

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

The Sound and the Fury and *ma Tabaqqa la-Kum*:
Disclaiming Authorial Intent
By

Faten Yaacoub

A thesis
Submitted in complete fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Comparative Literature

School of Arts and Sciences
September 2011



LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERRSITY

School of Arts and Sciences - Beirut Campus

Thesis Approval Form

Student Name: Faten Yaacoub

I.D. #: 200700766

Thesis Title: *The Sound and the Fury and ma Tabaqqa la-Kum:*

Disclaiming Authorial Intent

Program: Master of Arts in Comparative Literature

Department: Humanities

School: **School of Arts and Sciences**

Approved by:

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Ibrahim El-Hussari Signature:

Member: Dr. Latif Zeitouni Signature:

Member: Dr. Cheryl Toman Signature:

Date: September 29, 2011 for

THESIS COPYRIGHT RELEASE FORM

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

By signing and submitting this license, I (the author(s) or copyright owner) grant the Lebanese American University (LAU) the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined below), and/or distribute my submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. I agree that LAU may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation. I also agree that LAU may keep more than one copy of this submission for purposes of security, backup and preservation. I represent that the submission is my original work, and that I have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. I also represent that my submission does not, to the best of my knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright. If the submission contains material for which I do not hold copyright, I represent that I have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant LAU the rights required by this license, and that such third-party owned material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission. IF THE SUBMISSION IS BASED UPON WORK THAT HAS BEEN SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED BY AN AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION OTHER THAN LAU, I REPRESENT THAT I HAVE FULFILLED ANY RIGHT OF REVIEW OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS REQUIRED BY SUCH CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT. LAU will clearly identify my name(s) as the author(s) or owner(s) of the submission, and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to my submission.

Name: Faten Yaacoub

Signature: 

Date: September 29th, 2011

PLAGIARISM POLICY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

I certify that I have read and understood LAU's Plagiarism Policy. I understand that failure to comply with this Policy can lead to academic and disciplinary actions against me. This work is substantially my own, and to the extent that any part of this work is not my own I have indicated that by acknowledging its sources.

Name: Faten Yaacoub

Signature:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Faten Yaacoub.

Date: September 29th, 2011

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to three of my professors: Dr. Ibrahim El-Hussari, Dr. Latif Zeitouni, and Dr. Cheryl Toman for having sustained me in the process of completing this thesis. In particular, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Hussari, for his time, advice, patience and, above all, for his faith in my ability to complete this project. Without his invaluable comments and sound recommendations, the pursuance of this academic research work would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Riyadh Nassar library at LAU for having been constantly helpful and always ready to provide me with the reference materials I used in this thesis.

The Sound and the Fury and *ma Tabaqqa la-Kum*:
Disclaiming Authorial Intent

Faten Yaacoub

Abstract

This study focuses mainly on the significance of free readership as juxtaposed against authorial intent through examining the linguistic elements of the narrative discourse shaping the fictional worlds of William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* (1929) and Ghassan Kanafani's *ma Tabaqqa la-Kum* (1966) (*All That's Left to You*). To this effect, the study ventures on the methodology of deconstruction, precisely utilizing Michel Foucault's notion of the author and Mikhail Bakhtin's emphasis on heteroglossia, in order to delve into the dramatic and psychological dimensions of the characters inhabiting the two fictional worlds in question. This approach entitles the reader as critic to scrutinize the primacy of language, and at the same time it dethrones and brings the Author back to the parade of readers. Eventually, several inter-textual links are drawn between the two apparently strictly "regional" works, which will stratify the concept that literary art transcends the locale and summarily all authorial idiosyncratic restrictions.

Keywords: Deconstruction, Heteroglossia, Intertextuality, Narrative Discourse, Author
Function

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
Introduction.....	1-9
A Deconstructivist Approach to <i>The Sound and the Fury</i>	10-31
Ghassan Kanafani's <i>What's Left to You</i> and	32-57
William Faulkner's <i>The Sound and the Fury</i> : Elements of Intertextuality	
Conclusion	58-62
References.....	63-67

Chapter One

Introduction

In order to explain the magnitude of the criticism which attached almost every Faulknerian text to *The Sound and the Fury*, there is a need to review a few critical readings that served such a purpose. Faulkner's short story "That Evening Sun", for instance, was encompassed as a clarification of the novel under study. Michael Millgate (1966) comments on a scene in this story to relate it to the bigger prospect of *The Sound and the Fury*. In this 1931 short story, Quentin remembers the incident when the Compson family maid, Nancy, tries to commit suicide after she has been impregnated by a white man. Millgate sees a connection between this scene and the novel. He argues that the scene explains how the children of the Compson family "are again placed in a situation whose adult significance they do not wholly comprehend." This relatedness allows for "disentangl[ing]" Benjy's dissected recollections and viewing them as a short story in its own right (Millgate, 1966: 90). On the other hand, Cleanth Brooks (1963) is cautious in making similar affiliations; hence, he hesitates towards critics who read *Absalom, Absalom!* Quentin as an initiation to *The Sound and the Fury* Quentin, as the latter commits suicide in the last novel after he has reappeared in Yoknapatawpha (Faulkner's fictional world) months before that in the former novel. Richard Godden views these two Quentins from

one thematic perspective, that of "the formation, resilience, and failure of a southern owning class" (Godden, 1997: 1).

Interestingly, however, the readings of *The Sound and the Fury* which have virtually defined the novel also exist in Faulkner's unfinished introduction, Appendix, letters, interviews, and classroom discussions related to the work under study. These texts form a stout connection between the text and the author. Following on from this, the Appendix perceives the characters of *The Sound and the Fury* from a historical angle. Such perception which is noticeably omniscient repels the novel's particularly limited narrative points of view. In addition to the Appendix, Faulkner repeatedly claims for the novel an inexplicable centrality around the post of the writer. This implies that in order to understand the text accurately, readers must follow the author's canonical work.

Accordingly, Faulkner's re-readings of the novel did actually conform to the principal grounds of critical interpretations about his work. The notion that Benjy "loved three things: the pasture, [Caddy], and [the] firelight"; the claim that Quentin "loved not his sister's body but some concept of Compson honor precariously and [he knew well] only temporarily supported by the minute fragile membrane of her maidenhead"; and the picture of Caddy as the writer's "heart darling" – all these concepts are dictated by Faulkner himself (Faulkner, 1966: 411-423).

Phillip Novak writes that it "[has] often been noticed" that "Faulkner's commentary on his work is consistently less appealing and less complicated than the work itself" (Novak, 1996: 87). In the case of *The Sound and the Fury*, however, such observations

have been very infrequent and largely ineffectual. Eric Sundquist, for example, argues how the Appendix and comments recast *The Sound and the Fury* as the mythic center of Faulkner's career, but not how they determine which concerns most critics find commendable for argument (Sundquist, 1983: 4-5- 27). John Matthews discusses Faulkner's mythologizing as the foundation of one prominent line of criticism but does not address its pervasive control on other critical approaches (Matthews, 1991:20-23).

In addition to Novak and Matthews, Philip Weinstein contends that the dependency on the Faulknerian Appendix in explaining *The Sound and the Fury* "is weighty indeed, and it is not limited to undergraduates who don't know better" (Weinstein, 1987:188).

Relatedly, Godden addresses the same note: "I make no excuse for attributing an active consciousness to Benjy. Many readers continue to listen to the dismissals of Faulkner's Appendix (1946) and of his Paris Review interview (1956)" (Godden, 1997:9). As a matter of fact, the influence of the texts has been determinative; most critical interpretations of the novel refer to the unfinished introduction, Appendix and/or interviews, most of the times absorbing these texts as authoritative sources for readers trying to find a way into a difficult narrative. That is how it has become a habit for a few critics to quote lines from the Appendix and interviews to ground their analyses. In fact, most of the famous lines in reading *The Sound and the Fury* have been directly affected by the appearance of the Appendix to an extent that they were Faulkner's comments rather than from the text of the novel itself. However, critics ought to have examined the complete insinuations of the canonical methodical task these critical texts have presumed.

It is not novel to suppose that Faulkner's re-readings of *The Sound and the Fury* had a form of canonical position from their 1970s preliminary publication. Malcolm Cowley (1966), for example, calls for the need of authoritative interpretation, basing it on his literary friendship with Faulkner. Harrison Smith, known as Hal Smith and as Faulkner's editor at Harcourt Brace, writes: "One morning his editorial reader, Lenore Marshall, came running downstairs to say, breathlessly, "I think I have found a work of genius." Hal must have assumed that it was *The Sound and the Fury*, since he had heard about the book. But he only said, according to Mrs. Marshall, "What's it about?"/ "I don't know," she confessed. "I'm just starting it." /"Finish it." She did, that day, and thereupon accounted that *The Sound and the Fury* was really a work of genius, though she still didn't know what the content was.

To analyze this incident, it is obvious how Cowley summons images of the breathless reader, the one thirsty for a literary genius like that of Faulkner's, in order to meet with his understanding of authorship, reading, and the relative significance of authors and readers. In this context relevant to literature and criticism, Faulkner's reflections are believed to have an authorial status similar to that of the original novel. Surprisingly at a certain stage, these retrospections may, for Cowley, surpass the text since he believes "the story lived in Faulkner's mind, where it grew and changed like every living thing" (Cowley, 1966:4- 41).

Yet, with the introduction of Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author" and Michel Foucault's "What is an Author?" the critical concept on which critics like Cowley

depended has been shaken. Following is how Foucault sees the “author function” of modernity:

The author provides the basis for explaining not only the presence of certain events in a work, but also their transformations, distortions, and diverse modifications [...] The author is also the principle of a certain unity of writing--all differences having to be resolved, at least in part, by the principles of evolution, maturation, or influence. The author also serves to neutralize the contradictions that may emerge in a series of texts: there must be at a certain level of his thought or desire, of his consciousness or unconscious--a point where contradictions are resolved, where incompatible elements are at last tied together or organized around a fundamental or originating contradiction. (Rabinow; 1984:111)

Foucault read *The Sound and the Fury* repeatedly, and interestingly the post-structuralist critics have approved of those readings, a fact which leaves a wide range of questions on the illustration of the author function at work. Simply put, Foucault states that “the author is the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning” (Foucault, 1984:111-119).

Astonishingly, though, Faulknerian criticism has stayed strongly impermeable to such a poststructuralist approach. Materialist, feminist, and even deconstructive readings of *The Sound and the Fury* have, to some extent, remained under the spell of the demonstrative authority of William Faulkner. However, there are few critics who have not

gone down that road. Take, for example, Cheryl Lester who comprehends the Appendix as a work of criticism rather than “the canonical representation of this author’s writing” (Lester, 1987:272). Matthews, as well, points out that reading the Appendix prior to exploring the novel cuts short the “intended shock and confusion Benjy’s section was [...] surely meant to produce” (Matthews, 1991:123).

Like that of his American counterpart, Ghassan Kanafani’s literature has often been read from the local Palestinian perspective that believes Kanafani to be weaving in his fiction the artistic equivalence of his people’s ordeals by utilizing the sociological and historical conflict that results in the loss of their homeland. This interpretation fails to artistically celebrate the individuality of *What’s Left to You* since it classifies it under “committed literature”, a type which focuses the interpretive lens on authorial intents or explanations rather than on what the text offers. Some critics have narrowed the critical, linguistic, and artistic horizons of *What’s Left to You*.

Sami Soueidan, for instance, reads Hamed’s ordeals, Zakaria’s betrayal and Mariam’s fetus as respectively the embodiment of the generation shock of the 1948 crisis, the loss of the homeland and the condemnation of the people responsible for this crisis, and last the fetus as a “symbol of resistance and liberation” (Soueidan,1997:19). In addition, Khalida Khalil quotes Faisal Darraj’s argument that “this culture [...] can’t become innovative without its commitment to the human cause, without its defense of human dignity, without raising its objection to the invasion and rape of the land” (Khalil, 1989:93).

While we continue reading the same trait of critical thought, we come to a conclusion that such critics comprehend the Palestinian cause as the historical mine of gold for Kanafani’s fiction through seeing him utilize the tragic crisis of his land, not by

presenting statistical data or historical inquiry, but by sublimating the problem into the artistic dimensions of *What's Left to You*. These critics are undoubtedly influenced by what the author himself says about his work. Kanafani himself states his works reflect the reality of the sixties: "My own observations and writing have led me to the sound analysis of the style of the protagonists and the choices they make. I reflect and express reality as I understand it" (Khalil, 1989:84).

The common ground among these studies is that they confuse the author with the character since they rely on the characters' opinions and standpoints and take them for Ghassan Kanafani's. The mishap that these readings fall into is confounding the author's reality with the novel's artistic illusion without any sort of discrepancy. Another shortcoming of these analyses is that they do not follow a critical literary standard which analyzes and explains the narrative discourse per se in order to be able to persuade or justify, and this is the prominent reason why they often produce inferences that completely transform the text because these conclusions are based on subjective ideological creations.

It is, thus, necessary for critics to bring out the connections that govern the artistic elements which the novel is made up of since these connections formulate the main comprehensive structure of the work. And this structure is in turn dialectic where its linguistic factors interplay to produce the spirit of the text.

In her article "Ghassan Kanafani and William Faulkner: Kanafani's Achievement in *All That's Left to You*", Aida Azouqa (2000) demonstrates the difference between committed literature and non-committed literature to illustrate the dilemma which writers like Kanafani besides his works confront. Arab writers, Azouqa explains, were influenced by Sartre's notion of commitment in art. She gives the example of Salama Musa who

launched a campaign that laid the foundation for the concept of committed Arabic literature. A committed author is governed by a socio-political cause which draws the contours of his work.

As an opponent to commitment in literature, Hilary Kilpatrick asserts that Kanafani is “not merely a writer who is concerned with political issues, but a writer who cares about the artistic development in literature” (Kilpatrick, 1976:64). Haydar Haydar (1981) also refutes any propositions that confuse literature with other social, political, or historical writings. Raymond Williams, as well, defends the autonomy of art as an institution, fully entitled to freedom of expression: “Art is more than a perception; it is a particular kind of active response, and a part of human communication” (Williams, 1996:590).

Following on from this, Kanafani himself pronounces this wavering between commitment and non-commitment in literature. He mentions that “the writer is the victim of the controversy between his national roots and his artistic aspirations” (qtd. in Azouqa, 2000:151). Accordingly, we can infer a dichotomy between the socio-political tendencies and the aesthetic inclinations. By deconstructing this statement, we notice some form of contradiction between these two orientations. The former restricts the literary text to a national cause, while the latter “reveal[s] the wider universal struggle between the individual and the world,” as stated by Azouqa herself (152). Thus, reading *What Is Left to You* from the Palestinian cause channel will be a “technical ignorance of all the literary innovations,” as echoed by John Barth (1999:163).

In this respect, a deconstructivist approach will be employed to maintain a fuller understanding of the linguistic and dramatic dimensions in both William Faulkner’s *The*

Sound and the Fury and Ghassan Kanafani's *What Is Left to You*. Such an approach together with Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author", Michel Foucault's "What Is an Author?" and Mikhail Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* and other critics will reveal the primacy of the reader/critic over the ultimate Signified (cf. Saussure 1916). Hence, both literary works will be comparatively studied within the circle of readership, cultural norms, and intertextuality to reassure that texts are mediated in their construction, communication, and reception.

Chapter Two

A Deconstructivist Approach to *The Sound and the Fury*

The authorial presence in the critical history of *The Sound and the Fury* seems to have persisted to an extent that it has regularly interfered with the novel itself. The fact that the novel employs four internal narrators has been found exigent for critics to come to grounds with the “truth” beyond the story. The three interior monologues of the Compson brothers report exceedingly subjective voices: Benjy is self-captivated by his mental constraints; Quentin is ruptured by his neurosis; and Jason is imprisoned by his defensiveness. The fourth voice, the Compson black maid, however, does not solve these monologues; it only illustrates in juxtaposition with them the impracticality of an omniscient point of view, as it is echoed in John Matthews’ *The Play of Faulkner’s Language* (1989). Although the four narrators are complementary parts for the novel, most critics have concentrated on complications of the narrative structure to the extent that the possibility of arriving at a closure has become almost futile. Yet, Foucault re-directs these attempts to assert that “the novel’s exploration of language and voice implies that the author loses his very individuality, or ‘endlessly disappears’ in the endeavor to write” (Foucault, qtd. in Stoicheff, 1992:453). Accordingly, modern critics commonly consent to the result that “truth” is destabilized by these interior monologues, and so are some concepts of firmness.

To examine Faulkner’s narrative practice and its difficult outcome, it would be useful to visit Mikhail Bakhtin’s views about the novel’s polyphonic discourse. Bakhtin’s notions challenge critical thoughts which granted Faulkner the ownership of his text. For

Bakhtin, the genre of the novel commences when the homogeneity of “myth over language” has been shattered in order to build a “distance [...] between language and reality [...] Language is transformed from the absolute dogma it had been within the narrow framework of a sealed-off and impermeable monoglossia into a working hypothesis for comprehending and understanding reality” (Bakhtin, 1984:60-61). The novel expands in a world that is hence primarily overflowing with manifold languages it recognizes as “historically concrete and living things”:

The prose art presumes a deliberate feeling for the historical and social concreteness of living discourse, as well as its relativity, a feeling for its participation in historical becoming and in social struggle; it deals with discourse that is still warm from that struggle and hostility, as yet unresolved and still fraught with hostile intentions and accents; prose art finds discourse in this state and subjects it to the dynamic-unity of its own style. (Ibid: 331)

Bakhtin’s notion of the novel’s presence in an infinite atmosphere begets original techniques to undermine Faulkner’s influence as author of *The Sound and the Fury*. He describes the writer’s innovative work and also sheds light on the authoritative discourse which clarifies Faulkner’s multiple interpretations of *The Sound and the Fury* and also his critics’ passive recognition of these interpretations as authoritative references. The way Bakhtin suggests that novelistic discourse makes the endeavor to direct meaning quite dubious, enlightens the reader/critic that the dependence on Faulknerian references to understand the story of the Compsons is a hopeless attempt.

Unquestionably, the novel's Appendix and the several interviews with Faulkner offer definite depictions and claims of original meanings to the text. They surprisingly impose a unilateral authority over a text that is rich in "heteroglossia" (See Bakhtin 1986). This applies to what Matthews states about *Absalom, Absalom!* since he considers how the Appendix is claimed as a demonstrative framework and an authoritative "truth" about *The Sound and the Fury*, in the sense that it stipulates what the text could convey (Matthews, 1989:56). To clarify this claim, Matthews explains how the Appendix imposes on the Compsons a destiny of enclosed future that denies any intrusion from probable readings. It is worthy of note as well that the interviews unrelentingly propose the novel as a failed version of the depiction of Caddy Compson. Peter Stoicheff also mentions how Faulkner's introduction, interviews and drafts envision Yoknapatawpha as a "unique fictional world" which most probably mocks authorial power and provides a nostalgic and "rueful gesture" for the classical image of the author (Stoicheff, 1992:462). It is essential to bring out the link among Stoicheff, Foucault and Bakhtin though they have their differences. However, both Foucault and Bakhtin meet around the notion of the inexhaustibility of writing. Therefore, Faulkner's authoritative position as author in his commentary will be explored later in this study.

To dispute this authoritarianism, Bakhtin argues against the privilege that writers endow themselves with or even more seriously receive from critics and reviewers. For him, the author does not inhabit a distinct surface since the consciousness of creativity "stands, as it were, on the boundary line between languages and styles". Bakhtin does not idolize the author's language but rather sees it as a voice of many in and about the literary text:

Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (always more or less dialogized). These distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into the rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogization--this is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistics of the novel. (Bakhtin, 1984:263)

Bakhtin demonstrates how language, which is the author's tool to communicate a vision, plays against the author himself and even, outsmarts him in his game. Through heteroglossia, the notion of monopolizing intentions becomes self-defeated since the novelist is "refract[ing]" his own feelings and ideas by speaking "through language" and not by utilizing one language (Bakhtin, 1984:299-300). This is how the writer loses his capability to supersede other discourses. Heteroglossia weakens any try on the part of the author to recover the traditional authority already given to him. Bakhtin advocates the necessity to study Faulkner's commentary about *The Sound and the Fury* more cautiously than how it used to be handled before. Hence, it is quintessential to revisit Foucault and Barthes to study the function of the word of the text rather than the world of the author since even at some point when Faulkner himself renounced his presentation as author, many critics still have not noticed it. For instance, *Selected Letters of William Faulkner* mentions that in 1946, Faulkner wrote to Robert Linscott, his editor at that time, in his re-

reading of his 1933 story draft of *The Sound and the Fury*: “I had forgotten what smug false sentimental windy shit it was” (1977:253). Nonetheless, Faulkner continued until his last days to “sell” the same original story he used to expound in his presentations and college interviews. Thus, it is obvious how it is critically significant to renounce most readers’ attachment to Faulkner’s authoritative word.

It is worthy of note as a point of departure into this study to see the connection between the title of the Appendix (Appendix Compson: 1699-1945) and the claim of authority. The years included in this title are related to the history of the story, yet the usage of the word “appendix” stratifies that this text is more than fiction. Faulkner weaves both genealogy and encyclopedia to cast an atmosphere of factuality as if the novel is the true story of the Compsons from beginning to end. Critic Robert Dale Parker brings out a comparison between *The Sound and the Fury* and *Absalom, Absalom!* to confirm the “problematic relation” between these novels and their chronology and genealogy. Parker stated that these texts rely “on some implied notion that the chronology holds superior authority because it comes directly from the author, who, the unspoken assumption implies, holds superior authority because in an appendix he speaks with the privileges of omniscience instead of the mediated and therefore tenuous authority of a character or even an author who speaks in the text proper”. For him, an “Appendix brings with it an “implicit claim to exterior and final authority” (Parker, 1986:193-195). Parker’s words remind us as well of what Bakhtin names ‘authoritative discourse’: “we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. [It] remains sharply demarcated, compact and inert: it demands, so to

speak, not only quotation marks but a demarcation even more magisterial, a special script, for instance” (Bakhtin, 1984: 343).

To begin with, Faulkner offers an explanation for writing the Appendix; he states that he had promised Cowley only “a page or two of synopsis” to introduce the Dilsey section in the Portable Faulkner anthology. These claims reveal the reality of the Appendix. In many correspondences with his editors, Faulkner identifies the Appendix as a salvation for readers who have a difficulty understanding the novel, as if the Appendix is formatted to help “the four sections as they stand now fall into clarity and place’ and “clear up its obscurity” (Blotner, 1977: 202-220-237). In addition, a letter written by Faulkner to his editor Robert Linscott clarifies more the link between the Appendix and authority:

So maybe instead of an unconscious willful tour de force in obfuscation the book was rather the homemade, the experimental, the first moving picture projector--warped lens, poor light, clumsy gears and even a bad screen--which had to wait eighteen years for the lens to clear, the light to steady, the gears to mesh and smooth.(Blotner, 1974:1216)

Repeatedly, Faulkner demonstrates the impulsion behind the Appendix by stating that it is mandatory to change a very sophisticated narrative discourse into a merely monologic account, to limit the Compson stories to one centre until “the whole thing would [fall] into pattern like a jigsaw puzzle when the magician’s wand touched it” (Cowley, 1966 :36). This statement tells us clearly how Faulkner tries to manipulate Cowley’s editorial ends in order to meet a subjective purpose he has for the novel. As a matter of fact, he is

building through this Appendix an authoritative re-reading of *The Sound and the Fury*. The fact that Faulkner demanded that the Appendix be published at the beginning of the novel in the 1946 Modern Library edition is an evidence that he wanted readers to approach the novel with his focal lenses (Blotner, 1974:220ff). That is how the Appendix became an inseparable part of the novel from 1946 until 1984. Noel Polk, however, wanted to bring the novel back to its original form; hence, he did not publish the Appendix with the novel, and neither did the subsequent new Modern Library edition in 1992.

The fact that the Appendix was annexed to *The Sound and the Fury* after the war added a huge effect to the novel since in the late 1940s and 1950s Faulkner was a renowned figure in the world of literature. Not only did Faulkner receive the Nobel Prize (1949), but he was also merging in the milieu of art and criticism. Critics like Brooks and Cowley helped in the foundation of Faulkner as both a writer and a critic (Schwartz, 1988:28ff). It is critically surprising how little criticism on *The Sound and the Fury* was published before Faulkner's addition of the Appendix, and how essential studies of his work did not sprout until the end of his career. With minor discrepancies, critics were following Faulkner's guide through referring to the Appendix in their interpretation of the novel. Any disagreement critics had with reference to the novel were usually in the form of footnotes or marginal notes that even in the 1980s and with the novel theory of the 'death of the author', no significant interference with Faulkner's views was registered (Bleikasten, 1984:79-81). As a matter of fact, Polk and Meriwether as textual critics are probably the first to point out that if readers continue to read *The Sound and the Fury* with the help of the Appendix, they will end up understanding a meaning different from the novel itself as it

was published from 1929 to 1946. Each of Polk and Meriwether protests against U.S. editions from 1946 to 1966, which, in response to Faulkner's demand, added the Appendix at the beginning of the novel, hence introducing readers to a completely diverse starting mode to the novel. According to Meriwether, such editions relieve readers "of the burdens which [it] was originally designed to impose on them" (Meriwether, 1984:29). Years after Meriwether, Matthews and Walter Taylor both started to warn readers and critics alike against using the Appendix, be it at the beginning of *The Sound and the Fury* or at the end of it. As Taylor puts it, the Appendix story "undermines" both "the process of discovery" and the influence of the novel's narrative style; Matthews suggests to teachers, too, that they should "intensify the readerly vertigo Faulkner induces" instead of "serving as Faulkner's 1946 appendix" themselves (Taylor, 1996:67). It is, therefore, obvious that the experience of reading *The Sound and the Fury* beginning with the Benjy section is tremendously dissimilar to that of reading the novel beginning with the Appendix.

Since the text of the Appendix has been given a heavy interpretive weight to hold, it is likely that this demands vigilant assessment. When Faulkner first gave the text of the Appendix to Cowley, he presented it as a neutral account of Compson history; Faulkner called the Appendix "a piece without implications," "a sort of bloodless bibliophile's point of view" (Blotner, 1977:205-6). However, the authority blending with the Appendix form, the detailed details it stratifies, plus the frequently ironic tone of the narrator himself combine together to forfeit Faulkner's original claim. While reading the Appendix, we notice how Faulkner re-depicts the novel characters with accuracy and decisiveness which leave strong residues on the revision of the novel. Instead of submerging in the rich

complexities of the original novel where characters are drawn psychologically and artistically slowly but surely, the Appendix is introduced to provide unequivocal character designations which support the claim of authorial observation. The Appendix tells readers openly that Quentin “loved death above all [...] loved only death,” that Jason was “[the] first sane Compson since before Culloden [...] logical rational contained,” that Benjy “could not remember his sister but only the loss of her,” and that Caddy, “[doomed] and knew it, accepted the doom without either seeking or fleeing it” (Faulkner, 1966:415). The Compson brothers are thus presented as more inflexible versions of their novel depiction which leaves little space for their artistic growth. These illustrations, which are almost similar to a painter’s contour of a sketch, became a focal point in nearly all analyses of these characters. The idea that Benjy is incapable of remembering, for instance, became almost a fact regardless of the reality that in the first section of the novel when he is thirty-three years old, he is still overflowing with recollections from his childhood. In addition, Faulkner characterizes Caddy as vitally changed, while the librarian Melissa Meek sees in the magazine photo she discovers that Caddy looks “ageless and beautiful, cold serene and damned”—just like the view her brother Quentin sees her before his suicide, different from the fervent independent figure which we read in the original novel (Faulkner, 1966:415). Melissa, therefore, fails in her attempts to “save” Caddy’s image in the face of Faulkner’s re-reading of Caddy as doomed (Davis, 1995:238).

If the Appendix seems to afford a socio-historical framework for comprehending the Compson family, it is only at the expense of hampering the family with a descendance of futility which makes any freedom impossible. Taylor sees that the Appendix “short,

pithy statements [...] identify core aspects of personality,” yet they also force a sense of definiteness on the novel which shrinks the uncertainty of the text and loosens the complexity of the characters and cuts short the open-endedness of their stories (Taylor, 1996:64) This transformation leaves *The Sound and the Fury* in an arranged place which gives readers a feeling of ironic illusion. We see Benjy filled with remembering and Jason panicking at the notion of collapse. Caddy alone has fled the Compson history, while her brothers have still to see beyond her. Caddy’s future is created by her daughter’s escape from home and also from the domineering Jason. Then, when Faulkner tries to straighten out the novel’s complicated narratives, he persists on finalizing the novel with a clean closure which the novel itself cannot tolerate. Therefore, the Appendix shows readers how Jason has an evaluation of what he wants, how Benjy can remember nothing, how their brother Quentin is forgotten, how their niece is condemned, and how Dilsey ceases to have any interest in Caddy. Additionally, Caddy is doomed to be the mistress of a German general; she is certainly deprived of the right to have her own distinct voice in the novel, which makes her appear only as others represent her. Davis comments on Caddy’s silenced voice as “debasement [her] into an icon of evil” and changing her into “[a] spectacle [of] corruption” (Davis, 1995:238ff). Her daughter Quentin remains voiceless likewise. The Appendix predicts her fate “doomed to be unwed from the instant the dividing egg determined its sex” and destined to be a regular echo: “whatever occupation overtook her would have arrived in no chromium Mercedes; whatever snapshot would have contained no general of staff” (Faulkner, 1966:424-426).

Even though many conflicts appeared between *The Sound and the Fury* and the Appendix, Faulkner continued to defend the later text:

Would rather let the appendix stand with the inconsistencies, perhaps make a statement (quotable) at the end of the introduction, viz.: The inconsistencies in the appendix prove to me that the book is still alive after 15 years, and being still alive is growing, changing; the appendix was done in the same heat as the book, even though 15 years later, and so it is the book itself which is inconsistent, not the appendix. That is, at the age of 30 I did not know these people as at 45 I now do; that I was even wrong now and then in the very conclusions I drew from watching them, and the information in which I once believed. (Cowley, 1966:90)

While Faulkner's words insinuate a sense of flexibility within the narrative itself, they also propose his authoritative perspective of how the novel should be read since he deliberately shows readers how to answer some complicated questions about the Compsons (Donaldson, 1991:27). Faulkner purposely provides a holistic vision for *The Sound and the Fury*, which contradicts the modern nature of the original text and alters it into a strict account of the Compson story (Miller, 1983:155). Sergei Chakovsky ironically points out that the Appendix "contains the plan of *The Sound and the Fury* as it could have been written [...] but luckily never was." The Appendix draws a different Compson contour, one which is dictated by an authoritative voice, built around fixed fences and restricted by a closure stranger to the novel itself. In the same line, Davis states that the Appendix "enacts

a repositioning of the author himself from the margins to the center,” giving Faulkner the advantages of the author (Davis, 1995:239).

This shift from periphery to center happens more forcefully in the far-reaching comments Faulkner made in interviews and classroom discussions in the 1950s. Many critics rely strongly on these notes although some of them caution against total dependency upon them. Matthews, for example, quotes Faulkner’s Appendix as a framework for his arguments in his *The Play of Faulkner’s Language* although he writes fervently on the ambiguity in *The Sound and the Fury* (Matthews, 1982:22). The interviews and the Appendix share a common ground with respect to the novel; they both present an additional characterization of the novel’s more complex and discrepant interior monologues. The most dominant of these character readings have been the interpretation of Benjy as an idiot and the determination that Quentin imagines some of the incidents he relates in his interior monologue. In these interviews and sessions Faulkner himself calls Benjy an “idiot [...] who didn’t know what he was seeing” and an “animal [who] doesn’t feel anything” (Meriwether and Millgate, 1968:246).

To measure the influence of this characterization, we can refer to Faulkner criticism. Benjy has often been read as a reliable narrator depending on Faulkner’s words that he only depended on his external senses; therefore, what Benjy recounts is what Benjy sees, hears, smells, tastes, and touches. In addition, Faulkner was asked in a question-and-answer lecture at Virginia whether the conversation about Quentin’s images of incest really took place between Quentin and his father. Faulkner answered:

He never did. He said, If I were brave, I would--I might say this to my father, whether it was a lie or not, or if I were--if I would say this to my

father, maybe he would answer me back the magic word which would relieve me of this anguish and agony which I live with. No, they were imaginary. He just said, Suppose I say this to my father, would it help me, would it clarify, would I see clearer what it is that I anguish over?(Gwynn and Blotner, 1977:262)

Such statements formed for many critics an authoritative ground upon which they depended in their analyses of the multifaceted Quentin section. On one hand, Matthews brings up this reading to support the notion of the ambiguity of the multiple voices of the novel. On the other hand, Stephen Ross and Noel Polk use this reading as a reference of clarity for the blurriness of the novel: “Faulkner said that Quentin only imagined that he confessed incest [...] though there is no internal evidence in the novel to determine whether Quentin is remembering or imagining “(Matthews, 1991:84).

The images that are strongly supported by these interviews have become the principal premises in *The Sound and the Fury* criticism. First, the notion that the conceptual center of the novel lies in the symbol of young Caddy with muddy drawers, climbing the tree and looking in the window, and second, that the novel is a futile attempt to narrate a story that could never be told right – these major readings rely definitively on the interviews mentioned above (Hedeem, 1985:641).

Faulkner started to express these readings in the introduction drafts in 1933. He continued to reiterate them in his interviews especially as a visiting writer at Virginia in the 1950s, and there is no doubt that the perspective of narrative these readings comprise has dominated most discussions regarding the text’s compound narrative voices. According to Faulkner, writing *The Sound and the Fury* was a process of attempting to bring out an

insistent image; in this sense, image controls narrative. To illustrate this, we should pay a good attention to the 1956 Paris Review interview to witness how Faulkner answered the question: “How did *The Sound and the Fury* begin?”

It began with a mental picture. I didn't realize at the time it was symbolical. The picture was of the muddy seat of a little girl's drawers in a pear tree where she could see through a window where her grandmother's funeral was taking place and report what was happening to her brothers on the ground below. By the time I explained who they were and what they were doing and how her pants got muddy, I realized it would be impossible to get all of it into a short story and that it would have to be a book [...] I had already begun to tell it through the eyes of the idiot child since I felt that it would be more effective as told by someone capable only of knowing what happened, but not why. I saw that I had not told the story that time. I tried to tell it again, the same story through the eyes of another brother. That was still not it. I told it for the third time through the eyes of a third brother. That was still not it. I tried to gather the pieces together and fill in the gaps by making myself the spokesman. It was still not complete, not until 15 years after the book was published when I wrote as an appendix to another book the final effort to get the story told and off my mind, so that I myself could have some peace from it. It's the book I feel tenderest towards. I couldn't leave it alone, and I could never tell it right, though I tried hard and

would like to try again, though I'd probably fail again. (Meriwether and Millgate, 1968:245)

This almost-mythical story which was told thirty years after the publication of the novel has definitely influenced Faulkner criticism. This creation myth promptly became the main ground upon which the readings of *The Sound and the Fury* were based. The major readings which were directly and strongly affected by this commentary are those approaching the novel from a psychoanalytic point of view which sees the Compson world constituent of myths about loss and remembrance, connects the four parts of the novel in a formal complementary fashion, and focuses on language's shortage in the face of experience. For Godden, Faulkner tried to "swaddle" the contradictions he produced in the novel through his explanations instead of having those contradictions confronted by readers and critics.

It seems that Faulkner wants to achieve an easy solution for the missing voice of Caddy; he mentions that he alongside with the Compson brothers cannot narrate Caddy's story at the same time he embeds a "true" plotline about her, dispatches her with a Nazi general, and deprives her of narrating her own story based on the comment that she is "too beautiful and too moving to reduce her to telling what was going on" (Gwynn and Blotner, 1977:1).

If we are to use a Bakhtinian context for Faulkner's words, we will be reminded that there are no final words since narratives take place in a heteroglot world where several stories could be told at the same time within a monologic mythic image. To apply this explanation to *The Sound and the Fury*, we find Caddy Compson's image the most prominent and yet the most obviously absent of all the stories. In Faulkner's Appendix, we

see Caddy as a “frozen” image on screen (Kaivola, 1987:39). In addition, Faulkner’s later story of Caddy changes her into an overly resolute object, the basic pillar upon which the novel is formulated and through which alone it can be understood. Therefore, these later readings call critics to focus more on a character they had fundamentally disregarded. Faulkner mystifies and iconizes Caddy, transforming her into a “visual symbol of masculine desire and longing, of male need and loss” (Davis, 1995:246). Matthews comments on this part craftily that this style of remembrance in the narrative leaves “no space for Caddy’s subjectivity, her version of her story” (Matthews, 1991:91).

Caddy’s imperative presence in the novel through memories and imaginations of the other narrators proposes the importance of her words permeating the novel without being contained within one single voice. This is why critics who study Caddy’s character inquire on Faulkner’s expository narratives earlier and more tenaciously than do critics dealing with other topics. Initially, critics were attentive to Faulkner’s description of Caddy as his “heart’s darling,” yet the time that they’ve started to scrutinize Caddy’s character, they started to see her outside the authorial grain. For instance, Eileen Gregory begins her 1970 analysis of Caddy’s untraditional “vitality” by throwing away all critical dependence on the Appendix and she reads the latter instead as “irresponsible.” Later in 1976, Douglas Hill writes an essay with a minimal reference to the author and a focal centrality on the reader’s understanding of Caddy’s essence in the novel. Hill suggests the importance of the reader’s viewpoint of Caddy, especially through her brothers’ voices; for Hill, “the Caddy of the novel” overcomes the “stock female characterizations” of the Appendix (33-37). In order for critics to take a similar trend of orientation with regard to Caddy’s character, they should disarm themselves of all authorial narratives about Caddy, then weigh the reader’s

response, and eventually contextualize her within literary theories such as feminist theories in order to create a room for her subjectivity in their reading of *The Sound and the Fury*. Only then can critics find the meaning of a character whose linguistic and dramatic dimensions can change the form and the underlying purport of the whole text. Hill stresses this point by arguing that although Faulkner refused or was unable to contain Caddy within the perimeters of a character, Caddy's individuality is made concise by the end of the Benjy and Quentin sections, and that is how readers are capable of dismissing Jason's description of Caddy as a false being. Caddy's dialogues with Benjy, Quentin, and Mr. Compson stratify the concept of her individuality despite the fact that her voice starts to vanish by the last section of the novel. To this effect, Linda Wagner suggests that Caddy may seriously be read as one of the novel's "essential narrators" (Wagner, 2002:61).

Minrose Gwin comments on this angle and writes that readers "may begin to hear the whisper of Caddy's voice" exactly because Faulkner cannot call himself the only author of the text (Gwin, 2010:35). The minute readers recognize Caddy's voice, her voice continues to echo and reverberate outside the restraints set by others' words. Here is how Bakhtin approaches Dostoevsky's fiction where characters "do battle with such definitions of their personality in the mouths of other people":

[These characters] acutely sense their own inner unfinalizability, their capacity to outgrow, as it were, from within and to render untrue any externalizing and finalizing definition of them [...]. Dostoevsky's hero always seeks to destroy that framework of other people's words about him that might finalize and deaden them. Sometimes this struggle

becomes an important tragic motif in the character's life. (Bakhtin, 1984:59)

If we are to contrast Dostoevsky's account with Faulkner's, we conclude that while Dostoevsky rejects the privilege of literary finalization and gives his hero the authority of the author, Faulkner attempts to claim it all. Nonetheless, Caddy impairs the controllability of the novel's four narrators and of the author of *The Sound and the Fury* through the margins of the text. If Faulkner thinks that his words about Caddy's beauty and its inability to "get it right" say anything about her, then he is mistaken. Those words, however, speak of subjectivity and its relationship with narratology. In Novak's words, Faulkner "invariably spoke as if the substance of the novel lay at the limits of narratability" (1996:87). Deconstructively, the narrative difficulty of the novel which is established on the notion of heteroglossia contradicts with the novel's inability to endow the subject who is the preoccupation of all other subjects, with a voice.

Faulkner's attempt to maintain the realm of the author and to proclaim the world of the critic is explained by Bakhtin's outline of the historical development of novelistic discourse. According to Bakhtin, the modern novel has converted the "positioning of the author":

The novelist is drawn toward everything that is not yet completed. He may turn up on the field of representation in any authorial pose [...]. The underlying, original formal author (the author of the authorial image) appears in a new relationship with the represented world [...]. The 'depicting' authorial language now lies on the same plane as the 'depicted' language of the hero, and may enter into dialogic relations

and hybrid combinations with it (indeed, it cannot help out but enter into such relations) (Bakhtin, 1983:64).

Therefore, novel writing contains a big risk for the traditional privileges of authorship since it could construct implied authors who are unreliable narrators pretending to have knowledge they do not own, authors who are constrained readers of their own texts, in addition to producing many narrative uncertainties. Even if the writer tries to disregard heteroglossia and speak from an authoritative position, he knows that this language is:

not self-evident and not in itself incontestable, that it is uttered in a heteroglot environment, that such a language must be championed, purified, defended, motivated. In a novel even such [...] language is polemical and apologetic, that is, it interrelates dialogically with heteroglossia. It is precisely this that defines the utterly distinctive orientation of discourse in the novel--an orientation that is contested, contestable and contesting--for this discourse cannot forget or ignore, either through naivete or by design, the heteroglossia that surrounds it.
(Ibid: 332)

A traditional author may sprout from within the modern novelist but cannot factually become one. The strongest example in this situation is Faulkner's retrospective reading of *The Sound and the Fury* which illustrates this aforementioned predicament. Faulkner's explanations have been largely accepted as authoritative analysis instead of being regarded as "competing" texts (Parker, 1986:193). *The Sound and the Fury* has been limited by the terms established by these explanations, yet the latter should be argued against the original novel.

A few critics have estimated the Appendix as a text claimed with authorship, yet others offered that it should be read as a work of fiction away from the novel itself. Nonetheless, knowing that it has limited readings of *The Sound and the Fury* for more than fifty years, the Appendix's convoluted relationship with the novel is definitely the more essential subject for later study. It is time for readers to examine Faulkner's expository account hesitantly instead of clinching to it in their reading of *The Sound and the Fury*.

The vicinity of readers is to bring out the heteroglot milieu and the distinct voices which get involved into one another between the novel and Faulkner's retrospective readings. Readers should open their eyes to the interaction between the vocalicity of the narrators in *The Sound and the Fury* and the omniscience of the author/critic which Faulkner plays in his later narratives. Most Faulknerian critics have witnessed the complexity of the reader's role towards the novel. Olga Vickery points out that "by fixing the structure while leaving the central situation ambiguous, Faulkner forces the reader to reconstruct the story and to apprehend its significance for himself" (Vickery, 1959:29). *The Sound and the Fury* suggests in itself the dialogic involvement of the reader with the text as soon as the reader notices Benjy's limited perception and tries to fill out the narrative gaps between the lines. Wolfgang Iser suggests that the result of this attempt will be that the reader "experiences Benjy's perspective not only from the inside-with Benjy-but also from the outside, as he tries to understand Benjy" (Iser, 1974:140). Once the reader/critic recognizes this duplicity between the inside and the outside of the text, the text itself will expose the fact that not even all voices could establish the entire story.

The Appendix and interviews both instigate the authoritative position of Faulkner and mislead the analytical experience of studying the complicated voices of the novel, let

alone the Benjy section first. Warwick Wadlington writes on the difficulty of reading the novel's narratives; for him, the novel needs more than the traditional "reconstruction of an inferable narrative line", and hence it is the reader's job to "read in several ways, and in several ways at once, with no necessity of seeing contradiction and epistemological gaps in this multiple functioning" (Wadlington, 1987:88). Definitely, such an approach could exhaust many readers who want to put the pieces of the novel back together, yet Susan Donaldson contends that the Appendix "implicitly [...] insist[s] upon the never-ending process of reading" (Donaldson, 1991:38). For a long time, Faulkner had been evaluated as the owner of his novel and due to that, the Appendix was a means for closure. However, Lester sees the Appendix as a "portable text" since "its details stretch in plural and contradictory ways in several directions at once," even if most Faulknerian critics fail to understand this vagueness (Lester, 1987:389).

According to Bakhtin, this urge to complete the novel is inherent in the novel itself since in the modern world "the absence of internal conclusiveness and exhaustiveness creates a sharp increase in demands for an external and formal completedness and exhaustiveness, especially in regard to plot-line" (Bakhtin, 1984: 31). Ironically, though, Faulkner, who demanded from his publishers to place the Appendix at the front of *The Sound and the Fury*, writes on the importance of the text itself: "To me, the book is its own prologue epilogue introduction preface argument and all. I doubt if any writing bloke can take seriously this or any other manifestation of the literary criticism trade" (Blotner, 1959: 236). This statement clicks on the critical contradictions of modern authorship.

Following on from this, Wadlington notices the typical errors which the Compsons fall into through experiencing “difference as contradiction, multiplicity as stalemated war, the world as a universe of antagonisms” (Wadlington, 1987:70). It often appears in the novel that Quentin and his father, Jason, and his mother see their world like traditional readers, looking for concrete applicable solutions; the voices in the novel resemble several readers who would misunderstand the open-endedness of the story and take it for a flaw, and eventually resort to the Appendix with certainty and relief. It is Quentin only who shakes up this comfort and disappoints their conclusiveness since he reads meaning as inconsistent, difference as irreconcilable, history as void. In a heteroglot environment hesitance and uncertainty are the irresistible, yet frequently able to produce and reinvent.

Undoubtedly, the Compsons’ dialogues, monologues and contradictions, whether revealed or concealed, originate into the reader the impulse to read both critically and creatively away from the conventions of text analysis, as in Andre Bleikasten’s words: “to meet the text on its own ground, to heed its uncertainties and indeterminacies, its disjunctions and dissonances, and to engage them dialogically” (Bleikasten, 1976:17). The challenge of rethinking Faulkner's dialogic relationship with his *The Sound and the Fury* serves as a confrontational reminder that for readers, as for Benjy Compson, "each in its ordered place" is an always temporary condition that time and language will modify (Faulkner, 1987: 371).

Chapter Three

Ghassan Kanafani's *What Is Left to You* and Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*: Elements of Intertextuality

Ghassan Kanafani's *What Is Left to You* has been frequently approached from a regional and authorial perspective which undermines the structural and thematic dimensions of the text itself in the same manner as with William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*. According to this line of thought, Kanafani weaves in his fiction the artistic equivalence of his people's ordeals by utilizing the sociological and historical conflict that results in the loss of their homeland. However, Kanafani the critic interferes to connect the regional to the universal by explaining that "Palestine is a symbol of the world as I delineate its features in my characters; any critic may observe that my stories don't focus on the Palestinian individual but detects a human condition," and he explains that every man who suffers the loss of land and shares with the Palestinians their national cause, and therefore, there is no universal experience that doesn't affiliate with this human tragedy (qtd in Allen, 1972: 44). Accordingly, the human condition becomes the axis of the narrative in *What Is Left to You*. It is evoked through the characters' awareness of their psyche, in the symbolism of the setting and objects, in the motifs of time and place. Hence, Mariam and Hamed are aware of both external and internal forces; Hamed is aware of his social shame and of the danger he encounters in the desert; Mariam is aware of her sexual fulfillment and of the ticking of time inside the house. Both Hamed and Mariam long for freedom, and this longing makes them self-evaluative. This awareness becomes a pre-

requisite for consciously-made moral choices which are deeply rooted in the function of the will, whether with Hamed and the Israeli or with Mariam and Zakaria. This psychological trip with its recollections represents a painful journey, since memory for both Hamed and Mariam re-constructs, re-evaluates laments or celebrates, and provides a representational scene.

Yet, the link of the text to the Palestinian specific has made several critics shed light on the same spot, qualifying Kanafani to dramatize the reality of the Palestinian experience as locale speaks to the universal. This is how he carries the hard adventure in the world of Palestinian fiction stating that *What Is Left to You* foreshadows an upcoming of the “armed resistance”. The generation shock of the 1948 catastrophe, *al-Nakba*, of the homeland and the condemnation of the people held accountable for this catastrophe are represented simultaneously in Hamed’s family problems, Zakaria’s betrayal of his people and Mariam’s illegitimate fetus, the last taken for a “symbol of resistance and liberation” (Soueidan, 1997: 19).

This total submersion in history and the attendant exposure to its predicaments and hazards are understood to qualify Kanafani to reflect in his fiction the quintessentially Palestinian crisis. This validates the organically intertwined relationship between culture and history. As Faisal Darraj argues, “this culture [...] can’t become innovative without its commitment to the human cause, without its defense of human dignity, without raising its objections to the invasion and rape of the land” (qtd in Khalil, 1989: 93). Kanafani himself states that his works reflect the reality of the 1960s: “My own observations and writing have led me to the sound analysis of the style of the protagonists and the choices they make. I reflect and express reality as I understand it’ (qtd in Khalil, 1984: 84). One can

notice how the Palestinian cause is the historical mine of gold for Kanafani's fiction: he utilizes the tragedy of his people within the pages of *What Is Left to You*, whereas critics should concentrate on the artistic sublimation of the narrative which itself has introduced an innovative step into the modern Arabic novel.

Kanafani's revolt against the traditional rules of fiction makes his literature fit in the modernist movement. This movement resulted in the creation of a more open form, and of stories endowed with psychological depth, inner dialogue and impressionistic delving into the realm of human consciousness and human perception. However, modernism is part of the historical process by which the arts have dissociated themselves from the nineteenth century conventions by emphasizing common experience. Some critics regard the change in structure an inevitable leap to make art possible in the modern world. Stephen Spender, in *The Struggle of the Modern*, observes that "modern art is that in which the artist reflects awareness of an unprecedented modern situation in form and idiom. Added to this, the principle of reality in our time is peculiarly difficult to grasp, and realism is not an adequate approach to it" (qtd in Faulkner, 1990: 15). Thus, the various experimentations in method characterize the development of modernism and stress the role of subjective perception. In *Modernism*, Peter Faulkner argues that a shift in concentration from the representation of the external world to a reflection of the nature of consciousness characterizes the tendency in modern fiction (Faulkner, 1990: 31).

Consciousness, as Joyce and Woolf indicated, "is not the passive reception of impulses from the outer world but is creative, intentional, implying the activity of making meaning and structuring reality" (Ibid. : 32). It is to this experimentation in the nature of consciousness that *What Is Left to You* responds, searching for materials to measure

adequately the subject matter and the different angles of vision lent to the characters.

The basic design, structured on interior monologues, indicates the subjective human experience represented in the context of *What Is Left to You*. This context amalgamates the three dimensions of existence: man, land, and time. The relation of man and time is controlled by relativity, as Ihsan Abbas argues in his article “Bridges and Relations”. What remains constant is the land because it means “a stable reality to each Palestinian” (33). Abbas adds that “when the relation with the land expands towards a future perspective, man becomes a cause”. And, therefore, by humanizing the desert and assigning the symbolic meaning to the different characters, Abbas sees that Kanafani “widens his scope of vision to philosophize the anguish of every refugee” (qtd in Abbas, 1972: 86).

Kanafani’s *What’s Left to You* shares with Faulkner’s *The Sound and the Fury* many common features of technical virtuosity. In *What Is Left to You*, the same narrative devices of *The Sound and the Fury* are used in presenting the private consciousness of the characters - - discontinuity, private implications - - through free association and retrospection. In both works, the stream of consciousness technique and the continually shifting point of view are structural strategies that have a determining effect on style. The narrative of *What Is Left to you* disrupts the chronology of time to portray the subjective nature of the human experience, presenting to us the psychic struggle of the gallery of characters in their search for “truth”.

It is remarkable, though, how Kanafani retreats from the scene in order to have readers come closer to the characters’ experience. Hamed’s stream of consciousness is triggered by the image of his sister wearing a red lipstick like “an open wound” (5). The image of the wound develops and associates with a series of defeats related to Hamed’s

past. He lost his sister to “a scum”, lost his home in Jaffa, and now is heading towards an elusive sanctuary represented by his mother in Jordan-annexed West Bank. Hamed moves forward while his losses accumulate backward and force him to escape. The fragmentation of his mind is indicated by italics which differentiate his interior monologue from the monologues of Mariam, the desert, and the clock. The surface level of action projects defeat, betrayal, psychic impotence, and the potentiality of survival in a hostile milieu, thus chronicling both the actual defeat and the potential victory of the Palestinian youth. Moreover, Mariam’s interior monologue reflects her implicated condition. She stands midway between her past dependency and her present dependency. Realizing that Hamed has taken the perilous journey, she repeats to herself that Zakaria is left with her: “You’re all that is left for me” (6). Mariam’s stream of thoughts continues and reflects the process of her encounter with Zakaria. Her monologue projects the image of her body as if “on fire” and burning with desire. Even when she takes her clothes off and hangs them on the wall, the flames of desire continue to feed on the garments and threaten to turn them into ashes. Being scared of turning into dust, she leaps to her passions with Zakaria (11). Looking into the broken mirror, Mariam projects her distorted emotions and disintegrated life in a poetic image of her body “as a series of disconnected parts belonging to the disembodied figure of a girl being paid the last rites by the merciless mocking beat of the clock’s pendulum against the wall” (12). Mariam’s disintegrated image, combining both desire and frustration, is similar to Hamed’s “swaddled” position of disappointment, inexperience, and inability to act out his will. Mariam doesn’t reject her own identity but yearns to achieve wholeness. She refuses to take life in fragments and regards her affair as the “pendulum which lost its destination” (12). She deviates from dependency, thus coming to an adjacent

point with Hamed.

Mariam describes her experience as a dilemma to Hamed, who, in her opinion, cannot see that the passage of time to her is “death announcing itself at least twice daily” (18). Regarding her age and celibacy, she develops a negative concept of time. In her long monologue, the juxtaposition of the memories of the past with the obstacles of the present heightens the dramatic effect of time on her and causes her to fall into a dangerous liaison with Zakaria. The process of recollection accumulates in her mind though the defeated reminiscences of the lost proposal in Jaffa. At that time, the occupying forces caused the disintegration of her family and deprived her of a real opportunity for decent marriage and higher school education. Faced with a moment of recognition, she acknowledges her feeling of shame for having married a married man. She tries to escape the misfortunes of time but falls into the snares of blame and culpability. The life force channels her nature, but her partner proves to be a villain, an anti-life force: he pressures her to abort her embryo.

Through the reflection of Hamed’s and Mariam’s points of view, we meet Zakaria: a calculating man who reacts to the events of life pragmatically rather than emotionally. He emerges in stages: the relaxed groom, the careless brother-in-law, the traitor, and the irresponsible partner who seeks sensual pleasure and avoids the consequences. Acting as an enemy of the people, Zakaria lacks any respect for family values. Even the value of real patriotism and martyrdom doesn’t exist to him. Yet his villainy and his practicality do not guard him against the unexpected. Mariam retaliates, stabbing him to death. The stab is aimed at his groins, a symbolic act of unmanning Zakaria in the first place. By eliminating the menace to her motherhood and her reputation, she not only terminates the life of her

exploiter but also, metaphorically, cleanses her people of an internal enemy, a traitor.

The various settings in *What Is Left to You* introduce Hamed as he delves into the desert. The internal setting is Hamed's psyche with his disturbed thoughts flowing freely. The fragmentation of the human mind as a medium of expression, builds this internal setting through which the modern mind is dramatized. The same happens to Mariam's mind. Mariam is confined inside the small room in Gaza, but her mind moves in a great flux to the past years of her life and collides with her actual suffering.

Richness of the human experience in *What Is Left to You* is manifested in perception, memory, and time. The events of Hamed's life aren't isolated or static; they form a time-space continuum in his quest. The time as duration is represented in the clock and the wrist watch. Hamed and Mariam are time-framed creatures. Through traversing the lonely desert, Hamed questions the value of his wrist watch. And because the immediate situation joins the human and the cosmic time, he regards his watch as useless. Duration becomes measured by his internal consciousness which is activated by his shedding his past dependencies.

The watch and clock motif lends universal and coherent value to the private and chaotic experience of both Hamed and Mariam. The immediate settings - - the desert and Mariam's bedroom - - and the internal settings are the framework through which the deep level of action takes place. It is this blend of the external and the internal that lends significance to the symbols of time: the watch and the clock. Hamed's wish to do away with the mechanical time finds a symbolic expression in his gesture: "I unstrapped it from my wrist and threw it away" (20). In order to achieve the true time of liberation, he sheds his dependencies - - his watch being one of them. Mariam's relation with the mechanical

time is quite the opposite. She regards the wall-clock as “a bier” declaring the fatal procession of her daily life (6). To her, the passage of time means “death announcing itself at least twice daily” (18). Even the faintly strokes of the clock’s pendulum declare the perilous travel of her brother “as though the solitary clock had stumbled upon a new variation on the theme and was proceeding to try it out” (21). She hears the hollow metallic chimes of the clock surge through the half open door as the chimes intuit the aloof feeling that Mariam feels toward Zakaria. The mechanical time and the biological time converge in Mariam’s psyche to form the rebellious force in her mind. Between her and Zakaria there is “a wedge of iron”, and so as the passage of time declares the beginning of a new dawn, she closes her ears to Zakaria’s threats of divorce, rushes to the kitchen and stabs him to death.

Time in this novel derives its significance from being a unifying principle, structurally and thematically. The clock, or the watch, is a symbol of mutability and confusion that corresponds to the artistic structuring of perception against confusion and chaos. The clock and the watch indicate mechanical time, but the psychic development of Hamed and Mariam transcends all mechanical ticking. The time of action, of violence, of eliminating the enemy is the true time of the will, eventually born to both Mariam and Hamed. Mariam’s fetus is the incarnation of the birth of the proper time to act. Also the sound of bumping and pounding is a repeated motif which declares movement and foreshadows action. The sound of pounding accompanies the pounding desires of Mariam, the ticking of Hamed’s wrist watch, the footsteps of his journey as well as the movement of the embryo in her womb. Added to these is the bumping of the boat ores as Mariam recollects the night of her exodus. The silence of the desert also bumps. The repetition of the words “bump” and “pounding” describes the psychological motivations of each

character. It is worth mentioning that the sound is repeated more than 30 times through the various monologues.

Space is bestowed a special priority in *What Is Left to You*. The desert extends immensely, vastly and mysteriously. The realization of what is essential and insignificant commences at the dusk and ends at the dawn - - both times acting as part of the temporal setting. In the desert, Hamed realizes his search for identity and achieves self-realization. The desert, as a matter of fact, provides the bare stage on which he confronts the Israeli soldier who has lost his way. The vast space is exploited technically as an objective observer which throws into relief Hamed's helplessness against the forces of nature; at the same time, Hamed has the courage to go unarmed and unguided into the vast mystery of distance. The objective observation assesses Hamed's development and growth and accompanies his quest like a detached rendition of a chorus. Simultaneously the small room in Gaza extends as an external setting for Mariam's maturity. The clock guides her dramatic development from a spinster to a frustrated wife to a courageous mother. The setting of her psychic conflict trots the inclination of the pendulum or the clock. Once the chimes declare the coming of dawn she feels able to transcend the limitation of the imposed situation to achieve a willful condition. Both protagonists move and develop combining the private and the public or the particular and the general awareness of the human condition. The anguish in the text is a metaphysical anguish of time. But the time as duration or confusion is transcended in Hamed's and Mariam's internal consciousness.

Another technical feature of the narrative in *What Is Left to You* is the combination of the direct interior monologue, the omniscient narrator and the soliloquy. Hamed's journey, for example, explores the exterior action with the internal workings of the

consciousness. The surface level of action moves forward until Hamed is forced to assess his confrontation with the enemy. The desert holds the role of the omniscient narrator, or that of detached observer - - which adds a measure of objectivity to Hamed's actions. In the desert's first monologue, Hamed is described as "a paltry creature, resolved on an endless journey charged with fury, sorrow, suffocation, even perhaps death, night's solitary song that parades in my body" (8). Hamed is delineated as the furious rebel and the lonely song of the night. But the emotions of Hamed when he confronts the desert are charged with love. The desert can deal not with emotions but with reasoning: "I couldn't tell him that by deviating just that little bit towards the south, he had embarked on a course that would lead him to the heart of the sun" (9). The interaction between consciousness and space is manifested in Hamed's humanization of the desert. He contemplates it in terms of sexuality, not realizing that it corresponds to logic and objective detachment whose function resides in declaring the correctness of time. The desert is utilized technically as an objective observer throwing into relief Hamed's helplessness and insignificance versus the forces of nature, displaying simultaneously his courage and bravado in going unarmed and unguided into the vast desert. A symbolic replacement of the human condition, the setting necessitates the isolation of the hero. This isolation is essential for the initiator because the "absolute isolation of the initiate is a prerequisite for the ordeal of initiation in most cultures" (qtd in Saddiq, 1984: 33).

The translation of the human condition into art as revealed in *What Is left to You* does not escape the same dimension in Faulkner's novel *The Sound and the Fury*. In both works, the human heart is depicted in conflict with itself and with the world. The southern

family is also examined by excavating the roots of its past. The memories of the Compsons project the decline of the Old South. In this measure, memory and emotions, and not the progression of years, dictate the significance of any event. The South is represented as a place where people tend to dwell on the past, on the glories of the pre-civil war days, and on the innocence of childhood. Often the characters find that the past, relived through memory and through history which has been learned from others, is more real to them than the present moment. This sense of the past is developed in the Compsons. The Compsons represent the upper class of the old social hierarchy, the plantation owners and their descendants who, because they are at the top of the social tree, have the furthest to fall when the tree begins to wither and die. The people of the South, who belong to the post-war period, do not live in an active way but spend their lives in the passive contemplation of the pre-war past while their world continues to decay around them. The Compsons are dramatized to reveal the failure of people in the South to recover from the destruction of their culture more than eighty years back.

The similarities between Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* and Kanafani's *What Is Left to You* could be grouped within the tragic view of the human condition as revealed in the characters' words and actions, the obsession with the past, and the fragmentation of the human mind as a structural device.

To begin with this comparative study, I find it appropriate to provide a summary of Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* and Kanafani's *What Is Left to You*. Faulkner's is an account of the Compsons' disintegration in the modern world, presenting the events of four days, with the reconstruction of the events from 1898 to 1928 being discerned from the

characters' monologues. The juxtaposition of the childhood of the Compson children with their present existence results in the development of deterioration and loss. The Compson family, a metaphor of the dissolution of the old tradition in the New South, revives a genuine evoking of "fate in terms of heredity and environment" (Chase, 1978: 220).

Quentin's sensitive perception of the glorious past of his family isolates him as a romantic idealist who opposes the change which time has brought on his sister Caddy. Because they are conditioned by environment and controlled by heredity and instinct, the Compsons' experiences are associated with "adventures and emotional intensity, acts of violence which culminate in desperation and death" (Pizer, 1960: 13). The tragic view of the human condition is displayed in Caddy's promiscuity, Quentin's suicide and Jason's celibacy in a barren existence--- Jason being the last survivor of the Compson family.

In *What Is Left to You*, the tragic view of the human condition is reflected in Hamed's escape into the desert, Mariam's surrender to a traitor and the disintegration of the family due to the loss of the homeland and the martyrdom of Hamed's father. This, in fact, is the initial image of the human condition, which will develop later into an image of hopeful defiance. The duration of Hamed's journey extends from sunset to dawn. Yet the reconstruction of the events extends from 1948 till 1965 and is displayed in the characters' monologues. As Hamed proceeds in his journey, his sister Mariam assesses her hasty marriage to Zakaria. As a spinster obsessed with the wasted time of her youth, Mariam indulges in a sexual affair with a married man, Zakaria, loses her virginity and gets pregnant outside wedlock. Her hasty marriage to him adds to her sense of isolation and one day, in an act of furious rebellion, she stabs him to death. Between the beginning of Hamed's quest and the two acts of killing that synchronize the elimination of Hamed's and

Mariam's enemies, the monologues of the protagonists, firstly, reflect the disintegration of their family and their homeland, secondly, reflect inevitable challenges of future events, and thirdly, create a gallery of characters whose perspectives of reality are essential for the articulation of a lucid though complex vision of the human condition.

The implicated human situation, or the historical and personal fate, binds Hamed and Quentin in a critical situation and forces them to escape and seek refuge. Hamed seeks his mother, takes a nocturnal quest into the desert to reach her in Jordan. Quentin takes a long journey into the night to escape his sister's promiscuity and the mutability of his condition.

The crucial element of historical and personal fate is evoked by Kanafani in his delineation of Hamed and Mariam as main characters. Nothing once formed in the mind can perish, "everything survives and is capable of being brought to light in regression" (Raleigh, 1969: 201). This regression is the objectification of the subjective state of mind and it is expressed stylistically to reflect Hamed's mind in his quest into the ambiguous future. Being the common feature that binds, splits, and condemns memory resembles fate in one way or another. In both novels, Mariam's surrender to Zakaria and Caddy's yielding to Dalton form the impetus of the various perspectives imprinted in the memories of Hamed and Quentin.

Hamed tries to escape his shame when he fails to protect his sister from an imposed marriage to Zakaria "the tiny, ugly, monkey-like scum" (4). Being a romantic idealist, he escapes the imposed situation by choosing to traverse the desert to reach the security of his mother in Jordan. The night and the desert are imposed on him. There, feeling betrayed by his sister and isolated from established society, he is forced into assessing his relationship

with the past. "I've decided to leave Gaza" (2) resonates in his memory as a spontaneous alternative against Mariam's disgraceful act. The cultural past that haunts Hamed is both familial and historical. The familial side deals with Mariam's promiscuous act and her pregnancy with Zakarai's baby. The bitter memory that hurts Hamed most is that of the fact that nobody tried to stop him from taking the journey at night. "The desert [that] swallows up ten men like him in one night" (4) sets the perilous path for Hamed. He wanted his sister to stop him from opening the door, but the only sound he heard was his quick footsteps on the stairs. The ultimate horror of the desert is its indefiniteness where it destroys individuality and sets another dilemma on the border with the enemy. Hamed confronts the ambiguity of the desert and retains his identity. The omniscient narration that occupies the first six pages of the novel defines his act as similar to diving into the night, where his voyaging mind is fused with the world in a wave-like form. The identity of the self is threatened by losses in a sea of recollections "as a wool ball" tied to his home in Gaza. One can infer that Hamed is presented in an "archetypal image of the sunset phase". In a human world viewed as tragic "the hero is betrayed, isolated, deserted in tyrannical world and hostile community" (Lodge, 1998: 432). This tragic vision affiliates with Hamed's quest into the desert, ruins and perils. He is isolated, self-exiled, yet his deep level of action is a psychic unfolding to achieve self-assertion, a process that will start as soon as the omniscient narration comes to an end. The first pages provide the adequate description of Hamed's loneliness or alienations: "For sixteen years they had enveloped him with these constricting strands and now he was unraveling the ball letting himself roll into the night" (2). The immediate present of the starry cold night shifts to the immediate past. The repeated motif "I give you my sister" disrupts Hamed's level of perception and indicates

his reluctant consent to Mariam's pregnancy. His memory shifts back to ponder of the sexual act of Mariam and Zakaria. He soon improvises the scene: "one day he left school, got an excuse pretending he had a headache [...] then sneak into the house in my absence"

(3). The conditional phrase "If your mom were here" (3) accentuates Hamed's psychic burden. The relation between the desert and the human will is relevant, since man's decisions concerning his destiny are partly determined by his milieu. Hamed's orientation is enhanced by the desert, and the courageous path he treads is a kind of rooting himself in reality, in existence. In fact, realism implies, besides truth of detail, "the truth in reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances" (Luckas, 1981: 52). Hamed is rooted in the mundane experience of the loss of his family and his land simultaneously. The confrontation with the enemy is imposed on him; the night and the ambiguity of the destination is another realistic dilemma he has to challenge. Will he be able to liberate himself from the dependencies [family, past, culture] and liberate the warrior-liberator inside him? This realistic pattern shapes Hamed's experience in terms of the structure of feeling. The experience of isolation, alienation and self-exile is an important part of the "contemporary structure of feeling, and any realist novel would have to come to terms with it" (Lodge, 1998: 590). Raymond Williams explains the relation between the contemporary novel and realism, arguing that creating any new realism different from tradition is the main achievement of the 20th C. He also recognizes the fact that we literally form the world we see, concluding that "this human creation - - a discovery of how we can live in the material world-- is necessarily dynamic and active" (qtd in Lodge, 1998: 590). In his recollections, Hamed reflects on Zakaria's cowardly act rehearsing the scene at a concentration camp captivating young Palestinians. The armed Israeli officer in charge

asked for Salim, an underground resistance fighter. The officer threatened to kill all the captives if they didn't lead him to Salim. Hamed closed his eyes to escape the implicated situation. At that moment Zakaria rushed out of the long queue and volunteered to show them Salim. Slowly, hesitantly the guns were lowered as the officer strode forward and kicked Zakaria who said, "I'll show you Salim". But before he could do this "Salim stepped forward of his own and stood in front of us [...] we heard the single shot fired behind the wall and we all turned our eyes to Zakaria" (11). So in Hamed's memory, his sister's staining family honor and hasty marriage to a despicable traitor are bitterly felt. The presentness of the past haunts Hamed in his long journey. To defeat this situation, he makes of reality a probability then an absolute denial expressed in his wish-fulfillment: "I'll tell your mother you died and I buried you inside the pants of a rotten man together with the woman who has borne him five children" (17).

On the other hand, Quentin's quest of fathoming the depths of his being in order to find a vision that fits his idealism is similar to that of Hamed's. Quentin's ideals are allied to the emotional ties of his early years. He equates Caddy's sexual innocence with the Compsons' honor, his conflict with reality reaching its climax with "Caddy's loss of virginity" (Volpe, 1964: 108). The escapade that Quentin performs is attributed to the imposed forces of change on his family, especially that of Caddy. As Caddy grows into maturity and begins her adult experience, she introduces to the Compson family a kind of reality with which they cannot cope. Mr. Compson avoids the problem by labeling it a state "like death, only a state in which others are left out" (48). In Quentin's mind Caddy becomes a potential for ignorance and sin and he feels that it is his mission to prevent her from committing the hideous act. What haunts his thoughts throughout his last day on earth

is the memory of her promiscuity.

Quentin is intelligent enough to understand what the family has been in the past: “one of our forefathers was governor and there were generals” (62). Being fed on the stories of the past he becomes imprisoned by the old times of fading glories and too sensitive to cope with what his family has become in the present. In one flashback, he remembers his father’s remark that “man is the sum of his misfortunes” (64). This negative view on life renders him victim to his heritage. His battle with time marks the long fight which commences at Harvard in his room and ends on the same day in suicide. Quentin’s traditional, social and moral codes are at the heart of his psychological condition. He has been given the education to associate sex with revulsion and sin in a manner “characteristic of southern Puritanism in general” (Yager, 1993: 82). Hence his dilemma that results from his awareness that he harbors incestuous feelings toward Caddy and Dalton, “the beast with two backs [...] the swine Euboleus running coupled with Caddy” (90). The attitude of disgust towards women and sexuality explains Quentin’s inability to accept any sexual relationship; his answer is clear when, as a young boy and after sexual contact with Natalie, he considers her a ‘dirty girl’ and throws himself in the pig trough. He cannot understand his own sexuality: “That’s Chinese, I don’t know Chinese” (71). It is not surprising that he relates women to shadows, to imperfections “whispering with their soft girl voices lingering in the shadowy places” (62). Actually, the guilt Quentin feels over sex, as Laurence Bowling argues, “is not limited to the act alone but encompasses the desire itself” (47). Quentin considers self-castration as a means of freeing himself from desire. “Castration is the punishment for incest”. According to Freud’s explanation, the sense of incest develops when “a little boy may take his sister as love-object in place of his faithless

mother... A little girl takes an older brother as a substitute for the father” (qtd in Chabrier, 1993: 133). This explains the fixation of Quentin towards Caddy, the contrition he feels towards his virginity and his psychological impotence. Regarding his virginity and his psychological impotence, it is true that his father never encouraged him to assume his manhood. He tells him, at one time, that virginity is a negative state: “Father said it’s like death only a state in which the others are left” (48). Impaired by his condition, Quentin tries to convince Caddy that he is no longer a virgin: “Yes... lots of time with lots of girls” (75). His virginity and implied impotence are so intermeshed that he feels remorseful and helpless. This further explains his obsession with punishment and damnation for incestuous desires. His inclination to damnation is related to his effort to isolate Caddy away from the world: “Nobody else there but her and me. If we could have done something so dreadful that they too would have fled hell except us” (58). Evidently, damnation becomes Quentin’s means of eternalizing his relationship with Caddy “to guard her forever and keep her forever more intact amid the eternal flames” (71). In eternalizing his relation with her, Quentin can relive his lost innocence. Hence, the idea of isolation, guilt, and punishment” is equated with “the symbolic concept of incest” (Irwin, 1975: 37). Quentin ends up delving into the deep river water as a punishment for his forbidden desired and for Caddy’s lost innocence.

Moreover, Quentin designs his escapade by ignoring time, his inclination to avoid it being triggered by the intense guilt that Caddy’s dishonor has given him. He purposely breaks his watch, purposely regards his watch as “the mausoleum of all hope”, but, ironically, time keeps on moving. Actually, Quentin wants to capitalize on his past. If he

can forget, then his fear has no meaning and the passage of time will wipe it out. He feels that he must stop time or arrest it at the innocent childhood of the past. Ultimately, suicide becomes his only means of stopping time and of evading the absurdities of life where “the roof of the wind” will ward him from “the harsh and loud world” (71).

The fragmentation of Quentin’s mind finds its symbolic equivalence in the ticking of the watch which “can create in the mind broken the long diminishing parade of time you didn’t hear” (47). Again, when Quentin passes a jeweler’s shop, the window of which filled with clocks that tell different times, he enters it and asks the owner “would you mind telling me if any of these watches in the window are right” (51). He is not interested in the answer; he only wants to assert that each clock has the same assertive and contradictory assurance “that mine had without hands at all. Contradicting one another” (51). As a matter of fact, Quentin strikes a posture of self-blinding, and self-deafening arrogance as he projects on time and on life “his own inner chaos of assertive and contradictory assurance” (Thompson, 1963: 20). But the jeweler’s answer to his question implicitly endows the entire episode with the quality of a parable: “they haven’t been regulated and set yet” (51).

Obviously Quentin is incapable of dealing with the past, present or future. He thinks of his last day in the past as if he is already dead. Hence, the future doesn’t exist for him. The fragmentation of his mind resonates with the influence of his father and the impact of his mother. Quentin’s affinity with his father becomes a leitmotif of his moral code. “Father said” is the sign of authority and the established system. He remembers his father’s words throughout his quest. Mr. Compson’s cynicism is less of a protective therapy than a retreat from reality. He asks Quentin to unwind his conflict after the affair Dalton has with Caddy

explaining to him that “virginity is a temporary condition” (50). He tells Quentin to stop resisting time for “no battle is ever won” (47). Quentin’s thoughts are constantly interrupted by his father’s view on life. Mr. Compson’s view on virginity and purity as negative states confuses Quentin and causes him to experience a dark side of tragedy that eventually leads him to his fatal suicide.

Similarly, in Kanafani’s *What Is left to You*, Hamed structures his escape by ignoring time and taking refuge in the innocent past. In his nocturnal journey, he reflects on his fated family situation trying to repress the feelings which he feels, “because he is threatened by outside forces that can sever him from family” (Strong, 1973: 46). The menace is obvious because Hamed feels fragile and because Zakaria’s act evokes his sexual jealousy. The evidence that Zakaria has usurped his place in Mariam’s life drives him to rage. Zakaria deflowers Mariam on Hamed’s bed, and Hamed considers the duration of their encounter as stolen from him personally. Zakaria hints that jealousy is the instigator of Hamed’s strict guardianship over Mariam. He intuits that Hamed would rather kill Mariam than see her with another man, “let alone Zakaria” (4). Mariam’s question to Hamed, when he comes out of the shower, bare with only a towel around him, if he has ever been with a woman indicates her own jealousy and her concern with his sexual affairs. This augments the sense of inadequacy in failing to protect his sister’s honor. Added to this is Hamed’s experience of sexual impotence in relation to the emphatic reference to his smallness, for even though he is of huge physical stature, he is usually called “the little one”. He could have easily squeezed Zakaria to death, but he does nothing of the sort when Zakaria violates his family honor. Hamed is called the “little one” and Zakaria dismisses everything he says as “childish nonsense” (4). Mariam observes that his own signature is small, and

Hamed reflects that his own personality is similar to his signature. Thus, the dominant image of himself in his own mind is that of a little boy who has been swaddled in cotton wool for sixteen years.

Moreover, Hamed's sexual impotence is provoked by Mariam's sexual affair. He recollects, in one of his monologues, his aunt cautioning him to marry his sister off before anything undesirable happens. But he affirms that Mariam "was always inside my clothes, in my burning body, in my bed" (7). Hamed's emotional commitment to the code of honor is manifested in "his internal thoughts about Mariam's pregnancy and her marriage to the man whom he despises" (Said, 1977: 244).

But Hamed is helpless to do anything about the fact of Mariam's pregnancy. Instead of pressing forward the process of individuation that her pregnancy has set in motion, he tries to impede it by reverting to an earlier "more infantile stage of development marked by the child's complete dependence on the mother" (Darraj, 1992: 38). Hence his plunge into the desert in a desperate attempt to reach his mother is a Quentin-like behavioral action. From the moment he leaves Gaza behind, "the image of the mother and his sister fuse with the desert" (Said, 1977: 275). Hamed's feelings towards the desert are expressed in sexual overtones and his complete surrender to it, even though it can swallow ten men like him, suggests the intimacy of intercourse. The monologue reveals Hamed's sexual feelings: "It is not within my capacity to hate you but will I love you? I am compelled to choose your love [...] you can swallow ten men like me in one night. I therefore choose your love [...] Nothing is left for me but you" (6). Quentin counts his losses and disappointments on his final journey, and so does Hamed in his acquaintance with the desert on his first journey. He recollects his losses and his defeats, and is forced to accept the imposed condition. The

image of his deceased father interrupts the stream of his thoughts and challenges the undefined heroic dimension of his mind. The immediate situation prevails when Hamed hears the roaring of trucks and intuits the existence of a hostile territory which he approaches carefully. He tries to look at his watch, but it is pitch black: "I unstrapped it from my wrist and threw it away" (20). He is close to himself and an ally to darkness. Thrown into a new situation and battlefield, he dissociates himself from the mechanicality of time. Thus, one of the correspondences is lost: "I had cut off a part of my wrist" (21). His awareness develops as he evaluates his liberation from past-attachments, the watch being one of them. Furthermore, he imagines his mother's lamentation for Mariam's reckless situation. Then he evaluates his choice, realizing its futility. His internal conflict is dramatized by the culpability he feels and the impasse he faces. He should have remained in Gaza and should have killed his sister (25). He blames himself for his impulsive act.

Dialogue with the self is possible and leads to a climactic point of maturity. If Hamed is not the sum total of these correspondences, then what is he? The dramatization of his consciousness becomes the deep level of action, drawing the psychograph of his maturity: "The thread unraveled itself from the ball of wool [...] but who are you?" (25). The process moves from confusion to recognition. The existential question clears the mask of past dependencies and prepares the long march to self independence. Every question is a device that provides a glimpse of revelation. These glimpses accumulate to build up recognition of the whole condition. His new birth occurs through his recognition of a new human condition. When he abandons the ideal image of his mother, he turns towards the skeptical route that leads to truth. By doing this, he is able to detach himself and achieve psychic liberation. Before the beginning of the quest, he took things for granted, but now

his mind develops and raises questions. By virtue of exploring the possibility of a new human condition, Hamed considers the real and the ideal images of his mother. She is now reduced to an ordinary woman. Hamed accepts his losses, including that of his mother, and this acceptance forms a prelude for the will to act. The future is open to another possibility or probability until the moment of decision and true time come into existence. Hamed's long monologue (30) dramatizes a new perspective of truth or of the ability of acting out the independent will. Reminiscences of his father, reduced to "one bare yellow arm hung loose" (27), and the memory of Mariam's words assessing the loss of Salem and the safety of Hamed, resonate in his ears (29). Her comforting words motivate him to reevaluate his childhood. The image of "bubble" floating in vacuum indicates the emptiness of his past life and his present status: psychically and physically. Hamed now defines himself in new terms of dignity, patriotism and action. His uncertainty comes to an end: "The sure knowledge that I was utterly alone fired in me a fierce desire to fight in defense of my life and all at once I grew calm and controlled the rhythm of my body [...] I was facing someone whose situation was the exact opposite of mine" (31).

The drama of search and expectations builds up Hamed's certainty of a hostile condition. He is alone in the desert facing an unlikely situation, the moment of confrontation being inevitable; the enemy is armed, well trained, but is lost. Both Hamed and the enemy are reduced to ghosts in an expressionistic image of darkness and night. Hamed assumes his omnipotence by dominating his condition. He is able to take his enemy by surprise. A long soliloquy reveals the internal and external actions of the clash (34). Hamed attacks the enemy and disarms him. His clash with the Israeli soldier changes the

course of his life. The armed soldier represents the obstacle or the challenge Hamed has to overcome in order to assert his identity. The reversal of the human condition is elaborated in his recognition that “there’s something strange about that because only a few minutes ago everything in the universe was working to my disadvantage and I was rooted here surrounded by loss, so I’ve nothing to lose now” (36). In realizing his mission, Hamed now gives value to the killing and eliminating of his enemy. Glimpses of the past that includes his father, his mother, Salem and the perfidy of Zakaria - - all rush into the inescapable choice of slitting the throat of the enemy. As the mood changes in Hamed’s mind from love to hate or from attachment to detachment, the living act becomes an act of defiance. By attacking his enemy and captivating him, he proves to be of a brave heart. Thus, the real birth of light and independence necessitates a new stab of the outsider. By virtue of the distance that separates Hamed from his enemy, the initiation into action is assessed. The movement in distance is parallel to the advent of a new concept of time. Hamed becomes the pioneer in planting the new time of liberation from the enemies. Contrary to the traditional experience of the Palestinians and their inability to act, Hamed acts and faces the consequences courageously. The psychological rebirth of the will to fight the Israeli occupiers is exploited through Hamed’s perception of his tragic reality.

Both Quentin and Hamed converge at intersecting points on the human condition, the theme of honor and the incestuous feelings due to a rapidly changing condition. But they diverge in parallel lines: Quentin is not capable of liberating himself from the grip of the past or the culpability of his emotional link to Caddy. Crippled by his inertia, he chooses to escape from life. Hamed is in praxis-in action. By rejecting his past, his losses and the mechanicality of time, he is able to initiate the birth of a new condition.

The similarity between *The Sound and the Fury* and *What Is Left to You* is drawn closer through the journey motif. The journey Hamed takes involves him in occasional stops when he will be put in the position of a stranger and will himself be seen in a different light by the desert, by Mariam and by Zakaria. Moreover, the possibility of new experiences will reveal unexploited facets of Hamed.

In *What Is left to You*, the exploitation of Hamed's consciousness through his journey is the backbone of action. By the end of the journey, we feel that we have heard not only the story of the perilous mishaps he has faced but also the recollections of the other characters. The significant moments and the feelings which have grown from previous incidents form the crucial part of the quest. So, within the linear framework we have many excursions back into the past.

We also see the personalities of the characters revealed both in their reflections and habitual concerns, and in their reactions to the new challenges thrown up by the journey. Mariam, for instance, explores her true identity when Hamed commences his journey. She too trots the perilous path and assesses her status. She feels the intimacy with Zakaria before Hamed leaves. The moment Hamed slams the door, Mariam becomes psychologically tormented by shame or remorse. Later on she justifies her act by her refusal to wait for the decent dowry and the end of the cause. She faces her pregnancy and her condition as a second wife, but her isolation is made whole by Hamed's absence: "the room seemed hollow punctuated by the monotony of the clock which kept beating against the walls of my skull" (15). Zakaria tries to break the barrier of her isolation and offers his admiration as a sycophant: "your body is a fertile land, you little devil" (31). In another monologue he asks her to abort the embryo: "you will destroy your youth for him [...] you

will be a walking milk bottle” (15). Mariam’s journey into her battlefield renders Zakaria identical with the oppressors during her exodus from Jaffa. In her recollection of the scene of her departure, “All at once the smell of men spread out as I began relentlessly undulating up and down, rhythmically crushed beneath his shoulders, flung pushed [...] floating over a vortex of unconsciousness” (16). Highly charged with physical frailty and passive verbs, Mariam’s words reveal her passivity with respect to her relationship with Zakaria. Her mind reiterates the past when the instinct for protection and motherhood channels her action: “I’d be denying myself life if I allowed him to use me as a path between his school and her house” (33). She defines herself in new terms, and later supposes the gossip among the neighbors and feels like a lost bark “adrift like a sailor on a ship whose rudder has been smashed by the waves” (42). What adds insult to injury is Zakaria’s presence through his menacing words of an imminent divorce. In a cluster of violent actions she rushes to the kitchen, faces Zakaria and silences his threats.

Mariam’s life represents a unique experience within the political or cultural context of her condition. She shares many tendencies with Hamed, but alone intuits the mishap that faces him and the dilemma that confronts her. The journey binds both protagonists: Hamed is taken through distance and Mariam is taken through time. Allowing Kanafani to explore many avenues and throwing his characters into different perspectives, the journey justifies Mariam’s and Hamed’s development into emotional and political maturity.

Chapter Four

Conclusion

William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* and Ghassan Kanafani's *What Is Left to You* are two untraditional novels as regards both narrative structure and narrative technique. The first is a fragmentary narrative where characters recount individually their subjective view of their private life experience; the other novel is an intertwined narrative where voices of main characters overlap one another. This unorthodox narrative structure reflects the relativity of truth of human experience, leaving the total sum of the subjective points of view to provide a measure of objectivity. The function of the multiplicity of the subjective perspectives is to correct and evaluate one another through the agency of the reader's consciousness. This is why the collective vision is not exclusive to any character, thus inviting the reader to become the owner of the last point of view. The reader, as critic, is compelled to re-interfere in the re-construction of the human experience in a chronological order to build an evaluative point of view.

Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* and Kanafani's *What Is Left to You* break down the omniscient narration; hence, each character's point of view contributes the best of their ability to the "truth". This fragmentation of point of view necessitates the fragmentation of structure, providing different levels of thoughts, styles, and language. Thus, the philosophical justification for breaking down the narrative technique is that there is no absolute truth, which is the pinnacle of modernism. This technique is best revealed through the separate interior monologues which serve two functions: first, the central consciousness presents and defines itself to the reader; second, the narrative point of view illuminates the

sides of other characters, leaving the reader/critic with glimpses of ambivalent information on each character. In addition to the interior monologue, the literary style creates character attitudes, and since all the main characters in both novels are narrators, the reader/critic is left with an uneasy atmosphere of complexity. This complexity evokes a sense of the human condition which is founded on the co-existence of contradictions.

This modern human condition can be better understood in terms of post-structuralism. Post-structuralism rebuffs the belief in a coherent “self”; instead, any entity is made up of contradicting polarities whether in class, gender, or race. Accordingly, to interpret a complicated narrative like *The Sound and the Fury* or *What Is Left to You* a reader must reflect on his/her subjective meaning of self. At this point, the authorial intent, which is in deconstructive terminology a fictional construct, becomes secondary to the reader’s perception. This is how the literary text ceases to have a singular meaning or purpose since every reader would create a novel existence for a given literary text. Therefore, the sum of interpretations, regardless of their expected conflict, will establish the meaning of the text including the identity of the reader as critic.

This approach to textual reading substitutes the author for the reader in a process of “decentralization”, generating much efficacy for the text itself. Without resorting to authorial intent, analytic readings examine more backgrounds for meaning such as intertextuality and cultural norms. However, these sources never claim authority or constancy; they are always perceived as “alternative”. On this new semantic examination, Emmanuel Levinas states in his book *Humanism and the Other*:

Language refers to the position of the listener and the speaker, that is, to the contingency of their story. To seize by inventory all the contexts of language and all possible positions of interlocutors is a senseless task. Every verbal signification lies at the confluence of countless semantic rivers. Experience, like language, no longer seems to be made of isolated elements lodged somehow in a Euclidean space. [Words] signify from the "world" and from the position of one who is looking. (Levinas; 2003:11-12)

Thus, the only source of meaning left is contained by the text, entirely disconnected from the author's life or thoughts. In his "What's an Author?" Foucault speaks about authorship and how this concept is not solid since it "came into being" (Foucault, 1977: 101) and can be changed through readership. Foucault criticizes the perspective which authors are viewed through as heroes who can go beyond history. In his essay Foucault goes on to reflect on Roland Barthes' proclamation of the "death of the author" which urged several critics that they could "do without [the author] and study the work itself". In addition to Barthes, Foucault focuses on Jacques Derrida's reassignment of the author's privileges and shifting them to "writing" or to "language" (Foucault, 1977:105).

Throughout stressing Barthes' "death of the author" notion, Foucault questions the fate of any novel in case it is disconnected from its author, and at this stage he introduces the concept of the "author function". To illustrate, Foucault draws the distinction between the "author" and the "author function". The latter comprises beliefs or codes controlling the initiation and classification of texts. Foucault gives a concrete example to prove the authority that has been attributed to literary writers; literary critics and readers often search

for the “author” of a poem or a novel in contrast to scientific or even commercial productions. This is how the “author function” is more dominant in literary texts. At this point, Foucault discusses the difficulty of attributing a certain literary text to its author or not:

This problem may seem rather trivial, since most of the literary texts that we study have already been reliably attributed to an author. Imagine, however, a case in which a scholar discovered a long-forgotten poem whose author was completely unknown. Imagine, furthermore, that the scholar had a hunch that the author of the poem was William Shakespeare. What would the scholar have to do, what rules would she have to observe, what standards would she have to meet, in order to convince everyone else that she was right? (Foucault, 1977: 124)

Following on from this, Foucault suggests that the way to do without the “author function” is not well-paved since the reader/critic will always face a new “set of constraints” in any literary text. Comparatively, Bakhtin describes the life of literary texts as always at the stage of *becoming* since they “find themselves in continual mutual interaction” because readers with “differing time-spaces recreate and in so doing renew the text.”(Weinstein, 1989:11)

In brief, this study has attempted to decenter both William Faulkner and Ghassan Kanafani as authors although criticism has often regionalized these writers’ works and tainted them with a literary narrowcasting. Instead of simply consenting to themes such as

the Palestinian cause in the case of Kanafani or the Southern class disintegration in the case of Faulkner, this research has tried to show the dependence of one polarity on the other through deconstructing the narrative discourse in both *The Sound and the Fury* and *What Is Left to You*. Through a deconstructivist approach, the reader could lend Caddy Compson a voice rather than accept Faulkner's justification that she is "too beautiful" to narrate (Faulkner, 1959:1); the reader could also understand Hamed's rebellion and escape as his endeavor to disconnect from the female principle embodied in his absent mother and disgraceful sister rather than admit merely to the Palestinian resistance against Israel as an occupation force and a settlers' state in Palestine. Such an approach guarantees the "proliferation of meaning" which can never be achieved with the pro-Author interpretations (Foucault, 1984:111). However, this line of criticism will always have its inconsistencies since deconstruction emphasizes the unconscious structure that lies behind any work of art, which in turn instigates an insightful destabilization of our inherent hierarchy of concepts and themes. In effect, the exposure of contradictions and failures in a work of art will often start a novel perspective in opposition to a former one, leaving this work open to future examinations and unlimited by any critical constraints.

References

- Abbass, I. (1972). Bridges and relations in the fiction of Kanafani.
Shuun Filistinia, 13, 36-39.
- Azouqa, A. (2000). Ghassan Kanafani and William Faulkner : Kanafani's achievement in all that's left to you. *Journal of Arabic Literature*, 31, 147-170.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barthes, R. (1978). The death of the author. In S. Heath (Ed.), *Image, Music, Text* (pp. 142 – 148). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bleikasten, A. (1976). *The most splendid failure: Faulkner's the sound and the fury*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Blotner, J. M. (1977). *Selected letters of William Faulkner*. New York: Random House.
- Bowling, L. (1958). Faulkner and the theme of innocence. *Kenyan Review*, 20, 466-487.
- Brooks, C. (1963). *The Yoknapatawpha country*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Chabrier, G. (1993). *Faulkner's families: A southern saga*. New York: Gordian.

- Chakovsky, S. (1984). Word and idea in the sound and the fury. In D. Fowler & A. J. Abadie (Eds.), *New directions in Faulkner studies* (pp. 283 - 301). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Chase, R. (1978). *The american novel and its tradition*. New York: Gordian.
- Cohen, P. & Fowler, D. (1996). Using Faulkner's introduction to teach the sound and the fury. In S. Hahn & A. F. Kinney (Eds.), *Approaches to teaching Faulkner's the sound and the fury* (pp.275-278). New York: MLA.
- Cowley, M. (1966). *The Faulkner- Cowley file: Letters and memories, 1944-1962*. New York: Viking.
- Darraj, F. (1992). الثورة ودلالة الموت [The Revolution and the Signification of Death]. Beirut: Al Adab.
- Darraj, F. (1992). دلالات العلاقة الروائية [The Significations of the Novelistic Discourse]. Damascus: Dar Kanaan.
- Davis, T. (1995). Reading Faulkner's Compson appendix: Writing history from the margins. In D. M. Kartiganer & A. J. Abadie (Eds.), *Faulkner and ideology* (pp. 238). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Donaldson, S. V. (1991/92). Reading Faulkner reading Cowley reading Faulkner: Authority and gender in the Compson appendix. *Faulkner Journal*, 7, 27- 41.
- Faulkner, P. (1990). *Modernism*. London: Routledge.
- Faulkner, W. (1987). *The Sound and the fury*. New York: Vinatge.
- Faulkner, W. (1966). *Appendix*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1984). What is an author? In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 111-119). New York: Pantheon.

- Gidley, M. (1987). Explanations as composition: Faulkner's public comments on his fiction. In M. Gresset & K. Ohashi (Eds.), *Faulkner: After the nobel prize* (pp. 260- 281).Kyoto, Japan: Yamaguchi.
- Godden, R. (1997). *Fictions of labor: William Faulkner and the south's long revolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Irwin, J. (1975). *Doubling and incest*. Baltimore : Hopkins.
- Iser, W. (1974). *The implied reader: Patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Kanafani, G. (1966). *What Is left to you*. Beirut: Arab Researchers Press.
- Khalil, K. E. (1989). *The symbol in Kanafani's fiction*. Cyprus: Sharq Press.
- Lester, C. (1987). To market, to market: The portable Faulkner. *Criticism*, 29, 372-375.
- Lodge, D. (1998). *20th century literary criticism*. London: Longman.
- Lukacs, G. (1981). R. L. Stone (Ed.), *Essay on realism*. Cambridge : Massachusetts.
- Matthews, J. (1982). *The play of Faulkner's language*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Matthews, J. (1989). The rhetoric of containment in Faulkner. In L. Honnighausen (Ed.), *Faulkner's discourse: An international symposium* (pp. 56). Tubingen,Germany: M.Niemeyer.
- Meriwether, J. (1970). The textual history of the sound and the fury. In J. Meriwether (Ed.), *The merrill studies in the sound and the fury* (pp. 28). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

- Millgate, M. (1966). *The achievement of William Faulkner*. New York: Random House.
- Novak, P. (1996). Meaning, mourning, and the form of modern narrative: The inscription of loss in Faulkner's *the sound and the fury*. *Faulkner Journal*, 12, 87.
- Parker, R. D. (1986). The chronology and genealogy of *absalom, absalom*: The authority of fiction and the fiction of authority. *Studies in American Fiction*, 14, 193.
- Pizer, D. (1960). *Realism and naturalism in nineteenth century american literature*. Illinois: Illinois University Press.
- Raleigh, J. (1969). *Eugene O'Neill: The man and his works*. London: Forum House.
- Roger, A. (1972). *The arabic novel: An historical and critical introduction*. N.Y: Syracuse: University Press.
- Saddiq, M. (1984). *Man is a cause: Political consciousness in the fiction of Ghassan Kanafani*. Washington: University Press.
- Saiid, K. (1977). *حركية الإبداع: دراسات في الأدب العربي الحديث* [The Mechanism of Innovation: Modern Arabic Literature Studies]. Beirut : Dar al Audi.
- Schwartz, L. H. (1988). *Creating Faulkner's reputation: The politics of modern literary criticism*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Strong, B. (1973). Toward a history of the experimental family: Sex and incest in the nineteenth century family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 457-485.

- Stoicheff, P. (1992). Between originality and indebtedness: Allegories of authorship in William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*. *Modern Language Quarterly*, 53, 453.
- Sundquist, E. (1991). *Faulkner: The house divided*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Taylor, W. (1996). The Compson appendix as an aid to teaching *The Sound and the Fury*. In S. Hahn & A. F. Kinney (Eds.), *Approaches to teaching Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury* (pp. 67). New York: MLA.
- Thompson, L. (1963). *William Faulkner*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Vickery, O. (1959). *The novels of William Faulkner*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Volpe, E. (1964). *A reader's guide to Faulkner*. New York: Farrar.
- Wadlington, W. (1987). *Reading Faulknerian tragedy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Weinstein, P. M. (1986). *Meditations on the other: Faulkner's rendering of Women*. In D. Fowler & A. J. Abadie (Eds.), *Faulkner and women* (pp. 81-99). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Weinstein, P. (1989). Thinking I was I was not who was not was not who: The vertigo of Faulknerian identity. In D. Fowler & A. J. Abadie (Eds.), *Faulkner and the craft of fiction: Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha* (pp. 188). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Yager, R.F. (1993). Driven by guilt. *Mediaevalia: A Journal of Medieval Studies*, 16, 82-85.