when decoded, "a refined wickedness":

> Nietzsche fed the sense of confrontation with anarchistic forces; beneath the surface of modern life, dominated by knowledge of modern science, he discerned vital energies which were wild, primitive and completely merciless. At the appropriate, man, he proposed, would raise himself to titanic proportions and conquer his civilization; the vital forces will be released in revenge, and produce a new barbarism. [……] In all this, he proposed much that is in keeping with the themes and the very forms of modernistic art. (Kuna, 1976:446)

Nietzsche does not regard morality as the outcome of civilization: on the contrary he considers morality as a difference-eliminating factor whose basis is fear. In that respect Nietzsche draws a parallel between animal behaviour motivated by the instinct of survival and the "moral" behaviour of the human race whose basic drive is to seek refuge within the community, a "herd instinct" in his own terms. Therefore the basis of morality, according to Nietzsche, is fear and utility, the fear of "the lofty independent spirituality" that he/she might elevate himself/herself above the herd, and the utility that the community provides by eliminating the difference that would threaten the common (Nietzsche,1997)

> [……] self-adaptation, self-deprecation, submission to orders of rank –all this is to be found as social morality in a crude form everywhere, even in the depths of animal world […..] Thus the individual hides himself in the general concept 'man', or in society, or adapts himself to princes, classes, parties, opinions of his time or place: and all the subtle ways we have of appearing fortunate, grateful, powerful, enamoured have their easily discoverable parallels in the animal world. […..] The beginning of justice, as of prudence, moderation, bravery – in short, of all we designate as the Socratic virtues, are animal…….(Nietzsche, 1977:91-92)

Therefore Nietzsche eliminates the so-called distinction between the civilized and the brutal and conceives the civilized and the social as the re-shaped form of the instinctual according to the fear of the uncommon and the utility of the communal. Thus, according to Nietzsche, morality is the institutionalization of barbarism; it is a way of giving a new form to the instinctual. In this respect the immoral and the

fearful is not the individual that is "evil", because evil is a defined form of behaviour according to the code, but the one that can not be categorized, and designated as "uncanny"[7]. Thus immoral is the one that is "beyond good and evil". In other words, if we take good and evil as interpretations, because all morality is a matter of interpretation according to Nietzsche, the study of morality should not be based on the question of what is good and what is evil but the systems of categorization and how the uncanny is moulded in order to fit into the category of evil and good. Thus morality does not work on the principle of "good and evil" but on the principle of exclusion and inclusion formed according to a commonly recognized and institutionalized fear and a sense of utility.

War is also waged against "evil" that is made to be common for all the members of a society, and war is based on moral grounds. To take part in a war means, for the member of a society, to accept and recognize that common idea of "evil". Therefore a war is based on the creation of this sense of common evil, which means that a war is based on moral grounds. In that respect war can be regarded as a "refined wickedness". It is the "will to power", an instinctual drive, that assumes a justification under the name of "glory". Although war is cruelty it turns out to be glory thanks to the common sense of evil that the members of a society share and the moral grounds it is based on. If war were the passion of one individual it would be "insanity". Therefore, as Nietzsche claims, it is through religion, myth, superstition and culture that cruelty is elevated to the ranks of "civilized".

> Almost everything that we call "higher culture" is based upon the spiritualising and intensifying of cruelty - this is my thesis; the "wild-beast" has not been slain at all, it lives, it flourishes, it has only been transfigured (Nietzsche, 1997:97).

In conclusion, it is not the nature of debasement and glorification that matters but how the category of evil and good is formed and in what sort of a rationalization the judgment is involved in creating its categorizations.

[7] The word "Uncanny" is the translation of the adjective "unheimlich" and it is taken from Freud's text. Nietzsche does not use the word "uncanny" in his own text.

A similar methodological attempt to Nietzsche's can be recognized in Foucault in the 20th century. Foucault and Nietzsche have a common feature in their recognition that the "will to power" is the basic motive of human activity. Just as Nietzsche argues that the refined morality is a normalization process that teaches the individual its basic tenets through the institutionalization of sense of morality, which he calls "herds instinct", Foucault includes the discourse of science within the herds and directs his attention to psychology and criminology as the newly institutionalized sciences of the twentieth century. Nietzsche's "herds" has its counterpart in the panopticon in Foucault's terminology. As we have already seen, the panopticon is the model disciplinary institution, and it is a symbolic microcosm of the power structure. It is through a panoptic observatory system that the discourse of morality and science proliferates, the individual is shaped and categories are formed according to which the individual is defined. Foucault does not recognize an agent in whose hands the power is given. According to Foucault in modern societies the panoptical power structures proliferate even in the smallest community. However it should not be forgotten that Foucault does not make the claim that the working of the panopticon has a universal form. Foucault's panopticon is a structure to which the human willingly submits, and Nietzsche's concept of morality is similar to the working of a panopticon. According to Nietzsche forming herds and adherence to the communal code is an instinctual drive which he calls herd instinct. The structure of panopticon, like Nietzsche's herd instinct, is also sustained by a willing submission. Morality for Nietzsche is similar to panopticon in the sense that morality is the refined form of instinctual motives such as protection, utility and fear.

> With morality the individual is led into being a function of the herd and to ascribing value to himself only as a function […..] Morality is the herd instinct in the individual. (Nietzsche, 1977:102)

Therefore instinct- if it can be moulded with myth and culture so as to be shared by all of the members of the group and if it can turn into a discourse- can be regarded as a rule that the community must preserve for the sake of its own utility. Therefore the distinction is not between good and evil, primitive and civilized, but how the phenomenon is interpreted in order to acquire a communal form. Foucault

turns his attention to sexuality and science as fields around which a discourse is formed. And just like Nietzsche's elimination of the question of good and evil- because he takes them as objects of interpretation- Foucault turns away from the question of what is right or wrong and focuses on how the discourse is formed. Therefore, just as Nietzsche claims that morality can grasp any kind of statement and exult it, regardless of its being "evil" or "good", Foucault claims that a statement within a discourse, does not follow the pattern of a previous discourse, nor does it simply pile up or follow a successive order that preserves the origin of the statement. Both Nietzsche and Foucault claim that, in the formation of a discourse the origin is forgotten and contradiction comes into existence. In Archeology of Knowledge Foucault's emphasis is not on the coherence of the discourse but on the disruption and the contradictions within it. These contradictions are hidden but equally significant because discourse rises upon what it hides just like civilization rises upon what it hides.

> Discourse is the path from one contradiction to another: if it gives rise to those that can be seen, it is because it obeys that which it hides. To analyze discourse is to hide and reveal contradictions; it is to show the play that they set up within it; it is to manifest how it can express them, embody them, or give them a temporary appearance. (Foucault, 2004:168)

Therefore Foucault is in agreement with Nietzsche who argues that tradition does not preserve its origin in its later stages; in its later stages it might come to serve for what it was initially against. Therefore it is of no use to look for a coherent origin and the preservation of that coherence in the later forms of a tradition. To look for coherence, both for Nietzsche and Foucault, is to imagine a coherence which is not, in fact, to be discovered within the discourse:

> How the tradition has arisen is here a matter of indifference, and has in any event nothing to do with good and evil or with any kind of immanent categorical imperative; it is above all directed at the preservation of a community, a people; every superstitious usage which has arisen on the basis of some chance event mistakenly interpreted enforces a tradition which it is in accordance with custom to follow […..] Every tradition now continually grows more

> venerable the farther away its origin lies and the more this origin is forgotten […..](Nietzsche, 1977:76)

Bakhtin, on the other hand, underlines the fact every utterance has the tendency to display heteroglossia. Language and culture are the playground of this conflict between the centrifugal and centripetal, a dialectic relation that reaches a higher unity that he calls "heteroglossia".

> […] Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel, each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and relationships (always more or less dialogized). […] Such a combining of languages and styles into a higher unity is unknown to traditional stylistics. (Bakhtin, 2002a:263).

What is centripetal in the Bakhtinian sense? It is the official sphere of language. Official sphere, centripetal forces, is inherent in all the elements of culture, such as language and the novel, at all moments of their formation. It is the official that tries to gather everything around a common basis. The centrifugal, on the other hand is what belongs to the folk. It disintegrates the official, parodies it. The outcome is heteroglossia, the culminating point of divergent voices. Bakhtin celebrates heteroglossia and claims that such a divergence does have elements which when decoded can be included within the sphere of either the centripetal or the centrifugal. Therefore heteroglossia keeps its elements in already discrete and distinguishable forms. Heteroglossia and dialogism in the novel can be separated into unities that have a distinct identity. Therefore in Bakhtin's sense of heteroglossia each element within the unity is considered to belong to the centripetal or centrifugal. Foucault questions if there are entities that are reliable or taken for granted. For Foucault the heteroglot unity consisting of centripetal and centrifugal can only be a huge panopticon in which every entity is entitled to have recognizable, recorded features. However this refutes Bakhtinian idea of heteroglossia because within heteroglossia the entities do not present an easily identifiable homogeneity because they are the outcome of another sort of panopticism. Therefore an element that is identified as centrifugal might easily seem to be a centripetal force or an

element that is identified as centripetal force might seem and assume the features of a centrifugal force and the outcome might be a pastiched identity that would not follow an already defined formula of formation. Therefore the Bakhtinian sense of heteroglossia is refuted both by Nietzsche and Foucault on the grounds that every supposed origin and whole are formations in themselves that do not require the conflict between centralizing and decentralizing forces but follow more complex paths.

Bakhtin, Nietzsche and Foucault diverge in terms of ethics as well. According to Bakhtin the only possible way for the acting individual is to gain validity and recognition within a whole which provides the objectivity that is missing in the individual's evaluation of himself/herself. Therefore, while acting, the person can only be actualized and fully expressed when his/her act has a meaning within an already-categorized group of values. There is no personal aspect in the act that is performed. For Bakhtin this seems to be the only way for the acting consciousness.

> However, I neither express nor determine myself through my acts; I actualize through them something that has validity with respect to objects and meaning, but I do not actualize myself as something that is determinate or that is being determined: only objects and meaning stand over an act I perform. The act performed proceeds in an objectively valid context: in the world of narrowly practical ends (ends that relate to living one's daily life), in the world of social and political values, the world of cognitive validities (the act of cognition) [……] my act- performing consciousness as such poses questions only of the following type: what for? To what end? How? Is it correct or not? Is it required or not? Is it good or not? It never asks such questions as the following: Who am I? What am I? What kind am I? (Bakhtin, 1990:138-139)

However according to Nietzsche the first type of questions such as "to what end does it serve" and "how does it serve" are the appearances behind the question of "who am I?" When "who am I?" acquires a general recognition and it turns out to be "To what end?" In other words the transformation of "who am I?" into "To what end?" designates the individual's connection to a community, the personal turns out to be communal, "civilized" and cultured, and it hides behind the utility of the

community. For example, when we consider this in terms of the novel A Farewell to Arms, Henry might question the social utility that an act might bear by asking the question "To what end?" until he loses his only connection with the communal, but while he is returning to the hotel after the death of the baby and Catherine having lost his former belief in the social identities such as "soldier", "husband" and "father" he should ask "who am I?", a question which signifies his detachment from any kind of supposed social wholeness. His actions after Catherine's death cannot be directed towards fighting against the enemy forces (utility) or hiding from the Italian war police (fear). In other words it is not utility or fear —the concepts that morality relies on —that determine the ends of Henry's actions. According to Nietzsche it is at that moment Henry can be detached from the herd and he can become a free being, and according to Bakhtin Henry is:

> Once having lost the popular chronotope of the public square, his self consciousness could not find an equally real, unified and whole Chronotope; it therefore broke down and lost its integrity, it became abstract and idealistic (Bakhtin, 2002b:187).

Therefore, for Bakhtin, the individual can only be realized by merging into a unity that gives him/ her identity. However, being a part of a whole is, for Foucault, the moulding, shaping and the defining of the individual. Therefore the individual does not become idealized and loses his connection with the whole when he/she is detached from the "popular chronotope"; on the contrary the popular chronotope is the one which is abstract and idealistic in the Foucauldian sense. Both the individual and the community are pseudo- identities that use tradition, myth and culture in a modern context. To be determined by the existence of other, which is the only way of being "consummated" for Bakhtin, is "slave morality" in Nietzsche's terminology:

> […..] In order to come into existence, slave morality always first requires a contrary and outer world, it requires, in the language of physiology, an external stimulus in order to act at all –its action is from the very bottom reaction. (Nietzsche,1977:112)

Because within the community it is thanks to the fear that his/her revenge might be punished and thanks to the expected utility that his/her charity might elevate him/her to the ranks of "the charitable" and might endow him/her with the shelter of an identity that the individual tends to behave "morally". Therefore, for Nietzsche, morality is the shelter of the slave. However, according to Nietzsche the human is enslaved and becomes a part of the herd through the repression of the power that is inherent in him. For Foucault power is not repressed but administered which gives way to the incitement of power within the individual. Destructive power for Foucault is not repressed but motivated for the sake of communal ends. Therefore, as opposed to Nietzsche, who argues that the will to power is repressed, according to Foucault destructiveness is not repressed but triggered, utilized and administered? It is given a communal shape, and morality does not repress what is destructive in the human but takes a form so as to build a discourse in order to give a socially-approved form to destructiveness. Therefore according to Nietzsche the individual power —which includes destructiveness in the Nietzschean sense — is repressed and morality is built around what is repressed, but according to Foucault destructiveness is triggered and administered so as to be utilized within the communal, and morality is not repressive but inciting. In other words according to Foucault, there is no repression but incitement and morality is one of the technologies of power. Power, which used to be "a right of seizure" in the classical age, is transformed into,

> A power bent on generating forces , making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impending them, making them submit or destroying them […..] a power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations. Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vita. (Foucault, 1998:137)

Therefore both Foucault and Nietzsche are in agreement on the question of utility. However they diverge on the issue of how this utility is sustained. For Nietzsche common utility demands the submission of the slave. However utility in

the Foucauldian sense and in its modern usage demands not the impeding of power but the administration of it.

In this respect modern warfare aims to serve the utility of a nation as the reason for waging it. It is not the sovereign power that is aimed to be preserved but the welfare of a nation. Moreover along with a scientific discourse that might justify genocide; a war makes use of a traditional discourse that is based on the glorification and mythification of a nation. Therefore it makes use of both a threat that the nation involved would be extinguished if it does not wage war and a kind of award that emphasizes the advantages of winning a war. This kind of a relation with myth that glorifies and science that threatens is the reflection of the individual soldier's fear into the communal ground; the individual fear and expectation to be appreciated is given a communal, acknowledged form. The soldier fights in order not to be killed during the war and expects to be rewarded. Scientificity and morality enhances the primordial fear and the expectation to be rewarded. Therefore what is primordial in human (fear and appreciation) is given a communal ground and a "civilized" form thanks to the scientificity and morality which are the inventions of a civilized, communal life. Primordial and individual gains justification when it takes the shape of "civilized". What is primitive and what motivates the exertion of power is organized and administered so as to gain a common utility. Therefore it is paradoxical that the civilized in fact derives from the incitement and the regulation of the primordial. In that respect the logic behind modern warfare justifies both Nietzsche's claims and Foucault's claims.

As distinct from those of Fitzgerald's novels A Farewell to Arms presents characters in the war. Just as the characters in The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night underline a paradox by being myth-ridden commodities, war is represented in its peculiar paradox in A Farewell to Arms. War is on the one hand the product of civilization, because it uses the facilities of civilization such as technology destructively with the claim that it is waged in order to protect the benefits of civilization, and on the other hand it is "moral" because it relies on the supposed "common good" and is based on alliances and generalized rules. In that

respect the moral aspect of war justifies violence, and technology enhances violence. Therefore like the characters in the former two novels, who are connected to the past in order to preserve an identity that would connect them to the community to which they belong, war also strengthens communal bonds by making use of the common myth of "good". On the other hand, like the characters in these two novels, who use technology widely and cause their own destruction, war also uses a technology that provides massive annihilation. Therefore while enhancing communal bonds thanks to myth and tradition it disrupts these bonds through the use of technology.

The paradox of war and civilization is underlined in several ways in A Farewell to Arms. Hemingway's approach to the theme of death is one of the conflicts that the book underlines. On the one hand there we see death in its consecrated and mythified form and on the other hand death is presented in its most realistic and contradictory aspect. The cemeteries are described thus:

> Sculpture had always seemed a dull business – still, bronzes looked like something. But marble busts all looked like a cemetery. There was one fine cemetery though- the one at Pisa. (Hemingway, 2004:27)

Hemingway deals further with the consecration of the dead in several parts by referring to news in the papers which publish the list of the dead soldiers who are given medals. Therefore the concept of death is used in order to justify the causes of war and to strengthen communal bonds that would sustain the war. Death, in its consecrated and glorified form, is added as one of the elements that protect the morality that the war is based on. Therefore civilization aims at an indirect utility by using myth and tradition. Cemeteries belonging to soldiers are made in order to keep war alive in the memories. Thereby it is through consecrating death and sustaining myth that violence is justified. Thus the concept of death, like other mythified forms, provides an indirect utility in the strengthening of communal bonds and as one of the factors that makes it easier to wage a new war in order to dominate more. It is thanks to the existence of consecrated cemeteries belonging to the dead of previous wars that the war and death are consecrated.

On the other hand, the novel presents death in its most natural aspect. On their way to Udine, Aymo's car is stuck in the mud and in their terror Henry orders the sergeants to cut some brush in order to move the car. Two sergeants do not obey Henry's order and attempt to run away. Bonello, another soldier, kills one of them and they use the dead soldier's clothes in order to move the car.

> The sun was almost out from behind the clouds and the body of the sergeant lay beside the hedge.
> 'We'll put his coat and cape under,' I said. Bonello went to get them. I cut brush and Aymo and Piani dug out in front and between the wheels. I cut the cape, then ripped it in two, and laid it under the wheel in the mud, then piled brush for the wheels to catch (Hemingway, 2004: 183).

While the event is taking place the group is in danger of being killed by the Germans or the Italians who are also too afraid to distinguish between the allied forces and the enemies. In fear they kill the soldier and make use of the dead soldier's clothes for their own survival. This kind of an expression of death is no more a consecrated one that justifies war and violence and is expected to provide an indirect utility in the long run, but a death that aims to provide an immediate direct utility: they have to kill the solider because he is a threat to their own survival, and they also have to use his clothes in order to move the car. It is the fear of Henry and the other soldiers that disrupts the sacred aspect of death. In the case of the consecration of cemeteries, the indirect form of utility that is provided through death underlines the fear that the nations must dominate further in order not to be dominated and in the case of direct utility the soldier kills in order not to be killed. Both of the ideas of death that the book presents–the communal one in its consecrated form through which an indirect utility is expected by glorification and the other which is immediate and is expected to provide direct utility originates from fear. However, the first one is a communal fear that is reflected through mythification and the glorification of war, and the second one, its individual and immediate form, is a fear that aims to find an instantaneous solution. Therefore although both forms originate from fear (a primordial impulse) the consecration of the dead mythifies in order to find a solution in the long run based on the idea of death as the "common good" which justifies war. Therefore both the civilized and

the primitive derive from the same origin which is the primordial fear. However the civilized justifies itself and gives itself an absolute form by institutionalizing and deploying fear. For example the Italian soldier Ettore touches his stars when being killed is mentioned:

> 'I'll be a colonel before the war's over,' Ettore said.
> 'If they do not kill you.'
> 'They won't kill me,' He touched the stars at his collar his thumb and forefinger. 'See me do that? We always touch our stars if anybody mentions getting killed.'(Hemingway, 2004: 111)

Therefore the civilized creates culture and myth in order to cope with and redeploy the fear of death; a fear that, if it is not mitigated this way through culture and prejudice, can disrupt the sense of alliance that the community is based on. The individual fear of death is regulated by determining common objects of fear and by being given a communal form so that it both acquires a societal form – there are common objects of fear- and common ways of coping with it. Thus one of the means of creating myth and culture is the deployment of the primordial impulse of fear. For example, Ettore and the group he belongs to are all afraid of being killed by the bullet of the enemy, and they all believe that they can cope with that fear by touching the stars of their uniforms. Therefore the Nietzschean idea of morality as a "refined wickedness" applies to the idea of myth in the book. Morality is not opposed to the primordial, but it is a way of regulating and deploying it. When the primordial impulses, such as fear, acquire a communal form, they turn out to be morality. For example, Fussell argues that fear takes the shape of a "German Soldier in disguise" among the soldiers that fought in the First World War. This German soldier is supposed to wear the uniform of ally forces and serve as a spy. Fusell argues that the fear of prolonged warfare turns itself into "myth, ritual and romance". Fussell refers to Marc Bloch while explaining this:

> From this skepticism about anything official there arose, he says, "a prodigious renewal of oral tradition, the ancient mother of myths and legends." […..] One of the best of these, bred by anxiety as well as by the need to find a simple for the failure of British attacks, is the legend of the ghostly German officer- spy who appears in the British trenches just before an attack. He is most frequently depicted

> as a major. No one sees him come or go. He is never captured, although no one sees him return to the German lines. The mystery is never solved. (Fussell1977: 121-122)

This fictional antagonist finds its resonance in A Farewell to Arms during the retreat of the army:

> Last night on the retreat we had heard that there had been many Germans in Italian uniforms mixing with the retreat in the north. I did not believe it. That was one of those things the enemy always did to you (Hemingway, 2004:192).

The idea of the disguised antagonist is manifested in the speech of the barber who comes to the hospital in order to cut Henry's hair. The barber mistakes Henry for an Austrian:

> 'What's the matter? Don't you know any news?" I asked.
> 'What news?'
> 'Any news. What has happened in the town?'
> 'It is time of war,' he [the barber] said. '*The enemy's ears are everywhere.'* [8]
> (Hemingway, 2004:83).

It is also manifested in Catherine's speech that cautions Henry that they should be careful in front of other people: 'We'll have to be awfully careful. You'll have to be careful in front of other people.'(Hemingway, 2004:85). Therefore the disguised and mythified antagonist serves as an agent that regulates forms of fear. In other words fear is regulated by creating an enemy which in turn regulates society. It, on the one hand, strengthens the communal bonds and on the other hand makes every member of the community keep a watch over the other with the suspicion that s/he might be the enemy. In that respect the mythified, uncanny and disguised enemy (fictional antagonist) creates a part of the observation mechanism which is as well enhanced by the utility technology provides. Therefore technology along with myth, culture and tradition serve as the media of civilization, although myth's function is more indirect than that of the technology.

[8] Italics mine

Hemingway emphasizes the fact that both the tradition and technology can work hand in hand as forms of regulative and equally destructive forces by referring to two kinds of forces within the same army: bersaglieri with their fezzes and soldiers with their helmets.

> I looked back and saw the three cars all climbing, spaced by the interval of their dust. We passed a long column of loaded mules, the drivers walking along beside the mules wearing red fezzes. They were bersaglieri. (Hemingway, 2004: 42)

In this respect the mythified antagonist serves as an indirect observation mechanism that has the same utility as the technology provided by the Austrian searchlights to which the book constantly refers: "Afterward it was dark outside and I [Henry] could see the beams of searchlight moving in the sky" (Hemingway, 2004:81)

There the identity of the enemy is created as the object of fear, an object whose identity is recognized by the community, and the regulation of fear through the creation of a common antagonist is a part of the constant observation that is deployed by the disciplinary mechanism. Therefore while creating the object of fear, the disciplinary mechanism also determines how the primordial fear should be manifested and regulated so as to acquire a communal form. This is the way morality and civilization creates its rules of regulation and arranges the relationship between its members. The enemy is created by the myth, and it regulates how the object of fear can be coped with. If the fear of death is not given a common identity; if its object is not identified by the members of the community, and if it is not regulated, and preserved in its primordial crude form, the community would dissolve. There would be no "feared" as an element that strengthens the bonds between the members of the community, and if fear is not regulated through myth and tradition, and if the common ways of coping with it are not regulated, the members of the community would turn their guns on each other instead of observing the other and finding out whether he has features that are peculiar to the "enemy", because there would be no enemy whose characteristics are determined. Hemingway, as well as presenting the forms of regulated fear, shows the reader how

primordial fear, if it is not regulated so as to find a common target, and if it can not find a mythic form, would destroy the community. Aymo is killed by the Italians, although he is fighting for the Italian forces. It is fear, whose object loses its common identity when not regulated through myth and tradition, which kills Aymo. As we have argued the regulation of fear the bonds between individuals in a community and determines the common form of the object of fear. The regulation of fear provides utility, and fear is regulated so as to turn into an observation mechanism that gives a form to the individuals of a society. In this respect the definition of the enemy and regulation of fear defines also the individuals. We have also argued that it is through tradition, myth and superstition, that fear takes its regulated form in the long run. But during the war fear can return to its crude, primordial form by breaking its connection from a systematized form. If the soldiers cannot identify their enemy any more, the community may dissolve, and those who fight for the same camps will be the each other's enemy. A Farewell to Arms presents an instant of fear in its crude, unregulated and undirected form. This is a frenzy of fear that the soldier is confronted with the fact that there is the possibility that he might be killed by his own forces as Henry says.

> The Italians were even more dangerous. They were frightened and firing on anything they saw [….] Nobody gave any orders, let alone Germans. Still they would shoot us for Germans. They shot Aymo. (Hemingway, 2004:192)

Therefore Hemingway implies the fact that the regulated fear of the group that serves as an organizing force for society can easily turn into its crude form and dissolve the unity of the group and annihilate its own members. Thus civilization, which regulates fear and decks it out with tradition and myth, might easily transform into a destructive force, annihilating even those whose object of fear has the same decorations and badges, when the decorations are cut and when the individual remains naked having no more the clothes that identify him/her as the member of one group. Civilization can easily turn into its crudest form when the fiction of fear that used to regulate it is exposed as the fear of only one individual who has to kill in order not to be killed. Hemingway, in A Farewell to Arms tells the story of civilization and the collapse of civilization's fiction. The novel has its setting in the

war, a communal form of destruction that is enhanced by technology and myth. The camps in the war are based on the common identity of the soldiers and their common enemy, but as the plot advances the groups dissolve and they start killing each other. Communal fear and war, which is waged by one group on the other, is transformed into individual fear of death and the individual's violence against the other individuals in the same group. In that respect the novel starts with the presentation of the dissolution of solidarity and regulated form of fear in the group and it progresses to the primordial fear of one individual. At the beginning Henry considers other people in the mess and while he is running away from the Italian war police he considers only himself and tries to survive as an individual. While he is running away from the war, Henry's fear is not a fear of the Germans or Austrians; on the contrary it is a fear of his own camp. The war is not a matter of winning or loosing for him; his life is the only thing that matters because he might get killed by his own camp, the Italians. Therefore the book presents the fear of a group from the enemy and one individual's fear from his own group.

Following eating rituals throughout the novel leads us the same conclusion: that the collapse of fiction, which keeps the members of the society in unison, leads to the dissolution of solidarity. At the beginning, the novel presents Henry eating with other soldiers in the mess under candle light.

> That night in the mess after the spaghetti course, which every one ate very quickly and seriously, lifting the spaghetti on the fork until the loose strands hung clear then lowering it into the mouth, or else using a continuous lift and sucking into the mouth, helping ourselves to wine from the grass-covered gallon flask […..] (Hemingway, 2004: 6)

At this point in the novel Henry is still one of the soldiers in the mess. They eat in communally, their fear hasn't taken the form of an individualized fear, and their communal bonds are still strong. They act in a group, satisfying their hunger with the frugal meal offered at the mess. They eat less, they eat out of hunger and they are members of a group which is fighting for a common enemy confiding. At this point their fear is towards the common enemy, and there is no possibility that

the group members would act contrary to the law of solidarity and the cause of the war that requires the recognition of hierarchy. But as the group identity dissolves and fear takes an individualized, unregulated form so as to be directed towards members within the same group, the number of those that involved in eating rituals decreases, and the quantity of meals and the time spared for eating increase. After Henry is wounded in the war and treated at a hospital, and after his ends and fears become independent of the group and acquire an individualized form —having a life with Catherine and protecting his and Catherine's life — we see Henry and Catherine in a restaurant. This time the number of people involved in communal eating decreases and the variety of meals increases:

> The waiters came in and out and there were people going by and candles with shade on the tablecloths and after we decided that we liked the Gran Italia best, George, the head waiter, saved us a table […..] We [Catherine and Henry] drank dry white Capri iced in a bucket; although we tried many of the other wines, fresa, barbera and sweet white wines. (Hemingway, 2004: 101).

In the end while Catherine is giving birth to a still born baby at the hospital Henry overeats by himself.

> Outside it was getting dark. I walked down the empty street to the café. There was a light in the window. I went in and stood at the zinc bar and an old man served me a glass of white wine and a brioche. The brioche was yesterday's. I dipped it in the wine and then drank a glass of coffee. […..]
> The waiter brought a dish of sauerkraut with a slice of ham over the top and a sausage buried in the hot wine- soaked cabbage. I ate it and drank the beer. I was very hungry […..]
> I ate the ham and eggs and drank the beer. The ham and eggs were in a round dish – the ham underneath and the eggs on top. It was very hot and at the first mouthful I had to take a drink of beer to cool my mouth. I was hungry and I asked the waiter for another order. I drank several glasses of beer. (Hemingway, 2004:278,281, 290)

This is the end of Henry's social existence, which at the beginning takes the form of his involvement in the group of soldiers at the mess, a larger group — and takes the form of a family— a smaller group— through the end. In the end he is detached from all sorts of social bonds, from that of the friends in the mess and at

the front and from Catherine and the baby. His overeating by himself indicates the end of his social and communal aspect. In the end, after the baby and Catherine die, Henry is reduced to a human being whose aim is to satisfy his insatiable hunger and who lives on the basis of natural necessity. Therefore the communal bonds that the war imposes by creating a sense of insecurity for the group are transformed into the insecurity of the individual, and the group's regulation on the basis of fear is transformed into the primordial fear of one individual. Henry is detached from the communal fear of the group in the face of a common enemy, which entails unbelief in the group's most necessary tenets and the dissolution of the group, and relapses, into his own fear of death. And as the ordering of eating rituals manifests Henry is isolated from the communal eating ritual and tries to satisfy his own hunger in the end. Thus the novel distances the individual from social solidarity and treats him as a solitary being that tries to satisfy its basic necessities such as hunger. Either in its communal form or in its individualized form it is fear and hunger that mark and motivate the behaviour of the group or the individual. The only difference between the communal and individualized forms is the fact that the communal form of eating and fighting entails the basic necessity of rituals: in its consecrated, moralized and mythified form. In addition to this, the communal form of fighting of one group against the other moralizes fighting on the basis of myth, tradition and solidarity; it justifies massive annihilation by presenting itself within absolute principles which are – when negated – turn into an individualized fear of death, like that of Henry's. Therefore war as a communal form of violence derives from the regulation and moulding of the fear of the individual through myth and tradition. Bakhtin, who strictly distinguishes between individual forms and communal forms and argues that the individual can only be defined and made meaningful within the group contradicts the underlying idea of the book, which is strictly in conformity with Nietzsche, by arguing that the tenets and shared values of a society are the enactments and justifications of primordial forms "refined" by myth and tradition. Bakhtin states that,

> The leading themes of these images of bodily life are fertility, growth, and a brimming over abundance. Manifestations of this life refer not to the isolated biological individual, not to the private,

> egoistic ‘economic man’, but to the collective ancestral body of the people (Bakhtin, 2002b:205).

This view contradicts Hemingway’s perspective in matters of the distinction between the communal and the individual. Henry’s individual fear of death comes into the foreground even in a highly moralized and regulated form of communal violence such as war, and his personal choice to leave the battleground and form a family reflect societal claims. Therefore individual motives and societal ones cannot be separated from each other with distinction. Hemingway, who implies that the communal and individual are easily convertible to each other and that war is the outcome of an individual fear moulded and given shape so as to conform to a traditional morality in order to be utilized for the regulation of the society, is closer to Foucault, in the sense that he conceives human beings as constituted so as to adapt to and create a sort of power mechanism. Henry is always the outcome; he does not have an initiative role although he seems to be making personal choices in his rejection of fighting. The only alternative to fighting a communal cause for Henry is to form the basic institution of society, which is the family. Therefore both fighting and forming a family are not facts alternating each other although the book presents them as if they were two alternating phases in Henry’s life. Hemingway separates them as if they were two alternating phases but negates both of them as destructive forces at the end of the novel. Therefore just as war is the manifestation of the civilization that destroys and violates itself through “civilized” means, as the images of blown up bridges and houses suggest, there is the paradox in Henry’s life that every new beginning he attempts is the outcome of a destruction and every beginning is taking steps towards devastation. Just as war is the beginning of civilization and civilization is the end of war. In that respect A Farewell to Arms, presents the paradox of civilization through Henry’s narrative.

CHAPTER 4

FIESTA: THE SUN ALSO RISES

The Sun also Rises is a postwar novel published prior to A Farewell to Arms in 1927. The novel is of concern to this study both as a work sharing the modernistic concerns of the three novels we have so far studied and as a novel that illuminates the contradictions within post-war discourse. When the fact that it discloses such a contradictoriness is taken into consideration it also becomes a useful context to present a Bakhtinian claim for dialogism that argues the existence of a multiplicity of voices in a unity and a Foucauldian claim that the individual distinction within the group is not a work of heteroglossia in any libratory sense but the work of a disciplinary mechanism that he describes as panopticism. In this sense the plot and character relations in the novel highlight the incompatibility of Bakhtin's and Foucault's thinking because it deals with a central character and a group and with the dissolution and re-emergence of groups. The Sun also Rises, just like the other three novels, has its focus on a central character the events of whose life and whose relation with the other characters form the main plot line, although this is presented along with minor plots and stories centered on the minor characters. The novel starts with the expatriate group and narrows down to one individual, who is the narrator himself. In that respect the The Sun Also Rises is similar to A Farewell to Arms which initially deals with its protagonist in its relation to a group and which terminates with the narrator as a character outside the group. Thus The Sun also Rises, like the other three novels, because it deals with the postwar era and the endeavour to create a whole out of fragments, can provide the context for the discussion of the contradiction between Bakhtin and Foucault on the issue of the creation of wholes. Whereas Bakhtin argues that the struggle of conflicting forces within the society creates a whole which keeps the struggling forces identifiable, distinct and easily recognized, Foucault, in contrast, opposes Bakhtin's dialectical outlook and the claims of dialogism. Therefore in this section we will be dealing with the main plot that is centered on the narrator Jake and minor events and stories

that make their appearance occasionally reinforcing the main plot and its relation to the experience of the war.

Because the central character, from whose point of view the reader is informed, is the narrator of the story, The Sun also Rises is similar to Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby and Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms. By including the narrator within the plot as one of the characters, like The Great Gatsby and A Farewell to Arms, The Sun also Rises introduces the fallibility and the subjectivity of the narrator as an element to be decoded. Therefore Hemingway's novel both introduces a sense of the unreliability of the first person's narrative to be decoded by the reader and, since it is based on the subjectivity of Jake, raises the question why Jake the narrator chooses these specific events to narrate. To put it more specifically, why does he narrate petty events such as his seeing a long cockroach in the hotel, and why does he talk as little as possible about his mutilation during the war; an event that is the least spoken haunts the novel and is only referred to in a hotel room while Jake is lonely and ruminating in a stream of consciousness.

Another point that we will deal with is the issue of time and setting in the novel. As we have argued so far, all the novels we have studied rely on an association of symbols to stress the characters' fixation in time and setting. In other words, the way the novels concern themselves with time and setting is largely dependent on the symbols they use. For example horses and cars are the symbols Fitzgerald uses in order to underline the conflict between the chaotic and swift present of the characters and the nostalgic "whole" of the past. In Tender is the Night suspension in time is emphasized through Nicole's father who we know raped his daughter and runs away from the hospital as he is expected to die. The present of the novels is haunted by an agonizing past.

We also said that there is a movement in time and space that is contrary to the movement of history. In The Great Gatsby the narrator Nick goes from the west to the east at the end of the novel or glances back at a secure past while moving further in time towards a present which he deems chaotic. In A Farewell to Arms the narrator Henry's movement is from a space that is defined on the map and that

he supposes to be secure towards an insecure, undefined space. They are lost in the woods or they plunge into insecurity while running away with Catherine on a boat from Italy. They leave what they consider secure and move towards insecurity. It is in the scenes of Henry's looking back and saying farewell to other characters that the novel's concern with time is presented. It is a sense of time that gives priority to characters' suspension that is revealed through repetitions and constant recurrence of several sounds such as the "click" in A Farewell to Arms. In that sense the novels rely on the recurrence of several images and symbols in order to present the characters' sense of time. In The Sun also Rises Hemingway again uses repetitions and the associative power of images and symbols that involve the character and the reader as well. The novel focuses on the statues of prominent figures in Paris that emphasize a frozen sense of time. On the other hand the description of cathedrals in Spain gives a sense of an enlivened past that continues to live. The movement in space and time is backwards as Henry and his friends move from urban Paris towards rural Spain. Therefore the novel concerns itself with time through the change of geographical locations. Just as in The Great Gatsby, the narrator moves from the west to the east to suggest a backwards movement in time, in The Sun Also Rises Jake the narrator and the group, by moving from France to Spain suggest a backwards movement from industrialism to feudalism. Hemingway uses symbols peculiar to each location in order to underline the retrogression in time. Such a concern with time that has its focus on character's sense of time rather than calendar time makes it an example of what has often been seen as modernists' engagement with time. On the other hand, the novel gives us the opportunity to discuss it in terms of the Bakhtinian chronotope in the novel and the Foucauldian sense of historicity. Therefore this section will be dealing with the novel's chronotope in terms of the contradictory views of Bakhtin and Foucault on the issue.

4-1- Retrogression and Repetition

The novels we have studied all deal with retrogression in time. In other words the sense of time and space is arranged so as to reflect a personal sense of time which freezes at a moment in the past and recurs constantly as we move forward in the plot. It is often a frozen image or a repetition of movement and speech that appears and reappears as the characters experience frustrations and when reality does not coincide with the recognition of characters' sense of actuality. In that respect all the post-war novels we have dealt with follow a modernistic trend in their concern with time and space: a compulsion to repeat an earlier state of mind and looking backwards at a previously occupied space or a period of time.

Paul Fussell detects the same tendency to freeze and repeat and in postwar literature and in war memoirs. Fussell refers to Frye's classification of literature into three categories namely: "myth and romance in the early stages; high and low mimetic in the middle stages and ironic in the last stage" and categorizes modern literature as belonging to the last phase; a phase which signifies a return into the myth of early stages. According to Fussell postwar literature offers, by returning to an earlier stage with its demonic imagery and its depiction of a world of ruin, a vast amount of renewed myth:

> These memoirs are especially worthy of the closest examination because, for all the blunt violence they depict, they seem so delicately transitional, pointing at once in two opposite directions – back to the low mimetic, forward to the ironic and-most interestingly – to that richest kind of irony proposing, or at least recognizing, a renewed body of rituals and myth (Fussell, 1977: 312).

Therefore both as a literary phase and with respect to its thematic concerns and plot structure post-war literature, by offering a renewed material for myth, presents a retrogression in time. The novels we have so far studied concern themselves largely with frozen moments in time or flashbacks in characters'

personal history and, as a part of a literary movement they renew the myth and treat it in an ironic mood by pointing out the fact that the past is repeated not because it was pleasurable but because it can be mastered and controlled when it is recollected in the present. As Freud, in his essay entitled "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", argues, the repetition of the unpleasurable experience is at one level a way of assuming an active part in unpleasant and traumatic events rather than being a passive party who is merely influenced by the event. Freud takes his example from children:

> It is clear that in their play children repeat everything that has made a great impression on them in real life, and that in doing so they abreact the strength of the impression and, as one might put it, make themselves master of the situation [….] As the child passes over from the passivity of the experience to the activity of the game, he hands on the disagreeable experience to one of his playmates and in this way revenges himself on a substitute (Freud, 1985:286).

When the past is concerned, that is kind of nostalgia and that is kind of fixation as reflected in the novels, does manifest a Freudian procedure of coping up with the traumatic. Therefore the past in the modernist novels, is not a matter of remembrance and a loyalty to the past as it really happened but a kind of past that is re-made in the act of narration.

We will focus on The Sun also Rises in terms of its frozen moments and the symbols Hemingway uses in order to reveal that fixation and retrogression. We will compare and contrast the perception of time and space in the novel with the Bakhtinian sense of time and setting, which he calls the chronotope, and with a Foucauldian understanding of historicity, which is incompatible with Bakhtin's way of analysis because Foucault rejects a scientific causality and focuses on frozen moments rather than a sequence composed of stages following one after the other within a sense of historical continuity. Therefore, to put this in terms of the novel, it is of concern to us to reveal certain frozen points within a plot that seems to be flowing between a beginning and an end but indeed concludes at the point where it starts. The novel is retrospective both in terms of its plot and its thematic concerns. Jake the narrator is, in the end, at the point where he starts his journey. On the

thematic plane, even minor characters such as the bullfighter Belmonte retain their retrospective gaze in order to cope with a too complicated present which provides a new, an unaccustomed, a hard- to- define and unexpected experience. Among all the new experiences Jake's view is highly relative: he even cannot fix his gaze on a definite point: "The room was unstable unless I looked at some fixed point" (Hemingway 2004:194).

The Sun also Rises presents retrogression on two planes. First of all, when the journey from urban Paris to rural Spain is concerned, this retrogression seems to be a backwards movement in history from industrialism to feudalism. Thus the backwards movement is in the official history. On the second level the retrogression is experienced on the individual plane; the characters go backwards in their individual history, and this is achieved by disclosing their points of fixations in the past. It is either through the glorification of a past victory – or through mythification of the character's past victory- or through intentional loopholes in the characters' past which are characterized by an unpleasurable experience and omission of explicit articulation of that unpleasurable experience that these points of fixation are indicated.

On the plane of officially recognized history recording, the backwards movement from industrialism to feudalism starts with Jake's and the group's (Cohn, Bill, Mike and Brett's) journey from urban France to rural Spain. As this backwards transition takes place through a train journey Jake and Bill take, the statues of France, the signs of a frozen moment of glory, give way to rural scenes and cathedrals in Bayonne, which indicate the existence of an enlivened past in Spain; a past merged with present unlike the frozen moments of history in Paris. The description of Ney's statue in Paris can be regarded as a frozen moment from the French Revolution, an idealized moment of the past living through inscriptions. The immobility of the statue is contrasted with the renewal of nature. Thus Hemingway's emphasis is on the discrepancy between a sense of time that freezes and glorifies and a sense of time that flows in a cyclic, natural pattern, a contrast he also emphasizes through the symbols of statues and natural phenomena in A Farewell to Arms.

> I passed Ney's statue standing among the new leaved chestnut trees in the arc-light [……] I stopped and read the inscriptions: from the Bonapartist groups, some date; I forgot. He looked very fine; Marshal Ney in his top boots, gesturing with his sword among the green new horse-chestnut leaves (Hemingway, 2004:26).

The contrast between natural time that is determined by the changing form of natural phenomena and a frozen, static history is furthered when Bill, Jake and Cohn arrive in Spain where the description of a rural life style and a communal living is the initial point of the novel's retrogressive movement into the past.

> We passed lots of Basques with oxen, or cattle, hauling carts along the road, and nice farmhouses, low roofs, and all white plastered. In the Basque country the land all looks very rich and green and the houses and villages look well off and clean. (Hemingway, 2004: 80)

The cathedrals in Spain reinforce the idea that the past in Spain is enlivened, it is infused into the lives of people in the form of a cathedral rather than being presented in its frozen state to be read through the inscriptions. Therefore we move back in time from a society which is ordered according to the class system because Ney's statue is a reference to the bourgeois revolution and it contrasts with the crowd of fiesta in Spain in which there is a communal feast, a rural lifestyle that absorbs even those who seem to be the most alien.

> The fiesta was solid and unbroken, but the motor cars and tourist cars made little islands of onlookers. When the cars emptied, the onlookers were absorbed into the crowd. [……] The Fiesta absorbed even the Biarritz English so that you did not see them unless you passed close to a table (Hemingway, 2004: 178).

Movement backwards manifests itself in the representation of two characters, one in France the other in Spain, which works as one of the contrasts strengthening our conviction that the book relies on this backwards movement. These characters serve as gate keepers in the both the literal and the figurative sense. They determine who will be admitted into the buildings they keep watch over, and figuratively they are the guardians of the values of their society, determining who will be admitted

inside and who will remain outside of the classification system. The concierge waiting at the gate of Jake's apartment in Paris has her ready-made criteria of a class society. She admits those who can be classified into one of the categories and rejects those who seem unfit for any of them.

> Her [the concierge's] life-work lay in the *pelouse*, but she kept an eye on the people of the *pesage*, and she took great pride in telling me which of my guests were well brought up, which were of good family, who were sportsmen, a French word pronounced with the accent on the men. The only trouble was that people who did not fall into any of those categories were very likely to be told there was no one home, chez Barnes. (Hemingway, 2004:46)

Montaya, the hotel owner in Spain also works as a gate keeper; he decides who to admit into the hotel, to whom to grant personal favors when there are no vacancies. However, Montaya's criterion for exclusion or inclusion is not in tune with the classification of a class society. He has his own evaluation made according to his own classification system. Those who have "aficion" are admitted to Montaya's hotel:

> *Aficion* means passion. An aficionado is one who is passionate about bullfights. All the good bullfighters stayed at Montaya's hotel; that is those with *aficion* stayed there. The commercial bullfighters stayed once, perhaps, and did not come back. The good ones came each year. In Montaya's room were their photographs (Hemingway 2004:115).

Therefore just like the concierge in Paris, Montaya the landlord serves as the value keeper of a community, with a slight difference however. Montaya feels it is his responsibility to keep an idealized value system pure. He feels responsible for the sacredness of the symbols of an idealized past. Montaya wants the bullfighter Romero to remain "pure" and not to "degenerate" by coming to contact with the other Americans except Jake. His role as the gate keeper of an idealized past becomes obvious when one of the residents in the hotel, the bullfighter Pedro Romero, is invited by the American ambassador. Montaya does not give the invitation to Pedro Romero on the grounds that:

> ‘People take a boy like that. They don’t know what he’s worth. They don’t know what he means. Any foreigner can flatter him.’ [……] ‘He’s [Romero] such a fine boy,’ said Montaya. ‘He ought to stay with his own people. He shouldn’t mix with that stuff.’ (Hemingway, 2004: 149-150).

Montaya’s system of classification never shows instability or any kind of divergence from a fixed course. People either remain as aficionado or lapse into degeneracy even if the circumstances change. On the other hand, although the concierge keeps her own ready-made classification system safe, valid and ready-to use at all times, the categories into which people fit might change. Upon taking a huge tip from the Count she can change her mind very easily as to what category Brett belongs to and admit her into the apartment.

> ‘I’ll [the concierge] speak very frankly, Monsieur Barnes [Jake]. Last night I found her [Brett] not so *gentile.* Last night I formed another idea of her. But listen to what I tell you. She is *trés, trés gentille.* She is of a good family. It is a thing you can see.’(Hemingway, 2004:46).

Therefore the concierge and the landlord Montaya, while identical in the fixity of their value systems, are not identical as to the features of their value systems. The former is the system of a class society and the latter is of a more personal one determined on the basis of being an aficionado-in other words a criterion that depends on being pure and preserving itself as the symbol of “purity” and “glory” of the past. In that respect Montaya’s attitude towards preserving the purity of the bullfighter Romero is similar to the attitude of society in Tender is the Night which keeps an eye on Rosemary’s whiteness on the beach. However it is ironic that, both in Rosemary’s case and Romero’s case, the ones who are taken care of and chosen as the national symbol of purity are those who work for the commercial sector. Both Montaya and Rosemary expose purity, naivety and courage as part of a show. This makes the concierge and the landlord similar in an indirect, ironical way. The concierge’s system of values can transform a person from the “low classes” to a person of great gentility when a large sum of tip is offered. Therefore her values depend largely on commercial favours. On the other hand the landlord really believes that he is preserving an ideal state while watching over Romero’s

purity. However, he serves the commercial ends of show business, which feigns the presentation of a glorified past. Therefore the landlord Montaya's attitude is similar to that of the consumers of cinema industry in Tender is the Night who strongly believe in and glorify Rosemary's naivety. Both serve indirectly for the continuance of highly commercialized institutions while believing that what they are trying to preserve in its purified form is the values of the past which identify the members of a community. Therefore, although the occasion of the fiesta is a retrogressive movement in time reminding us of a classless society, absorbing everyone regardless of their class and nationality, even this seemingly glorified past is a part of show business. Thus although the fiesta seems to be a period in the past that diverges from the official order as Bakhtin would say, it still conforms to the commercialism of the twentieth century in an indirect way. While introducing a new medium to the power relations within the society, cinema, although a new technological phenomenon, seems to act in the service of tradition.

Therefore, although cinema and bullfighting diverge, in the sense that the latter is an old form of entertainment and the former is a new form, cinema in Tender is the Night shares has the same characteristics as the event of the fiesta in The Sun also Rises. They keep the society in unison, they both seem to present a divergence from everyday reality and relations of authority, they determine what and how the struggle should be and keep the struggling parties constant. In other words, they maintain and organize an ongoing conflict between a commonly recognized sense of vice and a common sense of virtue. In that respect both the cinema as a modern form and the fiesta as a traditional form are in compliance with what Bakhtin defines as carnival which, according to Bakhtin, stages the struggle against authority. However, Bakhtin considers authority as a fixed form and defines it as a restrictive element. He ignores the inconsistencies and contradictions in the definition and practice of authority. For Bakhtin the distinguishing element in the definition of authority is its opposition to carnival which reflects the genuine folk tradition.

> As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from

> the established order: it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, forms and prohibitions (Bakhtin, 2002:199).

By taking the idea of authority for granted, he also takes for granted carnival's opposition to authority as a stable, unchanging unit and defines it as a phenomenon that actually took place periodically in history and was sought universally by people afterwards. In this respect he disregards the fact that carnival might as well be an authoritative form, and that authority can also appear in a carnivalesque form. Both cinema and bullfighting in the novel promote the idea that there used to be a pleasurable state in the past, and they sustain the idea of how a perfect state of events should be; cinema in Tender is the Night and the bullfighting along with the feast in The Sun also Rises are social gatherings that keep this idea of goodness and evil constant in the consciousness of a society. In other words these forms of entertainment stabilize the ideas of vice and virtue. We can easily apply Bakhtin's definition of carnivalesque to the bullfighting in Spain. According to Bakhtin, carnival is a temporal and spatial setting in which official and historical time turns topsy -turvy, in other words it is a phase in history that is immune to authoritarian oppression and the chronological order of historical continuity. The feast in the The Sun also Rises is a folkloric form that celebrates a timeless ideal such as the purity of the bullfighter, as Montaya the gate keeper explains to Jake the narrator.

Bakhtin's definition implies that carnival is a frozen moment that is looked for eternally by humanity. For Bakhtin the idea of the feast requires sanction by an ideal, and that is what produces carnival as a universal, timeless ideal:

> The feast (every feast) is an important primary form of human culture. It cannot be explained merely by the practical conditions of the community's work, and it would be even more superficial to attribute it to the physiological demand for periodic rest. The feast had always an essential, meaningful philosophical content. […..] Something must be added from the spiritual and ideological dimension. They must be sanctioned not by the world of practical conditions but by the highest aims of human existence, that is, by the world of ideals. Without this sanction there can be no festivity […..] They were the second life of the people, who for a time, entered the utopian realm of community, freedom, equality, and abundance (Bakhtin, 2002:198-199).

Therefore the carnival in the Bakhtinian sense has an archetypal quality. It stages a state of affairs that is supposed to have universal appeal and validity as an idealized form. When we consider this in terms of The Sun also Rises, the fiesta stages a tradition, and the novel stages the staging of that tradition. The novel, by staging the staging of bullfighting adds a new element into it and presents it not as a pure form of entertainment but as an endeavour to keep things in their "pure" stage: as a repetition of the endeavour of turning into an earlier stage. Therefore in the novel the bullfighting is not represented as the bullfighting in the literal sense but as an act of repeating the past.

Bullfighting signifies the process of taming nature, bending nature to the will of the human. Bullfighting stages the procedure of taming nature, and it sanctifies the whole process so as to change its function from that of bending nature to human will, to that of re-animating a primordial form of conquering nature and giving it sanctity and preserving the past as a valuable identity. It glorifies the bullfighter as the symbol of courage and purity, and turns him into a symbol that animates a phase of perfection. In other words through bullfighting the procedure of taming the nature and gaining victory over it is re-staged. Therefore what the onlooker sees during bullfighting is not the consequence of the moment of victory but the whole procedure re-experienced again. In other words retrogression in official history and turning back to a feudal phase in history takes place as the bullfighting scene repeats the process of gaining victory over nature whose symbolic manifestation is the mutilated ears of the bull given as a gift to Lady Ashley (Brett) by the bullfighter Pedro Romero.

> The crowd did not want it (the bullfighting) ever to be finished.
> The bull was squared on all four feet to be killed, and Romero killed directly below us. He killed not as he had been forced to by the last bull, but as he wanted to. He profiled directly in front of the bull, drew the sword out of the folds of the muleta and sighted along the blade. [….]
> Romero took the ear from his brother and held it up toward the President. The President bowed and Romero, running to get ahead of the crowd, came toward us. He leaned up against the *barrera* and

> gave the ear to Brett. He nodded his head and smiled. The crowd were all about him. Brett held down the cape. (Hemingway 2004:191).

Therefore bullfighting in Spain is a repetition of a process in a symbolic form and when we compare this animated symbolic process of returning and repeating the past with its parallel symbols in France, Hemingway seems to be underlining the contrast between the ways in which the past is idealized in these two countries. While we see the whole procedure in an animated dramatic symbolic form in Spain, the symbols in France present not the whole procedure of gaining victory but the consequence of victory and its manifestations with statues that freeze the moment of gaining victory over nature:

> We walked down the Boulevard. At the juncture of the Rue Denfert Rochereau with the Boulevard is a statue of two men in flowing robes.
> 'I know who they are.' Bill eyed the monument. 'Gentlemen who invented pharmacy. Don't try and fool me on Paris.'(Hemingway 2004:63).

As opposed to the bullfighting experience in Spain which tries to re-capture a past glory by animating it, the book underlines the fact that France, instead of repeating a past experience, presents its consequences by freezing the moment. In this respect the ears of the bull that are given by Romero the bullfighter to Brett, might as well be contrasted with the stuffed animals that Bill wants to buy in France.

> 'Here's a taxidermist's,' Bill said. 'Want to buy anything? Nice stuffed dog?
> 'Come on,' I said. 'You're pie-eyed.'
> 'Pretty nice stuffed dogs,' Bill said. 'Certainly brighten up your flat.'
> 'Come on.'
> 'Just one stuffed dog. I can take'em or leave'em alone. But listen, Jake. Just one stuffed dog.' […..]
> 'See that horse-cab? Going to have that horse-cab stuffed for you for Christmas. Going to give all my friends stuffed animals. I'm a nature writer.'(Hemingway, 2004:65).

If a stuffed animal is the manifestation of a nature that is dominated, what differentiates it from the mutilated ears of a bull is the fact that the ears of the bull are the manifestation of the cathartic event of watching the bull being killed and mutilated; they are the outcome of an event that is re-staged and watched. What makes bullfighting pleasurable is its cathartic nature. Stuffed animals on the other hand lose their connection with the event of killing and stuffing, and the mere product, the object not the process, turns out to be something out of which pleasure would be derived. In this respect symbols such as the statues or stuffed animals of France freeze the past with its emphasis on the consequences rather than the procedure. On the other hand, the symbols of Spain such as cathedrals, the bull's ears given as a gift to Lady Ashley and the bullfighting itself, celebrated as a feast giving cathartic pleasure, gains its symbolic effect from the re- staged process of taming nature rather than the consequence. The symbols and characters employed in order to describe these countries such as Montaya in Spain and the concierge in France, are paralleled. On the one hand we see the concierge and the consequences of the classification system, but not how it is formed. On the other hand we have Montaya the hotel keeper in Spain who sticks with the process of classification. The concierge tends to prohibit those who are unclassified and does not let them enter the apartment, and she does this according to her ready-made values, without rage.

> One of my friends, an extremely underfed-looking painter, who was obviously to Madame Duzinell [the concierge] neither well-brought up, of good family, nor a sportsman, wrote me a letter asking if I could get him a pass to get by the concierge so he could come up and see me occasionally in the evenings (Hemingway, 2004: 47).

The concierge's attitude towards unclassifiable strangers does not stem from her rage or any kind of personal feeling. Not letting those unclassifiable strangers into the apartment is an endeavour to keep the value-system safe and stable. Therefore she wants to see the consequence and the rule as a valid support and does not want any unusual event to take place, just as she is used to seeing Ney's statue in its place concrete and undefiable, no matter who it is. Montaya the landlord, on the other hand, is full of rage towards those, who, he thinks, are a threat to the purified object of glory. His reactions are based on protecting this object rather than

protecting the rule or the classification system. Therefore in Montaya's case it is not the consequence —the rule or the categories —that he wishes to be kept stable but the procedure of keeping the thing in its purified state. He repeats the process rather than the consequence, which is exactly the contrary of the concierge's case. Montaya sticks with the process of creating the object of purity, however the concierge sticks with the system of classification.

> Just then Montaya came into the room. He started to smile at me, then he saw Pedro Romero with a big glass of cognac in his hand, sitting laughing between me and a woman with bare shoulders, at a table full of drunks. He did not even nod. (Hemingway, 2004:154).

We have so far argued that going back in history in the novel takes place as the setting changes from urban France to rural Spain, a change which divides the novel into two parts; the sections about France where the backward glance is organized so as to capture the frozen moment of glory not as a process but as a sum of consequences and the second part of the novel, the chapters dealing with the trip to Spain, the fiesta and bullfighting which presents a retrospection that focuses on the re-staging of the process of gaining victory over nature. Therefore the novel is separated into two sections with respect to retrospection. Each section has its backwards glance with its own differentiated features; the Paris section focuses on the consequences of the historical process and tends to repeat it, the other, Spain section, tends to repeat and dramatize the process. The part of the novel related to the narration of the events in Spain presents the bullfighting game and the event of the fiesta as a form of carnival which gives pleasure in the same way as a horror film does by creating the effect of catharsis upon the audience. Bullfighting therefore is a ritual giving people the opportunity to re-experience the same feeling whenever it is staged. It is a sort of addiction to the repetition of the same feeling of horror that makes bullfighting a ritualized from of entertainment. For example some of the audience, in order to re-experience the sensation of being under threat, run ahead of the bull after the bulls are free in the bullring, and one of them is attacked and killed by the bull.

> There were so many people running ahead of the bulls that the mass thickened and slowed up going through the gate into the ring, and as the bulls passed, galloping together, heavy, muddy-sided, horns swinging, one shot ahead, caught a man in the running crowd in the back and lifted him in the air. (Hemingway, 2004:170)

Later on the reader is informed through a newspaper report that the man who has been killed in the habit of attending the fiesta each year ever since being married. Therefore attending the fiesta is a way to break the routine and repeating the same sensation of terror each year as a carnival is a temporary divergence from everyday routine. Brett (Lady Ashley), contrary to others' speculations as to how she may react, watches the scene of the bull's killing the horse keenly:

> 'How about the horses?'
> 'I couldn't help looking at them.'[Brett]
> 'She couldn't take her eyes of them,' Mike said. 'She is an extraordinary wench.' (Hemingway, 2004:143).

On the other hand fiesta and the sensation it recalls remind Jake of the war. Unlike Spanish audience which watches the bullfighting and remembers the previous bullfighting experience due to the identical emotions they recall, Jake associates the bullfighting and the feeling it recalls with his own war experience:

> It was like certain dinners I remember from the war. There was much wine, an ignored tension, and a feeling of things coming that you could not prevent happening. Under the wine I lost the disgusted feeling and was happy. It seemed they were all such nice people (Hemingway, 2004:127).

Just like the Spanish audience who especially take part in the event of the fiesta in order to repeat the same sensation every year, Jake, while watching the bullfighting game repeats his own feelings that emerged during the war. The repetition of the same game of bullfighting in order to repeat the sense of terror brings us back to Freud's argument in "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". Repetition in this case leads to an indirect yield of pleasure. Freud takes his example from child behaviour:

> We are therefore left in doubt as to whether the impulse to work over in the mind some overpowering experience so as to make oneself master of it can find expression as a primary event, and independently of the pleasure principle. For, in the case we have been discussing, the child may, after all, only have been able to repeat his unpleasant experience in play because the repetition carried along with it a yield of pleasure of another sort but none the less a direct one (Freud, 1985:286).

Fussell in his study The Great War and Modern Memory detects the tendency to perceive two juxtaposed traumatic experiences in terms of the former experience. According to Fussell war memoirs disclose the fact that the experience of the Second World War, a new experience is integrated into the experience of the First World War.

> The act of fighting a war becomes something like an unwitting act of conservative memory, and even of elegy. The soldiers dwell not just on the preceding war but on the new idyllic period before the present war as well. For him, the present is too boring or exhausting to think of, and future too awful. He stays in the past. Thus the personal style found appropriate for the earlier war will usually be one adopted for the new one, at least during its early stages. (Fussell, 1975:314)

Therefore the fact that the bullfighting takes a ritualized form has to do with the tendency to perceive the new awe-inspiring experience in terms of previous experiences. In this sense the book approaches Fusell's argument in the book Great War and Modern Memory which claims that war becomes mythified thanks to memory and the way the new sensation is integrated into the old one. Fussell refers to the theory of E.D. Hirsch while explaining how certain images and motifs in war literature gain their mythic, everlasting form:

> No one would ever invent or understand a new type of meaning unless he were capable of perceiving analogies and making novel subsumptions under previously known types….. By an imaginative leap the unknown is assimilated to the known, and something genuinely new is realized. (Fussell, 1977:139)

Fussell's argument is close to Freud's argument in Beyond the Pleasure Principle. Freud in this essay argues that the organism tends to achieve its final goal by death. "Conservative instincts", in that sense, are resistant to new experience and try to achieve death, the final goal, by preventing the external stimuli that would come with the new experience. Therefore "conservative instincts" try to protect samples of previous external stimuli stored up in the brain and categorize the new experience of external stimuli in terms of the previous experiences.

> They [conservative instincts] are conservative in the same sense as the other instincts in that they bring back earlier states of living substance; but they are conservative to a higher degree in that they are peculiarly resistant to external influences; and they are conservative too in another sense in that they preserve life itself for a comparatively long period (Freud, 1985:313).

When Freud's argument is transferred to the social plane, Fussell's argument can be interpreted that The Second World War, which is a new experience that excites new stimuli in a society, will be perceived and reflected in terms of the tradition and the myth of a previous war.

If we turn back to the carnival in general and fiesta in particular we can see every event of carnival and bullfighting as a repetition of earlier forms. The bullfighting audience aims to repeat the same sensation every year. When bullfighting is considered not in its representative function as a sports activity but in its literal and initial meaning, which is humans' endeavour to bend nature to their will, we can consider it as an "external stimulus" in Freudian terms. But when it is considered as a symbolic re-staging that represents human's endeavour to conquer nature, it is not an "external stimulus" anymore, because its samples have already been stored in the brain, and it provides a "protective shield" that prevents the perception of an unaccustomed excitation that would cause a trauma. That is to say, when the struggle with nature, which is the exact and initial event causing excitement, is repeated in a game-like fashion it turns out to provide "a crust" as Freud puts it:

> It would be easy to suppose, then, that as a result of the ceaseless impact of external stimuli on the surface of the vesicle, its substance

> to a certain depth may have become permanently modified, so that excitatory processes run a different course in it from what they run in the deeper layers. A crust would thus be formed which would at last have been so thoroughly "baked through" by stimulation that it would present the most favourable possible conditions for the reception of stimuli and become incapable of any further modification. (Freud, 1985:297)

The fiesta and the bullfighting can be considered an external excitation because they diverge from the usual order of stability. On the one hand, both the fiesta and the bullfighting are against the conservative instincts since they cause an unusual amount of excitation, but on the other hand, they are in the service of conservative instincts because of their repetitious character and their tendency to turn to earlier forms. Therefore, the fiesta and bullfighting aim to bring about the organism's final shape, which is death. In that respect they serve as a "short circuit" to the last form, which will terminate the organism's life. And on the other hand by being repetitious fiesta and carnival always aim to reach an earlier state and by so doing they detain the organism on its way to death, which is its final shape, through a "short circuit". By bringing death through short circuit due to the unaccustomed amount of external stimuli it reveals and by delaying death due to its repetitious and backwards movement the fiesta is both in the service of an earlier death reached through a short circuit and in the service of the organism's ending its life by completing its normal course, which terminates with organism's turning back to its "inanimate state". Freud claims that all instincts are "component" in that they serve to advance the organism's path to death because the aim of life is to turn to an inanimate state, in other words the aim of life is to turn to beginning after following the course of life.

> Seen in this light, the theoretical importance of the instincts of self preservation, of self assertion and of mastery greatly diminishes. They are component instincts whose function is to assure that the organism shall follow its own path to death, and to ward off any possible ways of returning to inorganic existence other than those which are immanent in the organism itself […..] What we are left with is the fact that the organism wishes to die only in its own fashion. Thus these guardians of life, too, were originally the myrmidons of death (Freud, 1985:311-312).

Bakhtin's definition of carnival is in coherence with Freud's system. According to Bakhtin carnival is on the one hand a challenge to the status quo and stability because it means "constant renewal", and on the other hand it is located strictly within the natural cylicity of life. In other words, Bakhtinian carnival is both repetitious — its order is determined by natural cylicity— and challenging because it a sort of divergence from the order. To put it in Freudian terms carnival works as an external stimulus that hastens death and, because it is based on the folkloric roots, it tends to go back to earlier forms.

> The feast is always essentially related to time; either to the recurrence of an event in the natural (cosmic) cycle, or to biological or historic timeliness. Moreover, through all the stages of historic development feasts were linked to moments of crisis, of breaking points in the cycle of nature or in the life of society and man. Moments of death and revival, of change and renewal always led to a festive perception of the world (Bakhtin, 2002: 198-199).

The description of the fiesta in the novel reveals the element of stability along with a return to earlier forms and a kind of external stimulus that hastens the return to a previous pre-fiesta state of the characters. The novel reveals these two supposedly contradictory movements through characters' experiences; on the one hand the novel categorizes a character's role by referring to an earlier state in the process of civilization, and on the other hand the characters consider this return to an earlier state as a challenge to their present state, which is ironically not very different from their earlier role. Therefore carnival in the book is initially represented as characters' returning into an earlier state in their lives, a return which is considered a challenge, a test, and expressed as a nightmarish experience by them, and the characters' endeavour to return to their pre-fiesta state in France

If the internal relations within the group partaking in the activity of the fiesta are considered it becomes clear that carnival does not set free but solidifies and eternalizes. It solidifies the character Brett as a female idol to be danced around, it solidifies Jake's role as the protector, and it solidifies the other male characters of the group as competitors for the love of the idol, just as cinema freezes and eternalizes Rosemary as the symbol of purity and the role of the audience as the

protectors of purity. In that respect, what is frozen and solid during the fiesta is considered an external stimulus challenging the stability and the continuity of the characters' roles in France. Therefore the carnival presented in the book is in coherence with Bakhtin's definition of the carnival in the sense that it is a divergence from everyday reality. It is true that it is a divergence from the characters' usual order in France. In this respect, carnival is opposed to what Freud defines as conservative instincts because it is a challenge for characters who want to turn to their stable lives in France after the fiesta. Nevertheless the fiesta in the book also celebrates the fixity and the constancy of several roles because it eternalizes roles such as the bullfighter as the concrete and eternal symbol of purity and courage. In that respect carnival in general and the fiesta in particular is the expression of a tendency to return to earlier forms. During the fiesta the male members of the group (Cohn, Mike, Jake, Bill and the bullfighter Romero added afterwards) compete with each other for the love of Brett and her role as an idol is emphasized by Hemingway in an elaborate scene of dancing and feasting:

> Some dancers formed a circle around Brett and started to dance. They wore big wreaths of white garlics around their necks. They took Bill and me by the arms and put us in the circle. Bill started to dance too. They were all chanting. Brett started to dance but they did not want her to. They wanted her as an image to dance around (Hemingway, 2004:135).

Moreover the carnival in the book also presents the solidified myth of courage and purity through the character bullfighter Romero. He is depicted as a character of immense courage, honesty and purity. He refrains from using the old tricky methods of other bullfighters and he is depicted as a solitary, dignified, detached figure in his room with his bullfighting clothes on. This is how Jake the narrator describes him and compares and distinguishes him from the other bullfighters:

> Romero never made any contortions, always it was straight and pure and natural in line. The others [other bullfighters] twisted themselves like corkscrews, their elbows raised, and leaned against the flanks of the bull after his horns had passed, to give a faked look of danger (Hemingway, 2004:145).

> He [Pedro Romero] was standing, straight and handsome and altogether by himself, alone in the room with the hangers on as we shut the door (Hemingway, 2004:142).

Thus carnival imposes types and preserves myths and shapes everything so as to fit into a traditional and equally safe idealized form. For that reason, a carnival is also in the service of what Freud describes as "conservative instincts". Carnival, as it is presented in the book, is also opposed to conservative instincts which incure pleasure by conformity to stability. The fiesta is against stability since it is a challenge for the characters; it oppresses those involved in the group's activity. For example, Pedro Romero does not want to speak English when he is in the company of Spaniards not to oppose the idea of a dignified bullfighter:

> 'You know English well.'
> 'Yes' he [Romero] said. 'Pretty well, sometimes. But I must not let anybody know. It would be very bad, a *torero* who speaks English.' (Hemingway 2004: 162).

He is also disapproved of by his Spanish friends when his relation with the short –haired Brett is understood. After being involved in a love-affair with Romero Brett speaks as follows:

> 'It was rather a knock his being ashamed of me. He [Romero] was ashamed of me for a while, you know.'
> 'No'
> 'Oh, yes. They ragged him about me at the café, I guess. He wanted me to grow my hair out. Me, with long hair. I'd look so like hell.' (Hemingway, 2004:212).

The carnival also solidifies Jake's role as the protector of sacred objects. He gains a pass to the bullfighter Pedro's chambers by being an *aficionado*. Montaya the hotel keeper introduces Jake to Pedro Romero thanks to his role as an aficionado. Moreover it is Jake to whom Montaya reveals the secret that Romero was invited by the American ambassador and it is Jake who suggests to Montaya that he should not inform Pedro Romero of the invitation. Jake also plays the role of a dependable man when he is in the company of his American friend. He is exempted from competing

with them on the issue of Brett Ashley. His impotence in this case gives him a free pass in his close relation with Brett. Jake's role as protector oppresses him just as Romero's role as a man of dignity oppresses Romero. Whenever Jake is involved in an activity on his own, and whenever he wants to get rid of time tables, he is reminded of the date and the duty by a telegram coming from a friend who is in need of aid. Once he goes on a fishing trip to Burguete with Bill and Harris (an Englishman they met on their fishing trip and who is much loved by Jake and Bill) and reminded of the date by a telegram sent by Mike (Brett's husband) informing the date they will arrive. Towards the end of the book when Jake is all alone on the beach he is once more reminded of his duty as a protector by a telegram coming from Brett: "COULD YOU COME HOTEL MONTANA MADRID AM RATHER IN TROUBLE BRETT" (Hemingway 2004:209). Thus is like a masquerade during which each member wears a worn-out mask and at the end of which each mask sticks to the face of the participant. The reader is informed that neither is Brett an aristocratic idol nor is Romero the dignified bullfighter. Brett was a V.A.D nurse taking her title from her husband whom she nursed in the hospital during the war and by whom she was tortured afterwards, and Romero is not a bullfighter whom people serve but a waiter who learned English while he was working.

Audience at the bullfight is similar to those who watch Rosemary as "the father's girl" on the cinema screen in order to feel the same sensation and excitement over Rosemary's "naïve" beauty whenever they watch the same movie. Thus just like a cinematic experience the carnival, while giving the opportunity for the audience to have the same sensation during the act of watching, it stabilizes the value system. Both the modern and old forms of carnival are not a diversion from control mechanisms but a way of re-inscribing them by recalling and repeating the emotions, however different the techniques may be. Hemingway recalls the sensation of historical frozenness and the inability to dissociate oneself from a massive carnivalesque flux by referring to the image of the glacier twice in the sections about Spain. Jake goes on fishing trip to Burguese with Bill and refers to the book he has been reading.

> The book was something by A.E. W. Mason, and I was reading a wonderful story about a man who had been frozen in the Alps and then fallen into a glacier and disappeared, and his bride was going to wait twenty-four years exactly for his body to come out on the moraine, while her true love waited too, and they were still waiting when Bill came up. (Hemingway, 2004:105).

It is the frozen state of roles and certain emotions that the carnivalesque relies on and it is this fixity that forms the basis of a carnival. However active it might seem, the movement in fiesta is one –directional and aims at the community's repetitive action. People during the fiesta move in the same direction, and the members of the audience are not distinguished from each other as individuals. In this respect carnival and the roles it ascribes are like the idea of eternal love mentioned in the book Jake is reading. Carnival, as it is represented in the book, does not submit to change but retains its existence as an "idea" in the platonic sense. Like the glacier which freezes the lover and the love relationship, carnival requires a one-directional movement and inscribes certain patterns of behaviour to protect abstract concepts such as love and courage. Hemingway refers to this glacier- like movement once more while he is describing the sport of bullfighting: "We could not make our way through but had to be moved with the whole thing, slowly, as a glacier, back to town." (Hemingway 2004:142) Therefore a modern carnival, as opposed to what Bakhtin argues, is not a divergence from acknowledged patterns of behaviour but a kind of communal act that reinforces conformity and preserves a frozen identity furthered by the myth. It serves authority because it offers whatever is necessary for the formation of the ideal state; it offers concrete exemplary idols, such as Romero the bullfighter, Brett the nurse, and Jake the protector for sustenance of an abstract, idealized state. Neither their role within their small group nor the small group's role within the larger community alters. A similar glacier- like scene in France places an emphasis on the unaltered roles of the group members within the massive flux. In France Brett and Jake are involved in a repetitious dancing scene. They cannot stop dancing, and they are unable to dissociate themselves because they are stuck in the crowd.

> The music stopped and we started toward the table where the count sat. Then the music started again and we danced. I looked at the

> count. He was sitting at the table smoking a cigar. The music stopped again.
> 'Let's go over.'
> Brett started toward the table. The music started and again we danced, tight in the crowd.
> [……..]
> 'Come on. Let's dance.' Brett said,
> We danced. It was crowded and close. (Hemingway, 2004:55-56)

Their position in the crowd connects this section in France with the fiesta section in Spain and underlines the similarity between the two sections, the former taking place in France, the latter taking place in Spain. Both of the sections in the novel introduce the same sense of being stuck in the crowd and having the obligation to adjust to the crowd's movement. And when these two sections are compared with respect to the character's role in the crowd the France section of the novel can be characterized by the characters' unchallenged identity in the crowd and the Fiesta (Spain) section can be characterized by the challenging of the characters' previous roles in France and their endeavour to protect and preserve the pre-fiesta identity. In other words, Spain and the fiesta can be characterized as sections that appear as a threat to the characters' identity in France. In that respect the false threat of carnival in Spain leads to the characters' endeavour to return to the previous secured stage in France.

As well as symbolizing stability and fixity of values, fiesta in the book represents the characters' encounter with a threat to their identity. In this respect the carnival in the book also includes a risk that reminds the characters that they will never be able to turn to their previous pre-fiesta lives. Most of the characters consider the fiesta stage a nightmare that will encapsulate and trap them and never let them return to their pre-fiesta states in Paris. Thus, as well as being in the service of stability by introducing recalcitrant roles, fiesta is an excitory process that appears as a threat to the characters. The threat is the possibility that they will never be able to go back to their previous selves and lives in France. Therefore the fiesta in the book coincides both with Freud's argument which claims that the final goal of life is death and the organism tries to achieve death not through a short circuit but delays it as much as possible. In this respect, the fiesta serves both as an excitory process by

appearing as a risk for the characters, and as an event that is in the service of conservative instincts by repeating and fixating identities and values. The fiesta in the book also coincides with Bakhtin's definition of carnival which represents renewal within the natural cyclicity just as the organism's goal is a natural death. How does the fiesta in the book represent a risk for the characters and serve as an excitory process for them?

When considered from the point of view of the Spanish crowd and Montaya the hotel keeper who feels responsible for the chastity of Romero the bullfighter, carnival is a phase during which the symbols of chastity, such as Romero, are presented and exposed to the public. Romero's relation with a bare-shouldered woman (Brett) and a drinking American crowd are considered threats to the chastity of Romero.

> Just then Montaya came into the room. He started to smile at me, them he saw Pedro Romero with a big glass of cognac in his hand, sitting laughing between me and a woman with bare shoulders, at a table full of drunks. He did not even nod. (Hemingway2004:153-154)

In this respect carnival and fiesta introduce the threat of losing something that is deemed sacred. When considered with respect to another idol, Brett, the carnival is a threat to her supposed mobility and polygamy. During the carnival she meets Romero the bullfighter, who asks her to grow her hair and bear children and live a settled life with him. This is a threat to Brett's supposed identity as a woman of mobility; the crowd in the carnival requires her to be stable and fixed as an idol is. The crowd dances around her as if she were an idol and expects her not to dance. Carnival for Brett introduces something she does not want to be:

> 'No. It wasn't that. He really wanted to marry me. So I [Brett] couldn't go away from him, he said. He [Romero] wanted to make it sure I could never go away from him. After I'd gotten more womanly, of course.' […….] 'I'm [Brett] thirty-four you know. I'm not going to be one of these bitches that ruins children.' (Hemingway, 2004: 212).

Therefore carnival presents a threat to the supposed identity of the character, and it obliges the character to protect this supposed identity. In this respect it

requires the character to react so as to protect and return to her/his former state. The characters during the fiesta go back to a state where their identity is tested. Brett faces a process in which she has to go over the process of becoming Brett again. Due to the threat the carnival introduces, the characters feel obliged to protect and return to their pre-fiesta states in France, where they do not have to prove their identity. In this respect, the fiesta is a threat to what they supposed themselves to be. Romero the bullfighter is made to re-constitute and prove his false identity as a man of courage by fighting with dignity, and Brett must re-gain and prove her supposed identity as an independent, immobile individual. Therefore carnival (Fiesta) is a threat to supposed identity and gives the participants the opportunity to repeat the procedure of forming and re-gaining their idealized states. In other words the fiesta provides the impetus to capture the unthreatened, secure and equally false state of continuity. Brett, Jake and Mike will turn to France and celebrate the security of the stable because fiesta is a temporary state which will surely end by reinforcing the safety of the ideal. In that respect carnival, by introducing the threat, induces the endeavour to protect the former state of the characters. Therefore carnival is considered a nightmare which seems pleasant when looked at retrospectively. All the group members (Bill, Mike, Jake, Brett) consider their fiesta experience as a sweet nightmare as Bill says at the end of the fiesta:

> 'Well, it was a swell fiesta.'
> 'Yes,' I said; 'something doing all the time.'
> 'You wouldn't believe it. It's like a wonderful nightmare' (Hemingway, 2004: 193).

The fiesta is a nightmare because it threatens the cherished security and stages the endeavour to re-form and re-capture this security, and it is a nightmare because it does not totally deprive the characters of security; the characters, after attempting to re-capturing and re-gain their supposed identities during the fiesta, will wake up to a France where their identities will be more assured, their ideals will be more concrete and stabilized. Therefore if we go back to the differentiation we have made between the countries as to the different ways of presenting their idols – France exposing the consequence and Spain exposing the procedure- Brett, Jake and the other members of the group experience how the ears of the bull are cut in a

symbolic fashion. In other words, they come to be under the threat of losing the sterility of stuffed animals and bearing the sight of bull's bleeding ears. Therefore the fiesta and Spain stage a procedure of formation in history and the France section shows a later stage where certain values and a class society have already been formed. This retrospection in history is repeated on the level of characters' formation. Just as the fiesta section symbolizes a procedure of formation in history – as the symbols of the bull's bleeding ears in the fiesta and the stuffed dogs in France show- the same section in fiesta also symbolizes a procedure of formation for the characters. During the fiesta the characters are all tested and are made to re-gain and re-capture their previous identities they had in France. They all wake up from the nightmare of fiesta during which they have to prove that they are what they think themselves to be. However the identities which are threatened and which they try to regain during the fiesta, which are the characters' pre-fiesta states, are not actually differentiated from those that are introduced during the fiesta as threats. In other words, the character's pre-fiesta identities and their fiesta roles are not very different from each other.

Therefore the threat of losing something that is supposed to be owned by the character is not a genuine risk. For instance, if we consider Brett's supposed identity as a polygamous, mobile woman more closely, we see that it does not signify a freely-made choice but a constant need for protection and security expected from males. Therefore even the personality – Brett's mobile state in France-that the characters want to re-capture during fiesta is a well- formed, fake personality. In that respect the character of the short-haired, polygamous and mobile Brett is similar to the character Nicole in Fitzgerald's Tender is the Night who seems to reject her husband's protection by having an affair with Tommy Barban and gain mobility and freedom by getting rid of high-heeled shoes and wearing espadrilles. Brett, like Nicole, asks for the approval of her protector (Jake) while looking for Romero the bullfighter and she equally looks for Jake's aid when she is rejected by the bullfighter for not being more "womanly". All of Brett's journeys are taken in the company of male characters as Jake the narrator implies several times.

> ‘Sure she went down to San Sebastian with him [Cohn].’
> ‘What a damn-fool thing to do. Why did she do that?’
> ‘She wanted to get out of town and she can’t go anywhere alone. She said she thought it would be good for him [Cohn]’ (Hemingway, 2004:89).

Brett goes to San Sebastian with Cohn, she goes to Pamplona with Mike and goes to Madrid with Romero, and she seeks the company of Jake while she is looking for Romero. On the other hand she also assumes the role of a protector throughout the novel. We are informed that she nursed Jake, from whom she gained eternal protection, and her husband, form whom she got the title “lady” and she nurses Romero when he is beaten by Cohn: “ ‘He feels very badly,’ Brett said.’ he should be in bed’” (Hemigway2004:185).

The last scene of the book testifies to our conviction that either in Spain or France the characters are in their acknowledged and recognized roles: Brett as the supported providing nursing when necessary and Jake as the eternal protector consulted and called in need of aid.

> I [Jake] put my arm around her [Brett] and she rested against me comfortably. It was very hot and bright, and the houses looked sharply white. We turned onto Gran Via.
> ‘Oh, Jake,’ Brett said, ‘we could have had such a damned good time together.’
> Ahead was a mounted policeman in khaki directing traffic. He raised his baton. The car slowed suddenly and pressed Brett against me.
> ‘Yes’ I said. ‘Isn’t it pretty to think so? (Hemingway 2004:216).

When Brett wants to protect her identity as a woman of mobility she lapses into the threatened state. She rejects Romero and his protection because she does not want to get married, give birth to children and lead a settled life; marriage and being a mother appears as a threat to her supposed identity. But when avoiding this threat she lapses into what she avoids. Instead of nursing children she nurses the male, and instead of the protection Romero offers she has Jake as a shield. Therefore what seems to be a nightmare for Brett (the fiesta and the possibility of getting married with Romero) leads back to a situation that she ordinarily experiences in the France section of the book. Carnival is just a more intensified and symbolic form of what

the characters really experience in their ordinary life in France. What they suppose to be nightmarish is the real state of affairs, and the ideal, which they consider as the reality and protect from being tainted, is the fictionalized and idealized form of what they suppose as a nightmare. Similarly Romero does not want to taint his identity as a bullfighter during the bullfighting but he is not a bullfighter but a waiter. What he saves by fighting is a fictional identity. Brett also does not want to fit into a conventional idea of woman who grow hair and give birth to children.

> 'I'm [Brett] thirty-four, you know. I'm not going to be one of those bitches that ruins children.'
> 'No.'
> 'I'm not going to be that way. I feel rather good, you know. I feel rather set up.'(Hemingway2004:213).
> […….]
> 'You know it makes me feel rather good deciding not to be a bitch.'
> 'Yes'
> 'It's sort of what we have instead of God.'(Hemingway, 2004:214).

When Brett is introduced to this possibility of being a mother after her affair with Romero she wants to break free and feels threatened. However, in her everyday life she in fact fulfills the conventional role ascribed to woman by being a dependant who is expected to nurse the male.

Therefore the threat of losing and the endeavour to protect the thing that the character thinks he/she will be deprived of is presented as a game. The characters live constantly under the threat of losing something which they have never had. Thus carnival feeds a belief that does not exist but which is necessary for the continuity of the community. Trying not to loose something that is supposed to have been owned but which does not exist in actuality is one of the thematic concerns that the historical retrospection in the book leads us to, and carnival is presented as one of the stages in that retrospection. It represents not the loosening of official authority but a moment of threat that can destroy an ideal state which has thought to have been captured. The characters keep on repeating the nightmare and face the risk of loosing what they have themselves created. Carnival (fiesta) then is the repetition of the nightmare, not the pleasurable as Harris, recalling his war experience, comments

after the fishing trip with Bill and Jake: "I've not had much fun since the war" (Hemingway, 2004:112). Thus retrospection in official history in the novel is presented as a former and a fearful stage which turns out to be pleasurable in retrospect. It is the repetition of the fearful that makes it pleasurable. It is fearful at the moment it is experienced, pleasurable at moments of reminiscence. The novel is especially based on a dichotomy between the moment of experiencing a sort of instability, which is the scene of the fiesta, and the threat of losing what has been so far formed, and the aftermath of the experience, the characters' choice of returning back to the stability of their expatriate lives in Paris. The return to stability, to a stage in which everything has already been formed and in which the characters are what they deem themselves to be is repeated on the plane of official history, where return to Paris signifies a return characterized by the concluded, frozen stability of civilization where victory is manifested not through the living symbols of victory such as Romero's upright, dignified posture after killing the bull but statues, such as Ney's statue in Paris, manifesting a victory once won, concluded and frozen. Therefore retrospection on the individual plane of characters' lives is also dealt with as a kind of retrospection in history. Therefore there is a historical retrospection from the perspective of industrialized and urban France to rural and unindustrialized Spain which is indicated through unasphalted roads and mule wagons.

Both the historical retrospection and retrospection in individual history are parallel in movement. They go backwards and introduce the danger of losing what is supposed to exist in the present. Both forms of retrospection introduce a threatening stage. In this regard it is Paris that is associated with stability and non-obscurity. While Jake is explaining his experience in France he hints at his contradictory experience in Spain.

> It felt comfortable to be in a country where it is so simple to make people happy. You can never tell whether a Spanish waiter will thank you. Everything is on such a financial basis in France. It is the simplest country to live in. No one makes things complicated by becoming your friend for any obscure reason (Hemingway, 2001:204).

The fact that Hemingway introduces retrospection as an unstable, threatening phase suggests similarities between the novel The Sun Also Rises and the novels of Fitzgerald. Hemingway introduces retrospection in history by using symbols. He reveals backwards movement not as an event in which the characters go to the past but as a game, a fiesta which symbolizes the setting of a prior stage in history. On the other hand, Fitzgerald, rather than employing symbols like Hemingway, goes backwards and gathers information about the past of the characters. In The Great Gatsby for instance we are introduced to Gatsby in his present condition and given information as to his past life, before he becomes The Great Gatsby. Similarly in Tender is the Night retrospection is achieved not through the use of symbols but by giving information about the past of the characters; it is through conversation that we understand what kind of an experience Nicole endured in her childhood and we are given information about how Dick's father as a priest became a model for Dick who is a prominent psychiatrist. Notwithstanding the incompatible ways they introduce retrospection, Hemingway and Fitzgerald are similar in their representation of the past as a haunting, unstable, threatening experience which can only be pleasurable in retrospection as "Englishman Harris" in The Sun also Rises talks about his war experience as a pleasurable event. However, the image of the past in both the novels of Hemingway and Fitzgerald, reflects a phase prior to the stable image of a present security; the past is a stage of crudity and it shows Gatsby before being Gatsby, Dick and Nicole before they become full-fledged images while in The Sun also Rises, we see a passage from the indeterminacy of values in Spain to the security and stability of values in France. Therefore in the novels of both writers, the past is a threat to the supposed security of the present. The retrospective gaze of Fitzgerald novels and the symbolic, backwards movement of Hemingway novels go back to a stage in the past that is constantly encountered by the characters, and this backwards movement introduces the threat of losing what has so far been compiled in the form of individual identities or collective values. In that respect the belief that the past is a former stage of the present is identical to what Bakhtin defines as "the spiritual and ideological dimension" of the feast. Carnival and feast are introduced as a kind of test that reinforces the mythified form of the present which is misconceived by the characters as if it were reality. The idealized state of the present

is a supposed reality for the characters. For example, Romero the waiter is tested during the fiesta once a year to see if he could prevent "Romero the bullfighter" from being tainted. Similarly, the fiesta also brings Brett to the verge of becoming "one of these bitches that ruins children" and growing her hair and becoming more "womanly" as Romero urges her to do. However we know that Brett can only be mobile and independent in the company of a male. So her independence, which she is trying to protect , is a fake identity; an ideal state threatened by being a part of the fiesta just like Romero's identity is, which is also an idealized form tested and renewed by Romero and the participants of fiesta. Therefore the novel also implies the fact idea what is consecrated and protected does not actually exist. Therefore the stimulus that the feast offers appears as a threat to the idea that is consecrated and it gives the impetus to protect and re-capture it. However this consecrated and mythified norm is not something very different from what appears to be the threat. And the struggle to keeping the ideal in its immune state, which is the process of the feast in the novel, is far from being pleasurable; it is fearful and painful as Bill suggests "It's like a wonderful nightmare"; a nightmare saying and repeating how painstaking the birth of myth was.

We have argued that carnival and fiesta in the case of The Sun also Rises, is far from being "a temporary suspension of all hierarchic distinctions and barriers among men and of certain norms and prohibitions of usual life" as Bakhtin argues on the issue of carnival. Instead of being a temporary divergence from everyday order, fiesta enhances the forms of usual life by introducing a fake crisis. It represents the idea that things can be lost during the process of testing and the fake crisis that introduces the repetition of supposed prior forms. In this respect, Gatsby's parties in The Great Gatsby, where Gatsby is not actually recognized but has an omnipotent existence, and Dick's parties, where Dick is constantly visible as a central point around which the crowd gathers, all introduce us to forms of carnival which threaten to reveal the secret past of the central character. Therefore they are points where the threat is looming. For example, Nicole's "madness" is revealed during a party scene in Tender is the Night and information about Gatsby is gathered during a party scene. Therefore the party and the fiesta are threats that represent the resurrection of

the past, and they are the initial points of revealing and re-experiencing the formation of the characters' present statuses. As experiences they are not pleasurable at the time they actually took place but they are pleasurable at the time they are thought of as painful experiences.

This kind of representation of the carnival as a crisis and as a threat makes the experience of carnival closer to the arguments about the experience of war. As Mike's words reveal on being reminded of Harris, a war comrade of Mike's in The Sun also Rises, the war is a crisis that is remembered as a pleasurable experience.

> 'Named Harris,' Bill said. 'Ever know him, Mike? He was in the war, too.'
> 'Fortunate fellow,' Mike said. 'What times we had. How I wish those dear days were back.'
> 'Don't be an ass.' (Hemingway, 2004:117).

Like the event of carnival, which is represented as a nightmare beautiful in retrospection, war is also represented as a nightmare pleasurable in retrospection in The Sun also Rises. In his essay Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Freud refers to the pleasure of remembering in his patients:

> Patients repeat all of these unwanted situations and painful emotions in the transference and revive them with the greatest ingenuity […..]None of these things can have produced pleasure in the past, and it might be supposed that they would cause less unpleasure to-day if they emerged as memories or dreams instead of taking the form of fresh experiences (Freud, 1985:291-292)

In addition to being pleasurable in retrospect, like the fiesta, war is a test to establish whether the participants can return to a state which is "sacred" and "pure". War is a matter of loss or gaining a state of bliss back, and like the fiesta a war always leads to the question whether there is really anything sacred, secure and stable that can be re-captured. Due to this resemblance between the scene of carnival where values and reliability are put into test and the war, which is a test of courage and which, when lost, would lead to the shattering of what has previously been formed, we argue that Hemingway uses the fiesta as the symbol of war, which seems

blissful in retrospect. The book represents both the fiesta and the war as a matter of losing and going back to a "crude" unmoulded stage or winning and returning back home where it is supposed that things remain unchanged. In that sense going back home to Paris for the characters is the removal of anxiety that the experience of the bullfighting and fiesta cause. However, when the fiesta comes to an end Jake the narrator stays another week and revisits Bayonne and San Sebastian; an act which tends to repeat the unpleasurable event and remember it as pleasurable.

> It was the same room I had slept in when Bill and Cohn and I were in Bayonne. That seemed a very long time ago. I washed, changed my shirt, and went out in the town. (Hemingway, 2004: 203).

In a similar fashion the characters who have taken part in the war visit the trenches after the war in Tender is the Night. Therefore the removal of the anxiety of the war or the carnival and the removal of the threat does not signify beginning anew and going on as if the rupture hadn't taken place. The anxiety is re-shaped as the characters turn backwards and try to experience the same anxiety over and over as Lady Ashley suggests in a very condensed repetitive dancing scene in Paris.

> I had the feeling as in a nightmare of it all being something repeated, something I had been through and that now I must go through again (Hemingway, 2004: 56).

During this speech Lady Ashley is involved in a repetitious dancing with Jake; they cannot sit down because it is too crowded to move and go to their seats. They are obliged to dance to the rhythm of the music which does not cease. This is a very condensed scene representing the activity of Jake and Brett all through the book, because all through the novel Brett and Jake move in tune with the movement of their own group and to the rhythm of the fiesta, "like a glacier" as Jake the narrator suggests, and that is what gives their repetitious movement a collective quality.

Even if every character is provided with an individual history, Hemingway's emphasis is on a scene of collective backwards movement in order to see how the

characters' process of formation is repeated and how it is manifested. In that respect The Sun also Rises is similar to A Farewell to Arms which makes reference to the collective movement of the community in The First World War, and presents open-ended stories of characters met haphazardly, although the novel is based on the story of Catherine and Henry. Therefore the novel, by staging a backwards movement to the formation of myth, presents a collective tendency to capture some initial or original moment. However, by making Romero a waiter who tries to re-capture the title of "the bullfighter" that does not actually exist, and by making aristocratic Lady Ashley, who is treated as a female idol during the fiesta, a dependant woman tortured by her ex-husband, Hemingway refers to a thwarted non-existent origin. Neither is Brett a female idol nor is Romero a mythical character of courage and dignity. Therefore the idea of returning to an original state is nullified in Hemingway's novel. While the original is nullified, what we see in Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms and The Sun Also Rises as a "discursive regularity" is an ironic approach towards the myth. There is an attempt to capture and re-experience the myth by the war-torn characters of Hemingway but what is encountered by all of them is the fact that such a myth and the essence is not to be found.

The narrator of A Farewell to Arms, while trying to experience the myth of ever-lasting love with Catherine, a V.A.D nurse, in a bucolic Swiss cottage returns from a modern hospital where he loses Catherine and the baby. Jake, the narrator of The Sun Also Rises, is the central character during the fiesta; he has the role of protecting the sacred object of the American group, which is Lady Ashley, and he is also given the role of "man of confidence" by the Spanish. Montaya, the hotel keeper, chooses him as his confidant and pays him respect due to his being an *aficionado*, a real lover of bullfighting. However, Jake loses his central role as "a man of confidence" and as a genuine aficionado when he introduces Brett (Lady Ashley) to Romero (The bullfighter), two figures considered sacred by the Americans and the Spanish. Jake is beaten by Cohn and called a pimp, and Montaya averts his eyes and changes his attitude towards Jake when he sees Romero in the company of Lady Ashley because he played an active part in the meeting of these two sacred objects. Jake who is considered to be genuine by both of the parties is no

longer considered a suitable confidant. In the end Jake, the man of confidence and genuinity finds himself alone with Lady Ashley in a taxi. In actuality Jake is not a secret sharer; he is a journalist, not a point where secrets are kept but an agent from whom the secrets are delivered. In that respect the book signifies the collapse of what is considered to be an original state. In that respect the novel assumes an ironic approach to the myth by emphasizing the fact that the myth is not an original state to be captured but a creation which is supposed to have taken place and which the characters try to repeat. The novel shows a state of affairs in which the post-war is associated with the "demonic imagery" of the myth so as to show a passage from "high-mimetic" in Frye's terms, which calls forth the mode of epic and tragedy where characters are capable of an activity that is greater than ours and a transition towards "ironic" where "we have the sense of looking down on a scene of bondage, frustration or absurdity." (Fussell 1977:311). In The Sun Also Rises we look at a "scene of bondage, frustration and absurdity" because whom we read about is a group of expatriate characters who have a myth in their minds while struggling to capture what they believe to be the essence. While they are struggling to re-capture the essence the reader sees the collapse of the holistic idea of an origin.

At the beginning of this section we referred to Frye's classification of novel into three stages as "myth and romance in the early stages; high- low mimetic in the middle stages; ironic in the last stage" and his classification of the modern novel in what he calls ironic stage. According to Frye the modern novel is ironic in the sense that it both refers to myth and "sacrificial rituals" in which "dying gods began to reappear" and the ideal is re-introduced, and on the other hand the characters are inhibited and absurd in their inactivity. As Fussell suggests, the characters of the postwar novel designate such a transition. It uses the myth in an ironic way so as to show human bondage and forms a "renewed body of rituals and myth" in return.

> These memoirs are especially worthy of the closest examination because, for all the blunt violence they depict, they seem so delicately transitional, pointing at once in two opposite directions – back to the low mimetic, forward to the ironic and-most interestingly – to that richest kind of irony proposing, or at least recognizing, a renewed body of rituals and myth (Fusell, 1977: 312).

Where Hemingway's novel is concerned, we can say that the renewed body of rituals and myth is derived from the old. However, Hemingway does not use myth in order to say that myth is itself the original, an emphasis that shows how absurd what really happens is when compared to the essence. He rejects the dichotomy between the essence and the real. Hemingway defies the existence of the essence, and what makes his novels absurd is not a dichotomy between the origin and the real but the fact that the characters are all struggling to find an origin where there is no origin. That's why the novels — both The Sun Also Rises and A Farewell to Arms — present the war and the bullfighting as procedures after which victory is expected to be won and the essence captured; in other words, they are chronotopes, in Bakhtinian terms, that are supposed to re-capture the essence of things. However it is impossible to capture the essence that is non-existent. Both in the trenches and in the fiesta there is a fiction that is considered an essence initially and defied later on: Henry is not the faithful lover nor is he the courageous soldier; Jake is neither the eternal protector of gods and nor is he the confidant but a journalist. Brett is not an idol that the people consecrate by dancing around but an extremely dependant woman who is mobile and aristocratic thanks to the male characters around her. Therefore a regular theme in Hemingway's novels is a quest for an origin that does not exist; a quest for the sake of which the characters move. Therefore Hemingway implies the fact that there is not an original moment of emergence that is collective and universal. What is stable is the fact that there is a quest for the original; a quest to capture a moment at which things can be found in their original state, and this is a quest similar to that of Henry in A Farewell to Arms, to that of Jake and Brett in The Sun also Rises in the sense that they are staged at a moment where Henry is challenged in his choice of going to war and where Brett, Jake and Romero the bullfighter are challenged. These two settings such as the war and the carnival do not go back to a time of re-birth as Bakhtin suggests in his definition of carnival but to a time where the already-formed is stable.

Therefore Hemingway, by challenging the existence of a stable, secure origin and a moment of collective emergence, is in tune with Foucault who claims, in his

essay “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History” that a quest for origin is futile because history does not evolve simply by connecting certain occurrences to certain causes but through “minute deviations” that are ignored by the traditional historian. Foucault considers history not as a “glacier” that has a definite beginning and end, promising security to the individual but as “an unstable assemblage of faults, fissures, and heterogeneous layers that threaten the fragile inheritor from within or underneath” (Foucault 1991:82). Foucault refers to Nietzsche in his claim that an original does not exist:

> Why does Nietzsche challenge the pursuit of the origin (Ursprung), at least on those occasions when he is truly a genealogist? First, because it is an attempt to capture the exact essence of things, their purest possibilities, and their carefully protected identities; because this research assumes the existence of immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession. This search is directed to “that which was already there, “the image of a primordial truth fully adequate to its nature, and it necessitates the removal of every mask to ultimately disclose an original identity [……] not a timeless and an essential secret. But the secret that they have no essence or that their essence is fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms (Foucault, 1991:78).

Of course our concern is not history but fiction. Therefore Hemingway, in his novels might reveal a sense of history that is disconnected and that has no stable origin, and he might be close to Foucault in his conception of history, but as a modernist novelist Hemingway also creates a fiction that tends to favor a certain attitude in his perception of post-war identities and circumstances. Hemingway might be challenging a kind of continuous history but, as Frye suggests, he reinforces the creation of a post-war discourse that imposes a certain kind of myth on individual and his/her post-war catastrophe. In this respect, in his ironic presentation of individual, Hemingway is not aloof from the myth but strictly connected to a tradition that created a myth.

CONCLUSION

This text, which includes a study of The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night, by F. Scott Fitzgerald and A Farewell to Arms and The Sun Also Rises by Ernest Hemingway, can be considered an interpretive study that aims to focus on several aspects of the novels in terms of a disparity between M.M. Bakhtin and Michel Foucault, two twentieth - century critics.

Although Michel Foucault and Mikhail Bakhtin have been influential in different fields and Foucault's theories are mainly based on power relations and scientific discourse while Bakhtin developed a systematic approach specifically to the genre of novel, this has not become an obstacle for me, because the application of a critical theory to a literary text is not exactly what I aimed to do. The theories of these critics are included in this study as two discrepant social views, and the conflict between these two irreconcilable social views are dealt with in their relation to modernism and the novels we chose for this study. Why then has this conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault become indispensable to this study, which aims to look more closely at postwar novels written within the modernist movement? In other words, what is the relation of the conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault to the war and the post-war texts?

Before starting this study I had not the least notion that the discrepancy between Bakhtin and Foucault would highlight a central contradiction between two major philosophers: a Hegelian dialectic that aims to reach at a higher unity and a Nietzschean refutation of dialectic duality and focus on multiple separations and divergences instead of unities. I was particularly attracted by the Bakhtinian sense of polyphony in the novel and Foucault's ideas on the proliferation of discourse, but I was taken unawares as to the fact that these two theoreticians contradict each other even on the most basic level of the constitution of their theories. I was also unaware that the conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault would be central to an argument about the modernist novel.

Bakhtin's theory of criticism can be understood in terms of Hegel. Bakhtin's method of literary interpretation echoes Hegel in its concern with the "other" and "I". Bakhtin's ideas on aesthetics are largely influenced by Hegelian philosophy. Bakhtin carries Hegelian dialectic to the plane of aesthetics and literature, and transforms Hegel's dialectic struggle between "being for self" and "being for others" into a struggle between "I for myself" and "I for the other", the outcome of which is a higher unity and a higher consciousness (Hegel, 2001:631). Bakhtin's concerns with characterization can serve as a counter argument to those of Foucault. Foucault refutes the idea that such a supposed bipolar struggle defines the character and identifies him/her within a higher unity. From a Foucauldian perspective the supposition that a bipolar struggle between centralizing and decentralizing tendencies exists is itself a vehicle that reinforces a more complicated technology of power. The outcome of such a dialectic struggle (dialogic in Bakhtinian terminology) is not self -consciousness or architectonics as Bakhtin and Hegel define them, but the forming of a discourse that renews itself and shapes the individual, who is subjected to the modern technologies of power. However, this does not bring out a conclusion that Foucault has a deterministic attitude about the individual and his subjection to a power mechanism. Foucault argues that every site of power defines also a site of resistance and a counterdiscourse but the definition of a countermovement does not take place within a dialectical struggle. Thus according to Foucault it is not the dialectical struggle between "I" and "the other" that is supposed to define the individual but a power struggle that is not bipolar. Instead of binary oppositions, Foucault offers multiple separations as a part of power struggle. Foucault echoes Nietzsche in arguing that the essential thing is not the making of the whole as Bakhtin suggested, but the disintegration of the whole. If we think in terms of the novels, it is not the struggle between centrifugal and centripetal forces that endows characters with consciousness, since there is not a centre from which the centralizing and the decentralizing emanate from, but rather the collapse and disintegration of unities and fragmentation that defines the character within a postwar context. According to Foucault, it is impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between the centripetal and the centrifugal, and the novels do not reach heteroglossia through the struggle of two forces (official and unofficial), because the

novels do not reveal a discourse that can be identified either as centripetal or centrifugal. What I detected in the novels is an interweavement of several discourses instead of the bifurcation (or unity) between the official and the unofficial.

The novels I have studied are all considered a part of the modernist movement. The novels unveil the characters' separation from the group and their physical or psychic dismemberment. The novels stage the individual's gradual separation from the group and the reality that the unities represent. Dick in Tender is the Night is a character who experiences such a gradual separation from group identity and from his own idea of perfection. Gatsby is also separated from the holistic idea of past when he is detached from the figure of Benjamin Franklin. Henry in A Farewell to Arms is snatched away from the cause of the war and the group of soldiers and attached to the private ideal of forming a family and settling. The novel ends in the nullification of both the idea of war and the idea of family, two ready-made wholes that shape the society. Hemingway concludes the novel with the nihilation of societal forms, and disintegration of ready-made wholes.

Therefore rather than a Bakhtinian and Hegelian bipolarity that leads to whole-making, the novels are in the trend of a Foucauldian and Nietzschean tendency to disintegrate the wholes and challenge the way the wholes are constituted.

Another issue that is central to Bakhtin and Foucault contradiction is again central to modernism. Modernism's pre-occupation with the concept of time in terms of rupture and discontinuity rather than a continuous process that follows a cause and effect relationship finds its resonance in the novels. All the novels we have studied follow the tendencies of the modernist movement, and they are all published in an era that encompasses the decade between 1925 and 1935, the years after the First World War (1914-1918). The texts exhibit certain common characteristics. First and foremost, the novels display a movement that is not progressive but retrogressive. They are either too pre-occupied with the past of the characters or diverge from the progressive numerical operations of calendar time and exhibit a

backwards movement or fixations within the continuity. For instance, The Great Gatsby and Tender is the Night are exemplary in the sense that the determining element in the present is the characters' fixations in the past, and The Sun also Rises and The Great Gatsby display a retrogressive movement in history by endowing spaces with symbolic significance. In A Farewell to Arms the characters are deprived of spatial and temporal location. The characters have no ancestral ties that would identify them, and they also have no sense of belonging. Throughout the novel they try to form family ties, and they struggle to find a space to settle, a struggle which is nullified at the end of the novel. Therefore all the novels are concerned with historical and spatial displacement. Fitzgerald's characters are all fixated at a moment in the past, and they endeavour to re-create that moment that is supposed to be pleasurable.

The conflict between Bakhtin and Foucault is central to this sort of a pre-occupation with time. Bakhtin's concern with time can be seen from two perspectives. In his approach to texts, Bakhtin determines several spatio-temporal moments, which he calls chronotope, each belonging to a different moment in the history of the novel. Bakhtin approaches a text in terms of chronotopes which characterize the aesthetic visualization of the image of human in terms of space and time. In other words, the image of the human is characterized by his relation to time and space in the novel. In addition to this, Bakhtin's approach to the novel genre is determined by tracing the historical transformation of a text. That is, Bakhtin's categorization requires a linear approach that assumes a historical juxtaposition and takes a continuous and gradual mutation for granted.

Foucault, on the other hand, disrupts this developmental sense of history and he opposes categorizations that are based on a kind of stratification that takes gradual modifications for granted. According to Foucault, it is useless to look for origins of historical phenomena because events are not tied to each other in a cause and effect relationship. In other words, such a sense of continuity is itself a retrospective projection. To look for origins, according to Foucault, is to create an origin and strengthen the biased cause and effect relationship; it is to re-create an

unbroken continuity. Foucault focuses on the non-identical, on the divergent and on the transient. In his approach to history Foucault follows a Nietzschean trend by rejecting the idea of an unbroken continuity and adopting a Nietzschean focus on deviation and rupture.

The novels deal with a discontinuous sense of time arranged in terms of ruptures, fixations, repetitions and fragments. For example, although A Farewell to Arms exhibits a natural flux and alteration through the use of natural imagery, Henry's perception of time and his way of gathering the events are in a fragmentary fashion, which is conveyed through the imagery of broken lights that are projected onto a surface, a long carpet that is worn-out in some places, the clicking of a lift, devastated farm houses on the road that challenge the integrity of the family idyll, fragments of human beings whose stories enter in some level into the plot and stories of some characters that has no beginning and no end. The Sun Also Rises coheres strictly with a modernist conception of time that can be identified as ruptured. After dealing with the flux of an expatriate life in France, Hemingway conveys his characters to the Spanish fiesta in Pamplona, a change of setting that challenges the characters' idea of self. In this novel Hemingway uses the image of a glacier to refer a sense of fixation. Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby focuses on a sense of history that is pastiched and fictional, and conveys this perception of history within the novel by using the image of a house, Gatsby's house, that is a newly-built "eye-sore" imitating the features of a colonial mansion. The rooms stage certain periods in history within a house, which seems like cardboard. In addition to this, as the novel advances, it is implied that what all the characters rely on as a secure point in their past lives is just a fiction. In The Great Gatsby, past and present are dealt with not in terms of cause and effect relationship as a continual flux of events following each other but as fixations and ruptures.

Along with the contradiction between Bakhtin and Foucault our study deals with the novels in terms of the war experience. Then our question becomes, what is the relationship between the experience of The First World War and the post-war literature? In dealing with the war Paul Fussell's study on the relationship between

post-war memoirs and the war provided us with the necessary insight into the war, the shaping of myth in the modern memory and literature in its aftermath. Fussell argues that the war worked as a rupture in the perception of history and divided history into two phases, "before the experience of the war" and "after the experience of the war". The war, argues Fussell, inscribed the perception of history in terms of a primary break. Fussell detects this polarity between ruptures and continuities in postwar literature, which means we can also detect the war's influence in Hemingway's imagery of roads broken with exploded bridges, in Fitzgerald's novels which depicts characters that are displaced between their past and present, between their past "golden girlhood" and present conspiracies and which depicts a wasteland between East Egg and West Egg. The perception of history not as a continuous flux but as divergences and separations underlines the fact that the post-war novels we have studied reflect a Foucauldian rendering of time.

With respect to its focus on displacements and divergences within history, the novels are shaped by a view that is opposed to Bakhtin's outlook. Especially the novels of Hemingway underline the justification of a Foucauldian approach to time which is discontinuous. In the novels, life is constituted of fragments, and it is constantly implied that what is deemed by the characters as an original state has never taken place. Gatsby's endeavour to capture a perfect state that remained in the past is not the endeavour to experience what has really happened but the attempt to create a past, a perfect state.

In dealing with the settings in the novels, rather than taking a Bakhtinian and Foucauldian opposition as the basis of our argument we intertwined two opposing views and studied settings in terms of "panoptic carnivals". Foucault's system of panopticism is a constant observation mechanism that symbolizes the power structure in the community. According to Foucault, one is intricately connected to a panopticon which is a modeling of community and of power relations within the community. Panopticism is based on an "anti-nomadic technique" which fixes the individual, defines him/her, defines others in relation to each other and builds a network of discourse. Panopticon is a complex and intricate mechanism that serves as a microcosm in the definition of modern institutions. The individual, which is a

composite, is made, disunited and re-made in this mechanism. Foucault defines the making of the individual in quite negative terms.

Bakhtin's carnival is at one level quite similar to Foucault's panopticism. However, where Foucault defines panopticon in negative terms and recognizes no system outside the panopticon, Bakhtin, on the other hand, recognizes a bi-polar struggle between authority and the folk, and carnival is a phase and a place that is outside relations of authority. Carnival is a phase that has its roots in the folk tradition and a phase that would provide the individual with a sense of "integrity" by putting him/her under the scrutiny of the other's gaze, which is an indispensable condition of becoming a whole. We connect Bakhtin's ideas of carnival with Foucault's ideas of panopticism. Because we agree with Foucault that a panopticon does not have to seem as an oppressive, restrictive system, and a carnival, which is something pleasurable and communal, might as well construct and strengthen a power structure that defines individuals, fixates their roles, changes their roles and re-defines them. In the modernist novels we have studied we are presented with panoptic carnivals such as parties, cinema industry, institutionalized psychiatry that constitute the characters, alter their roles, create a discourse which is highly contradictory, and strengthen the myth. Therefore, dealing with the settings in terms of "panoptic carnivals" provides us with an understanding that is central to the presentation of the spatial settings in the novels.

At some moments in this study we excluded either of the two theoricians and adopted Nietzsche's criticism of morality and civilization along with Foucault or adopted Freud's views on compulsion to repeat along with Bakhtin for the sake of further clarity. Especially in A Farewell to Arms the attitude towards civilization and its contradictions is compatible with Nietzsche's ideas. Nietzsche gives primordial fear a primary role in the constitution of morality and society. Hemingway deals with how the individual impulse of fear assumes a communal character and turns into a cause for the war and how easily it can turn back to its primordial form and devastate even the ones that are in the same camp. Hemingway implies that war is the result of primordial fear which is consecrated by being given a communal form.

In addition to Nietzsche, Freud also became very enlightening for us in the interpretation of The Sun also Rises. Freud's recognition of two groups of instincts: one of which hastens organism's reaching at its final destiny, which is its inanimate form, death and the other prolongs and postpones this final form of death. Freud categorizes this second category of instincts as conservatory instincts which aim to mitigate the effect of external stimuli by tending to repeat the stimuli. It is significant that both categories of instincts, not withstanding their different ways of reaching death, aim to reach death. To quote Freud, "These guardians of life, too, were originally the myrmidons of death." These views that Freud puts forward in Beyond the Pleasure Principle recall Bakhtin's theory on carnival which symbolizes both an external stimuli that hastens death, because carnival is strictly associated with a kind of natural death and renewal; it symbolizes a divergence from the usual order, and conservative instincts that tempts the organism to repeat the excitory process, since carnival is at the same time in the service of the cylicity of life. Intertwined with Bakhtin's views on carnival, Freud's argument finds its place in our interpretation of The Sun also Rises, which depicts the fiesta in Spain. The fiesta is represented both as an excitory process, because it puts the American expatriate group in the middle of an unaccustomed way of life by challenging their identities and as a conservatory instinct, which makes the characters repeat their lives in another setting and under new circumstances. In other words, what is considered by the characters a new, challenging experience is in fact the repetition of the same experience under new circumstances, and the characters are in pains to experience the challenge of the fiesta in the same way as they experienced the preceding events. In other words, the characters want to repeat themselves during the process of the fiesta.

Thus Freud is of central concern to this study for giving the act of repetition a primary role. According to Freud every repetition is the renewal of the event, a constant repetition means the constant renewal of the event until there becomes no original event residing somewhere outside the speech. To put it in Foucauldian terms, it is the discourse on the nature of the origin that creates an idea of the origin. At some level in our study we explained that while the characters are trying to be

faithful to their past selves they become faithful to the vision of themselves. In other words the characters are created by several contradictory discourses.

We have repeatedly returned to a Foucauldian concern with power throughout this study. Foucault, at one moment during an interview on power and knowledge, argues that, even if one is writing about the history of peace, it is war he/she is writing about. By saying this Foucault underlines the fact that peace time is the continuation of the war, and it is through discourse a war-like domination is continuing even in peace time. Here of course Foucault's use of the word "war-like domination" in peace time refers to power struggle within discourse. When considered in terms of the phenomenon of war in the literal sense the literature produced in peace-time, in the post-war era both exhibits a war of discourses in the figurative sense and it creates a discourse on the war in the literal sense. In other words, the post-war novels we have studied both reveal a war of discourses and a discourse on the war and they shape the experience of the war. Thus the literary pieces are not about the actual experience of the war, but they are texts in which war is recreated and reanimated in the modern consciousness.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to interpret post-war novels of Hemingway and Fitzgerald in terms of the conflict between two twentieth-century critics, Bakhtin and Foucault, who became influential in different fields. The works chosen for the study are Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender is the Night,* and Hemingway's *The Sun also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*.

The introduction gives an outline of Bakhtin's and Foucault's theories and explains what aspects of these theories will be influential in a study of modernist texts, and in what ways they can determine the central issues of this study. The introduction also includes a brief outline of modernistic approach to time, space and their relation to individual.

Chapter One includes the study of *The Great Gatsby* in its relation to Bakhtin's and Foucault's theories, and an approach to the novel in terms of fragmentation and dialogism, and the relations between time and space. In this section the incoherence between Bakhtin and Foucault, especially on the issue of origins, the creation and fiction of the past and the influence of discourse determined the way the novel is approached.

Chapter two includes the study of *Tender is the Night*. Foucault's theory on power and his ideas on the generation of power and disciplinary mechanisms determined the focus of the study on characterization. Bakhtin's view of carnival in contradistinction with Foucault's panopticism highlighted the way the relations between spaces and characters are studied in the novel. In this section war is considered a primary influence in the perception of time and the creation of myth. Paul Fussell's study on war memoirs became an invaluable resource in understanding the text's relation to the war.

Chapter Three starts with an argument about the tradition of confession. The difference between Bakhtin and Foucault on the nature of confession became crucial in the interpretation of the confessional style in *A Farewell to Arms*. The protagonist's centripetal movement is considered a fragmentary experience, whereas the act of narration is considered an attempt of unification. The dissolution of unities and how Hemingway expressed fragmentation is central to the concerns of this chapter. The theme of war in the novel is interpreted in terms of Nietzsche's criticism of civilization and morality.

Chapter Four includes an analysis of Hemingway's *The Sun also Rises*. The setting and characterization in the novel are interpreted in relation to modernism and Freud's views. The chapter also includes an analysis of the role of mythification in the creation of reality.

The study concludes with a brief explanation of how and why the contradiction between Bakhtin's and Foucault's views is related to a study of modernist novel.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Hemingway ve Fitzgerald'ın savaş sonrasında yazmış oldukları dört romanı, farklı alanlarda çalışmış iki yirminci yüzyıl eleştirmeni olan Bakhtin ve Foucault arasındaki temel çelişki açısından incelemektir. Bu çalışmanın içeriği Fitzgerald'ın *The Great Gatsby* ve *Tender is the Night* adlı romanları ve Hemingway'in *A Farewell to Arms* ve *The Sun also Rises* adlı romanlarının incelenmesiyle sınırlı tutulmuştur.

Çalışmanın giriş bölümü Bakhtin ve Foucault'nun teorilerini ana hatlarıyla anlatmanın yanısıra modernist olarak adlandırdığımız romanları konu alan bir incelemede bu teorilerin hangi yönlerinin etkili olabileceğini göstermektedir. Giriş bölümü modernizm hareketinin zaman ve yer kavramlarını nasıl ele aldığını ve bu kavramlar aracılığıyla bireyi nasıl ifade ettiğini de anlatmaktadır.

Birinci bölüm *The Great Gatsby* adlı romanın Bakhtin ve Foucault'nun teorileri ışığında yapılmış bir incelemesini kapsamaktadır. Romana parçalanma ve "dialogism" açısından yaklaşılmış olup, romanın zaman ve yer ilişkisini nasıl ele aldığı açıklanmaya çalışılmıştır. Bakhtin ve Foucault'nun, özellikle de köken kavramı, geçmişin kurgulanması ve söylemin etkisi konularındaki uyuşmayan görüşleri romanlara ne açıdan yaklaşıldığı konusunda etkili olmuştur.

İkinci Bölüm *Tender is the Night* adlı romanın incelemesini içermektedir. Foucault'nun "güç" kavramı konusunda geliştirmiş olduğu kuramın yanısıra, gücün üretimi ve disiplin mekanizmaları üzerine görüşleri romana kişileştirme açısından yaklaşmada belirleyici olmuştur. Romandaki yer ve karakter ilişkisi, Bakhtin'in "carnaval" kavramı üzerine görüşleri ile Foucault'nun panopticon modeli arasındaki çelişki açısından incelenmiştir. Savaş olgusu, zaman algısında ve mit yaratımında önemli bir etken olarak ele alınmıştır. Paul Fussell'in savaş anılarını inceleyen çalışması, metin ve savaş olgusu arasındaki ilişkinin anlaşılmasında önemli bir kaynak olmuştur.

Üçüncü bölümde öncelikli olarak ititraf geleneği tartışılmıştır. Bakhtin ve Foucault'nun "itiraf" konusundaki çelişen fikirleri, *A Farewell to Arms* romanında kullanılmış olan itiraf tarzının yorumlanmasında bu çalışmaya kaynaklık etmiştir. Ana karakterin geçirmiş olduğu deneyim ve onun merkezi söylemi gerçekleştiren hareketi "parçalayıcı" olarak nitelendirilirken, anlatma edimi bütünleştirici bir çaba olarak ele alınmıştır. Bütünlüğün çözülüşü ve Hemingway'in parçalanmayı nasıl ifade ettiği bu bölümün temel konusudur. Romandaki savaş teması ise Nietzsche'nin uygarlık ve ahlak konusundaki eleştirileri bağlamında incelenmiştir.

Dördüncü bölüm Hemingway'in *The Sun also Rises* adlı romanının incelemesini içermektedir. Romanda uzamın işlenişi ve kişileştirme Freud'un görüşleri doğrultusunda ve modernism bağlamında incelenmiştir. Bu bölüm ayrıca romanda mitleştirme ve gerçekliğin yaratılması üzerine yapılmış bir incelemeyi de kapsamaktadır.

Çalışma, Bakhtin ve Foucault'nun görüşlerinin modernist romanı incelemeyi amaçlayan bir çalışmada neden ve nasıl etkili olduğunun açıklanmasıyla son bulmaktadır.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakhtin, M. M. *Art and Answerability,*ED. Michael Holquist (Texas:University of Texas Press, 1990).

_____ *The Dialogic, Imagination,* ED. Michael Holquist (Texas: University of Texas Pres, 2002a).

_____ *The Bakhtin Reader,* ED. Pam Morris (London: Arnold, 2002b).

_____ *Speech Genres and Other Later Essays,* ED. Caryl Emerson (Texas: University of Texas Press, 2004).

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections,* ED. Hannah Arendt (New York: Shocken, 1969), 253-264.

Bergonzi, Bernard.*The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth Century Literature,* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1986).

Bradbury, Malcolm., McFarlane, James.*Modernism,* (New York: Penguin Books, 1976).

Brandist, Craig. *The Bakhtin Circle,* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).

Faulkner, William. *The Sound and the Fury,* (London: Vintage, 1995).

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby,* (London: Penguin Books, 1994).

_____ *Tender is the Night,* (London: Penguin Books, 1997).

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge,* ED. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980).

_____ *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture,* ED.Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 1988).

_____ *Discipline and Punish*, (London: Penguin Books, 1991a).

_____ *The Foucault Reader,* ED. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books,1991b).

_____ *Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth,* ED. Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 1997).

_____ *The Will to Knowledge,* (London: Penguin Books, 1998).

_____ *Michel Foucault Aesthetics: Essential Works of Foıcault 1954-1984,*(Vol. 2), ED. James D. Faubion (London: Penguin Books, 2000a).

_____ *Power,* ED. James D. Faubion (New York: The New Press, 2000b).

_____ *The Archeology of Knowledge,* (London: Routledge, 2004).

Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis* ED. Angela Richards (Middlesex : Penguin Books, 1984), 275-338.

Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. "Phenomenology of Spirit", *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticsm,* ED. Vincent B. Leitch (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001).

Hemingway, Ernest. *A Farewell to Arms,* (London: Arrow Books, 2004a).

_____ *Fiesta: The Sun also Rises,* (London: Arrow Books, 2004b).

Kuna, Franz. "The Janus-Faced Novel: Conrad, Musil, Kafka, Mann", *Modernism,* ED. Malcolm Bradbury (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1976), 443-452

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *A Nietzsche Reader,* ED. R. J. Hollingdale (London: Penguin Books, 1977).

_____ *Beyond Good and Evil,* (New York: Dover Publications, 1997).

Ouditt, Sharon. *Fighting Forces, Writing Women,* (London: Routledge, 1994).

Roston, Murray. *Modernist Patterns in Literature and the Visual Arts,* (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

Stevenson, Randall. *Modernist Fiction An Introduction,* (Worcester: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

Yüksel, Ayşegül. *Yapısalcılık ve Bir Uygulama: M. Cevdet Anday Tiyatrosu,* (Ankara: Gündoğan Yayıncılık, 1995).