

T.C.
İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

DOKTORA TEZİ

TAINTED ART:
THE REFLECTION OF
THE DEFECTIVE FUNCTION OF ART
IN THE ENGLISH NOVEL
AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

FERAH YAZICI İNCESU
ÖĞRENCİ NO: 2502990140

TEZ DANIŞMANI:
PROF. DR. ZEYNEP ERGUN

İSTANBUL 2007

ÖZ

Çalışmanın konusu, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrası İngiliz romanında sanatın kötücül algılanışı, işlevi ve kullanımının çizilişidir. Kötücül kavramı burada noksan, yetersiz ve yıkıcı anlamlarına karşılık olarak düşünülmüştür.

Savaş sonrasında günümüze uzanan yaklaşık altmış yıllık bir sürede ilk, orta ve son dönemlerden birer roman, dönem temsilcisi iddiası olmaksızın, ele alınarak sanatın çağdaş İngiliz toplumundaki işlevi ve işleyişinin çeşitli alan ve açılardan romana yansımaları izlenmeye çalışılmaktadır.

Kingsley Amis'in **Lucky Jim** (1954), John Fowles'un **The Magus** (1977) ve Ian McEwan'ın **Atonement** (2001) romanları, seçilen konunun tezde irdelendiği metinlerdir.

Çalışma, giriş olarak tarihsel süreçte dikkat çeken, devam eden veya değişip dönüşen sanat anlayışlarını sergiler ve sanatın öngörülen, var sayılan, uygulamalardaki işlevlerine yönelik bir gözden geçirme yaparak, art alan değerlendirmesi sunar. Girişi izleyen üç bölümde tarihsel sıralama ile metinlerin çözümlemesine ve tez konusu açısından yorumlanmasına geçilir. Konu incelenirken metinler arasında ortaya çıkan kıyaslama ve karşıtlamalar yapılacaktır. Romanların seçilen tez konusu bağlamındaki irdelenme ve yorumlanmasında, okur odaklı eleştirel yaklaşım yöntemi uygulanmış, kuramcı ve eleştirmenlerin yapıtlar hakkındaki görüşlerinin derlenip değerlendirilmesi yerine, metinlerin yakın okunması yöntemine ağırlık verilmiştir. Geçmiş dönemlerde daha baskın olan, sanatın yapıcı işlevi yerine, günümüz Batı kültüründe üzerine daha vurgu yapılan sanatın yansıttığı kötücüllüğü fikri bağlamında, romanların yakın okumalarının, bir insan eylem ve ürünü olarak sanatın yetersiz, bozuk veya zararlı işleyişini vurgulayışlarına bakılmaktadır.

Çağdaş toplumdaki çözülme ve olumlu, yapıcı, sağlıklı iletişim ve etkileşimden yoksunlaşma eğiliminin, sanata bakış ve sanatı kullanım üzerindeki koşut etkisinin araştırılıp tezde sergilenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to explore the reflection in the English novel after the Second World War the abuse and misuse of art, its inverted, depraved and depraving, unhealthy function and its distorted reception and conceptualisation.

Analysing one novel from the first, middle and recent periods of the approximately sixty years after the Second World War, though they are not labelled as representative, the study displays in various aspects and contexts the manifestations in the novel of the function and working of art in contemporary British society.

The three novels in which the subject matter will be researched and discussed are: **Lucky Jim** by Kingsley Amis (1954), **The Magus** by John Fowles (1977) and **Atonement** by Ian McEwan (2001).

The study first presents a chronological survey of understandings of art, and its supposedly prevailing, predicted and practised functions, which survive or transform in time. Following this introductory section, the texts are studied in chronological order and interpreted with respect to the subject matter of the thesis. In the analysis the possible comparisons and contrasts will emerge between the works. Adopting reader-response critical approach, in the interpretation of the novels within the context of the given subject matter of the thesis, the method of a close reading of the texts is applied rather than evaluating the theoreticians' and critics' views and comments. The inefficient, faulty and harmful functions of art as an act and product of mankind suggest an idea of evil art prevailing in contemporary Western culture instead of earlier constructive ideas and uses observed in the studies of art.

The study is to present the parallel effect on the idea and use of art of the tendency in contemporary society to dissolve and to be deprived of regenerative and healthy communication and interaction.

FOREWORD

Art, as a man-made phenomenon, has been loaded with various meanings, functions and missions like other human creations, concepts and institutions in Western thought. In time definitions, roles and perceptions of art modify. As a human construction, act and product, art is a used entity and work. Mainly as a functioning entity, it has carried a positive meaning, a constructive status, even a distinguishing or elevating force. As a practical circumstance or an abstract sphere, it has mostly referred to such usefulness and constructiveness. At times, still, it has been possible to find depreciative and negative associations with it. Yet, we can indicate that after the Second World War, especially in the period which focuses intellectually on the mass culture and consummation society, in other words, in the so-called postmodern times, the evil, problematic, defective or destructive potential of art come to the foreground more than the previously emphasised views on it. Its practical aspect, use value, moral impregnation and idealisation continue as in the precedent times. Anyhow, in contemporary thought, the malfunctions and dysfunctions of art are more prevalent and questioned, discussed and explored more frequently than the topics of its beneficence and exaltation.

This dissertation aims to question and explore this modification and digression in the perception and evaluation of art in recent times as to be found in a form of art, the novel. Some examples of the English novel after the Second World War appear to carry the same depreciative, negating, questioning or suspicious attitude towards art. While conditions of life and ways of the world get more complex under the influence and use of high technology, mass production and mass culture, healthy communication and relation between human beings, and man's constructive connection with the outside world and nature get harder and harder to achieve. Art is one of the sites revealing these human deficiencies, faults and frailties. In such an environment art is also damaged, blemished and faulty. Man's association with, position in, perception of and use of art get more problematic and distressing.

Lucky Jim, **The Magus** and **Atonement** obliquely reflect this negativity and demystification of art. **Lucky Jim** shows the abuse of art in human relations and in social hierarchy. **The Magus** reveals the dysfunction of art, questions its moral function, reveals its affinity with the privileged class and material powers and discloses its fluxes through the ordinary world inducing tantalisation, confusion and depression. **Atonement** also undermines the conventional exaltation and powers of art. The idea of immortality and revival through the stability and continuation in the frozen realm of art are questioned and negated.

I am extremely grateful to all the members of the supervising committee, Professor Esra Melikoğlu, Professor Sibel Irzik, and especially to my supervisor Professor Zeynep Ergun, for their great understanding and tolerance of my recurrent personal obligations.

CONTENTS

Öz	iii
Abstract	iv
Foreword	v
Contents	vii
Introduction	1
1. Modified Perceptions, Uses and Functions of Art	6
2. Art as a Tool in Social Clashes: Lucky Jim	28
3. Life as Art, Art as Lessons in Life: The Magus	60
4. Fragility of Art as Historicised History: Atonement	77
Conclusion	100
Bibliography	104
CV	107

INTRODUCTION

The present study aims to explore the reflection in the English novel after the Second World War the abuse and misuse of art, its inverted, depraved and depraving, unhealthy function and its distorted reception and conceptualisation.

Analysing one novel from the first, middle and recent periods of the approximately sixty years after the Second World War, though they are not labelled as representative, the study displays in various aspects and contexts the manifestations in the novel of the function and working of art in contemporary British society.

The three novels in which the subject matter will be researched and discussed are: **Lucky Jim** by Kingsley Amis (1954), **The Magus** by John Fowles (1977) and **Atonement** by Ian McEwan (2001).

These texts constitute the scope of the study with a view that in these renowned works written and published in different periods or dates after the Second World War, the topic of the thesis is treated with artistic sensibilities and qualities, and that, taken into consideration collectively, they portray various aspects of the issue of unhealthy use of art and its dysfunction.

In this way, the subject matter of the thesis, conceptualisations, receptions and evaluations of art in contemporary British society, treatments of these in the novel, will be researched and analysed in social, political, individualistic and psychological contexts. It is aimed that these various points serve a depth and extension in the study. Consequently, in the analysis of **Lucky Jim** it will be seen that in an academic sphere, in an institution of education, in a circle which is accepted to be refined and qualified as “superior”, art and culture are still used in an unhealthy, distorted way, and loaded with a mission to make and call some individuals unworthy and to suppress them in society. Art becomes a tool in the clashes between the social classes. In the text we see that the romantic conceptualisation of art, that is, its elevating and exalting aspect, its humanising effect, its moral power, and its potential to refine and strengthen human understanding, perception and sympathy, is all questioned and undermined. People

related with and interested in art are neither morally superior nor intellectually more efficient. Thus, art and the social conditions and formations connected with it or feeding its production and reception are demystified and criticised. In this novel, socially conditioned and defined forms and types of art are emphasised. Within the socio-economic system of society a discrimination between types and styles of art has emerged or rather been formed in time. Power centres in society, the dominant classes, holding cultural discourse and intellectual conventions in their hands, also have used art to stratify and shape society and culture in general. Relevantly, in the book high art and low art concepts are underlined. They are accordingly associated with the relevant segments of society. High art is high brow art associated with upper classes, privileged, moneyed classes, which are supposedly socially, economically, intellectually and “thus” morally superior whereas low art is low brow art related with underprivileged, disadvantaged lower classes, which are economically in short of money, presumably socially unrefined, intellectually less developed and crude, and “thus” morally coarse and open to degenerate. In the novel, through the prominent middle-class figure, it is pointed that the dominant classes, the middle classes, impose one type and description of art, that is, solely “high art” forms are regarded as art. In this way, people who associate themselves with “low-brow” art are subjected to despising and humiliation. **Lucky Jim** furthers its indication of social defects and problematic social approaches. The book also points to the course art has begun to take in the period after the Second World War and foreshadows the overlapping and approaching of these two poles of art in the so-said postmodern period. Yet, this note also implies dissolution and negativity as this modification of the art world discloses a deficiency and faultiness. Thus, on the one hand Amis’s novel obliquely repeats and reveals the deep roots of the established conceptualisations of art and, on the other hand it exposes their wicked and futile sides.

In **The Magus** the focus will be transferred to the possible metaphysical dimension in the function and treatment of art. Problems and perversion in the relationship and communication between individuals that come out by means of an unhealthy, defective view of the conceptualisation of art in the prevailing culture, and an existential burden and distress as a consequence of loading a human being

with the function of and definition of a work of art, that is, the degenerating effect of art in individualistic and psychological terms will be analysed. The novel will question the representative and expressive power of art and its concomitant evil, perverse potential. The text promises to be a site in which consequences of uniting the power of art with the power of money, particularly blending the freedom of action and realisation of whims, can be examined. **The Magus** explores the borders and overlaps between reality, mundaneness, ordinariness and unreality, presumption, fantasy. The work points to their association. Yet, such an association induces restlessness, confusion and degeneration rather than rehabilitation, complacency and force. In the novel art and its creative, redefining power are seen as attractive and influential, expansive and stimulating, instructive and moralising. But, these characteristics and powers sour; more than its refining and exalting and humanising aspects, its evil sides are emphasised and brought to the foreground. Attraction turns into seduction, influence into abuse, expansion into exile, stimulation into conditioned reflex, instruction into deception and moralising into whim. Though art is made a tool in a sophisticated and metaphysical scheme and also presumably with a moral cause, it both corrupts and dysfunctions. The novel shows art and the artist failing. **The Magus** is a contradictory and comprehensive text, which contain and displays ambiguous and paradoxical qualities, potentials and effects. Art also generates a way to escape limitation, reality, ordinariness and dullness, yet this escape might also produce the same effects and results. Expansion refers to a kind of confinement. In the work concepts of certainty, security and stability are also shaken. Ingenuity and novelty, the two anticipated requirements of art, constitute the means of nightmare and trapping. The text carries the inference that the deviation, distortion and unhealthiness in the understanding and use of art parallel the dissolution and dissatisfaction in the individual's character, outlook and tendencies. In **The Magus**, as one of human phenomena, art highlights human deficiency and destructiveness in communication, relation and creation.

Atonement draws the focus on the possible reasons and capacities of art for all these inefficiencies, malfunctions, frailties, imperfection, failure and destructiveness. The text discloses many factors and potentialities embedded into art, the work of art, and inevitably the artist behind art and the work, who is the first

mover or the first cause as s/he executes the act of creating and puts forward the product. As the text simultaneously highlights its both fictional and real makers while it suggests a revelation of the creative process and the creative drive, the audience witnesses the inevitable human factor behind the practice and outcome of art. In one respect, as a fallen being, in another respect, as having capabilities for unreality, untruth, which are closely related with self interest and imposition pointing to relativity, humankind also distorts, corrupts and taints art as practice and as production. The final novel in this selection adds a last, summarising explanatory accent to the discussion of the topic. The artist both in his/her act and in his/her product becomes an epitome of the imperfect individual, community and culture. The relations between reality, the mundane world and art, an alternative realm are pointed out. Like **The Magus**, **Atonement** emphasises the reshaping and redefining powers of art. In an allusion to the traditional and romantic conceptualisation of art, the novel refers to the immortalising and reviving qualification of art. These seem in connection with constructiveness and positiveness. Yet, the text shows the dead point of artistic resurrection. It is eternity and ultimate death simultaneously. It is a life-in-death situation. Thus, the artist of McEwan's text is another failing figure. The professional writer in the book attempts to atone for a moral fault or one of the deadly sins in religious terms via her art. She takes on the mission of re-bearing a dead couple, the two lovers she has betrayed and destroyed owing to her imaginative power in the real life within the fictional world. She wants to atone for her previous imaginative performance through her recent imaginative construction. Yet, as in **The Magus**, artistic creativity and extents of art and the artist are all tainted and result in failure. Thus, even the practice and outcome of the artist turn into self-deception and self-delusion. Also in this text, art constitutes another field of dysfunction in human sympathy and communication.

The study containing these given three novels will first present a chronological survey of understandings of art, and its supposedly prevailing, predicted and practised functions, which survive or transform in time. Following this introductory section, the texts will be studied in chronological order and interpreted with respect to the subject matter of the thesis. In the analysis the possible comparisons and contrasts will be made between the works. As an exemplification of

the reader response criticism and reception theory, in the study and interpretation of the novels within the context of the given subject matter of the thesis, the method of a close reading of the texts is applied rather than collecting and evaluating the theoreticians' and critics' views and comments on the texts. However, the emphasis of the close reading of the novels on the inefficient, faulty and harmful functions of art as an act and product of mankind will be noted in concordance with the prevalence of the evil that art reflects in the cultural level instead of its constructive workings, which are observed in the studies of art.

The study is to research and present the parallel effect on the view and use of art of the tendency in contemporary society to dissolve and to be deprived of regenerative and healthy communication and interaction. Though through ages intellectuals, artists and people had pondered on and discussed the negative, inadequate examples of art and its such uses as well as its constructive, regenerative uses and qualities, the emphasis is being put on the malfunctions of art and we come across the examples of this maltreatment in the English novel more frequently after the Second World War. The effect of the last collective war upon Western thought and culture, theories and criticism of culture and art produced after the 1970's, the examinations and views about free market, high capitalism, high industrialism, high technology, mass media, mass market, mass art, strengthening individualism, man's increasing loneliness and self isolation in an age of greater availability of knowledge and communication, the dissolution of the previous social patterns, strict social structure and class strata both have produced a more expansive, comprehensive, flexible, relative human world and culture, and have increased social and individual anxieties and deviations. Art as a human product, tool and sphere both reveals these vulnerabilities and unfolds its vulnerability and defects in such environments and conditions. It is tainted. Both the maker's hands and the audience's gaze p/taint art.

1. MODIFIED PERCEPTIONS, USES AND FUNCTIONS OF ART

The meaning, definition, function and effect of art have been explored, constructed and expressed in the West with different aspects and scopes since the times of Plato. On art and aesthetics, conceptualisation of art, art people, artists and people associated with artistic creation in its various phases, philosophers and intellectuals pondered and pronounced more intensively in some periods. Besides, as Noël Carroll summarises (Carroll, ed. , 2000: 3), thinking and professing on art and aesthetics has become an extensive and autonomous field through the 1970s to 1980s, and constitutes a literature of its own. This affluent field of contemplation and study carries the head topic and name art theory. As well as the sources and ideas of this contemporary accumulation, a general and backstage survey is to be related with a prevalent sensibility of the English novel after the Second World War, the impotent and destructive functionalisation of art.

It is ironic and questioning of the novel of this period that a phenomenon or concept associated with performance and activity, or production and creation is presented or suggested in a negated context or as dysfunction or to be destructive. Etymologically, the English word “art” stands for the Greek word “techne” and the Latin “ars”, and it basically means making (Shiner, 2001: 19). Larry Shiner, in his book **The Invention of Art: A Cultural History**, explores the historical transformation in the meaning and cultural use of the word, and follows in detail the social split in the conceptualisation and practice of art in the West. Throughout the book he explains an old system and a modern system of art, their social grounds, their social meanings, and their execution and requirements. He consequently takes into account anti-art and points to its assimilation into the modern system of art as a style (Part V). On the field of art, processes of questioning, negation and contradiction to art as an established concept and institution also acquire and take over the role and function of art executed. Thus, as to its historical basis, art or some art movements in the claim of anti-ness and antithesis still carry a sense of performance and fulfilment, an effect of action and activeness. Simultaneously, it is

possible to find in the post-war English novel organically embedded concerns and ideas about a nullification or inefficiency of the concept and practice of art.

When we take into consideration the constructive and generative aspect of the conceptualisation of art, which was prevalent in the earlier periods alongside its continuing examples in the contemporary times, its destructive and negating appearance is emphatic and frequent in the English novel after the Second World War. Art is a human phenomenon; a human activity, human-made and a human construction. This characteristic of creation presents and promotes it as something positive and fulfilling. Since art works are embodiments which come into being out of nothing, in other words before they are materialised or produced, there was no such thing at hand or before the addressee, they have a stand to bear the essential requirement of creation, they seem to epitomise creation. As there is a great gap, a big difference between void, nothingness and being, creation, art as mental and physical phenomena reflects a positive quality, a condition of achievement. Its output as production, creation also resembles and alludes to religious creation and godly power and might. In the Bible the earth and earthly life was generated by God out of nothing. The Bible begins with the book Genesis and tells this story of creation and beginning (of existence) as the word itself comes to mean. Biblical genesis and artistic genesis have parallelism in that way. As the life of an art work begins when it comes to exist, the genesis, beginning metaphor is suitable for its status. At the same time, as the art work is strongly associated with the origin, originality, the first idea, like the first cause, God in the Bible, genesis in the sense of beginning is spontaneously related. The interrelation, counteracts, and reactions between the art movements, artistic trends and styles, and the idea of intertextuality in recent times, can also be connected with and symbolically referred to genesis, beginning. An art work or an artist may activate a chain process; as a style is followed by others in their production of art, or an artistic tradition can begin after the first examples, the first productions, or an art work and artist can trigger counteracts, counter reactions, contradictions or digressions and diversions. Even if art and the art work are taken into consideration on the level of craft, in the sense of competent execution with or without a touch of brilliance or ingenuity, in accordance with Larry Shiner's diagnosis of historical shift in the meaning and cultural reference of art and the work

of art, such art and art works are still embodiments against annihilation and nothingness or nonexecution. Both as the unique, individual production in the craft, and as the first sample of a series, one can still use the metaphor of biblical genesis for such art and works. The former is in parallelism with the creation of the individual and the beginning of individual life, and the latter is in parallelism with the creation and origination of a species. These formations and states of art and art works all stand as a positive value, as something fulfilled, as construction and regeneration facing and standing against nonexistence, unfulfilment or destruction. The idea and concretisation of art carry the illusion of positivity and acquisition or appreciation, and this is against the relevant opposite concepts of negation and negativity or dissolution and failure. In the English novel after the Second World War a focusing on and examination of this illusion and its negation are prevalent and noteworthy.

As a human-made phenomenon, art cannot strip off human vision and evaluation, human measurements and human change. Its definition, meaning and features change as the human world, society and vision transform. Since, unlike scientific fields of research, it is not something solely mathematical and concrete and easy to assess, defining it and indicating standardised features are problematic, and explaining its meaning is elusive and changeable from period to period and from society to society. Yet, as many attempts have been made to do these, there are various suggestions and theories. Some twentieth-century thinkers, like Morris Weitz and William Kennick, even declare that art is indefinable (Carroll, ed., 2000: 3). Alongside the accompanying difficulties, changeability and multiplicity, it is possible to trace down prominent viewpoints and evaluative tenets, effective in long-term periods or as individual approaches, or temporarily effective. Meanwhile, acknowledging incidental questioning and critical views and acts, approximately up to the First World War, art had been basically and prevalently regarded as a positive human phenomenon or an approvable or integral social function. This view and its applications continued also after that period; yet like the flourishing in the art theory field, stirrings, critical gazes and scepticism have not ended. The English novel of the contemporary period grasps these and discloses them embedding in the texts of the topic.

The reasons for the long continuance in the positive perception of art and its integral place in human mind and society may seem to depend on not so pertinent issues. Analysis of other aspects of the topic thus can be facilitated. Larry Shiner's pronouncement in **The Invention of Art: A Cultural History** about the shift in the meaning and scope of the word art is also explanatory about the long-standing perception of art functioning. Shiner professes that in Europe in the eighteenth century art began to come to denote fine arts that people conventionally understand today whereas beforehand the term was inclusive and extensive relating traditional crafts and general human production and ability (5). He expresses this conclusive polarity:

But in the eighteenth century a fateful division occurred in the traditional concept of art. After over two thousand years of signifying any human activity performed with skill and grace, the concept of art was split apart, generating the new category fine arts (poetry, painting, sculpture, architecture, music) as opposed to crafts and popular arts (shoemaking, embroidery, storytelling, popular songs, etc.). . . . But this historic change of meaning became difficult to remember after nineteenth-century usage dropped the adjective "fine" and spoke only of art versus craft or art versus entertainment or art versus society. (5)

Obviously, though this differentiation in category occurred in the matter of regarding human abilities and undertakings, common view on them and their common functionalisation remained. Art still has carried the quality, the state it shares with crafts. In root it is making. Thus, it evokes a sense of integrity and success, drawing a role and response of approval. In this Christian culture, alongside the mistrust about the rivalry against God in the act of creating, also as a godly bestowal and as a divine inheritance art as creation was good. In Genesis following each creative step, it is affirmed that it was good. Also as a Christian moral tenet working, doing something, attempting, diligence is highly regarded in opposition to idleness and vain pastimes. Art and producing art thus have been given a moral dimension and a quality of goodness, from which the audience are also expected to benefit.

As in its etymological root shared by craft, art is concrete and practical in its produced objects and states. In a historical perspective, as Shiner indicates (Part I,

II), up to the eighteenth century in Europe art mainly had been an issue of social practicality, a particular work. Richard Harland's indication about literature, as his scope is focused on it, is also parallel to this socio-historical fact; Harland reminds that in the ancient world literature was tied to specific social occasions (1). Similarly, E. H. Gombrich, in **The Story of Art**, states that

what we call "works of art" are not the result of some mysterious activity, but objects made by human beings for human beings. . . . originally they were made to be touched and handled, they were bargained about, quarrelled about, worried about. . . . For most of the paintings and statues which are now strung up along the walls of our museums and galleries were not meant to be displayed as Art. They were made for a definite occasion and a definite purpose which were in the artist's mind when he set to work.
(1978:12-3)

This kind of transaction among the artist, the client, the task, the finished work - the work of art and the audience generates a sense of tangibility, completeness and fulfilment.

In the past, senses of substantiality, reality and triumph about art works were operating multidimensional. Though the art object or an artistic happening is a substantial phenomenon, which can be evaluated or interacted in terms of its internal dynamics, its peculiar realm of existence, its distinctive qualities and its formal or compositional features, the audience can also load it with or regard it through dimensions, purposes, approaches and criteria external to it. The art work's compliance with these external expectations or tasks also engendered a sense of concreteness and positivity in those earlier centuries. This kind of compliance is the use and/or benefit dimension of art in those times. The work of art, like craft works, was something to use or function in daily use or in public life, by an individual or the public or relevant people. As much as the subtle and skilful qualities of the work of art, its accomplishment of the task and purpose asked and its socially well functioning were important. An administrator's order of a construction or painting, or Shakespeare's "changeable scripts for popular performance" (Shiner, 2001: 4), or music played by groups for tavern audience, or later tableaux as shop signs carried and fulfilled this dimension and need of usefulness and everyday functionality.

Contemporary inclusions of tribal societies' daily instruments and social objects into art museums also point to the modern acknowledgment of this mundane side of art. With the same enhanced sensitivity towards depreciated and scorned groups of people, "women's art", embroidery and quilting are exhibited in art museums and galleries at the end of the twentieth century. The objects which were once of the topics of ethnography and anthropology museums are submitted their artistic value while unfolding the practical side of art and art's possible close connection to life and daily experience.

In the past the use value and useful side of art and art products were not matters to depreciate and externalise from the conceptualisation and evaluation of art. As it is making, this aspect was taken for granted and regarded integral. Shiner notes that "In the ancient world, calling an activity "an art" carried the kind of prestige that calling something "a science" does today." (2001:22-3) For a long period, fields and activities of knowledge, study and research, and creativity which are contemporarily regarded and termed as sciences, branches of knowledge or sports or social activities were knowledge/art/activity categories. In the late Hellenistic and Roman times there was a division of the arts as the liberal (free) and the vulgar (servile). The former were intellectual and appropriate to the highborn and the educated, and the latter depended more on physical labour and/or payment. The verbal and the mathematical arts grouped in the first category. There were education systems of trivium (logic, grammar, rhetoric) and quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music theory). In a third category there were mixed (intermediate) arts which included medicine, agriculture, mechanics, navigation and gymnastics. To this category the visual arts and musical practice were sometimes added and these were sometimes considered as servile arts. By the ninth century the meaning of "mechanics" had broadened to include all the manual arts. By the twelfth century the categorisation was modified. Philosophy and physics were the theoretical arts; politics and ethics were the practical arts. Meanwhile, the vulgar/servile arts were termed the mechanical arts. The mechanical arts were also constituted by weaving, armament, commerce, agriculture, hunting, medicine and theatrics. In the Renaissance the categorisation of art and knowledge was modified again. The new grouping, the *studia humanitatis* covered up grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history and

moral philosophy together. In the seventeenth century music began to be regarded like rhetoric and poetry. In the period painting, sculpture and architecture were considered as liberal arts. Still, in the seventeenth century poetry, painting, music and other arts were seen as serving useful functions such as: instruction, prestige, accompaniment, decoration, diversion. In all these processes of division and categorisation, and these hierarchical orders of the branches of knowledge and art, the aim and function of usefulness were basically a priority. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries some paintings and sculptures were acquired and appreciated for their own sake by a tiny élité. Yet, this was still a rare occasion and an issue of the affluent and educated minority. Whether handled with concerns of utility or affirmed for its own sake, art primarily occasioned a state of integrity and satisfaction.

As vehicles and areas of utility and societal life these arts were strongly connected with social realities, and class resources and hierarchies (in the way we find in contemporary society). Thus even in the very earlier periods there were hierarchies in the categorisation of art and an affinity between art categories and class divisions.

In the earlier periods art, as a human issue, was also connected with class matters and realities. Music played in open areas or in taverns, or objects used in mundane life were benefited by common people and by a type of majority, various art works existed or survive because an authority asked their composition. Members of upper classes in each society and every period put art into use for their personal and authoritative benefit and benefited also from art's and art works' social and public effectiveness and force. The person who suggested or created the occasions, purposes and places for the art work is termed "patron". In the earlier periods, the work of art materialised before the client, before the patron, the person who asked the artist to make it and/or provided conditions and necessities for its composition.

Contemporary culture has inherited the division and discrimination between high art and low art, high brow art and low brow art, elite culture and popular culture, art and mere recreation, from the earlier centuries, that is, from accumulative culture, settling ways of thinking and living system, and institutionalised approaches and practices. From the very early forms of human communities, there has been

stratification among the components and members of society. This construction based on class in a strict or more flexible sense also engenders a classification of human activities, ways and styles of living, and of every component of human life and culture. Art and artistic activities have been also subjected to this discriminating and hierarchical order. Still, these different formations and practices function within their pertinent realms and concerned class and culture, and have an operative role. We can discern this functional and beneficial quality of art and art works in the past both before and after the art concept was divided between fine arts and crafts/popular entertainment.

In the earlier styles of human societies, human beings lived a more collective life in a stricter sense of the word. In contemporary culture, after the Second World War, there is a terminology of masses, mass culture, mass production and mass art. But these masses do not have to exist quantitatively in time and place to be active or to function. Even within isolated or distanced individual realms they can still act in a collective manner, in similar activities. Contemporary advancements in technology could provide individuals with individual but very realistic copies of mass art, for example. A young student, a housewife or a building worker in the West can buy high-quality musical devices, like MP3 players or i-pods; they, in mini dimensions and by themselves, can consume popular or classical music very akin to the original production or concert standards, which might bring many people together. Likewise, one person or a few people together may watch a popular or classical play in the DVD format in their flat, even with their personal home theatre system, producing the stage light and acoustics.

Yet, in earlier cultures and livings, human beings used, consumed and experienced an art work or activity in a communal way, physically coming together. Initially, even different classes were gathering in the same place for the same activities, also owing to the integral state of arts, to the undivided state of fine arts and crafts/entertainment. In the Greek amphitheatre and Roman stadium, common people, upper-class people, administrative authorities and even the emperor together attended to tragedies, oratories, artistic competitions, sportive games and various rituals. In the ancient times artistic activities were also part of religious and social activities. The Greeks and the Romans contributed artistic production, tragedies,

religious songs, masquerades, also competition for them to their religious festivals, celebrations for national, military triumphs and conquests, and exaltations of their rulers and emperors. Art was an organic component of life, of social and public life and served social unity and accord among various classes. It functioned for social integrity and for the pride and prestige of the rulers and the state.

Christianity, which replaced the pagan worship, also became a social factor to put art in use. To exalt this time the Christian God art works were produced. The Christian temples, churches, were furnished by frescoes and later by sculptures to narrate, teach and promote biblical history. The constructions themselves in the Middle Ages substantiated the aspiration to reach divinity. This constituted a new architectural style, the gothic. The attendants to the churches, cathedrals and also the passerbyes thus were made consumers of art. People inside and outside the religious building were possible beneficiaries of art. The religious and administrative authorities exploited the influential power of art to channel people's exuberance and need to depend on something to an area which would supposedly pacify and discipline. Not only decorative and narrative arts were activated in construction field, but also vehicles of religion were sometimes endowed with artistic traits. Very aesthetic crosses, rosaries, furbished bibles, even sometimes with precious stones were produced. Creating beautiful religious objects, art works on another level, was considered as acknowledging and exalting the goodness and beauty of the divine power and the possible beatitude and heavenly bliss of the other world. Likewise, religious plays, like miracle plays and morality plays, representing biblical stories and religious precepts, served to strengthen people's contact with religion and elucidate religious morality for them. These plays were performed in open places for people to gather during religious festivals and special days. Special effects and mechanisms were also employed to demonstrate miracles and holiness. All the community attended to these performances.

With the advances in secularisation and prosperity, and their related practices and institutions, art, production of art and consummation of art began to be individualised. Art certainly still carried social functions and even individuality served for social aspects. Yet, in lesser degrees, with the Renaissance period, individual will began to be the initiative factor behind the production and utilisation

of art. While Humanism brought to foreground man's needs and capabilities alongside deference to the divine supremacy, the Western culture came to the direction of the drastic division of art, Shiner analyses, and which was to complete in the eighteenth century. Thus, though still its executive, social and serviceable sides were primary, art and art works began to be more involved with individuals and individual initiative and will. Patronage and commission system enhanced and began to prevail in matters of art - or fine art. This system was a definition of the possible relationships and manner of connections between an artist and the audience, and it also became a crucial determinant on the work of art produced.

The patron is the person who demands a work of art from a certain artist. In most cases it was a man as we take into consideration of the man-dominant social structure of the British society in the past. The patron provides the artist with the necessary physical resources and conditions to produce the asked work of art. Most of the time he wants this art work for a specific, special occasion and reason in his hand. He knows why he needs and demands this specific work of art, and what to do with it. In some cases he can also give the artist a definition and description of the work of art which will be produced. He can also indicate the pattern for the work. He could define his expectations; he could give the idea. He can describe the physical features of the work art to be executed. He might prescribe the relevant characteristics of the would-be work. The subject matter, the sizes, the length, the colours, the instruments to be used in the act of execution could be determined by the patron and demanded from the artist. The time and the date of submission of the finished work can be indicated beforehand. The patron can also inform the artist about the kind of occasion the work is needed for, the purpose it would serve and the place it would locate in. The artist may know about the other possible audiences. In the past, most of the time the patron fulfilled the necessary physical conditions for the artist to produce the asked work. The artist was given lodging, sustenance, and sometimes also a salary and a social environment in cases of continuous service. The artist might also get a commission for the resulted work in the time of submission. The features of the work and the conditions of the production process given beforehand might be put into a contract as well. In most cases the artist dedicates the output to the patron, the first cause for the finished work.

This kind of contact between the patron and the artist, in other terms, the primary audience and the artist, is a kind of dealings and business. The artist is like a seller and the patron positions as the primary customer. The success and the approval for the artist and the work depend on the degree of the fulfilment of the asked and predetermined conditions. This kind of relationship also points to and is a result of the social structure based on classes. Particularly in the past the patron was a man of the aristocracy. Even before and in the Middle Ages there were traveller artists, like minstrels, troubadours and later theatre companies, who also looked for an occasion and for a lord's settlement to find continuous protection and accommodation and to produce their art. Later about the seventeenth century the patron could be an upper-class man. In time some members of the rising bourgeoisie aspiring to a social identity akin to the aristocracy also imitated the patronage system. In an overall view, the patron needed such a relation with an artist as he looked for personal prestige, an occasion to express his dignity, resourcefulness, power and prosperity among other members of his class and to the members of the lower classes or the subordinate people or his subjects. Art and the art work were employed as a site and instruments to demonstrate the patron's social and material power and position. Besides, the patron might as well appreciate the art work for its aesthetic side and qualities. He might also want it for the satisfaction of his aesthetic needs or solely as an actualisation of a personal whim. On both personal and social levels, in this system the finished work evoked senses of and constituted a state of completion, achievement, fulfilment, certainty and positivity both for the patron and for the artist.

As the social conditions and society were changing, the working and production conditions of the artists changed. The signification and functions of the art work modified. With the developing bourgeoisie, mercantilism, the initiating market system, the audience, and the relation between the audience and the artist were changing. The identity and the social position of the audience also changed. The chief social factor in British society became the bourgeoisie, the middle classes around the eighteenth century. With the monetary and administrative powers and resources, they were also getting social power. As the newcomers to the existent social and cultural arena, they needed ways and instruments to employ and express their power. The bourgeoisie aspired to the aristocratic living, adopted ways of the

aristocracy and tried to imitate the precedent living models. As in the case of their predecessors, the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie made use of art for their similar personal and social needs. As middle classes were prospering and gaining a social dominance, their satisfaction was becoming a sector of business in concordance with their population. Both as a population and as an affording social force, middle classes led to formations of art markets. As they needed to show off their resourcefulness and economic power and to imply their refined manners, thus, their dignity, they sought after renowned art works like paintings and statutes. For their leisure, concerts, theatrical performances, and literary works were produced. The middle classes constituted a specific and prevalent audience and potential of customers. The patronage system began to be a minor occasion and factor in the production and use of art. Quantitatively more clients replaced one effective demander. Thus, in the market system there is no one to one, mutually open relationship between the artist and the audience/customer. Unlike the patronage system, the two sides do not know each other personally. They do not get informed of each other beforehand. For the artist, the actual audience is an unknown person. The audience in potential is a population, a mass, a generality. Though the artist does not know the audience in person individually, he or she can know about the audience/client in general, as a group. The artist enters a relationship with the potential audience indirectly, on general terms.

In one respect, this kind of indirect relationship and the physical and conditional distance between the artist and the audience actually made the artist freer and caused him or her act and produce more independently. The artist would not be subjected to personal whims and peculiar demands of an individual, of the patron. His or her production would not be defined and described for him or her beforehand. The artist seemed to obtain a greater control and possession and claim over his or her creation. He or she seemed to be in a position which would enable him or her to exercise a greater freedom in his or her artistic choices and decisions. The art work, the artistic product also seemed to gain a greater authenticity and originality in this case. Rather than the individual patron, the artist seemed to be able to exercise individual will over and in the art work. This possibility of freedom and independence also evoked integrity and elation.

The relative independence of the artist generated and in a way necessitated the originality of the artist and the art work. As the artist got rid of the interference of the patron and the production conditions got more individualised, (the guild and the workshop system dissolved about the seventeenth century in the case of painting, sculpture and constructional arts), the artist's individualistic production, original ideas and practice, authentic creation, and novelties in method and material both came to modify the meaning of art and art work and brought a different social status and function to the artist. There were still numerous artists who produced and lived in the older system Shiner analyses, art/craft, serving under given conditions. But the rare figure of the earlier periods, the individual, distanced artist began to be highlighted and to come foreground in the social arena.

As the members of the upper, affluent, leisured, dominant classes also wanted to be highlighted among themselves, within their general, collective realm, as they were competing in the matter of social prestige, superiority, capability and dignity and of possession, they continued to utilise art as an expression and embodiments of these aspects. An authentic, unique art work, a renowned artist was for and referred to a prestigious, important, prominent social figure.

This kind of attempts to differentiate and specialise both the artist and the art work culminated in the nineteenth century with the cult of Art, the Religion of Art, the Temple of Art, and engendered a figure of the artist as a very special human being, a genius, a person with different, extraordinary capabilities, a semi-god. Also embedded in the ideas of some romantics, art was increasingly elevated, exalted, and the artist was regarded as a kind of saviour, a redeemer. These conceptualisations and viewpoints advanced two divergent directions. At the end of the nineteenth century aesthetics saw art and the art work as a superior but closed, self-contained realm, which existed only for beauty's, art's sake, and which did not refer to any external reality or area, also stripped off any moral function. At the beginning of the twentieth century modernists also saw art and the art work as a sublime, holy sphere, but they simultaneously load these with moral and social functions, with a duty and also force to redeem society and culture. For modernists art could and ought to serve social good as it has this moral power, as it can activate and strengthen people's moral sensibilities and vision.

In these exaltations of art, the artist and the art work various aspects of art and capabilities and functions loaded on it became effective and were regarded as causes of sublimity and good. Apart from their substantive, realistic, practical, serviceable side activated in forms and uses of object, property, commodity, art and art works have been handled with more abstract and indirect uses and services. They can satisfy aesthetic needs of human beings. They can beautify people's personal life and also social or public environment. They can entertain people and gratify their recreational needs. They can make time pass nicely. They can also be tried to functionalise for more serious needs and uses. They can be used as instruments of benefit and good, on both individualistic and public spheres. Education/instruction and morality are these conventionally superior areas of effect.

Art's affinity with education and morality is a subject matter and a potentiality which has been put into use since the very early periods of recorded history. The Greek elucidated the social force and influential capability of rhetoric. Plato, Aristotle and Aquinas, to remember at the first count, also alluded to the influential, evocative, instructive and morally functional side of art in different ways. Horace can be regarded as the first eminent man who directly talked about the instructive side of art. He almost generated a formula, moreover to be acknowledged and conceded for centuries (even up to the aftermath of the Second World War). Art or the art work ought to instruct and entertain simultaneously, provide education and delight at the same time. It is accepted as capable to instruct while entertaining, which would be a better method in education. This view and formula was also repeated or rephrased by some of the succeeding philosophers, intellectuals and artists.

In the seventeenth century in Britain during the social conflicts and struggles in matters of religion and administration, likewise in France during the Revolution related to the political issues, art was a tool at the hands of the contradicting sides. Some literary works, plays, drawings, paintings, songs, and plays were produced as propaganda material. A similar approach was exercised by the Soviet state itself to solidify the regime in the twentieth century. This kind of propagandist art or art's use for propaganda and for political concerns, by state, for or against state, is a phenomenon which occurs in times of social upheaval in different communities.

In the eighteenth century in Britain, art, particularly in the form of the novel, a recently developed genre at the time, was also to serve the recently flourishing middle classes in their need for social education. These classes were trying to copy the aristocracy, the formerly dominant social force, in their manners and life style and their ways to prevail. They also wanted to be effective by their peculiar prospects, needs and practices. Yet, they needed some guideline and exemplification to do these. The art of the novel were used by the public and the middle-class market as the artists themselves were mostly from these classes and produced texts subjectifying characters and experiences from these classes instead of the protagonists and patterns of courtly romances.

The presumably educational side of art is related to the supposedly moral function of art as they are considered to integrally generate good and use. Purportedly, in conventional thinking, art serves morality while educating and this morality is a good thing and usable to better man, his society and the world. As human beings have been trying to better themselves and their life, in another respect, as man tries to live better, art also can be turned into another tool of man for this aim. As man can be regarded as a gracious being in a view, rapacious in another view, he might easily make use of any available means for his aims.

This educational and moral function of art is based on art's capacity to affect human beings. Art generates or leads man to have thoughts, opinions, judgements, insights, emotions and sensibilities. All these are human stuff which might also be transformed and put into use, action and consequence. Thus, art, supposedly an abstract phenomenon or a fragile factor, is seen as carrying a great potential, as a fertile force. When art educates people in goodness, when it moves people into good, when it refines and sharpens their sensibilities, consciousness and moral vision, art comes to serve goodness and morality, and thus functions to better man and society, and subsequently it executes a social work, and fulfils a social duty.

In the moral betterment of man the efficiency of art and its supremacy is located in its distinction as a peculiar realm. Though art is regarded as capable to serve society in betterment, its qualities, conditions and requirements in their difference from and peculiarity in comparison to society and social reality, are made use of in this moralising process. In order to better or in order to serve the betterment

of man and his world, art or any agent for this purpose ought to be superior, ought to be in a better position and state. Thus, art as a realm is considered to be better and superior to man, life, society and reality in such a view and program. The seventeenth and eighteenth century moralists and modernists in their anxieties for society adopted such a view and endowed art with such an image.

The moralists of the earlier periods used allegory and utopia/dystopia and satire in literature, drama and painting. As they criticised society of their period and wished to cure it, they indirectly and subvertedly presented the existing panorama, distorted it through exaggeration or parody so as to describe and highlight it in a moving manner, and they could also made up such opposites of the present situation and so extremely different worlds from the real circumstances that the gap and dissimilarity between the reality and the fictive world revealed the faults, lacks and depravity of the real state.

Romantics tried to disclose the mistakes of the real world as they constructed integral, harmonious, ideal fictional realms in which substance and form, the material and the spiritual, the real and the ideal, the temporary and the eternal, the one and many, blended and coexisted.

Realists portrayed images from the real, current times. They expected to initiate rehabilitating movements and precautions by representing problematic, defective aspects of society in an easily discernable fashion. Naturalists furthered these realist tendencies. They generated a realistic world in fiction, in art taking characters and situations from the actual world and depending on cause-and-effect relationship and its analysis alluded to the inevitability of consequences and results of some present conditions.

Modernists aimed to enhance the individual consciousness exploring its limits, make people's perception and sensitivity keener, enable them to get deeper insights, help them to humanise themselves, by employing unconventional methods, techniques in their production of art work so as to shake and awaken the individual and to point to aspects and sides of life and reality which remained marginal and unnoticed before. Postmodernists furthered this concern for and this look to the marginalised and the minor, in their examination, portrayal and criticism of the contemporary circumstances and issues. They inverted the precedent methods and

changed the focus. They gave voice, the right to speak to and put the focus on the ones at the periphery, they brought the other, the sub-worlds, the sub-cultures, the disadvantaged, the underprivileged, the oppressed, to the foreground.

The view which sees art as a superior realm and/or as an agent to regenerate humankind depends on the supposed differentiation and/or contradiction between art and reality. It relies on art's capability and characteristic to construct alternative, fictive worlds and realities. It also promotes art as an evaluation system on which better and superior values can be loaded. As art stands in opposition to prevalent reality, system, order and conventionality, it supposedly contradicts their characteristic values and practices. Particularly after the shift of meaning of the concept of art in the eighteenth century as Shiner emphasises, art began to come to stand against bourgeois values and practices as the features of originality and individual creativity differentiated it from ordinary or serially produced craft works, or from products based on ready-made or earlier patterns.

Modernism as a noun and term carries the disadvantage of the suffix "ism" and seems to impose and require its own patterns and features. The term implies certain outlooks, conceptualisations, expressions, manners, styles and production when taken as a movement and artistic approach. Like other "ism"s, it generates certain expectations and "conventions", or rather, aware of being confronted with it, the reader may tend to expect a "modernist" work to have and achieve particular features and components. On the other hand, as this plurality concerning outlooks and techniques suggests, modernism appears as a flexible, extensive and multifarious term or notion. It seems to be elusive, and so by its nature. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, accordingly, say "The name, then, is clear; the nature of the movement or movements - the where, when, why and what of it - is much less so. And equally unclear is the status of the stylistic claim we are making." (Bradbury and McFarlane, eds. , 1991: 22) They also talk of "the oblique nature of Modernism" and remind us of the critics' difficulty in determining a place or date for its beginning when taken as a movement (30). Michael Bell, in line with them, indicates that "it is in no way an organized or unified movement . . . this does not imply a single movement so much as a series of discrete centres whose effects widely overlap." (Bell, ed. , 1980: 2) So, in a way fluidity, slipperiness, multitudinous vision,

constitutes modernism and modernist art. Modernism suggests acknowledged and demanded variety, plurality and relativity; it points to a continuous quest for novelty and new expression, new ways of expression. Bradbury and McFarlane consequently assert that “Modernism is less a style than a search for a style in a highly individualistic sense; and indeed the style of one work is no guarantee for the next. . . . modernism does not establish a prevalent style of its own; or if it does, it denies itself, thereby ceasing to be modern . . . each work with a structure appropriate only to that work. The condition for the style of the work is a presumed absence of style for the age; and each work is a once-and-for-all creation . . .” (1991:29). In relation to this, Rainer Emig, also inspired by Paul de Man, traces in modernism a universal and timeless quality, which also seems to point to a human urge:

modernism is not so much the feature of one historic era as a recurring element within literature itself. In [Man’s] words:

The appeal of modernity haunts all literature. It is revealed in numberless images and emblems that appear at all periods - in the obsession with a *tabula rasa*, with new beginnings - that finds recurrent expression in all forms of writing. No true account of literature can bypass this persistent temptation of literature to fulfill itself in a single moment.

(Emig, 1995: 5)

Thus, we can say that the modernist attitude and artistic, aesthetic approach inheres in flexible and expansive manners; and in a way novelty, search into new ways of creation and expression, into possibilities of technique and form, becomes its expectation, its “convention”.

On the other hand, the comprehensiveness, variety, flexibility and questing drive of modernism consequently connects it to the other or precedent movements or artistic styles. As it is essentially open to experimentation and novelty, and aims at new forms and expressions, modernism also exploits the other or earlier forms and styles in its contest with them. In this way, it is no wonder or irrelevance that Emig points to a Classicist trait in Pound and Eliot, and indicates the modernists’ association with the Romantic tradition, also recalling Yeats’s phrase for them, “the last Romantics” (Emig, 1995: vii), that, as Bradbury and McFarlane remind,

modernism is also considered “as a species of Realism”, especially by Marxist critics (Bradbury and McFarlane, eds. , 1976: 23), and that these two critics also trace down a connection between Naturalism and Modernism with regard to their drive to search and delve into human sensibility, and survey the affinity and shifts between modernist traits and the movements from Symbolism, Impressionism, Decadence, Expressionism to Surrealism, Futurism, Imagism, Art Nouveau (192-205). So, in short we can state that modernism or a modernist work can present the reader with a theme, notion, figure, trope, pattern, structure and/or mood which is supposedly a convention or component of an earlier movement or a different artistic mode.

Still, it is also to note that a modernist use and treatment of a familiar or habitual component or situation carries some peculiar artistic anxieties and levels of vision. Additionally and in relevance, we can say that this modernist processing of a known material - of life and/or of art - still transforms it in a particular way. So, alongside its elusiveness and extension, we can talk of the presence of modernist features and sensibilities in literature, of some commonly prevailing, traceable aspects in some literary works, in the way it is possible to detect particular qualities of and views on the life in the early twentieth-century Western world. Accordingly, Bradbury and McFarlane affirm that “Modernism does indeed exist” (1976: 23).

One major aspect of modernism or modernist vision is its tendency to synthesise, and thus to reach at a new, different sensibility for existence and for the act of creating, or to extend sensibility and perception for viewing the world and for artistic creativity. In the way Eliot asks for an association of sensibility in his article “The Metaphysical Poets” (Eliot, 1950: 241-50) and, in “Tradition and Individual Talent”, for a poet who can create “a new compound” out of ordinary emotions and of his store of various bits of knowledge and experience rather than inventing new ones (1950: 3-11), and Pound intend poetry to achieve to present “an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time” (Perkins, 1976: 333), modernist capability constitutes an amalgam, a compound, a synthesis of supposedly contradictory notions or stands and engenders a revision and reformulation of already-present phenomena subjected to artistic process. Bradbury and McFarlane summarise this multidimensional, ambivalent quality of the pattern:

Modernism was in most countries an extraordinary compound of the futuristic and the nihilistic, the revolutionary and the conservative, the naturalistic and the symbolic, the romantic and the classical. It was a celebration of a technological age and a condemnation of it; an excited acceptance of the belief that the old regimes of culture were over, and a deep despairing in the face of that fear; a mixture of convictions that the new forms were escapes from historicism and the pressures of the time with convictions that they were precisely the living expressions of these things. (1976: 46)

The two critics also emphasise the dualistic, complementary drive of the modern times and the modernist potential and talk of “the concern to objectify the subjective, to make audible or perceptible the mind’s inaudible conversations, to halt the flow, to irrationalize the rational, to defamiliarize and dehumanize the expected, to conventionalize the extraordinary and the eccentric, to define the psychopathology of *everyday* life, to intellectualize the emotional, to secularize the spiritual, to see space as a function of time, mass as a form of energy, and uncertainty as the only certain thing.” (1976: 48)

Uncertainty is strongly connected with the inherent plurality, variability and multiple perspective of the modernist stance. Modernism is another form of the reaction against absolutism, conformism, narrow vision, one-sided judgement, prejudice, strict patterns, complacency, rationalism, positivism, dehumanising industrialism, capitalism, degrading, unaesthetic urbanisation; in short, when considered as a movement in the early twentieth century, it was a contesting response to the seemingly dominant ideology, system, order and aesthetic understanding. On the other hand, as the set patterns and structures and views were dissolving and transforming, as the shortcomings of the prevailing order were revealed and displaying themselves, as relativity and multiplicity were thriving, this situation was generating a tension and anxiety. While assurance and complacency were forced, novelty and variety engendered a sense of obscurity and insecurity.

In parallel with the political, social and economic tension in the society and between the prominent nations and with the signals of transformations in these fields, intellectual, moral and artistic visions were also agitated and sharpened. Bradbury and McFarlane describe the art of this new sensibility as questioning “an entire civilization or culture” (1976: 19-20). Emig similarly highlights the intelligentsia and

artists' dissatisfaction at the period and says of "the temporal discomfort of the modernists themselves, their sense of being "posthumous" or "out of key" with time." (Emig, 1995: vii) He also cites Eliot's modernist critique of modern culture, "which Eliot condemned as a "vast panorama of futility and anarchy"" (vii). There was a dissolution of traditions and a disenchantment with civilisation. Inefficiency and partiality in the systems, while bringing their questioning and failure, also threatened the status quo with fragmentation. Social and intellectual restlessness sharpened the concept of individuation and sense of flux and chaos. This sense of disorientation and discontinuity also brought forward a sense of despair, meaninglessness and nihilism. Alongside a search for solutions, remedy or change and the urge for novelty and rebirth, the strain engendered a sense of crisis. These times, the social and intellectual conditions, suggest apocalypse.

As the individual felt the strain of emotional, cultural, social isolation, alienation and suffered a lack of communication in recently urbanised environments, in the technology- and industry-ridden system, at last the conflict, rivalry and disharmony between the prominent countries initiated the Great War, the First World War. The war reinforced and in a way justified the sense of an ending, the already-existing sense of fin de siècle, of apocalypse since the beginning of the new century.

Modernist sensibilities, points of view and art, deliberately and inadvertently, carry these qualities, moods, sentiments, revolt, disjunction and restlessness. Bradbury and McFarlane evaluate modernist art:

In short, experimentalism does not simply suggest the presence of sophistication, difficulty and novelty in art; it also suggests bleakness, darkness, alienation, disintegration. . . . reaches formal crisis - in which myth, structure and organization in a traditional sense collapse, and not only for formal reasons. The crisis is a crisis of culture; it often involves an unhappy view of history - so that the Modernist writer is not simply the artist set free, but the artist under specific, apparently historical strain. (1976: 26)

Relevantly, modernist art, modernist literature, acutely, exploits and reveals the dissolution of the dominant order, of the idea of a prevailing reality and the split of language and artistic creation from such "reality" or system of referents. The same critics outline this referential release of modernist art:

It is the art consequent on the dis-establishing of communal reality and conventional notions of causality, on the destruction of traditional notions of the wholeness of individual character, on the linguistic chaos that ensues when public notions of language have been discredited and when all realities have become subjective fictions. Modernism is then the art of modernization - however stark the separation of the artist from society may have been, however oblique the artistic gesture he has made. (1976:27)

We are presented with a scene and atmosphere which evokes a sense of privacy; yet, the persona is not alone at this particular instant, time, rather shares the moment with another person who seems special for him. The personal, individualistic perspective and disclosure of the personal experience or mood suggests a lyric mode and form. Modernist dissolution, rupture, futility and discontinuity is there. Generating a possibility of modernist reading, signals the variety, anarchy, chaos, flux, change, contradictory and complementary moods and possibilities of life and of art. Furthermore, the text is so processed and constructed that it constitutes a self-contained, close world even deprived of any reference to the 'outside reality' and society, and both through the changes in the two versions and through the tension or inner dynamism in one version, it reveals and articulates its constructed quality, being. As Clement Greenberg says, "Modernism used art to call attention to art." (Waugh, ed. , 1997: 75)

Postmodernism furthers this tendency to self-reflexivity. Self-reflexivity also brings criticism. This criticism opens the ways more to connections with the outside world, society and its policies. In this period also various ways to read and perceive conceptualisations of art and their close relations with society, politics and general culture and cultural conventions are examined and interpreted. In this period after the Second World War, criticism of society and prevalent world politics practised in the West strengthens the methods and liabilities to criticise the consecration of art, its elevation and idealisation. Though both the tendency to idealise art and demystify it continue through human history and different periods, in these recent times, the evil potential of art and of its uses is more emphasised in theory and in art works themselves.

2. ART AS A TOOL IN SOCIAL CLASHES: **LUCKY JIM**

Kingsley Amis's **Lucky Jim** (1954) designates the defective perception, use and malfunction of art, and in the text art can be detected as a malevolent or imperfect force in the dimension and interaction of social classes. Not only do art and the artist not emerge as entities in themselves, as self-contained concepts, mainly structured on and working in the field of aesthetics, but they also constitute failing forces in the arena they serve.

The artist figure and the concept of art do not stand by themselves in the book; they are not merely entities functioning in an aesthetic context and dimension. They rather function to enable the reader to trace down the defects and inadequacies in both the social system and social relationships. The novel uncovers the flaws of society, in particular the post Second World War British society, in their reflection into the realm of art. The text provides a view of art in the service of social system which is still hierarchical at the time, and problematic. In the novel art is seen as an extension of the existent social system and panorama.

Though it is a subject of discussion whether art is to be perceived, analysed and practised as an entity in itself or it is heavily associated with and constructed by entities other than itself, that is, it is heavily bound up with society, or social messages/perception or social functions/critique, Amis's book evolves around the issue of handling art as an entity other than itself, of extending it into other, namely, social contexts. In Amis's book what matters is not solely the aesthetic structure and conjunction of the work and the narrative, social criticism is embedded in the work; yet this treatment does not seem to cause a misapplication of art as there is a comprehensive quality in the product/activity itself. The novel tackles the topic in multiple vision, in various aspects. The reader can reach a complementary perception of the flawed attitude to art. In the work we observe the evil aspect of defining and using art outside its inherent order and structure. In this context the production and use of art constitute abuse; art becomes, or rather is misused by human beings, by particular members of society as a tool in the service of social hierarchy and class structure. In such a framework, art, apart from its inherent or aesthetic quality, comes

to be a fallen instrument to differentiate some members of society in a restless, unpeaceful, conflicting way. This points to failure if social formation is considered as the process of a healthy, harmonious, beneficial, profitable, integral, reciprocal, communicative gathering and interrelation.

Suitably, in the “Kingsley Amis” item of **Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia** the novels’s inherent social criticism and the social separation between high-brow art and low-brow art is noted. It says:

the novel satirizes the high-brow academic set of a redbrick university, seen through the eyes of its hero, Jim Dixon, as he tries to make his way as a young lecturer of history. The novel was perceived by many as part of the [Angry](#) Young Men movement of the 1950s which reacted against the stultifications of conventional British life. (“Kingsley Amis”)

In the same manner, Gareth Jenkins, in an obituary article he writes in **International Socialism**, indicates the protagonist’s being a common man, a member of the lower classes, who is in reaction and resentment against the oppressive middle-class authority, who is a man of set patterns. He says:

Jim is presented as an ordinary bloke with ordinary tastes, up against the snobbish, Bloomsbury style culture of his academic superior, Professor Welch. Jim is more at home in the pub than at the ridiculous musical soirées given by the Welches. (Jenkins)

Jenkins also says of the novel “Lucky Jim is a satire on the aesthetic and artistic establishment of the day, its metropolitan entrenchment and contempt for anything provincial” (Jenkins).

In **Lucky Jim** neither the artist figure nor the concept of art is seen as an efficient, workable, constructive social factor. Instead, art and the artist which are available in Amis’s work are alienating and disintegrating factors in social intercourses. Art, as a subcategory of culture, functions to detect and indicate “suitable” members of society but at the same time art seems to be insufficient to generate a necessary quantity of these “suitable” members. As there exists this difference, and more than that, as social and cultural hierarchy constitute and depend on a clash of powers, art separates people and restrains some members of society. In

such an outline both the dominant side and the disadvantageous side are flawed; while the former exploit or oppress the others, the latter misbehave so as to survive in the system. The world of the book does not substantiate the conventional, romantic view of art and the artist as a regenerative, exulting, elevating force.

The novel also points to the direction art which has been taking in society. While the class system based on a conceptualised sense of distinction prevails, as there are also movements in the social ladder with changing conditions and requirements of society, art, its uses, and treatments it is subjected to, are in a process of transformation. In a way, the main route of such a state is signalled in the book by means of the eponymous character. The position he gets, or in terms of this system, he ascends to, at the end of the book is about to initiate him into the acclaimed world of art, eminent circles of the artistic, intellectual world. On the one hand, taking into consideration the class origin and conditions of this main character it can be said that such an incident suggests and exemplifies the possible vertical movement in the social field and thus a loosening in the hierarchical, strict structure. This seems to allude to the democratisation, decentralisation of art, a blurring of the boundaries between the concepts of high art and low art, and in that way it heralds mass culture and also the all-including postmodern attitude, all of which settle increasingly following the Second World War. Yet, in the text the evaluation of this course is problematic. The qualifications, dispositions, potentialities and capacity of the main character are open to question. The fulfilment and satisfaction he can get from the interaction with the artistic circles he will enter and the benefit both sides can obtain from such contact, or the outcome of such encounter, are not certain or guaranteed. Neither is his meeting the requirements of his new job in the field of art criticism indisputable. Thus, this possible incongruity between this ascendant character and the world of art, on the other hand, does not help to elevate or approve of the unelitist tendency in society and in its culture. The caricaturisation of the character seems relevant in this context. The satirical mode in the narrative seems appropriate for the critical undertone and feeds the topic of the abuse and dysfunction of art.

As the title suggests, **Lucky Jim** narrates the main character's, James Dixon's, experiences and interactions with his environment, from his point of view. As his conditions are not so comfortable and as the state he is in is not so easeful, he

acts and feels through constant chaos. Throughout the narrative, with only small intervals, Jim is anxious, insecure, restless, evasive, and resentful. When finally he gratifies his main desires, this time the reader cannot be so sure about its validity and security. The primary indicator and cause of such a state in the narrative is art, that is, the prevalent cultural and artistic surroundings. In Dixon's surroundings or rather in the social environment he is in, a great factor which is to affect and shape his current life is the issue of art. It is a decisive element in the course of his life at the moment.

Dixon is an academic, a minor lecturer at a college in a town in a provincial area. He has obviously lower class origins. The surname, accordingly, reminds Dixie, US states where slaves were owned, an image of the underprivileged. He comes from an underdeveloped region as he talks "in his flat northern voice" (9). He is economically and socioculturally underrated. He stays in lodgings, and he has to be careful with his money as his sensitivity in this subject is reminded many times in the book (20, 21, 25, 33, 43, 44, 49, 54, 68, 86, 88, 90, 152, 153-155, 169, 170, 179, 191, 204, 220). As the time in the narrative is the period after the Second World War and, though in a minor degree, socioeconomic state and difficulties are discernable in the text, we see that though he is a university teacher and scholar, Dixon's income is little. There is also a covert threat of unemployment in the book. In the postwar economy there was an expansion and variety in the sectors as the war restraint ended; yet this accompanied a great national debt and an increased population of work force as men returned to civil life and women who participated in the economy as a working force in wartime while the male force was busy in fighting, did not want to give up their gained socioeconomic activity and independence. In the novel Dixon is a man without the guarantee of employment. This induces a constant anxiety and stress in him. Throughout the book his main anxiety and curiosity is his job prospects. He is on two years' probation at that university. But since he is aware of his disharmony with the environment, he is continually worried about an imminent dismissal; "I can't be taken on to the permanent staff until two years up. It doesn't mean that I can't be ... asked to leave at the end of the first year." (84) Even the pause in his statement points to the tension he feels. Because he lacks a sense of belonging and stability, he also does not bring belongings to his office room other than a few reference books and some notes (230). Since the academic year is about to

come to an end, Dixon wishes to learn of his expectations; “Because I shall have to start looking for another job, you see. And most of the schools will have made their appointments for September before they break up in July. So I shall want to know in good time.” (86)

The council will decide on his future, yet the opinion of the head of his department is certainly vital. In this context art constitutes a criterion and turns into a tool of social hierarchy and class structure. The head of the History Department Dixon works at, Professor Ned Welch is a conservative, traditionalist middle class man, and associates himself with art. In a self-appointed way he adopts a mission of promoting art in his environment. He is not only interested in art and aims to perform it some way, but he also aspires to propagate it arranging artistic activities. He in a way institutionalises art in his social area and wishes to traditionalise these activities which are themselves to conform to the traditions of classical or conventionalised art. As members and agents of “high culture” he automatically expects university people to understand, like and even produce this art to some extent. Thus, if a colleague is not such a person, he does not seem to be a proper member of that community. Welch does not state this requirement and judgement directly in the narrative. Yet, even this absence of direct declaration indicates that as a representative of higher education, of an institution of culture and civilisation, the professor takes it for granted. However, this expectation and assurance points to and creates strictness and oppression. The conviction and the conventional idea of the academic figure define university staff in a certain way, and unwritten rules and requirements have been formed. This conventionalism and conceptualisation asks for one model, one type of the academic; beyond academic, educational tasks, it demands a certain type of man. The goals of refinement and sensitivity might be favourable in themselves; yet the denial of the integrity of a person in the act of shaping him and of not seeing him as what he is is a way of oppression and inhumanity. Welch’s associating Dixon with his own sense of art and culture constitutes a case of tension for the assistant lecturer and discloses Dixon’s lack of attributes due to his class origin as well as to his natural dispositions.

As a professional of higher education Dixon has to have particular talents, capabilities and execute particular duties. He has to be a teacher, a researcher and a

secretary simultaneously. He is to teach in arranged courses, produce articles on his specific subject and assist Welch in his academic work and office work. Welch wants him to prepare a specific course for tutorials, "Medieval Life and Culture" (28-9). He also reminds Dixon that he ought to make his article "The Economic Influence of the Developments in Shipbuilding Techniques, 1450 to 1485" published;

If I were you, Dixon, I should take all the steps I possibly could to get this article accepted in the next month or so.[. . .] It's no use anybody coming to me and asking "What's young Dixon's stuff like?" unless I can give them an expert opinion of what it's worth, is it now? But an acceptance by a learned journal would . . . (15).

The senior academic also wants him to deliver a public lecture at the College Open Week at the end of the term, which is an advertising activity in a way for the attraction of the university, and he also determines the subject for the subordinate man, "Merrie England" (17). He sends Jim from the town to the public library in the city to acquire some historical facts for his speech to The Antiquarian and Historical Society (172-5). Dixon also indexes Welch's notes and makes some research for his book on local history (81, 82). He proofreads a long article Welch is having printed (82). He draws the departmental timetable (85).

Dixon does these as necessities of his job. But beyond the academic nature of the work, Dixon's motive is to be tactful and thus to survive in this environment. Especially the article and the evening lecture are to cause to strengthen his position at the department, in other words, not to lose his job. He is after "the removal of the 'bad impression' he'd so far made in the College and in his Department." (15-6) He says to the art critic who asks about the owner of the idea of this public lecture that "Professor Welch's. I could hardly refuse, of course. If it goes well it'll improve my standing here." When the man questions his ambition, Dixon says honestly "No. I've done badly here since I got the job. This lecture might help to save me getting the sack." (214) The offer of the new course should similarly be attractive for the students in order to show him an influential teacher though not as much as his "superiors"; "Clearly, the more students, within reason, Dixon could get 'interested' in his subject, the better for him; equally clearly, too large a number of 'interested'

students would mean that the number studying Welch's own special subject would fall to a degree that Welch might be expected to resent. . . . three students seemed a safe number to try for." (28) The inclusion of a hardworking, distinguished student in his course is also prestigious and to his credit; in his affirmative reply to Welch's question about Michie, Dixon hopes that "Welch would take due heed of this testimony to his power to 'interest' such a good lad." (176) Under these circumstances, we see that Dixon perceives the elder scholar as a boss, whom he has to please, rather than as an experienced academic and counsellor, and that he actualises the tasks out of diplomatic strategy rather than enthusiastic volition. He feels put to the test all the time. In that way, Dixon describes Welch's summonses as announcements of "the imposition of some fresh academic task designed, conceivably, to probe his value to the Department." (80)

Similarly, social and cultural activities into which Welch draws Dixon are regarded as instances of examination by the young man. It is obviously not enough to stay in his position that the minor scholar fulfils academic and office work, but he is also expected to have a particular social identity and particular living habits. As an academic, in addition to instructional and researching capabilities, Dixon ought to be a refined man, with an understanding of culture and art, and a will to enjoy and consume culture and art. Thus, Dixon is also involved in an "arty week-end", an "arty get-together", arranged frequently by the Welches. The professor wants to see Dixon among the guests and participants. The programme of the artistic soiree consists of "Part-songs. A play-reading. Demonstration of some sword-dance steps. Recitations. A chamber concert." (23) The media are also invited; men from a newspaper and a B.B.C. radio programme are to be present.

An artistic environment, being interested in art, being an audience or performer of art, might be beneficial, valuable and constructive in themselves; in this respect Welch's intention to associate the young scholar with art or his not excluding Dixon from the social and cultural aspect of the university community stands well-meant acts. Yet, in this contact the quality, the style, the effect and the result of the intention and of the art concept are not indubitable or totally positive. Dixon deciphers Welch's demand in his own discourse:

I know what it is. Good sign in a way. He wants to test my reactions to culture, see whether I'm a fit person to teach in a university, see? Nobody who can't tell a flute from a recorder can be worth hearing on the price of bloody cows under Edward the third. (24)

Dixon seems to be unable to associate teaching history with art, or having knowledge in a special subject with understanding another subject. He is also angry that art stands for something other than itself. He is aware that art becomes a criterion, a norm to measure a social and professional feature or efficiency.

Art comes to mean distress and apprehension for Dixon. In his invitation Welch indicates that he expects Dixon's active participation, but he does not explain the part he assigns to him; "it should be quite good fun. . . . We'll probably call on you to lend a hand with something." (17) This indefiniteness also becomes a cause of tension for Dixon; he even asks Margaret Peel, another lecturer who stays at the Welches' for her convalescence after her attempt at suicide, to get information about what he is supposed to do. At first he supposes that as a party the gathering will depend on "fine talk", but when Margaret tells about the programme he panicks:

My God, this is really serious; Neddy must be going off his head at last. It's absolutely fantastic. . . . You'll have to start finding out what he's got lined up for me. So I can start thinking up reasons for not being able to do it. (23-4)

He conceives of this intellectual, artistic environment as so alien and hostile to himself that his instinct of self protection is aroused; as a precaution in case of misfortune at the party, he arranges one of his lodgings mate, Bill Atkinson to phone the Welch house and call him back with a false excuse. Appropriately, sensing the intensity of the situation and the plan for rescue, Atkinson asks "Afraid you won't be able to last out, or what?" (34)

Dixon has to perform in a contemporary French dramatist's, Jean Anouilh's, play and sing madrigals as one of the tenors. However, he has self knowledge as he tells Margaret earlier, "I can't sing, I can't act, I can hardly read, and thank God I can't read music." (24) Thus, Welch's headlong inclusion of Dixon in the performance after his acceptance of the invitation shows the already set convictions of the head of the department and his strict, one way of thinking. As Dixon is a

university figure, he automatically expects him to be artistic. Dixon perceives Welch's offer as an imposition. Accordingly, Welch's not asking Dixon whether he enjoys classical art or whether he has stage abilities points to the senior teacher's disregard of the subordinate man's reality and character. Dixon rebels against this inconsiderateness and this attack at his integrity in his thoughts; "Why hadn't they had the decency to ask him if he'd like to join in, instead of driving him up on to this platform arrangement and forcing sheets of paper into his hand?" (37) In that way, art turns into a device of psychological war and spiritual violence.

Welch's attitude towards Dixon, his expectations from him, his engaging him in art shows constitute a form of oppression. Dixon seems to lack abilities or inborn tendencies necessary for such performances. But what is more he lacks necessary training, habits and manners for them. He does not seem to like these works of art. But he is also not accustomed to them. The works and the type of performances Welch presents and in a way sponsors what is accepted as art. Yet as Welch is a middle class man and as this type of activities is basically associated with the middle and upper classes, especially in terms of audience and consumption, the matter also has a socioeconomic dimension. Thus in a way it is the art of the middle classes or "high art" though the subject, the creator in terms of his living conditions and the performer might be of the lower classes (like the origin of the madrigals or Evan Johns's social stand). Even if some pieces of art or the artists were regarded as base or improper, in time gaining a higher status they have been adopted by the middle and upper classes and defined as classical. Also some forms and products of contemporary art have classical status conforming to patterns of classical traditions in some way, like the music of Peter Racine Fricker, or an acclaimed status attaches to some modern art works.

But Dixon, who is of lower class origin though he works in university, dislikes classical art and highbrow culture. Their exposition to him and his encounter with them are bothersome. He does not care about the recorder's being the ancestor of the flute (7-8). Out of boredom and resentment he childishly spoils the cover photograph of a contemporary composer Johns likes (30-1). The book of poetry he buys as a gift to Margaret is written by a contemporary poet whom he considers as "nasty" (35). Singing in the chorus means "whatever noises Dixon might feel himself

impelled to make” and a piece by Brahms is “some Brahms rubbish” in his way of thinking (36). As he does not understand or like his native art, foreign culture and its products are puzzles to him, “Why couldn’t they have chosen an English play?” (44). He does not feel any need to play an instrument as an enrichment with culture; about playing the recorder he says:

no disgrace in not playing them. I’m only a lay brother, after all. . . . Isn’t it horrible? How many of the bloody things do you have going at once? (44).

His perception of and his discourse about art is derogatory; “the local composer and the amateur violinist were going to ‘tackle’ a violin sonata by some Teutonic bore [Fricker] . . . There’s at least an hour of scraping and blowing in front of us.” (45), and a tune is identified by him “as some skein of untiring facetiousness by filthy Mozart” (63). A piano concerto Welch insists to play him on the gramophone is “boring” and only useful as a tune to mock at Welch by fitting words to it:

“You *ignorant* clod, you *stupid* old sod, you *havering* *slaver*ing get . . .” Here intervened a string of unmentionables, corresponding with an oom-pah sort of effect in the orchestra. “You *wordy* old *turdy* old scum, you *gripping* old *pip*ing old bum” (87).

Dixon also mimicks Edith Sitwell to express his grudge against Bertrand Welch on the phone (102) All the components of art and culture are the same to him, or vague and remote to him at the same degree; he is confused between Plato and Rilke to be the owner of a view he remembers on love (72), also between Aristotle and I. A. Richards about a view on the effect of beauty (107), and the walls of the dance floor

were decorated with scenes from the remoter past, portrayed in what was no doubt an advanced style, so that in the one nearest Dixon, for example, some lack of perspective or similar commodity made a phalanx of dwarf infantrymen (Spartan? Macedonian? Roman?) seem to be falling from the skies upon their much larger barbarian adversaries (Persian? Iranian? Carthaginian?) (105-6).

While Dixon’s reactions to art or the established culture are in this hostile and unbenefiting way, his senior academic’s efforts, beliefs and targets, especially when

these are directed to him, seem to him unbearable in consequence and come to mean an attack at his personality and his personal choices and tastes. The situation appears to be a middle class agent's attack at and imposition on a lower class man; it points to upper class dominance and hegemony and it represents the oppression one class exercises over another. Dixon's resentment at this art reveals a failure in society. If it is regarded as high art or culture, it is obvious that it serves only the needs or whims of the middle classes and that it diagnoses the difference or otherness of the lower class members of society. Thus art discloses the hierarchical social structure. If it is regarded only as the general concept of art, it fails again as the society cannot relate all its members with that culture. Thus art disintegrates human bonds. It cannot attract every individual and bring members of society sincerely together. This is in contrast to the romantic cult of art in its constructed function of unification and sympathy.

It can be argued that the needy Evan Johns or the provincial Margaret Peel are also lower class personages, and still Johns is versatile in music and participates in Welch's recitals without complaint and Peel has been in "the choir of the local Conservative Association" (37) and sings the madrigals in a contented way in Welch's party. Yet they are different from Dixon in that they are assimilated in middle class culture more than Dixon, that their conformism is stronger and that their dissatisfaction and in turn their restlessness find expression in areas other than art or cultural practices. Johns is an eavesdropper and sneaks on Dixon, and Margaret has problems with the opposite sex up to the point of being hysterical. On the other side, Dixon shows traits of philistinism. Welch's son Bertrand also defines him in this way (184). Dixon's dislike of art prevents him from pursuing betterment in this subject. Dixon considers his insufficiencies in this field as a component of his identity. Yet, Dixon too is a product of this society. He alludes to the point at which art disfunctions and is perceived in a negative way.

This is contradictory to both sides of the romantic view of art, which admits suffering in the act of creating but which promises elevation and pleasure in the act of consuming. Dixon is desperate in performances. But this does not produce anything. He reads his line in the French play wrongly, with a mistake in tone. He just pretends to sing the madrigals in the chorus. The silence he causes (36, 38)

symbolises the cultural void, the emptiness of the artistic aims in their encounter with the lower classes and the failure of social orchestration and harmony. Neither is he entertained by the produced pieces of art. Rather than staying there and listening to classical music, he prefers to go to a pub and drink beer, which are defined as traits of “low culture” or lower class taste. So, he runs away, and his beer makes him happy, at least at the moment (54). Nor does art bring dignity to him; instead of moral betterment and human dignity and elevation, we see Dixon sink into lies and evasion and hypocrisy in order to protect his position or entity in the artistic setting. For Dixon the artistic party environment and any contribution to such an activity are a burden. He does not ask for them. But as he feels obliged to adjust his actions to the professor’s wishes with financial and occupational anxieties, he does not express his real attitude or feelings. His subordinate position hinders him from behaving in an honest and free way. He cannot confess his lack of artistic talents. His resolution to that is “opening and shutting his mouth in silence.” (36) Though he does not care about the concerts, when the professor counts them “Dixon nodded as if pleased.” (45)

Actually, the party scene is an echo and elaboration of the beginning of the book. The novel unfolds with art or the supposedly artistic environment, with Welch’s talk about one of his artistic parties. He complains that the newspaper has confused recorder with piano. Dixon is resentful that he listens to this talk which is not connected with him or history, and that they are not at Oxford or Cambridge and they do not talk about history in the way it is done there. But still he accompanies the senior scholar;

what mattered was that this man had decisive power over his future, at any rate until the next four or five weeks were up. Until then he must try to make Welch like him, and one way of doing that was, he supposed, to be present and conscious while Welch talked about concerts. (8)

Actually, Dixon’s reaction to the inconvenience and imposition he experiences about art is an extension of his reaction to other obligations, real or fancied. Hypocrisy and escapism have become his methods of survival and adaptation. He tries to get his article published though he does not believe its worth;

“the thing’s worth could be expressed in one short hyphenated indecency” (15). Having lied to Michie that the syllabus he asks of is only to be typed, he replies to him about the main ideas he will discuss in his new course in a way “that at least he knew it didn’t mean anything.” (28) In order to keep this well-learned young man away he thinks of removing the material and topics he is interested in. Dixon’s fondness of beer and his resort to imagination are also indicative of his need and practice of escapism. Since he cannot put forward his reactions freely or without a consciousness of socioeconomic subordination and necessities, he internalises these reactions in an evasive and escapist way and expresses them in his thoughts which become fantastic and aggressive in proportion to suppression he subjects them to. As, following his talk about his musical gathering, Welch begins to tell some past events about another topic. Dixon rebels violently in his imagination:

He pretended to himself that he’d pick up his professor round the waist, squeeze the furry grey-blue waistcoat against him to expel the breath, run heavily with him up the steps, along the corridor to the Staff Cloak-room, and plunge the too-small feet in their capless shoes into a lavatory basin, pulling the plug once, twice, and again, stuffing the mouth with toilet-paper. (9-10)

Dixon’s repetition and continuance of his restless, problematic, almost neurotic attitude and behaviour also in his responses to art or to his cultural environment negates the healing, regenerative and the truth-revealing powers attributed to art. His contact with art does not liberate Dixon from his dual psychological and mental reactions. Art does not help or cure Margaret either. Throughout the book she experiences problems in her relationships with men. Along the fact that Dixon’s point of view, which is imperfect and conventionally male at times, portrays her, her difficulties are obvious. Her relationships are fed by illusion, pretension and inconsistency. When Dixon says about Margaret to Christine “she’s got no real claim on me”, Christine expresses her sound observation, “She seems to think she has.” (150) Though Dixon oscillates between aloofness and intimacy in his communication with Margaret, it is actually Margaret who makes the first attempts to establish closeness, particularly in terms of sexuality. Dixon engages himself with her somehow as he does not think there are other alternatives in his environment. He

is attracted to Bertrand's girlfriend, Christine Callaghan, but in his class consciousness, at first, he does not cherish any hopes about her:

The sight of her seemed an irresistible attack on his own habits, standards, and ambitions: something designed to put him in his place for good. The notion that women like this were never on view except as the property of men like Bertrand was so familiar to him that it had long since ceased to appear an injustice. The huge class that contained Margaret was destined to provide his own womenfolk: those in whom the intention of being attractive could sometimes be made to get itself confused with performance; those with whom a too-tight skirt, a wrong-coloured, or no, lipstick, even an ill-executed smile could instantly discredit that illusion beyond apparent hope of renewal. But renewal always came: a new sweater would somehow scale down the large feet, generosity revivify the brittle hair, a couple of pints site positive charm in talk of the London stage or French food. (39)

However, Margaret likes to behave in a manner as if they are close or as if Dixon also likes their relationship. She says as if they are two lovers "Can't we talk about ourselves? We've got so much to say to each other, haven't we?", whereas Dixon's response is not so warm,

he meditated on Margaret's capacity of talking like this at no notice. He wanted to give an inarticulate shout and run out of the bar, not stopping until he was on board a city bus.

But Margaret starts small physical contacts with him; "Margaret was yet managing to keep up the pressure by intimate glances, even touching his knee with hers." She furthers her imposition;

"How close we seem to be tonight, James. [. . .] All the barriers are down at last, aren't they? [. . .] But can't we sit somewhere more . . . out of the public eye?" (24-5)

In a similar way, in the Welches' house, though Dixon is drunk, when he comes back from the bathroom, "she was still sitting on the bed, but had evidently put on some lipstick for him." (57), which leads them to physical intimacy. Yet, Margaret also becomes the one who ends it, adopting a manner as if she is not involved in this act of getting closer. In the following morning she scolds him almost forgetting her

suggestive remarks in the previous night, “Whatever made you think you could get away with that sort of thing?” (76) At another time, when Dixon indicates his dislike of their silly quarrels, she cries (88). When he states he is quitting any emotional and sexual interaction between them, Margaret has a hysterical fit (158-9). Moreover, she reveals her inner thought about Dixon as she alludes to Christine; “You don’t think she’d have you, do you? a shabby little provincial bore like you”.

Her previous relationship with a man called Catchpole is in the same fashion. She attempts to commit suicide owing to it. Yet, her account of the matter that he has abandoned her for another girl heartlessly finally comes to be a fiction. As the man tells Dixon, she tried to convert, or rather perceived, a friendship to be a love relationship and treated him in an ill-tempered and unbalanced way. As the two men speak, it is understood that the suicidal attempt is a melodrama, a fake one, just to draw their attention and evoke pricks of conscience in them. Really, as they both did not go to the appointment that evening, which was actually made at the same hour without their knowledge, they both suffer from a sense of guilt and responsibility since they think if they had kept the appointment, they could have prevented her, and if her downstairs neighbour had not gone up to her for the loud music, the worst would have happened. One of Dixon’s reasons to stand by her is this sense of betrayal and responsibility.

However, her hunger for interest and her pretentious mode of relationship is a feature of her personality. At the Summer Ball she is flirtatious with the art critic; she takes him to the dance (113), at the bar she sways towards him “so that their shoulders kept touching.” (119), then while laughing “she had a hand on Gore-Urquhart’s nearest shoulder” (125). It seems that her singing ability and her participation in choruses do not have a rehabilitating, balancing effect on her. Apart from this, Dixon seems to know the unbalancing effect of art or fiction on Margaret or the unpeaceful consequences of life imitating art. While analysing her inconsistent behaviour in their physical relation at the Welches’, he says to himself “why had she decided to seem so keen, after so many weeks of seeming so not keen? Most likely because of some new novelist she’d been reading.” (59) In that way art also becomes material to use for neurotic behaviour, a factor in illness.

In **Lucky Jim** art carries negativity, or rather people related with art, those who can stand as the pseudo-artist, cause art to exist in or induce negative contexts. With all their musical abilities Johns is a sly, grudging man of espionage and Margaret has communicational problems and complexes. Dixon also has similar defects; he also bicker with Johns in a childishly secretive and spiteful way and he too has difficulties in his interaction with his environment and a complex at times due to his class origin. So, it is also relevant that even he who shows features of a philistine, dreamed of being a poet, being an artistic man; "Dixon himself had sometimes wished he wrote poetry or something as a claim to developed character." (140) This points to a trace of pretentiousness in his character as this wish to be artistic is not a natural tendency towards the sincere production of art but a wish for another issue, for strengthening his psychology, confidence and social stand.

The same dual and pretentious attitude towards art is also observable in Welch, the pioneer and representative of the artistic claims and activities in that community. He is actively interested in art and in making others interested. He also seems sincere in this interest and in the delight he gets from it. Yet, furthermore he pursues the benefits and boons such activity may simultaneously bring. He actively tries to get these additional benefits and to realise the possible advantages artistic activities can yield. Welch plays the recorder, conducts the chorus, arranges the artistic parties, gives people information about music and his effort to spread the knowledge about art and to put people into contact with art seems to serve the concept of art. But Welch is also after prestige. He likes the social stance and the self-image brought by his dealings with art and culture. His connection with art feeds and enhances his social position. The inclusion of the media in the party, his hope of "an article or a wireless talk on the provincial culture-group. . . . that stuff he came back from Manchester full of at Easter." (24), which is probably inspired by the big city and its comparatively more active cultural environment, his resentment at a mistake in the report about one of his artistic evenings on the opening page of the book, all imply a self-consciousness, care and importance attached to the social aspect and image of these artistic activities. As Margaret states "I've heard nothing else from either of the Neddies for the last week" (24), Welch and his wife, who shares his enthusiasm by helping the arrangements and playing the piano, hold these

weekends highly. Welch's talk of his painter son also indirectly reveals his pride and the consciously constructed family image, "Bertrand whose arrival with his girl had been heralded, with typical clangour, by Welch every few minutes since tea-time." (38), he is "their brilliant son" (43). Welch's effort to contact a rich and prestigious man who is also actively interested in art, "who had a house in the neighbourhood where persons of distinction sometimes came to stay, and who was a fish that Welch had more than once vainly tried to land" (47) signals Welch's social concern about the issue of art.

Yet, the artistic setting Welch generates does not seem to be what it is supposed to be, that is, it is not so qualified or successful either. In other words, the art world Dixon is directed to is not a perfect or complete one, it is a pseudo one. The definition of the parties in the book is "arty week-ends", alluding to illusion and pretension, rather than being artful or artistic. The performances in the parties do not always go smoothly, in a professional way. Most participants are amateur after all. Welch tells, "There was the most marvellous mix-up in the piece they did just before the interval. The young fellow playing the viola had the misfortune to turn over two pages at once, and the resulting confusion . . ." (8). Even the first sentence of the novel conveys the sense of imperfection and negativity. Welch refers to the report about a weekend in the newspaper, "They made a silly mistake, though". Not only this artistic world but also the information about it, its definition is faulty. This realm of art is also limited and paid devotion up to a point. When a madrigal is interrupted by Bertrand's arrival, the participants do not seem to resent this coming to an end of the performance much; "perhaps finding the chance of a break not completely unwelcome" (38).

In the book it is implied that Welch's effort is not so fruitful. His idea and viewpoint of culture, the wider concept, also parallels and reinforces the insufficiency of his service to art. He defines his attitude as traditional and conservative, he is committed to the English cultural heritage. He confesses the limitation in a way, "the things that are so important to me, the English social and cultural scene, with a kind of backward-looking bias in a sense, popular crafts and so on, traditional pastimes and that" (176). Yet, in the scene he conveys these to Dixon, immediately a negation follows. Neither the representative common Englishman who

holds the English tradition and the Establishment, nor the people who execute a traditional pastime are seen positive, refined and efficient individuals and agents of society. The national heritage or the collective culture does not seem to integrate and elevate these men. Both moral and physical forces are seen open to question, and deficient:

Standing on the pavement was a big fat man whom Dixon recognized as his barber. Dixon felt a deep respect for this man because of his impressive exterior, his rumbling bass voice, and his unsurpassable stock of information about the Royal family. At that moment two rather pretty girls stopped at a pillar-box a few yards away. The barber, his hands clasped behind his back, turned and stared at them. An unmistakable look of furtive lust came over his face; then, like a courtly shopwalker, he moved slowly towards the two girls. Welch now accelerated again and Dixon, a good deal shaken, hurriedly switched his attention to the other side of the road, where a cricket match was being played and the bowler was just running up to bowl. The batsman, another big fat man, swiped at the ball, missed it, and was violently hit by it in the stomach. Dixon had time to see him double up and the wicket-keeper begin to run forward before a tall hedge hid the scene. (177)

The evening lecture Dixon has to deliver is written by Dixon in the way Welch's ideas can be transmitted. As Dixon's special subject is the Middle Ages and as the title is *Merrie England* as Welch assigned, the paper is to describe the period in an appreciative way and in respect for the authentic traditions and habits. The cultural heritage is to be approved of and yearned for. Yet, neither does Dixon, the supposed follower and agent of Welch, believe what he is to preach, nor is the lecture presented in an understandable, successful way, and completed. Thus, with the failing Dixon and lecture Welch fails, and the ideas and culture he stands for are seen vulnerable and unstable.

Dixon is for the new century, new order, new society and the modifying culture which is to be defined as mass culture or lowbrow culture. Yet, due to his subordinate position, he is not to write the essay in that way. In his inner rebellion he expresses his reaction in his thinking during the writing process:

Something on the lines of 'Finally, thank God for the twentieth century' would satisfy him, but it wouldn't satisfy Welch. Then he seized his pencil

again, gave a happy laugh, and wrote: 'This survey, brief as it is, would have no purpose if left as a mere' – he crossed out 'mere' – 'historical record. There are valuable lessons here for us, living in an age of prefabricated amusements as we do. One wonders how one of the men or women I have tried to describe would react to such typically modern phenomena as the cinema, the radio, the television. What would he think, accustomed as he was (had been? would have been? is?) to making his own music (must look at Welch at this point), of a society where people like himself are regarded as oddities, where to play an instrument himself, oneself, instead of paying others to do so, to sing a madrigal instead of a cheap dance-lyric, is to incur the dreaded title of "crank", where . . .' (195)

It is obvious that Dixon prefers the new ways of entertainment or art and he mocks at Welch and his taste and effort. It is relevant that the surname additionally reminds dixieland, old-style jazz, which became popular in the 50s as a modern form of music and as a form of art mainly associated with common people. Dixon's fondness of pubs, beer, light dance music and the cinema exemplifies the ways of the lower classes and mass culture, which gains power and expansion after the 50s. Still, at the moment he revises the conclusion in the required way:

"What, finally, is the practical application of all this? Can anything be done to halt, or even to hinder, the process I have described? I say to you that something can be done by each one of us here tonight. Each of us can resolve to do something, every day, to resist the application of manufactured standards, to protest against ugly articles of furniture and table-ware, to speak out against sham architecture, to resist the importation into more and more public places of loudspeakers relaying the Light Programme, to say one word against the Yellow Press, against the best-seller, against the theatre-organ, to say one word for the instinctive culture of the integrated village-type community. In that way we shall be saying a word, however small in its individual effect, for our native tradition, for our common heritage, in short, for what we once had and may, some day, have again – Merrie England." (204-5)

As a mouthpiece of Welch, Dixon writes against what he actually represents, contemporary, low-brow or mass culture, yearns for a lost period and verbalises the illusion of a return or revival. In the lecture at the beginning Dixon's drunken imitation of Welch and the principal of the college, of the voices of the established authority, symbolises the situation Dixon is in, and points to the hypocrisy Dixon has to adopt and the imposition exercised on him. It also suggests the false, unfitting,

borrowed quality of the view he is handed over and is to maintain and cherish. But that evening in his drunkenness he says his real opinion:

What, finally, is the practical application of all this? [. . .] Listen and I'll tell you. The point about Merrie England is that it was about the most un-Merrie period in our history. It's only the home-made pottery crowd, the organic husbandry crowd, the recorder-playing crowd, the Esperanto . . . (227)

While fainting, "I've done it now, he managed to think. And without even telling them . . ." . In his way this is Dixon's triumph and Welch's defeat.

It seems that Welch is another character to whom association with art does not bring the claimed or wished elevation and refinement. His manner and behaviour do not seem to improve or be perfected by means of art and culture either. He is an idealist, but he is also a clumsy, absent-minded, inefficient man with shallow perception. He drives badly (Ch. 1, Ch. 18). He cannot perceive the external world completely (171, 174); his "wondering frown" to which Dixon often refers also implies this limited comprehension, he confuses names, the timetable of trains (16, 247). He forgets appointments (Ch. 1, Ch. 18). He dirties his attire (172). He speaks in a halting way and leaves the sentences incomplete - according to Dixon and alluding to his position and class, with the exception of reproofs and commands (81, 83). Though Dixon's awkwardness and Welch's are similar - Dixon is clumsy (Ch. 1, Ch. 5, Ch. 6) and inefficient most of the time, Dixon's becomes problematic. While Welch goes on without much external interference, Dixon's disadvantageous socioeconomic, class position makes his behaviour easily condemnable. Yet, in both of them the attitude to art shows them failing personages.

In the novel as well as people interested in art, the figure of the artist is deficient. It is also suggestive that we do not find any artist performing art in the book. There are two artist figures, Welch's two sons, but we do not see them produce art or we do not observe the productions or effects of their art. It seems that art becomes a void or a non-entity at their hands. Art becomes just a material to talk, palaver or just an excuse to show off, pretension. Thus, **Lucky Jim** shows the artist figure as the so-called artist, rather than a competent and upright figure. The narrator introduces these two artists from Dixon's viewpoint in a way which draws attention

to their lack or deficiency of the genuinely artistic quality. The grammatical structure of the expression is indicative of that; “the effeminate writing Michel and the bearded pacifist painting Bertrand” (13, 38, 178, 250). The Welch brothers are deprived of the active role and label of the artist. The narrative deliberately does not define them as the writer and the painter, which would be the usual way of discourse.

Michel, the so-called writer is depicted as an inefficient, torpid personage. He is not positively portrayed both in his way of living and physically. Our knowledge of him is relevantly second-hand. As he is to exist as a deficient character, his existence is shadowy and he seems to lack power to stand on his own feet both metaphorically and literally. He is said to be living in a London flat by the support of his family. As an adult man, this shows him as a parasitic character. This privilege evokes rebellion and social criticism from Dixon:

Why hadn't he himself had parents whose money so far exceeded their sense as to install their son in London? The very thought of it was a torment. If he'd had that chance, things would be very different for him now. (178)

Thus, in contrast to the one aspect of the romantic conceptualisation of the artist, this figure does not function with self-sufficiency, charisma, dignity, virtue and a sense of social mission. On the contrary, he draws critical reaction in points of lack of power and social injustice. His association with foreign culture is also reflected as an instance of pretentiousness and as a form of deficiency and unhealthiness. This conforms to the other aspect of the romantic portrayal of the artist as an ill, suffering man at the hands of society. But this view is satirised in the narrative as his suffering is neither due to society nor a functioning one, it is vain self-indulgence:

This Michel, as indefatigably Gallic as his mother, had been cooking for himself in his small London flat, and had in the last few days made himself ill by stuffing himself with filthy foreign food of his own preparation . . . Michel was evidently coming down in a day or two to recuperate on his parents' English fare. (178)

His physical appearance also augments this image of torpidity and decadence. “He was a tall pale young man with long pale hair protruding from under a pale corduroy cap.” (250)

The other Welch brother is opposite to Michel in physique and manner. Bertrand is a robust, noisy man who is extrovert and self-assertive. Yet, similarly he is functionless as the artist. Instead, he is a snob, a pretender and a bully. His way of entering the narrative, literally the music room parallels and announces his personality; “An irregular knocking on the door at the far end of the room was at once followed by the bursting-open of this door” (38). His voice is also said to have a “baying quality” (42, 46, 99, 113). At the party he immediately “dominated the central group, doing a lot of laughing as he told some lengthy story” (40). Like Michel’s artistic corduroy, his clothes are eye-catching. At the moment he wears a lemon-yellow sports-coat and a vine-patterned tie. Later, we frequently see him in a blue beret, an accessory associated with painters. Dixon seems to sense the pretentiousness in it and rebels inwardly;

If such headgear was a protection, what was it a protection against? If it wasn’t a protection, what was it? What was it for? What was it for? (188)

He has a large beard which is also associated with artists.

His artistry is formal, superficial rather than essential. It is to Dixon’s credit in point of insightfulness that he wonders about Bertrand’s pictures (140). Pertinently, the person who tells about him, his girlfriend Christine Callaghan has not been shown them. Bertrand has even reasoned with her saying he will show them to her when he feels a painter, as a sign of modesty which he does not adopt with other people. Christine knows their quality as others have verified it. Yet, his artistry is again questionable as these are Bertrand’s friends and so there emerges the matter of partiality.

Christine seems charmed by him, by his supposed devotion to one aim, to art, as “something that isn’t just material, or self-interested.” (140) She claims that it does not matter even if his art only interests himself. She also seems to accept the artist’s egocentricity to create;

the work of an artist does takes so much out of him, in the way of feeling and emotion and on, that he hasn't got much left over for other people . . . he's sort of got special needs, you know, and it's up to others to supply them when they can, without too many questions asked. (141)

Dixon senses the contradiction in the matter of the artist's freedom from self-interest and his asocial ways to produce, and intuitively apprehends that "Christine must, perhaps unconsciously, be quoting her boy-friend, or some horrible book lent by her boy-friend".

Dixon's guess is also palpable as Christine's view of the artist's self-appeal parallels Bertrand's general lack of social or socialist anxieties. Behind this detachment is his egoism, selfish concerns and his need of and interest in money. Both as a man and as an artist he is devoid of social missions and approves of the established social structure. He is angry with the leftist government and does not like or care about the movements and institutions which keep the rights of the lower and working classes. He says of the present government "their home policy . . . soak the rich". (51) Being from the adverse class, Dixon instinctively adopts the role of the antithetical party in the conversation. He alludes to social justice; "what's wrong with it, even if it is that and no more? If one man's got ten buns and another's got two, and a bun has got to be given up by one of them, then surely you take it from the man with ten buns." (51) Bertrand does not think so. As a bourgeois, he sees the lower classes as threat. When he talks about an orthodox art critic with whom he often coincides, even in front of the same pictures, a sign of the similarity of the two men's taste and understanding, Bertrand also refers to the man's beautiful house with a sarcastic allusion to the Welfare State. He says:

I always say he's the last of the old-fashioned professional critics, and so he knows what he's talking about, which is more than you can say for most of the fraternity nowadays. . . . his house – a lovely place . . . Wonder how long before the Rubber Goods Workers' Union takes it over (112).

Bertrand is not a revolutionary figure or an artist who presents the conditions of the disadvantaged. Thus, he is different from the romantic artist figure for who justice, equality and reform was important. Since, like his brother, he is after the support of

the moneyed people, he acclaims the status quo, the rich and wealth. He reveals his conformism when he talks about the prosperous:

I'm not going to bore you with the stock platitudes about their having kept the arts going, and so on. The very fact that they are stock platitudes proves my case. . . . what else I happen to like? Rich people. I take pride in the contemporary unpopularity of that statement. And why do I like them? Because they're charming, because they're generous, because they've learnt to appreciate the things I happen to like myself, because their houses are full of beautiful things. That's why I like them and that's why I don't want them soaked. (51-2)

Bertrand is a self-seeker. He aims to be present in the environments where he can make contacts which are to his advantage socially and professionally. He says “. . . despite my passionate interest in this kind of sport,’ he nodded towards the piano . . . ‘it isn’t quite enough to draw me down here unaided, glad as I am to see you all. No no; I had been promised a meeting . . .’” (47). He has come to the provincial town to be acquainted with the rich art lover and art critic via his girlfriend, who is the man’s niece and to make himself the man’s secretary. Since he wants an easy, comfortable life and living, he plans to find a job which both will not interrupt his painting and will provide him with enough earnings without difficulty and with a prestigious and supportive social environment. He says “I doubt whether the post will be publicly competed for, and so I’m at the moment busily engaged in grooming myself for the part. Patronage, you see, patronage: that’s what it’ll be. I’ll answer his letters with one hand and paint with the other.” (48) When he finally meets the man at the Summer Ball, he turns around him and tries to impress him. As in the case of his implying the sameness of his taste as that of the old-fashioned critic and thus indirectly stating the power of his vision, he tries to sell himself. He imposes the incident like a reference or recommendation. He indicates the man’s liking some of his works. Dixon traces Bertrand’s effort as “frenzy of self-advertisement” (112). Bertrand can even cancel his dislike of the lower classes for a time for his profit. As he is deceived on the phone by Dixon’s persona of a journalist requesting information about his recent works, he behaves politely as this will be an opportunity for publicity, “Very fine body of men, the gentlemen of the Press.” (102)

Bertrand's conformism, selfishness and pretension are also uncovered in his exploiting the social position he and his family have. He and Dixon, as social opposites and opponents, do not get along with each other. Worse, they also come to be rivals for the same girl. Dixon happens to get fond of Christine and interested in her. He takes her away from the Summer Ball as Bertrand neglects her in his attempt at enticing her uncle, and he meets her at teatime. Bertrand's reaction to this thievery or intervention is hysterical. He turns into a bully, but an inefficient one who threatens his opponent with calling for his father. Bertrand tells Dixon to stay away from his girl or he will make his father dismiss him. He alludes to his class and position and wants Dixon to know his place; "Don't think you can defy me and get away with it, Dixon. People never do." (184) In turn, Dixon alludes to changing social dynamic; "People are beginning to, Welch." Bertrand is stripped of his social veneer and reveals the disdain he habitually holds for the lower classes; "I've had enough of you, you little bastard. I won't stand any more of it, do you hear? To think of a lousy little philistine like you coming and monkeying about in my affairs, it's enough to . . .". When Dixon disregards it and sees Christine, Bertrand behaves more rudely and offensively as a member of the upper classes.

I gave you a straight warning to leave Christine alone. When I say that sort of thing I expect people to have the sense to do as I say. Why haven't you? Eh? (206)

When I see something I want, I go for it. I don't allow people of your sort to stand in my way. That's what you're leaving out of account. I'm having Christine because it's my right. Do you understand that? If I'm after something, I don't care what I do to make sure that I get it. That's the only law I abide by; it's the only way to get things in this world. (207)

His discourse reflects the stereotypical self-righteousness, complacency, possessiveness, selfishness, unethical individualism, arrogance and sense of insecurity of the middle classes.

In this context, it is also uncovered that his pacifism is a pretence. Rather than a philosophical, moral and social attitude, it is just another instance of Bertrand's egoism. We see that the man who has objected to fighting for his country tends to exercise physical violence for his personal interests. Though he simultaneously

becomes glad when the occasion prevents the real fight as a sign of instinctive self-protection and of egoistical avoidance of pain as in the case of Christine's intervention at the arty weekend (53) and Dixon's readiness against his bluff to fight (183), Bertrand's intention displays his aggressiveness. Dixon's last resistance against his threats finally brings the real fight which Bertrand starts and at which Bertrand strikes the first blow. Yet, as a metaphor for Dixon's social triumph, it is Dixon who becomes the winner of the match.

Bertrand's love affair with Christine is also entangled with duality. While he carries on a relationship with her, he has a relationship with a married woman which he hides from Christine. Bertrand's morality is deficient. His hypocrisy is seen about the unreality of his self-dramatisation too. In his introduction of himself he shows himself as a disadvantaged, self-sacrificing man being not for the market or the mainstream;

I am a painter. Not, alas, a painter of houses, or I should have been able to make my pile and retire by now. No no; I paint pictures, Not, alas again, pictures of trade unionists or town halls or naked women, or I should now be squatting on an even larger pile." (41)

But on the phone he says something opposite to the supposed journalist about his recent topics; "There's a rather splendid nude . . . there's a self-portrait, an outdoor one against a brick wall. . . . There's a little one of three workmen looking at a newspaper in a pub" (100-1). His remarks about his subjects do not seem consistent.

Thus, the artist figure in **Lucky Jim** is an antithesis to the romantic convention. The artist is not a superior, refined, pioneer or prophet-like figure. Bertrand does not substantiate the other aspect of the romantic conceptualisation either. The dark side of the artist is his rebellion, unconventionality, which is a mystified or glorified property. Yet, Bertrand with his conformity is also dispossessed of that aspect of the romantic representation. The dark or evil side of Bertrand is his being an ordinary member of the middle classes. In addition to his disfunction in his profession, he lacks sensitivity and humanity as an artist. The description of his eyes is indicative of his failure and incapability, "Bertrand's eyes, which seemed to lack the convexity of the normal eyeball" (41), "as if a sheet of

some patterned material were tacked to the inside of his face, showing only at two arbitrary loopholes.” (47), “His unusual eyes looked like polished glass.” (206) As painting is heavily associated with eyesight and as eyes stand for both the concrete ability to perceive the outside world and the abstract inner vision, intuitive understanding of emotions and moral qualities, the peculiarity or defect of Bertrand’s eyes, his lack of usual properties of eyesight is an important flaw in an artist.

As well as the artist figure, in **Lucky Jim**, though indirectly and without details, contemporary artistic circles are shown as blemished environments. They are sites of ambition, competitiveness, pomposity and presumption. Bertrand’s reply to Margaret’s enquiry of his work also suggests the self-image of some of London artists; “You make it sound like missionary activity. Not that some of our friends would dissent from that description of their labours.” (40) In a way, here the romantic image or pose of the artist is pointed to. The pretentiousness and superficiality in another man is even detected by Bertrand; “Most assuredly Otto. He certainly looks like a missionary, even if he doesn’t behave like one.” (41) Dixon unfolds the detachment of the sophisticated circles from real matters of art, “the Rotarians and the stage crowd and the golfers and the arty types talking about statements of profiles rather than volumes and the musical . . .” (215). The involvement in the artistic locales obviously brings advantage in other matters by the exploitation of that particular identity. Christine tells:

I hadn’t been working in the bookshop very long, when a man got talking to me and asked me to come to a party. So I went, of course, and there were a lot of artist kind of people there, and one or two ones from the B.B.C. [. . .] I kept being asked out by men, [. . .] it was such marvellous fun. [. . .] But they kept . . . trying to seduce me the whole time. And I didn’t want to be seduced, you see, and as soon as I’d convinced them of that, they were off. (138)

The necessity of Bertrand’s encounter with Christine’s uncle, the art critic in the provincial setting rather than in London suggests the complicated, confusing environment of competition in the big city whereas Bertrand needs concentration and isolation to promote himself. The critic’s view and experience of the prominent circles also point to the quality of these communities as fields of struggle and

pretension. He says to Dixon, who asks why he tolerates the silly atmosphere in the Ball,

I let myself in for several hours' boredom every day, Dixon. A couple more won't break my back. . . . I want to influence people so they'll do what I think it's important they should do. I can't get 'em to do that unless I let 'em bore me first (215).

The man seems to be aware of the formality in the cultural environments or resents the established manner of these. He wants to soothe the excited Dixon before his lecture; "No need to worry; to hell with all this." (221) While the drunk Dixon adds various signals of derision and disbelief to what he himself says, which is actually Welch's ideas about the contemporary culture and that of the Middle Ages, this critic is the only person who reacts frankly among the authorities, almost like the common audience:

Below him, the local worthies were staring at him with frozen astonishment and protest. Of the Staff contingent, the senior members looked up with similar expressions, the junior wouldn't look up at all. The only person in the main body of the Hall who was actually producing sounds was Gore-Urquhart, and the sounds he was producing were of loud skirling laughter. Shouts, whistles, and applause came from the gallery. (226)

Julius Gore-Urquhart is an important personage in the book. He is accepted as an authority of art. He is an eminent man, with social prestige. He is rich and in contact with international environments. He lives and manages his affairs in both the countryside and the metropolis in the same esteemed and affluent way. His name also verbalises his identity and social stand. Reminding Caesar, his Roman first name alludes to grandeur, prestige and pomposity. Urquhart, with the prefix "ur", refers to old periods. Together with the first name it alludes to antiquity and elitism in a way and thus it constitutes an image of worth and establishment. This parallels the man's social position. The surname also includes the word "art" and this alludes to his interest and profession; as it also sounds like "quart", a unit of measurement, it also alludes to his function as a judging critic. The man is introduced as "a rich devotee of the arts who made occasional contributions to the arts sections of the weekly

reviews” (47). Margaret gives an account of his recent deed, “He was presenting some water-colours to our Gallery here. . . . It’s a good job there are some people still about who can afford to be, in that way” (50). Apart from his energetic devotion, as in the case of his assessment of the academic conventions and of his disapproval of Bertrand, Gore-Urquhart seems to have some merits in respect of judgement and perception.

Yet, as the word “gore” in his surname signals, he is not a perfect man or art lover either. In contrast to the conventions about people related with art and culture, he is not so refined. Dixon even recognises something vulgar in him:

He was younger than Dixon had expected any distinguished man, and an uncle of Christine’s, to be: somewhere in the middle forties. His evening suit, too, was not nearly as spectacularly ‘faultless’ as might have been predicted. His large smooth face, surmounting a short thin body, was the least symmetrical, short of actual deformity, that Dixon had ever seen, giving him the look of a drunken sage trying to collect his wits, a look intensified by slightly protruding lips and a single black eyebrow running from temple to temple. (109)

His thumb is nicotined too. As another token of the deviation from the conventional figure of culture, he does not have the Queen’s English. He has a “strong Lowland-Scottish accent.” (109) On the other side, in that way, he substantiates the preconception about Celtic indelicacy. Yet, he seems assimilated and reconciled to the social and hierarchical ways of the English system. As his remarks about his strategy to make people do what he wants them to do show, he is another personage who exploits his superior social position. Thus, he is another character who repeats and contributes to the pattern of the book exhibiting the tainted quality of people related with art. Gore-Urquhart utilises the benefits originating from his wealth and position. At the Summer Ball he bribes Maconochie, the supervisor of the barmen, with tip enough to make him serve an amount of drink which is not regulated. When Dixon asks naively “How on earth did you manage to get pints?” (110), Gore-Urquhart refers to Maconochie as “A fellow Scottish Nationalist” (110). His idea of nationalism seems to be confined to his personal gratification. His ethic is not so

powerful either. It is obvious that after Bertrand he becomes the lover of Mrs Goldsmith (216, 249).

Gore-Urquhart's choosing Dixon as his secretary, as an agent of art also undermines the concept of art in the book. Admittedly, Dixon also has positive qualities. He employs hypocrisy for monetary reasons of survival and though he knows he is inefficient in his field of work, he wants to continue with financial anxieties. But he has a sense of morality as well. He keeps secret what he has witnessed; he does not tell about the relationship between Bertrand and Carol Goldsmith neither to Margaret nor to Christine whereas he could gain Christine by disconnecting her from Bertrand in that way. When Carol warns Dixon that her husband knows her affair, he is naively surprised and thinks "not for the first time, that he knew absolutely nothing whatsoever about other people or their lives." (123) When Mrs Welch asks about his damaged bedclothes and says she will deal with her maid as he does not accept involvement with the impairment, Dixon immediately admits the guilt and the bill so as not to cause inconvenience to a servant girl. When Mrs Welch also expresses her suspicion about his personification of a reporter on the phone, Dixon decides not to confess it in a second as this will also reveal Christine's initiation of the matter. These instances show the presence of self-discipline, patience, loyalty and a sense of responsibility in Dixon. His conversation with Gore-Urquhart is appreciated by both this man and the reader. He has self-knowledge. His judgement can be sound. The critic refers to his job:

"I've a notion you're not too happy in it; am I right?" . . .

"Where's the trouble? In you or in it?"

"Oh, both, I should say. They waste my time and I waste theirs."

"Mm, I see. It's a waste of time teaching history, is it?"

. . . "No. Well thought and sensibly thought, history could do people a hell of a lot of good. But in practice it doesn't work out like that. Things get in the way. I don't quite see who's to blame for it. Bad teaching's the main thing. Not bad students, I mean." (214)

In the matter of academic qualities, as the academic community includes people like him and produces works in similarity to his – he thinks of his article "[He] had read, or begun to read, dozens like it" (14), his failure also owes to his

disconnection with the involved circles and his deprivation of manipulative power as well as to his deficiency. This situation is underlined by the incident that another man deficient in both academic qualities and ethics plagiarises Dixon's article and makes it published in an Italian history journal (229). This is the Caton fellow, to whose journal Dixon has sent his article. It shows that in this way or other his work is admissible to publish. Dixon's view of Bertrand also duplicates Gore-Urquhart's view or vice versa. Gore-Urquhart's remark might be uttered by Dixon, "I knew young Welch was no good as soon as I set eyes on him. Like his pictures." (234) He has intuitively thought the same, "Bertrand must not be a good painter; he, Dixon, would not permit it." (112)

Yet, whatever positive qualities can be also discerned in Dixon, his active involvement in art, artistic atmospheres and cultivated circles is questionable and might be problematic. Gore-Urquhart explains the reason for his choice, "It's not that you've got the qualifications, for this or any other work, but there are plenty who have. You haven't got the disqualifications, though, and that's much rarer." (234) Still, Gore-Urquhart becomes the man who brings a man awkward, immature and not well-learned to an important position. "It'll be mainly meeting people or telling people I can't meet them." (233-4) It can be summarised in this rough way, but the job is related with cultural activities and art, which necessitate a certain background, training and manners. Dixon might be naive and well-intentioned, yet his potential is not so profound or available for either qualified art or intricate relationships. Dixon does not know about elite, highbrow art and conventions. But even if the matter is new movements, his efficiency is not guaranteed. Whatever his qualities are, Dixon is a man who is aloof to art and culture. He does not like or wish to improve himself. He does not seek knowledge, "Dixon, whose policy it was to read as little as possible of any given book" (16-7). Besides, as the new surroundings he will find himself in are not unflawed artistically or socially, and thus they are not so dissimilar from the one he departs at the moment where he is immensely bored and dissatisfied, he might experience the same plight. In the conclusion of the novel Dixon seems a winner as he obtains both the job and the girl, particularly the two objectives of a middle class man, also representing a victory of the lower classes over the upper classes. But Dixon's fulfilment, gratification, ease and peace are not secured or accessible. Art

and the artistic world do not promise heaven to him. The title of the novel, Dixon's being lucky might just as well be ironic. Though Kingsley Amis was defined as an angry young man at the time, surveying the whole text, we can trace that Amis seems to be unable to erase the assimilated conventional view of his educational origin. Dixon, with all his defects and deficiencies, is a caricature figure. It is difficult to take him or his success seriously. Similarly, Gareth Jenkins comments that "Jim's triumph is meant to be the triumph of the ordinary and basically decent person over the pretentious hypocrites who occupy positions of social, moral or sexual authority. Even so, the novel's praise for ordinariness and decency raise a number of problems." Jenkins also has in mind an oblique embedment of philistinism in the book and an inherent slightness of political criticism. (Jenkins)

Amis's **Lucky Jim** uncovers the inadequacies and corruption of art and the art world at the second half of the twentieth century and on the verge of postmodern, mass cultured society. It is a world of set patterns of behaviour, understanding and creativity and of the idolisation of distinction. Responsive commotion and motions of change are inevitable. But complete purification, absolute refinement and fertile gratification are not definite. Neither art nor the people involved in art can draw such a picture.

3. LIFE AS ART, ART AS LESSONS IN LIFE: **THE MAGUS**

John Fowles's **The Magus** (1977) is a novel which unfolds the misuses and abuses of art, distorted and unhealthy perceptions of it, and its malfunctions and dysfunctions. Through contradictory, complementary, multidimensional and ambiguous narrative elements, the concepts and elements of art are filtered in prevalently metaphysical, philosophical and psychological levels, with an essentially individualistic focus.

The novel exploits the affinity and distinction between reality, ordinariness, mundaneness and unreality, fiction, elusion. Art as life and life as art become the ground on which narrative and thematic elements are activated and negotiated. The individual is strained by the continual interaction and tension between these symbiotic phenomena.

The Magus is a text in first-person narration and retrospective. It positions as the protagonist's autobiographical account of an extraordinary experience he has gone through in a Greek island and the relevant events and moods before and after it. As form, the novel alludes to *building's roman*. Yet, ironically, the reader would not find any securely and clearly built elements or individual character in it. Though the theme and mode are intricate, the narration is traditionally in chronological order. Yet, this conventionality and orderliness do not provide senses of certainty or confidence. Pertinently, the narrative is open-ended. The mode of ambiguity, uncertainty and dissolution persists with the ending of the narration during a scene, in an ongoing interaction between two characters, who are in a way the two main characters. This is also noted by the narrator himself. At the beginning of the last chapter of the book, that is, in the penultimate section which is constituted by the narrator/author's inner thinking as a commentative interlude, the ending of the novel and generally endings are indicated to be gaps, cuttings in dimensions and not to be ultimate. Even if the narrative process comes to an end and the events or states unravel, there still remain narrative bits, subsidiary, peripheral elements, which are potential focuses for other tales or texts, and which have the fuel yet unexhausted in the present text to further it at other angles. This opinion of the narrator reflects a

deprivation of certainty and finality in tales and texts, which would be reinforced in an open-ended narrative like his:

The smallest hope, a bare continuing to exist, is enough for the anti-hero's future; leave him, says our age, leave him where mankind is in its history, at a crossroads, in a dilemma, with all to lose and only more of the same to win; let him survive, but give him no direction, no reward; because we too are waiting, in our solitary rooms where the telephone never rings, waiting for this girl, this truth, this crystal of humanity, this reality lost through imagination, to return; and to say she returns is a lie.

But the maze has no centre. An ending is no more than a point in sequence, a snip of the cutting shears. Benedick kissed Beatrice at last; but ten years later? And Elsinore, that following spring?

So ten more days. But what happened in the following years shall be silence; another mystery. (645)

Here the self-reflexivity of the narration and the authorial interference also recall to the mind Fielding's commentativeness, and the reference to human ambivalence, confusion, impasse, expansion and enrichment with the word "maze" alludes to Pope. Yet, in contrast to the general mood of poetic justice and faith in the period of those earlier literary men, as the citation suggests, contemporary man is generally represented unheroically, as the anti-hero. The twentieth-century protagonist suffers from a decentralisation at the hands of both his own inefficiencies and the factors other than himself, and rather than a definite and satisfactory attainment as a result of his experience, what he gets, according to the narrator, is the smallest expectation and just the state of existing. This modern protagonist's main action of achievement is reduced to the act of existing, of surviving in one way or another.

Accordingly, in **The Magus**, particularly taking into consideration his insular experience, the narrator protagonist's achievement is small and questionable. As a modern protagonist, the traditional associations of his name are subverted and ironically annulled; he is not a Saint Nicholas figure, who is conventionally beneficent, generous and affectionate. Nicholas Urfe, from the beginning of the novel to the verge of its end, has been a selfish and self-indulgent man. The island experiment turns out to be a moral lesson, an education to curb this egoism and sensuality. To some extent, at the level of consciousness, the lesson seems to be

learned. Yet, in the last scene Nicholas's involuntary but compulsive, uncontrolled offence -his slap on the cheek of the woman he waits for- unfolds his unchanging inner aggression and egocentrism. This also displays the limitedness, incompleteness and deficiency of his moral education and self-betterment. His manner of talk with his beloved, mutual misunderstanding, and lack of and difficulty in communication still repeats the defected pattern at the beginning of the book. He is still not so voluntary to farewell his individualistic "freedom"; he still resents renouncing his emotional and physical freedom, independence, and disloyalty. He has great difficulty to bring himself to express his love. For him acknowledging and expressing love, and his "education" seem to constitute defeat rather than triumph, and cause restlessness rather than contentment. The consequence and solution of his experience do not induce success, peace or order. In the ending of the book, Nicholas has neither succeeded something nor acquired anything. On the contrary, we see the "hero", the anti-hero, solitary, isolated, without a secure home, family and friends, and jobless, with a decreasing money supply. Though, with his background and specialties, with his status of class, education, knowledge, abilities and potentialities, he would not be a mere failure and rootless tramp, and though in his hour of existential and emotional crisis he is given both accommodation and emotional support by his landowner mothering him and in this respect he is not totally friendless, all these do not guarantee for him a stable order, a continual sense of complacency, security and inner peace, or a certain and acclaimed social position, and instead his past and endowments remain functionless and his current home and case of adoption are transitory. This lack of existential construction and formation, and this constitutional inefficiency are dominant in the mode of narration and the conveyed mood, because the narrative is of the first-person viewpoint and the protagonist's thoughts and feelings, which get more and more oscillatory and disillusioned, are directly transmitted.

In its rough framework, **The Magus** unfolds a selfish philanderer's coming to the point of practising loyalty. Alongside various and elaborate philosophical, psychological and cultural aspects and associations, Nicholas tells of how he has come to be a faithful man acknowledging his love. Yet, John Fowles amplifies and deepens an ordinary and commonplace subject-matter like the man and woman

relationship. The text is based on this expansion and sophistication to explore the mundane but complicated topic, and attaches it to the overall intricacy of human experience and culture. The protagonist, an individual, a man could turn into a realm to obliquely signify the human species and human history. The phonetic associations of his surname are also suggestive; “Urfe” sounds like the “earth”, standing for universal life on earth, the generality, and like the prefix “ur”, meaning the original, primitive, standing for the prototype (“ur-” in **Online Etymology Dictionary**). Nicholas Urfe’s urge to detach himself from the woman he likes and his inner difficulties in disciplining this egoism allude to unceasing departures from humanity and humaneness, and, hardships, problems, defects, deprivation and depravity mankind generate and get through.

Nicholas, the young Englishman, has had numerous affairs with women. He gets acquainted with an Australian woman at a party, Alison Kelly, who is in a way an engaged person, yet with whom he begins a physical relationship immediately. As they both find jobs, they separate due to vocational reasons by appearance. Actually, the separation is Nicholas’s choice; the departure from the country is not imperative. He might have found another job easily, but he does not search. On Phraxos, the Greek island he goes to for the job, he makes contact with a mysterious, enigmatic rich man about whom there are rumours. The man seems to live in and creates mystery. The man, Maurice Conchis as he introduces himself, holds various performances not claiming performative qualification for them. Thus he first stimulates Nicholas’s curiosity and interest and then draws him to his realm. As Nicholas is an adventurous, curious man enjoying both physical and intellectual novelty and challenge, and interested in fiction and art, he cannot help himself drifting to Conchis and the continuously changing fictional world Conchis conjures. The luxury and the beautiful women present in the environment Conchis designs are the primary factors enchanting Nicholas. He gets obsessed with one of the women. At a point where he is supposedly banished by his host from the realm of fantasy, the news of Alison’s suicide is conveyed with a letter from her friend. Despite the confusion, humiliation and pain he suffers in the world Conchis creates, Nicholas does not relinquish his connection with it. The events and his subjection exacerbate. He begins to neglect his job. The fictive world begins to overlap the mundane world

Nicholas goes through and consequently the extraordinary, devised realm surmounts the ordinary realm. He finally copulates with the woman he desires. But this turns into the last trap in the plot. In the last phase he is in a way tortured and thrown to the wilderness. He loses his job. Nicholas tries to solve the mystery and understand what he has gone through. On Phraxos and returning first to Athens, then after a visit to Rome, to Britain, he almost does detective business. This time he is obsessed with searching for “the truth”, reality, getting information about Conchis and his tricks. Thus he does not look for any job. He lives on the check he is given at his dismissal from the school he has worked on the island. At another point the news of Alison’s suicide is understood to be fake. She is somehow one of this phoney circle. He waits for the moment she will appear and explain events. Alison comes across him at a time he least expects, and rather than explicit explanation they have a row, which at the end of the book remains unfinished and uncleared. Eventually, Nicholas’s island experience basically comes to mean a vehicle to teach him the “value” of his previous beloved, Alison, and thus also to be a moral education for him to tolerate ordinary life and people. Fundamentally, almost the whole bulk of the narrative presents the chain of “lies”, the fiction and imaginary world created by Conchis, yet to serve in making Nicholas aware of Alison and the world she obliquely represents.

Alongside libidinal motivation, Nicholas Urfe’s egoism and sensuousness are related to sociological factors. His selfishness, lasciviousness and pretension are fed by socioeconomic conditions. Nicholas has egocentrism and intellectual vanity, which are blunted and curbed in time, yet which are not annihilated completely. As the narrative is chronological and proceeds from his youth, Nicholas’s pursuit for self-satisfaction, entertainment, physical pleasure and complacency as a young man is understandable. To these inner motives are his social and monetary conveniences and resources added. As well as presenting possible human tendencies, he becomes a produce of his culture and environment.

As long as his narration discloses, this social realm is aloof to the world of “lesser people” like Alison, and is lacking in humane bonds. Nicholas is a progeny of the English middle classes. He is the only child of a middle-class English family. His father is a brigadier and his mother is a middle-class wife, who does not work out of home. His lack of siblings also alludes to and duplicates his egocentrism; he is not

used to share properties and rights, and care about or empathise with a fellow being. Further, his parents are not qualified to show and teach him these. As the narrator, Nicholas introduces his home and family as an environment lacking love, compassion and freedom. Signalling the lack of intimacy, there is no occasion in the book to indicate the parents' first names. It is also very relevant to imply the family's thin ties that Nicholas mentions and describes them shortly, just at the beginning of the text, in concordance to the conventional mode of narration beginning with origins. The Urfe parents are deficient, and dysfunction. They are not much loving and warm; they do not establish a strong and healthy emotional bond with their son. They are not so caring; they do not take into consideration their son's personal integrity and distinctiveness. The family is patriarchal in conformity to the general social system. Thus, Mrs Urfe is a shadowy woman, who tries to boost the patriarch's position at home, instead of cherishing love for his son. Nicholas says "my mother was the very model of a would-be major-general's wife. That is, she never argued with him and always behaved as if he were listening in the next room, even when he was thousands of miles away." (15) This meekness and excessive respect is submission. Yet, it is an insufficient model of the relationship between the sexes. There remains in the child's mind the complete obedience of the female, not any mutually satisfactory, pleasant and cheerful man and wife communication. Nicholas as a male child inclines to attach himself to the father, yet the father is a traditionally aloof and strict figure. So as to produce a conformist citizen, who is in harmony with social customs and class traditions, he imposes these on the son. Nicholas's sarcastic narrative voice in this part reveals his childhood resentment:

in his long absences I used to build up a more or less immaculate conception of him, which he generally -a bad but appropriate pun- shattered within the first forty-eight hours of his leave.

. . . in lieu of an intellect he had accumulated an armoury of capitalized key-words like Discipline and Tradition and Responsibility. If I ever dared -I seldom did- to argue with him, he would produce one of these totem words and cosh me with it, as no doubt in similar circumstances he quelled his subalterns. If one still refused to lie down and die, he lost, or loosed, his temper. His temper was like a red dog, and he always had it close to hand.

(15)

Mr Urfe is not only the patriarch of the microcosm, the family, but also a patriarch charged in the macrocosm, in the social system. His profession seems to worsen the familial and filial relationships. As he is a brigadier, a military man, his relations with the boy weaken. As a military commander, he is a man of commands, order, strictness and even harshness. Nicholas's or the writer's word choice and suggestion also point to a probable physical aggression and punishment as a form of upbringing. Further, the man is not only a military man but also a man of war. He is an active member of armed forces since the country is at war during Nicholas's adolescence. Thus, the patriarch is not only deficient but also absent. Nicholas notes "I saw very little of my father during the war" (15). War, as a state of annihilation and inhumanity, deprives the child Nicholas of his father at a critical age. The Urfe father is functionless as he does not exist in the little Nicholas's world and as his qualifications malfunction when he is around. As a middle-class educational convention Nicholas goes away from home too; he is sent to a public school. He indicates the lack of involvement in the family: "By the time I was eighteen . . . they had become mere providers" (16). Since the family life Nicholas experiences does not develop his sympathetic faculties, and senses of attachment and loyalty, the ultimate disappearance of his parents from his life does not move Nicholas much. At his early twenties he loses them in a plane crash on their route to India with a mission. He says "After the first shock I felt an almost immediate sense of relief, of freedom." (16)

Nicholas is a lone self. Not only is he left without a family, but also he is bereft of kinship. His mother's brother is a farmer in Rhodesia; two of his father's brothers have died in the First World War and the other one has escaped to America with gambling debts. Nicholas does not know about any affinity possible among kin. These lacks of emotional and social experience seem to be other factors feeding his individualism and aloofness. It is also noteworthy that social factors play role in these disappearances of kin; colonialism, war and money are basically social phenomena.

The general condition of the society as a warring country and the current attitude of European culture unable to prevent making war fill the young mind of Nicholas with resentment and detachment. He grows up developing reactions to

prevalent social values represented and enforced on him by his father. Thus, he is estranged to his country and society. He is not interested in the current war or the post-war situation; he is the son of a soldier, of a commander, though lesser, yet, he is not full of patriotic feelings or any ideals of serving his country. He says of the obligatory military education after the public school “I wasted two years doing my national service” (15), “As soon as I could, I got myself demobilized.” (16) Both as another middle-class male educational convention and as a way to escape the army, he goes to the Oxford University. His spiritual solitariness, individualism, conceit and adaptation problem drag him more and more away from the country, eventually expelling him physically from it. Because his father does not leave him a great inheritance due to his expenses for entertaining people, Nicholas has to earn his living. Yet, as he lacks any faith and purpose in life other than entertaining himself, he is not so willing and motivated for a specific profession or job. He neither aspires to nor fits typically bourgeois jobs; “the Foreign Service, the Civil, the Colonial, the banks, commerce, advertising- was transpierceable at a glance.” (17-8) He fails at interviews. Thus, at least, as an Oxford graduate he leaves out the other two candidates from Redbrick universities and gets a teaching position at a minor public school in East Anglia. Yet, on the one hand since he is not at peace with his background, family and class and he lacks a general capability to love and cope, and on the other hand since the society and institutions are repressive, strict and monotonous for an alienated and restless mind, the job and the environment of the school become unbearable to Nicholas. He describes the mood he is in:

The mass-produced middle-class boys I had to teach were bad enough; the claustrophobic little town was a nightmare; but the really intolerable thing was the common-room. . . . Boredom, the numbing annual predictability of life, hung over the staff like a cloud. And it was real boredom, not my modish ennui. From it flowed cant, hypocrisy, and the impotent rage of the old who know they have failed and the young who suspect they will fail. . . . a glimpse of the bottomless pit of human futility . . . (18)

Nicholas regards the school as a sample of the country in a micro level; “the smug, petrified school was a toy model of the entire country and that to quit the one and not the other would be ridiculous.” (18) He resigns from the position. Thus, the extent of

his detachment and solitariness increases. Eventually, he is to depart from his homeland as he loses any sense of home and belonging. He dislikes England and the English. He explains: "I didn't know where I was going, but I knew what I needed. I needed a new land, a new race, a new language" (19). Yet, it seems that what he says of his father and the institution he represents is valid for his general sourness; "I had got away from what I hated, but I hadn't found where I loved, and so I pretended that there was nowhere to love." (17) Though not so willing for teaching English in foreign schools, solely as a means to abandon the country, he applies to the British Council for such a position as they can only offer it due to the limitation on overseas personnel. Via them, he sends a form to the Lord Byron School, Phraxos, Greece.

Nicholas resents England and prefers a strange place, Greece. Simply, he dislikes England and loves Greece. As he is estranged to his native land, it is a kind of loss to him. Emotionally and intellectually he needs reparation and a kind of replacement. Since he escapes his homeland as an embracing entity and embodiment of his dull childhood, his past and roots, reality, ordinary life, order and customs, Nicholas subconsciously needs an outlet, a route and a different direction, which is supposedly and thus functionally an antidote and antithesis of England. Greece does this for Nicholas. Rather, Nicholas uses an idea or idealisation of Greece in his mind subconsciously to draw himself out of the personal crisis, and confinement and repression he feels in England. Nicholas conceptualises Greece in a particular way and makes her his goal to attain. Thus, even reaching that land would mean the actualisation of an aim and stand as a victory within and against the void he feels he is in. He says:

Even if I had failed the board I should have gone there. . . . it needed only the seed of the idea of Greece, that morning in the British Council. It was as if someone had hit on a brilliant solution when all seemed lost. *Greece* -why hadn't I thought of it before? It sounded so good: *'I'm going to Greece.'*
(39-40)

In his mind Nicholas creates an image of Greece, and his perception of her filters through and is shaped by it. Whereas he complains about English conventions and patterns of living, that is, already set practices and visions, as long as they bar his ego and libido, in respect of Greece he shows a similar attitude, that is, he sets ideas

and develops a peculiar view of her before he has direct experiences in that place or acquires first-hand knowledge about her. On the matter of prejudices, Nicholas is a bigoted person as well although his are positive and appreciative. His yearning for that distant country is based on its foreignness and mysteriousness. For Nicholas Greece is the unknown. His exuberance and preference for Greece are also motivated by his lack of factual knowledge of her and his curiosity for the un-tried. He expresses his ignorance of that alien country and the abstract level on which he makes himself connected to it:

I never studied Greek at school, and my knowledge of modern Greece began and ended with Byron's death at Missolonghi. . . . I knew no one -this was long before the new Medes, the tourists, invaded- who had been there. I got hold of all the books I could find on the country. It astounded me how little I knew about it. I read and read . . . (39-40)

Accordingly, he says of setting off "the excitement of the voyage into the unknown" (48). Greece also represents the "different", the "antithesis", in other words the "other". In Nicholas's mind Greece substantiates the difference from, contradiction to England or his idea of England. In his idealisation Greece reflects solitude, peace, dignity and purity, all of which are lacking in England for him. When he first observes the Attic plain, he employs an exalting discourse in contrast to his derogatory manner in his evaluation of England. He expresses a wish to un-Anglicise himself:

Serene, superb, majestic: I tried for adjectives less used, but anything else seemed underweight. I could see for eighty miles, and all pure, all noble, luminous, immense, all as it always had been.

It was like a journey into space. I was standing on Mars, knee-deep in thyme, under a sky that seemed never to have known dust or cloud. I looked down at my pale London hands. Even they seemed changed, nauseatingly alien, things I should long ago have disowned. (49)

As the particularization and impregnation of the flow of time is a covert notion in Fowles's novel, the island part subtly serves to underscore a dual conceptualization of time. Frank Kermode, in **The Sense of an Ending**, analyzes this conceptualization. He talks of a distinction between the successive passage of time

and distinguished, charged spans of time. Also referring to biblical interpretation, he uses special terms for them: *chronos* and *kairos*. As he adopts their senses outlined by Oscar Cullman and John Marsh; “*chronos* is ‘passing time’ or ‘waiting time’—that which, according to Revelation, ‘shall be no more’— and *kairos* is the season, a point in time filled with significance, charged with a meaning derived from its relation to the end.” (Kermode, 1968: 47) Nicholas’s early admiration for Greece and the island’s expansion in his mind covertly constitutes a secondary temporality which is filled with potentialities to modify in the protagonist’s mind and his personal perception of mundane time and of ways of the world in general.

However, even his predilection for and idealisation of that foreign land covertly carries social conditioning. It is a conventional view that some of the peoples and cultures constituting the opposite pole to Englishness are the Mediterranean societies. In this kind of schematised thinking, whereas the English stands for reserve, rationality and order in a cool and pallid climate, the Mediterranean world symbolises warmth, colourfulness, sensuousness, spontaneity and a loose control. This metaphorical contrast causes Nicholas to ask at the British Council for Mediterranean spots to be designated (19). It is also relevant that Nicholas sees that different country in a conventional image of the female and employs a language conventionally used in depicting the woman. At any rate, he is a reared and educated member of a society which uses feminine linguistic units (pronouns and adjectives) to refer to a country in its standardised language. In the conventionally male opinion of the world, the female represents senses, feelings, irrationality, passion, chaos and the lack of restraint. Thus, Nicholas perceives Greece in terms of the female. She is a different body to discover and to try in self-gratification. His interest in and advance to Greece is simultaneously in a context of the sexes. His arrival on the Greek soil would also be deliverance from the female and from a possibility of continual emotional, physical and social bondage, and of a stable living and recurrent patterns. Any prospect of a steady and continuous relationship married or unmarried constitutes a threat to his individuality. So, his departure is also an abandonment of his woman and his desire for another place is also a disloyalty to his mistress. The narrator Nicholas interprets the young Nicholas’s urge to go abroad and his mental immersion in Greece in terms of the

man and woman relationship: "What Alison was not to know -since I hardly realized it myself- was that I had been deceiving her with another woman during the latter part of September. The woman was Greece." (39) When he arrives there, his self-analysis shows another instance of the lack of inner peace. Nicholas is such a restless and cynical type that even in the place which is his goal to reach he is not at ease and content. This agitation is again depicted in a comparison with the man and woman relationship and more than that with the metaphor of the temptress:

When that ultimate Mediterranean light fell on the world around me, I could see it was supremely beautiful; but when it touched me, I felt it was hostile. It seemed to corrode, not cleanse. It was like being at the beginning of an interrogation under arc-lights; already I could see the table with straps through the open doorway, already my old self began to know that it wouldn't be able to hold out. It was partly the terror, the stripping-to-essentials, of love; because I fell totally and for ever in love with the Greek landscape from the moment I arrived. But with love came a contradictory, almost irritating, feeling of impotence and inferiority, as if Greece were a woman so sensually provocative that I must fall physically and desperately in love with her, and at the same time so calmly aristocratic that I should never be able to approach her.

. . . this sinister-fascinating, this Circe-like quality of Greece . . . In England we live in a very muted, calm, domesticated relationship with what remains of our natural landscape and its soft northern light; in Greece landscape and light are so beautiful, so all-present, so intense, so wild, that the relationship is immediately love-hatred, one of passion. It took me many months to understand this, and many years to accept it. (49)

Nicholas's chaotic emotional reactions to a place just for the very causes of his love and addiction disclose his general problematic state and psychology. The extent of his admiration and enjoyment generates irritation and inferiority complex. Emotional involvement and physical dependence induce riot in him. This attitude is a repetition of what he goes through in a love affair. Nicholas's introversion, self-containment and egocentrism go to the extent that he dislikes liking what he likes.

Still, Nicholas continues to admire, love and enjoy the Greek landscape and climate in Phraxos, specifically at Conchis's manor. Thus, in consequence of the ending of the game Conchis and his agents play on the young Englishman, his separation from the place and its nature become traumatic to him. Nicholas's early

estrangement to and renunciation of the homeland and the English culture are reinforced after the island experience. His frustration about the inability to return and the anger he feels for Conchis are added to his depreciation of the English atmosphere compared to the attraction of the Greek one, and, increasing his general restlessness, incite this disclaiming. Leaving Phraxos, he first transits Athens to inform the British Council about the cancellation of his contract. The official invites him to dinner. Nicholas accepts it as a class reflex but immediately revolts:

The stiflingly English atmosphere of the place had never seemed more alien; and yet to my horror I had detected myself trying to fit in acceptably . . . I had to find courage to refuse all my social past, all my background. I had not only to be ready to empty dustbins rather than teach, but to empty them rather than ever have to live and work with the middle-class English again.

The people in the Council were the total foreigners; and the anonymous Greeks around me in the streets the familiar compatriots.

(555-56)

As the memories of his involvement with Greece are fresh, the phase following his island period is particularly intolerable in respect of the resumption of his English life. His criticism persists:

The dinner that evening was dreadful, the epitome of English vacuity. Before I went, I had some idea that I might tell them a little about Bourani; I saw a spellbound dinner-table. But the idea did not survive the first five minutes of conversation. . . . they were all the same, each mind set in the same weird armour, like an archosaur's ruff, like a fringe of icicles. All I heard the whole evening was the tinkle of broken ice-needles as people tried timidly and vainly to reach through the stale fence of words, tinkle, tinkle, and then withdrew.

Nobody said what they really wanted, what they really thought. Nobody behaved with breadth, with warmth, with naturalness; and finally it became pathetic. I could see that my host and his wife had a genuine love of Greece, but it lay choked in their throats. The critic made a perceptive little disquisition on Leavis, and then ruined it by a cheap squirt of malice. We were all the same; I said hardly anything, but that made me no more innocent-or less-conditioned. The solemn figures of the Old Country, the Queen, the Public School, Oxbridge, the Right Accent, People Like Us, stood around the table like secret police, ready to crush down in an instant on any attempt at an intelligent European humanity.

It was symptomatic that the ubiquitous person of speech was 'one' - it was one's view, one's friends, one's servants, one's favourite writer, one's

travelling in Greece, until the terrible faceless Avenging God of the Bourgeois British, one, was standing like a soot-blackened obelisk over the whole evening. (559-60)

Nicholas is emotionally honest and intellectually able to self-criticise. Though he is a hedonistic, self-centred and flawed person, he knows about these yet cannot help himself being otherwise and has a covert self-hatred alongside his intrinsic self-love. He carries some traits which he finds faulty in others, hence his self-criticism and self-hatred. He disapproves the middle-class Englishness, yet owing to his innate need for self-gratification and comfort, his habits and his formation -conditioning in his own terms-, he does not object to benefit from the middle-class situation, position, provisions and ease. However, his Phraxos experience and the emotional chaos following it sharpen his criticism and impatience for English hypocrisy, corruption and assimilation.

In his discord and inadaptability, his idealisation of Greece is a kind of weapon, shield against his alienation and a means of self-defence against his existential isolation. As human, he is a social being. He needs alliance. His specific idea of Greece provides this mental accompaniment. After the gathering, his agitation and emotional rebellion broaden. He says "I felt upset, profoundly unable to face the return to England. I was in exile, and for ever, whether I lived there or not. The fact of exile I could stand; but the loneliness of exile was intolerable." (561) Nicholas's preferment of Greece is such an idex that other non-English spheres do not work as alternatives to England. Before the return to England, he visits Rome shortly to search a clue for Conchis's experiment as one of the previous guinea pigs, a Catholicised Englishman, is there. Nicholas's comparison of Rome with Greece reveals his general disturbance, widening of criticism and intolerance of pretension:

In my mind Greece lay weeks, not the real hours, behind. The sun shone as certainly, the people were far more elegant, the architecture and the art much richer, but it was as if the Italians, like their Roman ancestors, wore a great mask of luxury, a cosmetic of the over-indulged senses, between the light, the truth, and their real selves. I couldn't stand the sight of the opulent, animal Romans; as one sometimes cannot stand one's own face in a mirror.
(569)

Yet, following this spatial prelude, his confrontation with his homeland on his return constitutes utter depression and edginess:

If Rome, a city of the vulgar living, had been depressing after Greece, London, a city of the drab dead, was fifty times worse. I had forgotten the innumerability of the place, its ugliness, its termite density after the sparsities of the Aegean. It was like mud after diamonds, dank undergrowth after sunlit marble; and as the airline bus crawled on its way through that endless suburb that lies between Northolt and Kensington I wondered why anyone should, or could, ever return of his own free will to such a landscape, such a society, such a climate. Flatulent white clouds drifted listlessly in a grey-blue sky; and I could hear people saying 'Lovely day, isn't it?' But all those tired greens, greys, browns ... they seemed to compress the movements of the Londoners we passed into a ubiquitous uniformity. It was something I had become too familiar with to notice in the Greeks -how each face there springs unique and sharp from its background. No Greek is like any other Greek; and every English face seemed, that day, like every other English face. (573)

In the depiction of his vision, it sounds like that Nicholas complains about being English and inhabiting in London. Yet, all these are personal matters. His perception and reactions are his personal stand. Whether his view is real or true, it is still very individualistic and subjective. It is heavily blended with his general psychology and his particular plight. He reflects a total negativity about the place and its people, and makes generalisations based on generalised comparisons.

At an Italian restaurant he used to go with Alison before, he again feels disorientation:

I looked round, to try to find someone I might hypothetically want to know better, become friendly with; and there was no one. It was the unneeded confirmation of my loss of Englishness; and it occurred to me that I must be feeling as Alison had so often felt: a mixture, before the English, of irritation and bafflement, of having this same language, same past, so many same things, and yet not belonging to them any more. Being worse than rootless . . . speciesless. (574)

Nicholas discloses his subjectivity and the dependence of his reactions on the satisfaction of his need for partnership.

As he has hidden self-hatred and thus self-escapism, he cannot bear loneliness and tends to avoid such a state. It seems that when this need for emotional association is fulfilled even if not so strongly and constantly, Nicholas's general perception and mood become a bit more positive, confident and tolerant. When he realises that he has to wait for Alison, this process and temporal expansion induce stability and a choice to find a place as home instead of staying at the hotel as if ready to go or run away immediately. The landlady of the attic he rents has a character to which he can develop attachment. This small change in his life also modifies his perception of the external world he is in:

She drank like a trooper and talked like one, but in every other way she was what I wanted and what I needed: a warm heart and a compulsive gossip about herself, who accepted without suspicion my explanation of my joblessness; partly reconciled me, in her bitter-warm way, to London and being English; and -at least to begin with- stopped me from being, whenever I felt it, too morbidly abandoned and alone. (576)

As his first shock of banishment from Phraxos begins to decrease and his first reactions to his exile begin to get smoother in this transition phase, his perceptions get milder and a bit merrier. So, he can compare a London day to a Greek day: "It was a very fine day, cloudless September blue; a day to compare with a Greek day." (586) It is also noteworthy that this is the day he is on the trace of a clue he has found to get information about Conchis.

Though Nicholas is a solitary man, as a human being, he inclines to establish relationships and he needs physical accompaniment. He carries out these particularly with women. Yet, his fear for the continuity of these as this signifies the status of the dependent shows him as an immature character. Nicholas spiritually oscillates between commitment and renunciation, attachment and independence. His stress is like that of a child's in his/her progress to individuality. Since he is in need of proving himself his absolute freedom, he practises evasion and allows self-illusion. Whereas he accuses the English folk of insincerity, he applies it in certain dosage for egoistic aims. Throughout the narrative we observe circumstantial modifications in Nicholas's approach to and treatment of women. Yet, these are actually very slight

changes and originate from external causes. In other words, his inborn selfishness persists and he becomes constant and loyal as he regards it as a test. Essentially, the quality of Nicholas's view of and handling of the women he contacts with depends on the degree of benefit he is to attain.

Alongside with innate egocentrism, Nicholas does not have a cruel and harsh character. He does not deliberately behave to induce evil. Actually, throughout the book he seems to be susceptible to external factors and effects. He is egoistic but owing to his earlier deprivations his ego is problematically built and at times vulnerable. Thus, beside a whining woman, he almost comes to surrender to marriage once. Amid his disturbance in East Anglia, he enters an affair with the daughter of a senior teacher. Though she practises free love, she also wishes to keep up appearances and to conform to social customs. Although love is of no concern, Nicholas confesses his mild side: "There were even one or two evenings when I felt myself near surrendering to Janet" (21). As he senses this subjection to influence, so as to protect himself against self-betrayal, he transits London "with the firm determination to stay away from women for a while" (21).

This kind of decision is not realistic for him as a womaniser. Yet, Nicholas also confuses matters of love, desire, company, freedom and evasion. As he has not learnt about loving and caring, he can neither establish a healthy, mutually satisfactory and peaceful relationship nor recognise any probability of such an environment. In the structure of the novel, as a thematic necessity, before his departure from England, Nicholas is given a chance for a state and sphere of attachment and belonging.

4. FRAGILITY OF ART AS STORICISED HISTORY: **ATONEMENT**

In Ian McEwan's **Atonement** (2001) art and the artist primarily appear as deficient and evil concepts. In contrast to the elevating side of the romantic view of art, in a comprehensive outlook neither the producer nor the product of art can attain a satisfactory triumph and fulfilment. Since also in this novel art is not considered only within its artistic realm and aesthetic framework, and since it primarily exists and evaluated within a social realm and on different levels of human relationships and human drives, art and its components, the creator, the material, the medium, the method, the outcome and its perception, are all tainted and flawed. **Atonement** can be regarded as a novel about novel writing and the formation of the artist. It also covertly carries the traits of *bildungsroman* and *künstlerroman*. Yet, in the book the artist, society, written word and memory are faulty and have destructive potentials. In **Atonement** art and the artist also inhabit in this comprehensive dimension which is heavily interwoven with the wider concepts of culture and history. Thus, in the book we observe the fall and fault of culture and history alongside the artist's memory and memoirs.

In **Atonement**, the narrative of which is understood to be fictively autobiographical, there is a "real", professional, acclaimed artist, writer, as opposed to the aspiring artist figures or rather characters interested in art in **Lucky Jim** and **The Magus**. In this text we have a writer whose books are studied at school and known by many people, and who is asked to read the texts of the aspiring ones. Yet, even this professional success does not provide her with a full or unblemished triumph and competence, nor does it save her art from taint and deficiency. Furthermore, this professional success and the acknowledged writer identity do not make her different from the incompetent and failing arty figures in the other stated novels. Briony Tallis is as fallen and failing as the others with regard to character. As a person this artistic figure is very flawed, even sinful. Like other characters of the given books, her association with art does not purify her morally, does not refine her spirit and conduct or does not endow her with healthy communicative potency. Instead, Briony stands as a selfish, proud, egocentric character. As the young writer

seems to be deficient in perception or blind to reality, the adult writer retains this as she gets senile.

Briony destroys a young man's life and career and with this the possibility of happiness of her own sister. As, also directed by her adolescent drives, her mind is full of plots of romance, her pattern of thought and her perception of the world are affected by them. In turn this causes a deficiency in her understanding and visualization of real life and persons. Her misinterpretation of or rather her unreal, fantastic, evil construction of an interaction between Robbie Turner and Cecilia turns the lives of the couple into nightmare and void. This misreading of the adult world through a veil of her readings which are obviously melodrama, romantic literature, the nineteenth century literature with moral, also causes her to make a mistake in sight. This state, which also points to the corrupting effect of art, sends an innocent man first to jail, then to war, and thus ultimately to death. We see that art becomes a destructive factor rather than a regenerative force refining humanistic sensibilities or bestowing a more powerful perceptive efficiency. Her sister's life is also ruined as she separates herself from her family and she goes through a futile waiting for her lover which ends in her death in a German attack at war. Thus, the couple cannot fulfil themselves.

When Briony realizes what she has done and its consequences, she aims to compensate it some way. As people concerned are dead and as her only tool for that is art since her ability is only in it, she decides and many times tries to write the real happenings of that time. This is both a confession on her part and an apology as her writing requires visualizing other people's experiences and realities. More than that with a view of romantic conceptualization of art, the writer aims to give the couple in the fictional world what she has deprived them in the real world; making the couple survive the war and bringing them together in the novel she writes, Briony allows them eternal love. Art in its lifelessness immortalizes them. Yet, though as an aesthetic whole and structure this is a success and generates integrity in terms of fiction, in respect of Briony's aim the situation includes an oxymoron. The couple lives in a lifeless realm. Though Briony constructs a story of them all, she cannot change the reality. Worse, the story, her account of the real events which is announced to carry the aim to display reality is deprived of reality as she confesses at

the end. Her story seems to be a history, a personal history, yet what it turns out to be is really personal. While she historicises the events of the time, she actually distorts the concept of history, playing and reshaping the facts in her account in accordance with her own will and personal needs, which are in this case matters of her conscience. Thus, the novel in which Briony writes about herself and the couple is not a true story. In terms of art and fiction there is no problem with this aspect as the fictive world is unreal. Yet, with regard to Briony's aims it points to the limitation of art. At the same time it shows Briony as a liar again. Further, it activates our suspicions of history writing; the personal aspect, or the inevitable inclusion of a viewpoint in history writing causes the questioning of this activity. Art as a form or text of history does not seem so trustworthy and indubitable. In that it carries a failure and deficiency and at the same time an evil potential as a site of untruth and lies. Critical authorities such as Laurence Lerner, Hayden White, George Steiner, Joseph Brodsky, Czeslaw Milosz, Walter Benjamin and Alun Munslow point to these points (Walder, ed. , 1992).

Accordingly, Brian Finney interprets the novel; "**Atonement**, then, is concerned with the dangers of entering a fictional world and the compensations and limitations which that world can offer its readers and writers." (Finney) Art is a means of constructiveness and production, yet its realm is different from the ordinary, material and practical world. Its formations and methods differ; its rules are distinct. Thus, any replacement of reality with art within the ordinary world is invalid and fails. Resurrection and immortality in art cannot function in the real world through art, or can happen just as a metaphor and intellectual state. In this context, Finney's comment is relevant also in respect of defective human relationship and selfish human vision. Finney says "Every time a character misinterprets the situation it proves to be the consequence of a projection on his or her part onto another character." (Finney)

In **Atonement** there are other demonstrations of the deficient and evil aspects of art and the artist. Though Robbie and Cecilia are faithful to one another and seem to be in love, and though in letters they convey their love in coded language, when they come face to face they fail to communicate and actualise their intimacy. In letters they can talk about literature and fictional lovers in parallel with their situation, yet in "real

life” they do not have this ability. This also alludes to the distorting and distancing effect of art and to its dehumanising potential as an unreal realm. Similarly, stream of consciousness and its use in art carries the potential to omit reality, the concrete aspect of life and art and occurring events in the world outside the individual’s mind.

In the same way we see that though the novel is full of references to literature, which is conventionally supposed to boost humaneness and inner peace, it is a story of misery and restlessness, and the civilization producing it cannot keep itself immune to war. Literature and art do not seem to strengthen human sensibilities and humanistic potential; socioeconomic and political conditions seem to be indefatigable.

Likewise, art does not seem to be so liberating and independent a force. Behind the adult writer’s creation and creative process, there are also the audience expectations. As mass culture, and social and artistic conventions generally require “happy endings”, the writer also wants to fulfil it. Thus, the illusion and self deception, which are associated also with failure and evil, appear to be a cultural phenomenon revealing itself also in the activity of art producing and consuming.

Atonement displays a case of development and formation of the artist. The reader witnesses or is told of a way to become a writer. The birth of an authoress and the creation of a literary text are unfolded in primarily a five years’ and totally a sixty-seven years’ time. The book starts in 1935 when the would-be writer is 13. The events of the narrative basically pass between 1935 and 1940, and a coda takes place in 1999. The book also refers to three years earlier, to the artist protagonist’s age of ten when she begins to write. As Part One presents a girl practising creative writing in prepuberty, Part Two shows a young woman in 1940 at wartime, still with artistic aspirations and attempts to create a piece of literature. The brief ending part identifies the protagonist as the writer of the previous bulk of the text. Thus the earlier body of writing attains the definition and label of a literary text, a novel, and the attempting girl of the antecedent narration is recognised as a known writer. While the narrative carries traits of bildungsroman as it unfolds the experiences, and psychological and moral phases of an individual, it also alludes to Künstlerroman as an artist’s becoming can be observed. In the longer narration the artistic requirements, needs, aims, quest, questionings, manner of thought, problems, dilemmas and searches for solutions are all embedded. The creative process and the act of creating a literary text are

displayed obliquely. Thus, with the contribution and revelation of the coda, Briony Tallis, the writer, who can be regarded in the previous text either as one of the characters or as the protagonist, confirms her centrality to the text and regains her position as the protagonist, a situation which highlights the *künstnovel* quality of the book.

Briony Tallis, the writer young or old, is a fallen and defected character alongside the taint and deficiency of her art. The young Briony carries the greatest sin, pride. This brings her other sins, and leads her and her environment to chaos. The 13-year-old girl is conventionally impregnated with sin and chaos already due to her gender, which is of the same kind as Eve, the first human rebel to God. Briony is in a critical phase as obviously she is an adolescent and as her age of prepuberty means that she is on the verge of chaos found in the adult world and sexuality. Briony seems to be destined to lack of peace and to confusion with her gender and age. Her pride makes her care about her ego. As a young person she needs self assertion and self realisation. Yet, furthermore she has a restless personality. She is egocentric and obsessive. She has a tendency to dominate and command. She can be hysterical. Her artistic tendencies are also heavily blended with this restless and defected personality. In a conventional sense, her ambition to create, her commitment to establish a world in fiction, which is an alternative to the world created by the male Christian God, is a connection to the rebellious Eve, who tended to compete with God according to the Christian mythology. Briony's wish to write is a selfish inclination, which stems from her ego and pride. In the Christian framework, crime and punishment wait her.

When the reader is introduced to Briony's private life, the girl's room is depicted. As a lucky young female, who has an upper middle class family being a daughter of a senior civil servant and a bourgeois woman, she has a room of her own, in Virginia Woolf's phrase; in a moneyed and domestically comfortable situation she has conditions to produce literature, to write. She is provided with a room and she is bestowed with the opportunity to interfere in and shape this territory. The place reflects the human factor as a site of the individual's will and manifests the girl's personality and character. The room is the only orderly one in the mansion. Briony also keeps her toys in order according to their kind and size and keeps them in line. A

hierarchical anxiety is sensed. This is the girl's conventional and complacent side, which is also connected with her upbringing and class. Yet, her care and attempt to impose order in this miniature dimension signs an obsessive inclination in her character. As all the toys are arranged in her direction being their owner, which is a key word and concept, Briony's readiness to interfere, her wish to shape and oppress, her need to command and dominate can be perceived. The child or the young person begins her attempts to shape and order the world and life in her own vision early, from her room. As the room is a microcosm which is to be a parallel world of the macrocosm to which Briony comes out, her vision of and her expectations from the outside world are reflected in the smaller, "miniature" place. This miniature space is also a metaphor for the physically small space of literature, the book or pamphlet as a concrete object, the page as the unit of writing, or the stanza, the "room" of a poem. In the way she puts her room in order, in the way she demands a strict order in this microcosm, Briony wants to impose a strict order on her fictive characters and she highlights poetic justice and morality. The act of miniaturising and the fondness for a miniature world allude to the girl's writing activity; in the way she has a miniature farm she wants to have a world she can possess and apply her control over.

Briony also likes to create areas of privacy, secret regions in small scales. She hides favourite objects or objects of personal importance under the bed; she keeps some drawers locked; she has a diary locked. This secrecy and care point to her need for self expression and individuality. She pretends that she has or knows things of importance. This signs her need to boost her ego and pride.

Yet, she has no secret, no adventure, and no information of importance actually. Thus, her fondness for writing fiction is to compensate this lack, this deprivation of personal significance. When the book opens, Briony stands as a girl who has a writing experience formed by fairy tales, fantasy, romantic literature, melodrama and moral tale. These provide her with secrets and adventure. In literature the writer 'knows' or commands the secrets of others, as these others are the characters she creates; she can go through adventures, experiences different from ordinary life as she can shape fantasies in the fictional realm; she can carry and reflect some knowledge of or lessons of life, or morals, or insights about human beings and human life as she embeds these in fiction through the experiences or

moral conditions of the characters. Moreover, as the ability to create and the competence to animate lifeless or unreal persons and worlds, seem a secret and a magical thing, the writer obtains a particular importance and a superior identity.

In adolescence Briony has a dual physical and psychological existence. The novel refers to a world, time and society in which conventions and the patriarchal system prevail. Thus, as a child or as a young female Briony seems to need a patriarch. She behaves in a chaotic, unrefined way whereas as a well taught girl or as a young lady she is to display a neat appearance. She wanders in nature, plays in the open area, beats nettles and walks around in dirtied and disordered dress. Having artistic tendencies, she is open to chaos. She lives through it with her restlessness and urge to write, with her ability to dissociate from the ordinary world and life, and she can produce chaos in her act and ability to establish fantasies or tales of fiction. A patriarch presumably stands against chaos and he is a founder of order. With his fatherly care or patriarchal authority he supposedly dissolves digressions from the common, customary modes of behaviour and thought. Yet, as a senior official Briony's father is very busy and as his job is in London, Mr Tallis is away from the family mansion. Thus, Briony lacks a patriarch and fatherly love. She instinctively looks for them in surrogates or in compensatory behaviour. In her act of writing, which is, in conventional thinking, a male activity, she takes on her the authority of a patriarch, and in this creative practice she also plays the role of God. In the lack of the patriarch she makes herself one. This is conventionally sinful and rebellious in terms of religion and social system. Without the father, his supervision, guide and advice she can produce fantasies in daily reveries and carefree time.

Briony loves her brother well and as a surrogate father she expects his approval and love. When she hears the car carrying her brother and his friend approaching, in her egocentric thinking and in her need of attention, she supposes he will hasten to her way. She writes a play for the first time and intends to dedicate it to him. She dreams that he will like the play well and he will boast of her as a famous writer in future. She needs his attention as her favourite audience. But she asks for more audience. In her hunger for approval and appreciation, she aspires to worldwide fame. She would gain the love and admiration of the society as a greater surrogate of the father figure. All these hopes are self centred, and her method to realise them, her

search for personal satisfaction and compensation through art, means a betrayal to art as an entity. She basically uses art for anxieties and needs other than the aesthetic and artistic aims. Art is a magic wand in her hand to actualise her wishes.

Thus, we see that the artist has a vulnerable and defected personality and weaknesses from her youth and she taints her art with goals outside the realm of art. The rivalry between her and Lola functions in the same way; the work of art, the play becomes a site on which the two girls' egos clash. Lola is two years older than Briony. She is another adolescent. Yet she behaves like a young woman. She dresses well and adorns herself. She is also another young female who lacks a patriarch. Like Briony she is deprived of fatherly love. She not only lacks the father but also a family in that her parents are divorced, which is a rare thing at that time, and what is more, they both stay away from the children. The father works at Cambridge. The mother goes to France with her lover who works in the wireless. Lola and the twin boys are accepted by their aunt, Briony's mother to the Tallis house to stay actually for an unpredictable period. They are like refugees. They feel disadvantaged and underprivileged. Lola, as the elder child, seems obligated to represent good sense. She suggests to the younger they should obey the rules, order and wishes of the Tallis household. They are to feel obliged after all as they are admitted to the place, as they have found a place to stay on earth. Yet, since Lola is in need of parental, fatherly and in general human love and attention, she wants to grasp the leading role in the play driving Briony outside. As the princess of the romance and melodrama, who first makes a mistake, then suffers from it and pays for it, and then serving the punishment is rewarded, Lola wants to be at the focus. To compensate the lacks she suffers, she intends to be the centre of attention and sympathy. On stage she would be the star. At first she seems even not to be satisfied by the role, she begins to handle casting. Suddenly, she seems to have usurped the rights Briony as the playwright could claim. But the younger girl, who leaves Arabella, the role to the care of Lola out of politeness and pity, also with Lola's oblique incitement, takes over the part of the director. The play is not solely a piece of art. It is treated and used by the two unsatisfied girls as an object over which they exert their wills. They covertly rival for it; they want to use it to draw the audience's attention and appreciation. The play becomes an indicator of pride, jealousy and ambition.

Briony also envies Lola's accumulated knowledge of the adult world. Though also Lola is a young, incomplete member of this world, because of the two-year gap between them, Briony feels disadvantaged. She resents the ways Lola knows and uses to get what she wants, or Lola's mimicry of the adult stand. She wonders whether she will have to adopt the same and whether she will achieve them. As an adolescent she is on the verge of change, but she does not seem to be ready for it or happy about it. This is not only because of her critical and difficult age, but also because of her selfishness and self closed personality. She has her own world, fantasies and order, and she does not want to change or lose them at the beginning.

Her ambiguous situation and her personal vision also limit and distort her perception and evaluation of the world. Her prepuberty obsessions and her artistic introversion and creativity engender an unhealthy, untrue and destructive perception of and reaction to the external world. At the window of the nursery she witnesses a scene between her elder sister, Cecilia and Robbie Turner, their cleaning lady's son. Yet her lack of knowledge and her deluded mind misinterpret what she sees. At first Robbie's way of standing seems to be a proposal of marriage. Then Cecilia undresses herself and plunges into the fountain. She comes out and picking a vase of flowers enters the house. Briony thinks that as Robbie lifts his arm, he commands her sister to do something. He most probably threatens her, or blackmails her. She believes that he forces her to do this bold action. Actually, Robbie has been trying to help Cecilia fill the vase with water. Cecilia is resentful at Robbie owing to his self consciousness beside her though they are childhood friend. Thus, she refuses his offer for help. While they are struggling with the vase, it cracks and some pieces fall into the pond. Cecilia hastens to go into the fountain to precede Robbie, to prevent his help in bringing the pieces out of the water. Out of her resent and anger she does not hesitate undressing before him. At any rate they have known one another since their childhood and are used to each other's intimate appearance. Yet, Briony does not know what passes between her elders. Nor does she realise their reasons and motives. As an adolescent, who is excited about the adult world and as a would-be writer, whose mind is full of plots, she constructs her own vision of the scene, her own tale out of it. Briony fictionalises what she has seen. Though she does not have the first hand knowledge about what the elder couple do, she does not hesitate reading it in

her own view, or loading it with a meaning she believes to be valid and true. This reveals her deficient vision, her selfishness and her destructive potential.

The act of witnessing, the scene evokes her literary tendencies, her desire to write. She plans to write the scene from three involved persons' viewpoints. This seems to be unselfishness, multiple vision and a profound perception. Yet, this act will work in the realm of fiction. It will serve as a method of writing. In the realm of real life in the book, Briony holds one way of thinking about this matter. She could not be sure about what has happened or what has been the real matter. She could not establish cause and effect relationships or the order of actions; she could not rationalise the event or the scene, the happening and she could not discern the logic of the scene. But she evaluates it in one way. It has to be based on threat and impropriety. There could not come any good out of it.

The following sections of the book reveal that though she is not right in her guesses about the details of the scene, Briony almost instinctively could perceive the aggressive quality embedded in the happening. Though Briony does not clearly understand the electricity between her sister and Robbie, she could sense the potential aggression in the whole scene. There is not any threat or command on the part of Robbie; Cecilia undresses in her own will. The event even carries the trait of juvenile struggles. Yet, actually there is a suppressed and covert sexual attraction between the two young adults and the scene or the tableau Briony witnesses is loaded with its tension and secrecy. In that sense Briony's suspicion about the threat is valid as sexual attraction and passion is related to aggressive or outwardly instincts in the way a threat includes or generates aggression.

Still, Briony fails about this scene in an important matter. At the moment she is a personage who is related to art. Though the motive behind the happening is sexual, the happening is constructed on art; and Briony fails in seeing this fact. Though she is an artistic person, she is not aware of any artistic aspect. Her elders struggle on the antique vase. Cecilia undresses for it. The tension is displayed due to it. The main plot is constructed by means of it. Yet, for Briony the vase, the piece of art is just a peripheral object in the tableau in contrast to its central importance. When Cecilia comes out of the fountain, Briony discerns that she picks up a vase of which she has not got aware before. She does not load any meaning or significance to it.

Briony's failure at this point is a metaphor about her art and artistic sensibilities. In the way she lacks adult knowledge and vision, there are some elements missing in her artistic vision and capacity. At the moment, metaphorically, she could not acknowledge the power of art or recognise the artistic value of the art object. These deficiencies allude both to her incapacity to understand the destructive effect of her imaginative mind in case of her fiction about Robbie, and to her deficiency in realising the artistic lacks of her first attempt at professional authorship and also to her unprofessional aim and anxiety about compensating her evil deeds through fiction and thus to her undermining the artistic value of her last fiction, which is loaded with a historical, confessional stance.

Young Briony's defects in seeing and evaluating the adult world are to be seen also in another scene which involves Robbie and Cecilia again. She interrupts them in a sexual act. Robbie seems to be confused as Briony is again around him. She has already conveyed a message from him to Cecilia, which is to be his apology about the vase scene, but which is the wrong one expressing his passion for her. While he expects resentment from Cecilia, she unfolds her unacknowledged and repressed interest in him. But Briony thinks she saves her sister from a tense and distressed situation. She interprets Robbie's mood and complexion as one of the guilty and red handed. Cecilia is resentful and seems to feel empty as an intimate moment is broken up. Yet Briony sees just an expressionless face, and she interprets her quick, wordless departure from the room as anger with Robbie and an occasion to escape thanks to Briony. As a self centred and incomplete personage, Briony reads the external world in her own view, in other words, in her own fiction.

The worst wrong reading or fiction of Briony, or Briony's most evil tale whose consequences are the most destructive and impure, is her identifying Robbie as an attacker, a rapist. The evening of the event is a chain of misfortune. Briony has already observed the scene with the vase, and read and conveyed the wrong, unintended letter. It is the hottest day of the year, which is a state symbolising the passion of the childhood friends and that of Briony's brother's friend, the restless and distressed characters and environment and the destructive deeds and events. There is also a case of burning at the kitchen where the dinner is prepared. The main dish is burnt and the kitchen is in chaos and dirt. The dinner is also brooding and oppressive.

Communication is defected and unhealthy. Mrs Tallis is constantly tense and apprehensive. She is not a perfect hostess. Mr Tallis is the one who is able to lead a fluent communication and a pacifying order. But his absence causes also the lack of these. The characters' attempts to communicate and initiate talk are not successful, but problematic. The twins are excluded from the table. Briony cannot help herself from leaking out what Lola has said about them. They bruised her. Her acknowledgement of the attack and her tears bring another disorder and hubbub. Yet when again Briony finds a letter, which is from the twins this time, a bigger chaos blooms. The letter says the boys run away. It is night and the area is not so secure. Everybody except Mrs Tallis goes searching. It comes to be Robbie who finds the boys under a tree. He has the stance of a saviour, a hero as he returns with them. He expects thanks and awe for his success.

Yet, what he receives are the handcuffs and an arrest. His name is stained, he is excluded from his circle and deprived of the Tallis favour, and his future, his carrier, his youth and his beloved are all taken away from his hand. Briony not only leaks out to Mrs Tallis about the letter Robbie sends Cecilia, the one talking of Cecilia's organ, but she also states the man whom she has seen leaving from the place, the island temple where Lola is raped, is Robbie. As she has already suspicions about Robbie due to both her resentment about her father's support to the young man and to her anger with his letter and passion, which provide him with the label psycho by Lola, and as her mind is a productive one making up fictions, she allows her statement to stand against Robbie. She supposes and believes that whom she sees is Robbie. She persuades or deceives herself because her way of thinking, her own logic, her view of the world, which are all structured on her melodramatic vision, do not give way to any other alternative. It is Robbie because it has to be so in accordance with the requirement of the standard melodramatic plot. He is the villain, the hypocrite, the secret source of evil, the elusive abuser and opportunist. He uses and abuses the Tallises and their folk. As the cleaning lady's son who is rising in society by means of the employer and benefactor, he is not to be the one who deserves a final success and happiness; instead his origins should draw him to where he belongs to, downwards, to baseness. His low and unrefined essence and nature would come out some way and lead him to his real and inevitable destination, to evil and consequent misery.

The perversely artistic mind of Briony constructs such a plot or in that case destiny for Robbie, and brings his ruin. Instead of attending the medical school at Cambridge, being a respectable member of society and getting Cecilia, he is banished from all his civil rights and his promising prospects. He is put into jail. Then, in order to shorten his service he makes an application for military service as the war begins. He is sent among the British troops to France. Yet, this only costs his life rather than bring his freedom earlier. Meanwhile, he endures difficulties and injustice by means of Cecilia's encoded letters of love and her promise and dedication to him. He lives and fights with and for the hope of their union. One day they will come together. But since he dies, everything is failure and void. After his death, at a bombardment also Cecilia dies in London.

In that way Briony, the artist comes to be a killer. Ironically, the most creative person in the conventional or romantic view, the artist becomes the biggest destroyer; she destroys a life. It is relevant and indicative that her name reminds one of Byron. While her plots include Byronic heroes, fierce and destructive figures, hypocrites who seem good but behave in evil ways, she herself acts as a destructive, dark force and brings evil and death. Moreover, what causes this destruction is the most productive and creative side of her, her imagination, her creative power and abilities. Her artistic power generates evil and destruction. The artist's power to create ends the existence of a living, real being. This time art destroys instead of creating out of nothing in accordance with its conventional mission and conceptualisation. This result of producing lifelessness metaphorically refers to the lifelessness in art as it is an unreal realm. Art creates yet at the cost of killing. The aesthetic existence and realm is a site, an existence with conditions and requirements peculiar to its own. Establishing a world, a structure which has not existed before in the real world and which emerges deliberately, only by the will of the writer, art or the work of art substantiates an existence by itself, stands for life or liveliness. On the other hand, since the created, artificial, man made arena, structure is not the real, external world and art freezes or fixes the work, the characters, and the state in the fictional world or in the art object, art and the artistic creation also alludes to or engenders lifelessness or deadliness. Actually, this fixed, frozen state carries oxymoron. It paradoxically means eternal life, a continual existence. Meanwhile living beings, objects and states in the real world can

fade away, sometimes in a very short time, a work of art, physically or as a cultural phenomenon, can exist timelessly or can stand against centuries, and the unchanging structure in the work of art, though its interpretation and evaluation may change, and the static quality of the plot or of the physical structure in the work of art generate a kind of eternity and endlessness. But this is still a kind of surrogate life and condition of being. This alternative existence, this artificial, fictive liveliness is like a consolation for the inherent deadliness of art and the art object. The unreal living and changelessness included by the work of art seems to atone for its abstract, airy, evasive, vulnerable, unreal and, or static quality. The life in the art object cannot replace or function like the life in the real world. It is just life in death.

Briony not only causes someone's death and another's unhappiness, but also her art or her product of art exemplifies this life in death condition of the work of art. Metaphorically, as Briony, the artist is a failing and tainted being, her product, art created by her is incomplete and tainted too. When Briony arrives at adulthood, she seems to come to the realisation of the worth of one's life and rights of life. Besides, the deaths of the unfortunate couple and the unfulfilment of their lives move her. Briony seems to have pricks of conscience. She has stained the name and honour of a man and led him and his beloved to misery and death. As the deceased have gone and the past cannot be cancelled and time cannot be rewound, there is nothing she can do or manipulate in the real world of the fictional world in the book. She, as a person, cannot resurrect the lovers and she cannot return to the moment she has given her statement against Robbie. But she feels the urge to compensate. Thus, as an artist, as a writer, she bestows the couple what she has deprived in real life. She writes their story, tells their tale. Yet this tale has a kind of happy ending. At least, in this fictive version of the events the lovers survive the war and come together, though in difficult conditions and with embedded effects of the war. Briony has the talent to write fiction. She uses this as her only power to atone for her wrong and sin. She writes a book, produces a fiction in which the deceased Robbie and her sister take place in major roles. The novel becomes their tale. Briony does in fiction what she cannot achieve in real life. In her novel she conjures the ghosts of the dead lovers. Briony's book includes an episode where the lovers are shown living together in a rented room. The section even unites them in love; there is a scene of long kissing. However, this is at a

point in actual time after the deaths of these two people. The union and love in this case are merely fictive. They are unreal. The situation constitutes life in death. Briony's novel makes the lovers alive and united and as long as the book is read they will stay in that way. But this regenerative state is valid only in the aesthetic realm, as an aesthetic object or element. On the other hand, Briony's attempt is for compensating her harm; she has moral and psychological aims. She wants to ease her conscience and make poetic justice. But her achievement is imperfect, lacking in two aspects. Since her only device for compensation is unreal, her playing God is illusory and delusive. As she cannot bring back to life the people against whom she has made an injustice, her stance is only a pseudo god, false god. Since in creating her tale she has aims also other than aesthetic, artistic ones, her art is tainted. Her novel seems to be under an obligation to function for her personal anxieties. It is not just an aesthetic structure, but it stands as a tool for Briony's releasing her conscience. Thus, Briony and her work fail and are impure.

Briony the artist stands as an immoral character. When the reader reaches the coda of the book, the previous part of the work changes its structural and functional definition and quality. Up to that point Briony is a character like Robbie and Cecilia in a story narrated in the third person point of view. An omniscient authorial voice narrates the events and discloses the inner world of the personages. Robbie and Cecilia are major characters; they each might also function as the protagonist. The same is also valid for Briony. Yet she seems to be the primary character more than the others. Since she seems to function as the ravelling component, the problem causing character and also since she, being aware of these, tries to be the unravelling element of the matter and the problem solving character, her stand gains a more focal quality. In that way, it can be said that her story is told also unfolding that of the other two significant characters. In the bulk of the book the narrative voice lets the reader think s/he reads an integral, complete account. Three basic figures are depicted and their converged fates and experiences are conveyed. Anyhow, the short final part of the novel undermines and deconstructs most of the elements and patterns of the body of the book. The position and function of the characters, the structure and quality of the narrated text, evaluations and judgements about the event and any morality it reflects are all modified.

Briony, who is understood to be a proud adolescent and self centred young woman, is seen to make another self assertive deed. The coda is a first person narration. Briony here talks about herself and her actions directly. The reader learns about her job, her social position and her methods in her art. This knowledge transforms and inverts the previous text and the reader's perception of Briony. Briony in this last section is the adult, old Briony. She is the renowned artist, a writer whose books are even in the cannon and included in the reading lists at schools. In a way, with this affinity with the establishment and institutions she is an official writer. She has attained a stable and solid place in society. She is a widow. She is childless; indicatively, as her creativity is in the intellectual area, she has not given birth physically. This can be also metaphorically relevant to her fatality. We see that the preceding text is Briony's own tale; she is both the writer and the major character of this narrative. Since she is not just a character of a story but a character of her own story both in the sense that she herself writes it and that she tells of herself, her position as the protagonist is reinforced and verified. In the overall view including the coda, she is the major character. Thus, the antecedent text is an autobiographical one. More than that, it is a confession. The artist states and acknowledges that she is a killer. Her self punishment and purgation for that is this autobiographical tale.

Yet, Briony's immorality and defectiveness is revealed in that whereas autobiography, as a kind of history and true account, requires and suggests realism and sincerity, Briony's narration comes to be a distortion and inversion of reality and a case of deception. The problematics of the bulk of the narrative are established in the coda. In that short part it is understood that the previous narrative is a novel by the elder Briony. In the coda Briony also tells of her method of writing. She discloses the process of construction of the book. She informs not only about the study and research for the details and verisimilitude but also about her approach to her subject matter and material. She carries the aim to reflect reality and to be realistic. Thus, she collects information like the ranges of the military men at the Second World War. But what are important and central are her aim and her way to fulfil it. Though her narration is a novel, fiction and thus suggests unreality, her undercurrent goal is personal confession and reparation. She employs her tale as autobiography and tries to pay her debt to the two dead people in her confession. She is to state and verify the reality about Robbie

in writing. This act and its outcome are even like an official or legal document, a police report. It is her testimony. The attacker is not Robbie but Paul Marshall; her previous statement is invalid and mistaken. She has to reset reality. Ironically, this novel is her device for making justice and correcting her wrong statement. In a paradoxical way, she wants to reflect reality in a field which is by definition constructed on unreality. Here fiction is to replace reality. Briony not only seeks after confession but also after atonement. Thus, she tries to clean her fault and sin, to withdraw her murder. She knows she can do it in the only way and with the only tool she has; in fiction. She has this inclination and talent for creative writing and at the same time art has this power to immortalise. In combination, she distorts reality, and both makes the dead couple survivors of the war and bring them together. Her novel about them shows Robbie and Cecilia alive and together. Yet, the coda informs of their death. In that way, Briony bestows eternal life on them; but in a lifeless realm, in fiction. Though in this aspect, Briony, as a creative person, stands as a creator, a god, an ultimate force who distributes life, she appears as a false god, a deluded and deluding guide since her power works only in a lifeless field. More than that, since she submits her text as a statement of reality but it is full of lies or inventions, she loses her moral stance and her claim on morality. Briony is a liar. She is a person who makes up unreal worlds and destinies. Thus, she is an immoral, faulty and defected character. She is tainted and her tool and product, her art is also tainted. Whereas as a mere artist she would not be subjected to disapproval and reproach, her aim beyond her art and her claim on reality in a site free from reality, undermine her professional and moral stands.

Briony's distortion alludes to the merging boundaries between history and art and to the converging acts of history and story writing. It is complicated to differentiate whether she fictionalises the reality or historicises the story; she seems to commit both of them. As she plays with the fate of the lovers and changes it in her novel, she fictionalises the reality. Simultaneously, as she presents the modified ends of the couple as their true story, she historicises the fiction. Her deed refers to the subjective aspect of history writing and causes the reader to question the methods of writing in history. As history is not a concrete phenomenon, a pure form of reality free from the human factor, it seems to be open for questioning. Since also history is

written, documented, formed by a human being, this takes us to a viewpoint, to an individual's vision. Consequently, this suggests a kind of subjectivity and possibility of plural visions and ways of writing. This means that there are histories but no one history. Since this field seems to lack one form of reality, the possible versions of history or account of events and experiences suggest changeability, instability and uncertainty. There are many ways to tell of a situation. This deprivation of absoluteness and this multiple interpretation indicate a dimension of unreality, which in turn alludes to fiction. History and different histories constitute stories. The boundary between story and history merges. This lack of certainty and this possible multiple vision in history writing bring history close to story and undermine its claim on truth and registration. Thus, any attempt to write history and any claim of historicalness are liable to deficiency and deceptiveness. Along with them, the concept of memory seems to be vulnerable. In consequence history and conventional claims about the certainty and validity of history imply a potential of taint and evil. These as well might be used to abuse and cheat people and their mind. Briony's abuse these concepts and methods of history and story and her deliberate confusion of them for personal reasons point to the evil and destructive potential of history and story and thus to their inherent faultiness.

Briony's case suggests the vulnerability and illusiveness of history not only because of her conscious choices in writing but also because of the natural structure, state and potential of the human mind and memory. While writing her novel or personal history, Briony makes deliberate changes in the plot and misleads in awareness. Roughly, she lies. But her mind and memory also cause some undeliberate mistakes in telling her truth, in conveying information. Though she does not intent to distort the events and mislead her readership, obviously her mind makes these unaware. Thus, the outcome of the deeds and approach of the child Briony and the adult Briony comes to be the same; deception. Whereas the young Briony makes mistakes also due to her deficiency in her vision and to the lack of her knowledge about the world she tries to interpret, about the adult world, the elderly Briony makes mistakes also due to the weakness of her view and perception originating from senility. The old Briony, who completes the hi/story of Robbie, Cecilia and herself, is literally and metaphorically an ill person. Her illness of the mind and memory is such

a one that causes unwilling, unpreventable forgetting. The novel or the personal history is written by such person. This means that it inevitably and consequently includes mistakes or lies and omissions or secrets and deceptions. Such documentation fails its claims on reality and historicalness in the conventional sense and automatically converts into a fiction. Briony's attempt at autobiography immediately turns into an act of imaginative writing. As she gets away from the real sequence and experience of the events, her writing comes close to the fictional structure free from the bonds of reality. The writer's conscious or unconscious choices prevail and create. Thus, Briony's uncontrollable forgetting or misremembering in writing her account of real events symbolically points to the act of fiction writing and to the creative process fed by the imagination and unconscious drives of a writer. In that way, both fiction and history are seen as tainted and defected acts or products.

This act of putting into writing or documenting or concretisation of such an unreliable phenomenon, the unstable, evasive, flexible, uncertain memories constitutes an evil and inefficient deed. The act of writing and the written word are questioned in that way. As much as documentation of reality, and language and words employed in practical life are distanced from their source and context, their potential to mislead or to be misinterpreted or to be abused and to initiate chaos gets stronger. Writing and concretisation, materialisation of language generate usable material and this potential of usability is ambiguous. One can activate it in good or evil. Such potential may serve constructively or destructively. In the book Briony's two acts of use of written words, of the two messages literally and metaphorically come to be evil deeds and trigger chaos. When she gets the notes in her hand physically, due to their materiality, they attain the function of objects and become usable things. Briony thus uses Robbie's note to destroy him and her finding the twins' note also contributes to and leads to action Robbie's fate as this note is also handed over to the authority figure, Mrs Tallis. She interprets Robbie's note as an evidence of his evil and criminal potential and the children's note initiating a chase in open and dark fields provides an environment and condition to catch the wrong suspect. The search after the runaway boys ends in Robbie's arrest with an accusation of rape. In that way, these two written notes in the first episodes in the narrative foreshadow the chaos in the following parts; they signal the questioned matter of the novel, the main problem of the narration in the overall

perspective. Writing has the power to destroy and deconstruct in contrast to its creative origin. It carries a taint and inheres failure.

This questioning of creativity and writing furthers us to an evaluation and critique of culture as the higher, ultimate concept covering the formers. If fictiveness and writing, story and history are potentially evil and faulty, the structure and framework housing them, culture, does not seem innocent and integral either. This also shakes another related concept; civilisation. As culture and civilisation generate and feed each other, they are both subjected to questioning and suspicion. In a book referring to a world war and collective destruction and crime such questioning and such criticism are valid and necessary.

Atonement is a novel of exploration and questioning rather than one in which we find a definite and stable discovery or result. It seems to be a novel of quest, yet at the end of which both the explorer and the audience or the witnesses can only encounter and arrive at something amorphous, indefinite and vague, something impalpable and elusive, which is paradoxically comprehensive and integral.

Though it is a literary work made out of and dependent on words, **Atonement** raises questions about words; neither does it disclose a plain, solid plot with a specific end, nor does it endow its characters and their lives with definite qualities or with established positions. This literary work is self-referential and essentially tackles literature itself. Although the novel proceeds from the desert island theme and in some way revises its conventions, and implicitly gives a sketch of the social and literary conditions of a period, it implants some crucial points and questions into his work, all concerning literature. This work makes us aware of the elements of a literary work; the writer, the work and the audience. It delves into these elements and explores the process of creating the work, the writer's relation with his/her work, the reader's expectations, the relation or connection between the work and the external world, the concept of reality or truth, the relation between language and the perception of the world and the power or scope of the word. These points raised in the novel are connected with the entity of these different elements, and the work can be considered to explore existence or the concept of existence also in terms of theme and mode. In this way the novel becomes a ground on which a great question of

existence surrounds and passes through us, as in its open end, which is consequently in accordance with the mode and content of the work.

The entity of the literary work and of its writer is explored along with a woman's struggle to survive and her claim for an entity. The book is embedded with contention on different levels. As the writer and the audience are aware of conventional distinction and discrimination, in the novel there are partly implicit and partly explicit rivalries between classes, sexes, conceptions, notions, and texts. In this context the title of the book is also suggestive in several ways. While it alludes to the social discriminations, it also refers to existential and literary distinctions. While we can observe a woman's struggle for her life and self-identity in a male-oriented society along with class consciousness, the notions of existence and nonexistence, freedom and slavery, assertion and renunciation, expansion and withdrawal, decay and immortality, the ideal and pragmatism, and their associations, are perceived as adverse and/or complementary notion.

As an underprivileged member of society, though she tries to tell her experiences to some individuals, she is not allowed to narrate them herself to the general public, in the form of a book. Therefore, she has to convey them to a professional writer to be made into a narrative and also a commodity to be sold in the market. She is automatically deprived of human completeness and integrity, human beauty.

Deficiencies, imperfections emerge also because of both the origin of words and the target of words and signs. Words, signs are produced and used by human beings, and again human beings are their receivers. This means that there is always the possibility that the user can use a sign out of its standard, conventional context or that the receiver can interpret a sign differently from the user's intention, and also there may simply emerge a lack or gap of communication even if the usage or perception is precise. They make the audience more conscious of the act of writing and also of reading since they foreground the elements and the process of fiction, and since they make bare the conditions of entering into a fictional dimension and consciousness.

Atonement, with its implicit discussion on language, writer, fiction, and perception, reflects the self-consciousness of the twentieth century. Each period of

human history has its own conflicts, tensions and ambivalence. Yet, when we compare the periods these two novels belong to, we see great differences; the novels' creative conditions are very different. We still have to admit that each period produces its own conventions, and the twentieth century is not different from the eighteenth century in this point. But, at least the present literary culture seems to be more aware of that fact.

In the eighteenth century there was a common understanding between the reader and the writer, or they both needed and searched for targets and ways of reaching them. Society had strict and relatively uniform values and conceptions in respect of morality and art and social norms. At the dawn of capitalism, colonialism and individualism, maybe it was easier to create a competent or complacent hero. But, after passing through all these phases and seeing their by-products, a twentieth-century writer, cannot reflect a plain, clear, tangible uniformity, or complacency and optimism, but amorphous comprehensiveness, doubt, obscurity, disappointment, helpless acknowledgement, relativity, and fragmentation and self-negation as a result of self-referentiality, of the exploration of the subject's artificiality or construction. In the background of the eighteenth-century and Victorian writers there were Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Newton to contradict or implicitly discuss a dogmatic, stable concept of the universe; but in the background of the postmodern writer both they and many more take place, Einstein, Freud, Jung, Schopenhauer, Thomas Huxley, Nietzsche, Bertrand Russell, and Wittgenstein, and they have furthered the former ones' exploration into chaos and relativity. The atomic power, two World Wars, have also shaken humanity's complacency. Modernism has already viewed the past sceptically. The post-war scene elevates individualism and the "now", while it has brought its delusions and rigidity during the Cold War. Advanced technology, democracy and consumerism resulting in pluralism, individuality, fragmentation have paradoxically generated new conventions, shallowness and self-alienation. While man looks for himself, he both finds and loses his identity. While he tries to free his perception, he both shapes it and confuses it.

Atonement at the same time both suggests the death of the author, as it paradoxically underlines his/her imposed presence, and alludes to the desperate cry of the individual in the consumer or mass media society, where s/he seems to watch

him/herself in a self-alienated and dehumanised context and medium. Also even in the applied democracies, and in this world of advertisement and of telecommunication or visually imposed bombardment of others' opinions, the individual can still find him/herself in difficulty to produce and express authentic, distinct opinions or simply his/her thoughts.

Atonement recognises the theme of modernist impersonality, regards it as an existential threat, and gets closer to the pre-war practical and empirical world in a wish for a distinct entity, also alluding to postmodern disintegration and confession. On the one hand, as it does not assert a clear, verbalised conceptualisation, the end of the novel can only engender an artificial and inexplicable sense of expansion, which constitutes comprehension and admission, and it evokes a pure, absolute state of existence, suggesting an implicit notion of democracy and humanism. In some sense, elitism is negated here as another aspect attributed to the postmodern or populist world. Thus, maybe the reader falls into the postmodern trap.

CONCLUSION

Art is a human phenomenon. Thus, its various conceptualisations, definitions, perceptions, its components, people and social aspects and institutions related with it are all human made and subjected to human view and evaluation. The act of making art and making art objects are all man-defined and -used. This brings the inevitable variations and transformations in the perception, use and function of art in the real world and in the questionings, reflections and manifestations of art in the fictional world as well as in intellectual and critical fields and activities. Through ages conceptualisations of art, views on art, practices of art, socialisation and objectification of art are in the move, modified, transformed, evolve, repeated, revised, reshaped and redefined.

Still, with regard to hi/stories of art, ideas and criticism, we see a focussing on degenerative, destructive, defective, insufficient reflection and use of art, and on its dissatisfying, unfulfilled qualifications in contemporary Western world and culture. Some products of the English novel put forward in the period following the Second World War exemplify these emphases. The present study tries to explore this dysfunction and maltreatment of art in various aspects of human experience. Individualistic and collective areas are both available to examine and discuss this topic.

Lucky Jim by Kingsley Amis (1954), **The Magus** by John Fowles (1977) and **Atonement** by Ian McEwan (2001) share a common point in which art, making of art, understanding of art, the maker of art, the object of art, art spheres, the use and function of art are lacking, deviating, depraving and disturbing. These components destruct and discord. Such kind of outlook and approach to art is different to the more constructive, positive, exalting and elevating evaluations and perceptions of art which were more prevalent and working in the previous periods.

Lucky Jim underlines the disuniting aspect of art in its use as a social and hierarchical weapon. Art is a site of class conflicts and definitions in the novel. Yet, the supposed superiority and its constructed promise to elevate people concerned with it are undermined as at the end the book the art authority comes to be the

formerly degraded lower class protagonist, who is portrayed as a boor dissociated from refined art and artistic qualities.

The Magus presents consequences of the confusion between art and reality, which are not constructive at all. The novel also alludes to the potentially depraving and destructive flirtation and association between art and money. The artist comes to the foreground as a false and peevish god.

Atonement undermines any positive, romantic, elevating and humanising claim for the artist. In the text art, its qualities, its position and role in society are questioned and eroded by means of the depraved, frail, inefficient and failing character and reality of the artist.

In **Lucky Jim** caricaturisation and sarcasm in the narration help the presentation of the topic. This method is also convenient as the framework of the novel is based on a social platform and class relations. The mode of the narration and the outcome of caricaturisation suggest to hierarchy and points of clashing. The narrative manifests the use of art as a social force and institution. The book includes irony as the lower-class protagonist, who are a kind of caricaturised portrait, gains a prestigious job and function as an art critic. This is almost self-ridicule as a work of art, the novel makes such an honest but crude character an art expert and undermines the established, upper-class oriented perceptions and evaluations of art via this character's usurpation of the status of the authority in art. Such a treatment shows the wicked potential of art at the hands of social forces and authorities.

The Magus searches and explores the negative and destructive aspects and uses of art in an ontological level and as a metaphysical concern. Various qualities and aspects of art are questioned, presented and materialised in the text. Art as an intellectual concept and as a social term is re-considered within the narrative. Though its moralising, harmonising, uniting potentialities are also pointed, the thematic directions and covert arguments highlight its evil seeds, de-constructive side and its possible futility and void. Alongside its indications of social inefficiencies and fragility of art as we find in **Lucky Jim**, **The Magus** adds the philosophical and psychological dimensions in its investigation of the malfunctions of art.

Atonement focuses more on the producer of art and the practitioner, the artist. Through a professional artist figure, again social and intellectual powers and

failures of art are given. As in **The Magus**, affinity and separation between art and fact, truth and fantasy are observed in McEwan's work. The imaginative and creative abilities of the artist appear as the means of distortion and deception of the truth. The use of art with aims and causes other than those of the artistic realm and structure and its futile and corrupt consequences are presented.

The manifestations of art, its components and its aspects in contemporary culture and in contemporary English novel parallel the relevant dissolving, disturbing, insecure, slippery fluxes, speed, expansions, exhaustions, consummations, productions, and fragmentations and isolations in the human world, human experience and relationships. While many human and nonhuman phenomena are defined and modified with superlatives and extensive labels, these "high"s, "free"s and "mass"es easily turn into "low"s, "black"s, "savage"s, "micro"s and "non"s. Art highlights this drift from exuberance and extravagance to suspicion and void. Yet, in this act of revelation art is also spoiled and points to taints substantially and metaphorically. The structural flaws and inefficiencies of art could allude to scars and annihilation in human communities and ways of life brought by wars, conflicts, wastefulness, partiality, injustice and narrowmindedness.

Human hi/stories also narrate stories of art, modifying conceptualisations, perceptions and evaluations of art, art worlds, institutions, works of art and artists. Present discussions and surveys show that in time a special, distinctive and distinguishing status and function have been bestowed on art in Western society. While at the earlier periods of time art and its social position and the ideas of art were more similar to other human phenomena, activities and products and it was associated more with the practical, mundane and public life, in time art was given more and more special missions and tasks, and it acquired specific qualifications and status, especially beginning with the period after the Renaissance. Yet, in modern times, this special position and agency are questioned more and more. In the so-called postmodern period, these are even undermined and unmasked. Though the taboo or sacred placement of art has not totally faded, in the period after the Second World War an opposite approach to art might be easily traced in Western thought and practice. Art and the idealisations of art in this period are deciphered, demystified, de-mythologised and unconsecrated. Its worldly, substantial, socially-

oriented, practical, mundane and mortal qualities are again put to the foreground. The human, social, political and material worlds behind art and art products are highlighted and examined. As all these worlds and phenomena are problematic, ambivalent, unstable, changing, and further, possibly sites of the human ego, benefit and profit, art and the art worlds in relation with them or inescapably components of them are not unified, complete and pure wholes and self-contained or in-built entities. As these three British novels disclose, like Cain's mark, they carry human taint on them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amis, Kingsley: **Lucky Jim**, Penguin Books, 1976.
- Bell, Michael, ed.: **The Context of English Literature 1900-1930**, Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1980.
- Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane, eds.: **Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930**, Penguin Books, with a new preface, 1991, Pelican Books, 1976.
- Carroll, Noël, ed.: **Theories of Art Today**, The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Eliot, T. S.: **Selected Essays**, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1932, new edn. 1950.
- Emig, Rainer: **Modernism in Poetry: Motivations, Structures and Limits**, Studies in Twentieth-Century Literature. Longman, 1995.
- Finney, Brian: “Briony’s Stand Against Oblivion: Ian McEwan’s **Atonement**”, (Online)<http://www.csulb.edu/~bhfinney/McEwan.html> 15 March 2007.
- Fowles, John: **The Magus**, Vintage, 1977.
- Gombrich, E. H.: **The Story of Art**, Phaidon, 1978.

- Harland, Richard: **Literary Theory from Plato to Barthes: An Introductory History**, Macmillan, 1999.
- Jenkins, Gareth: “Why Lucky Jim Turned Right'- An Obituary Of Kingsley Amis”, **International Socialism**, quarterly journal of the Socialist Workers Party, Issue 70, March 1996.
- (Online)
<http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj70/amis.htm>
 9 September 2007.
- Kermode, Frank: **The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction**, London, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 1968, first pub. 1966.
- “Kingsley Amis”: **Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia**
 (Online) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kingsley_Amis.
 11 August 2006.
- McEwan, Ian: **Atonement**, London: Jonathan Cape, 2001.
- Perkins, David: **A History of Modern Poetry: From the 1890s to the High Modernist Mode**, The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1976.
- Shiner, Larry: **The Invention of Art: A Cultural History**, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- “ur-”: **Online Etymology Dictionary**.
 (Online)
<http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?l=u&p=11>
 30 June 2007.

- Walder, Dennis, ed.: **Literature in the Modern World: Critical Essays and Documents**, Oxford University Press in association with The Open University, 1992.
- Waugh, Patricia, ed.: **Revolutions of the Word: Intellectual Contexts for the Study of Modern Literature**, Arnold, 1997.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Ferah Yazıcı İncesu, 1970 yılında İstanbul’da doğdu. 1987’de Kadıköy Kız Lisesi’nden mezun oldu. 1987-1992 yılları arasında İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı’nda Lisans eğitimi aldı. Yüksek Lisans eğitimini 1995-1998 yılları arasında İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı’nda **The Fallen Child: From The Coral Island and Treasure Island to Lord of the Flies** başlıklı tez çalışması ile tamamladı. 1999-2000 öğretim yılı Bahar döneminde aynı bilim dalında doktora programı çalışmalarına başladı. 1995 yılından itibaren İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı’nda araştırma görevlisi olarak çalışmaktadır.

CV

Ferah Yazıcı İncesu was born in Istanbul in 1970. She graduated from Kadıköy Kız Lisesi in 1987. She obtained her Bachelor degree at the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University between 1987-1992. She completed her MA education at the Department of English Language and Literature, the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Istanbul University between 1995-1998 with a thesis titled **The Fallen Child: From The Coral Island and Treasure Island to Lord of the Flies**. She began PhD studies at the same department in Spring term in the academic year 1999-2000. She has been working as a research assistant at the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University since 1995.