THE REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE

ANKARA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

(ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE)

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GROTESQUE IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES*, IAIN BANKS' *THE WASP FACTORY*, AND NEIL GAIMAN'S *THE OCEAN AT THE END OF THE LANE*

PhD Dissertation

Ferhat ORDU

Ankara, 2024

THE REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE

ANKARA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

(ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE)

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GROTESQUE IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES*, IAIN BANKS' *THE WASP FACTORY*, AND NEIL GAIMAN'S *THE OCEAN AT THE END OF THE LANE*

PhD Dissertation

Ferhat ORDU

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren ATAYURT FENGE

Ankara, 2024

THE REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE

ANKARA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

(ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE)

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GROTESQUE IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES*, IAIN BANKS' *THE WASP FACTORY*, AND NEIL GAIMAN'S *THE OCEAN AT THE END OF THE LANE*

PhD Dissertation

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren ATAYURT FENGE

Examining Committee Members

Name and Surname:

1. Prof. Dr. Ufuk EGE UYGUR

2. Prof. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ

3. Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem TARAKCIOĞLU

4. Assoc. Dr. Nazlı GÜNDÜZ

5. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren ATAYURT FENGE

(Supervisor)

Examination Date: 25.04.2024

TO THE REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE

ANKARA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

I hereby declare that in the dissertation "Representations of the Grotesque in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory*, And Neil Gaiman's *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (Ankara, 2024)" prepared under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren ATAYURT FENGE, all information has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic roles and ethical conduct. I also declare that I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work. (26.04.2024)

Ferhat ORDU

to

the one,

and the only,

my dear son, Yağız Ege ORDU

who grew up together with this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren ATAYURT FENGE, whose continuous politeness, persistent motivation, and constant student-friendly attitude led this thesis to this stage. Her extensive knowledge in academia, inspiration, and insightful guidance have enabled me to enjoy and learn so much during this enjoyable trip. Such a humble supervisor, in comparison to her accomplishments, would be something each PhD candidate would seek, though few would be blessed to meet one.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the dissertation monitoring committee members, Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem TARAKCIOĞLU and Prof. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ, who have shared their expertise with me through their insightful feedback and invaluable ideas during the research and writing process of this dissertation. Their critical touches and contributions played a crucial role when my inspiration got stuck, and their boundless knowledge enlightened me on the road to the end of the thesis. Their modest attitude to value every idea has been the driving force throughout the process. I would express profound gratitude to dissertation's examining committee Prof. Dr. Ufuk Ege UYGUR and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nazlı GÜNDÜZ for their valuable and perceptive feedback.

I also want to sincerely thank my friends, especially Lokman ŞEHİTOĞLU, İsmail TEKŞEN, Ali KUBAT, Fatma YILDIRIM and Enes TAŞDELEN who have always supported me and who will always support me during challenging times. Being surrounded by such good-hearted people is a big chance, especially when there is a need for motivation.

I am eternally grateful to my beautiful wife, Ayşe ORDU, who has believed in me more than I believe in myself. Her endless confidence, support, and deep understanding have pushed me out of my comfort zone, without which I would have been unable to succeed.

Last but not least, I am very grateful to my father, Necati ORDU, and mother, Halime ORDU, for their unconditional love, motivation, and trust in me. Finally, I would like to thank my second parents, Hasan AKDAŞ and Ümmahan AKDAŞ, who have always been happy to see our happiness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to examine the grotesque[1] elements and grotesque imagery in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954), Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory (*1984), and Neil Gaiman's *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013) to explore how these novels offer a representation of the grotesque as a critical tool to voice discontentment with the prevalent society at the time they were written in relation to three different terms: Claude Lévi-Strauss critical term *bricolage,* Sigmund Freud's analytical term "the uncanny" effect, and "the purpose of art" as defined by Viktor Shklovsky. To this end, firstly, the physical characteristics of the grotesque will be elaborated in cooperation with the visual grotesque elements in the selected novels chronologically. Secondly, the outstanding qualities of the grotesque like hybridity, ambivalence, and monstrosity (in the analysis of *Lord of the Flies*), inversion, monstrosity, carnivalesque (especially excrement), and abject (in the analysis of *The Wasp Factory*), ambivalence, hybridity, inversion, carnivalesque reversal and masks (in the analysis of *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*) which help to create the shock mechanism in the reader by "dazzling the beholder" (Scott 359), will be explained. The terminology for explanation is chosen according to the focus of each book, that is, some grotesque qualities are dominating in one of the novels while some others are predominant in another novel. Moreover, the grotesque imagery, one that is not solely physical but one that offers a complex vision, will be examined with references to the historical, political, social, and cultural atmosphere in which the works were created. This structure will be applied to each novel through the upcoming chapters of the study. The main argument of the thesis is also related to the terms "the death of the hero" (386) coined by Hélène Cixous in her "The Character of Character", "the decline of character" (636) discussed by Brian Phillips in "Character in Contemporary Fiction",

[1] There have been different attributions to grotesque like "method", "tradition", "technique", "criticism", and so on in literary texts. This dissertation refers to the grotesque in a variety of literary and critical contexts.

and “defamiliarization” and “bestrangement” put forward by the Russian Formalist Viktor Shklovsky (1895-1984) in his “Art as Technique” (1965).

The authors that will be studied within the scope of the dissertation displayed thought-provoking writing styles. The Nobel Prize winner William Golding fought during World War II, and he unabashedly reflected the brutal reality of war through his portrayal of human nature, which is made manifest in his *Lord of the Flies* in which he juxtaposed two paradoxical elements – the violence of the war and innocence of children. In order to honour the the book, Beyad states that “[*Lord of the Flies*] achieved a significant breakthrough and once became one of the most widely read and widely admired novels in English which fascinated wide array of readers ranging from the teenagers to adults” and reminds the nickname uttered to it as “Lord of the Campus” (Beyad 154) to highlight Golding’s extensive influence on both common readers and the academia. Iain Banks was no less skilful than Golding in bringing controversial and paradoxical concepts together. The protagonist in his first and most widely known novel is a 16-year-old boy named Frank, who committed three murders, all of whom happen to be his relatives. Committing these murders between the ages of 6 and 9, and justifying the final murder as “to redress the balance” (111) between the male and female sex, Frank proves to have a bizarre rationale, and is later revealed to have an isolated life. Despite his young age, his continuous tendency towards violence and the comprehensive details of these incidents creates disgust and curiosity in the reader. Perhaps, this is one of the reasons why *The Times* has acclaimed Iain Banks as “the most imaginative British novelist of his generation” (1). Neil Gaiman has a playful style in his novel *The Ocean at the End of the Lane,* in which he makes use of childhood memories of his hero where reality and hyperreality are interwoven. The novel bounces from being open to feminist criticism by the application of witchcraft techniques of the Hempstock women to gothic and grotesque qualities of metaphysics and the surrealist world of science fiction with black hole and

time travel. Although at first glance, the novels do not substantially portray grotesque materiality, which first comes to mind about grotesque images, they present grotesque imagery using violence, ambivalence, distortion, inversion, and hybridity, which ultimately create the "shock effect" that the grotesque is aligned with.

Through an exploration of the representation of the grotesque and the grotesque effect in these novels, the thesis seeks to engage with the grotesque in the British novel as a satirical tool that functions to draw attention to the ills of a changing world, an idea which is articulated by Harpham as follows: "[a]s our perceptions of the physical world change as the world itself is changed by technology, pollution, wars, and urbanisation-some things which had appeared as distortions are now perceived as commonplace or seen to obey other, previously unknown laws" (Harpham, *The Grotesque: First Principles* 463). Lack of equal law systems, poverty, inequality of riches, pollution, abuse of human rights, wars, ethical degradation, and problems of the immigrants are only a few of the social ills the modern world is surrounded with. Getting apathetic to the sufferings around has been the tendency for the survival of the modern human; therefore, as Harpham further states, "[d]omesticating our grotesqueries, we pay, applaud, or admire them, and finally pay them the ultimate tribute of ignoring their deformity (463). At this point, grotesque draws its "aggressive weapon" (Thomson 58) and uses its qualities with negative connotations to create the shock mechanism in the beholder and bewilders the audience to strike their attention to the degradation in the world. Thus, *Lord of the Flies*, *The Wasp Factory*, and *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, each written at a significant historical and socio-political time following World War II against the background of the threat and fear of a potential new global war, or when global economic crises hit the world as well as hopes for a peaceful world have deteriorated, reflect the pessimist atmosphere of their time which is represented in the novels through the employment of grotesque imagery.

The primary motivation behind composing the thesis is centred on examining the impact of grotesque elements on the contemporary British novel and exploring the intricacies of grotesque descriptions and representations within the literature of this era. In order to so, the physical representations and their possible symbolic meanings are analysed in depth by transcribing the grotesque images in the selected novels. Moreover, how the grotesque tradition with its critical concepts like "grotesque realism", "carnivalesque", "ambivalence", and so on may be represented in literature, a trade of artistic production which is not as vision based as art, architecture, or design is questioned. How the age of the children characters enriches the qualities of the grotesque like "hybrid," "bastard," "ambivalent," "unfinished," and "deformed" is also analysed and criticized. Additionally, the isolated settings in novels such as *Lord of the Flies* and *The Wasp Factory*, with their detachment from the outside world, as well as the farmhouse by the lake in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane,* characterized by limited interaction with its environment, and their collective contribution to the grotesque qualities of these works are also interrogated in the thesis. Finally, the grotesque and the uncanny effect created by the novels in relation to the *bricolage* technique, and the similitude of the emotional pessimism of the contemporary era with respect to the "function of art" as defined by Shklovsky is among the main concerns of the thesis.

Within the scope of all the above, the arguments of the thesis are: firstly, the grotesque is used as a shocking mechanism for the awakening of a broad social satire. Secondly, it helps for the depth of the fictional illusion. William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954), Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory (*1984), and Neil Gaiman's *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013) employ grotesque techniques to elevate the reader to the surreal world of fantasy and fiction. Defamiliarized or "bestranged" readers forget about themselves and their degraded selves and become alienated from their miserable state; therefore, they condemn, castigate, blame, and criticise the events and characters which

are indeed a mirror of their degraded selves which is covered under the mask of the grotesque excesses. These authors awaken the reader by sudden defamiliarization strategies: Golding asks a question in *Lord of the Flies;* Banks reveals a story-long hidden secret in *The Wasp Factory;* Gaiman uses flashbacks and flashforwards in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*. It is the real aim of contemporary British fiction: to make the reader aware of the disgraced state of the world/people, to hypnotise him about the realities of the world to prevent rejection and suddenly to awaken them with a shock to increase the effect and unforgettability of the influence, and to turn the reader in this cycle like a hamster.

The novel, as a genre, is not a visual art form, which creates the biggest limitation of the thesis. If it were a sculpture, a painting, or a building, it would be much easier to criticise the grotesque qualities of the work; only the descriptive language used by the authors enables these novels subject to grotesque analysis. The visual images in *Lord of the Flies* are aroused with the expertise of Golding's graphic narration, especially during the juxtaposition of the hunting of the wild pig with the spring dances of the butterfly. The same effect is attained by Banks, which is heightened by his vivid description of the scene which Eric confronts at the medical school, while Gaiman achieves a similar result with his gripping skips from fantasy to reality, and vice versa.

All in all, the thesis will analyse the representation of the grotesque in the contemporary British novel in the selected works written between 1954 and 2013. To begin with, the representation of the grotesque does not merely involve physical ambivalence, decadence, or combinations of different figures in a material form. These exceptional traits contribute to the reader's shock mechanism by "dazzling the beholder" (Scott 359). Uncovering the contemporary human being's disguise to hide its own defects and the human race's propensity to evil when confronted, no matter how contradictory it is with its civilised façade is another major feat of grotesque fiction. Accordingly, the

thesis will explore three selected novels, each of which will be evaluated under three themes: grotesque visual elements, representation of grotesque imagery together with some critical qualities of the grotesque (like hybridity, ambivalence, monstrosity, inversion, carnivalesque excrement), and the shock mechanism created by the narrative styles of each work in order to examine the function of the grotesque as a satirical tool to critique the tendency towards violence. The representation of the grotesque in these novels creates a patchwork, a *bricolage* of the modern world, to shock and unsettle the contemporary reader, manipulating the trusted myths, beliefs and ideologies and making them feel insecure, fragile, and uncanny. To this end, *Lord of the Flies* utilizes the stereotypes created by *The Coral Island* and deconstructs the ideas that British people are "gentlemen", "democratic", and "noble", no matter under which circumstances they are. By using the bits and pieces of this deconstruction, Golding puts a completely different presentation regarding the qualities of the British people, and it will be debated in Chapter II. *The Wasp Factory* deconstructs the stereotypes regarding the "sex/gender", "innocent/evil", and "female/male" binaries, and Banks surprises the reader by creating a suspicion for the long-lasting explanations for these terms, which will be analysed in Chapter III. Chapter IV examines the ways in which *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* creates *bricolage* through the deconstructed pieces of the earlier definitions of terms like "sacred family institution", "witchcraft", "femininity", and "parental care." By deconstructing and reconstructing these terms randomly, the insecurity and the uncanny created with the reader reflects the situation of the contemporary being, who is always in doubt, unsure and hesitant about the developments around them; therefore, pathetic, alone, desperate, impotent, and poignant in the modern world.

CHAPTER I

THEORIZING THE GROTESQUE IN LITERATURE

Within the aim of the thesis, the terms "uncanny", "bricolage", and "grotesque" have essential importance in relation to Shklovsky's explanation about "the purpose of art". When the definitions and explanations related to these critical terms are scrutinized in depth, common denominators like shock, defamiliarization, and especially alienation strike attention. These denominators constitute the core of the argument of the thesis. William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954), Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory (*1984), and Neil Gaiman's *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013) will be analysed with their grotesque qualities in relation to the bricolage technique, the uncanny effect created, and their convenience to Shklovsky's "purpose of art". To this end, these critical terms will be explained throughout this chapter within the scope of the aim of the thesis.

According to the Austrian neurologist, founder of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud, who first coined the term "the uncanny" in his article entitled "The Uncanny" (1919), the effect of the uncanny is "that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, very familiar" (1-2). He explains this effect is created "… if […] every emotional affect, whatever its quality, is transformed by repression into morbid anxiety, then among such cases of anxiety there must be a class in which the anxiety can be shown to come from something repressed which *recurs* [his italics]" (Freud 13). He names "this class of morbid anxiety" as the "uncanny". If what we know daily, what we are familiar with, what is known to us in our subconscious appears to us in an unfamiliar way, unexpected moment, or in a different shape then the anxiety triggered in the human being is called the uncanny. The function of the uncanny in literature is also explained through Freud's psychoanalytic perspective, with an emphasis on how writers intentionally employ uncanny features to elicit a sense of eeriness and uneasiness in their audience. This is important for the main argument of the thesis because

in contemporary British fiction, authors frequently attempt to disturb the reader by using a graphic language, by talking without censorship in their narrative as well as by creating unpopular characters that the reader cannot personify with. This helps them to break the automation in Shklovsky's terms while forcing the reader to stay engaged throughout the text. Freud references works such as E.T.A. Hoffmann's *The Sandman* and the uncanny effect produced by automata, wax figures, and the omnipresence of eyes in the narrative. According to Freud, these literary motifs touch on universal fears ingrained in the human psyche, eliciting a resonating reaction from readers. Furthermore, Freud claims that "the double", which occurs when one person "identifies himself with another person, so that his self becomes confounded, or the foreign self is substituted for his own" by the processes of "doubling, dividing, and interchanging the self" (Freud 9), is one of the events that may cause the feeling of the uncanny. He claims that seeing one's own likeness can cause great discomfort since it represents a confrontation with the duality of self and the inherent anxiety involved with seeing the other inside oneself. This dualism is linked to Freud's concepts of the "id" and the "ego," which represent the ongoing conflict between innate urges and the rational self (9). In terms of grotesque uncanny, Kayser is among the pioneers who studied the relation of the uncanny and the grotesque. Kayser mainly sticks to the supernatural interference related to the explanation of the grotesque. He claims, "We are so strongly affected and terrified because it is our world which ceases to be reliable, and we feel that we would be unable to live in this changed world" (184-185). The analogy of Kayser's explanation of the grotesque and Freud's definition of the uncanny reveals that Kayser takes these two terms synonymously, which is not very uncommon. In the thesis, the uncanny effect is important from two different perspectives: one that the characters face in the stories, and the other that the overall shock created with the reader. In both cases it functions to awaken the reader from the illusion of the narrative and force him to the practice of questioning.

In “The Character of Character”, the primary goal of traditional reading, according to Helene Cixous, is for the reader to connect with the character. She contends that in current literature; however, the reader cannot discover a hero or a character with whom he can identify. She names this situation as “the death of the hero” (386), which she explains as

> … a death generally experienced by the reader as a murder, a loss, on which follows the reader’s quick withdrawal of his investment, since he sees nothing more to be done with a text that has no one in it[.] No one to talk to, to recognize, to identify with. The reader is loath to venture into a place where there is no mirror. (387)

In “Character in Contemporary Fiction”, similarly, Brian Phillips remarks “the decline of character” (636) in contemporary fiction, in which “character is not precisely one finds” [and if he finds one the] character [is] a little guilty, a little diminished, … in two and a half dimensions” (635). By explaining the philosophical and economic evolution of the world, Philips stresses in his article, on the decline of the popularity of the characters in recent novels. The decline of the easily favourable heroes in today’s literature is interrelated to Shklovsky’s defamiliarization technique because the continuous disapproval of the reader is among the elements that keep him awake throughout the narration. As explained by Morson, Viktor Shklovsky’s idea of defamiliarization stems from “learning theory” (13). After learning something, we begin to execute it instinctively in our daily life and "we no longer have to think of each muscular adjustment" (13), much like when we walk, drive, cycle, or play an instrument. This hypnosis is problematic according to Shklovsky because it “may block our perception—may lead us to forget the details of something familiar or overlook the new in something already habitualized” as “we merely recognize them” (13). The process-he names as “automization”-may lead us to neglect the most important aspects. He defends, “To reverse this process of

automatization, we need to make the familiar unfamiliar again—to "defamiliarize" or "bestrange" it. "That is the task of art" (13). As also elaborated by Lemon and Reis, "The purpose of art, according to Shklovsky, is to force us to notice. Since perception is usually too automatic, art develops a variety of techniques to impede perception or, at least, to call attention to themselves" (36). Shklovsky explains his claim as:

> … artistic trademark- [is the]… material obviously created to remove the automatism of perception; the author's purpose is to create the vision which results from that deautomatized perception. A work is created "artistically" so that its perception is impeded and the greatest possible effect is produced through the slowness of the perception. (Shklovsky 52)

The three novels, having unpopular heroes, and disputable topics when compared to traditional novels, continuously trigger the fragile side of the reader, and leave him in hesitation between disgust and admiration.

In connection to the thesis's major premise, *bricolage* is a term used by the French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009) in his 1962 book *La Pensée sauvage* (*The Savage Mind*). While Claude Lévi-Strauss is well-known for his anthropological work as well as his notions of *bricolage* and *myth*, it is crucial to note that Lévi-Strauss did not address *bricolage* in connection with literature. In his extended work, he explains the *bricolage*-the technique *bricoleur*-the doer (referred to as "engineer" in the text)-at length, the latter of which is simply summarized by Derrida as "someone who uses 'the means at hand,' that is, the instruments he finds at his disposition around him, those which are already there" (Derrida 285). Since it has been popularized in England and around Europe, it has been adopted in a lot of fields, from economics to kitchen arts, from being a qualitative research method to being applied to social sciences. Yee and Bremner comment on the widespread use of the *bricolage* as, "[t]he bricolage method consists of combining methods from the social sciences, humanities, and hard

sciences to derive a suitable model of inquiry" (Yee and Bremner 2). Mainly the critics like Joyce Yee and Craig Bremner (2011), Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (2011), Shirley Steinberg (2012), Matt Rogers (2012), and Katherine Foelberg (2016) explain the term *bricolage* similarly, which is the technique of taking things at hand and connecting them to make something new. Yee and Bremner explain "a bricoleur [as] (someone who employs the bricolage method) is described as a resourceful and creative 'fiddler or tinkerer', and one who out of necessity uses available materials to create new objects from existing ones" (4), for Denzin and Lincoln, a *bricoleur* puts together a ''set of representations that are fitted to the specifics of a complex situation'' (4), Steinberg claims that "[b]ricolage involves taking research strategies from a variety of scholarly disciplines and traditions as they are needed in the unfolding context of the research situation. Such an action is pragmatic and strategic …" (233), Rogers states, "[l]ike an "intellectual bricolage," [Strauss] explains, mythical-knowers piece together their life-history with artifacts (e.g., texts, discourses, social practices) of their given cultural context to construct meaning (3), Foelberg associates a *bricoleur* to"… a quilter, carefully selecting pieces … and combining them purposefully to create a new and useful tool (3). In literature, bricolage generally opens a new perspective for the analysis of a text, rescuing the critic from the ongoing conceptions and stereotypes, it may deconstruct the text, reconstruct it, and it may do it again and again with new pieces put together and new resolutions achieved. Strauss' idea that "… there are several solutions to the same problem" (24) is in the core of literary *bricolage* analysis. Strauss further states that "[r]ites and myths, … like 'bricolage' … take to pieces and reconstruct sets of events … and use them as so many indestructible pieces for structural patterns which they serve alternatively as ends or means" (32-33). According to Strauss, by each deconstruction affected by the background of the beholder, and by each new reconstruction of the deconstructed pieces, one comes to alternative meanings or consequences. About this

multifaceted meaning-production process, the function of the *bricolage* is explained by Steinberg as, "… bricolage interprets, critiques, and deconstructs the text in question" (233), which as a result "compensates for the blindness of relying on one model of reading a cultural text" (234). *Bricolage* is frequently linked to postmodern literature because it questions established ideas of authorship and originality. It emphasizes the notion that texts are created through a procedure of appropriation, recontextualization, and recombination as opposed to deriving from a solitary creative source. *Bricolage* allows writers to produce works that are a reflection of the richness and diversity of the literary and cultural world. Denzin and Lincoln claim, "[t]he combination of multiple methodological practices, and empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry" (5), which according to Rogers "adopting a bricolage approach helped researchers respect the complexity of meaning-making processes and the contradictions of the lived world" (4). Moving on from the fact that Markham claims, "…bricolage can function politically to encourage multiple perspectives…" (814), the main argument of the thesis is that the grotesque is the *bricolage* of the contemporary British novel. By that, the conceptions like "children are innocent", "British people are noble", "the evil comes from outside" are deconstructed and reconstructed by the authors in *Lord of the Flies* and *The Wasp Factory*. The ideas like "witches are good/bad", "women are weak/domestic/angelic cherishers", "family environment is secure", and "parenting" come into question in *The Ocean at the end of the Lane,* the latter two of which are also questioned in *The Wasp Factory.* Grotesque novel, by using its techniques as exaggeration, monstrosity, and ambivalence, and getting its strength from the *bricolage* technique, and the *bricoleur*/the writer deconstructing and reconstructing the earlier myths also aims at awakening, shocking, and agitating the beholder of the modern novel as well as manipulating his/her earlier indestructible beliefs and conceptions; thus,

making him feel insecure, fragile, and uncanny. Just as the *bricoleur*'s main focus is not connecting the pieces with harmonious ones, the main focus of the grotesque novelist is not finding the appropriate contexts for the reader; on the contrary, the grotesque novelist puts disharmonious pieces together first to bewilder and disturb, and second to beware and provoke the reader about the degraded state of the world.

Regarding the concept of the grotesque, it can be basically defined as an adjective used to describe something that is enigmatic, unpleasant, challenging to comprehend, and deformed. Grotesque things, people, events, and circumstances can all exist in literary works, but characters are the best examples of the representations of the grotesque in literature. Quasimodo from Victor Hugo's *Hunchback of Notre Dame,* Erik from Andrew Lloyd Webber's *The Phantom of the Opera,* Gollum from J. R. R. Tolkien's epic masterpieces *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy, the monster from Mary Shelly's famous novel *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus,* Caliban from William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* are among the most famous grotesque characters. The sensation evoked on a reader by a grotesque character might be disgust as well as sympathy. Ospanova explains the grotesque as something "…where readers see two contradictory feelings at the same time" (104). It is further stated in the article related to the grotesque phenomenon that it is attained "by the establishment of something new, strange, false, and unnatural. Significant features of this phenomenon are the artificiality, the suddenness of events, and the use of the absurd and fantastic" (107). The author generally creates this paradoxical situation with an ugly-looking character with a virtuous personality or vice versa –generally someone who both attracts and repulses the readers. The hesitation of the reader whether to escape from the character or to embrace it would be a common explanation for hypostasizing and exemplifying the grotesque. However, a much more detailed observation of it will be implemented throughout this chapter. The

grotesque will be explored within a conceptual and historical framework followed by literary contextualisation of the grotesque in British literature.

The representation of the grotesque in these works has affinities with several critical insights into the grotesque. For instance, they reflect elements from Geoffrey Galt Harpham's definition of the grotesque as something unusual and bizarre, which has the potential to shock the reader (1976), display components of Wolfgang Kayser's depiction of the grotesque as something dreamlike and far from reality (1981), and echo Barbara J. Phillips and Edward F. McQuarrie's descriptions (2010) of the grotesque as "…bizarre, surreal, deviant, absurd, discrepant, peculiar, and odd" (378). Furthermore, they exhibit parallel components for Philip Thomson's claim in *The Grotesque* (1972) related to the effect of the shock mechanism on the reader, which he describes to be bewildering and disorienting "to bring the reader up short, jolt him out of accustomed ways of perceiving the world and confront him with a radically different, disturbing perspective" (58). Based on these insights into the grotesque, the shock mechanism induced by grotesque imagery stands out as one of the critical aspects of the grotesque due to the ambivalence and disorientation that the imagery creates in the viewer. For instance, monstrosity, or violence rarely correlated to the innocence of children, is one of the grotesque elements that help shock the reader, a common theme in all three novels. These effects are embodied through the grotesque imagery in the selected novels.

To begin with, the pig's head, which is hung over a tree and which "speaks" to Simon in *Lord of the Flies,* Frank's disfigured body and his ruthless torturing attitude in his games against animals in *The Wasp Factory,* the unageing bodies of the Hempstock women as well as supernatural elements like manta wolf, sorcery practices, fleas, worms appeal to the grotesque appeal in these three novels. The shock mechanism brought about by the grotesque imagery is made evident in various ways. For example, in *Lord of the Flies*, the children's capacity for violence and savagery creates this effect through a

juxtaposition of innocence and violence. In *The Wasp Factory*, this effect is conveyed through the notion of distortion enacted by the young protagonist of the novel, Frank, while in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, the hybrid way of life led by the Hempstock women as well as the inclusion of monster-like figures in the novel engenders this effect. Moreover, the authors' style, steadily increasing the tension until the shocking ending, adds to the severity of the shock effect created at the end of each novel.

The grotesque is a complex category which has acquired different meanings in different historical periods. As a term, it originates from the Italian language as the first known samples of it have been found in Italy, more specifically in Rome, during the excavations in the ruins of Nero's house. The figures on the walls of the house date back as far as the years between 64 CE and 68 CE. As Duggan notes, "Harpham, Barasch, Clayborough and Kayser agree in locating the first use of the word in connection with excavations during the late fifteenth century in Italy of Roman ruins and in particular with a certain sort of decorative art found on the walls of these uncovered rooms" (14). Frances K. Barasch, in her book *The Grotesque* (1971), explains that "the word 'grotesque' emerged as a designation for the stylised mingling of flora and fauna, and the realistic, symbolic, and fantastic creatures which were found in the antique frescoes of the grottoes or catacombs of Rome" (13). Wolfgang Kayser, in *The Grotesque in Art and Literature* (1963), gives an explanatory etymology of the word as "*La grottesca* and *grottesco*", which refer to *grotta* (cave) and which was coined to designate "a certain ornamental style that came to light during the late fifteenth-century excavations" (19). To Kayser, the reference to "*grotta*" in Italian, or "cave" in English stems from the fact that "nearly all of the original Classical designs could only be viewed by crawling down tunnels beneath surface ruins" (Duggan 14) as they were covered with tons of soil and could only be examined through tunnels from above which felt like crawling in a cave. However, according to Geoffrey Galt Harpham, "this naming is a mistake pregnant with truth, for

although the designs were never intended to be underground, nor Nero's palace a grotto, the word is perfect… Grotesque, then, gathers into itself suggestions of the underground, of burial, and of secrecy" (*On the Grotesque* 31-32). Arthur Clayborough, in his *The Grotesque in English Literature,* analyses the semantic development of the word grotesque, and he assumes it derives from the Latin word *crupta* ('crypt'), which derives from an even earlier Greek term *κρύπτη* for 'vault' or 'to hide' (2). The initial introduction of the term to the world of art and architecture starts with these mysterious interpretations for a few reasons: first, because it was new and shocking to the agenda as it was completely different from and even challenging for the classical conception of art, and second because the first samples of the kinds were physically "underground", discovered through places like "vaults". The strangeness and novelty have become the core of the modern depiction of grotesque art.

The images new to the artistic aesthetics agenda were "of monsters and hybrid human and vegetable shapes" (Duggan 14). The sensational but accurate term of Duggan as "hybrid" for the grotesque drawings is reminiscent of Vitrivius' term of "bastard forms" in his *De architectura.* As quoted in Kayser's *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*, Vitruvius states the following in his *De architectura*:

> All these motifs taken from reality are now rejected by an unreasonable fashion. For our contemporary artists decorate the walls with monstrous forms rather than reproducing clear images of the familiar world. Instead of columns they paint fluted stems with oddly shaped leaves and volutes, and instead of pediments arabesques, the same with candelabra and painted edicules, on the pediments of which grow dainty flowers unrolling out of roots and topped, without rhyme or reason, by figurines. The little stems, finally, support half-figures crowned by human or animal heads. Such things, however, never existed, do not now exist, and shall never come into being.

> For how can the stem of a flower support a roof, or a candelabrum pedimental sculpture? How can a tender shoot carry a human figure, and how can bastard forms composed of flowers and human bodies grow out of roots and tendrils? (20)

This style of art had its detractors like Vitruvius and Horace almost as soon as it developed in Rome in the first century BCE. Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, whose *De architectura* (about 27 BCE) criticised the use of monsters and hybrid human and vegetal figures, was the most famous of this type of art's notable critics. He criticised this painting's fantastical elements for deviating from nature by representing things that are impossible and arranging them in absurd ways.

The term hybridity has other linguistic, cultural, and political references. For instance, Bakhtin used the term to allude to the disruptive and transformative force of multivocal language circumstances, and hence multivocal narratives, further relating it to the dialogic and polyphonic narrative characteristics of the novel. Moreover, according to Homi Bhabha, the colonial effect that divides and fragments the identity, culture, and ideology of the colonised is represented by hybridity. He defines the "new" culture as "neither the one nor the other" (37) "a subject that inhabits the rim of an 'in-between' reality" (19). Due to this effect, two cultures—the Eastern and Western cultures—become strangely mixed. The Western colonial civilisation that changed the national identity and culture of the conquered regions is represented by hybridity. The term will be used throughout the thesis metaphorically as something possessing the mixture of two or more different elements like real and surreal qualities, evil and innocent characteristics, and childish and mature elements combined in one body or single setting in the storyline.

Duggan regards "the ugly, the fantastic, the gothic, the sublime, the abject, the uncanny, the monstrous, the ignoble, the generically mixed, the insane, the immoral, the exaggerated and the macabre" (13) as the acknowledged characteristics of the grotesque.

Duggan highlights the "heterodox" quality of the terms used to define grotesque art (13), which is inescapable due to its complex and marginal quality. Harpham contributes to the definition of the term as well, stating that the grotesque figures are "graceful fantasies, symmetrical anatomical impossibilities, small beasts, human heads, and delicate, indeterminate vegetables, all presented as ornament with a faintly mythological character imparted by representations of fauns, nymphs, satyrs, and centaurs" (*On the Grotesque* 29-30). With this definition, Harpham also points out the inanimate and hybrid qualities of the grotesque. Likewise, Kayser explains the grotesque in similar terms, primarily focusing on the uncharted characteristic of the grotesque:

> … a specific ornamental style suggested by antiquity, understood not only something playfully gay and carelessly fantastic, but also something ominous and sinister in the face of a world totally different from the familiar one – a world in which the realm of inanimate things is no longer separated from those of plants, animals, and human beings, and where the laws of statics, symmetry, and proportion are no longer valid. (21)

As the extract highlights, the novelty of the new artistic discipline is marked by its unfamiliar design devoid of all aesthetic rules of the classic art such as "statics", "symmetry", and "proportion". Kayser also emphasises the unproportionate combination of figures which is typical for grotesque production. This unproportionate characteristic of the grotesque which lacks symmetry and statistics, contributes to its ambivalent characteristic, supported sometimes by inversion of roles or sometimes by creating ambiguity with the reader, and this meaning of ambivalence will be used through the thesis metaphorically on incidents when the characters act inappropriately or opposite the social norms expected from them. For example, a setting which is not fantastic at all has some elements of the fantastic tradition, such as monsters, magic, surreal beings, or

sometimes when unbalanced violence is applied to innocent beings like baby animals or children.

Kayser adds with capital letters that "THE GROTESQUE IS A PLAY WITH THE ABSURD" (187). As Michael Steig explains, the grotesque's primary quality is its ability to evoke in an audience or reader a sense of the world's radical alienness, its "estrangement" from man, and its underlying absurdity. The grotesque accomplishes this by showing a world that is occasionally ruled by "demonic" powers (253). According to Kayser, grotesque is "AN ATTEMPT TO INVOKE AND SUBDUE THE DEMONIC ASPECTS OF THE WORLD" (188) [with capital letters] because he believes that when people have an "encounter with madness" (184), they become familiar with the unknown, and the fear from the unknown disappears, leaving a liberation from the limitations of footing the possible bills that are created in mind with fear of the unknown; therefore, grotesque acts as a mechanism to cope with the exaggerations of the modern world by simply showing that the world is entirely unreliable, and the ultimate independence lies in knowing and facing all the undiscovered dark faces of it. Throughout the novels, the hyperbole, the inversions, the ambivalence, monstrosity, or excesses related to physical excrement create disorientation in the reader and the reader consoles himself by keeping in mind the fact that all the exaggeration stems from their grotesque characteristics, and this is how he can face the evil aspects of the world.

Walter Scott contributes to the conceptualisation of the grotesque with an abundance of descriptors while claiming that it is very close to another term, "arabesque", which depicts "the most strange and complicated monsters, resembling centaurs, griffins, sphinxes, chimeras, rocs, and all other creatures of romantic imagination" (359). Scott explains the effect created by the grotesque as "dazzling the beholder as it were by the unbounded fertility of the author's imagination, and sating it by the rich contrast of all the varieties of shape and colouring" (359). He points out that "there is in reality nothing

to satisfy the understanding or inform the judgment" (359) among the aims of grotesque production. Scott literally talks about the shocking mechanism created by grotesque tradition.

Marie Jeannette Koening's definition seems to be one of the most relevant descriptions regarding the nature of the grotesque. Koening starts by outlining the varieties of subdivisions which have been made so far by the scholars before her. She refers to Kayser's distinction between the 'fantastic' grotesque and the 'satiric' grotesque and to Ruskin's various classifications of the grotesque from "noble", "true", "sportive' to "ignoble", "false", and "terrible" (22). Jennings affirms the ambiguous and even paradoxical descriptions of the term, viewing the grotesque as both 'fearsome' and 'playful' (22). Koening points out that "[b]eneath the need to polarise lies a clue to the quality of the grotesque: it has a double aspect, that is, it participates simultaneously in qualities which are normally mutually exclusive" (22), an idea which, indeed, tends to shed light upon the dual nature of the grotesque. Koening also refers to the "critical opinions" on the term which similarly seem incoherent as "some theoreticians … seeing the grotesque as ridiculous buffoonery or mere playful embellishment, others finding in it traces of horror, an alien world, the demonic and even the supernatural" (22). She explains this situation by claiming that "[t]hese seemingly contradictory tendencies are in truth both part of the phenomenon. Their combination provides a key to understanding the grotesque" (22). The contradictions and paradoxes in the novels to be studied in the dissertation support the ambivalent character of the grotesque tradition, which will also be highlighted throughout the following chapters of the thesis. What is also important related to these terms and descriptions is that they generally refer to the physical interpretations of the grotesque in architecture, art, and other vision-based branches of art; however, in addition to the physical, there is also a metaphorical dimension of the grotesque which the selected novels unfold. The contradictory character of the grotesque

helps the novels arouse the shock effect in the novels by shaking the reader between the two opposite poles, as well as it sides with the significant juxtaposition technique of all three authors.

With regard to the history and evolution of the grotesque, Bernard McElroy, in his book *Fiction of the Modern Grotesque* (1989), asserts that "[a]s a phenomenon in art, the grotesque is physical, predominantly visual", and he states that "its true home is in painting and sculpture", showing John Ruskin's three-volume treatise on Venetian art, *The Stones of Venice,* as a perfect sample. However, McElroy states that "[I]n literature, it [grotesque] exists in precisely those works that use language to evoke for the reader a vivid visual image which is perceived as grotesque" (ix). It is widely accepted that grotesque analysis is very open to visual works of artistic production like art or architecture; however, by virtue of the descriptive language in literature, grotesque becomes a critical term for literature as well.

Agata Krzychylkiewicz's survey on the grotesque and her analytical study of Bruno Jasienki's (Polish novelist, poet and playwright) works entitled *The grotesque in the works of Bruno Jasienski* is a valuable source, providing a chronologic outline of the grotesque. In the light of critical sources that she refers to, she states that grotesque images that were composed of half-human figures and half-animal figures date back as far as 3000 BC in the artistic reflections in Mesopotamia, Egypt and India, and adds that they later became characteristic figures in Chinese and Greek mythology with names like Minotaur, Midas, Daphne, Akteon, Gorgona-Medusa, Sphinx, and Pegasus (6). These 'hybrid' figures can be listed as the first representations of grotesque art. Different from medieval art, where the grotesque imagery was a form of portraying evil in order to boost the religious faith and keep the public away from the evil, ancient, or mythological, grotesque figures were alluding to celestial powers especially inferring that they stayed beyond the grasp of the human intellect (Krzychylkiewicz 9).

The approach of the classic artists was considerably hostile towards grotesque art. Classical art, which tends to depict an orderly world or a logical world with logical systems, is "associated with concepts such as 'archetypal', 'decisive', 'definitive', 'reliable', 'trustworthy' and 'sanctioned'" where grotesque is mainly associated with "chaos, uncertainty, or ambiguity" (Krzychylkiewicz 8). In contrast to the secure area that the classic artists were familiar with, grotesque art created a sense of spookiness for them, which is why they did not tend to welcome it. Horace began *Ars Poetica, or The Art of Poetry*, by criticising the type of creative expression known as grotesque without using the term grotesque. He stated that one would not "refrain from laughing" if artists combined body parts of animals or plants with body parts of humans, as well as if writers wrote in their books on subjects "like a sick man's dreams" (451). He acknowledges that painters and poets, together with philosophers, "have always had an equal right in hazarding anything"; however, it should not be "so far that savage should mate with tame, or serpents couple with birds, lambs with tigers" (451). Philip Ruskin was among the scholars who did not welcome this novelty in artistic production; in fact, he even condemned and humiliated this kind of production which he states in his book *The Stones of Venice Vol. 3* (1851), claiming that "[t]hose grotesques or arabesques … are the fruit of great minds degraded to base objects" (144). Even though he respects the effort paid into these works stating, "they ought to have produced a grand and serious work", like many other people, he is not yet, ready to see them as works of art, and he labels them as "a tissue of nonsense" (144). According to Ayşem Seval, Ruskin's justification for this is under the effect of classic production of art which aims for perfection contrary to grotesque production, which aims the opposite: "the distorted image of the unknown" (Seval 5), which is "unfinished" (6); therefore, "disturbing as it turns the familiar into the unfamiliar" (5). As Ruskin further states, "[i]f we can draw the human head perfectly, and are masters of its expression and its beauty, we have no business to cut it off, and

hang it up by the hair at the end of a garland … if there is [not] something wrong with us" (144). Duggan explains that "[t]he *grottesche,* according to Ruskin, are [*sic*] a waste of great talents and the result of a perverse desire to mix heterogeneous elements including the human and the animal, the animal and the vegetable, and to indulge in the creation of fantasy" (15). Mikhail Bakhtin similarly approaches this issue: determined to clarify the differences between the ongoing classic aesthetic understanding and the revolutionary grotesque aesthetic understanding, he explains in his highly referenced work *Rabelais and His World* (1965) that "… the grotesque images preserve their peculiar nature, entirely different from ready-made, completed being. They remain ambivalent and contradictory; they are ugly, monstrous, hideous from the point of view of "classic" aesthetics, that is, the aesthetics of the ready-made and the completed" (26). To Bakhtin, grotesque images "are contrary to the classic images of the finished, completed man, cleansed, as it were, of all the scoriae of birth and development" (26). To elucidate his claims, Bakhtin refers to the Kerch terracotta collection, where we can see the figures of ugly old women giving birth and laughing. They are ugly and contradictory because birth and old age (or death) are combined in the body of a single figure. Moreover, the figures look painless and calm while giving birth, which is paradoxical. They are incomplete; first, because they are about to give birth, which cognates regeneration and process of being rather than completeness even though they seem old and complete; second, the figures' limits are unclear (25-31).

The rigid medieval asceticism and the predominance of spiritual over temporal elements of existence were abandoned by European art by the end of the fourteenth century. A movement known as the Renaissance refocused attention on the more concrete experience of life. With it, the way people saw the world drastically altered. This innovative strategy promoted individuality and intellectual independence, frequently catalysing the abandoning of orthodox Christian thinking. Development of the sciences

encouraged investigation into the world's complexity, and the arts extensively reflected this. So to speak, the timing of the discovery of the grotesque paintings, which were accepted as the "embodiment of freedom", provided a suitable atmosphere for a fresh understanding of art (Krzychylkiewicz 9). This tolerant tendency towards the grotesque turned upside down when the Enlightenment and Neoclassicism started about the first half of the 18th century.

As known, according to Neoclassicist artists, the beauty of the artistic production was a revival of the classical aesthetic qualities, which were mainly based on proportion and unity. The grotesque art, which had a "cryptic" and "hidden" or "underground" characteristic from the first days it was discovered, was never on good terms with Neoclassic art; therefore, it turned out to become a marginal form of artistic production again with negative connotations like "deformed, macabre, ugly, unnatural, ridiculous, absurd" and was limited only to visual arts like caricature (10-11).

This fluctuating approach towards grotesque art changed during the Romantic era adversely again. Romantic artists acknowledged the grotesque as an acceptable and even desired component in their works. They used it to emphasise their uniqueness, their release from the restrictions placed on them by their previous age, and their seclusion from the rest of the world. Romantic authors often used the grotesque to draw readers' attention to the world's inexplicability and lack of logical understanding, which they recognised in their works of art. The negative connotations of the neoclassic period related to the grotesque art were all replaced with positive ones, "linking the grotesque with imaginative writing and making it synonymous with expressions such as 'full of fantasy', 'eccentric', 'fantastic', 'peculiar' and 'unusual'" (11). Krzychylkiewicz refers to the time after Romanticism as 'mimetic' realism, referring to authors such as Dickens and Gogol, who wrote of "ultimate poverty and debasement bordering on an alternative reality, more familiar to the grotesque than to the comprehensible world" (13). Due to the

abnormal development of civilisation and urbanisation, grotesque depictions of the writers sounded more like reality itself because moral decay, impoverishment, and horror were abundant.

Modernity saw the climax of grotesque art because it was a period that all the truth so far trusted, all the laws so far assumed valid have been deconstructed, and a new reality has started to be questioned in most of the dogmatic areas as well encouraged by the sceptical theories of revolutionists like Darwin, Freud, Einstein, Dewey, and Marx. According to McElroy, the primary character in grotesque fiction is a disgusting figure, an anti-hero, or a humbled guy. He claims that "[h]aving been taught since childhood that he is contemptible, even repugnant, he seizes repugnance as his banner and forces it upon the world with defiance and spite as an act of self-assertion" (23). The desperate agony and suspicion of the modern man seem to be good material for a grotesque character as they are first incomplete. Secondly, their degraded unhumanitarian situation is consistent with the incomplete nature of the grotesque and its thematic scope for the degradation. "He insists that perversity, not reason, is the basis of human character and the shaper of history, and that there is pleasure in perversity, that perversity is the weapon with which the individual fights for his autonomy against the stupid conformity of the average man" (28) and his perverse situation matches perfectly well with the perverse characteristic of the grotesque art. As quoted in Kayser, the Swiss playwright Dürrenmatt makes one of the most sensational claims that "[o]ur world led as inevitably to the grotesque as it did to the atom bomb" (11) and he adds:

> The grotesque … is only a sensuous expression, a sensuous paradox, the shape of shapelessness, the face of a faceless world; and just as our thinking seems unable to do without the concept of paradox, so is art, our world, which survives only because there is an atom bomb: in fear of it. (11-12)

As the grotesque initially appeared in architecture and different forms of art including painting or sculpture in Italy, its entry into literary works took some time. When it comes to the first use of the word "grotesque" as a literary term in Britain, the word "anticke" strikes attention. As Barasch contends, the representations of "demons and goblins" in Germany originating from "Teutonic mythological tradition" and "their similarity to the fauns and satyrs of the ancient Roman grotesques" resulted in calling "both types of fantasy" as 'antickes' in Tudor England" (40). To Barasch, "[i]n sixteenth-century England, it will be seen, similar connotations of 'monstrous' were attached to the word 'anticke', the Tudor term for 'grotesque'" (36) as a result, the English used the term 'anticke' when they meant 'grotesque' before the term became widely known in the literary world and was imported from other European countries. "[The word 'anticke'] already denoted 'chimera', 'demon', 'fool', and 'clown', and its meanings were transferred to 'grotesque' when the English adopted the new word in the next century" (40-41).

There were two different approaches towards the grotesque in England, which is, indeed, very similar to the attitudes towards the grotesque when it first appeared in other European countries, especially in Italy: "The first [Vasarian] was the uncritical acceptance of grotesque art as an antique and venerable style happily revived and embellished by modern Italian painters. The second [Vitruvian or Protestant] was the condemnation of grotesque ornamentation as immoral, indecorous, and inharmonious" (56). Even after the word grotesque entered English vocabulary, the word anticke continued to refer to the same thing for an extended period. As Barasch outlines, "[e]ventually, the association of 'anticke' and 'grotesque' in doubles was discontinued. The older term persisted in pulpit literature and the 'anticke-grotesque' double appeared in later books which were simply re-editions of, or which contained unrevised borrowings

from earlier books" (63). As an art term, in England, the grotesque is explained by Barasch as,

> … an ornamental style in imitation of the ancients, fantastic and delightful, "without anie . . . sense", but only "to please the eye" [Vasarian grotesque]. But 'grotesque' was also a synecdoche for the chimeric parts of the whole design; these chimeras were amusing harpies, mysterious sphinxes, ridiculous mermaids, or "monsters against nature" and "any rude misshapen thing", depending on the writer's critical principles. 'Grotesque' was also an ornamental technique used to fill surfaces left void in historical and mythological scenes, whether Italian or primitive. (77)

In brief, Barasch outlines three different attitudes towards grotesque art in England: the first one, parallel to the views of Vasari, underestimates the actual value of the grotesque, the second one is more appropriate for the actual use of the grotesque, which is composed of chimeric parts combining the natural with the unnatural or in unnatural ways, and the third one which is used just as a decoration technique. Throughout the thesis, the second form of the grotesque will be analysed, where ambivalence and hybridity are created by putting paradoxical and seemingly unmatching pieces together to create a shock effect on the reader.

Seventeenth-century England was a barren land for the use of the grotesque in art, even though it had been used more frequently in other areas like philosophy and politics. Regarding literature, according to Barasch, the name D'avenant is highly important. He states,

> The first writer in England to import the French word grotesques for fantastic characters…was William D'Avenant. D'Avenant already had used the art term 'Groteske' for a set of painted chimeras, a harpy and a foliated lion, in *Coelum Britannicum* (1633). About six years later, in 1639 or 1640,

> D'Avenant presented *Salmacida Spolia*, the last of the courtly masques of the reign of Charles I. In it, he used the word again with a new French spelling and an entirely different context. (81)

In D'Avenant's masques, "chimerical", "deformed", and "fantastical" characters were the prominent grotesque figures (82), and this is how it was introduced to the British literary world. In this way, the treatment of the grotesque as a trope for analysis has become a common trend in literature.

The relationship between the novel as a literary genre and the grotesque tradition became an area of interest for especially the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin and the American historian Peter Holquist. Bakhtin mainly focuses on the novel's "carnivalesque" characteristic by referring to the French writer Francois Rabelais' *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel*. Thus, Bakhtin situates the novel in a particular place because he claims that the novel is a polyphonic form of art which can be associated with a carnival's polyphonic atmosphere. He states:

> In the novel, literary language possesses an organ for perceiving the heterodox nature of its own speech. Heteroglossia-in-itself becomes, in the novel and thanks to the novel, heteroglossia-for-itself: languages are dialogically implicated in each other and begin to exist for each other (similar to exchanges in a dialogue). It is precisely thanks to the novel that languages are able to illuminate each other mutually; literary language becomes a dialogue of languages that both know about and understand each other. (400)

In literature, "heteroglossia" frequently draws attention to the employment of many linguistic forms in civilisations that employ formal or informal address systems, regional or local dialects, or any other alteration in language for religious, cultural, or social reasons. As also explained by Edwards and Graulund, "[a]s a literary mode, the novel, as [Bakhtin] argues, is different from other literary genres because it is characterised by a

plethora of competing speech patterns and registers; it does not conform to one tone of voice, structure or pre-existing expectation" (22). The term Bakhtin uses for this polyphonic quality of the novel is 'heteroglossia'. Bakhtin states that different from other genres which are "complete" and even "dead", the novel is "young" and still "developing". Different from the genres belonging to the "high literature" which have a "canon" and could be examined in categories, the novel has to be analysed "individually" as it has not established a category yet; and different from "high literature" which is explained by Bakhtin as "the literature of ruling social groups", the novel is anarchic as it is not "in harmony with" the other group of genres which can "can mutually delimit and mutually complement each other, while yet preserving their own generic natures", and, therefore are monophonic while the novel is an outcast which "gets on poorly with other genres", and therefore is "polyphonic" (Bakhtin 3-6). Edwards and Graulund elaborate on it, saying: "Meanings and utterances in novels are…heteroglot because the novel includes a multiplicity of social voices and their individual expressions" (22). This situation gives the novel a democratic and humanistic characteristic because "[a] single narrative voice [of other genres] might give the impression of authority, unity and closure, but no authoritative voice can stifle the competing voices in a novel where a variety of meanings that stem from social interactions in dialogue are constantly produced" (22). As a result, "[t]his plenitude of voices and meanings undermines the integrity of the dominant narrative voice, for, in these conditions, monologue is not really possible" (22).

The carnivalesque is "an effective critique of society's norms, … in that it is, like the novel, the source of dialogics in which no one voice, no one authority, is able to impose its supremacy upon another" as elaborated by Edwards and Graulund. Leesa Fanning, in her chapter entitled "Willem de Kooning's Women: The Body of the Grotesque", clarifies the relationship between the novel and the grotesque, or to be more precise, the carnivalesque characteristic of the grotesque, as follows:

> The carnivalesque is not just an aspect of a celebration, but, like the grotesque, it is a factor in texts and art, a liminal space where 'the law' is overturned. More than just parody, the carnivalesque is genuine transgression, an aspect of the semiotic/grotesque, a space where nonexclusive oppositions collide. (258)

Bakhtin claims that there is a liberation from societal mores in the carnival, a deviation from daily life that offers a space where customs are disregarded or abandoned, and this is how the perfect setting for the establishment of grotesque art is established. For him, carnivalesque is also a powerful critique of societal conventions because, like the novel, it is the source of dialogics in which no single voice, no single authority, can impose its supremacy over another. According to Bakhtin's approach, "the novel is sometimes a liberating bogatyr, a hero, and sometimes a debunking trickster" (Holquist 70).

To sum up, the deconstructive, heteroglot, polemical, trickster, transgressive, heteroclite, and independent qualities have affinities with the grotesque and its construction in the novel. Moreover, inspired by Rabelais' work where "the material bodily principle, that is, images of the human body with its food, drink, defecation, and sexual life, plays a predominant role" (18) "which differs sharply from the aesthetic concept of the following ages" (18), Bakhtin claims that "this ideology" which is "attributed to "materiality" and to the "body" should be called "grotesque realism" (18). Bakhtin claims that "[t]he essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (19-20). Therefore, it is more realistic and "downward" which, as Bakhtin claims, is "earth" rather than being "upward" which is "heaven" (21).

CHAPTER II

THE GROTESQUE AS A MIMETIC TOOL IN *LORD OF THE FLIES*

This chapter aims to demonstrate the parallels between the characteristics of grotesque literature and the social and political background of the novel *Lord of the Flies* (1954) by William Golding, which forms a *bricolage* of the modern world, deconstructing and reconstructing the stereotypical conceptions of childhood and innocence in 19th century children's adventure novels such as Robert Michael Ballantyne's *The Coral Island* (1857) and Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1883). To this end, firstly, the representation of the grotesque imagery in the novel will be analysed. Secondly, the shock mechanism triggered by the grotesque imagery will be elaborated within the conceptual frame of hybridity, ambivalence, monstrosity, and carnivalesque. The post-war pessimism, which refutes the notion that all people are noble beings, conforms to the features of the gloomy grotesque tradition; hence, it is an objective tool for humankind to perceive their degraded self from a neutral perspective. Grotesque realism acts as a mimetic tool for the novel in satirizing the established concepts like children are innocent, western part of the world is civilized, democracy is more powerful than the tyranny, and murdering others and barbarousness is only for the evil wild living beings and people of the underdeveloped societies, and evil comes from others or so called "other" countries. It also creates a *bricolage* out of the deconstructed pieces of "noble" conceptions uttered up to that time, in relation to the "British pride" from the earlier children's novels, especially *The Coral Island*. This is clearly revealed when Peterkin tells Jack "[he is] the best fellow [he] ever met in his life", which seems to be because "[he is] a Briton" (Ballantyne 38). The romantic influence that the book is under -the patronising idea about the superiority of the British people- is clearly reflected in Ballantyne's novel.

According to Bakhtin, the carnival atmosphere, which is devoid of any kind of norms, ethical values, dogmatic religious pressures, hierarchy, and social status

responsibilities helped to free the spirit of the people celebrating. Especially with the advantage of using masks, carnivalesque acts like role reversal, "orgiastic play" (Bakhtin 105), exaggeration of entertainment became possible, and people had the opportunity to act according to their free will. Different from the theatre scene, there was no distinction or limit between the spectators and the actors which removed the barrier between the entertainer and the entertained; everybody could laugh, and everybody could make others laugh which diminished the limits between "real and ideal" (8). According to Bakhtin, as a result of carnival entertainment, an optimistic relief comes to people; therefore, his carnivalesque symbolizes rebirth, relief, liberation and revival. He claims, "Carnival was the true feast of time, the feast of becoming, change, and renewal." (10). He emphasizes "the suspension of all hierarchical precedence during carnival time", which resulted in "… the creation of special forms of marketplace speech and gesture, frank and free…" (10). By "suspension", he means it in both "ideal and real" form (10). However, there is no hope at the end of Golding's novel, which originates the main argument in this chapter. In carnival atmosphere, according to Bakhtin, people tend to degrade themselves. In similar vein, the characters in Golding's novel, find themselves in a resemblant environment which does not have the legal rules of a socializing society, traditional teachings of the grown-ups, freed "from all religious and ecclesiastic dogmatism, from all mysticism and piety" (Bakhtin 7) and, inevitably, tend to degrade. This chapter will examine how the world of adults and children in *Lord of the Flies* are distorted, along with how the roles of animals and people are altered, which makes the novel subject to grotesque analysis. Briefly, it is a novel about a group of young boys who find themselves alone on a barren island. They build norms and an organizational structure, but in the absence of adults to act as civilizing impetus, the children inevitably become aggressive and vicious. William Golding claims in "On the Crest of the Wave" that he is "… by nature an optimist" (126), however, it is hardly possible to see a positive attitude in his

novel *Lord of the Flies*, which, indeed, helps the reader achieve the feelings and the messages the author aims to give. Accordingly, this chapter aims to discuss the elements of the grotesque tradition which appear in *Lord of the Flies*, in analogy with the satirical and political background of the novel.

The impression and image generated in the boys' heads as a consequence of the terror they experience as a result of their predicament, piled by the situation in the world outside, devastated by a worldwide war, will be discussed in this chapter as well. Thus, the pig's head and the parachute man, with their physical grotesque qualities, will be explained first, followed by the dichotomy between life and death in the hunting scene of the sow at a place where butterflies are dancing while the sow is mercilessly being slaughtered with its ambivalent and monstrous grotesque qualities. Thereafter, Jack and his team's howling, dancing and masking practices with their hybrid as well as carnivalesque grotesque qualities (the latter will be detailed in the later part related to the carnivalesque), three murders on the island which are committed by the little boys with their monstrous grotesque qualities will be explained in detail. The chapter will be concluded by commenting on the question asked by the naval officer to the kids, which ensures Shklovsky's "defamiliarisation" and "bestrangement" effect mentioned in the "Introduction".

The hunted pig's head which is offered "for the beast" as "a gift" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 170), is one of the most significant grotesque elements physically existing in the novel. The head of the pig, which is hung on a stick, two sides of which are sharpened, is a grotesque scene which combines two different bodies in one single body. Golding describes the scene: "Jack held up the head and jammed the soft throat down on the pointed end of the stick which pierced through into the mouth. He stood back and the head hung there, a little blood dribbling down the stick" (169). The stick, which is most probably made of long branches or young shoots of trees on the island, is jammed inside

the crack of a rock, and on top of it is erected the head of an animal is an elementary assembly of the famous depiction of the grotesque which is attained by "mingling of flora and fauna" (Barasch 13). As well as physically being a significant example of the grotesque look, Golding personifies the head and attributes humanistic qualities to it, stating, "[t]he head remained there, dim-eyed, grinning faintly, blood blackening between the teeth" (*Lord of the Flies* 170) which adds a new dimension for its grotesque appearance. The head is left in the forest, erected on the crack of a rock, and is allowed to decay, surrounded by flies which "were black and iridescent green and without number" (170), as a sacrifice to the "beast", that is why the book is titled *Lord of the Flies*.

The Hebrew word Beelzebub, a name for the devil, is translated literally as "The Lord of the Flies" in English. According to Bloom, "[f]or Golding, the true shape of Beelzebub is a pig's head on a stick, and the horror of war is transmuted into the moral brutality implicit (in his view) in most of us" (1). Moreover, Crawford highlights that the "…oxymoronic symbol, referred to in the title of the novel as "Lord of the Flies," reflects the enactment of misrule, the turning upside down of order and authority, of what is crowned. What is "lord" is lord only to flies –those insects of the scatological" ("Literature of Atrocity" 67) which reflect the carnivalesque grotesque qualities of the novel even in its title. According to Bakhtin, "comic crownings and uncrownings" (11) are the frequent applications of the carnivalesque; Golding's lord belonging to the flies is an excellent example of the comic crownings mentioned above.

In addition to the pig's head, the arrival of the dead parachute man causes a great deal of fear, worry and suspicion on the island, especially among the littluns who have already been under the severe effects of nightmares they saw lately. This doubt and inquiry related to an unnamed scary being on the island are first tried to be evaded by the grownups; however, later, they have to take it seriously and confess that they also need

to speculate on this unnamed snake-like being and understand what it really is so that they could know if they are really secure on the island. Piggy becomes the spokesperson of the littluns and states, “[one of the littluns] wants to know what you’re going to do about the snake-thing" (Golding *Lord of the Flies* 46). Ralph’s first reaction, as a leader of the group, is pretending to disregard the issue: “Ralph laughed, and the other boys laughed with him” (46) because taking the case seriously would increase the credibility and the horror of it. The small boy is insistent and asks again: “Tell us about the snake-thing” (46). The boy says it is a “beastie”, which is “[e]ver so big”, and claims “[h]e saw it” (46). Ralph becomes the sound of reason and explains: “You couldn’t have a beastie, a snake-thing, on an island this size, … You only get them in big countries, like Africa, or India” (47). A beast on an island would be unreasonable according to their official teachings, which are under the influence of novels like *The Coral Island* or *Treasure Island* and also because they are not in “other” countries like Africa or India. However, the small boy insists that he saw the beastie in the woods, that it came in the dark and tried to eat him, and he reveals he is scared and asks, “will it come back tonight” (47)? Jack, another leading character, helps Ralph console everyone about the beastie, finish the talk about the scary story, and put a stop to the chaotic environment:

> Ralph’s right of course. There isn’t a snake-thing. But if there was a snake we’d hunt it and kill it. We’re going to hunt pigs to get meat for everybody. And we’ll look for the snake too— … We’ll make sure when we go hunting. (48)

Later, Jack and Ralph meditate upon the incident by saying that the littluns were having nightmares at night, making them “talk and scream” (66). They try to be prudent about the words they use in case some of them would hear them. They correct Simon’s interruption when he uses the words like “beastie” and “snake-like thing”, which is stated by Golding as, “[t]he two older boys flinched when they heard the shameful syllable

[beastie]. Snakes were not mentioned now, were not mentionable" (66). This case is also crucial as it is another excellent example of parent-like practices of older children to protect the smaller ones. However, later, Jack, who symbolises the brutal power and courage on the island, talks about the beastie at one of the gatherings:

> Now they talk—not only the littluns, but my hunters sometimes—talk of a thing, a dark thing, a beast, some sort of animal. I've heard. You thought not, didn't you? Now listen. You don't get big animals on small islands. Only pigs. You only get lions and tigers in big countries like Africa and India—. (103)

He claims that he does not believe that there is a dangerous animal on the island that they need to be afraid of; despite that, the declaration of an animal, a beastie from him and his group's fear about the issue becomes a critical point on the island. From that point on, the beast's existence on the island becomes undeniable; only its attributes to it change on different occasions. As mentioned above, Jack labels it as "some sort of animal" (103) on one occasion, later explains the situation as a justification for the littluns' nightmares while scolding them because they "don't hunt or build or help" and only cry like "babies and sissies" (103). The ambivalent, fluid, and even contradictory descriptions of the beast intensifies the insecure and horrifying atmosphere on the island, increasing even more when different theories come from the children. An anonymous voice among the group speculates it might be "a ghost" (112); Jack argues with Ralph about the beast and bursting with anger, he says: "Bollocks to the rules! We're strong—we hunt! If there's a beast, we'll hunt it down! We'll close in and beat and beat and beat—!" (114) claiming first they are more robust. Then he ceremonially presents the head of his first pig hunt to the beast as a "gift" and puts it in a celestial position (170). The twins claim they "saw the beast with [their] own eyes" when "[they] weren't asleep" (172-74), refuting the theory that it was nothing but a nightmarish illusion, as well as making the most detailed

description of the beast as “furry”, having “wings”, having the ability to move, with an “awful” appearance and a sitting up position, having “eyes”, “teeth” and “claws” (124). They also claim to have been followed by the beast while they were running away from it, and one of them says that it “nearly touched” him (124-25). This shocks the boys, and “Johnny, yawning still, burst into noisy tears and was slapped by Bill till he choked on them. The bright morning was full of threats and the circle began to change” (125).

All these incidents were satisfying enough for the rest of the group of children to be sure that there was a beast on top of the mountain except for Simon, for whom everything seemed unreasonable; “a beast with claws that scratched, that sat on a mountain-top, that left no tracks and yet was not fast enough to catch Samneric”, nonetheless, Simon imagined the beast as something with a “picture of a human at once heroic and sick” (128). All these attributions for the physical qualities and abilities of the beast proved one thing for sure: everything was ambiguous as the beast was both “heroic” and “sick” at the same time, and as only Simon noticed, it was all ambivalent which supported the grotesque qualities of the beast. Moreover, the horrifying animalistic qualities of the beast combined with humanistic characteristics match perfectly with the physical hybrid grotesque appearance of the being. The rumour does not end even after the first encounter with the beast. The grotesque combination of animalistic and humanistic qualities continues with descriptions like “something like a great ape was sitting asleep with its head between its knees … [which] … lifted its head, holding toward them the ruin of a face” (152-53). It was something that looked like a “tiger” as well as looking like an “ape”, which adds to its hybrid grotesque figuration. It had “big black eyes” and “teeth” with a huge body, and it sat up and looked at the group of boys who climbed up the mountain to see it (154-55). There was also confusion over where the beast had come from: some claimed that “[t]he beast comes out of the sea”, while some claimed it came from the mountain among the trees when it is dark, and some insisted

that it sat up on top of the mountain "waiting" for the boys to "hunt" them (156). All these different and inconsistent descriptions, indeed, suggest the following: the chaos triggered by the horror and insecurity on the island, which is even more triggered by the horrors of World War II, causes chaos and shock in the children, and they become afraid of what they cannot describe, comprehend, personalise, or find bizarre, horrifying, terrible. Being afraid of the unknown provides a perfect atmosphere for the grotesque imaginings on the island in which the imaginary world of the boys supplements reality.

Wolfgang Kayser, in his *Grotesque in Art and Literature*, while outlining the artistic production of Bruegel, uses the descriptive adjectives "… inexplicable, incomprehensible, ridiculous, and horrible" (35); he defines Poe's art as "…a concrete situation in which chaos prevails … entire stories concerned with terrible, incomprehensible, inexplicable, bizarre, fantastic, and nocturnal happenings" (79), while E. T. A. Hoffman and Bosch's artistic production is described as "… incomprehensible, inexplicable, and impersonal" (185) concerning their grotesque characteristics. Golding's use of the grotesque in the novel is the same: bizarre, fantastic, inexplicable, chaotic, incomprehensible happenings, especially in the dark, open the way to the grotesque and all the descriptions above, the hybrid qualities were fictional and realistic, animalistic, and humanistic qualities which are subtly interwoven supports the eerie atmosphere the book was inspired by. On the other hand, the shock aimed to be aroused in the readers makes use of these grotesque ambiguities because, as Kayser asserts, "…reader is affected by the incomprehensibility of the phenomenal world which is strange and dreamlike" (147). According to Kayser, the grotesque has a crucial function in these cases; people describe what they cannot comprehend as grotesque. He explains this with reference to Inca art as it is a distant culture, especially for the western culture. He states that many of the Incas' sculptures will appear grotesque to those unfamiliar with their culture. Still, it's possible that what we perceive as nightmare-inducing and ominously demonic

artwork—that is, the art form through which some horror, agony, or panic of the inexplicable is expressed—is a familiar form that fits neatly into a coherent framework (181).

As discussed in the "Introduction", Kayser explains the grotesque as [in capitals] "AN ATTEMPT TO INVOKE AND SUBDUE THE DEMONIC ASPECTS OF THE WORLD" (185). In Golding's novel, it is precisely how the children instinctually benefit the grotesque; they try to suppress the demonic aspects and horrors created by World War II by creating their own beasts on the island, and accordingly, Golding draws attention to the evil facet of the world. In the sixth chapter, the ambiguity about the beast is resolved by Golding. The beast turns out to be the human's own self, not an exterior beast, thus revealing the novel's moral message that the sole enemy, beast, or evil for humankind is not a foreigner or an outsider but rather humankind itself. The Beast turning out to be the parachute man is physical proof of Golding's opinion which is encapsulated in his words, "… the only enemy of man is inside him" (Golding, "Fable" 255), an idea which he elaborates on, stating:

> One of our faults is to believe that evil is somewhere else and inherent in another nation…you think that now the war is over and an evil thing destroyed, you are safe because you are naturally kind and decent. But … the thing rose in Germany… could happen in any country. It could happen here. (255)

The image of the dead parachute is compared to the movement of an independent kite, freed from the tree branch it got stuck inside, slowly waving in the air and collapsing into the water with the slowest moves. As the narrator points out:

> … sign came down from the world of grownups, though at the time there was no child awake to read it. There was a sudden bright explosion and corkscrew trail across the sky; then darkness again and stars. […] a figure dropping

> swiftly beneath a parachute, a figure that hung with dangling limbs. The changing winds of various altitudes took the figure where they would. […] The figure fell and crumpled among the blue flowers of the mountain-side, […] the parachute flopped and banged and pulled. So the figure, with feet that dragged behind it, slid up the mountain. Yard by yard, puff by puff, the breeze hauled the figure through the blue flowers, […] and the figure sat, its helmeted head between its knees, held by a complication of lines. When the breeze blew, the lines would strain taut and some accident of this pull lifted the head and chest upright so that the figure seemed to peer across the brow of the mountain. Then, each time the wind dropped, the lines would slacken and the figure bow forward again, sinking its head between its knees. […] the figure sat on the mountain-top and bowed and sank and bowed again. (118-19)

The use of evocative language and the inclusion of all the information above makes one think of Kayser's argument, which he supports with an example from Inca art, that the boys' extraordinary and inexplicable dread and worry do, in fact, have an obvious explanation: traces of human evil, and remains of the war-the parachute man- physically visited the island where the boys were abandoned. By giving each detail and doing it at the slowest pace, Golding reinforces the idea that nothing is inexplicable. That is the brutal reality of the world, which is incomprehensible. According to Golding, they will find a reason for it as he states, "… when they [our prejudices] go beyond a certain point … they are wholly evil. Jew and Arab in the name of religion, Jew and Nordic in the name of race, Negro and white in the name of God knows what" ("Fable" 258). Paul Crawford excellently explains the situation saying, "In *Lord of the Flies*, fantastic hesitation breaks into the shocking natural explanation that the "Beast" is not an external, supernatural force of evil". According to Crawford, the only "Beast" on the island is the

fascist gang of English teenage boys who murder or attempt to murder the ones they label as “others”: Simon, Piggy and Ralph. Bloom focuses on the inner evil side of the human being as “[t]he dead parachutist, in Golding’s own interpretation, represents History, one war after another, the dreadful gift adults keep presenting to children” (1) related to the repetitive evil nature of human beings, the bloody and traumatic results of which are generally endured by small children like in Golding’s plot. Dickson supports Bloom’s claim and Golding’s opinion within the framework of the fallen nature of the man for “[t]he dead parachutist, whom the boys mistake for the Beast, is a symbolic reminder of the human history of self-destruction; the parachutist is literally and figuratively a "fallen man” (12-13).

Golding in “Fable” expresses how “man’s capacity for greed, his innate cruelty and selfishness” became no longer unconcealable, how he became sure that “man was sick” and this man was the “average man” … “not exceptional man” how he “believed that the condition of man was to be a morally diseased creation” and his mission as a writer “was to trace the connection between his diseased nature and the international mess he gets himself into” (252-53). He explains his self-awakening process in detail, stating:

> Before the Second World War I believed in the perfectibility of social man; that a correct structure of society would produce goodwill; and that therefore you could remove all social ills by a reorganisation of society.” … I am thinking of the vileness beyond all words that went on, year after year, in the totalitarian states. … They were not done by the head-hunters of New Guinea, or by some primitive tribe in the Amazon. They were done, skilfully, coldly, by educated men, doctors, lawyers, by men with a tradition of civilisation behind them, to beings of their own kind. … I must say that anyone who moved through those years without understanding that man produces evil as a bee produces honey, must have been blind or wrong in the head. (251-52)

Reiff claims that hopelessness and pessimism in Golding's nature and in his novels could be related to Golding's belief that people could not change their nature despite all the improvements and developments (65). Simply put, "Golding sees evil within man, but he does not see that evil is also outside of man, omnipresent and multiform, and that man is forever too weak to combat it" (McCullen 218). Evil is a reflection of the degraded self of the human beings, and the belief that the evil comes from others is nothing more than a hypocritical relief for them; therefore, Golding is hopeless about the salvation of the people and their possible enthusiasm towards the noble and the ethical values because he knows the human nature is instinctually willing to act according to its id and dominated by its primitive side whenever it finds the opportunity as explained by Bakhtin in defining the carnival and grotesque realism.

2.1. Grotesque Realism and *Bricolage*

Inspired by Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas related to carnival and carnivalesque, Allon White elaborates on the term "grotesque" and "carnivalesque" by focusing on the notion of "inversion", especially "the ritual inversions" (105). The phrases such as "reversible world" and "world turned upside down" are used to describe how carnival inverts everyday community customs, rules, and habits because where there is a carnival, "[h]ierarchies are inverted, kings become servants, boys become bishops, men dress as women and vice versa" (105). What is labelled as a "normal" moral rule becomes abnormal while all the prohibitions are ceased, and bodily pleasures even as extreme as "orgiastic play", "robust revelling in mud", or "excrement" (105) are tolerated.

According to Bakhtin, carnivals were "temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order"; therefore, they "marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions". As Bakhtin further adds, they were the periods of "becoming, change, and renewal" (10). In addition to the notion that Bakhtinian carnivalesque inversion merely consists of exchanging celestial values and

lower bodily stratum, the concept implies a reversion in the roles of social status, and this carnivalesque definition will be the focal point for the clarification of the carnivalesque in *Lord of the Flies*.

The book invites discussion of three different carnivalesque practice models: first, resulting from the distortion of the responsibilities of the adult and the child world, second by the dehumanisation of the people by attacking nature, imitating and attacking the animals and showing carnival-like dances after massacring the animals, and finally by Golding's artistic criticism of the dichotomy of conceptions "civilised" and "savage" throughout the novel. According to Bakhtin, "[t]he suspension of all hierarchical precedence during carnival time" was critical because "during official feasts", opposing to the carnivals, "[r]ank was especially evident [where] everyone was expected to appear in the full regalia of his calling, rank, and merits and to take the place corresponding to his position" (10). It ordained nothing but "inequality"; however, everyone was assumed "equal" in carnival time. This reversal of "hierarchical rank" created during the carnival is "liberating from norms of etiquette and decency imposed at other times" (10). Bakhtin talks about a "characteristic logic" where everything is switched, "the peculiar logic of the "inside out" (*a l'envers*), of the "turnabout," of a continual shifting from top to bottom, from front to rear, of numerous parodies and travesties, humiliations, profanations, comic crownings and uncrownings" (11). This will set the stage for the discussion of concepts like civilised and uncivilised, as well as rational and irrational behaviour. The distortion among these binarily opposite conceptions creates grotesque ambivalence, helps increase the shock effect with the reader, and the concepts start to become questionable, leading the reader to question his position in the world. In a setting where the civilised turns out to be savage, secure turns out to be uncanny, and innocent turns out to be evil slaughterer. Where they are all closely interwoven with each other, the reader starts to doubt even the most evident conceptions. The mingling of the mutilated and fragmented conceptions

creates hybrid misconceptions in the world like a leader who is a monarch but "affectionate", someone with a vicious character who has excuses like "neglected childhood", a war declared on a weak country with "noble" reasons, a thief who stole for "reasonable justifications", and so on. This uneasy and deconstructed environment that does not seem familiar to the reader depicts the general aim of the post-war novel. The alienated reader cannot identify with the hero as he can do with the various heroes of the Victorian novel; he reads the plot as if reading about a stranger's story living on another planet. Male or female, Victorian characters are generally strong-willed people who are rebellious and disobedient about the conditions they have lived in. Moreover, they are realistic like our next-door neighbours, somebody we come across on a public vehicle or on a distant end of a farmland; not isolated but commoners in our dwellings; therefore, they are easier to sympathise with. In grotesque novel, the sudden awakening that comes when the reader understands the story he has been reading is not the story of an alien from another planet but of himself (as it is done by revealing the real identity of the beast to be the parachute man) comes with a shock. This is the function of the grotesque in the novel, to create shock and to alert the reader about the actual degradation in the world and to embrace it with all its ugliness rather than rejecting it.

Bakhtin's expression of the carnivalesque is mainly based on folk humour and laughter generally attained by "folk festivities of the carnival type, the comic rites and cults, the clowns and fools, giants, dwarfs, and jugglers, the vast and manifold literature of parody" (5), a tendency which does not correspond to the serious ironic tone of Golding. However, it could be argued that the carnivalesque is made manifest in *Lord of the Flies* through "noncelebratory, violent, and fascistic carnivalesque behaviour" (Crawford "Literature of Atrocity" 104). The novel supports the carnivalesque qualities with "…a long tradition of turning the world upside down, of symbolically subverting the dominant, ruling hierarchies of social existence [where] …[r]ules are forgotten for a

period of time [which are interchanged by] an enactment of desires and drives that has been repressed" (*Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down*, 42-43). To begin with, the children, whose ages range between 6 to12 have to act like adults from the beginning till the end of the novel, like holding an election for a leader of the group, setting the rules to decide who to speak to in assembly, delivering duties like searching for food and water, or building shelters and keeping the fire alive for a signal for a probable passing ship, or even hunting for survival. Even though the novel starts with an allusion to R. M. Ballantyne's classic Victorian novel *The Coral Island,* the ending of the novel proves enough that Golding's story has no relation to that romantic reading at all since Ballantyne's novel ends with idealising the notion of civilisation. Golding reverses *The Coral Island* by attributing the notion of savagery to the English boys. This is complemented by James Gindin's claim that Ballantyne is influenced by the perception of the child that dates back to the nineteenth century, at least as far as Rousseau and Locke. According to this perception, children are either "naturally good" or "neutral", manifesting their best when left alone and untainted by the adult world or reflecting and recreating the wholesome and civilised environment in which they first developed (21).

In *Lord of the Flies,* Golding sets out to undo this belief in the civilised Enlightenment, which grew from a belief in human potential in the eighteenth century to a distinctively English social achievement in the nineteenth (Gindin, "The Fictional Explosion" 12). The island looks like a "boy's paradise", an imaginary perfect world full of adventure, ingenuity, freedom, joy, enough food, and everything but parents, or so it appears at first. The island offers food, water, housing options, and no harmful animals. It is playing time, with no grownups imposing limits or ordering the kids to bed. It will be a "wacko, magical" fun time, as Ralph and others initially imagine, with adventures and excursions, as well as games of leadership, battle, hunting, and tag (Stone 5). Ralph speaks out the general initial belief of the children "This is our island. It's a good island.

Until the grownups come to fetch us we'll have fun", and he adds, "While we're waiting, we can have a good time on this island" and he talks about the sentimental memories of reading the schoolbooks about the isolated island saying "It's like in a book" and the references are made to "Treasure Island", "Swallows and Amazons—" and finally to "Coral Island—" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 45).

The romantic view of fairy-haired boys on the golden beach sand surrounded by aquamarine lagoons fades when the older boys understand that they need to do something for themselves, at least until the adults discover them. The first thing they decide to do is to survey the land where they are deserted, hoping the land to be a dwelling place. To their shock, they find that they are at a place where there is no human dwelling: "We're on an island. We've been on the mountain top and seen water all round. We saw no houses, no smoke, no footprints, no boats, no people. We're on an uninhabited island with no other people on it." (43). Awakening to the cold reality from the warm romantic memory of a deserted island in their mind from earlier schoolbooks like *The Coral Island* or *The Treasure Island*, Ralph becomes the first child to talk about responsibilities they need to take for survival: "There aren't any grownups. We shall have to look after ourselves" (43). To do so, they have to establish a kind of a system of rules, as Ralph states, because "…[they] can't have everybody talking at once. [they]'ll have to have 'Hands up' like at school" (43). The "conch" becomes the symbol of authority, and the person who holds it also holds the right to speak in the meeting of the boys; Ralph says, "…I'll give the conch to the next person to speak. He can hold it when he's speaking" (43). The first rule is set this way, and starting to take adult-like responsibilities starts accordingly. Still, carrying British pride, Piggy supports Ralph like he supports his leadership in many cases, saying, "I agree with Ralph. We've got to have rules and obey them. After all, we're not savages. We're English, and the English are best at everything. So we've got to do the right things" (55). Under the long-lasting illusion of British

superiority as well as literally uttering the civilised versus savage dichotomy for the first time, and by adding a nationalist dimension, a sentiment which means nothing to the world of the young children, Piggy amplifies the level of responsibilities to the next level, increasing the psychological strain over the children.

The election for deciding for the “chief” between the two charismatic leaders of the group (Ralph and Jack) is one of the most apparent applications of the carnivalesque reversal of roles of the adult and children worlds. Ralph makes the first comment about the necessity for a leader, stating, "[s]eems to me we ought to have a chief to decide things," and the group of boys enthusiastically respond, "A chief! A chief! (29). Jack becomes the first candidate to be the group leader, expressing his reasons by saying, “… because I’m chapter chorister and head boy. I can sing C sharp” (29) like a politician’s election propaganda. When no one rejects this idea, and Jack is just about to declare his leadership, a suggestion about having “a vote” comes from Roger, which is welcomed by the crowd. The election was a kind of game for the boys more than a serious adult world election, which Golding reveals as he says: “This toy of voting was almost as pleasing as the conch” (30). However, voting belongs to the adult world normally, and boys tend to be very successful in accomplishing this task, too, indeed. Jack, the leader of his choir party, volunteers to survey the island and seek potential meat for sustenance as well as being "responsible for keeping the fire going" and “for keeping a lookout too [in case they] see a ship out there” after losing the election to lead the entire group (55). Even though the election signals the so-called British nobility like democracy, things do not go as planned in Golding’s fiction different from Ballantyne’s fiction. Indeed, by making use of the conceptions created by the earlier children’s novels, by deconstructing them and imprecisely reconstructing them, Golding creates the *bricolage* of the modern world. The reader, affected by the earlier fiction, waits for the salvation of the boys both physically and ethically; however, this expectation is turned upside down by what

happens in Golding's fiction. The modern picture of a group British boys has familiar parts from the earlier fiction like a beautiful coral island, turquois water, golden sand, the election practice, efforts of building shelter, blonde-haired boys, even character names (Golding borrows the names of Ballantyne's characters, Ralph and Jack); however, the total picture has nothing to do with the reader's earlier memory: it only forms a *bricolage* from these broken pieces. While forming this *bricolage*, Golding intentionally gives a paradoxical message with the original romantic idea related to the superiority of the British people.

Initially, the boys satisfy their hunger by consuming the island's vegetation, like fruits and vegetables. However, hunting is significant as a practice from two distinct perspectives: firstly, because it completely belongs to the adult world and is risky for young boys, and secondly, because it plays a crucial role in the boys' changing attitude as they become more and more savage. Both of these perspectives support the grotesque image in the reader's mind with their ambivalent qualities, which is of fair-haired so-called "civilised" British schoolboys hunting for wild animals with their primitive weapons like spears and sticks. The combination of these two inappropriate elements in one picture is similar to, as in Barasch's words, the "mingling of flora and fauna … in the antique frescoes of the grottoes or catacombs of Rome" (13). In the beginning, hunting starts like a game for Jack's team; however, later, it turns out to be something that feeds their animalistic instincts and causes them to release their barbarian side, which will be analysed later in relation to the grotesque conception of ambivalence as they are more closely related.

The excitement of hunting a wild boar leads them to forget their chief role of keeping the fire going, their only chance of survival. A ship passing by is missed since Jack and his team act irresponsibly and forget about the fire they must keep alive. Acting irresponsibly and unreasonably causes even more horrifying costs. The narrator's remark

foreshadowed this: “The world, that understandable and lawful world, was slipping away. Once there was this and that; and now—and the ship had gone” (113). The reader’s initial departure from the illusion of the narrative and suspicion caused them to examine what was rational and irrational. Piggy becomes the voice of the reader to ask the questions stuck in mind: “What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages? What’s grownups going to think? Going off—hunting pigs—letting fires out—and now!” (113). Further, it also reveals that Piggy still carries the load of being responsible for acting wisely towards the grownups because that is what is expected from them even though they are only young boys. Although they are not expected to act responsibly, at least not for the tasks inappropriate for their age range, they do so, they create the carnivalesque effect by exchanging their roles with the adults. Another thing that is not expected from them is to set up shelters to sleep in, secure themselves against bad weather conditions, and establish a secure consolidating area for the “littluns”. As also explained by Babb, “[s]ociety’s attempt to build shelters proves as ineffective as its effort to keep a signal fire going” (9). The littluns are dissuaded by the temptation of different games and are physically inconvenient as the task demands strength and durability under the hot sun without any kind of protection. As Babb elaborates, “[o]nly Ralph and Simon are still on the job when Golding first shows us this world at work, the other children having drifted off to doing whatever they enjoy, with Jack devoting himself to mastering a technique for hunting pigs” (9). This distinction between these two leading characters in the novel creates a kind of otherness that encompasses the rest of the novel as Friedman explains: “[s]oon Ralph and Jack find communication impossible, the former talking of building shelters, the latter of killing pigs” (61). Ralph complains about the difficulty of his job as well as being abandoned by the rest of the children to Jack stating, “They’re hopeless. The older ones aren’t much better. D’you see? All day I’ve been working with Simon. No one else. They’re off bathing, or eating, or playing” (Golding *Lord of the Flies* 64). He wants to

remind Jack of their decisions at the meeting: "And they keep running off. You remember the meeting? How everyone was going to work hard until the shelters were finished?" (64) In a way, he expects support from Jack and his choir as they are physically more capable of the job. Even though they are children, too, Ralph, Simon, and Piggy must bear the parental burden of comforting the little ones when they are terrified of the fictitious beast on the island. Building shelters is part of their role, which is literally revealed as "So we need shelters as a sort of—" … "Home" (66-67). Trying to build up a "home" to secure their younger friends on an uninhabited island is a hefty loan on a young child's shoulders, besides being improper as a task for a standard European child. Ralph understands that shelters are to shield themselves from the rain as well as to protect themselves from the beast that the littluns keep mentioning. Another thing to be mentioned related to the shelter is that in earlier versions of deserted island and children's novels like *Treasure Island* or *The Coral Island*, boys are able to build up shelters, ships or fire; however, what distinguishes Golding's novel is his use of strict realism. He explains his choice as follows:

> I decided to take the literary convention of boys on an island, only make them real boys instead of paper cutouts with no life in them; and try to show how the shape of the society they evolved would be conditioned by their diseased, their fallen nature." (Golding, "Fable" 253)

Rather than idealising the boys' attitudes as in his previous novels, Golding intended to write about their genuine behaviours, including the evil in them and their angelic side. He states this also in the audio introduction of the book: "Wouldn't it be a good idea to write a story about some boys on an island, showing how they would really behave, being boys and not little saints as they usually are in children's books." (Golding, "Introduction" *Lord of the Flies*). This approach was sensational as much as being revolutionary in the canon because, as Bergman states, "[b]efore Golding, nobody had ever attempted such

raw realism in a book about children. Instead of sentimental tales of houses on prairies or lonely little princes, here — ostensibly — was a harsh look at what kids are really like" (41). Stephen King approves the idea stating that "[s]omething about those books [set in the 20s and 30s] was just wrong. The kids in them were wrong." ("Introduction"), and he further adds:

> Flies wasn't a bit like the boys' books in the parsonage; in fact, it rendered those books obsolete. In the parsonage books, the Hardy Boys might get tied up, but you knew they'd get free. A German Messerschmitt might get on Dave Dawson's tail, but you knew he'd get away (by putting his Spitfire in prop-clawing mode, no doubt). (King, "Introduction")

It increased the shock effect created by the book, and the message aimed to be conveyed through the book shook the reader more poignantly. The strong effect created has benefited from the pastoral outlook of the previous books written with similar themes; however, with the cliché scenario where children have lots of fun, manage to overcome all the difficulties and the adults are just in time to save them from the island without any severe damage. Actually, Golding's book was published in 1954, right after the two biggest world wars in the history of human life; it was written in an environment entirely unlike the climate of Ballantyne's book. Kelly claims that Golding saw the realities of schoolboy conduct and biases as a teacher, which inspired his writing (9). The truth was far different from what was depicted in many children's adventure books, including the well-known Victorian novel *The Coral Island* by R. M. Ballantyne.

2.2. Dehumanisation and the Uncanny Effect

In addition to the thematic travesty and the shift between adult responsibilities and childish playfulness, the dehumanisation of the children towards nature by burning the island twice and their brutal approach towards wild animals through hunting practices strikes attention in the novel. Instead of showing sympathy towards the children, the novel

foregrounds their savage attitude on the island because what is expected from those characters as civilised beings is to behave sensibly and environmentally friendly. These qualities are especially ignored in three different cases: two fires and the murder of the sow, which are among the most significant incidents in the plot when the humanistic qualities of the children are eroded. This degradation is one of the components of the grotesque, as Bakhtin explains: "[t]he essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (*Rabelais and His World* 19-20). The degradation in Golding's novel appears in two different forms: the first is by the actions of human beings unvirtuously, and the second is by having animalistic attributions of the people, as may also be explained as a part of rhetorical art.

Animal imagery reinforces the boys' transformation into savages and subhumans. Predictably, evil is associated with the beast, the pig's head, or a snake, but as the story progresses, the boys themselves are described with an increasing number of animal images. The boys' disrobing early in the novel at first suggests a return to innocence, but as the hunters become more and more savage, their nakedness merely underscores their animalism. Dickson's claims that the boys' transition into "savages and subhumans" is reinforced by the use of animal images. Unsurprisingly, evil is represented by "the beast, the pig's head, or a snake", but as the plot develops, the lads themselves are increasingly shown as animals. The boys' stripping off early in the book first symbolises "a return to innocence"; however, as the hunters grow increasingly vicious, their nakedness only serves to emphasise their "animalism" (54). This animalism is part of the degradation of the self; therefore, it is directly related to Bakhtinian grotesque realism. All the animalistic traits of the characters are listed by Dickson as follows:

> Sam and Eric grin and pant at Ralph "like dogs" (pp. 17 and 46). Jack moves on all fours, "dog-like," when tracking the pig (p. 53); during the hunt he

> hisses like a snake, and is "less a hunter than a furtive thing, ape-like among the tangle of trees" (p. 54). Ralph calls him a "beast" (p. 214). Piggy, whose very name suggests an obvious comparison, sees that the boys are becoming animals; he says that if Ralph does not blow the conch for an assembly, "we'll soon be animals anyway" (p. 107). Without his glasses, Piggy laments that he will "have to be led like a dog" (p. 204). When he dies, his body twitches "like a pig's after it has been killed" (p. 217). Simon, hidden in the shadows of the forest, is transformed into a "thing," a "beast," when the narration shifts to the other boys' view (pp. 182–83). (54)

Towards the end of the novel, when all the other members of the surviving group of boys unite against Ralph and try to capture him, their savage and animalistic qualities reach their peak because they start to "howl" like a wild animal trying to threaten its prey before mortal combat starts: "It was an ululation over by the seashore— and now the next savage answered and the next. The cry swept by him across the narrow end of the island from sea to lagoon, like the cry of a flying bird" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 235). Surprisingly, the communication of the group employing ululation is reacted by animalistic movements of Ralph, too: "… worming his way into the thicket" … secretly trying to make out the place of the other boys from "the legs of a savage [his enemy] coming toward him" … by listening to the sound of "the legs moving in the long grass" (236). Then, the wild communication retakes place, "[t]he savage, whoever he was, ululated twice; and the cry was repeated in both directions, then died away. Ralph crouched still, tangled in the ferns, and for a time he heard nothing" (236). Thinking of these animalistic behaviours as symbols or in their real meanings, it supports the degraded self of the human beings in Bakhtinian sense. Moreover, the introduction of the *id* by Wolfgang Kayser to grotesque interpretation has also relation to this animal imagery. Different from the *id* in Freudian sense, he explains it is the "alien", "impersonal", and "inhuman" (184) force that controls

the people like “puppets” (186, 195, 198). The children are captivated by this force, and even the wisest ones cannot act properly when confronted with danger and horror. Ralph, who is accepted as the most civilised member of the gang, and most probably is the only character that the readers can sympathise with, or as declared by Stephen King in the “Introduction” (2011) of the novel to be the only character that many readers can identify with, is not different from the rest of the company in turning to his animalistic qualities. His gradual transformation is detailed by Dickson below:

> Early in the novel, he viciously accepts the hunters’ raw pig meat and gnaws on it “like a wolf” (p. 84). He is caught up in the savage ritual when Roger plays the pig (p. 181); he is part of the unthinking gang that murders Simon. When Piggy is killed, Ralph runs for his life and obeys “an instinct that he did not know he possessed” (p. 217). In the last chapter, Ralph is little more than a cornered animal. Ironically, he sharpens a stick in self-defense and becomes a murderous hunter himself. “Whoever tried [to harm him] would be stuck, squealing like a pig” (p. 231). We are told that he “raised his spear, snarled a little, and waited” (p. 233). Ralph’s transformation is both shocking and saddening. Alone in the forest, he brutally attacks the first adversary he meets: “Ralph launched himself like a cat; stabbed, snarling, with the spear, and the savage doubled up” (p. 234). When Ralph is trapped in the underbrush, he wonders what a pig would do, for he is in the same position (p. 236). (54-55)

This literal dehumanisation of the characters is very important because it contributes to their hybrid and ambivalent grotesque characteristics as well as it proves their degraded self and captivation by the *id*. According to Kayser, animalism is one of the essential characteristics of the grotesque, along with madness and automatism. As Stinson explains, “[i]n his last chapter, “An Attempt to Define the Nature of the Grotesque,”

Kayser seems to define three major grotesque motifs: animality [dehumanisation], madness, and automatism" (Stinson 75). Stinson further explains that "[t]he common denominator of the grotesque as a technique is always exaggeration. Its numerator may be various kinds of fanaticism, animalism, madness, perversion, and scatology" (Stinson xviii, xix). Moreover, it is another proof of the degradation of the human beings in terms of grotesque realism.

In the novel, "The Beast" is the most striking representation of the grotesque uncanny. Even though it is actually a dead "parachute" man whose parachute got stuck on top of a tree (Golding 189), children see it as a threat to their security - some labelled it a "beast", some labelled it with different animalistic and humanistic qualities, some even thought it had some supernatural powers. However, on the island, which is far away from the realities of the world, they do not even think it is one of the ugly remnants of World War II, or to say the least it is a dead human body. They are alienated from their daily routine before the plane crash. Moreover, they are defamiliarized with their own friends because of the fear of the "beast". Piggy, Ralph, and Jack's gang beat Simon to death with their bare hands. Even though he is a very familiar face to the children on the island, especially Piggy, Ralph and Jack, as he is one of the physically stronger ones on the island, they do not recognise him and torture him to death, thinking that the beast is attacking them. Piggy explains the uncanny feeling caused by Simon's death: "And what happened? What's grownups goin' to think? Young Simon was murdered. And there was that other kid what had a mark on his face. Who's seen him since we first come here?" (210). He is shocked and disturbed by it; however, his common sense is far away from the rest of the group, which leads to the traumatic killing of Piggy later. The disturbing uncanny effect is triggered when the children encourage each other by chanting, "Kill the beast! sever his throat! "Drop his blood!" (187, 188) a total of five times (!) soon after

their friend is mistaken for the beast and is slain by being repeatedly stabbed with spears by Piggy, Ralph, and Jack's tribe.

2.3. Carnivalesque Masks and "Piggification"

In addition to dehumanised characteristics attributed to the boys, wearing masks is another carnivalesque and hybrid illustration applied in the novel. Burke explains the relationship between wearing masks or make-up or paint and the carnival atmosphere, stating: "[w]earing masks helped liberate people from their everyday selves, conferring a sense of impunity like a cloak of invisibility in folktales … Masks not only liberated their wearers from everyday roles but imposed new ones" (202). Social statuses, as well as one's identity, disappear when one wears a mask. This gives the freedom to act according to the limitless demands of "id", in Freudian terms, when one is liberated from the norms of the society, "the superego". These demands might be related to limitless entertainment like the orgiastic play mentioned above or a tendency to commit a crime triggered by the animalistic instinct to murder. Jack is described as preparing his mask out of the mud and vegetal paints "Jack planned his new face" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 80). Golding's choice of words –"new face" – perfectly corresponds to the use of the carnivalesque mask and it also fits the change in his identity with his "new face". This is how Jack finishes his make-up, as the narrator points out: "[h]e made one cheek and one eye-socket white, then he rubbed red over the other half of his face and slashed a black bar of charcoal across from right ear to left jaw" (80).

Jack likes his "new face", looking at it "in astonishment" because he is "no longer [looking] at himself but at an awesome stranger" (80). His enjoyment of his new face is revealed literally as "[h]e spilt the water and leapt to his feet, laughing excitedly. Beside the pool his sinewy body held up a mask that drew their eyes and appalled them" (80). Then, the satisfaction of the new look is followed by the carnivalesque dance: "[h]e began to dance and his laughter became a bloodthirsty snarling. He capered toward Bill,

and the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness" (80). The mission of the mask is achieved by a change in the look and an escape from all the potential responsibilities of a conscious man. From that point on, there is also a transformation from a character ruled by the "superego" to the "id", with Jack and his team gradually increasing in number and savagery. Golding implies that Jack becomes successful in hiding himself behind his new look, saying, "… he [Ralph] saw that the tallest of them, stark naked save for paint and a belt, was Jack" (173). As Jack and his team insist on intensifying their hunting practices, they polarise against Ralph's small number of supporters who defend staying loyal to the rescue plan and not turning savages. Jack and his team's masking and painting practices do not make sense to them. As Ralph says, they will not abandon their initial plan "[j]ust for some meat — … [a]nd for hunting" and "for pretending to be a tribe, and putting on war-paint" (183). Even though his team "…understood only too well the liberation into savagery that the concealing paint brought", Ralph rejects the idea of "be[ing] painted" as they "aren't savages" (212). Ralph's last communication attempt with Jack and Jack's supporters demonstrates that it is no longer feasible to establish a healthy dialogue between them due to the sense of fear and discomfort created by the figure behind the mask:

> Freed by the paint, they had tied their hair back and were more comfortable than he was. Ralph made a resolution to tie his own back afterwards. Indeed, he felt like telling them to wait and doing it there and then; but that was impossible. The savages sniggered a bit and one gestured at Ralph with his spear. (216)

Crawford lists the elements of carnival and carnivalesque as "… rituals, spectacles, and a variety of folk culture motifs: fairs, feasts, processions, marketplace amusements, comic shows, costumes, masks, funeral wakes, dancing, mummery, dwarfs, giants, monsters, circus animals, parodies, travesties, vulgar farce, and "billingsgate" (*Politics and History*

in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down 45). In Golding's novel, these carnivalesque elements like masks, dances, shows, and role reversal help maintain the narrative's grotesque characteristics.

The part in the novel when Jack and his boys slaughter the pig is important regarding grotesque analysis from two different perspectives: first, it has carnivalesque characteristics as the boys, devoid of the responsibilities of a conscious mind, show all their primitive nature which is followed by a carnivalesque dance and performance imitating the hunting incident; second, the violent killing of a mother animal and the vibrant and happy dance of the butterflies are two contrasting themes that Golding juxtaposes to show the disparity between life and death which can be linked to grotesque ambivalence because it is not appropriate behaviour for a group of boys belonging to a civilised society, the oldest of whom are aged 12.

To begin with, the pig was at its most innocent moment, unaware of the evil plot being written related to her brutal slaughter. It was noticed "[u]nder the trees [when] an ear flapped idly. A little apart from the rest, sunk in deep maternal bliss, lay the largest sow of the lot" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 166). Golding suddenly skips to the pig's physical qualities because it means meat to human beings; therefore, her mass is more important than her innocence or maternal qualities: "She was black and pink; and the great bladder of her belly was fringed with a row of piglets that slept or burrowed and squeaked" (166). Soon after, the chase between the hunt and the hunters starts: "The drove of pigs started up; and at a range of only ten yards the wooden spears with fire-hardened points flew toward the chosen pig" (166). "One piglet" gets an unintentional deadly scar even though a baby it is "with a demented shriek, rushed into the sea trailing Roger's spear behind it" (166) and most probably drowns in the sea; however, there is no detail related to its fate because it is just a trivial detail. The life and death struggle of the mother sow continues without any show of pity or relinquish from the boys: "The sow gave a

gasping squeal and staggered up, with two spears sticking in her fat flank. The boys shouted and rushed forward, the piglets scattered and the sow burst the advancing line and went crashing away through the forest" (166). The details are shocking because it is similar to the trench war struggle, which was a leading narrative of war literature, especially depicting World War I. To begin with, it is not fair because the boys focus on only one member of the pigs even though they outnumber the pigs:

> They surrounded the covert but the sow got away with the sting of another spear in her flank. The trailing butts hindered her and the sharp, cross-cut points were a torment. She blundered into a tree, forcing a spear still deeper; and after that any of the hunters could follow her easily by the drops of vivid blood. (167)

The struggle of the desperate animal to get away from the boys is futile because the greed of the boys becomes totally unstoppable when they see the blood and the passion for catching. Golding describes, "…the sow staggered her way ahead of them, bleeding and mad, and the hunters followed, wedded to her in lust, excited by the long chase and the dropped blood" (167). The poor thing does its best to survive, and in the moment of life and death, Golding artistically puts the butterflies into the scene, which supports the ambivalence of the portrait. He writes:

> …she [the pig] spurted with her last strength and held ahead of them again. They [the hunters] were just behind her when she staggered into an open space where bright flowers grew and butterflies danced round each other and the air was hot and still. (167)

Finally, the sow cannot endure anymore and collapses, soon "…the hunters hurled themselves at her" (167). The children, who are physically unfit for an even, one-on-one battle with the sow, got courage when the animal gave up, and mercilessly attacked the animal, which proves the savage attitude of the boys. She got "frantic" and "she squealed

and bucked"; however, the boys were stabbing their wooden spears "whenever pig flesh appeared" instead of showing any sign of mercy (167). Because it is grotesquely ambivalent for a bunch of youngsters to slaughter a wild animal with passion, all covered in blood, the following details would shock the families of these children if they were informed about them at a parent-teacher conference at school; as a result, it also shocks the reader:

> Jack was on top of the sow, stabbing downward with his knife. Roger found a lodgement for his point and began to push till he was leaning with his whole weight. The spear moved forward inch by inch and the terrified squealing became a high pitched scream. Then Jack found the throat and the hot blood spouted over his hands. The sow collapsed under them and they were heavy and fulfilled upon her. (167-68)

In this merciless killing scene, there is a group of youngsters who are reckless to the merciless slaughtering going on very close to them, which resembles the portrait of the indifferent side of the world who do not care about anything around them, who keep dancing and reflecting all colours of life: "The butterflies still danced, preoccupied in the center of the clearing" (168). Golding uses all the details of agitation and agony as well as all the brutal nakedness of the barbaric acts of the children and juxtaposes the scenes of the slaughtering of the sow and the dancing of the butterflies.

The horrifying details of this scene play one of the most significant parts in the novel with respect to its moral message. The children, who were afraid of any potential threat coming from the wildlife on the island, proved to be the real threat as well as proving to be wilder than the wildlife. The details related to the escaping attempts of the sow, its deadly cries, choosing the mother pig as a prey, and the panic of the piglets scattered all around intensifies the horrific and demonic qualities of the novel, which is further escalated by juxtaposing it with the dancing of the butterflies. This imagery

amplifies the grotesque ambivalence of the scene. All these details increase the shock effect and the pessimistic ambience: butchering the sow and the excessiveness of blood, pain, scream, and despair is like a parody of the trench wars in World War I or the unmerciful killings by the Nazis during World War II. Crawford's "piggification" of humans is highly illuminating in that sense as he states, "… the sadistic 'rituals of degradation' employed in camps such as Auschwitz…Indeed, *Lord of the Flies* is replete with violent carnival images of the pig and the 'piggification' of humans, which is a carnivalesque reversal between human and beast" (*Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down* 47). As a contribution to Crawford's ideas, grotesque realism and degradation as a result of the carnival intoxication is another term that explains the piggification process of the people. The celestial values of manhood are brought down to world, and all are debased and materialised during this process according to Bakhtin, which is identical to the piggification process explained by Crawford.

Additionally, Bakhtin claims, that "... grotesque debasement always had in mind the material bodily lower stratum, the zone of the genital organs. Therefore, debasement did not besmirch with mud but with excrement and urine" (147). Together with any use of "marketplace language" flourished with any kind of "invective" (164) in the free carnival atmosphere, excrement is one of the debasing and degrading elements of the self in relation to grotesque realism. The carnivalesque reversal is further amplified by the boys' physical reactions: the life and death struggle between the sow and the group of boys causes revealing body liquids like sweat, hot blood or hot internal organs. The boys enjoy touching and messing with all this dirt they would despise if it were in their school garden or backyard. "He [Jack] giggled and flicked them [his hands in hot blood] while the boys laughed at his reeking palms. Then Jack grabbed Maurice and rubbed the stuff over his cheeks" (*Lord of the Flies* 168). Bloom gives a relevant outline of the profile of the children in the novel, stating, "[h]is boys are indeed British private school boys:

regimented, subjected to vicious discipline, and indoctrinated with narrow, restrictive views of human nature" (Bloom 2). They use dirt as part of their game and put mud on their faces to get ready for hunting, which also becomes a source of identification for Jack and his team. Gindin explains the effects of Golding's use of excrement, saying, "[Golding's] fiction is full of graphic descriptions of waste, of the functions of excretion…Mud, slime, faeces, waste of all sorts are points of focus in Golding's fictional landscapes, which […] suggests ugliness, moral failure, depravity and inadequacy" (*Modern Novelists: William Golding* 14). These instances of "ugliness, moral failure, depravity and inadequacy" (14) together with children's close interaction with bodily dirt serve as a proof for the debasement of the grotesque realism. Acting out the killing incident is a perfect example of carnival parodies which is not surprising to see in Golding's fiction; as a result, his work becomes subject to analysis in terms of the carnivalesque grotesque: " … Robert and Maurice acted the two parts; and Maurice's acting of the pig's efforts to avoid the advancing spear was so funny that the boys cried with laughter" (*Lord of the Flies* 168). Burke makes a highly sensational claim related to the carnivalesque elements suggesting that "[t]he cock and the pig were contemporary symbols of lust…" (Burke 187). In the novel, there are indirect references to sexual passion, which are associated with the "orgiastic play" of the carnival practices. The most significant example comes during the re-enaction of killing the sow when boys want "uproariously" to put the spear "right up her [sow's] ass" twice. Another one is when all the boys lean over the hot body of the sow when it is about to die: "The sow collapsed under them and they were heavy and fulfilled upon her" (Golding, *Lord of the Flies* 168). Symbolically, using a phallic object-the spear-to kill, which is numerously pierced to the flesh of a female pig, is another reference to carnivalesque sexual drives, orgiastic play.

2.4. Grotesque Ambivalence

Finally, the novel is hybrid in terms of its genre, which creates grotesque ambivalence. It carries the characteristic qualities of psychological fiction, allegorical fiction, and dystopian novel at the same time. A majority of the critics agree that the novel is a modern type of "fable" Harold Bloom (1), James Gindin (17), L. L. Dickson (45), Lawrence S. Friedman (62), James R. Baker (85), Paul Crawford (106), Virginia Tiger (135). Paul Crawford discusses the qualities in the novel which belong to "Juvenalian or noncelebratory satire" (50) as well as the "Menippean satire" (74), two concepts which are defined quite distantly from each other. As a result, the novel combines a series of qualities from a variety of literary genres, and it creates its own identity, which cannot be defined by any of the genres mentioned; however, it needs bits of explanations from all of them. This gives the novel a grotesque hybrid quality because the genres which are attributed to the novel are inconsistent, paradoxical, and combined inharmoniously.

In the novel, one of the most significant incidents that can be analysed through grotesque ambivalence comprises the hunting of the little boys for survival. Supplying food and water for life is not generally among the daily routines of these children; therefore, this practice is not very suitable for them, especially in the so-called modern world. The earlier feasts are composed of ripe fruits. Their joy comes out of the abundance of them on the island, about which Golding states that the littluns were with "double handfuls of ripe fruit" (71); nonetheless, Jack and his team decide to "kill a pig and give a feast" (165), both of which are close in concept to carnival feast. This suggests two ideas; first, that their hunting is not because they are choiceless, but only since they want to eat something different, and it is clarified by Ralph's accepting the meat because "his past diet of fruit and nuts, with an odd crab or fish, gave him too little resistance" (92), and second that this abundant eating can be associated with carnival feasting of Bakhtin. Jack introduces his "tribe" to the rest of the group showing the feast as one of

the attractions, addressing ", [l]isten all of you. Me and my hunters, we're living along the beach by a flat rock. We hunt and feast and have fun. If you want to join my tribe come and see us. Perhaps I'll let you join" (174). Jack's promotion of feasting and food composed of meat plays a critical role in enlarging the number of boys in his group because it is not a very easy task for little boys to find food. As Gregor points out, the children act according to their childish nature in the beginning until they come across the threat of the beast incredibly late in the evening when darkness covers the island with all its panic, and horror from the possible inanimate object, especially when combined with children's power of imagination. Things start to get out of control from the first utterance of the probability of a beast on the island. Gregor states that "the sense of the lawful and the forbidden is strong" (iv) at the beginning. He adds that Jack first finds it challenging to butcher a pig because the knife falling and cutting into living flesh was heavy for his young arms; moreover, he was disturbed by the blood. Roger hurls stones at Henry, but his real intention is to miss since he was still under the effect of the protection of their parents, the school, the police, and the legal system.

The children's games and innocent behaviour in this part of the novel perfectly correspond to their age and childish nature (iv-v). This is what is expected from them, not to hunt pigs, set fire to the island, do elections, try to maintain the fire burning as a sign for a passing ship, be responsible for the security of the younger children near them, or fight or murder each other blinded by the desires of their ids. A group of young boys trying to fulfil these kinds of responsibilities gives an ambivalent grotesque picture which constitute a contrast to their nature. They look neither savage with their blonde hair, school uniforms (even though they are torn apart), blue eyes and childish faces, nor civilised trying to survive on an uninhabited island. The unnecessarily bold and reckless attitudes of the hunting boys and littluns, conflicting with the overload of responsibilities of Ralph and his group of boys, regardless of their ages, continuously increase the tension

throughout the novel. Eventually, the death toll reaches five people in the novel: the pilot of the plane crash, and the dead parachutist, who are indirect reminiscences of the war being fought outside the island. Moreover, a small boy with a birthmark is implied to be killed by the fire on the island by Golding as "[n]o one had seen the mulberry-colored birthmark again" (107) after the big fire incident. It would be completely unfair to blame the boys for the first two murders and partly unjust to blame them for the third one: however, the murder of Simon and Piggy and the brutal manhunt for killing Ralph show the savage face of the boys. As Gregor explains, "Destruction is everywhere; the boy's world is only a miniature version of the adult's. By now the nature of the destroyer is becoming clearer; it is not a beastie or snake but man's own nature" (Gregor v). Whoever questions the unreasonable actions of the boys within the framework of reason dies. It is Simon first who speculates about the source of the evil on the island, stating, "What I mean is ... maybe it's only us" (111), and he is murdered:

> The sticks fell and the mouth of the new circle crunched and screamed. The beast was on its knees in the center, its arms folded over its face. It was crying out against the abominable noise something about a body on the hill. The beast struggled forward, broke the ring and fell over the steep edge of the rock to the sand by the water. At once the crowd surged after it, poured down the rock, leapt on to the beast, screamed, struck, bit, tore. There were no words, and no movements but the tearing of teeth and claws. (188)

While Simon is mistaken for the beast and is murdered by being stabbed repeatedly by Piggy, Ralph, and Jack's tribe with spears, the group of children motivate each other by yelling as "Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!" (187, 188) five times! After the reader is made aware that the evil is not a spooky outsider to the island but the ones already on the island-the man itself-the intruder-the parachute man-flies free in the air

from the branches he got stuck with and sank in the water, which supports the moral claim of the novel that the evil is no one outside the self but the self itself:

> Now a great wind blew the rain sideways, cascading the water from the forest trees. On the mountain-top the parachute filled and moved; the figure slid, rose to its feet, spun, swayed down through a vastness of wet air and trod with ungainly feet the tops of the high trees; falling, still falling, it sank toward the beach and the boys rushed screaming into the darkness. The parachute took the figure forward, furrowing the lagoon, and bumped it over the reef and out to sea. (189)

This is one of the major shocks with the story because it means that all the tension which has increased throughout the novel was for nothing horrifying in real but for something symbolically horrifying: the war. Therefore, the justification for all the grotesque debasement and self-degradation above becomes also pointless: people are ready to debase and degrade themselves; however, the wars, the scarcity, racism, unfair distribution of income, poverty, and so on are only meaningless justifications on earth. People, in a way or so, find a way to degrade themselves. In Bakhtinian grotesque realism, carnivals are for the benefit of the humans like entertainment, demonstrating your instincts and finding a temporal relief, and removing the boundaries between classes and races, freeing the spirit; however, the world, in fact, is a huge carnival arena where people wear their masks of status and responsibilities instead of hiding them, and under the mask of acting responsibly for a fake virtuous reason, ruin their environment. In the novel, Piggy becomes the next one who questions what they have been doing: “And what happened? What’s grownups goin’ to think? Young Simon was murdered. And there was that other kid what had a mark on his face. Who’s seen him since we first come here?” (210). Moreover, he invites the group to behave rationally, asking questions like: “Which is better—to be a pack of painted Indians like you are, or to be sensible like Ralph is?”

… “Which is better—to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?” … “Which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?” (222) Unfortunately, he becomes the next victim of the non-proportional desires of Jack and his group:

> The rock [intentionally pushed by Roger] struck Piggy a glancing blow from chin to knee; the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist. Piggy, saying nothing, with no time for even a grunt, traveled through the air sideways from the rock, turning over as he went. The rock bounded twice and was lost in the forest. Piggy fell forty feet and landed on his back across the square red rock in the sea. His head opened and stuff came out and turned red. Piggy’s arms and legs twitched a bit, like a pig’s after it has been killed. Then the sea breathed again in a long, slow sigh, the water boiled white and pink over the rock; and when it went, sucking back again, the body of Piggy was gone. (222-23)

Soon after Piggy’s death, Ralph loses his biggest supporter and mentor on the island; nevertheless, there is neither time for mourning for his loss nor for demanding justice. Jack threatens Ralph and “hurled his spear at Ralph [which] … tore the skin and flesh over Ralph’s ribs” (223). The rest of the tribe joins, attacking Ralph with their spears, and Ralph can barely escape. The following days until the novel’s end, when the naval forces arrive on the island to rescue the children, become a life-and-death struggle for Ralph. He escapes and hides among the bushes like a wild animal and is grotesquely pursued by Jack’s tribe along with ululations, plots, traps, and finally, setting a fire on the island to capture him. The ambivalent hunting scene of the boys dares to go one step further, evolving into a clear manhunt on the island; therefore, it is grotesque. The chase for the sound of the rational as well as the minority is explained by Crawford: “The shadowing of pig hunt and human hunt, ending with Simon’s and Piggy’s deaths, and almost with Ralph’s, signifies the link between the pig symbol and the extermination of those

considered alien or outsiders" (*Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down* 64). The tragic death of one of the favourite characters in the novel kills the last hope for salvation, which is followed by a human hunt. All these sign that the degradation of the humanly qualities will continue, and no opposition will be possible because they are being killed or frightened every day by the stronger party. The fact that the unruly part acts devoid of any written or traditional values makes them stronger and victorious in the end. Jack's losing all his supporters foreshadows the hopeless message related to the end of the novel as well as the end of the world.

L. L. Dickson claims that the ironic "rescue" of the main character by a navy officer –who is also mired in the brutal business of global conflict – shows that the chaotic island world is really a miniature representation of the war-torn adult world. He adds that the book dramatizes the true character of all people rather than making the assumption that kids would become savages if they were not under adult supervision. The nightmarish environment that swiftly emerges on the island is analogous to the atomic bombing of the outer world (45-46). A group of living beings who define themselves as civilised destroy the environment and wildlife around them in a barbaric way, while another group of living beings dance for the upcoming season, which resembles the agony of some nations or the sufferings of some marginalised groups of people, such as minorities or refugees, which go unnoticed by the rest of the so-called civilised European people. A group of people (even though tiny in number) are divided because of different views, which resembles people divided by different political parties in the world who go as far as murdering each other just for the sake of their views which is echoes the brutal killings during the wars throughout history. Jack terrorising Ralph and the island, and not feeling guilty even though he became the reason for the murders on the island just because he is strong and the people around him are crowded resembles the tyrant regimes in the world who govern countries with anti-democratic methods just because they are rich, potent, powerful, and

the people around them are crowded. Golding indirectly gives the message that uncontrolled authorisation given to a privileged group of people causes them to lose control of their power which inevitably results in the moral or physical destruction of the world, which is closely related to the Bakhtinian grotesque realism. He claims that people tend to degrade themselves in a way or so, the only difference is, Bakhtin depicts a small area of a local feast with domestic people entertaining themselves; however, the situation of the world, in the act of commune-degradation rather than self-degradation of a peer on a carnival area will end up with a total devastation all around the world.

The people are becoming more and more apathetic to the things happening around them while the intensity and brutality of the events caused by them are increasing. They are in a lobotomized state and they do not react to anything at a time when they should react most because as Harpham explains; "One can't be shocked forever" (463) because he gets used to it. He continues that "to the Parisian who strolls by Notre Dame on his way to work, even the gargoyles must seem as comfortable as old slippers" (463) because seeing the same thing, even though grotesque that is, blinds people. Harpham finalizes this claim saying, "Domesticating our grotesqueries, we pay, applaud, or admire them, and finally pay the ultimate tribute of ignoring their deformity" (463). Viktor Shklovsky identifies this situation as "automatism of perception" (52). The difference between ethical and unethical is not criticized and people do not seek to actloyally anymore. The chivalric people of the past are extinct and codes of chivalry are just a thing of romantic fairy tales. As Helene Cixous states there is not a favourite character the in the novels of the contemporary fiction for a conventional reader, "[There is n]o one to talk to, to recognize, to identify with" (387). Similarly, there is a "decline of character" (636) in contemporary fiction as Brian Philips claims. The characters in Golding's novel have similar qualities: even Ralph and Piggy are not like the Victorian heroes with whom the reader can quickly identify. This liberates the author to write about all the excesses

and exaggerations of life, which could infuriate the reader of conventional literature. It also helps the grotesque tradition to experience its golden age because the reader who does not identify with the hero does not adopt the degraded self of the character. He just witnesses all the fallacies the hero has, just like watching a documentary without caring about the plot's ambivalence, hybridity, and bastardity. What is unique in Golding's novel is that he shocks the reader by demonstrating that all the drama witnessed belonged to the reader itself, nobody else. Boyd states that "the loss of innocence for which Ralph weeps at the end of the novel" is not the result of a shift from youthful kindness to teenage depravity [which is a common factor in bildungsroman] or of a maturing into evil. It is instead the arrival of a consciousness of darkness, of the evil in man's heart that has always been present in the young. Recognising the presence of this darkness in one's own heart is a necessary but tragic stage of maturation, of being entirely and yet imperfectly human (27-28).

Ralph's cry at the end of the novel is not a relief for being saved; on the contrary, an awakening of the actual war outside the island as well as the awakening of the evil capacity of humankind. Crawford explains the disturbing effect of the novel, which does not relieve as what disturbs *Lord of the Flies* is the shock realisation of the negative, transgressive, "evil" aspect of human conduct and the behaviour of English boys. When the lads are "rescued" by an English naval commander at the novel's end, the reader does not feel relieved. Our anxiety moves from the carnival square of the island to the larger adult world – a world at war for a third time, a world where the theatre of conflict substantially mimics the Second World War in its dead parachutist and its detail of a paramilitary fascist outfit. It is a world marked by persistent inhumanity (62-63). Different from the carnival atmosphere on the island, which seems closer to Bakhtinian carnivalesque, the carnival atmosphere outside is even more catastrophic and more complex and more pessimist because the intention creating the carnivalesque big picture

on the world is malevolent. The masks are only for hiding the hypocritical targets of stronger countries, excessively consumer capital system, degrading ethical values of majority of people, indifferent people all of which push the world to an inevitable calamity. The nightmares in the novel will end; however, the real nightmare surrounding the world will never end; and this enlightenment gives the real shock to the reader. The question at the end of the novel asked by the navy officer; "I should have thought that a pack of British boys—you're all British, aren't you?—would have been able to put up a better show than that—I mean—" (Golding 248) is a question for awakening from the fantastic illusion and questioning the real life. What does the word "you" in the question refer? The reader is lelft to question if it refers to the English boys in the novel, western countries who could "put up a better show" to stop World War II, us who try to hide our dark side, or rich and powerful countries/people who could "put up a better show" to stop the wars, do something for the ills of the world like pandemics, unfair distribution of income, hunger, poverty, abuse of basic human rights, and so on, or us who give uncontrolled authority to tyrants all around the world which will inevitably result in catastrophic results for the world.

The aim of art according to Shklovsky is "defamiliarization", "bestrangement", or to create "deautomatized perception" (52). Golding turns the world upside down in his novel, and this other side of the medallion shown by Golding's narrative style shocks the reader; his turning the world upside makes his narrative grotesque and his characters (very suitable to the contemporary fiction characterisation) to be questioned. The *bricolage* as a portrait drawn by Golding is devoid of harmony and against the expectations of the reader. It is realistically depicted; therefore, it is distant from the romantic idea uttered in earlier fictions. Reader's disturbance is not relieved at the end of the novel; oppositely, it leaves its place to an even more significant depression. The grotesque struggle of the children in need, as well as their monstrous slaughter, is given with excellent details to

revive the trench war fever of the world wars. The parachute man is proof that the absolute beast is the human himself rather than an outsider. The increasing tension throughout the novel is not repressed because human beings with all their evil side do not have the right to comfort. Moreover, there is a warning that if people continue to give unbalanced authorisation to people or institutions just because they are crowded or powerful, a massacre will be inevitable. It will be the democracy, reason, peace and salvation that will lose. Atayurt explains it, stating, "The one boy who is most ostracised and finally murdered is the one who promotes a world of democracy, reason, peace, and even, to speak religiously, salvation" (61). In Bakhtinian sense, grotesque realism, in relation to the carnival atmosphere is established by losing all the titles, wearing masks, and reaching a free debased spirit by using invectives, exaggerated dances and defecation. Exaggerated depictions of the human body that are associated with ugly appearance, evil, hideousness, death, rebirth, growth, fertility, dismemberment, and decay are known as grotesque realism. The carnival atmosphere reaches rebirth, revival and relief as a result of Bakhtinian carnivalesque, therefore, it is not completely pessimistic. However, it is opposite in modern grotesque literature: there is no hope, carnivalesque qualities like masks are abused for the benefit of the advantaged party in the world, therefore a complete catastrophe is unescapable. Moreover, this tendency is relevant for the mass majority on the earth, which will eventually lead to the mass debasement, different from the carnivalesque self-degradation. For all those, grotesque is one of the most objective representations of the modern novel, which fits to the gloomy atmosphere of the time; moreover, it helps people to question what is normal and what is not, what is original and what is replica, or is replica the distorted image that claims to be the original. The end of the novel does not give a relief to the reader even though some students are rescued safe and sound because the bigger picture is much more depressing about the world; Golding shakes the reader about the hypocrisy around the world, and the reader becomes aware of

the disturbing fact that they are completely covered in the debasement they had been condemning and detesting throughout the novel. The enlightenment that comes at the end of the novel is concerning the fact that what they had been reading as fiction is nothing but the fact itself.

CHAPTER III

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE CARNIVALESQUE IN *THE WASP FACTORY*

Iain Banks wrote *The Wasp Factory* (1984) for the reader who had been trying to revive their trauma after the World War II, which is claimed to have lasted more than 60 years by Kuwert et al. (2007), and Rzeszutek et al. (2023) . The main protagonist tries to find his way in life against the artificial interferences created by his father and his limited society, while in the big picture, the world is trying to find its way in a world encompassed by all kinds of artificial barriers like wars, political quarrels, arguments about different world views and questioning of different ethical values. By "artificial", Marxist definition of the term "superstructure" is meant here, which is defined simply by Edmund Wilson as the institutions of "politics, law, religion, philosophy, literature and art" (188) the rules and the principles of which are defined by the ruling/dominating class. Frank's life is full of absurdities like deaths of his ancestors, the way he committed three murders, his rituals on the island, his communication with his family members and so on, which mimics the stupidities in the world in general like wars led by developed countries, hunger in poor countries in contrast to the technical innovations and abundancy of sources, migration, arguments about fundamental human rights, and arguments of gender issues. Banks artistically deconstructs and even manipulates the long-lasting stereotypes related to gender roles, family bonds, and sexual differences. By doing so, he creates the *bricolage* of the contemporary British society especially by redefining these terms. Moreover, the name of the narrator, his father's scientific experiments about his sexual identity by giving him additional hormones, the big lie told by his creator, his being completely alone in the world, his official non-existence, his being devoid of and continuous search of affection, his creating rules of his own ethics prove the novel to be a *bricolage* of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus* (1818). The

physical grotesque qualities in the novel aim to shock the reader, distortion of the child character's role as well as his constant loneliness constitute an example for the dysfunctioning familial and social relationships, exaggeration and semantic economy as a grotesque technique increase the annoyance with the reader throughout the text, graphic description of the murders and tortures in relation to grotesque monstrosity, macabre and horror act as a documentation of the suppressed feelings of the society. Banks targets the reader throughout the reader and puts him on a psychological test until the end so that s/he feels emotions like depression, disturbance, annoyance, and abhorrence, and finally forces him to protest as a result. By looking through the grotesque exaggeration and hybridity, one can comment on the novel that artificial systems of people like gender roles, official education and health systems, wars, and religious beliefs are institutions that ruin the nature of the people as is with the characters Frank, Eric, Agnus, and Agnes in the novel. Modern man is an "abject" being, in Kristeva's terms, and these artificial systems aforementioned double his loneliness rather than give him relief and comfort. This chapter aims to highlight the parallels between the ongoing stress in the novel stirred artificially and the social and political stress the background of the novel has with references to the grotesque discourse.

The Wasp Factory is about Frank Cauldhame, the 16-year-old narrator, son to Agnes and Angus, half-brother to Eric (he respects and likes), brother to Paul (he murders). He has compulsive rituals during the day like patrolling the island and taking bizarre precautions to protect his neighbourhood like hanging dead animals on sticks. He is superstitious because he decides for his actions according to a machine he invented from the remains of an old clock, and believes he gets some good and bad fate signs from the machine. He does not have a social network, and his family relations are also weak. He has been home-schooled by his father and does not have any official records. He has been made to believe that he is a boy castrated by the family dog Saul; however, at the

end of the novel he learns that is a complete lie told by his father for doing an experiment. He shares a remote home on an island (the name is not given) off Scotland with his introverted father. His father Angus is a discreet figure who has secrets and is inclined to tell lies. He has a study, but Frank has never been inside because it is always locked. He repeatedly tries to open the door throughout the story in the hopes that one day his father will forget to lock it, and finally, one day, he has the chance to enter, which reveals the fundamental mystery at the end of the novel: that the family dog has not castrated Frank, indeed, the whole story has been a lie of Angus who has been experimenting by feeding Frank (actually Frances) on male hormones. There are still other mysteries that are to be solved throughout the novel such as what the wasp factory stands for, the reason for Eric's hatred towards dogs, as well as the story behind his insanity, the reasons for Frank's identity to be kept secret along with his brutal attitude towards animals and people around. Step by step and taking advantage of all the opportunities of delaying the truth, Banks reveals all the secrets at the end of the novel: Frank wasn't castrated by Old Saul (the family dog); he was, in fact, born Frances. Frances had never actually had masculine genitalia. Old Saul had attacked Frances as a youngster, but the harm was not great. Despite this, Angus used this as a chance to experiment on his child. Frances was brought up as a boy and given male hormones by Angus. Frances is shocked by this fact, which also shocks the reader at the novel's end. Banks' technique in deferring to reveal the mysteries in the novel increases the shock effect at the end of the novel by increasing the tension throughout the narrative, which contributes to the grotesque effect. The author's success in writing his most famous novel also opened the way to becoming a full-time writer and earning a living.

After its publication in 1984, *The Wasp Factory* has been exposed to some controversial arguments by the literary community. Some praised it for being a masterpiece, like *The Financial Times* labelling it as "a Gothic horror story of quite

exceptional quality" and claiming its "originality rare in established writers twice the author's age", or *The Daily Telegraph* claiming it to be "a truly remarkable novel" all of which have been printed on the cover pages of the book printed throughout the years. While, some newspapers like *The Irish Times* condemned it with words such as, "It is a sick, sick world when the confidence and investment of an astute firm or publishers is justified by a work of unparalleled depravity …" (Freyne), or *The Sunday Express* which harshly commented on the book stating that it was "…a silly, gloatingly sadistic and grisly yarn of a family of Scots lunatics, one of whom tortures small creatures … " (qtd. in Shotton), or *The Times* suggesting that the novel is "… all a joke meant to fool literary London into respect for rubbish" (qtd. in Lewis-Hasteley). Actually, Banks confessed that he was not planning to publish *The Wasp Factory* before the other science fiction novels he had written earlier. In an interview, he revealed that he just wanted to start with an "ordinary conventional novel" (Sawyer 7) and wanted it to be "mainstream" to increase its chance of being published (21). Moreover, most of the author's readers were curious or even dubious about Banks' childhood. It is common to look for biographical allusions to examine a literary piece as a literary theory; yet, in *Raw Spirit*, which offers the most trustworthy facts relating to Banks' biography, he claims that he "had a happy childhood" in contrast to the problematic childhood story he has written. He adds,

> A lot of people who've read *The Wasp Factory* and have fallen for those old nonsenses about people only writing about what they know and first novels always being autobiographical seem to think I must have had a really awful, disturbed and even abused childhood, but it just ain't true. (*Raw Spirit*)

The fact that *The Wasp Factory* did not include autobiographical traces is also justified by his mother's answer to a dubious reader, as also stated in the same book, as; "Och, no, Iain was always a very happy wee boy" (*Raw Spirit*). Kincaid explains the question asked by the reader if Banks had a "disturbed childhood" (*Raw Spirit*), "betrayal, mistrust, and

physical danger often come from within the family" (Kincaid). But Banks was an exception, and "such a consistently recurring theme [also in Banks's other novels] appears to have had no basis in his own life" (Kincaid), which is a strong proof of the writer's elevated imagination talent. "A very happy wee boy['s]" novel, based on a child character's memories full of violence and murders and all the graphic details given for these acts, was inevitable to attract the literary world's attention and established the inspiration for this chapter.

The novel, abundant with grotesque qualities, is open to analysis, especially with its physical grotesque qualities as well as the hybrid characteristics of Frank with his official non-existence and his physical being, which he tries to fulfil by collecting items related to his past. In the chapter, "the carnivalesque excess", "exaggeration", and "excrement" in relation to Kristeva's conception of the "abject" will be explored to present the grotesque qualities of the novel. Finally, "grotesque monstrosity" will be examined in detail with references to the murders Frank committed, the weird childhood games he plays, the weird deaths of the family members and the graphic details in the novel will be criticised in terms of revealing the grotesque shock mechanism.

As also explained in earlier chapters, "[t]he grotesque in visual culture and literature often includes hybrid forms in which animalistic characteristics are merged with humanoid forms" (Edwards and Graulund 158). The inappropriate connection of the limbs of different living or unliving beings will be explained as physical grotesque in the analysis of *The Wasp Factory*. Furthermore, the storage vaults owned by Frank and his father, which act as *grottoes* for them both and conceal secrets in exchange, are open to physical grotesque analysis.

The "semantic economy," according to Duggan, enhances the realistic element of Banks' story as well as keeping to structures and providing extensive physical descriptions of his games and his machinery. By semantic economy, Duggan alludes to

Barthes's critical theory claiming that "… the greater the syntagmatic distance between the two data, the more skillful the narrative; the performance consists in manipulating a certain degree of impressionism: the touch must be light, as though it weren't worth remembering …" (Barthes 22-23). By this, Barthes indicates that all information linked to a tale should not be revealed all at once; in order to create a good narrative approach, the writer needs conceal some mystery until a later section of the narration. According to Barthes, the writer should also include certain things that appear so irrelevant that the reader will forget about them until the startling moment arrives. Therefore, as also agreed by Duggan, Banks's narrative quality is partially a result of his skilful use of the technique of semantic economy. He does not reveal all the secrets, or all the facts related to a character or an event in the text, and he keeps the tension and curiosity of the reader until the last moment when the climax is resolved. Accordingly, Banks' novel is full of climaxes and resolutions different from the traditional narration of a single climax and resolution. The relevance between the semantic economy and the grotesque is that they both help to increase the shock effect at the end of the text. The *grottoes* of the two leading characters are the most significant examples of the semantic economy. Frank's father has a study in the house that he keeps locked all the time, and Frank is prohibited from entering the room under no circumstances. It is the physical *grotto* of Frank's father, Angus Couldhame. Frank's statement "I think there is a secret in the study" (Banks 13), arouses curiosity; however, Banks intentionally increases the tension related to the room by not only keeping its secret until the end of the story but also by not letting the reader forget about the room. He occasionally mentions the secrecy of the room on several occasions when Frank tries to open the door, which he fails until the end of the novel. It might be thought that it is not an unusual thing to have a locked room inside the house where a child lives; however, Frank is too old to be labelled as a child to keep some parts of the house locked to protect him from dangers, and it is the only place in the house that

he does not have access to. Yet, can understand his strong desire to enter the room when he states:

> The study. One of my few remaining unsatisfied ambitions is to get into the old man's study. The cellar I have at least seen, and been in occasionally; I know all the rooms on the ground floor and the second; the loft is my domain entirely and home of the Wasp Factory, no less; but that one room on the first floor I don't know, I have never even seen inside. (Banks 12-13)

Additionally, 16 years is a long enough period to protect a room unseen by a family member; therefore, it is one of the *grottoes* in the novel. The second *grotto* is the loft of the house where Frank keeps most of his tools and machines, which is inaccessible by Angus because of his injured leg. He has to use a stick to walk properly even inside the house, which also serves as an alarm detector for Frank with its clicking noise approaching.

> That stick [Frank's father has to use because of his injured leg] is the symbol of the Factory's security. My father's leg, locked solid, has given me my sanctuary up in the warm space of the big loft, right at the top of the house where the junk and the rubbish are, where the dust moves and the sunlight slants and the Factory sits - silent, living and still. (Banks 6)

Thanks to the lock and Angus's great care not to leave the door open, Angus's cave stayed protected from Frank, while because of Angus's leg injury, Frank's cave remained secret to Angus. These two physical sanctuaries and their oddities helped the grotesque tension be kept until the end of the novel. Iain M. Banks's narrative technique of "deliberate postponement" (Duggan 156) is appropriate to Barthes's claim that "Expectation thus becomes the basic condition for truth: truth, these narratives tell us, is what is at the end of expectation" (Barthes 76). By expecting the climax to come to a resolution, the reader is continuously and impatiently swept through the novel with an instinct to learn the truth.

The result is a new unresolved climax. In addition to Frank's story, the details about Eric's past and future, the details of Angus's past, the location of the island, which is not given in the novel, the details of the family dog, or the details of the machine he made and named the wasp factory are all elements of secrecy which draw the reader breathlessly to the next page for solution. Duggan explains the situation, claiming, "[t]hese pieces of information scattered throughout the novel have a limited semantic function until they are realigned by the revelation of Frank's sex at the end of the book" (153).

Besides these two physical *grottoes*, *The Wasp Factory* contains grotesque elements in which inappropriate limbs of different beings are unnaturally connected. To begin with, Frank is the collector of dead animal parts -most of which were killed by himself- for building up grotesque watchmen around the island. He keeps these limbs in a bag he calls "Bunker", and he explains how the collection of "severed heads of gulls, rabbits, crows, mice, owls, moles and small lizards" (Banks 57) looked as follows:

> They hung drying on short loops of black thread suspended from lengths of string stretched across the walls from corner to corner, and dim shadows turned slowly on the walls behind them. Around the foot of the walls, on plinths of wood or stone, or on bottles and cans the sea had surrendered, my collection of skulls watched me. The yellow brain-bones of horses, dogs, birds, fish and horned sheep faced in towards Old Saul, some with beaks and jaws open, some shut, the teeth exposed like drawn claws. (Banks 57)

This store is one of the most grotesque collections that a boy of 16 can have, and the graphic description of the organs scattered in his sanctuary makes it even more horrifying and may be disgusting. Surprisingly, Banks' narrative tone is quite nerveless; it reminds of a boy describing the tools and furniture in his bedroom. Jennings' explanation about grotesque is highly relevant to this calm narration: "The element of the terrible must be disguised and robbed of its menace by the suggestion of the small, insignificant,

contemptible, and ludicrous. The grotesque is *the demonic made trivial*" (Jennings 17). Banks trivialises what Frank is describing and attaches the tone of a daily discourse to what could be regarded as shocking. He uses the same tone while describing how Frank murdered three people in cold blood. The heads of the dead animals were attached to poles he named "Sacrifice Poles," which he put on various sections of the island, and the usage of so-called "Sacrifice Poles" were his "early-warning system and deterrent […] infected, potent things which looked out from the island, warding off" (Banks 5). This reminds of the pig head attached on the tip of a wooden spear presented as a gift in *Lord of the Flies* as grotesque body. As can be understood, Frank has a different kind of imagination - in his fantasy world, everything has its own reasoning, which is impossible to accept by the norms of the society outside. Similar applications in both *Lord of the Flies* and *The Wasp Factory* are superstitious precautions against the uncanny possible danger coming from outside; and both of them are, beyond any doubt, childish for the reasonable adult world. In Frank's grotesque imaginary world, his "watchmen" to protect the island are those poles that "… held a rat head with two dragonflies, the other a seagull and two mice"; and "sticking one of the mouse heads back on ..." (Banks 1) is one of the most basic daily activities he was committed to with solid responsibility. After all is done, he confesses he "… then turned at the bottom to look back up at those small heads and bodies as they watched over the northern approaches to the island. They looked fine, those husks on their gnarled branches" (Banks 3) to check if everything was in its place which occupied a majority of his time during the day. Frank's ceremonial care for keeping all the poles pierced with several animal heads that he killed, as well as his struggle to keep his "Bunker" with an adequate number of spare heads, is grotesque for the viewer though it is commonplace for Frank. Like the sow head sacrificed for the beast erected on the tip of a stick, an example of the grotesque in *Lord of the Flies*, Frank frequently practises the ritual of inserting animal heads on the tips of sticks.

Frank's games and mechanisms he invents also contain an abundance of grotesque bodies. For example, while trying to kill Blyth, he makes use of his "artificial leg" (Banks 46) by placing a poisonous snake inside his prosthetic leg. A man with an artificial leg made of plastic or something that kind clearly exemplifies the grotesque body. He places explosives by "… slit[ting] the buck in the anus" (Banks 40) to take *revenge* on an innocent animal, and this is what happens at the end: "Whatever was left of the buck landed way behind me. I followed the smell of burning to where it lay. It was mostly the head, and a grubby stub of spine and ribs, and about half the skin" (40). Not even seeing the "warm remnant" of the body consoles him as he "gritted [his] teeth" while picking it up from the ground. (40)

He also talks about another torturing incident: "Once I tied a wasp to the striking-surface of each of the copper-coloured bells on the top, where the little hammer would hit them in the morning when the alarm went off" (20). The futility of the torture is explained as "I always wake up before the alarm goes, so I got to watch" (20). These are the only ways he can amuse himself and pass the time. While doing these, he produces grotesque bodies by connecting the inanimate with the animate and creating hybrid beings. He also confesses that "Before I realised the birds were my occasional allies, I used to do unkind things to them: fish for them, shoot them, tie them to stakes at low tide, put electrically detonated bombs under their nests, and so on" (143). His limitless power of imagination about torturing and killing as a pastime activity supports his ability to create grotesque bodies without even realising it, which also prepares the reader to expect all kinds of oddities in the plot.

His childhood deprivation is revealed when he says he "wished [they] had a cat"; however, "All I've ever had was a [cat's] head, and that the seagulls took" (14), which seems to have fuelled his weird imagination about grotesque bodies. Their sense of humour is also bizarre and has a different kind of imagination. Even though there is no

proof throughout the text if it is for real or for just the sake of teasing Frank, Eric claims to have eaten a "fat and juicy" dog after he "make[s] friends with it and take[s] it out to the woods and then [he] kill[s] it and eat it" (72) when he was a runaway from the mental hospital. It seems like a tradition for the whole of The Couldhames family because its sons played and fed inappropriately; its father, Angus, "dressed Eric in girl's clothes and let him run wild" (Banks 82); its mother left the house by leaving her sons as very little children, its elder son, Eric, shoplifted "just for the hell of it" (Banks 72) the goods "like tampons" (72) he will never use and did not sleep because he thought people did not have to sleep (73). Frank is also noteworthy for his habit of matching unmatching pieces together or using devices and tools beyond their purpose. For example, he uses "the candle inside the skull of Old Saul" (56) to illuminate his attic, which is also grotesque as a picture. As well as keeping the inanimate piece of a living being, which wounded him for the rest of his life, using it as a tool is also quite grotesque. He describes his weird collection of tools as follows:

> To the right of the brick, wood and concrete altar where the candles and the skull sat were my small phials of precious fluids; to the left rose a tall set of clear plastic drawers designed to hold screws, washers, nails and hooks. Each drawer, not much larger than a small matchbox, held the body of a wasp which had been through the Factory. (57)

This description reveals Frank's obsessive approach towards his tools and machines and their organisation, as well as the high value he places on them as they are the most significant instruments in his fantasy universe.

Among many others, the most physical grotesque portraits are described when the secret about Eric's case is being revealed. The graphic details of the descriptions are so realistic and detailed that it is inevitable to feel disturbed. These details increase the disturbance and shock effect on the reader, which helps to elevate the grotesque effect.

Eric is closely connected to Frank, and so is Frank. This is how Frank sympathised with Eric when Blyth killed their family pets, "Eric was inconsolable, desperate with grief because he had made the thing Blyth had used to destroy our beloved pets. He always was a bit sentimental, always the sensitive one, the bright one …" (43). Frank murdered Blyth because Blyth had annoyed Eric by burning their two pet rabbits alive, and Eric, after his mental breakdown, sets fire to dogs because their family dog wounded Frank. Being once a sweet, clever and sympathetic boy, the reader ends up learning that Eric has been arrested for "disturbing the peace" (190) because he was in the habit of "… frightening small boys from the town, first by throwing worms at them, then by stuffing worms down their shirts as they came back from school", (Banks 189) about which Angus was also informed when "Eric started trying to force the kids to eat the worms and handfuls of maggots" (189). The reason for his mental breakdown is one of the most grotesque pictures in the novel. He was vigorously shaken by the death of a toddler who was under the care of Eric while he was a doctor in training. When the hospital's ventilation broke down, flies entered the building and hatched their eggs on the toddler's brain, which was closed with a metal cover. Eric witnesses the worms and maggots eating or wiggling among the curves of the child's brain, which causes him to attack them with a sharp tool attacking the innocent child's brain at the same time. Frank expresses the graphic details of the scene as follows:

> Flies had got into the ward, presumably when the air conditioning had been faulty earlier. They had got underneath the stainless steel of the child's skull-cap and deposited their eggs there. What Eric saw when he lifted that plate up, what he saw with all that weight of human suffering above, with all that mighty spread of closed-in, heat-struck darkened city all around, what he saw with his own skull splitting, was a slowly writhing nest of fat maggots,

> swimming in their combined digestive juices as they consumed the brain of the child. (Banks 188)

This imagery is reminiscent of gore images depicted by war poets like Siegfried Sassoon, Rupert Brooke, and Wilfred Owen who are known for their graphic descriptions of the trench war during World War I. Many people criticise their depictions for being too realistic and harsh and being away from the widespread propaganda of the war, like martyrdom, being a veteran, patriotism, dying for the sake of your country and people, or promised heaven, and so on. The details in Banks's depictions of the disturbing scenes in the novel have the same effect. They create a kind of objection and rejection due to disgust, just like the one above: Nobody would like to arouse this kind of picture in their minds because it shocks them. Banks craftily juxtaposes two opposing images to disturb the reader; the innocence of the toddler is brought together with the disgusting and brutal image of the maggots eating and nesting in his brain. Barasch describes the classic look for the definition of beauty as "Rule, reason, order, perfect proportion, and harmony […] were concepts which belonged to the classical school of thought" (31). Different from the classic conception of the body, which is beautiful, complete with mathematical calculations of the proportion, monumental and full of aesthetic details like muscles, veins, and other limbs, the grotesque body is debased, low, deformed, incomplete, and distorted because it does not fit the normative definitions of the body imposed by the dominating culture. Therefore, it is disturbing especially for the dominating culture; it can be labelled even riotous or rebellious as it is unusual for what they want the majority to accept as "norms". The view of a smiling child whose brain was being gnawed by maggots and worms was disturbing not only for Eric but also for the reader, and the effect was achieved by Banks' vivid description of the scene with all its details in the same vein as Brooke, Sassoon, and Owen achieved it with their realistic descriptions of the trench war.

The last representation of the physical grotesque unveils how even these two brothers with strong childhood ties have become alienated from each other. After Eric returns to the house and sets fire to the sheep, and tries to burn down the house, Frank comes face to face with him, and he describes Eric with words, "His face was bearded, dirty, like an animal mask. It was the boy, the man I had known, and it was another person entirely" (Banks 234). His face, which looked strange to Frank, is similar to the carnivalesque masque; even though it is nothing artificial or extensional on his face, it is something that shook Eric off all his communal and personal responsibilities and gave him limitless independence to do whatever he wanted, to act entirely instinctually.

3.1. Frank's Hybrid Identity and His "Official Non-Existence"

Before Frank's hybrid identity, the novel as a genre, has hybrid qualities which will be shortly analysed. Mona Jafari, Maryam Soltan Beyad, and Zohreh Ramin, in their article, claim that the novel has the qualities of genres like "postmodern parody" (2), "gothic" (1), and even "bildungsroman" (1). Among these, bildungsroman may sound surprising; however, Frank's maturation is sensed from the beginning to the end of the novel. This formation as a young being also parallels his degree of awakening about his own identity and his environment. His struggle to keep his brother, Eric, away from troubles is striking as proof of his awareness and maturation, as well as his awareness about his real sex and his acceptance and sudden adaptation to it with dignity. The commonality among all three novels examined in the thesis is that those with grotesque qualities often defy straightforward genre categorization, exhibiting a hybrid nature. This is also valid for *The Wasp Factory*.

Frank is a character who has been living within the dilemma of being Frank and Frances, that is, male and female, being existent in body and non-existent in soul and ethics, belonging to a family and being desolate, being in a crowd of memories and memorials and being alone in that crowd. This fragmented identity of the main character,

who has the genitals of a female but the stereotypical character attitudes of a male, both of which even transform towards the end of the novel, also contributes to the *bricolage* portrait created by Banks. Frank, by swapping the gender and sexual identity towards the end of the novel, deconstructs the perceptions related to these roles. Moreover, Banks also turns the conceptions related to family bonds upside down. By doing so, he makes the propaganda of the uselessness of the ongoing arguments about these arbitrary ideologies, he focuses repeatedly in different cases on the stress created by these institutions. Secondly, this situation creates a grotesque hybrid identity in Frank because half of the reader pities him for his desperate and isolated situation in the middle of nowhere on the earth; however, the other half is disgusted with his murders and torture towards people and animals devoid of any set ethical rules or moral orders. Edwards and Graulund explain mediaeval grotesque hybridity as "the deformed body" which is "visibly multiple" as a contribution to the usual definition of the term referring to something which "has the parts of more than one creature: part man, part goat" (Edwards and Graulund 61). However, they also make a contemporary contribution to the definition, stating that "hybridity is about a dual nature that exists simultaneously, and this can, in some cases, produce grotesques" (Edwards and Graulund 61). This description of grotesque hybridity will be referred to throughout the chapter in the analysis of the hybrid nature of Frank. He has a female body who has been made to believe in having a male body and has lived accordingly until he learns at the end of the novel that he is, indeed, she, namely Frances. He is so accustomed to his "made-up" identity that he confesses that his "greatest enemies are Women and the Sea" (Banks 50). He explains that he hates women "because they are weak and stupid and live in the shadow of men and are nothing compared to them …" (50). In fact, the whole novel is very open to feminist criticism; however, this is not among the purposes of the thesis. Nonetheless, the duality and instability, the fluidity and incomplete state of the character resulting from a

lie about his sex are elements compatible with grotesque identification. Being deceived by his father, isolated by his mother when he was a baby, and deprived by Eric, Frank has lived completely lonely during the most critical phases of his maturation. John Nicholson (1998) and Paul Kincaid Speller (2000) comment on the physical isolation of the story's setting, an island off Scotland, which also contributes to the disturbed imagination of Frank. Nicholson also indirectly comments on the hybrid characteristics of Frank's identity. He claims that,

> The few humans in the nearby village ignore the narrator and his solitary parent. He has the characteristics of the other flora and fauna: left overs, social debris like the carcasses which litter the waste land … We are inside a mind of madness, childish, cruel, nasty and perverse. (Nicholson 262)

Nicholson uses the words "flora and fauna" in order to describe the unnoticeable, ambiguous and ambivalent character of Frank, which strengthens the claim that Frank is a human being with inhuman characteristics and, therefore, has hybrid qualities. Moreover, he also puts into question the general tendency of using the descriptors like clean, innocent, and well-behaved with their opposites like mad, cruel, nasty, and perverse. However, the focus point for Nicholson is the loneliness of Frank, both physically and psychologically. Speller defines the island as "a kingdom separate from the rest of the world" (Speller 29). This kingdom and its isolation set the macro-*grotto* on the island, which contains the *grottoes* mentioned above. The island is also mysterious; its name is not given, the exact location of it is not mentioned and "[w]hat [Frank's] father thinks of it is not recorded" (29) and contains lots of secrets similar to the personal sanctuaries of Frank and Angus. Speller claims that "… to Frank it is a world in itself, a world he is creating and naming. Frank is unacknowledged monarch of this ravaged world, and also apart from our world …" (29). Frank's desolate being on the island gives him limitless freedom to act according to his instincts without norms or ethical rules,

which would be unacceptable in any civilised world. Moreover, according to Speller, Frank's surname is an artistic sarcasm related to the lack of communication, love bonds, and abstract bonds to the ancestors. He claims it has a connotation of "Cold Home" in pronunciation: He claims that

> … the home is indeed cold, if we are to take a traditional view of the situation - two men making shift for themselves; a house lacking in emotional warmth, affection, a man who spends much of his time locked away in his study; a solitary boy who roams the island, committing atrocities on the local wildlife. (Speller 29)

Being a wholly abandoned kid from all his dearest ones, both physically and psychologically, the coldness of the house of The Couldhames is at its peak, especially for Frank, which also explains his sadistic attitude.

Related to his surname, it is also interesting to note that three of Frank's ancestors share the weirdest dying stories of their kind. To begin with, Leviticus Couldhame, Angus's eldest brother, is mentioned to have "emigrated to South Africa and bought a farm there in I954" (Banks 29). Leviticus has been affected by the political instability in Scotland, which led to making him a racist against blacks in the country. However, he had one of the most absurd and ironic deaths in the world especially thinking about his artificial haste against the blacks. While he was walking on a street of Johannesburg, a black man jumps down a building on suicidal attempt and falls on Leviticus almost killing him whose last words were tragically "My God, the buggers've learned to fly..." (Banks 30). The funny narration in contrast to the tragic context and the ironic reason for his death has elements of grotesque exaggeration, excess, reversal and absurdity. It is one of the deaths with the lowest possible percentage; therefore, it is exaggerated and excessive, and the order – even symbolically – is turned upside down; therefore, it includes carnivalesque reversal. This tragic death is also a reason for laughter,

contributing to its grotesque quality. Banks also artistically mocks the political hollowness of the time with this anecdote. Leviticus, even at the moment of death, is far away from the reality of the society he is in because a representative of the community he bestialises in his mind, which also fed the lifelong hatred towards blacks, is believed to have achieved the ability to "fly" to attack them. The moral message emphasises that hatred towards someone you do not know well is meaningless.

Another relative, Frank's uncle, Athelwald Trapley's death, is even more tragic. He was an emigrant in America who also became financially successful. Still, the woman he fell in love with left him, and he ended up "broke and heartbroke, in a cheap caravan site outside Fort Worth, where he decided to put an end to himself" (Banks 31). The absurd line of coincidences started when "He turned on his Calor-gas stove and heater but didn't light them and sat down to await the end" (31). However, later on, he remembered his habit of lighting a cigarette to calm himself down as he was emotionally down. Easy to imagine, he caused a fire inside the caravan, the rest of which is described as follows:

> Out of the blazing wreck he leaped, stumbling around on fire from head to toe and screaming. He had intended a painless death; not being burned alive. So he jumped head first into the forty-gallon oil-drum full of rainwater which stood at the rear of the caravan. Wedged inside that drum he drowned, his little legs waggling pathetically as he gulped and squirmed and tried to get his arms into a position from which he could lever himself out. (30-31)

As well as the ambiguity of emotions aroused by the poor uncle's death, it is absurd, excessive, and exaggerated, all supporting its grotesque characteristic.

The death of Frank's other uncle, "Harmsworth Stove, a half Uncle from Eric's mother's side of the family" (Banks 41), shares similar grotesque qualities to the ones above. He tried to commit suicide "with an electric power-drill and a quarter-inch bit

[which h]e inserted … through the side of his skull and, finding that he was still alive though in some pain" (41). It was a painful and unsuccessful attempt, and he rode to the nearest hospital to relieve the pain he had been suffering; however, he did not succeed in that either, because he died there. Frank confesses he is indirectly responsible for his uncle's death because it was shortly after he killed The Stoves' only daughter, Esmeralda, leading Harmsworth to the suicide attempt. Similarly, it includes too many coincidences for everyday life, leaving the reader between two different emotions towards the case. Speller's general commentary related to the whole story is illuminating. He claims, "On the one hand, the story is so bizarre, one simply can't believe that it might be true; on the other, the story is so bizarre, how could it not be true?" (Speller 29). Abundant in exaggerations and excesses, the story continuously leaves you in the dilemma of reality and fantasy. The reader finds short moments of consolation while thinking that it is just a product of imagination; at the same time, he is bitten by the cold shock of the number of details the incidents are described by, which makes one believe it is realistic.

Frank's "official non-existence" (Banks 11), in contrast to his hybrid physical existence, is also open to criticism concerning grotesque ambivalence and hybridity. Moreover, it includes exaggeration and excess elements of the grotesque. As Speller explains, Frank "…theoretically doesn't exist - if we are to believe him, his birth has gone unregistered, and the authorities are not aware of his existence, officially. In a curious way, he is not of this world at all" (Speller 29). As criticised earlier, this endows him with carnivalesque freedom to do whatever he wants because he is covered with a massive mask of invisibility. Frank explains that his liberty is a result of "some sort of unspoken agreement" (Banks 61) between him and his dad, according to which he has to "keep quiet about not officially existing in return for being able to do more or less as [he] like[s] on the island and buy more or less what [he] like[s] in the town" (Banks 61). Frank summarises his legal situation: "I was never registered. I have no birth certificate, no

National Insurance number, nothing to say I'm alive or have ever existed. I know this is a crime, and so does my father …" (Banks 10).

The fact that Frank does not exist according to laws creates four problems in his life: he is uneducated, he does not have any health record, he doubts if he will be able to inherit any of the possessions of his father after his death, he cannot apply for a gun certificate. He has never had an official education, but he claims, "… you could hardly say that I wasn't educated … I probably know more about the conventional school subjects than most people of my age" (Banks 10), which serves as a system criticism praising the underground system and putting the regular education system in a useless position. This travesty is entirely parallel to the ideology of the grotesque. His father, who he claims, is a "doctor of chemistry, or perhaps biochemistry" (11), taught him everything he needed to know. Even though he doubts the things his father taught him and double-checks the correctness of them in the library in Porteneil, he believes that,

> [his] father is an educated man, and he passed a lot of what he already knew on to [Frank], as well as doing a fair bit of study himself into areas he didn't know all that much about just so that he could teach [him]. (11)

His confidence in his father's knowledge is also apparent because he applies all the legal injections specified by the National Health Service to his son, Frank. Nonetheless, Angus's choice of unknot registering Frank with any governmental institution creates doubt about his father's love towards him which is revealed when he says, "I think that sometimes he regrets the decision he made seventeen years ago, in his hippy-anarchist days, or whatever they were" (Banks 10). While considering his legal situation about inheriting the house after his death, he confesses that he "would miss him" (49). Because his father is the only sane person aware of his existence, his death would mean the death of the only person witnessing his existence. Kincaid claims that Frank? lives in a world of doubts and untruth; therefore, he cannot connect with anyone emotionally. He states,

> He is detached from the world physically as well as legally, living on an island that is connected to the mainland by a footbridge, though the fact that there is a gate part way along the bridge makes us see this more as a barrier than a link. Frank's questionable legal status means that he must pretend he is only an occasional visitor to his own home, and so he goes into the nearby town only rarely, usually to get hopelessly drunk. Moreover, within this disconnected existence, he lives in a miasma of untruth … (Kincaid)

Frank is the narrator of the story and the reader sees everything from his vision, and he believes nothing; for that reason, he is untrustworthy as well. That is one of the reasons the reader is completely stuck in the ambiguity of reality and truth; this grotesque ambivalence makes the reader get outside of the magic of the imaginary world and question the reality of the actual world.

Frank's lonely world surrounded by lies leads him to apply grotesque ways to fulfil the missing parts related to his family and relatives in his past. He has three different habits which are repetitive and attention-catching from the earlier pages of the novel: first, he is a collector of goods about his past; second, he gives names to everything he possesses, no matter whether they are animate or inanimate, and third, he conducts different rituals and ceremonies on different daily occasions. The fact that he does not have stable family relationships, especially being abandoned by his mother at a very young age and lacking healthy communication with his father and missing Eric, and the fact that there are weird deaths of his ancestors, as well as being deprived of official rights leaves the narrator in an incomplete state; therefore, he sticks to the material goods as a memorial from his past as if trying to prove his being. The wasp factory, which he built from the remnants of an old clock face from the Royal Bank of Scotland building, is his collection's masterpiece. The skull of Old Saul, their family dog, by which Frank is convinced to have been castrated, is one of the most valuable pieces of the collection. The

skull of the snake that killed Blyth is another one, and he calls all these items "powerful things" (Banks 157). He describes his collection of "powerful things" with short summaries of their stories as follows:

> … the skull of the snake which killed Blyth (tracked down and sliced in half by his father, using a garden spade - I retrieved it from the grass and hid that front part of the snake in the sand before Diggs could take it away for evidence), a fragment of the bomb which had destroyed Paul (the smallest bit I could find; there were lots), a piece of tent fabric from the kite which had elevated Esmerelda (not a piece of the actual kite of course, but an off-cut) and a little dish containing some of the yellow, worn teeth of Old Saul (easily pulled). (157)

These are monumental pieces symbolising the most important events in his life. He keeps them as proof of his existence compared to his official non-being. At the same time, his grotesque habit gives him a life full of grotesque obsession, like naming all the tools he possesses and attaching too much importance to them by even naming or seeking revenge for them. Lacking the warmth of an ordinary family environment and friends, Frank, in a way, befriends these items and personifies them to fulfil the lack of peaceful events in his own "cold home", like birthday celebrations or naming ceremonies. According to Kincaid, Frank's is a story "[…] of a life constantly shaped and guided by beliefs and rituals that are themselves the necessary constructs of a life disconnected from friends, from family, from reality, and even, we learn, from gender" (Kincaid). Speller goes as far as stating these rituals as "religious duties" (Speller 28) and claims that "It's as though he needs the ritual to keep his world, and his understanding of his world, under control" (28). Lovasz thinks the opposite; he claims, "The problem for Frank is that the more he shapes his life around these rituals and symbols, the more out of control it becomes" (Lovasz 6). Actually, both Speller and Lovasz are correct in their claims to some extent; however,

they miss the point that this excessively compulsive habit is mainly to establish a healthy environment around himself, which he lacks because he does not have an appropriate family atmosphere in the house. Therefore, his struggle to take under his control is quite naïve compared to the lack-which is ignored by both Lovasz and Speller-which leads him to all his sadistic commitments of murder and torture. He identifies with the tools around him and, in a way, becomes friends and family members with them. For example, his catapult, named Black Destroyer, becomes one of his best friends, and he seeks revenge for it. He thinks that a buck -in a struggle, clearly trying to save his life from Frank- humiliated his catapult. Then he mercilessly kills the rabbit, "[t]he catapult was avenged, the buck - or what it meant, its spirit maybe - soiled and degraded, taught a hard lesson," as a result of which he confesses he "felt *good"* (Banks 41). The incident when Frank reveals his emotions after the battle with the rabbit is even hallucinatory:

> My catapult, my pride and joy, the Black Destroyer, itself destroyed by a *rabbit*! Oh, I suppose I could have written off and got a new length of rubber, or got old Cameron in the ironmonger's shop to find me something, but it would never feel right again. Every time I lifted it to aim it at a target living or not - this moment would be at the back of my mind. The Black Destroyer was finished. (Banks 36)

It is like a requiem after losing somebody you are firmly attached to. Frank loves exaggerating the incidents and tends to believe the excessive enemies he creates in his imaginary world, which proves his psychological disturbance. His imaginary world and a need to protect itself against an uncanny enemy, his battles with this enemy are traces of the grotesque representation. Following this is another ceremony, "I wanted to get to bed early so that I could be up in time for the naming ceremony of the new catapult" (74). There is too much agitation in his feelings, and he is surprisingly too fast to give up and

stick to newly invented values like the new catapult. That is because he has no idea about real bonds between people. After all, he has been deprived of them all his life.

3.2. Carnivalesque Excrement

Carnivalesque excrement and abjection are also to be mentioned to illustrate grotesque representations in the novel. In contrast to the ideal, spiritual, and lofty, excrement is a material substance for Bakhtin that stands for the bodily and the lower. According to Bakhtin's "carnivalesque" theory, the grotesque body, linked to the lower functions, upends the established social order and hierarchical structures and temporarily inverts power dynamics. This is best illustrated by the clown, a character that is both filthy and subversive. The novel's protagonist, Frank Cauldhame, has a collection of his excrement that he keeps in jars in his room. He uses this collection as a means of controlling and manipulating his environment and as a symbol of his rebellion against the constraints of social norms. Eric, Frank's older brother, who has long been thought dead, appears in one of the book's most unforgettable scenes. Eric returns to the family house, smeared in his own faeces. His bearded face resembling an animal, was mentioned earlier in the chapter. In this scene, Eric's physical rebellion against the established social order can be interpreted as a carnivalesque illustration. Another example of the carnivalesque is the wasp factory itself. Frank developed the primitive, makeshift factory to exterminate wasps and other insects. Blood, urine, and faeces are among the body fluids and waste materials used in the killing and dissection of insects. This procedure might be considered a subversive revolt against conventional notions of purity and cleanliness. Moreover, Banks literally mentions excrement moments in the novel on repeated occasions where he does not hesitate to give details about these moments of defecation, urination and vomiting. In the earlier pages of the novel, Frank talks about going to the toilet "for a crap" because he "… didn't need a pee because [he]'d been pissing on the Poles during the day, infecting them with [his] scent and power" (Banks 14), he gives the details of the

sound coming from his “crap” falling to the toilet saying “Plop splash” and explaining it as “Some water came up and hit my bum …” (Banks 15) as well as the details how he cleans his “arse”, and later in the novel he explains how he uses his own body and delays his regular baths “to make precious substances such as toenail cheese or belly-button fluff” (51), among the few dialogues with his father, his father warns him that he understands how much Frank drinks in the bar from the smell of his “farts” (67). In his book project entitled "The State of Farts," Angus makes the claim that he can infer information about a person’s personality from their farts, including what they should eat, whether they are emotionally vulnerable or disturbed, and whether they are hiding something from you, making fun of you behind your back, or attempting to make friends with you. He can even determine what they are pondering about at the exact moment they fart (67) is one of the best examples of carnivalesque excretion and the reflection of society towards it. Even though he has been sending the novel continuously to several London publishers, he has always been rejected because it is unacceptable by common sense, just like Bakhtinian excrement. He describes the naming ceremony of the catapult, the importance of which was stressed earlier with the following words:

> In the ceremony I smeared the metal, rubber and plastic of the new device with earwax, snot, blood, urine, belly-button fluff and toenail cheese, christened it by firing the empty sling at a wingless wasp crawling on the face of the Factory, and also fired it at my bared foot, raising a bruise. (Banks 78)

Honouring his new catapult with all sorts of body fluids is entirely controversial for the look of the general public, which could be nothing but elements of debasement or disgust. Quite the contrary, Frank confesses that “it made [him] part of what [he] own[s] and where [he is]. It makes [him] feel good” (78).

According to Julia Kristeva, “abjection” refers to the human experience of confronting and rejecting that which is perceived as impure, disgusting, or repulsive;

something or someone that is "ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable" (Kristeva 1). In her influential book *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (1982), Kristeva argues that abjection is a universal human experience arising from our sense of "separation" (12-15) and our fear of dissolution, condemnation, or contamination (18). She suggests, "it is … not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite" (4). To elaborate, abject is that which disorders the orderly categorizations and systems we use to make sense of the world and which we intuitively refuse in order to preserve our sense of self. She exemplifies by stating that,

> "[t]he traitor, the liar, the criminal with a good con science, the shameless rapist, the killer who claims he is a savior . . . . Any crime, because it draws attention to the fragility of the law, is abject, but premeditated crime, cunning murder, hypocritical revenge are even more so because they heighten the display of such fragility." (4)

She adds that that abjection is a cultural and social phenomenon that moulds our collective values and standards, rather than just a psychological or subjective experience. Kristeva's abjection theory is concerned with how we navigate our complicated and often conflicting relationships with the world around us, as well as how we employ rejection and exclusion to preserve order and stability. Frank's obsession with murders and tortures might be interpreted as a sort of abjection since it entails a desire for the macabre and gloomy. Frank's fascination with murdering insects and tiny creatures, as well as his collecting of body parts, might be seen as a means of testing the limits between life and death and questioning traditional notions of what is acceptable. On various times, the reader observes that Frank takes joy in his deeds and has his own way of justifying what he has committed. Supportive to how Frank tries to justify the murders he committed and the joy he takes after torturing the animals, Kristeva explains that "[a]bjection" is immoral,

sinister, scheming, and shady: a terror that dissembles, a hatred that smiles, a passion that uses the body for barter instead of inflaming it, a debtor who sells you up, a friend who stabs you" which fits the hypocritical justification system established by Frank. He grins, laughs, or smiles after the sadistic actions he has taken. The night he spent with his friend Jamie is full of abject representations in Kristeva's terms.

To begin with, his best friend Jamie is an abject character, a dwarf, with his body. His bodily deformity fits the definition of abject because a minority people are dwarves; therefore, it is perceived abnormal. This deformity pushes these people from the centre of the society to the margins; however, it is not surprising Frank feels most comfortable when he is with him. He literally confesses that Jamie is his "only real friend" (Banks 62); even so, he refers to him as "Jamie the dwarf" (12, 63,93) on different occasions, which might be regarded as an insult for many people. On the night they go out, he feels terrible about his stomach because of drinking alcohol; he gives details of his urinating and vomiting, after which he says he feels "a lot better" (106-07). The character of Eric, Frank's older brother, can also be seen as an example of abjection. Eric is depicted as a grotesque figure who has been mutilated and scarred physically and mentally. His return to the family home disrupts the established social order and challenges the idea of being human. The theme of gender and identity in the novel can also be seen as an example of abjection. Frank's ambiguous gender identity and his exploration of different identities, including those of his mother and grandmother, challenge traditional ideas of masculinity and femininity and blur the boundaries between the self and the other. Moreover, he makes jokes about his sadistic acts similar to what Frank does. Related to his bullying of the boys for eating worms and filling maggots in their mouths, Frank says, "[Eric] just sat smiling and sometimes mentioned how much protein there was in worms" (Banks 190). Additionally, he makes jokes about eating dogs and describes their taste as "fat" and "juicy" (72). Apart from all these, the detachment

of all these three people with grotesque characteristics from the rest of society is abject itself. They live on an island and rarely go among the society on their rare visits to the town; Eric tries to adapt to the life of society by starting a medical school; however, he is abjected by a horrific incident, first lives the life of a lunatic separated from the rest of the society, and later lives the life of an exile by escaping from the protectors of the normal society, the policemen. Their abjection from the mainland as they constitute a threat to the rest of the society is one of the macro abjections in the novel.

3.3. Grotesque Horror and Demonism

According to David Punter, "Frank is a seventeen-year-old monster, living on an island with his eccentric father" (Punter 168). However, this attribution contains some prejudice. The questions as to who decides for the monster and what qualities should be put forward for a character to be labelled a monster should be discussed. Winkler explains, "The monster is both a *product* of society's norms, and an *embodiment* of all that society excludes to sustain itself as normal, and natural" (15-16). Reminiscent of the deconstructionist theory of Derrida, where a concept gains meaning in relation to its binary opposite, Winkler explains the concept of the monster, stating, "If the monster did not provide one half of the binary pair, the ideological framework of norms would collapse. Because constructed norms are dependent on constructed monstrosities, the complete eradication of monsters is impossible" (Winkler 16). In summary, he suggests that the monster is the monster because of the definition of the "norm", or the "normal" made by the dominating culture. Since the grotesque is an underground culture, - especially from the vision of the society whose conception of the aesthetics is dominated by the classical outlook (explained before) grotesque novels are abundant in monsters and demons. However, it is difficult to judge the monstrosity of the protagonist of the novel for two reasons: first, because "[t]he conflict between being a player and being played upon, and the difficulty of discovering the rules of the game in which one is playing, are

the insistent themes of Banks' fiction" (Craig 233). Moreover, compared to the fact that Banks creates an unfavourable character by constructing him as addicted to several brutal and sadistic traits, there is a substantial number of readers who sympathise with him, thinking that he is, in fact, a victim deceived by a major lie for all his life. Frank's obsession with violence, coupled with his ambivalent and ambiguous behaviour, amplifies his grotesqueness. Jennings makes the definition of the modern grotesque monster as "the demonic element be rendered ludicrous or trivial in order for the grotesque effect to ensue" (Jennings 30). Frank's killing Esmeralda as "something of a statistical favour" because he "reasoned" he "ought to redress the balance at least slightly" (Banks 111-12) between the two sexes among his victims is a perfect example of grotesque monstrosity that fits Jennings' definition.

Earlier depictions of grotesque monsters include gigantic or mainly hybrid figures; however, modern grotesque monsters are more complex in spirit than in body. Frankenstein's monster is shown as the most popular example of a grotesque monster in that, in addition to its deformed body, his paradoxes in his spirit against his environment, his struggle to find a place in the world, and his humanistic weaknesses opposite his artificial body are best reflections of his monstrous characteristics. Edwards and Graulund's definition of the modern grotesque monster fits perfectly for Frankenstein's monster and Banks' protagonist, Frank. They claim that "[f]or the monster is a creature of uncertainty, and it is because of this state that the monster can never find peace, or fit in; thus, he is rejected by everyone with eyes to see, including his maker" (Edwards and Graulund 68). Both monsters are detached from the rest of society and can never fit in or find peace in society. Jennings stresses the change in the concept of the monster with modernity, "Even the most outlandish demon is human in its general appearance, however inhuman its individual features may be. Where combinations of man and beast occur, the most grotesque are undoubtedly those in which man predominates" (Jennings 8). In a

modern grotesque figure, his human frailties are highlighted rather than his bizarre physical attributes. Alixe Bovey talks about a "monstrous behaviour" (45) in his study entitled "Monsters and Grotesques in Medieval Manuscripts" where he associates the monstrous behaviour of the character with his monstrous body; however, in *The Wasp Factory*, Frank's body does not include any kind of deformity or enormity-even though the reader learns he is not castrated but fed with male hormones only at the end of the novel-inappropriate to the norm of the society, his monstrous behaviour is what makes him a monster in the contemporary sense.

According to Nicholson, contemporary writers like Slaughter, Gibson, Rush, Swift, Iain Banks, Ian McEwan, and Alan Garner "offer a world *without* moral judgement…These novels are presented as real life, unlike much horror. This is how people really behave. The use of the confessional-documentary device increases this impression" (269). We come across Frank's confessional, documentary-like narration from the beginning till the end of the novel where all the ignoble acts are realistically presented without censorship, even if they are immoral, unaccepted, or illegal for the rest of the community. There are several instances in the story where the monster trivializes all his demonic acts. When Frank comes home, at the dinner table, on a daily talk with his father, his father asks if he was out killing things; Frank replies with his inner voice saying, "Of course I was out killing things. How the hell am I supposed to get heads and bodies for the Poles and the Bunker if I don't kill things? There just aren't enough natural deaths" (Banks 9). This dialogue shows that his father knows he has been torturing living beings all day; however, he does not try to prevent him; moreover, we understand that Frank also knows what he has been doing is unacceptable to society as he says, "You can't explain that sort of thing to people, though" (9). As mentioned earlier, Frank has his own sense of reasoning, which is inappropriate for community life; this makes him a tyrant devoid of any moral rules in his acts and makes him "right", according to himself.

He thinks he has the right to kill small animals because he does not "go giving people presents of burning dogs, or frighten the local toddlers with handfuls of maggots and mouthfuls of worms" (10), which, he considers, is eviler. Bombing the rabbit holes, torturing small animals like wasps and insects, killing birds just to keep his poles with guards, and so on are among his daily routines, and they are his commonplace activities. Frank confesses that he "wanted to kill Blyth there and then" (43) because "… he lit the thrower and sprayed [their] two hutches with flame, incinerating all our beauties [pet rabbits]" (Banks 43). What Blyth had done to deserve to be killed by his own cousin is not much different from what Frank does to the animals on the island every day; still, Blyth paid his act with his life because of the sick reasoning in Frank's imaginary world. He feels excited about applying his scenario to kill Blyth, and he even confesses that,

> A death is always exciting, always makes you realise how alive you are, how vulnerable but so-far-lucky; but the death of somebody close gives you a good excuse to go a bit crazy for a while and do things that would otherwise be inexcusable. What delight to behave really badly and still get loads of sympathy! (Banks 48).

A boy who praises death and is proud of his murders would sound psychopathic -he killed his younger brother when Paul was only five and Frank was eight. He plotted to kill him with a bomb swept to the island's shore just by evoking his curiosity towards the bomb. It was a day they had great fun, and Paul had been entertained a lot, trying to build different pools, catching fish, and discovering the new items swept to the shore by the waves. Frank naively describes their relationship as follows:

> I always got on well with Paul. Perhaps because I knew from an early age that he was not long for this world, I tried to make his time in it as pleasant as possible, and thus ended up treating him far better than most young boys treat their younger brothers. (83)

Paul is caught up in his curiosity about a huge church bell they found on the coast, and the urge to be complimented by Frank pushes him to death. Frank knew that it was not a church bell, but a bomb left from the war from the beginning, led the way for Paul's death and escaped a good distance to keep himself undamaged. Practically, by hitting on the bomb with his full power, Paul was the reason for his own death; however, the demonic scenario and the establishment of an environment of trust -which led to Paul's death- all belonged to Frank, and the plan worked well; the bomb exploded while Paul was trying to ring the bell leaving almost nothing out of poor Paul. He explains why he did this: "Not that I bore him any personal ill-will; it was simply that I knew he couldn't stay" (83). Frank decides whom to stay and whom to leave in his kingdom, where he sets all the rules according to his will like a spoiled child. He talks about his murders as "score" (49), from which we understand that he is proud of them and sees them as elements of success; he simply explains the period of killings as "It was *just a stage* [my italics] I was going through" (49). The more he trivialises his crimes, the more the tension increases as his actions and sense of reasoning are unacceptable in a civilised society with rules and orders.

As a contribution to Frank's taking pleasure out of tortures and murders, his games, including sadistic and torturing activities, should also be emphasised. To begin with, he has a War Bag, where he keeps all kinds of his tools like "twenty-centimetre electric-piping bomb" (Banks 38), "some smaller bombs" (38), "air-pistol" (39) and his catapult to assist him with his attacks. He sets wars; there are two wars he plays in the novel: The war between "Mussels" and "Dead Flies" (8) and the war between "Ordinary Soldiers" and "Aerosols" (23-24). He carefully writes the war scenario, starts it, and manipulates it according to his will. For example, he describes the details of the second war as follows:

> In that scenario, all the 72nd-scale armies, complete with their tanks and guns and trucks and stores and helicopters and boats, had to unite against the Aerosol Invasion. The Aerosols were almost impossible to stop, and the soldiers and their weapons and equipment were getting burned and melted all over the place until one brave soldier who had clung on to one of the Aerosols as it flew back to its base came back (after many adventures) with the news that their base was a breadboard moored under an overhang on an inland creek. A combined force of commandos got there just in time and blew the base to smithereens, finally blowing up the overhang on top of the smoking remains. (23-24)

The graphic details of the wars, the ammunition he has to execute his scenario, and the imagination for a young kid to think about all these destructive details empower the creepy grotesque characteristic of Frank. Apart from his imaginary wars, we can see traces of the wars of the real world in the novel. First, the bomb that caused Paul's death, which was swept to the shore of the island by an earlier storm, belongs to World War II. Frank explains that "it was a German bomb of five hundred kilograms and it was dropped by a crippled He. III trying to get back to its Norwegian base after an unsuccessful attack on the flying-boat base farther down the firth" (Banks 89). He. III, or Heinkel He 111 with its full name, is the name of a warplane designed in 1934 and used in the Second World War. Moreover, Banks refers to the "H-bombs and *Neutron* bombs" (146) in the novel, which are modified versions of the atomic bomb that ended the Second World War. While talking to Jamie, his best friend, Frank talks about mass self-destruction of the world using these "wonderful" (146) bombs, which would be better than harming others. Frank ironically talks about wiping out himself from the world and becomes the spokesperson of hundreds of readers who despise Frank's hazard to the world. At the same time, he helps the readers to have a more comprehensive look at the world, where

people have been torturing, killing and wounding thousands of their own kind every day, or at least keeping their unresponsive position towards all the agonies around them. Finally, Banks indirectly criticises the wars for political and religious diversities he calls "Total War, a Jihad", from which he thinks people cannot be helped in any way (168).

In conclusion, as stated earlier, Banks wanted to write a "mainstream" novel, which created too much controversy when it was published. He believed that "[a]ll our lives are symbols. Everything we do is part of a pattern we have at least some say in. The strong make their own patterns and influence other people's, the weak have their courses mapped out for them" (153); therefore, everything in the novel is symbolic. Contrary to many commentaries that think it is a book of excess and exaggeration, in close analysis, you can conclude that it is a "mainstream" novel about the world's commonplace facts. The world is not a harmonious whole as in the memories of many people; on the contrary, it is a *bricolage* incuriously combined by the fragmented pieces of the modern man created by the tensions which surround him. People destroy each other in the world just because they have their way of reasoning; they only console themselves according to the ethical rules they have made up, like religious differences, ethnic discrimination, financial independence, racial diversities, financial independence, territorial integrity, and so on. These manmade but *divine* excuses for war only help them trivialise their demonic and monstrous qualities. Banks' novel was unacceptable for many because it was a realistic mirror that directly showed their evil and destruction. Similar to what Golding did in *Lord of the Flies,* Banks wanted to awaken the people from the fictional illusion of the novel and be responsive to it; he wanted people to feel the pain of it. He first did this by keeping their tension at its peak with his narrative technique of semantic economy, in which he kept the answer hidden until the end, or at least kept their attention alert for a few more pages. Secondly, he did not avoid the graphic description of the settings, even if they were disgusting and disturbing. He wanted the reader to sympathise with the character and feel

his feelings, even if it were distaste, excessive anger or condemnation. He did not want the reader to get lost under the fake illusion of fiction, which is all sweetness and light; instead, he also focused on the ugly, which had been ignored for so long. He acted like the war poets who wrote all the bruteness of the trench war, which provided the people with an objective picture of the war. Third, he used flashbacks and forwards as a narrative technique. Flashbacks and flashforwards are generally used to establish unity in the plot and to fill the story if there are any missing parts. Banks wants his reader to question the degraded state of the world - torture, gender oppression, wars, tyranny. All these techniques, in collaboration with the grotesque tension, excess, absurdity and exaggeration, contribute to the aim of art, which according to Shklovky, is "defamiliarisation", "bestrangement", or to create "deautomatized perception" (52), which was explained in "Chapter I". Banks' main goal is to break the automated, numb, irresponsive state of the people to the horror and deformity he is surrounded by. He wanted his reader the to question the artificial stresses that the modern man is struggling under; by murders of Frank, he wanted to focus on the deaths around the world, by Angus' experiment on Frank, he wanted to focus on the familial and social suppression on people trying to live their own lives, by daily rituals Frank is compulsively sticked to, Banks focuses on absurdity of different believes around the world. As a result of all these degrading hypocritical establishments, which are imposed by the superstructure of the society, the individual is pushed to despair and isolation as in the case with all the characters in the novel.

CHAPTER IV

THE "GROTESQUE UNCANNY" IN *THE OCEAN AT THE END OF THE LANE*

One of Neil Gaiman's latest novels, *The Ocean at the End of the Lane,* released in 2013, was initially written with the romantic goal of the author to let his musician wife, Amanda Palmer, have a greater insight into him as a child. In the novel, an unnamed adult narrator, a male figure, pays a visit to his hometown after long years for a funeral. The reader sees everything from his vision when he was an adult to when he was a little boy. The memories of his boyhood are revived when the middle-aged man takes a tour around the neighbourhood of his childhood. When he comes across a farm that he remembers from his childhood, all his memories and the story of the novel begin to develop. Lettie Hempstock, the little daughter of the next farm, becomes the protagonist's strongest supporter throughout their adventures and against a mysterious enemy for manhood, namely Ursula Monkton. Lettie takes the young protagonist on a breath-taking series of events where logic, laws of the earth, and reason do not function. The Hempstocks' farm and the boy's neighbourhood suddenly turn out to be a place of magic and sorcery. As the boy and his magician, loyal assistant, delve deeper into the strange happenings around them, they find themselves on the very crucial duty of protecting the world from an ancient calamity that leaked into their community, even the boy's family. The Hempstock family, particularly Lettie, her mother, and her grandmother, play an essential role in supporting the main character in conquering this supernatural difficulty and reaching a good resolution. The story is subtly intertwined with themes of infancy, memory, the limitless power of imagination, and the fine line between fact and fiction. The narration in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* is characterised by its richly descriptive and vividly detailed prose, creating a surreal and dreamlike atmosphere that permeates the entire novel. The narrative combines mythology and folklore with the protagonist's personal

and emotional journey. Finally, it is a story of wonder and peril that enchants readers with mystical and otherworldly components.

Neil Gaiman did not plan to write a novel-long text at the beginning (Schnelbach); however, it found its way, and at the end of the "lane", it turned out to be a novel. As revealed in his newspaper interview with Schnelbach, the novel is a combination of biographical references like the setting as well as some of the productions of Gaiman's imaginary world like The Hempstocks, which he uses in some of his other books as well like Daisy Hempstock in *Stardust* (1997), Liza Hempstock in *The Graveyard Book* (2008), and Lettie Hempstock in *The Ocean at the end of the Lane* (2013). This combination of fact and fiction parallels the technique in Gaiman's novel, which creates a grotesque hybridity, which is explained by Harrison as follows: "By blending fantasy and horror elements with realism, Gaiman presents a text that is as hybrid as the creatures and characters within it" (Harrison 67). This hybrid combination of the novel among the genres can be affiliated with the characteristics of the grotesque, for instance. Thus, this chapter will analyse the physical grotesque characteristics of the novel, like the physical *grottoes* (hiding places) of the characters, followed by the analysis of "grotesque hybridity" and "uncanny", respectively. Following this, the bodily transformation of the characters by "sorcery" practices will be analysed within the context of the "grotesque body". The function of time shifts as a narration technique and the distinction between the children's world and the adult world will be focused on in terms of supporting Shklovsky's claim related to the function of art, which, as he contends, is to break the artistic illusion and keep the beholder awake throughout the text. This holds significant importance because the grotesque element effectively sustains the reader's engagement, aligning with the artistic purpose as articulated by Shklovsky. Finally, the novel will be analysed through the lens of *bricolage*, exploring how it portrays the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of stereotypes associated with family

roles and the very concept of family. To begin with, the narrative structure of *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* might be seen as a form of *bricolage*. The tale creates a distinctive and captivating narrative by fusing elements of magical realism, fiction, and contemporary life. Gaiman mixes myth, folklore, childhood experiences, and his own imagination to create a narrative that blurs the lines between fiction and reality. Furthermore, the narrative is pieced together like a *bricolage* from the protagonist's childhood recollections, the intriguing Hempstock family, and other-worldly elements. The novel invites readers to consider the boundaries that separate fact from fiction by combining a variety of elements such as witchcraft, magic, transformation, masks, memories of childhood, and actual life references into a coherent and powerful narrative that is an artistic expression of the *bricolage*. This process is akin to the widely used *bricolage* tradition of combining disparate components to produce a new unit. This is also consistent with the representation of the grotesque, which requires the combination of disparate parts. Thus, the techniques of grotesque and *bricolage* complement each other, offering a collaborative aspect that can be further analysed within the novel.

On a thematic level, the novel *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* is laden with many themes, including the paranormal, nostalgia, and childhood innocence. The novel's themes are weaved together to create a complex web of thoughts and feelings related to the evil side of the world, the evil side of the being, innocence and disparity of the children's world, affection of the family life, and dangers of the outside life for the children. Gaiman artistically deconstructs and reconstructs the ongoing stereotypical ideologies related to the affectionate domestic family life and the possible dangers of the outside world, especially for children. The mother figure in the boy narrator's life is continuously non-existent, and she never appears in the moments when the boy needs her warm approach and protection. The substitute mother, Ursula Monkton, turns out to be a monster who first tries to occupy his father's emotional void and take up his birth

mother's place eternally. The father figure seemed affected by the emotional intimacy of Ursula.

4.1. The Manifestations of Disharmony: The Physical Grotesque

To begin with the physical grotesque representations in the novel, the *grottoes* that characters use as hiding places play an essential role in the novel. The narrator's "laboratory", as he names it, which, is described as "…a green-painted shed as far away from the house as you could get, built up against the side of the house's huge old garage" (Gaiman 73) is one of the hiding places in the novel. As defined in the previous chapters, "*grotto*" is the Italian word used for "cave", which constitutes the etymological root for the word grotesque. The first *grottoes* were places dug to uncover the hidden wall paintings on the walls of the earlier Roman people. Therefore, hiding places are claimed to be grotesque, a notion which, as discussed in Chapter II, can be related to Frank's secret place in the attic, as well as Angus' study room where he hides secrets until towards the end in *The Wasp Factory*. In a similar fashion, the narrator's "laboratory" fulfils the same function in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane.* It is his private place where he hides his prohibited belongings and where he performs different experiments. It also has another use for the narrator when he refuses to eat the food his new nanny Ursula Monkton prepares for him; it is where he surreptitiously hides food and feeds himself. It plays a life-or-death role for him because he rejects all of the food offered by Ursula, and it becomes his sole source of nutrition. In both *The Wasp Factory* and Gaiman's novel, the main characters use their *grottoes* for their own benefit, and this private sanctuary keeps them away from the adult world.

Secondly, the supernatural powers of the characters in the novel also put them under the category of the grotesque. For example, the Hempstock women can see the number of people approaching their home before they can see them. Before meeting the boy in the house, one of the ladies states that "[t]his must be the boy from the top of the

lane" (Gaiman 27), which happens to be true. Moreover, she knows about the dead man in the car. She is also capable of telling the number of people approaching their house related to the case: "There will be five of them needing tea soon" (27), which is corrected by the other lady in the house as, "Six. The doctor will be here too" (27). Among the ladies, only the little boy is amazed by the gift of the ladies. The conversation continues naturally, like the people they are talking about are on a video from surveillance cameras. In the description, they are defined as farmer ladies of different ages; however, the reader gets the first impression that they are more than that. These ladies also gossip about the procedure of the investigation of the dead man, commenting, "They've missed the note," she said. "He wrote it so carefully too, folded it and put it in his breast pocket, and they haven't looked there yet" (Gaiman 27). The Hempstock women are aware of the secret and all its specifics, even though the police officers are unaware of these facts. The readers' questions of amazement and curiosity related to these people are put into words by the protagonist. He states, "I wondered … but I did not ask, any more than I dared to ask how they knew about the suicide note or what the opal miner had thought as he died. They were perfectly matter-of fact about it" (Gaiman 29). This renders them hybrid entities—human in form yet possessing inhuman abilities such as perceiving events that occurred in their absence and delving into the thoughts of others. Edwards and Graulund's description of the hybrid stated, "[t]he grotesque in visual culture and literature often includes hybrid forms in which animalistic characteristics are merged with humanoid forms" (158), which constitutes the core of the analysis of the grotesque hybridity here. They elaborate on their description, claiming that "hybridity is about a dual nature that exists simultaneously" (61), which is akin to the hybrid nature of the characters in the novel.

Ursula Monkton is another hybrid being in the novel. The child hero of Gaiman literally labels her as a "monster" (87, 88, 92, 100, 114, 141) several times and even a

“flea” (100) or a “worm”. She is, in fact, “a sort of housekeeper” (68), as their mother initially described her, someone to watch over the kids while their mother is at work. This introduction was made with the hope that it would be received as “good news” (68). However, from the very first day, the boy does not reconcile with her, which proves him right, especially towards the end of the novel.

To begin with, the boy sees Ursula in several flirtatious gestures with his father reciprocatively, and he sees her as an opponent to steal his mother’s place in the family. It might be thought that he is right with his anxieties because he sees Ursula and his father in intimate physical contact with each other. Secondly and more importantly, Ursula appears to have supernatural qualities in the later parts of the novel, when she “…hung in the air, about twenty feet above […], and lightning crawled and flickered in the sky behind her. She was not flying. She was floating, weightless as a balloon, although the sharp gusts of wind did not move her” (Gaiman 109). Besides hanging in the air like a “weightless” figure, she is abnormally fast and sneaky. Moreover, especially during the power struggles between Ursula and Lettie Hempstock, she transforms from being a sexually attractive person to an ugly beast. With all these qualities, she is physically a grotesque character with hybrid natural and supernatural characteristics.

Grotesque beings are also strong figures in the novel, like the Manta wolf, fleas, hunger birds and the cats with their transformative features. For instance, the description of the Manta wolf contains some grotesque qualities. It is something that came “… above … heads” which is physically “…brown and furry, but flat, like a huge rug, flapping and curling at the edges, and, at the front of the rug, a mouth, filled with dozens of tiny sharp teeth, facing down” (Gaiman 50). The Manta wolf serves as an illustration that the boy and Lettie overstepped their limits, also symbolizing the emergence of wildlife in consequence. Nevertheless, the description of the animal has some supernatural elements, such as looking like a rug-possibly flying-and too many teeth. Moreover, the depiction of

the hunger birds also contains hyperbole, which requires analysis within the framework of the grotesque. They are birds who "were not birds" (168) and who were superfast and hungry in that their devouring Ursula is described as follows:

> They [hunger birds] landed on it [Ursula] like seagulls on a beach of stranded fish, and they tore at it as if they had not eaten for a thousand years and needed to stuff themselves now, as it might be another thousand years or longer before they would eat again. (Gaiman 170-71)

The metaphysical qualities related to these strange animals reach their peak when the boy inconsistently tries to explain their numbers. He states, "… there were hundreds of them, but I might have been wrong. There might have been twenty of them. There might have been a thousand" (Gaiman 171). He tries to justify his contradictory explanations, which even adds to their unearthliness, as he states, "I could not explain it: perhaps they were from a place where such things as counting didn't apply, somewhere outside of time and numbers" (Gaiman 171). The descriptors used to describe these animals with their excessiveness, and inconsistencies make them subject to grotesque critique. The worm inside the boy's foot is another grotesque figure because even after he takes most of the body of the worm out of his foot with tweezers, it causes pain and even more, it makes a "hissing noise" (135). We can understand that physical integrity is not a criterion for the worm to stay alive and cause damage, which is grotesque. It also has a Biblical reference in that the young boy goes against Lettie's instructions and eats from the forbidden tree. Despite being urged to trust her and hold onto her hand, he is deceived and tricked by Ursula, the carpet spectre. This act infects him, akin to a worm burrowing into an apple. He tries hard to remove the sinful worm-like entity from himself, but it separates, finding shelter within his heart.

Bernard McElroy, in his *Fiction of the Modern Grotesque* (1989), simply defines the types of grotesque hybrid figures with "gross physicality of existence" by making use

of "exaggeration, distortion, or unexpected combination" (11). These figures might differ from being "entirely animal, though the human-animal, to the entirely human" (11). Prominent or imaginary animal figures, inanimate images having some parts of some of the animals, shapes composed of "combination of human and animal features" (11), and humans with extreme qualities of distortion are among the types of grotesque hybrid images according to McElroy. He also states that "animalistic or humanoid plants; the combination of mechanical devices with animal forms … or gruesome machines that take on life of their own" are among the types of grotesque hybrid forms. It is explained earlier in the thesis that the term hybrid throughout the thesis is far from its connotations in colonial criticism, which means cultural combinations between two different cultures. Different from the earlier definitions of grotesque hybridity based on the physicality of hybridisation, and unlike its connotations in colonial criticism, the phrase will be used throughout the chapter to describe something that combines two or more separate aspects: the novel's genre, plot, the novel's realistic and surrealistic features, evil and innocent traits of the characters, celestial and degraded qualities of parenthood, all of which are integrated into one unified form in the narrative. All these hybrid elements in the novel increase the spooky tension in the novel while supporting the shock effect created. Furthermore, the erratic and unorganized nature of the novel could symbolize the uncanny condition of the modern individual in contemporary Britain—constantly uncertain, suspicious, and feeling incomplete. Before analysing the hybrid identity of the characters in the novel, the novel can be categorized into three distinct classifications— the novel contains essential components of magic realism, gothic, and horror genres. As known, the genre magic realism was popularised by the Colombian author Gabriel Garcia Marquez when his novel *One Hundred Years of Solitude* was published in 1967. It can be defined as the use of fantastic elements in a realistic setting, where the borders between fantasy and reality become blurred. Gaiman's novel repeatedly plays with the reader's perception

of reality and fantasy; therefore, it has features of magical realism. The main character of the novel visits his hometown for a "duty" (Gaiman 3), that is to say, for a funeral, and he goes for a loose ride around his childhood neighbourhood, which leads the way to his childhood memories. The setting and the plot of the novel are pretty realistic, including real place names like "Sussex country roads" (3), "Caraway Farm" (6) and "Shetlands" (6) with realistic names of people like "The Hempstocks", "Callie Anders", "Lettie", "Ursula", referencing real books like "*Puss in Boots"*, "*Dick Whittington"* (13), "*Alice in Wonderland"* (Gaiman 177), and so on. However, it is also rich in fantastic elements like the Hempstock ladies who practise sorcery, and Ursula, who has superpowers like flying, moving inhumanly fast, and standing alive in flames. In addition, the novel has horror and gothic elements as well. When the main character's dad loses his control and starts to torture the little boy, the tension of horror starts to increase in the novel. It reaches its climax at the scene of a manhunt between Ursula and the little child in the dark and rainy forest outside the family's farmhouse. The boy literally recalls his horror, saying, "I was seven years old, no longer a little child, but I was wetting myself with fear, like a baby…" (Gaiman 112). Moreover, when Lettie has to leave the boy alone at night in their garden within a safe circle she drew, and Ursula challenges him with different personas, the element of horror is triggered again. The description of the Hempstocks' farm, as well as the mystery, which is not clearly solved even after the novel ends, is one of the most gothic elements in the novel. Moreover, the description of the father character is reminiscent of a typical gothic male character with his dominance over female characters in the novel, namely his wife and Ursula, his flirtatious attitude towards another woman, and his spirit devoid of any responsibilities. In addition to the various genres with which the novel is affiliated, Tara Prescott claims that the work is also autobiographical. She claims:

> … Gaiman offered a rare glimpse into his own life in 2013 with the release of his semi- autobiographical short novel, *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*. This book, written in response to Amanda Palmer wanting to know more about Gaiman's childhood, beautifully blurs the boundaries between fact and fiction, biography and imagination. (4)

Gaiman indirectly confirms the autobiographical aspect of the novel in the "Acknowledgement", stating, "[t]he family in this book is not my own family…I liberally reshaped those places [that my family let me plunder] into a story" (Gaiman 237). Being inspired by different families around his family, he created The Hempstocks. In his interview with Leah Schnelbach, he acknowledges that the novel is set on the lane where Gaiman spent his youth, and it is about a fictional family called the Hempstocks, who originally appeared in Gaiman's mind when he was nine years old. Indeed, several members of this family appeared in his literature, including Daisy Hempstock in *Stardust* and Liza Hempstock in *The Graveyard Book*. Derek Lee adds another dimension to the hybridity of *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, making a completely different claim that the novel is "anti-bildungsroman" (552). As Lee claims:

> … Gaiman develops the fantasy anti-bildungsroman as the "novel of enchantment" in response to the dominant "novel of disenchantment" that is the realist bildungsroman, a generic innovation that reconsiders both humanity's relationship with capitalist society and the role of fantasy in contemporary life. (552)

The importance of the dimensionality of the novel in terms of genres is that it supports the overall grotesque effect that promotes analysing through different scopes. That fundamental aim is to lead the readers to a continuous suspicion and questioning the answers of which are impossible to find. The structures or the structuralism of the earlier eras gave the reader a sense of security, something the limits of which they know;

however, the grotesque novel, lacking these traits, shocks the reader, prompting a continual quest for stability and ultimately leaves them unsettled and unresolved by the conclusion. This circumstance precisely corresponds to the emotion generated by classic art for a classic audience and grotesque art for a contemporary audience. Hence, the subcategories of the novel that share close ties with the grotesque unite various literary traditions, exemplified in Gaiman's novel, amalgamating components from fairy tales, gothic literature, and realistic fiction. Also, the target reader of the novel is ambiguous, straddling between an apparent appeal to younger readers while veering into content more suited for adults, particularly due to the pervasive elements of horror interwoven throughout the narrative, rendering it a nuanced and mature read despite its initial impression.

The hybrid qualities of the characters are made manifest through their dualistic positions. The father is both a caregiver and a villain who tortures or even tries to drown his child in the bathroom, while the mother is both present and absent. Also, the narrator is both an adult and a child. Ursula Monkton is a nanny who is supposed to take care of children and a monster who deadly scares the child, she is the caregiver and a substitute mother and therefore has a celestial position in the house, but she acts like a seductress, seducing the father of the children. Lettie is a peer of the child narrator, but she has to take responsibility as a sacrificer and a protector as well. The ladies of the Hempstocks farm are bot sorcerer witches and compassionate grandmas, they are doing the domestic chores as well as battling to protect their neighbourhood from the evil beings. The author plays with the perception of the reader, that is to say, the water near the house is not clear as to whether it is as big as an ocean or as small as a lake, there are cats at different moments in the novel; however, the reader cannot make sure if these cats are mere illusions or real cats. The multitude of inconsistencies and uncertainties within the text contribute to the reader's unease, as they're compelled to approach each aspect with

scepticism, constantly reevaluating their judgments. This experience prompts a reconsideration of their perceptions regarding the contemporary world depicted in the novel, fostering a deeper introspection and critical analysis of their own beliefs and assessments.

From the very first page, the debate over the size of the water captures the reader: "Lettie Hempstock said it was an ocean, but I knew that was silly" (Gaiman 1). For an ordinary rational mind, the difference between the size of an ocean and the size of a lake is so immense that a dispute on it would be pointless. The gloom continues as "She [Lettie] said they'd come here across the ocean from the old country" (1). Who they are, where the old country is, and what they mean by calling "ocean" are the first questions that the reader becomes curious about. These hybrid and contradictory qualities bring to mind the characteristics of the grotesque.

According to Wolfgang Kayser, the uncanny feeling is also among the grotesque qualities. This feeling is a result of the hybrid situations mentioned above as well as the uncanny situations, which will be analysed hereafter. As is well known, Sigmund Freud attempted to explain the term uncanny by concentrating on E. T. A. Hoffman's short story "The Sandman" in his essay "The Uncanny" (1919). By synthesising the uncanny situation with his previous psychoanalytic analyses, he concludes that objects that evoke repressed childhood desires or mentalities -in other words, objects that generally remind us of fundamental psychological processes -are what generally give us a sensation of the uncanny. He explains,

> [The uncanny] undoubtedly belongs to all that is terrible—to all that arouses dread and creeping horror; it is equally certain, too, that the word is not always used in a clearly definable sense, so that it tends to coincide with whatever excites dread. (Freud 1)

Freud defines the uncanny (*unheimlich* in German original) with its opposite, *heimlich*, which he claims he found "by collecting a number of individual cases" (1) stating that "the "uncanny" is that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar" (Freud 1-2). Moreover, Freud claims that among the events that might cause the feeling of the uncanny is "the double", which occurs when one person "identifies himself with another person, so that his self becomes confounded, or the foreign self is substituted for his own" by the processes of "doubling, dividing and interchanging the self" (Freud 9). The horror scenes through the novel, which causes it to be placed away from the children's novels in the bookstores, are abundant when the *heimlich* turns out to be *unheimlich* and when especially the closest people of the narrator appear to trick him in their doubling masks during his psychological battle with Ursula. In the Freudian sense, when the *heimlich* (homelike) becomes *unheimlich* (unhomelike), according to Yaeri Kim, in the novel *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* is when the child narrator's home becomes a stranger place for him, a place where he desires to escape from. He becomes alienated from his own living place. The young narrator experiences the uncanny when his father loses his temper and breaks the bathroom door and starts to torture the boy (Kim 152-153). As Kim claims, "[t]he home has become a strange, porous, and unsafe place that allows strangers to interrupt the narrator's life and does not protect him. It has turned into an unhomely place" (156). The definition of the term by Freud fits the uncanny circumstance analysed by Kim, yet it is incomplete. The child narrator also grows estranged from his father upon seeing his father's violence for the first time in his life. He even considers the possibility that his father may murder him, and in this way, the sense of safety and trust that his father has given him is totally upended. The kind person suddenly reveals himself to be the deadly adversary. The boy explains his father's earlier thoughts related to violence as follows:

> He never hit me. He did not believe in hitting. He would tell us how his father had hit him, how his mother had chased him with a broom, how he was better than that. When he got angry enough to shout at me he would occasionally remind me that he did not hit me, as if to make me grateful. (Gaiman 87-88)

It is clearly understood from this extract that the father figure is someone who strictly against violence at home, which might be partly because he was subjected to his parents' violence as a child, and partly because he believes that is useless from his own childhood. The fact that he uses his nonviolent attitude towards his son as a boasting mechanism also supports the idea that he has been-at least trying to be-polite to his child. This picture of the father from his son's vision is what we can call *heimlich* in Freudian terms. However, things start to change when the time for the dinner comes. To begin with, father gets under the influence of the new caregiver, and they reciprocally act flirtatious towards each other. In addition to this sexual drive, the son acts very impolitely during the dinner towards the lady according to father's view. The boy rejects the food she cooked, even though, normally, the menu is composed of the boy's favourite meals. Later, the boy explains why he rejects the food and behaves disrespectfully towards Ursula as, "Because she's not human," I said. "She's a monster. She's a . . ." What had the Hempstocks called her kind of thing? "She's a *flea."* (Gaiman 92). Only a few moments later, the boy starts to describe the horror aroused by his father's rage towards him. Even seeking refuge and locking himself inside the bathroom, which was considered his safe haven, proved futile as his father's rage escalated to the point of breaking down the bathroom door. When the boy started to be scared of his father's determination to commit violence against him, he made the choice to defend himself physically, initiating a physical struggle between them. Everything *heimlich* to the kid has become downright uncanny all at once. He literally describes the situation as follows:

> I was horrified, but it was initially the horror of something happening against the established order of things. I was fully dressed. That was wrong. I had my sandals on. That was wrong. The bathwater was cold, so cold and so wrong. That was what I thought, initially, as he pushed me into the water, and then he pushed further, pushing my head and shoulders beneath the chilly water, and the horror changed its nature. I thought, I'm going to die. (95)

Normally, he would not be in this bathtub "fully dressed", with his "sandals on", when "the bathwater was cold" and more importantly he would never be in physical battle with his father in their bathroom. The place where he had the joy of having a bath, had turned into a completely strange place for him. The father's role as a guardian would forever change for the boy, and likewise, his once secure space—referred to as "I had read many books in that bath. It was one of my safe places" (95)—would no longer offer the same sense of comfort or familiarity.

In addition to the claims related to the uncanny, the part where the boy is tested with a lot of "doubles", which triggers the uncanny feeling for the boy, is also important. In Part XI, Lettie leaves the boy in his garden to summon help from other Hempstock ladies in order to get rid of Ursula and the hunger birds. She tells him "to stay inside" and assures him, stating that "[n]othing that wants to hurt you can cross it" (173). The thing they are talking about is a "green circle of grass" in the garden and "a fairy ring" in the boy's hand (173). The child narrator finds himself alone and is terrified in the middle of the night, inside a circle that he does not entirely trust would keep him safe, and Ursula begins to practise her tricks. First, he hears the voice of the opal miner. He challenges the boy to get out of the circle. He provokes him, saying, "You're just prolonging the inevitable" (176). When this does not work, he tries to convince the boy saying that "It won't hurt" (176). The boy is terrified to hear the man's voice, even if he is someone he has met before since he is meant to be dead. This must be the worst thing a boy could

encounter in the middle of the night when he does not feel safe at all. Besides, they do not have a good experience because the opal miner is the man who killed his cat. The boy describes his appearance saying, "The dead man in the dinner jacket turned his head slowly, until his face was looking at mine. His eyes were rolled back in his head, and seemed to be staring blindly at the sky above us, like a sleepwalker" (Gaiman 177). As if the boy did not have enough troubles, he is alone with a spectre, and he cannot move as is told by Lettie. He understands that the dead body belongs to the opal miner; however, he does not have good memories related to the man. He is the man who rents the narrator's room in England and bothers his comfort, but the man's reasons to rent the flat remain unclear. He appears callous, accidentally kills the narrator's kitten, and brings in an unsuitable replacement. Events worsen as he steals the family's car and commits suicide, seemingly opening a pathway for a supernatural creature to enter the mortal world. Later on, the boy understands that this-the dead body- is a trick played by Ursula. The trick is there has never been a spectre near the boy, just an illusion trying to force him out of the circle. Even so, when the boy encounters the opal miner for the first time, he feels uncanny and insecure because of his existence. This doubling image of him, even though he was not somebody to be scared about, makes the boy feel insecure and *unheimlich* probably firstly because he was declared dead by the police officers, secondly because of his personal distress about the man about sharing his bedroom and losing his cat. All the combination of earlier memories are revived by the *doppelgänger* of the man. Secondly, his little sister appears in the garden and tries to take him out of the circle. She claims that "Daddy's on the phone. He says you have to come and talk to him" (178). In order to persuade the boy, she says, "If you don't come now, you'll be in trouble" (178). Normally, he should have got out of the circle and run to his house to ask for help from his father, whom, her sister claims, is waiting on the phone; however, he cannot do that. He doubts if it is his sister or not. He does not trust what his sister tells him because of the feeling

of unease attached to her. He literally confesses saying, “I did not know if this was my sister or not, but I was on the inside of the grass circle, and she was on the outside” (178) and “I wondered if this was actually my sister or not. It definitely sounded like her” (179). In the end, this proves to be nothing more than a trick played by Ursula to get the boy out of the circle. The boy feels a strange feeling toward his sister, even though she talks about something very personal— the phone call from his father— and he finds himself unable to engage with her. This inability to respond turns out to be the right decision, as it becomes evident that Ursula, the monster, is actually concealing herself behind the guise of his sister trying to provoke the boy to get out of the circle. The narrator’s own sister, even when she is talking about a very personal memory, causes the boy to feel *unheimlich*, and this uncanny feeling saves the boy’s life once more like it did with the opal miner. Subsequently, the mystical interchange of characters, where Ursula replaces individuals, intervenes for the third time, orchestrating a deliberate challenge aimed at pushing the boy out of his safe circle drawn by Lettie. While the boy is urinating in his garden without getting out of the protective circle around him, his father flashes the torch and shouts: “What on earth are you doing down here?” (181) His father speaks affectionately, later jokily, and then angrily to convince his son to leave his place and go home; however, the boy does not move in each case. Later, Ursula returns with her distinct persona, revealing that also the father was merely an illusion crafted by Ursula. Surprisingly, despite her body being torn apart and devoured entirely by hunger birds, Ursula reappears with a complete body, defying the previous gruesome fate she suffered. The boy describes the situation as follows: “I had seen her torn to pieces a few hours before, but now she was whole” (183). She tries to demoralise the boy first by claiming that his situation is hopeless, and that relenting would be much less painful than resisting. She states, “Now, step out of the circle and come to us. One step is all it will take. Just put one foot across the threshold, and we will make all the pain go away forever: the pain you feel now and

the pain that is still to come. It will never happen" (185). The boy is wet, hungry, cold, afraid, and alone, all of which lead him to become psychologically fragile. Everything outside the circle is very familiar to him because he is in the garden of his own house; however, he cannot act freely and is limited to a circle. Everything outside the circle is deadly dangerous, and Ursula could manipulate anyone out, so the uncanny feeling was prevalent. Finally, Ursula wears the mask of Lettie and tries to deceive the boy; however, the boy is cautious again. This time, he says, "If you're really Lettie Hempstock," I told her, "you come here" (185) to double check if the voice he hears belongs to Ursula or Lettie, and he wins against Ursula's tricks last time. Ursula, acting logically, tries to tease the boy to come out of the circle where she will be able to attack him, by using the apparitions the boy is familiar with from his earlier experiences. Usually, these are the individuals the boy would typically find reliable and familiar. However, his inability to trust them, which later turns out to be justified due to the potential danger Ursula poses, stems from his past encounters and experiences. *Heimlich* becomes *unheimlich* and the doubles of the people-the apparitions-helps to create the uncanny affect with the narrator.

Wolfgang Kayser's psychological analysis of the grotesque relates the grotesque and the uncanny as they contribute to each other to increase the unease with the beholder, and both of them become estranged from the familiar. Parallel to Freud, according to Kayser, the uncanny is a sensation of uneasiness or discomfort that arises when something familiar starts to seem weird or uncomfortable. It is a feeling that frequently results from coming into contact with the forgotten, repressed, or suppressed parts of the human mind. However, Kayser's remarks on the grotesque and the uncanny differ from Freud's in categorizing what's termed as grotesque:

> [T]he third kind [of grotesque] is constituted by the 'demonic' characters whose appearance and behavior are grotesque. As long as they are disguises of the devil ... their grotesqueness is lessened. Even where they [grotesque

> figures] do not themselves interfere with the action or bring their supernatural powers into play, their mere presence usually spells death and destruction. They tend to possess uncanny mechanical skills... (Kayser 106)

The elements of fantasy, hyperbole, or pure comedy can attain this diminishing effect of the uncanny with the grotesque according to Kayser. The grotesque and uncanny elements within Gaiman's novel align more closely with McElroy's definition of the grotesque. This is because the tension and fear intensify through the unsettling transformation of the familiar and the presence of the doppelgänger, evoking a sense of horror for the boy. Unlike Kayser's definition, there are no elements of comedy or fantasy that diminish or lessen this effect of horror. McElroy suggests that,

> our response to the grotesque, whether in life or in art, has as a fundamental component that sense of the uncanny which arises from the reassertion of the primitive, magical view of the world. It seems to me inescapable that the grotesque is linked definitively to aggression in human nature, both the impulse to commit aggression and even more, the fear of being the victim of aggression: and I do not mean merely natural aggression, but aggression by impossible, all-powerful means - which is to say aggression by magic. (4)

McElroy's inclusion of magic within the definition of the uncanny resonates with Ursula's implementation of magic, displaying her aggression towards the young boy. Additionally, the primitive aggression within the narrator's father surfaces when triggered by his son's rebellious behaviour in the presence of the woman he covertly flirts with. Amid the unsettling effect created by the uncanny, what offers solace to both the reader and the boy is the boy's consistent ability to see through the malevolent character's deception each time he is confronted. However, the tension escalates steadily until the real Lettie arrives to rescue the boy, ultimately relieving the mounting suspense. As also mentioned in the previous chapters, contemporary novel with grotesque qualities does not have the aim of

comforting the reader; on the contrary, its main aim is to disturb, provoke and keep him awake. Kim states that "[t]he comforting pattern of everyday life is disrupted by the intrusion of strangers; the beliefs and assumptions about the home, the family, and the general ways of things are shattered; and the world becomes an uncertain place" (Kim 153). Everything that the person anchored in the memories and stability of a structured, classic era had once trusted, believed to be solid and factual, and found assurance in, becomes the origin or cause of feelings associated with the uncanny. This occurs because the modern era's instability challenges and disrupts established ideologies. Jung delineates the unconscious into two layers: the personal unconscious, which stems from an individual's experiences, and the deeper "collective unconscious". This collective layer isn't shaped by personal experiences; rather, it's innate and shared among all humans. Jung refers to it as "collective" because its contents and behaviours are "universal" and "identical" across cultures, serving as a common psychological foundation present within every individual (Jung 3-4). The collective unconscious mind of the world, which repressed all sorts of traumas of humanity like wars, pandemics, child deaths, massacres, natural disasters, and similar catastrophes, left nowhere for the modern individual to feel secure and *heimlich.* The uncanny feeling of the grotesque has been the new reality of humanity.

4.2. Adult vs. Children's World / Time Shifts

Throughout the novel, one could frequently come across the distinction between the rational mind of the adult world and the free spirit of the children's world. The child narrator of the novel continuously criticises and complains about the adult world. Moreover, the flow of events has sudden changes from the current time of the plot to the past, and vice versa, which also leads the way to transitions between the narrator's childhood and adulthood. The disruption of traditional narrative structures, such as chronological storytelling, is a common technique often employed in contemporary

novels with grotesque elements. Such novels disappoint the reader's expectations by diverting from a chronological timeline, attempting to intrigue and attract them. This divergence from chronological storytelling aims to keep the reader interested and aware throughout the book by adding an element of surprise, altering their normal reading experience, and raising the overall sensation of anxiety or unrest within the plot. This deviation from standard narrative tactics is consistent with Schklovsky's idea of art's ultimate objective. To display a novelty in presenting the familiar subjects, artists stop applying traditional narrative strategies such as chronological narration. This novelty accompanied by a defamiliarization compels the beholder to think about the world around, people, and events in new and thought-provoking ways. This leads a re-examination of the familiar, keeping the audience engaged and urging them to go deeper into the messages the story. People, according to Schklovsky, eventually become accustomed to the commonplace, routine, and relaxing, resulting in a loss of consciousness and a diminished ability to perceive and experience life with imagination and vitality. He felt that rather than just reflecting reality, art should compel people to engage with it in new and profound ways. Achronological narration has the potential to serve this purpose as it defamiliarizes the reader. In Gaiman's novel, time shifts backward and forward is a good example for this. The old narrator of the story wandering around his hometown comes across a farm and starts to remember his childhood memories, which causes him to revisit the period when he was about seven years old. Schklovsky's notion of defamiliarization in art, cantered on presenting the familiar in an unfamiliar or unusual manner, intersects with the concept of the uncanny, particularly in its transformation of the *heimlich* (familiar) into the *unheimlich* (uncanny or unsettling). When an artist defamiliarizes the known elements – be it characters, settings, or plot points – they become distorted or rendered strange, creating an uncanny effect. This shift from the familiar to the unfamiliar disrupts the audience's expectations and comfort, evoking

feelings of unease or discomfort, much like the experience of encountering the uncanny. Both defamiliarization in art and the uncanny effect involve unsettling the familiar, prompting a shift in perception and inviting the audience to engage with a new, unsettling perspective on the familiar aspects presented to them.

In addition to the flashbacks and flash forwards, Gaiman challenges the readers' attention through merging life-like situations and factual circumstances with fantasy. While the story continues like a childhood memory, suddenly, the reader comes across the magical powers of the Hempstock women in that they give all the details of the crime scene as well as the people who approach their house. Soon after the boy gets out of the water of the ocean in a bucket where he remembers and knows about everything and acquires the magical power of wisdom, everything turns back to normal: "And then my head broke water, and I blinked and coughed, and I was standing, thigh-deep in the pond at the back of the Hempstocks' farm, and Lettie Hempstock was standing beside me, holding my hand" (Gaiman 195). This transition from the fantastic realm of acquiring eternal knowledge, as expressed by the boy narrator, "I knew everything … from Egg to Roe…" (191), to the harsh reality of permanently losing his best friend, serves to captivate the reader's attention. Without this engagement, following the storyline becomes difficult, and everything within the novel loses its significance. The deliberate use of this technique by the author aims to unsettle the reader and place upon them the responsibility of constant questioning. By juxtaposing the boy's proclamation of all-encompassing knowledge with the stark reality of losing a dear friend, the author creates a jarring contrast. This purposeful diversion forces the reader to reevaluate how well they understand the narrative. This sudden change in tone makes readers uncomfortable and makes them question the veracity of what they have already learnt. The continuous ambiguity that is strengthened by this strategy, encourages the reader to reassess their assumptions and standpoints as the story develops.

The role of sudden temporal changes or the division between real settings and fantastical storylines is also comparable to that of the division between the worlds of the impulsive child and the rational or structured adult world. The reasoning of adult characters in the novel is often grounded on realistic, pragmatic thinking, focusing on practicalities and logical explanations for happenings. Their ideas frequently correspond to conventional knowledge and established standards. In contrast, the minds of youngsters are portrayed as more inventive, lively, and receptive to accepting imaginative themes. Their perspectives of view embrace the mystical and enigmatic, allowing them to see the world beyond traditional boundaries. This mentality comparison illustrates the gap between adult logic, which is grounded in pragmatism and conventional thinking, and children's susceptibility to creative, magical moments that transcend the confines of traditional knowledge. As a result, the narrative highlights a dynamic between these opposing viewpoints, emphasizing the depth and complexity of human sight and experience. As mentioned earlier in the thesis, Kayser claims that the grotesque is "… where the laws of statics, symmetry, and proportion are no longer valid" (21). In accordance with this argument, the world of the children seems to display "a feast of misrule", resisting any formal rules. In contrast, the adult world seems to be closer to the classic art with its formality and set of laws governing every area of life. In the novel's "Epigraph," accompanied by an explanation referencing the conversation between the renowned children's literature writer Maurice Sendak and Art Spiegelman in The New Yorker on September 27, 1993, Gaiman quotes, "I remember my own childhood vividly . . . I knew terrible things. But I knew I mustn't let adults know I knew. It would scare them" (Epigraph). Here, the writer draws the attention of the reader to the difference between the adult world and the children's world. Certainly, one may deduce from these statements that the speaker feels the logical, mature world would struggle to grasp the universe's intricacies. The idea that "terrible things" are known but hidden from adults

shows an appreciation of the limitations of logical, adult comprehension. This suggests a view that some parts of the universe are inexplicable within the framework of established earthly rules or conventions. The idea that disclosing these hidden facts will frighten adults indicates a schism between the adult world's apparent certainties and the cryptic, unexplained portions of reality that may lay beyond logical grasp. As a result, the lines allude to a schism between the apparent limitations of adult comprehension and the ineffable, enigmatic character of some realities. According to Gaiman and Maurice Sendak, the things which he cannot explain "would scare them." Clearly, Gaiman tends to privilege the children's minds over the adult world. Moreover, his clothing choice for the funeral seems perfect for the adult world; however, he does not like it, and he feels "uncomfortable" in it because it is formal, and parallel to the rational adult world. He states,

> I wore a black suit and a white shirt, a black tie and black shoes, all polished and shiny: clothes that normally would make me feel uncomfortable, as if I were in a stolen uniform, or pretending to be an adult. Today they gave me comfort of a kind. I was wearing the right clothes for a hard day. (Gaiman 3)

It can be understood that feeling formal and acting like an adult gives him discomfort because he does not internalise his adult self and the rational/formal way the adult mentality thinks. Moreover, he escapes the daily talk of the adult world, which would take place in a funeral meeting like "marriage", "children", "work", and so on (6). He barely remembers most of the things in his childhood hometown; his memory revives and becomes more and more vivid, like when the first *grottoes* became covered under tones of soil in ancient Rome. He says, "Childhood memories are sometimes covered and obscured beneath the things that come later, like childhood toys forgotten at the bottom of a crammed adult closet, but they are never lost for good" (Gaiman 6-7). As he turns to his childhood memories, we can see references to his clothing several times, which is

nothing more than a pair of pyjamas. This is the perfect comfortable clothing for a little child, and it would not be a problem for a child to wander in the dark forest or to visit the neighbouring farm with a pyjama different from the adult world. The intrusion of the adult world into the little boy's shelter causes a severe upheaval in his comfort. The presence of the opal miner, subsequently proven to be a problematic character and criminal, upsets the boy's safe refuge by allocating the stranger his bedroom and bed. This interference not only physically but also emotionally displaces the youngster, making him feel like an alien in his own house. The boy's sense of security is further destroyed when he becomes a victim of his father's callous assault, causing him to escape the house in his pyjamas under heavy rain. This terrifying encounter not only puts him in danger of bodily damage, but it also strengthens his isolation from the logical adult world. Feeling like a stranger in his own home and invisible to the adults around him, the youngster senses a significant gap between his environment, which formerly provided peace and familiarity, and the harsh, incomprehensible reality pushed upon him by the adult world's actions. The rational adult world disrupts the playful and fantastic world on several occasions throughout the story. For example, when the boy asks his father about the debate on the ocean and the lake, the father says, "Ponds are pond-sized, lakes are lake-sized. Seas are seas and oceans are oceans. Atlantic, Pacific, Indian, Arctic. I think that's all of the oceans there are" (Gaiman 32). This sharp attitude of the father also breaks the possibility of building a healthy dialogue between a child and his parents. He does not want to share everything with them anymore because most of the elements in a children's world barely have a place in the national mind of the adult world. While complaining about the adult world, the boy narrator says,

> I wanted to tell someone about the shilling, but I did not know who to tell. I knew enough about adults to know that if I did tell them what had happened, I would not be believed. Adults rarely seemed to believe me when I told the

> truth anyway. Why would they believe me about something so unlikely? (Gaiman 37)

One day, he has a dream, and when he woke up, there was a shilling in his throat. He could not talk about this to anyone because it was "so unlikely" for the adult world. The narrator's dilemma is mirrored here, as he struggles with the decision to share an amazing event yet is unsure about finding a receptive audience among grownups. The narrator is impelled to relate their contact with "the shilling", but he is cautious due to previous events. He shows distrust in adults' capacity to believe them, highlighting that even when he previously spoke truly, his remarks were frequently received with incredulity. This cynicism about being trusted by adults extends to this improbable, remarkable experience, prompting the narrator to wonder if his experience would be accepted or believed by adults. The boy reads a lot and, as a good reader, has the potential to have good criticism about books; however, he does not like adult stories. He comments, "Adult stories never made sense, and they were so slow to start. They made me feel like there were secrets, Masonic, mythic secrets, to adulthood. Why didn't adults want to read about Narnia, about secret islands and smugglers and dangerous fairies?" (Gaiman 69-70) He also claims that adult stories are dull and colourless; "I thought about adults…long adult books, the kind with no pictures or conversations" (Gaiman 150). By relating the adult books with the adults, he indirectly criticises the adult world. The distinction between the adult world and the children's world becomes even more pronounced when he states,

> Adults follow paths. Children explore. Adults are content to walk the same way, hundreds of times, or thousands; perhaps it never occurs to adults to step off the paths, to creep beneath rhododendrons, to find the spaces between fences. I was a child, which meant that I knew a dozen different ways of getting out of our property and into the lane, ways that would not involve walking down our drive. (Gaiman 74)

According to Gaiman, children are risk-takers, while adults are not brave enough to stray from the usual path. It is the boy's explorer nature that enables him to flee Ursula Monkton''s torment and abuse and visit The Hempstocks' farm. Moreover, they manage to escape from Ursula for the second time by using alternative roads. They veer away from the main road, following a path Lettie is familiar with, which leads them through open fields, then into the extensive, neglected gardens surrounding the deteriorating estate of an affluent individual, and ultimately guides them back to the lane (151-52).

Gaiman's message to humanity also comes through the repeated distinction between the adult and the children's world. Lettie and Ursula are contrasted regarding the distinct phases of life that they inhabit, childhood and adulthood, respectively, and in the novel the adults are depicted as nothing more than the scourges of the world. As the narrator claims:

> But Lettie was just a girl, even if she was a big girl, even if she was eleven, even if she had been eleven for a very long time. Ursula Monkton was an adult. It did not matter, at that moment, that she was every monster, every witch, every nightmare made flesh. She was also an adult, and when adults fight children, adults always win. (Gaiman 114)

This extract is like a brief summary of our concrete world, in which adults bear the majority of the responsibility for starting conflicts and launching wars worldwide. Regrettably, innocent and vulnerable children frequently become the most tragic victims of these catastrophic consequences. Their vulnerability and innocence render them unfortunate participants in a world where the impact of conflict transcends boundaries, causing widespread devastation. The striking sentence is when the boy makes an analysis of the adult world and the catastrophes in the world. He says, "… there aren't any grown-ups. Not one, in the whole wide world" (Gaiman 150). Despite the physical maturation that comes with adulthood, the cognitive behaviour of the adults often resembles that of

children rather than responsible, rational decision-makers striving for the betterment of our world. Thus, the novel problematizes the notion that the adult world upholds the principles of order and law, representing the sensible facet of society since these ideals appear to be nothing more than an elaborate façade in the narrative. This is further elaborated through the grotesque elements in the novel, especially on instances when the formal and informal are juxtaposed. Gaiman, continuously supporting the joyful children's mind over the rational mind throughout the novel, also proves that all the institutions defined as rational and normal-even the family-is nothing but a source of the uncanny. Stereotypically unfavoured conceptions like witchcraft and sorcery claim to be safer than the stereotypically favoured conceptions like family and relatives. Through these deconstructions and reconstructions and *bricolage* formalisations, the novel proves that what is labelled as rational in the earlier times dysfunction in the contemporary era. To construct the adult world as an epitome of disillusionment, Gaiman masterfully engages in a process of deconstruction, skilfully dismantling the celestial and idealised notions associated with family. Moreover, the agonising experiences of his father's torment and propensity for violence, coupled with his sister's persistent and uncooperative disposition towards him, catalyses a profound transformation in his beliefs and perceptions surrounding the sanctity of family life. These formative experiences shattered the romanticised ideals he once held, forcing him to confront the harsh realities and complexities that often exist within the familial sphere. Gaiman's narrative thus stands as a testament to the tumultuous journey of reconciling the idyllic images of family with the sometimes harsh and challenging truths that life can unveil.

The dichotomy between the world within the boy's family and the external world could not be more pronounced. The Hempstock women's disposition toward the young boy, especially Lettie's approach, is a stark departure from the prevailing societal ideology that often portrays outsiders as potential threats to the safety of children. In fact,

the Hempstocks go to great lengths to shield the boy from the wrath of his own family, employing their mystical "nip and Stitch" (127) technique as a form of protective intervention. Neil Gaiman's narrative subverts conventional perceptions related to family dynamics, affection, and the concept of familial protection. In doing so, he deftly dissects and reconstructs the ideals traditionally associated with the sanctity of family life. The family unit, an institution deeply ingrained in our lives and often held as sacrosanct, undergoes a metamorphosis in Gaiman's narrative. This transformation aligns with the overarching objectives of grotesque literature, which seeks to unsettle and leave individuals vulnerable to the world, fostering suspicion even toward the most revered ideologies they hold dear. Gaiman's storytelling, thus, becomes a vehicle through which readers are encouraged to question and re-evaluate their preconceived notions about the world, family, and the sanctity of established norms. Gaiman achieves this effect through the *bricolage* technique which aligns seamlessly with the artistic objectives articulated by Viktor Shklovsky. Additionally, it is aligned with the overall aims of grotesque art. In order to prevent the mind from sliding into the laziness of automation, as suggested by Schklovsky, art should engage its readers' cognitive abilities. The time switches that smoothly move between present and the past, the author's skill in combining different literary genres in a single novel, and consistent integrity of the fantastic with the factual are factors that reinforce the reader's attentiveness throughout the narrative.

In the modern society, the *bricolage* method and the incorporation of grotesque aspects function as instruments to disorient and perplex people. In this approach, Gaiman's literature instils a constant feeling of scepticism, testing even the most deeply entrenched rules and customs of existence, such as the structure of the family. The traditional roles that characterize the boy's existence, such as father, mother, caretaker, neighbour/witch, and sister, are radically altered. These roles not only break apart and fragment but also become entangled, losing their original significance while acquiring

new, altered meanings. The boundaries between these roles blur, creating a disorienting and perplexing landscape where their conventional definitions are obscured or redefined entirely. This upheaval leads to a complex web of relationships and identities, challenging the boy's understanding of his world and those within it. The boy states, "She laughed at all his jokes … She was standing too close to him. Sometimes he would rest his hand on her shoulder" (Gaiman 87). This intimacy goes even further, as the boy states: "I watched as my father's free hand, the one not holding my sister, went down and rested, casually, proprietarily, on the swell of Ursula Monkton's midi skirted bottom" (Gaiman 89), which shows that they are also in physical contact. Finally, while trying to escape the physical torture of his father and manipulations of Ursula Monkton, he witnesses "…[his] father was kissing the neck of Ursula Monkton, that his hands had lifted her midi skirt above her waist" (104). Even though he cannot understand clearly what is going on firstly because he is a little kid, and secondly because he is more interested in fleeing the house without being noticed by any of his father, Ursula, or his sister, he knows that there is something wrong with this close affair. He literally confesses that everything he believes related to the family life has collapsed, stating, "My parents were a unit, inviolate. The future had suddenly become unknowable: anything could happen: the train of my life had jumped the rails and headed off across the fields and was coming down the lane with me, then" (Gaiman 104). It provocatively teases out the inherent lawlessness that exists in the modern world, leaving individuals in a state of disarray and aimlessness. Devoid of clear ethical guidelines and firm boundaries, the modern person becomes susceptible to a myriad of potential catastrophes, and nowhere can genuinely be considered secure. Gaiman's narrative approach thus serves as a mirror reflecting the anxieties and uncertainties of contemporary existence, urging readers to question and re-evaluate the very foundations upon which their understanding of the world is built.

CONCLUSION

This thesis delves into the interplay between the tradition of the grotesque and its presence in the selected contemporary British novels. The examination centres on three specific novels: William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954), Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory* (1984), and Neil Gaiman's *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013). These works are scrutinised in terms of their deconstruction of classical artistic qualities, which are presented as the binary opposite of grotesque art within the context of this thesis. It is worth noting that these selected novels were composed with roughly three decades between them, emphasising the enduring influence of the grotesque on the contemporary British novel over the span of more than half a century. While the origins of the grotesque stretch back to prehistoric times, predating the advent of written records, this thesis specifically delves into the period from 1954 to 2013, concentrating on the context of contemporary Britain. All the ideas here are open to the inspiration for the later researchers related to the relationship between the grotesque and the British novel.

The common elements in the novels encompass the child protagonists at the core of the narratives and the isolated spaces that set them apart from the broader world. The findings of the thesis are expounded upon using an organised framework that commences with the shared grotesque elements present in each of the novels, in accordance with the *bricolage* technique, and the uncanny effect created by the novels in relation to the overall "task of art" defined by Shklovsky, which is to "defamiliarize" or "bestrange" (13) in order to "force [the beholder] to notice" (Lemon and Reis 36). Grotesque art may simply be explained as connecting the parts which are "different from the familiar one" (Kayser 21) to compose a new unit; similarly, the *bricolage* technique can easily be explained as connecting the "means at hand…those which are already there" (Derrida 258) without paying attention to the harmony of the picture achieved in the end, and finally the

"uncanny" effect is achieved when the familiar (*heimlich*) becomes unfamiliar (*unheimlich*).

"Defamiliarization", as a term, is at the centre of all the conceptions analysed throughout the thesis, which reflects the defamiliarized state of the modern individual represented in the novels mentioned. Despite being published approximately three decades apart, these works are bound together by a thread of shared characteristics that have the potential to elicit similar emotional responses in readers–emotions that encompass shock, disturbance, antipathy, and a deep-seated sense of horror. The novels effectively reflect the prevalent tone of modern British culture, concluding with a familiar sense evoking both worry and complete confusion. As the stories go, they skilfully convey the tremendous depression that pervades the lives of modern British citizens. The despair and confusion stem from the severe failure of the once-reliable foundations of security built by older institutions such as ethics, religion, and the well-defined, written and unwritten rules of society. To begin with, in *Lord of the Flies*, the children psychologically bully each other, massacre wildlife as well as committing murders, creating an insecure environment even for the more civilized members of the society like Piggy and Ralph, elected leader of the boys. The undetected and limitless power of Frank, the narrator, who sets up his own ethos in *The Wasp Factory*, is a threat to even his own relatives. The eerie creature in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, devoid of any reasonable values, spreads terror for the whole humanity. The writers expertly expose the fragility of the modern individual, who is metaphorically stripped naked by the continual destruction of ideals that have previously offered a feeling of security and trust. These three minimalist windows of the contemporary world prove that earlier systems of values do not function anymore and are deconstructed into pieces. The value systems, once believed to be steady as a rock, prove to be as vulnerable as the modern man. As one of the most protesting art traditions, the grotesque serves as an artistic and

literary medium that speaks to these feelings. Being labelled as a marginal art form of earlier times, the grotesque acts as a realistic art form of modern times because all the absurdity happening on the earth can only realistically be portrayed by such deconstructive art forms. It is this common ability to provoke such visceral reactions that underscores the significance of subjecting these selected works to an in-depth analysis.

The thesis outlines the examination of the selected novels through the lens of grotesque realism, attempting to understand the complex relationship between narrative components and socio-cultural factors inherent in the portrayal of modern British culture. In *Lord of the Flies*, where the boys wear masks of mud and engage in violent acts on the island, including the killing of other children, their latent savage tendencies emerge as they adopt these disguises. The carnival-like dances to celebrate after the hunting practice is over, presenting a theatrical performance imitating the massacre of the animal, are elements of carnivalesque rituals which reveal the "debasement" (Bakhtin 147) of the human being in the Bakhtinian sense. They physically damage the island, a ripe land devoid and unaware of human interference, in three ways. They "set the whole island on fire" (Golding 37), firstly accidentally but secondly intentionally, for a manhunt; secondly, they slaughter the animals even though they do not really need their meat; and finally, they exploit the vegetation as food. In *The Wasp Factory*, Frank lives under a shroud of anonymity from the moment of his birth. Frank's "official non-existence" (Banks 11) affords him an unfettered liberty to engage in any actions of his choosing. This unrestrained freedom ultimately culminates in three gruesome murders besides his numerous ceremonial animal tortures on the island that go completely unnoticed. It is in these moments that their degraded, primal facets come to the forefront, emphasising the transformative and unsettling power of the grotesque in literature. The characters' age, vulnerability, and willingness to embrace the uncanny and macabre play pivotal roles in exploring the grotesque within these narratives. In *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, the

monster, Ursula Monkton, stops at nothing to achieve the chance to put the world into chaos. More strikingly, the family institution is under strict criticism in the novel because the mother is too busy to keep an eye on his family and children, the father is easily convinced by the seductive attitude of the young caregiver, and the warmth which is potential to be found inside the family is only possible outside the family.

Another denominator that reveals the grotesque effect in these novels is related to the use of child characters, which helps to create grotesque ambivalence. British boys in the novel *Lord of the Flies* are mostly twelve years old or younger. Frank, the protagonist in *The Wasp Factory,* is sixteen, yet his views are greatly influenced by far younger childhood experiences. Despite being an adult narrator, Neil Gaiman's anonymous protagonist in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* remembers a sequence of bizarre and unpleasant incidents from his early childhood. This typical age issue is thoroughly examined from two separate angles: firstly, the world of children lends itself well to the grotesque tradition as this world is generally devoid of rules. Kayser elaborates on this situation, stating that the grotesque is "… where the laws of statics, symmetry, and proportion are no longer valid" (21). The grotesque flourishes in a setting free of the adult world's rigid rules and laws, where creativity and play take precedence. As such, this childlike realm is more open to being reshaped, deconstructed, or reconstructed – techniques that align with the essence of the grotesque tradition. The outcome of this deconstruction can often be unsettling or even horrifying, effectively achieving one of the critical goals of the grotesque novel: to disturb and shock the reader.

The child characters in *Lord of the Flies*, like the people in a carnival atmosphere who are freed from "all religious and ecclesiastic dogmatism, from all mysticism and piety" (Bakhtin 7) as defined so by Bakhtin, tend to degrade and debase. Without the surveillance of the adults and most of them being devoid of any kind of ethical values, social rules, or religious teachings, the boys are captivated by their primitive instincts and

act like savages: spoil and exploit nature, massacre animals, murder their friends, and so on. Along with torturing animals and bullying other children, they also exhibit a variety of gender prejudices toward the feminine sex, as is made evident by their brutal killing of the female pig. In *The Wasp Factory*, Frank strikes attention by killing three of his relatives, who are also children. Moreover, like the children in *Lord of the Flies*, Frank also has strong prejudices towards women. He does not hesitate to reveal his biased thoughts about them. His extreme opinions are only consoled when he understands that he is, in fact, a female who is given male hormones throughout his life. This also reflects Angus' radical ideas about women. His hatred and antipathy towards women are so intense that he decides to raise his child with a big false story as well as keeping a laboratory at home full of male hormones he secretly adds to his child's food. The childhood memories of the narrator of *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* do not have uncivilized attitudes like in the earlier two novels; however, his problematic relationship with his parents-being exposed to his father's violence, being isolated by his mother, and poor communication with his sister-shows the decline in the divine family bonds. His finding solace supports this situation in Hempstocks' farm, a farm full of ladies who have witchlike practices and qualities.

Secondly, the narratives in these novels support the techniques inherent in the grotesque tradition, such as ambivalence and the carnivalesque. Despite the fact that the novel, as a form, is not a fruitful ground for grotesque analysis, at least in terms of physical grotesque representations, these works are rich with grotesque ambivalence and role reversals. The portrayal of a young child taking on adult responsibilities or behaving savagely, mirroring the actions of adults, or generating a split personality creates a parallel with the ambivalent grotesque images, the boundaries of which are blurred or even mingled. These split personalities in the novels, having the bodies of children and acting like adults, are somewhat parallel to the ambivalent grotesque images explained

by Barasch, which, as he says, are combined by “mingling of flora and fauna, and the realistic, symbolic, and fantastic creatures” (Barasch 13). Furthermore, the investigations in this thesis show that Derridean “binary oppositions” like “adult” and “child" or “mature” versus “immature” are not too far apart since a child may take on the responsibilities of an adult (as it happens in all three novels), an adult may fall into childish fallacies (as can be seen in *The Wasp Factory*, *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*), or children may get more brutal than a civilized imagination can reach.

In *Lord of the Flies*, the younger boys, who are frequently scared and uncoordinated in everyday duties, rely on the older boys to provide food and shelter as well as to think of ways for the survival of the stranded group from the island. These assignments create a grotesque image for the older boys, who are also too young to take on such significant responsibilities. Their childish nature, devoid of any responsibilities, and occupied by primitive instincts cause them to act violently and lose their innocence by ways of trying to set a democratic decision-making mechanism, slaughtering animals for food, and even committing murders. In *The Wasp Factory*, Frank takes on the responsibility of guarding the island, carrying out specific daily tasks like checking all the poles on the island and stopping his older, unstable brother from hurting animals. His actions demonstrate maturity and a feeling of self-imposed obligation to preserve order in his environment despite the fact that it is defined by indecent ceremonies. He feels obligated to achieve his daily tasks, and that is what causes him to torture and kill the animals around, the same way he kills three of his relatives. He has his own logic for maintaining the world’s equilibrium, which is far too important for an infant to do. He has to act maturely inside the home as well because his mother isolated him and his father with another man soon after his birth, and he has responsibilities for household chores. Similarly, the young narrator in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* bears a considerable load. He must defend the Earth from a secret and ancient evil entity. The figure is caught up in an otherworldly

fight that depicts the conflict between youth's innocence and the weight of adult-like obligations that extend beyond the customary confines of a child's responsibilities. In these works, the children accepting the responsibilities of adults emphasise the delicate line that divides youth from maturity, as well as the hardships and complications of growing up in circumstances where the fantastical frequently intrudes into the ordinary. Moreover, they are representations of the ambivalent grotesque art, with ambiguous and mixed-role characters the borders of which are uncertain.

In addition to the overall themes of the grotesque and the inclusion of child characters, the carefully designed locations in these three novels play a critical part in providing each author with an infinite canvas on which to unroll their storylines. Early novels with grotesque elements, like *Pantagruel* (1532) and *Gargantua* (1534) by François Rabelais, also illustrate the use of settings with little social interaction. This method is mirrored in the selected novels: In *Lord of the Flies,* following an aircraft catastrophe, the young characters are stuck on an isolated island, separated from the guiding role of adults and the institutions of society. *The Wasp Factory* unfolds on an anonymous Scottish peninsula with a small, insular community, intensifying the sense of isolation and eccentricity that permeates the story. Likewise, in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, the story predominantly transpires within the confines of a family house and a neighbouring farm, with a scarcity of characters outside these settings. These carefully chosen isolated settings serve to amplify the eerie and unsettling atmospheres within these novels, and in doing so, they underline the vulnerability and wild unpredictability of the child characters who find themselves thrust into these perplexing and often perilous landscapes.

The tendency toward isolation in the setting holds notable importance in its connection to the grotesque tradition for two compelling reasons: firstly, it signifies a deliberate detachment from the rational adult world, a characteristic that aligns with the

very essence of the grotesque as a marginal technique. The grotesque often thrives in settings that exist at the fringes, away from the heart of a bustling metropolis. It revels in the unconventional, the unusual, and the macabre, frequently situating its tales in the peripheries of society. Secondly, this isolation within the settings of these novels is intimately tied to the concept of “the abject,” as expounded by Julia Kristeva. Kristeva defines the "abject" as the human experience of encountering and rejecting materials or creatures viewed as impure, disgusting, or repulsive, which are "ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable" (1). In her influential work *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (1982), Kristeva posits that abjection is a universal facet of the human experience arising from our innate sense of “separation” (12). This concept also resembles Bakhtin’s idea of “carnivalesque excrement” (147), which he relates to the inversion of norms and the subversion of established order during carnival-like events. All three novels show alternate settings that are far apart from the conventional and the daily, suggesting intentional isolation from the standard population.

The settings in each selected novel - an island, a peninsula, and an isolated farm, respectively- are distanced from the mainland physically and in philosophy. Even though the characters physically resemble each other inside a union, one can easily recognise the emotional and psychological gap between these people. The children have different skills, beliefs, thoughts, and tendencies in *Lord of the Flies*, though they are a small community coming from similar backgrounds and belonging to similar financial circumstances. Frank is very distanced from his family members in *The Wasp Factory*; the narrator is in complete solitude even during his birthday celebration in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane.* This isolation gives each author the freedom to establish his own dystopian environment without interference from the world around; however, the main reason the characters and the setting are separated from the mainland is that they are unusual beings, abject individuals of the common society because they are ugly and disgusting in many

ways as well as being “beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable" (1)” (in Kristeva’s terms), who are pushed to the margins of the society. These novels explore the compelling theme of psychological estrangement, highlighting the feelings of alienation and separation that can arise in modern civilisation’s hectic, congested environments. The writers create their stories in these solitary, sometimes horrific environments, delving into the depths of human experience and the limits of our society’s acceptance of the strange and uncomfortable.

This thesis investigates whether the grotesque tradition serves “the purpose of art” as defined by Shklovsky. In that sense, Philip Thomson’s claims on the grotesque are important. Philip Thomson’s argument that the grotesque acts as an “aggressive weapon” (59) because of its typical capacity to deliver a rapid-shock echoes deeply in the works examined. From this claim, the capacity of the grotesque to shock and awaken the beholder, to challenge the reader to question and interrogate the world and his/her place in this world, is highlighted. In this respect, the grotesque impact is strongly related to the overall goal of art defined by Viktor Shklovsky, which can be summarized as the prevention of perceptual automation. As clarified by Morson, Shklovsky’s concept of “defamiliarization” is rooted in “learning theory” (13). It is based on the assumption that once we have mastered a skill or information, we do it automatically in our daily lives, with no conscious thinking required for each step or modification. This process of automation, or “automatization,” as Shklovsky refers to it, is harmful because it might cause us to ignore essential nuances or lose the distinctiveness of something familiar. We recognise the familiar without completely understanding it. Shklovsky contends that the fundamental goal of art is to switch this course of automatization, making the recognisable new once more or “defamiliarizing” it. Lemon and Reis explain his ideology, underlining that the motivation behind art, as Shklovsky indicates, is to urge us to notice and become sensitive to the events surrounding us. This is attained by

defamiliarization techniques in the given novels; therefore, Shklovsky's idea is closely related to the grotesque and the uncanny, which serve to reach this effect.

According to L. L. Dickson, the ironic "rescue" of the remaining children from the island by a navy commander who is also embroiled in global conflict in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* serves as a metaphor for the chaotic island representing the war-torn adult world. He claims that the novel dramatizes the vital basis of people, the uncivilized inherent in human beings, and introduces the provoking assumption that children would become savages if they were not supervised by adults or any other restricting facilities like ethics, religion and societal norms (45-46). The novel highlights how different groups of characters on the island symbolise various aspects of society, including those who destroy the environment and those who suffer, resembling marginalised groups. In a society where uncontrolled power, savagery and tyranny dominate, the characters who try to establish order on the island, like the "littluns", Ralph and Piggy, are overthrown because they are smaller in number, weaker and believe in democracy. All of them pay the price for defending their own truth or even not joining the dominating majority. The message conveyed by Golding is that unchecked power leads to moral and physical destruction, akin to Bakhtinian grotesque realism, where people tend to degrade and debase themselves, forgetting about their roles in society under the masks of the carnival land. The story illustrates that, despite the rising intensity and violence in the world, especially right after the 'Big War', individuals in contemporary society have become progressively indifferent to what is happening around them. The existentialist questions in *Lord of The Flies* serve the purpose of art by awakening the reader from the fictional illusion of the novel. When Piggy asks, "What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages?" (113), Golding also pushes the reader into the disturbing ambience among these questions, which can be explained as follows. The navy officer asks at the end of the book, "I should have thought that a pack of British

boys—you're all British, aren't you?—would have been able to put up a better show than that—I mean—" (Golding 248), which is quite ironic. Being a military member during the war, he expects the young boys to "put on a better show than that" (248). However, everyone knows that the adults outside the island have not been putting on "a better show than that", either. This is a question without an answer; however, Golding manages to make the reader notice the hypocrisy behind the question by forcing the reader to answer the question rather than getting lost in the fictional illusion of the novel, which is akin to Shklovsky's defined purpose of art. Ralph's cry at the end represents an awakening to the actual war outside the island and the dark capacity of humanity. The novel disturbs readers by revealing the negative and transgressive aspects of human behaviour, and the supposed rescue by a naval commander does not provide relief but shifts the anxiety from the island to the larger adult world, marked by inhumanity.

Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory,* contrary to some interpretations of the book as excessive and exaggerated, reveals the world's commonplace realities upon closer analysis. Banks portrays a fragmented and dissonant world created by the tensions surrounding modern humanity. Similar to what Golding does in *Lord of the Flies*, Banks aims to awaken readers from the fictional illusion and make them responsive to the destructive nature of human beings. He achieves this through narrative techniques like graphic descriptions of disturbing settings, and flashbacks/flashforwards, and "semantic economy" (Duggan 152-153), which can be defined as giving pieces of the secret of the story while delaying the surprising resolution to the following pages. Mentioning the *grottoes* of the main characters, Frank's story about the family dog, the location of the island, which is never revealed, the story of the family dog, the details about Eric's and Angus' past, the mechanism of the machine he named "the wasp factory" are all subject to semantic economy technique. The reader is continually and eagerly swept through the story with an urge to find the truth by anticipating the climax to come to a resolution. As

a result, there is a fresh, unresolved climax. These techniques, combined with grotesque elements like excess, absurdity, and exaggeration, aim to defamiliarize readers and break their automated and unresponsive perception of the horrors and deformities in the world, also serving the purpose of art, according to Shklovsky. Banks wants his readers to question the artificial stresses, or "superstructure" in Marxist terms, imposed on modern individuals, such as the murders depicted in the novel, which symbolise deaths worldwide. Angus' experiment on Frank represents familial and social suppression, while Frank's adherence to daily rituals highlights the absurdity of diverse beliefs. These hypocritical societal structures lead individuals in the novel to despair and isolation.

The Ocean at the End of the Lane first attains the awakening from the illusion of automation with a massive flashback to the narrator's childhood memories. More remarkably, Gaiman achieves it by continuously shifting from fantasy to reality and vice versa. The uncanny feeling of the narrator because of his father's surprising violence, heightened by the tricks of Ursula Monkton, also helps the reader's captivation by the narrative, which results in keeping alert throughout the plot. Gaiman uses fantasy to highlight the absurdity of reality and the fractured nature of the modern individual's existence, as evidenced by his critique of the adult world, his preference for the world of children over the world of adults, and the powerful signals he conveys when comparing the two worlds. This highlights one of the most critical messages of the whole book.

It can be stated that the grotesque elements and *bricolage*, serve as a medium to deconstruct and reconstruct societal values and norms in these novels. *Lord of the Flies* is a powerful critique of violence spread by the war and the rampant descent into barbarism. It stands up to British pride, which blames everything but the British for the catastrophes in the world and which holds the British virtues over all the other virtues. Through the narrative of young men getting more and more savage on an uninhabited island, Golding deconstructs the potent British predominance and offers a chilling

editorial on the inborn limit with respect to savagery inside human instinct. The novel is a *bricolage* of cultural standards, uncovering the delicacy of politeness and the potential for bedlam when authority and moral codes crumble. *The Wasp Factory* dissolves the superstructure and cultural standards, focusing on security, education, gender problems, health, and family. Frank, the protagonist, defies the traditional concepts of gender identification, questioning the strict categories of male and female. The story deconstructs stereotypes of family structures by depicting a dysfunctional family with unpleasant secrets. It calls current educational and health systems under debate because Frank's childhood and mental condition are too challenging for traditional solutions. Banks deconstructs traditional notions of relationships and relatives by showing a dysfunctional family with profoundly upsetting insider facts in order to stress that they do not function anymore. He also deconstructs and manipulates long-held beliefs about gender roles, familial ties, and sexual distinctions. This assemblage of cultural components undermines the notion of a secure and organized environment by exposing the arbitrary character of several cultural standards.

The Ocean at the End of the Lane protests the family as a social organisation, challenging existing laws and practices. It shows a supernatural cosmos that challenges the boundaries of reality and nature's established norms. The intriguing and powerful Hempstock family upends typical family structures, blurring the borders between generations and enticing the protagonist into a realm of magical realism. In Gaiman's novel, the *bricolage* technique constructs a story that subverts traditional family interactions and legal standards while also inserting an otherworldly aspect that calls into question the fundamental fabric of reality.

Basically, these novels use *bricolage* to deconstruct and reproduce prior standards connected with cultural establishments. They question the status quo and encourage readers to reexamine their assumptions about war, national pride, gender identity, family,

education, health, security, and the larger frameworks that define our lives. The authors use this literary method to draw attention to the complexity and fragility of the societal institutions and to examine and explore the limits of human experience and comprehension repeatedly. This is the common ground which the grotesque and the *bricolage* as traditions of the contemporary literature share. As Lee Byron Jennings explains in grotesque, "[t]here is a recombining of the elements of experienced reality to form something alien to it; the norms of common life are replaced by an "anti-norm" (9). What is particularly striking is how these "recombinations" and "anti-norms," often presented in the grotesque form in these novels, have a propensity to evolve into the new norms of the contemporary world because, the grotesque appears to provide a more authentic representation in literature, embodying the inherent irregularities, chaotic institutions, and behaviours of those who act without restraint or in a brutal manner. The portrayal of individuals and institutions with both physical and psychological gaps grotesquely filled by ill-fitting components seems to capture the essence of the present-day world. The new image composed is nothing but a *bricolage* both physically and psychologically.

The uncanny, in the thesis, is explored in accordance with Freud and Kayser's concept, which is the emotion when the *"heimlich"* becomes *"unheimlich,"* causing a disturbing and frightening effect on the character, or more specifically, when the character is defamiliarized with the familiar figure. In *Lord of the Flies*, the uncanny is exemplified by 'The Beast,' a dead parachutist misinterpreted as a threat by the isolated children. They assign animalistic and supernatural attributes to it, ignoring its actual existence, which is a corpse, and the reality of the world, which is World War II. Fear of the beast alienates them from their daily routine, resulting in Simon's violent death after being mistaken for the creature. The hunting gang's chants and theatrical shows increase the uncanny effect, resulting in fatal results and displaying the evil tendencies of human

nature in the face of dread. In *The Wasp Factory,* Eric's defamiliarization with his baby patient, whom he caresses daily, is significant. Eric is a promising student of Medicine until this irritating experience; however, his fate is turned upside down because his psychology cannot handle the trauma caused by this experience. "Flies", because "the air conditioning" was broken, place "their eggs" underneath the baby's metal "skull-cap" (Banks 188). When Eric opens it, he sees "the maggots" eating the kid's brain (188). Even though he is an intern doctor, a potential professional, and even though he is familiar with the kid's appearance, he cannot stand the scene and attacks the brain with a sharp tool. This uncanny feeling of the plot is triggered by vivid descriptions. Moreover, in the novel, Frank's alienation from his own identity, further boosted by his official non-existence, is one of the uncanny representations. Being a female, deceived to be a male, he reveals his prejudices towards the female sex continuously even though he, himself, is revealed to be a woman as well at the end of the novel. Frank does not feel the warmth of a family throughout his life. His mother abandons him, has a lunatic brother and has a very weak relationship with his father, which makes him question his value inside his family. His official nonexistence causes him to doubt his attachment to his father as well as he blames different people at different times related to his mother's abandonment.

In *The Ocean at the End of the Lane,* the child narrator is utterly shocked by his father's application of violence towards him. Normally, he is a person of common sense, and he declares violence is ineffective by explaining through his childhood bonds with his parents. However, he resorts to the use of violence when he rebels against his caregiver. Even though the woman is someone who is hired to nurture the kids and is a newcomer in the house, the father takes the position of defending her and beating his son in his "safe place" (Gaiman 95). This creates an immense trauma and defamiliarization with the kid towards his own house and his own parents. He cannot find peace at his home

anymore, and he has displaced the sacred place of home with an outside home, the farm of the Hempstocks.

All the uncanny situations in the novels are representations of the uncanny state of the world. Modern individuals are no longer safe in a familiar world, or the familiar institutions and values do not function properly anymore. People use the values like religion, laws and ethics according to their power of authority and generally for their own benefit, and such values do not give a sense of trust to people any more. In theory, their primary role is to instil order and ensure equal rights for all individuals. However, their inefficiency in adapting to the complexities of the modern world results in a sense of insecurity for the vulnerable and instils a paranoid fear of losing authority among the powerful.

In conclusion, the thesis manifests that three novels dismantle and reassemble conventional values that once provided a sense of security and established order for the modern individual. The values like family bonds, ethics, democracy, and the cliches about the innocence of children, British pride, and being civilized and savage prove to be old-fashioned by the thesis. As a result, the gap created by the absence of functioning values leaves the contemporary man helpless and in a sensation of fear and insecurity all the time. The novels represent the modern person's fragility and desolation, as the very beliefs and certainties they relied upon are shattered, exposing them to eternal uncertainties. The modern individual, now sceptical of everything, becomes fractured regarding identity, psychology, and mentality. The thesis outlines that the fragmentation and the ongoing struggle to fill the gaps with often ill-fitting pieces find a powerful reflection in grotesque art. In the Bakhtinian grotesque, the carnivalesque is a liberating power; it includes such positive values like dances, laughter, fun, caricature, folk humour, marketplace joy, and invective that results in relief; however, it is not unexpected that contemporary novels lack these affirmative carnivalesque attributes. Only in *Lord of the*

Flies is there a form of dance, but it is not a dance for joy in the Bakhtinian sense; rather it is a satirical display of the barbarousness of the individual. The thesis claims that the overall pessimism prevalent in these novels is conveyed through various aspects of the grotesque to deal with fragmented, alienated, uncanny, sceptic, and insecure feelings of the contemporary individual.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES[2]

Banks, Iain. *The Wasp Factory*. Abacus, 2013.

Gaiman, Neil. *The Ocean at the End of the Lane.* William Morrow, 2013.

Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies (Educational Edition)*. London, Faber and Faber, 1996.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Atayurt, Zeynep Z. "Kill the pig!: *Lord of the Flies*, 'Piggy' and anti-fat discourse." *Historicising Fat in Anglo-American Culture* (2010): 43-65.

Babb, Howard S. *The Novels of William Golding.* Ohio State University Press, 1970.

Baker, James R. "Golding and Huxley: The Fables of Demonic Possession". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 85–102.

---

[2] Turkish translations of the works until the year 2024 are as follows:

Banks, Iain. *Eşekarısı Fabrikası.* Translated by Aslı Biçen, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996.

Banks, Iain. *Eşekarısı Fabrikası.* Translated by Zübeyde Abat, Koridor Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 2015.

Gaiman, Neil. *Yolun Sonundaki Okyanus.* Translated by Zeynep Heyzen Ateş, İthaki Yayınları, İstanbul, 2013.

Golding, William. *İşte Bizim Dünya.* Translated by Müge Tayşi, Deniz Kitaplar Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1983.

Golding, William. *Sineklerin Tanrısı.* Translated by Mina Urgan, Adam Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 1984.

Bakhtin, M. M, and Michael Holquist. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Bakhtin, M. M. *Rabelais and his World*. Translated by Helene Iswolsky. Indiana University Press, 1984.

Ballantyne, R. M. (Robert Michael). *The Coral Island : a Tale of the Pacific Ocean.* London :Penguin Books, 1982.

Banks, Iain. *Raw Spirit: In Search of the Perfect Dram*. Arrow Books, 2004. e Book (epub)

Barasch, Frances K. *The 'Grotesque': Its History as a Literary Term*. New York University, 1965.

Barasch, Frances K. *The Grotesque: A Study in Meanings*. De Gruyter Mouton, 2018.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Translated by Richard Miller, Blackwell, 2002.

Beyad, Maryam Soltan, and Gharibreza Gholamhosseinzadeh. "Dialogue between Mikhail Bakhtin and Eric Fromm in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*." Forum for world literature studies. Vol. 11. No. 1. Wuhan Guoyang Union Culture & Education Company, 2019, pp. 147-163.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London, Routledge, 1994.

Biles, Jack. *Talk: Conversations with William Golding.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1970.

Bloom, Harold. "Introduction." *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 1–3.

Bovey, Alixe. *Monsters and Grotesques in Medieval Manuscripts*. University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Boyd, S. J. "The Nature of the Beast: *Lord of the Flies*". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 27–45.

Bregman, Rutger. "The real Lord of the Flies: what happened when six boys were shipwrecked for 15 months." *Sat* 9 (2020): 09-00.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Harper Torch Books, 2017.

Caroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Global Language Resources, 2002.

Cixous, Hélène, and Keith Cohen. "The Character of 'Character.'" *New Literary History*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1974, pp. 383–402. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/468401. Accessed 8 Dec. 2022.

Clayborough, Arthur. *The Grotesque in English Literature*. Oxford, Clarendon P, 1965.

Craig, Cairns. "Player of Games: Lain (M.) Banks, Jean François Lyotard and Sublime Terror." *The Contemporary British Novel since 1980*, edited by James Acheson and Ross Sarah C. E., Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 229–240.

Crawford, Paul. "Literature of Atrocity: *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors*". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 103–133.

Crawford, Paul. *Politics and History in William Golding: The world turned upside down*. University of Missouri Press, 2002.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. sage, 2011.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and difference*. University of Chicago press, 1978.

Dickson, L. L. "*Lord of the Flies*". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 45–59.

Duggan, Robert. *The Grotesque in Contemporary British Fiction*. Manchester University Press, 2013.

Edwards, Justin D., and Rune Graulund. Grotesque the New Critical Idiom. Routledge, 2013.

Fanning, Leesa. 'Willem de Kooning's Women: The Body of the Grotesque.' *In Modern Art and the Grotesque*. Edited by Frances S. Connelly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 241-64.

Fogelberg, Katherine. "Creation and application of a replicable analytic method to determine attitudes and beliefs of undergraduate science professors toward the discipline of education." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 15.1 (2016): 1609406916659291.

Freud, Sigmund. "The uncanny." (1976).

Freyne, Patrick. "Iain Banks: 'In the End We'll Be Smiling.'" *The Irish Times*, 6 Apr. 2013, www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/iain-banks-in-the-end-we-ll-be-smiling-1.1350434. Accessed 20 Feb. 2023.

Friedman, Lawrence S. "Grief, Grief, Grief: *Lord of the Flies*". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 59-71

Gindin, James. “The Fictional Explosion: *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors*”. *William Golding’s Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom’s Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 11–27.

Gindin, James. *Macmillan Modern Novelists*. Macmillan, 1988.

Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies (Educational Edition)*. “Fable”, London, Faber and Faber, 1996, pp. 249-273.

Golding, William. *The Hot Gates.* “Billy the Boy,” London, Faber and Faber, 1974.

Golding, William. *The Hot Gates.* “On The Crest of the Wave,” London, Faber and Faber, 1974.

Graulund, Rune. "Grotesque." Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature. 2019.

Gregor, Ian, and Mark Kinkead-Weekes. *Lord of the Flies (Educational Edition)*. "Introduction”, London, Faber and Faber, 1996, pp. i-xii.

Harrison, Jen. "" People Change as Much as Oceans": Posthumanism in Neil Gaiman’s *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*." *Studies in the Fantastic* 8.1 (2019): 65-85.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. "The Grotesque: First Principles." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34.4 (1976): 461-468.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*. Davies Group Publishers, 2006.

Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism Bakhtin and His World*. 2nd ed., London and New York, Routledge, 2002.

Horace. and H R. Fairclough. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica.* London: W. Heinemann, 1947. Print.

Jafari, Mona, Maryam Soltan Beyad, and Zohreh Ramin. "The Warped Bildung: Parody, Postmodern Gothic, and the Bildungsroman in Iain Banks's *The Wasp Factory*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* (2023): 1-14.

Jennings, Lee Byron. *The ludicrous demon: aspects of the grotesque in german post-romantic prose*. Vol. 71. University of California Press, 1963.

Jung, C. G. "Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious." *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, edited by Herbert Read et al., 2nd ed., vol. 9, Princeton Univ. Press, 1983, pp. 3–41. Bollingen Series XX.

Kayser, Wolfgang. *The grotesque in art and literature*. Translated by Ulrich Weisstein. Indiana University Press, 1981.

Kelly, Maureen. *Golding's Lord of the Flies: Notes*. Cliff's Notes, 2000.

Kim, Yaeri. "Not at Home: Examining the Uncanny." *Neil Gaiman in the 21st Century: Essays on the Novels, Children's Stories, Online Writings, Comics and Other Works* (2015): 152-63.

Kincaid, Paul. *Iain M. Banks*. University of Illinois Press, 2017. e Book e Book (epub)

King, Stephen. "Introduction". *Lord of the Flies.* E-book edition, Faber and Faber, 2011.

Koenig, Marie Jeannette. *Charles Dickens: Artist of the Grotesque*. State University of New York at Binghamton, 1977.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of horror*. Vol. 98. University Presses of California, Columbia and Princeton, 1982.

Krzychylkiewicz, Agatha. *The Grotesque in the Works of Bruno Jasieński*. Peter Lang, 2007.

Kuwert, Philipp, et al. "Sixty years later: post-traumatic stress symptoms and current psychopathology in former German children of World War II." *International Psychogeriatrics* 19.5 (2007): 955-961.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, theory, trauma*. Cornell University Press, 1996.

Lee, Derek. "The Politics of Fairyland: Neil Gaiman and the Enchantments of Anti-Bildungsroman." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 57.5 (2016): 552-564.

Lemon, Lee T., and Marion J. Reis. 1965. “Viktor Shklovsky.” In *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, 34– 37. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Lewis-Hasteley, Helen. “Why Does Everybody Hate Iain Banks?” *Pen Pusher Magazine*, 2010.

Lovasz, Adam. "Artifice and Dehumanization: Iain Banks’ *The Wasp Factory* and Hatred for Life." 2017.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The savage mind*. University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Markham, Annette N. "“Go ugly early”: Fragmented narrative and bricolage as interpretive method." *Qualitative Inquiry* 11.6 (2005): 813-839.

McCarron, Kevin. William Golding. Tavistock, Devon: Northcote House Pub, 2004.

McCullen, Maurice L. “Lord of the Flies: The Critical Quest.” William Golding: Some *Critical Considerations*, edited by R. O. Evans and Jack I. Biles, University Press of Kentucky, 1978, pp. 203–237.

McElroy, Bernard. *Fiction of the Modern Grotesque*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 1989.

Morson, Gary Saul. 1965. “Introduction” In *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, 6– 20. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Nicholson, John. "On sex and horror." *Horror. A Reader’s Guide from Poe to King and Beyond* (1998): 249-277.

Ospanova, Gulmariya, Askarova, Altynai, Agabekova, Balzhan, Zhutayeva, Assel and Askarova, Saule. "The grotesque as a literary issue" *Semiotica*, vol. 2024, no. 256, 2024, pp. 103-116. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2022-0090

Phillips, Barbara & Mcquarrie, Edward. “Narrative and Persuasion in Fashion Advertising.” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2010. 37. 368-392. 10.1086/653087.

Phillips, Brian. “Character in Contemporary Fiction.” *The Hudson Review*, vol. 56, no. 4, 2004, pp. 629–42. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/3852955. Accessed 1 Dec. 2022.

Prescott, Tara, “Introduction.” In *Neil Gaiman in the 21st Century: Essays on the Novels, Children’s Stories, Online Writings, Comics and Other Works*. Edited by Tara Prescott, 1-9. McFarland, 2015.

Punter, David. *The Literature of Terror: Volume 2: The Modern Gothic*. Routledge, 2013.

Reiff, Raychel Haugrud. *William Golding: Lord of the Flies.* Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2010.

Rogers, Matt. "Contextualizing theories and practices of bricolage research." *Qualitative Report* 17 (2012): 7.

Ruskin, John. *The Stones of Venice, Volume 3 (of 3).* Aldine Book Publishing, Boston, 1891.

Rzeszutek, Marcin, et al. "Long-lasting effects of World War II trauma on PTSD symptoms and embodiment levels in a national sample of Poles." *Scientific reports* 13.1 (2023): 17222.

Sawyer, Andy. “Iain Banks Interviewed.” *Vector: The Critical Journal of the British Science Fiction Association*, December-January 1990-1991, pp. 5–8.

Scott, Walter. *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott*. Vol. 6, Baudry, 1838.

Seval, Ayşem. *A Thing One Knows Not How to Name: The Female Grotesque in Early Modern Englısh Drama.* 2008. Boğaziçi University, PhD dissertation. Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=THel1nsCoGm1gR3IVexNgg&no=DopDs5PoVy3GX4at1Dh7_A

Shklovsky, Viktor. 1965. “Art as Technique.” In *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, 37– 58. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Schnelbach, Leah. “An “Accidental” Novel? Neil Gaiman Talks About *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*.” Reactor, 26 Jan. 2024, reactormag.com/neil-gaimain-talks-about-the-ocean-at-the-end-of-the-lane.

Shotton, Richard. “The Pratfall Effect and Why Brands Should Flaunt Their Flaws.” *The Guardian*, 28 Oct. 2015, www.theguardian.com/media-network/2015/oct/28/pratfall-effect-brands-flaunt-flaws. Accessed 20 Feb. 2023.

Speller, Maureen Kincaid. “No Man Is An Island: The Enigma of *The Wasp Factory*.” Steam Engine Time, Apr. 2020, pp. 28–29.

Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. "The politics and poetics of transgression." *A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion* (2008): 253-263.

Steig, Michael. "Defining the Grotesque: An attempt at Synthesis." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 29.2 (1970): 253-260.

Steinberg, Shirley R. "Critical pedagogy and cultural studies research: Bricolage in action." *Counterpoints* 422 (2012): 230-254.

Stinson, John Jerome. *The Uses of the Grotesque and Other Modes of Distortion: Philosophy and Implication in the Novels of Iris Murdoch, William Golding, Anthony Burgess, and JP Donleavy*. New York University, 1971.

Stone, Frances Tisdale. *William Golding: A Pessimistic Moralist: a Study of His Novels*. University of Massachusetts Amherst, 1980.

Tiger, Virginia. *“Lord of the Flies”. William Golding’s Lord of the Flies*, edited by Harold Bloom, Bloom’s Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 133–160.

Thomson, Philip. *The grotesque*. Vol. 24. Methuen & Co Ltd, 1972.

White, Allon. "Hysteria and the end of carnival: Festivity and bourgeois neurosis." (1985): 97-112.

Wilson, Edmund. "Marxism and literature." The Triple Thinkers (1938): 281.

Winkler, Vikki. "He is a Sister: The Monstrous (De) Construction of the Sex/Gender Binary in Iain Banks' *The Wasp Factory*." Ubc. ca. Np 31 (2008).

Yee, Joyce, and Craig Bremner. "Methodological bricolage: What does it tell us about design?." (2011).

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, 1954-2013 yılları arasında yazılmış olan *Sineklerin Tanrısı* (1954), *Eşek Arısı Fabrikası* (1984), *Yolun Sonundaki Okyanus* (2013) adlı üç farklı İngiliz romanında *grotesk* geleneğin temsilini incelemektir. Bu doğrultuda, her bir romanda romanın yazıldığı zamanın kültürel ikliminden duyulan memnuniyetsizliği ifade etmenin temel bir yolu olarak *groteskin* nasıl gösterildiği ayrıntılı olarak ele alınmıştır. Ayrıca *grotesk* terminolojisinin başka bir eleştirel terim olan *brikolaj* ile olan ilişkisi de açıklanmıştır; ortaya çıkan sonuca göre, *grotesk* gelenek, Viktor Shklovsky'nin tanımladığı "sanatın amacına" olumlu bir şekilde hizmet etmektedir. Tezde öncelikle *Sineklerin Tanrısı* romanı okuyucuda şok mekanizmasını tetikleyen fiziksel *grotesk* temsiller, melezlik, belirsizlik, gaddarlık, *grotesk* gerçekçilik ve *karnavalesk* açısından incelenmiştir. Fiziksel *grotesk* temsiller, romanın çocuk ve yetişkin karakterlerinin melez bir şekilde ve belirsizlik yaratan rol değişimleri, karakterlerin kendilerine olduğu kadar çevrelerindeki doğaya karşı da *grotesk* gaddarlık içerisindeki tavırları, karakterlerin toplumdan yalıtılmışlığı sayesinde yaratılan *karnavalesk* atmosfer ve bunun sonucunda *grotesk* gerçekçilik kavramı kapsamında yer alan etik bozulmalar, *Sineklerin Tanrısı* romanında yer alan geleneksel okuyucu için "sanatın amacına" hizmet eden yenilikçi unsurlardır. *Define Adası* veya *Mercan Adası* gibi klasiklerin bir *brikolajı* olan romandaki deniz subayının yönelttiği son soru, okuyucuyu olası yanıtlara zorluyor ve bir uyanış yaratıyor. Benzer şekilde, *Eşek Arısı Fabrikası* adlı romanda yer alan fiziksel *grotesk* imgelem, Frank'in melez kimliğinin analizinin ardından Frank'in izole bir İskoç yarımadasındaki günlük ritüelleriyle temsil edilen *grotesk* melezlik, *grotesk* aşağılanma, *grotesk* korku ile ilişkili olarak derinlemesine irdelenmektedir. Frank'in adadaki hayvanları sürekli öldürmesi ve kafalarını adadaki sopalara saplaması romandaki *grotesk* görselliği yaratmanın yanı sıra *grotesk* korku ve şeytancılığı da inşa eder; ancak üç akrabasını öldürmesi daha da şok edicidir. Cinayetlerin ve Eric'in ömür boyu yaşadığı

travmayı tetikleyen olayın rahatsız edici derecede gerçekçi tasviri, ek olarak gizemin sürekli olarak sonraya ertelenmesi şeklinde açıklanabilecek sözcük ekonomisi (semantic economy) tekniğini kullanması, roman boyunca okuyucuyu tetikte tutan ve Shklovsky'nin deyimiyle "sanatın amacı" olan romanın amacına ulaşmasını sağlayan faktörlerdir. Romandaki ana karakterin isminin Frank olması, anlatıcının yalnız ve toplumun geri kalanından dışlanmış karakteri, Angus'un Frank'in vücudu üzerinde yaptığı bilimsel deneyler bu romanın *Frankenstein* romanının bir brikolajı olduğu, ayrıca insanların hayatlarını kontrol eden "üstyapı"ya (superstracture) karşı hiciv niteliğinde olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Son olarak tezde, *Yolun Sonundaki Okyanus* romanındaki fiziksel *grotesk* temsilleri incelenmiş ve yetişkin dünyası ile çocuk dünyası arasındaki rol değişimi, *grotesk* belirsizlik kapsamında analiz edilmiştir. Romana hâkim olan *grotesk* tekinsizlik etkisi üzerine odaklanılmış, bunun da modern insanın içinde bulunduğu sosyal çevreye yabancılaşmasının bir göstergesi olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Sonuç olarak tezde, üç romanda da görülen *grotesk* geleneğin, modern dünyanın *brikolaj* portrelerini yarattığı ve Shklovsky'nin tanımladığı sanatın amacına hizmet ettiği savunulmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, grotesk imgelemin romanlardaki karakterlerin parçalanmış, yabancılaşmış, tekinsiz, şüpheci ve güvensiz hallerini ortaya koyan ve eserlerde ele alınan karamsarlığı betimleyen bir araç işlevi gördüğü sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: William Golding, *Sineklerin Tanrısı*, Iain Banks, *Eşek Arısı Fabrikası*, Neil Gaiman, *Yolun Sonundaki Okyanus*, *grotesk*, Mikhail Bakhtin, *brikolaj*, Viktor Shklovsky, *karnavalesk*, tekinsiz

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyse the representation of the grotesque tradition on three British novels written between 1954-2013: *Lord of the Flies* (1954), *The Wasp Factory* (1984), *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* (2013). In doing so, each novel has been examined to elaborate how these novels show the grotesque as an essential means to express dissatisfaction with the cultural climate at the time they were written. Moreover, the interrelation of the grotesque terminology with the critical term, *bricolage* has been explained, and the thesis has concluded that the characteristics of the grotesque serve positively for the "purpose of art" defined by Viktor Shklovsky. In this light, *Lord of the Flies* has been analysed in relation to physical grotesque representations, hybridity, ambivalence, monstrosity, grotesque realism and carnivalesque, which trigger the shock mechanism with the reader. Physical grotesque representations, the hybrid and ambivalent role reversals of the child and adult characters of the novel, grotesque monstrosity of the characters towards their nature as well as towards themselves, the isolation of the characters from the society create a carnivalesque atmosphere. As a result, the ethical degradation akin to grotesque realism in *Lord of the Flies* serves the "purpose of art". The novel, being a *bricolage* of the classics such as *Treasure Island* or *The Coral Island* shocks the reader, and the final question directed by the naval officer forces the reader for the potential answers and paves the way for an awakening. In a similar fashion, *The Wasp Factory* has been examined in relation to the physical grotesque figures presented in the novel followed by Frank's hybrid identity within the context of grotesque hybridity, grotesque degradation, grotesque horror and demonism represented by Frank's daily rituals on an isolated Scottish peninsula. Frank's continuous killings of animals and plunging their heads on the poles on the island create the grotesque physical imagery in the novel as well as constructing the grotesque horror and demonism; however, his

murder of his three relatives is even more shocking. The disturbingly realistic depiction of the murders, and the incident which triggered Eric's lifelong trauma, in addition to the semantic economy-continuously postponing the mystery for later, help to attain the "purpose of art" in Shklovsky's terms. Being a *bricolage* of the novel *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus* by the name Frank, the lonely and abject characteristic of the narrator, scientific experiments of Angus on Frank's body, are all satirical to the "superstructure" controlling the lives of the people. Finally, the thesis examines the physical grotesque representations in *The Ocean at the End of the Lane* and role-reversal between the adult world and the child world in relation to grotesque ambivalence. The grotesque uncanny effect, which evidences the alienation of the modern person to the social environment has been discussed. All in all, the thesis argues that grotesque tradition, apparent in these three novels, creates the *bricolage* portraits of the modern world, and serves the purpose of art outlined by Shklovsky. Viewed in this context, the grotesque imagery helps to portray the protagonists' fragmented, alienated, uncanny, sceptic, insecure feelings while providing a useful frame to examine the representation of pessimism in these novels.

Keywords: William Golding, *Lord of the Flies***,** Iain Banks, *The Wasp Factory*, Neil Gaiman, *The Ocean at the End of the Lane*, grotesque, Mikhail Bakhtin, *bricolage*, Viktor Shklovsky, carnivalesque, uncanny