

Tribhuvan University

Traumatic Loss in William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Nirmal Basnet

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

December 2012

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Central Department of English**  
**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**Letter of Recommendation**

Mr. Nirmal Basnet has completed his thesis entitled "Traumatic Loss in William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*" under my supervision. He carried out his research from 2068/05/01 B.S. to 2069/08/07 B.S. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voice.

-----  
Mr. Maheswor Paudel

Supervisor

Date: -----

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Approval Letter**

This thesis entitled "Traumatic Loss in William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Nirmal Basnet has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

**Members of the Research Committee**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head

Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgements**

Words fail to convey my feelings of gratitude to my honourable supervisor, Mr. Maheswor Paudel who provided invaluable inspiration and constructive and creative comments to give the final shape of this thesis.

I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, the Head of Central Department of English, for the approval of this research work in the present form. Even I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma and Dr. Birendra Pandey for their warm encouragement and suggestions while writing this thesis.

It would be sheer injustice if I don't express my sincere thanks to my friends, Kamal, Kshitij, Arbind, Pushpa for their academic support. In course of completing this thesis it received help and suggestions from various persons, institutions, and department and best wishers. I am too much indebted to them individually.

I am grateful to my parents Nib Bahadur Basnet and Rewata Basnet who provided me with the light of reduction in facing different challenges and difficulties. I am even grateful to my brother, Damber, Manab and Narayan for their continuous impetus to complete this thesis.

Finally, my special thanks goes to Our Communication, Bhajangal, Kirtipur which despite their busy time helped me in typing.

Nirmal Basnet

## **Abstract**

The present research on Faulkner's novel *Absalom, Absalom!* attempts to explore the trauma of loss and lamentation. This seems that the loss stems from the exclusive devotion to the lost object, characteristic of the melancholic. It assumes that the rhetoric of lamentation vacillates between the claims of position and acknowledgement of loss. The moment of lamentation in Faulkner's novel urges on the language of melancholia and trauma.

## Contents

	<b>Page No.</b>
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. Trauma Theory: An Overview with Reference to Faulkner	1-11
II. Lamentation and Loss in <i>Absalom, Absalom!</i>	12-37
III. Language of Trauma and Melancholia in <i>Absalom, Absalom!</i>	38-40
Works Cited	

## I. Trauma Theory: An Overview with Reference to Faulkner

This present research is a study of William Faulkner's novel *Absalom, Absalom!* published in 1936. This novel is considered by many to be Faulkner's masterpiece. However, the novel's complex and fragmented structure possesses considerable difficulty to readers. The novel has an undertone of loss that heavily colors the novel's plot. The tone of loss is found both in the narrative structure and with the references of the characters who participate in the narrative action. Every character in the novel loses something from their possession which consequently causes psychological trauma with underlying tone of pessimism. Despite the Faulkner's root in the south, he readily condemns many aspects of its history and heritage in *Absalom, Absalom!* He reveals the unsavory side of southern morals and ethic including slavery. The project explores the relationship between the modern humanity and the part, examining how past events affect modern decisions and to what extent modern people are responsible for the part.

This dissertation argues that Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* shows the trauma of loss and lamentation. The sense of loss stems from the exclusive devotion to the lost object which is the characteristic of Melancholia. Since the focus of this research is an investigation of loss and lamentation in *Absalom, Absalom!* and the theoretical framework is going to be trauma theory. The purpose of study is to highlight an undercurrent of pessimism in the novel - a departure from the optimism of American South in the era of modernism. While North America remained infected by pessimism associated with modernism, the south had remained rather immune to the infection. Faulkner's novel shows that he is an exception to the trend in American Southern Fiction.

This research assumed that the rhetoric of lamentation keeps changing between claims of possession of characters and their acknowledgement of loss. It also presumes that the moment of lamentation in Faulkner's novel resembles to the language of melancholy and trauma. Although this study makes a significant use of a concept developed in trauma theory, but not offers a comprehensive and detailed analysis of trauma theory. An analysis of trauma of loss as conceptualized by Cathy Caruth remains the primary tools of this analysis. Since the major objectives of the study is to display the lamentation for a lost object, however this project cannot include all these lamentation seen in the novels of American South.

As the review of literature shows, there is a lack of criticism on the novel from the perspective of trauma theory. Building on criticism like these the proposed dissertation will make an investigation of loss and trauma in *Absalom, Absalom!* The methodological tool will be the trauma theory by the notion of Cathy Caruth, Dominick LaCapra. However, the essay "Post-traumatic Hermeneutics: Melancholia in the Wake of Trauma" by Angelika Rauch will be particularly useful.

Credit for the development of trauma theory goes to Austrian psychoanalyst and medico, Sigmund Freud. He initially took the job of managing and flourishing the trauma theory in course of his treatment of the people who were being mentally and physically wounded, disordered and disturbed in the World War I. As a founder of psychoanalytical approach both in treatment and literature, mostly the trauma theorist and critics more or less influenced and associated with him and they try their best to define trauma on the basis of Freud's psychoanalysis and even speak for or argue against it.

However, in modern sense, the phenomenon of trauma seems all-inclusive trauma which can be defined from the two approaches: first psychoanalytic-

formalistic approach and second, cultural approach. According to the first approach, a victimized person does not disclose the true traumatic experiences; the victimized one exposes and expresses the testimony, in a very distorted and deceptive manner due to the fear of society. As so far the psychoanalytical approach is concerned. Freud's ideas are very important. In *Studies in Hysteria*, Freud and Breuer have the view that "remembrances that create hysterical sufferings are historical in the sense that they linked to actual trauma in the patient's life." (186). The effect associated with the part trauma cannot be acknowledged and the amnesia that results means that the force of the effect becomes dammed up. The injured person's reaction to the trauma exercises a completely cathartic effect if it is an adequate reaction.

Cathy Caruth, Dominick LaCapra, Geoffrey Hartman and others, basing this theory of trauma on Freud's psychoanalysis, stress the need for "acting out" and "working through" of trauma for leading life of a healthy person. Trauma is intrinsically multidisciplinary so it needs to displace older paradigms and attend to know configuration of cultural knowledge. Unlike the psychoanalytic - formalistic approach, historical approach examines the undercurrent of the distorted by contextualizing in the network of cultural politics. Sigmund Freud, in "Mourning and Melancholy", describes two opposite forces that act simultaneously to convert traumatic experiences in all forms of writing as:

The literary forms gets its strength from the struggle between the urge to cry out from burning core of traumatic experiences on the one hand, and the drive to rationally construct the core of the trauma as a symbolic representation model in language, thus keeping it at a safe distance from fact to fiction. (8)

In the sense, trauma brings the limitations of our understanding and at the same time, it dislocates the so called traditional disciplinary boundaries leading in to rethink our notion of experiences and of communication. In a person's telling of trauma, what remains to be said in the disaster, ruin of words and demise of writing for both the speaker and writer in the course of conversation.

Trauma theory is a privileged critical category which includes diverse fields, with its specific focus on psychological, philosophical, ethical and aesthetic questions about the nature and representation of traumatic events. In other words, all forms of writing on traumatic history is based on two forms of remembering trauma - the first result in the process of "Working - through" the other is based on denial and result in "acting - out". Both concepts come from Freud and have been developed in such a way that it could be used in historical studies.

In the 1980s, historical trauma surfaced as a topic of serious and intense debate within the community of scholars and critics. By the mid 1990s trauma therapies had mushroomed into an entire industry. The disorder's acronym, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) becomes a household work, a metonym that stands for whole constellation of symptoms, reinforced by popular culture images ranging from the row well, know phenomenon of 'flashback' to the stereotype of the "crazy vet" to the claims of some women that they have recovered memories of child sexual abuse. In the analysis of the relation between traumatic memory and history expanding Freud's ideas Caruth and Felman have added some more ideas on the topic. Trauma's meaning in western medicine extends from a surgeon's description of a wound to the head in early nineteenth century to a much more complex and nuzzling narrative about a wound to the psyche towards the century's end. This trauma formation has about it a compelling social character: Trauma becomes attached to

psychic injury when train accident victims complain of lingering mental and physical disorders despite the fact that they emerge from accidents scenes "unharmd". Giving a general definition of trauma in her essay, "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History", Caruth says:

Trauma describes on overwhelming experiences of sudden a catastrophic events in which the response to the events occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucination and other intrusive phenomenon. The experiences of the soldier faced with sudden and massive death around him, for example, who suffers this right in a numbed state only to reduce it later on in repeated nightmares in a central and recurring image of trauma in our century. (181).

In this passage Careth explains that it once one has become the victim of overwhelming experience that come repeatedly is the memory. Even the victim they have to suffer in the dreams and the repetitive of nightmare.

Similarly, Cathy Caruth in "Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals" further clarifies that "traumatic a disorder reflects the direct imposition on the mind of the unavoidable reality of horrific events where impact of violence cannot be registered" (24). Trauma is constituted not only be the destructive force of a violent event but by the very act of its survival. In this point Caruth writes:

In recent years an increasing instance in psychiatry in relation to external violence in psychic disorder has culminated in the study of "Post- Traumatic Stress Disorder". As it is the most destructive psychic experiences. If we are to register the impact of violence we cannot, therefore, locate it only in the destructive moment of the past, but in an

ongoing survival that belongs to the future. It is become violence inhabits; incomprehensibility, the very survival of those who have lived beyond it that it may be witnessed best in the future generation to whom this survival in passed on. (25)

Similarly, in the field of trauma, Dominick LaCapra's theory gives more emphasis on three different psychoanalytic topics: the return of the repressed; acting out versus working through; and the dynamics of transference. A traumatic historical events as LaCapra says, "tends first to be represented and then return of the repressed as discourse, rather than that with physical returns such as the genocidal repetition in Cambodia and Bosnia and he shows two symptomatic possibilities for the return of historical trauma as discourse. LaCapra emphasizes more in trauma's nature which devices compulsively fixated but accepts the role of paradox and aporia. In this regard, Berger writes:

LaCapra is of the opinion to create a position that avoids both redemptive narrative and sublime acting out. He sets out to describe a way to work through trauma that does not deny the irreducibility fixated . . . If there is no acting out at all, not repetition of the traumatic disruption. The resulting account of historical trauma will be that teleological, redemptive fetishizing that denies the trauma's reality. (575)

Among the three transference is the most pervasive concern of LaCapra that the failure to come to terms with the discursive return of some traumatic event usually signals the failure to recognize one's own emotional and ideological investment in the event and its representation. Transference in psychoanalysis is itself a return of the repressed or rather a more conscious summering of the repressed; it repeats of acts out

a past event a relationship in a new therapeutic setting that allows for critical evaluation and change. Transference is the occasions for working through the traumatic symptoms. It is imperative therefore, to recognize the symptoms and the trauma as one's own, to acknowledge that the trauma still is active and that one is implicated in its destructive effects.

The relation of loss is direct to the trauma and melancholia, it is inquire into a hermeneutical dysfunction that predicated on the loss of ego support - the traumatic arrogation of potential space that follow the loss of an intimate dyadic relationship. French analyst Jacques Hassoun, in *The Cruelty of Depression*, defines melancholia as an experience of loss in the absence of the person's knowledge or fantasy of what is lost which presupposes knowledge of fantasy about what is lost but cannot be claimed. According to Hassoun's theory, "melancholia" is the emotional attachment to an unmastered, ungrasped other in hitherto unconscious experiences. The other is felt as unmasterable effect and as such, coincides with the shock experience of trauma. Here Hassoun remarks:

We must ask ourselves about the object of anxiety as it arises in passion and melancholia and recall first of all that passion is the most spectacular mode of expression for a melancholic structure. Passion and melancholia on the one hand, melancholia and mania on the other, seems to set up a relation to the object of which melancholia is the key in that, being a symptom, it reveals as - I've shown - what is at stake in a child's relation to a mother who has been subjectively unable to help it through a first mourning process that grounds its subjectivity. (68)

The assumptions of this research is that the discourse of psychoanalysis and modernism and thus of Freud and Faulkner can broadly be brought as parallel

effort to map the traumas of modern gender & race. Faulkner is an equally compelling figure in this context because his account of Southern history echoes the dynamic terrain in Freud between two modes of trauma. He dramatizes the construction of Southern manhood as the inassimilable, traumatic incursion of the histories of white supremacy and misogyny upon the psyche. In doing so he offers one hand a richer account than even the early Freud of the interaction between individual psyche and traumatogenic social pronoun - in this case those associated with slavery and patriarchy. On the other hand, however like Freud Faulkner moves towards structural view of trauma.

The novel *Absalom, Absalom!* shows and makes us feel the troubling consequences of resolving ambivalence that is set in sensuously concrete motion the social and psychic dynamism of trauma, tracing the effects of pathogenic social process on individual mind and human relations. At the same time this novel moves towards the permission that is at the bottom more cosmic than historical. Faulkner's ambivalent attachment to patriarchy and white supremacy leads him to disavow his indictment of those institutions, rewriting traumas inflicted by them as the ineradicable truth of human beings and insisting that to feel the truth is both the conditions of ethnical authenticity and the prelude to literary suicidal despair. Faulkner elaborates an ever more complex and deeper personal part of this kind can be understood only by tracing its root in the histories of all those involved in it. This excavation reveals in turn how the characters apparently "personal" stories cannot be told independently are indeed, inextricably intertwined precisely because of all are implicated in the social history and legacy of slaves, the bloodshed of civil war and the violent supervision of reconstruction.

At the time of its publication, *Absalom, Absalom!* encountered mixed response to its unorthodox narrative structure. Some critics regarding the novel's structures as overly confusing and involved deemed it ineffective. This novel demonstrates the nature of history and its reliability. This emphasis that history's truths are not completely knowable. Supporting this idea Cleanth Brooks remarks:

Most important of all, however *Absalom, Absalom!* is a persuasive commentary upon the thesis that much of History is really a kind of imaginative construction. The past always remains at some level a mystery but if we are to hope to understand it anyway, we must inter into it and project ourselves imaginatively into the attitude and emotion of historical figure. (202-203)

According to Cleanth Brooks the truth of history can't be perceived in the form of reliability. The history always remains mystery in some level. It is somehow imaginative construction so it cannot be knowable completely but we have to project ourselves with the emotion of historical figure.

Considering the tragic sense of *Absalom, Absalom!* many critics have different opinions about the novel. The act of murdering of the characters definitely gives the sense of horror to the readers. Supporting this idea, Harvey Breit remarks:

It is a terrible gothic sequence of events; a brooding tragic fable . . .  
Was the design that had devoured Sutpen and prevented him from avowing the very thing that would have saved the design? Was it something in the south itself? In its social, political, moral economic origins that was responsible for Sutpen and all the subsequent tragedy? Question can make no judgment: Sutpen himself had possessed courage and innocence and the same land had nourished men and

women who had delicacy of feelings and capacity for love and gift for life. (15-17)

The complex narrative structure of *Absalom, Absalom!* most crucial feature. Telling the same story by different narrator gives the different perception of the novel. The narrator relates the story in terms of their own understanding. Regarding this view Jennifer comments:

The complex narrative of *Absalom, Absalom!* Present a major challenge for William Faulkner's readers. The story doesn't unfold in a familiar way; the readers must learn how to read it was the story is told and retold, piecing together elements of Sutpen story and then trying to understand Faulkner is underlying design. Because the novel consists of different narrators telling the same story, variation arises that provide insights into the characters who serve as narrators. (13-14)

According to Jennifer, the narrative structure of the novel varies in the perception of different narrators. The same story is told and retold by six characters. Some of them are not the reliable source to believe because they have also heard the story from other and they have related the story which has lost its originality.

As so far the narrative structures of the novel are concerned, the same story is told and retold by different narrators. Rosa is only the character during the events of the study. Her version of the story has an accusatory tone and she blames Sutpen for all the miseries of her family. Her narrative version shows (becomes of immoral characters like Sutpen) the full of south. Similarly, Mr. Common described Sutpen as a brave man, strong, determined and individualistic. Another narrator of the story is Quentin. Quentin is pre occupied with the Sutpen story as he tries to understand the story on the basis of his own part and better understand his role in the present.

Quentin fulfills the linking events in the story from other versions; the source of his information is his grandfather. Quentin finds himself closely connected with the story and forced to disclose the meaning of his own life share in the last narration of the story who asks Quentin to the story of South. He knows many of the events of the story and he also acts as a speaker for the reader. Shreve is the most furthest removed narrator from the story. He brings an objective view of the story to the novel.

The historical context is also very important in the novel. Causing trauma is directly related to the civil war. Almost one third of the southern man died in civil war and many suffered from the serious injuries. In the live of war, hundreds of refugees in the south white, black lost everything, they lived in uncertainty, horror, and terror about their future. Almost many families were compelled to seek the ways without their fathers, husbands and relatives to support them. Children and women found them incomplete and lived with the burden that they can never achieve their former status basically bravery and nobility. The south was in financial crisis towards the end of the war. Rail road manufacturing equipment, farm machinery and livestock were destroyed. During reconstruction (1865 - 1877) both the North and South struggled to exhibit their new relationship. The main concern of the reconstruction period was to define the relationship between former south and former north, regarding who was responsible for the war, punishment in order, which right should be granted for the freed slaves are recovering the southern economy.

## II. Lamentation and Loss in *Absalom, Absalom!*

We have already marked the degree to which the concept of loss is imbricated with the notion of mourning, trauma, crisis, negativity, absence, lack and death in modernity. These terms also appear regularly in a body of poststructural and deconstructive thought concerned with the ways in which loss inheres in language and in the epistemologies, histories and selves that are structured by it. Recognizing just how much is at stake in this language. Dominick LaCapara has recently analyzed two of these terms -- absence and loss and argued for the necessity of distinguishing between them, "Losses cannot be adequately addressed when they are enveloped in an overly generalized discourse of absence," (45), he contends, "including the absence of ultimate metaphysical foundation." He argues:

Conversely, absence at a "foundation" level cannot simply be derived from particular historical losses ... When absence is converted into loss, one increases the likelihood of misplaced nostalgia or utopian politics in quest of a new totality or fully unified community. When loss is converted into absence one faces the impasses of endless melancholy, impossible mourning and interminable aporiain which any process of working through the past and its historical losses is foredoomed or prematricely aborted. (45-46)

LaCapara's shrewd clarification of these terms not only demonstrate the significance of their distinction, but proves to the frequent leakage between them as well as the necessity of exploring the ideological work done by their indistinction. This research cannot by any means consider all the terms that traverse this dense intersection. This research wants to pursue the very significant example of the relation of loss to trauma, both as an illustration of the kind of conceptual indistinction this research has signaled

as a space of some of the most troubling problems. It is precisely in a stipulation on trauma and its symptoms that LaCapara acknowledges.

The relation between trauma and loss, which is called "Traumatic loss" but while the term overlaps, not all loss is traumatic and trauma does not necessarily involve loss. Although it has come colloquially to cover a broad range of experience, including modern life itself trauma is the product of a specific socio-political and clinical genealogy that emerges with late modernity. It is an artifact that responds to symptoms produced by modern technology, warfare and social relations; it first appears in its modern form in the nineteenth century with attempts to treat "hysterical" symptoms, the anguish produced by train accidents and shell shock and later by concentration camp experiences and domestic abuse.

Readers of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* have often remarked the relentless torrent of loss that comprises the novel's plot, the epistemological losses that inhere in its narrative structure, as well as the fundamental incomprehensibility of the narrated world both to the characters who participate in it and the narrator who describes it. If such lamentation prompts consideration of the novel within the lament tradition, so too do its tentative and contradictory narratives and shifting narratorial position; its propensity for paradox, antithesis, the hyperbolic and the irresolvable; its narrators' self-consciously belated position within radically discontinuous time; and its invocations, which under the dual threat of meaninglessness and unrequited injustice call out to passersby to witness, the novel in addition, shows recurrent symptoms of those moods we have associated with lamentation. The exclusive devotion to a cast object characteristic of melancholia.

The specific concern, to which this research turns, however, is the lamentation's uneasy rhetoric of possession, which vacillates between claims of

possession and acknowledgement of loss. The moment of lamentation is characterized by a redistribution of both material and ideological possession and dispossession is central rhetorical preoccupation of the lamentation: though seized by strangers, the lamentation insists they are our houses; though dead, he is my son; though destroyed it is my city - a proprietary insistence that also characterizes the lamentation from which Faulkner draws his title of novel from the passage in the Bible in II Samuel:

O my son *Absalom*,

My son, my son *Absalom*

Would God I had died for thee

O *Absalom*, my son, my son! (18)

This possessiveness is not entirely surprising; language about loss is inevitably language about possession. Loss is always loss of something, and of a particular something perceived to be proper to oneself. To lament something as lost is to presuppose that once possessed it, and therefore the lamentation must construct and possess a lost object it must engage, we might say, in act of retroactive possession. Even its most insistently possessive gestures and description of possession are lost or destroyed. This negative movement of dispossession as this research in this section is buttressed in the lamentation by a proliferation of privatives that rhetorically reenact dispossession.

But even beyond or before this semantic "taking away" a double uncertainty troubles the proprietary claims of possessions. The possession to which the lamentation lays claim is constructed belatedly when it can no longer be observed or experienced. And recollection through which this object (re)constructed is plagued with singular difficulties because it is concerned with (re)possession not only an object but its value and significance and further, because the possessions to which the

lamentation lay claim are after the "wholly familiar" the unreflective ground of being and thinking the everyday, occulted by its very familiarity.

The moment to which the narrators of *Absalom, Absalom!* respond is like the moment to which lamentation responds characterized by the transfer of property, the redistribution of possession and the remapping of territorial boundaries: Sutpen's apparently extortionary acquisition of land; the subsequent transfer of "Sutpen's Hundred" to Sharecroppers and ultimately its transfer to the state; Sutpen's obscene exchange of bubbles for an heir; Judith exchange of a store for gravestone. Indeed, a large portion of the narrative itself - the produced by Quentin and Shreve is conditioned by the Compton's exchange the piece of property for a room at Harvard by no means in significant exchange of real property for cultural property and of Southern land for Northern product. Indeed as we have noted, lamentation is a moment when ideological as well as material possession are transferred when for example value, knowledge and identity are redistributed. Material and ideological property are not, of course, unrelated; on the contrary they are inevitably collusive because possession functions as sign. Material property is often the procurer and guardians of ideological property, as the main character of the novel Sutpen requires chairs, chandeliers, tapestry, damask, slaves and wife to be sign of respectability.

Conversely, ideological possessions may be converted into material ones, as Shreve's parodic lawyer systematically appraises the value of knowledge, records it into a ledger and converts it into capital; or as Rasa in the novel bequeathing her knowledge and identity to Quentin suggests: "if you write down this story, you may sell it to the magazines and buy your wife a new gown or a new chair for the house" (5). Indeed it is because the customary functioning of such significance system are

advantageous to the preservation of both material privilege and fixed identities that it takes a catastrophe to effect a redistribution of possession.

For knowing the convertibility between material and ideological possession is to recognize the degree to which material possession functions as demarcation of identity. The "sprigs of wholly thrust beneath the knockers on the door and mistletoe hanging from the chandeliers bowls of eggnog and toddy on tables in the hall and the blue unwinded wood smoke standing about the plastered chimneys of the slave quarters" (267) all functions not only as sign of what Henry and Charles do not, in the state "something like pariah hood" (267) possesses, but also sign of what they are not: integrated part of the social body, member of respectable family, legitimate confederate soldiers. What Michal de Cartau in his article "The Practice of Everyday Life" calls it an identifiable and legible word in a social language" (140). Lamentation also emphasizes that to be possessed of material goods simultaneously to be dispossessed of the value of one's identity. The logical extension of this argument is that property loss is always a loss of self a formulation whose similarity to description of trauma should not be overlooked. Accordingly, the transfer of real property mentioned in *Absalom, Absalom!* is everywhere accompanied by redistributions of identity servant becomes master and subsequently, landowners becomes merchant, slave holding heiress becomes land lord employers, slave becomes freed person, a college boy becomes inadvertent plenipotentiary of the South.

In the novel *Absalom, Absalom!* the female character Judith towards the mid of the war wears "the made over dress which all women of South now wore" (34) and joins those others women "in the improvised hospital where they cleaned and dressed the self-folded bodies of strange injured and dead and made lint of the window curtains and sheets and liner of the houses in which they had been born" (100). In this

moment, then material possessions assume new identities because they become functionally other. In the world of *Absalom, Absalom!* rags become dresses, barns become hospitals, curtains become bandages and boards from the carriage hours become coffin for Charles Bon. This transformation is also a transvaluation: objects exchange value is transmitted into use value. A dress or curtain's value no longer inheres in its ability to function as sign of taste, status or prosperity but in its ability to function as material with which to cover the body or wound. This re-made property of the lamentation further no longer "proper" to its possession. Such redistribution of identity affects an alienating disjunction - a reconnaissance between a "possessor" and objects. This type of alienation for example is the disjunctive relationship between Rosa and the "botched over" dresses she wears, the second hand rings she is offered by a second hand husband or indeed the alien deaths she makes over with her elegies.

The argument of this research is that the language of *Absalom, Absalom!* And specifically, Faulkner's idiosyncratic use of demonstrative pronoun and negations is structurally and often semantically homologous to the lamentation's uneasy rhetoric of possession. Further this research contends that *Absalom, Absalom's* narrators deploy the lamentation's possessive and privatives gesture in order both to lay retroactive claims of possession and to effect and interested redistribution of possession.

The demonstrative pronoun is one of the primary mapping strategies of Faulknerian language and Faulkner's idiosyncratic and iterative use of it mimes the possessive activity of lamentation. Demonstrative pronoun basically shows that the characters have possessed something before and now they have lost the things, which creates trauma in them of losing things. Frequently, they remember and lament towards lost objects and again want to posses. In *Absalom, Absalom!* demonstrative phrase like "that quality of gaunt and tireless driving, that conviction for hates and

fleeting time" (27), "that maiden reverie of solitude which is the first thinning of that veil we call virginity" (118) are repeated device for demarcating ideological territory for distributing knowledge, identity and value.

The use of demonstrative pronoun indicates the frequent memory to the lost objects which ultimately gives trauma to the possessor. They just remember of the past and live in trauma life in the present. This trauma is present is no other than lamentation of the material dispossession.

In Cathy Caruth's *Psychoanalytic Theory of Trauma*, it is not the experiences itself that produces traumatic effect, but rather the remembrance of it. In her account there is always a time lapse, a periodical of 'latency' in which forgetting characteristic is between and event and the experiences of trauma links past to present through representation and imagination. In psychological account this can lead to distorted identity formation, where "certain subjects portion may become especially prominent or even overwhelming for example those of victims or perpetrator, where one is possessed by the past and lend to repeat it compulsively as if it were fully present" (3). In this mentioned extract, Caruth focuses on the event of past that always remain as the scars which can never be forgotten and always haunt in the present. The past events which work as the source of trauma remain in latent form and take a huge effect from the event of present which is similar to the past.

As the trauma leaves the spot in the psychology, it is also needed to recover this psychological disorder. So, trauma needs the combination of both for the sake of healing and testament. The change of trauma in the narrative memory allows the incident to be verbalized be integrated in one's own knowledge. Regarding this view, Caruth in *Trauma: Exploration in Memory* asserts:

The trauma requires integration both for the sake of testimony and for sake of cure. But on the other hand, the transformation of trauma into a narrative memory that allows the story to be verbalized and to be integrated into one's own and other knowledge of the parts may lose both the precision. And the force that characterizes traumatic recall. Yet beyond the loss of precision. There is another profound, disappearance the loss precisely of the event essential in comprehensibility, the force of its affront to understanding. (154)

In psychological or psychic trauma, the articulating discourse is a process of meditative involving alternative strategies and alterative voice. A traumatic problem evolves the need to narrate new foundation, which includes reinterpreting the text as a means towards response or paths to revolving physic trauma that emerges in a specific event or context but all of them in someway or other involve identity and memory.

Similarly, Compson's demonstrative phrase demarcating the nature of women and youths he describes Bon's marriage as "a ritual as meaningless as that of college boys in secret room at night" (93), for example, functions to devalue the narratives of Rosa, Quention and Shreve and thereby increases the value of own. The demonstrative pronoun not only distributes knowledge, value and identity but presupposes assert to the particular distribution it has affected. In addition to its act of retroactive possession, the lamentation contends two kinds of present possession; in alienable possession such as kin and body parts and possession of affliction. These assertions of present possessions belong to the lamentation's structure of antithesis and reversal for in the lamentation one comes to possess what is alien and is alienated from that which one ordinarily possesses most immutably.

By the means of linguistic constraint, lamentation posits present and rightful possession of kin and the body. While kin and body parts are possessions that are linguistically inalienable and possession of them is posited unequivocally in the lamentation references to kin are seen almost invariably to alienated enslaved, exiled or dead kin. Likewise, references to body parts are as we have seen almost invariably parts of a description of the body turned against itself in pain, description in which the body is the alien agent of physical pain, a weapon turned against itself.

Hence, the inalienable property which is shown in possessive pronoun spoken by Sutpen like "my children, my son, my daughter, my bones, my heart, my eyes, my flesh" (45) has in the lamentation become alien. And like the lamentation's figure of alienated kin and bodies in pain, the demonstrative pronoun of *Absalom, Absalom!* repeatedly marked the alienation of inalienable possession and are often complicit in effecting it. Mr. Compton for example, deploys the demonstrative pronoun to linguistically alienate kin from each other in his abridged rendition of Sutpen family history in the novel:

This father who should see that man one time. Yet have reason to make a six hundred mile journey to investigate him . . . this brother in whose eyes that sister's and daughter's honor and happiness granted that curious and unusual relationship which existed between them, should have been more jealous and precious than to the father even . . . and this lover who apparently without volition or desire became involved in an argument which he seems neither to have sought not avoided.

(79)

Hence, rather than his brother, her brother, his sister, her lover in Mr. Compton's narration kin have become discrete entities dispossessed of familial relation. This

disjunction between possessor and inalienable possession indeed appropriate to a family in which the father dispossesses one son, and the other son dispossesses the father, constructs "kin" who like a discarded object or uninhabitable land, no one bothers to possess.

Similarly, Rosa's description of her confrontation with Clytie on the stairs repeatedly employs the demonstrative pronoun to deny Clytie possession of her body. This linguistic severance of Clytie from her body ratified by the non-human terms in which she is described is in marked contrast to the possessive that Rosa urges to speak of her own body. "I was crying, not to someone, something but through some thing, through that force, that furious, yet absolutely shocklike and immobile antagonism which had stopped me that presence, that familiar coffee-coloured face, that body ... no longer than my own . . ." (110).

Clytie is thus dispossessed of the most rudimentary of possession of what Rosa calls "the citadel of the central I am's private own" (112) what is called the *proprius*. The demonstrative pronoun makes alien her face, her body, her hand, linguistically reenacting we might say, what the war has done to grandfather Compron's arm. But there is more to the passage than this for while the lamentation represents the alienation of one's own kin, and the pain of one's own body, the demonstrative pronoun with a similar gesture perpetrates this alienation one another. This is to say, that the gesture of language that represents loss can likewise discursively affect loss. This alienation of the inalienable, symptomatic of crisis has the ability to construct the sense of crisis to fabricate a moment which call for the inconvincible and which warrants extravagant action; in such a moment of confused and loosened relationships between possessor and possession inconceivable acquisition becomes a possible as inconceivable loss. Moreover, Rosa's description of

her confrontation with Clytie demonstrates that this alienation of the inalienable, while characteristics of the lamentation, may be neither cataclysmic nor exceptional; rather it exists alongside other narratives and discourse and may be eclipsed by them. This indeed is not about Clytie's alienated body but about Rosa's attempts to find out what has happened between Henry and Charles Bon. Not only Clytie's loss concealed by the narrative of another, it cannot even be conceived of as loss because it exists, rather than as an exceptional, disjunctive moment as a disregarded circumstances of everyday.

The second form of the present possession asserted by the lamentation is the possession of affliction. The lamentation repeatedly describes affliction, aversiveness, misery, and sorrow in terms of possession- as my sorrow, my trouble, our affliction or doom. The very proximity and presentness of sorrow, trouble, terror and misfortune make them seem like one's personal possessions; they comprise the immediate environment and designate one's identity. Indeed like remade materials property of the lamentation that effects a disjunction between possessor and possessions, or like the body turned against itself in pain, one's relationship to one's own knowledge value, identity is in the lamentation, both alien and adverse, to possess oneself is to possess affliction. Thus is the adversity of Sutpen household repeatedly described as the possession of doom, and thus does. This afflictive possession ultimately determine for example in the novel Charles Bon's identity, an identity adversarial to its own possessor:

Henry: You are my brother.

Charles: No I'm not. I', just the nigger that's going to sleep with your sister. (286)

While the lamentation's assertions of wrongful possession indicate adversity, the lamentation afflictive possession figures that adversity's inevitable suffusion into identity. For Quentin, that afflictive possession is, significantly accumulated significance hearing and knowing too much, too long, a knowledge no adverse, no inextricable from the self, Quentin will kill himself to be rid of it. And to express this afflictive knowledge, Quentin turns to demonstrative pronouns that simultaneously call forth and elide the overwhelming, aversive significance of while they are the trace. In the novel, Quentin says:

Yes I have heard too much, I have been told too much; I have had to listen to too much, too long thinning yes, almost exactly like Father: that letters and who to know what moral restoration she [Judith] might have contemplated in the privacy of that house, that room, that night, what hurdling of iron old, traditions since she had seen almost everything else she had learned to call stable vanish like straws in a gale. (168)

In the demonstrative pronoun only incidentally marks afflictive possession in *Absalom, Absalom!* its movement which accumulates, circumscribes and certifies is quite capable of instituting aversive knowledge or identity.

The lamentation's assertions of possession, then, which is characterized as retroactive, impossibly alienated and afflictive are all grammatically marked as certain possession. Beneath the estimable mien however all are disturbed by semantic contention that renders their possession claims equivocal. The assertion of prior possession for example is simultaneously and oxymoronic both an assertion of possession a catalog of loss; it asserts grammatically a possession that it negates semantically. The lamentation's two forms of present possession are both

simultaneously an insistence on possession and a disruption of the customary relationship of continuity and mastery between proprietor and property. This dual movement between assertion and negation, between possession and dispossession between language that acquires property and language that effects loss, runs throughout the lamentation and is manifested in a number of linguistics, grammatical, semantic and figural forms.

The lamentation is a language not only of possession but of dispossession and the work of dispossession is largely carried out by privatives and other forms of negation because unhinged from an assertion a privative means nothing, because it must assert in order to negate, establish in order to destroy, the privative, in remarking value, identity and knowledge, reenacts loss. Like the remade property of the lamentation, moreover, the privative is by nature comparatives, disjunctive, antithetical to itself.

The rhetorical dispossession affected by the lamentation is privatives are structurally and often semantically homologous to the various and relentless device of Faulknerian negativity Faulknerian privatives - a term under which this research includes negation, negative neologisms, figures of privation as well as linguistic privatives regularly function to dispossess ownness of authority, identity, knowledge and value. The narrator of *Absalom, Absalom!* deploy the lamentation's privative gesture to effect an interested redistribution of possessions and the ways in which the novel's narrator rhetorically construct catastrophe as with the way they represent the underlying thematic catastrophe of the Civil War. This research argues that, further. If the privatives of *Absalom, Absalom!* reenact the historical moment of the civil war and reconstruction, they also inscribe a subsequent moment that the novel only sketchily presents: that era between Charles Etienne's youth at Sutpen's hundred and

Quentin and Shreve's snowy night of storytelling at Harvard that is called "New South". The rhetorical moment movement of the privatives, structurally corresponds to the social movement conceived by New South spokesmen during the period from about 1877 to 1913, when southern journalists, educators, politicians and preachers struggled to establish a new social and economic order.

In Greek lamentation, privative regularly performs the loss of material possession as well as the loss of value and identity that accompanies them. In the same way Faulknerian through negative description designates and reenact the loss of identity concomitant to the material losses of the war: "It was winter soon and already soldiers were beginning to come back the stragglers, not all of them tramps, suffians but men who had risked and lost everything suffered beyond endurance and returned now to a ruined land not the same men who had marched away but transformed" (126).

In this passage, the negations functions first to distinguish those we possessed and lost property from those who cannot be dispossessed because they have never been entitled to possession in the first place and second to mark the coincident contrariety (not sameness) of property and identity; as man's land has become other, or become the property of another, so as the man become other to his former self. Likewise, when Sutpen returns form war, he, like the ruined fields, fallen fences and crumbling walls of his property, has become other indeed has become alien to his own physical presence:

He [Sutpen] rode up the drive and into our lives again and left not ripples rave those [Judith's] instantaneous and incredible tears. Because he himself was not there not in the house where spent our days, had not stopped there. The shell of him was there, using the room which we

had kept for him and eating the food which we produced and prepared as if it could neither feel the softness of the bed nor make distinction between the viands either as to quality or taste. Yes, he wasn't there ... Not absent from the place, the arbitrary square of earth which he had named Sutpen's hundred: not that all. He was absent only from the room, and that because he had to be elsewhere, a part of him encompassing each ruined field and fallen fences and crumbling wall of cabin or cotton house or crib; himself diffused and in solution held by that electric furious immobile urgency and awareness of shot time and the need for hate. (129)

Hence, just as the physical presence of the fence no longer possesses the characteristics of fence, the ability to enclose space divide properly, prohibit movement so the physical presence of Sutpen no longer possesses the characteristics of a self. The repeated negation of presence ("not there," "not in the house") of feeling and taste of effect ("no ripple" save Judith's incredible tears) and subsequently of absence, construct an identity which like the privative itself, is disjunctive form and antithetical to self identity.

If lamentation is a moment of remarking, it is also a moment when destruction has produced the radically new, when the world has been "reoriginated" through catastrophe. Indeed destruction commonly functions as a sign of the new and while the newly remade identities inscribed in the lamentation are alienating and aversive, newness is often partially marked destruction of existing knowledge is for example, closely associated with the production of new knowledge and indeed formulation of knowing itself revelation, disclosure, unconcealment after rely on primary act of destruction. The fact that destruction may stand as a sign for the new explains why

Faulknerian narratives often seem gratuitously destructive, narrator describes the knowledge they efface in more detail than the knowledge they affirm, employ privatives to construct suspiciously sophistic distinction and point highly unlikely possibilities as if merely for the point of having something to negate.

Faulknerian privatives, are moreover, frequently imbedded in a "not . . . but" sequence that not only destroys knowledge but function to affirm a new knowledge. Mr. Compson for example, explains what when Sutpen first arrived in Jefferson, he looked like a man who had been sick, yet "not like a man who had been peacefully ill in bed and had recovered to move with a sort of different and tentative amazement in a world which he had believed himself on the point of surrendering but like a man who had been through some solitary furnace experience which was more than just fever" (24). Similarly, Shreve insists that Judith grew old:

Not as the weak grow, either enclosed in a static ballooning of already lifeless flesh or through a series of stages of gradual collapsing. Whose particles adhere not to some iron and still impervious framework but one another as though in some communal and oblivious and mindless life of their own like a colony of maggots but as the demon himself had grown old. (151)

Emerging from a frenzy of rhetorical destruction, such affirmation allows the Faulknerian narrator to lay claim to a radically new and thus particularly valuable, knowledge: a pristine knowledge traditionally associated with purity of thought, with truth and later with the originality that Romanticism valorized as authenticity.

Even in those passages where narrators seem to be mired in a past that won't go away in a legacy that threatens to eclipse the way possibility of a New South, the

"not ...but" structure of the discourse insistently produces newness. Picking up the narrative from Quentin and Shreve, the omniscient narrator describe:

The starved and ragged remnant of [the confederate] army ... sweat onwards not by a victorious army behind it but rather by a mounting tide of the names of lost battles from either side... better lost not alone because of generals who should not have been generals, who were generals not through training in contemporary methods or aptitude for learning them, but by the divine right to say 'Go there conferred upon them by an absolute caste system.' (276)

The pervasive destruction of knowledge in *Absalom, Absalom!* enacted as the destruction of old ideas, ideals and identities in the interest of producing a New South. As advocated by the New South spokesman like Henry Grady of the Atlanta Constitution and Richard Edmond of the Manufacturer's Record was contingent upon a series of destruction: south single crop system of its reliance of its colonial raw-material economy, and of the leisure, manners and elitism associated with the antebellum plantation. Such destruction, New South advocates wagered, would at once signify and produce newness; a South characterized not by plantation farming but by diversified agriculture; not by production of raw materials but by diversified agriculture: not by production of raw materials but by the manufacture of finished products, not by Northern and freedmen's government but by Southern white supremacy would effect that is a radical redistribution of both material and ideological possessions.

To enact such a revolution and produce the new and because destruction functions as a sign of new - New South spokesman inevitably relied on a battery of rhetorical destruction, deploying not only the literal sort of privative in the

lamentation and in *Absalom, Absalom!* But a particularly rich line of mortuary burial imaginary. On December 21, 1886 at Delmonico's restaurant in New York, Henry Grady rose to speak to a group of New England businessmen and in what would become the new South's defining moment began by quoting Georgia statesman Benjamin Harvey Hill: "There was South of Union freedom - that South is dead. There is a South of Navery and Secession - that south thank God, is living, breathing growing every hour" (45). Grady's opening statement at once structurally reproduces the Faulknerian "not ...but" sequence predicated a claim to newness on an event of destruction and typifies the rhetorical construction of the New South. For just as Faulkner's narrators repeatedly perform acts of linguistic destruction to produce new knowledge.

New South spokesman often mired for rhetorical materials in the destruction effected by Civil War, a destruction that in New South terms was less significant for the freedom it granted to blacks than for the new order - and economic opportunity it produces for whites. Frequent rehearsal of the destruction of slavery thus expediently functioned as both a conciliatory gesture towards the North and the destruction necessary for production of the new. In Grady's *New South* speech at Delmonico's for example the South became the enslaved rather than the enslaver and the war, accordingly, about the South's emancipation rather than its defeat:

The South found her jewel in the toad's head of defeat. The shackles that had held in narrow limitations fell forever when the Shackles of Negro slave were broken . . . [The New South] understands that her emancipation came because through the inscrutable wisdom of God her honest purpose was crossed, and her brave armies were beaten.

(37-38)

Rhetorically appropriating the destruction of war also allowed New South Spokesman to insert themselves into that logic of lamentation that simultaneously declares the part utterly destroyed and proclaims loyalty to it—a position not unlike Mr. Compson's instance on the old South as both, "a dead time" and "large more heroic" than the "diffused and Scattered" present (71). At once constructing, decimating and eulogizing the Old South, the speeches and editorials of the New South routinely carried wrenching description of either the dying confederate soldier or the surviving soldiers who like Sutpen returns home to find "his house in ruins, his farm devastated his slaves free, his stock killed his barns empty, his trade destroyed, his money worthless, his social system, feudal in its magnificence, swept away" (74). Such lamentation ratified the New South program with the affective potency of catastrophic loss and the reverence afforded the dead.

The conceptual negativity of Redemption, moreover, materialized for Redemption was ultimately accomplished by a series of material destruction that, continuous with and legitimated by the Redeemer's rhetorical destructions, destroyed the bodies of blacks to affirm the identity of whites: the privative made flesh. During the "Redemption" of Faulkner's Mississippi for example, white leagues murdered as many as 300 blacks. *Absalom, Absalom!* alludes to this violence in Rosa's description in the novel "the sheets and hoods and night galloping horses with which the discharged the canker suppuration of defeat" (134). Indeed the novel's climatic fire at Sulpen's Hundred might stand as a figure for the materially enacted privatives of the Democratic Redeemers; it is at once the culmination and an incarnation of the novel's privatives a ritual purification and the destruction of a blackbody. Yet it is in the novel's rhetorical negativity, its destruction of old knowledge of redemption is most consistently chronicled.

If the privatives of *Absalom, Absalom!* inscribes the rhetorical structure of the New South, so too does that in distinction between the phenomenal and the rhetorical that characterizes both the lamentation and Faulkner's novel. J. Hillis Miller in his *Two Relativism* has argued that *Absalom, Absalom!* dramatizes the necessity but incompatibility of constative and performative language in narration:

If in one direction a story teller tries to stick to the facts (the constative effort) and ends by inventing them (the performative element), in the other direction if a story teller tries to invent a purely fictional story, wholly cut a from life, if he tries to absorb life into a perfect narratives design, he always ends by suffering to life and to history, since the words he must use are after all referential. (167)

Miller's first "direction" in which the constative slides into the performative describes a situation particularly acute in traumatic circumstances and thus particularly marked in the lamentation and that his second "direction" in which the performative inevitably "refer to life" describes not only a mere reference to, but a consequential construction of life. Mr. Compson in the novel, for example, narrating the moment of Mississippi's redemption employs that not . . .but structure to refigure the forgiveness of Charles Etienne as unreal:

This child with a face not old but without age, as if he had no childhood, not in the sense that Miss Rosa Coldfield says she had not childhood, but as if he had not been human born but instead created without agency of man or agency of women and orphaned by no human beings . . . but produced complete and subject to no microbe in that cloyed and scented maze of shuttered silk as if he were the delicate and perverse spirit symbol, immortal page of the ancient immortal

Lilith entering the actual world not at the age of one second but twelve years. (159)

This rhetorical emptying out of age, childhood, natural births, mother, the vulnerability of the body, and indeed mortality itself is not without consequences; for it not only enacts a sustained and fantastic loss of being, but legitimates the novel's later construction of Charles Etienne as insentient, as possessing "a strength composed of Sheer desperate will and imperviousness to the punishment, the blows and slashes which he took in return and did not even seem to feel" (164).

Indeed this rhetorical insentience solidifies into knowledge and ratified by the deictic gesture of the demonstrative pronoun because not only "that same survey and implacability and physical imperviousness to pain and punishment" (167), but in a disturbingly eloquent division of history, social condition and race, "that furious protest that indictment of heaven's ordering, that gauge flung into the face of what is" (164). The mutual contamination of constative and performative language of which Miller speaks thus allows a rhetorical construction of identity such as the catastrophic loss of identity suffered by Charles Etienne to pass for a representation that is for a disinterested record of the real. The gesture of a language that represents catastrophic may, such passage suggests function to construct useful and interested catastrophe for a reenactment and an enactment are disconcertingly difficult to distinguish.

In similar way, New South spokesmen, placing themselves like the narrators of *Absalom, Absalom!* at that site where the phenomenal and the rhetorical are indistinguishable, recorded so fact the very "New South" that they were in the act of rhetorically constructing.

Grady's negation of post-war condition and affirmation of "heaps of treasure" illustrate the manner in which a new knowledge or New South, which is less a

representation of phenomenon than a rhetorical construction of then, grants itself the state of a representation and thereby disguises its own interested production of the real: a reenactment and enactment are disconcertingly difficult to distinguish.

Yet while such representation might well produced belief in a material heap of treasure, it did not always produce the material heap of treasure itself, a fact confirmed for example by the "carpetless room [in which Judith and Charles Etienne confer] furnished with what ever chairs and such which they had not had to chop up and burn to cook food or for warmth or may be to heat water for illness from time to time" (167). Hence, Rebecca Saunder in his "*Absalom, Absalom!* and New South" mentions that Grady while enlisting his customary series of performative destruction shrewdly combined his rhetorical destruction of the one-crop system and of raw material production with a description of loss of profit:

With amazing rapidity [The South] has moved away from one crop idea that was once her curse. . . . With equal shelftenss has she moved away from the fully of shopping out her ore at \$2 a ten and buying it back in implements of from \$20 to \$ 100 per ton; her cottn at 10 cents pound and buying at 8 per thousand and buying it back in furniture at ten to twenty times as much. (100)

At the same time that Grady's constantive language slides indistinguishably into the performative - precisely as the fair's "exhibits" were intended to do his description of loss of profit compensates for the failure of rhetorical performativity by producing desire.

Desire is a kind of anticipatory loss; an anticipated possession and the lack of it. The lamentation produces desire for a lost objects, a forgotten part, a less aversive future not by only chronicling loss but by employing the privative for in (re)enacting

loss, the privatives enacts desire. It is thus, no coincidence that *Absalom, Absalom!* primary site of desire - Bon's longing for the recognition of his father - is repeatedly constructed through privatives: "And he sent me no word? He did not ask you to send me to him? No word to me, no word at all?" (285). The very conception of the father (Sutpen) and his signs (as anticipated possession) condition both Bon's desire and his sense of perpetual "loss" loss of a father he has never possessed.

Just as the novel's rhetorical loss of father produces Bon's incessant desire for the father, so does Grady's rhetorical loss of profits produce desire for profits. And the privatives employed by New South spoke men routinely functioned to produce a desire that compensated for the failure of rhetorical performativity: if language itself did not remark society, perhaps desire that remade world would. Benjamin Harvery hill writes in widely read article "The Land We Love" posited both a series of anticipated possessions and the lack of them and thus enlisting the common techniques of comparing the South's productivity with the North's recent and performatively enacts desires:

The persistent, pertinacious, preserving energy of the North has a reenacted a hundred cotton factories were we have but one ... The facilities for manufacturing are all in our favour and it is owing to our own inattention and neglect that we are so immeasurably behind ... We became dependent upon the North for everything from a Lucifer mates to a Columbia form a pin to a raclroad engine. A state of war found us without the machinery to make a single perusions cap for a soldiers trifle, or a single button for his jacket. (7-9)

The phenomenal redistribution of the moment of lamentation and the rhetorical dispossession of the language of lamentation thus often follow logic in which moment

and language indissociably produce each other in which language both represent and affects a redistribution of possessions. If the privative of *Absalom, Absalom!* chronicle the rhetorical destruction of New South spokesmen their production of newness and device they also inscribe the redistribution of possessions that characterized the New South. The materials and ideological possession customarily condition each other, moreover New South spokesmen often attempted to achieve a redistribution ideological ones, Benjamin Harvey Hill's argument for example in his "The Land We Love" mentions that which distributes value and aim to re-mark knowledge, transfer value to the manual labour hard work and utilitarian knowledge necessary to the production of material possession: We want... [a] plan of instruction, which will embrace the useful rather than the profound, the practical rather than the theoretic" (11). Richard transfers value from the pleasure of material luxury to the hard labour and autonomy will transfer material possession to the South, "a loaf, weather of bread or educational opportunity, won by hard and honest work by the sweat of The brow, means more for manhood than a thousand dainties accepted as charity from those upon whom they have no claim" (7).

Moreover, many men and women in the New South enacted the structure of New South privatives and like the character of the novel Judith, the mistress turned merchant which is assumed re-made identities in the same way the planter becomes industrialist, the industrialist become merchant the merchant becomes planters. Many blacks remarking their lives as freed people, acquired both mobility and an opportunity of bargain for wages that allowed them to obtain material possessions, they were able to acquire considerable amounts of clothes, furniture, musical instruments, bicycles and buggies. Many working class whites moving from farm to

the South's new mills towns acquired education, materials possessions and a new sense of respectability.

Thus, in the war itself caused singular cataclysmic transformation, New South boosterism brought about its own redistribution of knowledge, identity and material property — less dramatic to be sure, but arguably more sustained. And if as this research argued above, Faulknerian privative reenact the loss of identity concomitant to the material losses of war, they also construct and even more pervasive and continuous loss of identity. The Faulknerian privative accordingly, repeatedly enacts a loss of knowledge that makes knowledge disjunctive from its own customary constituents. In the novel *Absalom, Absalom!* Mr. Compson's, "It just does not explain" speech for example employs a series of privatives inscrutable that both describes the impossibility of constituting the past into knowledge and empties out the constituents of that knowledge, leaving ultimately, "just the words, the symbols, the shapes themselves shadowy inscrutable and serene" (80). Indeed Faulknerian privatives routinely construct perception that are emptical out of both knowledge and the properties of the 'natural' in the novel *Absalom, Absalom!* Rosa's description of her arrival at Sutpen's Hundred following murder of Charles sons is exemplary:

Rotting posits and scaling walls it stood not ravaged not invaded  
marked by no bullet non soldiers iron heel but rather as though  
reversed for something more: some desolation more profound than ruin  
as if it had stood in iron, juxtaposition to iron flame to a holocaust  
which had found itself less fierce and less implacable not hurled but  
rather fallen back before thee impervious and indomitable skeleton  
which the flames dust not at the instant's final crisis assail. (108-9)

In this passage privatives simultaneously establish and empty out the "natural" caused relation between the activity of war and a destroyed house and leave only a residual anti-knowledge, an emptiness (desolation) which can only be gestured towards negatively (as not ravage, not invasion, not the result of bullet or iron hell), metaphorically ("as though") and comparatively (something more, "more profound than ruin").

The New South program for all its emphasis on progress not only deployed enough nostalgia to rival any Faulknerian narrator but, though its very rhetoric of newness, disguised its continuity with that "lost" society on which *Absalom, Absalom!* so obviously dwells. Conversely, if the narrators of *Absalom, Absalom!* seem thematically to resist New South optimism by dwelling on devastations and clinging to nostalgia. They are rhetorically as insistent on producing newness as any New South spokesmen. The Faulknerian privatives thus simultaneously mark the appearance of the mode of lamentation, refer to a fictional moment of the catastrophe and inscribe the historical moment of the New South. Those privatives record that is the production of newness and desire, the redistribution of materials and ideological possessions, and the lamentation of incomprehensibility characteristics of both the lamentation and New South discourse: in the unprepossessing rhetorical gestures reside capacities to remark the world.

### III. Language of Trauma & Melancholic in *Absalom, Absalom!*

William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* is such a novel which carries and under tone of loss that heavily colours the novel's plot. The tone of loss is found both in the narrative structure and somehow connected to the characters who participate in the narrative action. The same story is told and retold by six characters and even they have not the sameness what they narrate regarding the story. It means the novel has fragmented structure and this fragmented structure obviously depicts the language of trauma and melancholic thoughts out the novel. In the novel

In the novel the language of trauma and melancholic is sprouted because of the loss of nearest and intimate things which the characters have possessed with them. After losing the things one has to live in psychic disorder and losing the things in the way of trauma and melancholic. After being conscious towards the lost object one has to express the sense of regains to the lost object in very sad mood and exposes in bitter way. Regarding this idea according to the physic analyst Jacques Hassoun, in *The Cruelty of Depression*, melancholi9c is defined as an experience of loss in the absence of the person's knowledge or fantasy of what is lost. Unlike Cathy Caruth's concept of "Unclaimed experience" which presupposes knowledge of the fantasy about what is lost but cannot be claimed. In such condition the result is an anxiety that, as Hasown says, is without a cause but not without an object. Here, then question of loss that cannot be hermeneutically accessed Hassoun's initial step in dealing with this problem. Therefore, is trying to understand the anxious affect of melancholic. Here Hassoun in his "The Cruelty of Depression" explains:

We must ask ourself about the object of anxiety as it arises in passion, trauma and in melancholic and recalls first of all that passion is the most spectacular mode of expression for a melancholic structure.

Passion and melancholia on the one hand, melancholic and mania on the other, seems to set up a relation to the object of which melancholia is the key in that being a symptom, it reveals - as I have shown - what is at stake in a child's relation to a mother who has been subjectively unable to help it through a first mourning process that grounds its subjectivity (68).

According to Hanoun's theory, "melancholia" is the emotional attachment to an unmastered, ungrasped other in hitherto unconscious experiences. The other is felt as unmasterable affect and as such, coincides with the shock experience of trauma.

Regarding the language of trauma and melancholia some characters have expressed their depressive mood. In the novel, Quentin expresses his thought: Why God let us lose the war: that only through the blood of our men and the tears of our women could, he stay this demon and efface his name and lineage from the earth. (48)

Here, the character Quentin expresses his sad mood in losing the war and the destruction caused by war what the American Southerners have achieved it was only possible the day night struggle of men and women.

Moreover, another character named Rosa who is only the person lived during the events of the story. Still her recollection is filtered through forty years of bitterness and hatred towards Sutpen. She refers to Sutpen as a demon, a djinn and the fiend. Her version of narration depicts an accusatory tone and she blames Sutpen for all the miseries of Coldfields. Further she interprets the fall of south and southern people in melancholic way. When Sutpen deceives her very badly, she is living in a darkroom remembering her past life which was full of struggle and miseries. Even she remembers their family members whom she has lost in war.

In the novel the main character Sutpen, when he loses his son, wife and relatives after that he always lives in regression and melancholia. In the very beginning he found himself very strong, proud and courageous that he could do everything for the sake of his family and his reputation. Because of his over ambitious nature and over confidence at fact he comes to be in ruined stage. After that he felt in regression and expresses his through in traumatic and melancholic way remembering his mistakes. In front of Quinten's grandfather he confesses and says:

"Where did I do wrong" but "Where did I make the mistake . . . what did I do or misdo . . . whom or what injure by it to the extent which this would indicate? I had a design to accomplish it I should require money a house, a plantation, slaves, a family- incidentally of course a wife. I set out to acquire there asking no favor of any man. (94)

From this passage we can say that Sutpen at last found his mistake to ruin his family members and his dream. This regression and lamentation shows the traumatic living of Sutpen throughout his life.

## Works Cited

- Alexander, Jeffery. *Towards a theory of culture Trauma*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004
- Breit Harvey, "Introduction." *Absalom and Absalom !* New York: Modern Library, 1936: 1-19
- Brooks, Cleanth. *William Faulkner's The Yoknapatanpha Country*: New Heaven: Yale Up, 1963.
- Bussey, Jennifer, "Ctiricism on *Absalom and Absalom*," *Novel for Students*. Vol. 13. Detroit: Thomas Learning, 2002: 13-15
- Caruth, Cathy. "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and Possibility of History." *Yale French Studies* 79 (1991): 181-92.
- Cerelan, De Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Stenen Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Crauth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.
- - -. "Violence and Time: Traumatic Survival Assemblage." *Violence, Space* 20.2 (Apr. 1993): 25-29.
- Edkin, Jenney, "Remembering Rationality: Trauma Times and Politics." *Memory trauma and World Politics*. Ed. Duncan Bell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 99-115.
- Faulkner, William. *Absalom, Absalom!* New York: Random House, 1990.
- Freud, Faulkner. "Caruth: Truama and Politics of Literary Form Forter, Geg." *Narrative Volume* (October 2007): 259 -85.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Memory and Melancholia." *Collected Paper* Vol. 4. Trans Joan Riviere. London: Hogarth Press, 1949. 152-70.

Harvery, Hill Bnejamin, "Education," *The land of Love* 1.1 (May 1866,) 1-11.

LaCapra, Domnick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkuns Up, 2001.

Lind, Else Dusoir. "The Design and Meaning of *Absalom, Absalom!*" *PMLA*. 70.5 (Dec -1955): 887- 92.

Max, Pulzel. "What is Gothic about *Absalom, Absalom!*" *The Southern Literary Journal* 4.1 (1971): 3-19.

Rauch, Angelika. "Post-Traumatic Hermeneutics Melancholia" *Diacties* 28.4 (1998): 111- 120.

Richard, H. Edmonds. *The South's Prosperity its Danger: Strength of character needed as never as Never Before*. Batimare: Manufacture Record, 1907.