Tribhuvan University

Reconstruction of History: Reading *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*

A Thesis Submitted to Department of English Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus Tribhuvan University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master's of Arts in English

By

Braj Mohan Adhikari

Roll No. 400692

T.U. Regd. No. 6-1-12-369-2004

March 2014

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

The undersigned members of the Research Committee have approved this thesis entitled "Reconstruction of History: Reading *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*" submitted to Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Tribhuvan University, by Braj Mohan Adhikari.

Members of the Research Committee:

Mr. Hem Lal Pandey

Supervisor

External Examiner

Mr. Chiramjibi Kafle

Head

Department of English

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus

Date 9th April 2014

Acknowledgements

The credit for the preparation of this thesis goes to my respected research supervisor Mr. Hem Lal Pandey for his invaluable scholarly supervision, constructive comments and suggestions that helped me to give the shape of thesis in its present form.

Moreover I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Chiranjibi Kafle, Head of the M. A. English Program at Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, for granting me permission to conduct this research, subject of my interest. Without their suggestions and instructions, the thesis would not have been completed.

With due respect, I would also like to express my gratitude towards my family members for their continuous support and encouragement in my academic career. Special thanks go to my senior brothers for their constant inspiration.

Braj Mohan Adhikari

March 2014

Abstract

The present study focuses on one of the most dominant aspects of historical reconstruction – genealogical method of analysis as proposed by Michel Foucault – in Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *Chronicle of a Death Foretold.* This research examines how Marquez applies this innovative literary technique of genealogical analysis of the history in this novel. In this sense Marquez deconstructs the traditional concept of history by denaturalizing the facts of the official history. Blurring the traditional concept of historical reconstruction, Marquez moves forward and backward in time, while reconstructing a murder that occurred twenty-seven years back. He even challenges the concept that history always presents absolute and certain events in their periodical order. To show this uncertainty he also applies magic realism that blurs hierarchy between the real and the fantastic.

Though Marquez is writing this novel to reconstruct the real happening, he also exposes how the discourses operate in society. In this matter, power plays a great role to mobilize these discourses. This novel shows how power itself shifts its balance and become creative. As a genealogical analysis Marquez's concerns also realize on the formation of self or subject, where the tradition of counseling affects. So, Marquez doesn't believe the official version of history as the valid and authentic one. He rather views it as a discourse created by the ideology of the state or the society, which can never go beyond the ideology in which it is written or produced.

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction to Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* in the Context

Gabriel Garcia Marquez's renowned work *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* sets out to reconstruct a murder that occurred twenty-seven years before. This chronicle does not present the series of events chronologically– as this name suggests–but Marquez moves backward and forward in time. In this sense, as this novel focuses on the historical matter, this thesis tries to show the way Marquez reconstructs it.

While reconstructing the event Marquez denaturalizes the facts of the official history. In this sense he even uses magic realism as a literary device that blurs the hierarchy between the real and the fantastic. The official history, as we believe, presents a series of events in their periodical order, and also shows the facts as if they were absolute, and certain. It doesn't trace the formation of certain type of discourse and the way discourse operates in society. It merely shows the surface events from one perspective.

But in this novel, Marquez tries to reconstruct the very event from genealogical perspective. This method as the theoretical tool is propounded by Michel Foucault. Genealogy deconstructs the chronological way of historical formation and shows the indeterminacy not only in its way of formation but also in its content. Genealogy also focuses on social, religion, political, issues while reconstructing history. While focusing on the contextual factors, it also deals with the way discourses format and work in a society. As the discourses operate in society power itself mobilize– among them who have no access to it by the power holder. But Foucauldian genealogy also shows how power itself shift its balance and become

creative. And in this context my concern also relies on the formation of self or subject. In this formation I will focus on the very tradition of counseling.

In the novel Marquez brilliantly excavates many of the Columbian concerns in particular. It also treats whole of Latin American concerns like society, culture, myth etc. The novel primarily presents the regional history of an unknown village from Columbia, only through reconstructing the murder mystery of Santiago Nasar. Here the unknown narrator – who may be the writer himself–returns to his bloody village many years back and tries to unearth the mystery. He individually asks many questions to the people of the village concerning the mystery. But, instead of finding total truth about the murder, the narrator himself exposes uncertainty. This very uncertainty as one of the postmodern feature also departs this novel from traditional detective novel.

This local chronicle, however, is the real representative of the history of Columbia from which Marquez tries to foster its mythological concern: As the real history of Columbia is followed by interminable civil wars, dictators, brief resurgences of democratic rule, mass massacre and rural violence, etc. In this sense Marquez's *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* begins by invoking a violent death in the future and then retreating to consider an earlier, extraordinary event. Compare to other writings of Gabriel Garcia Marquez Salman Rushdie analyzes that "Marquez is consciously trying to foster myth of Garcialand [. . .] by involving a violent death and [. . .] by his use of certain types of stock characters: the old soldier, the loose woman, the matriarch, the compromised priest, the anguished doctor" (302).

In the midst of this political turmoil of Columbia, Garcia Marquez began his career as a journalist. As S. Minta states:

> His concerns are [. . .] with the origins of violence, and with the effects that it has on the society in which people have to live. He is thus inevitably, concerned with the whole history of his country and continent, and, both as a writer of novels and as a journalist he has constantly laid stress on the importance of developing alternative sources of history as a challenge to the status of conventional ones. (3)

This challenge of conventional history is the primary focus of this thesis. To challenge this, the narrator presents events in such a way that there is no linearity. Despite this fact, the horror of the murder still haunts even at end of the novel. We find that the primary concern in the traditional mystery fiction is that the guilty can be identified and their crimes satisfyingly punished. "The central question in them is whodunit?" (Cavallaro1). But Gabriel Garcia Marquez purses inverted paths in his exploration of fact finding and moves towards indeterminacy.

Chronicle of a Death Foretold tells the story about a murder of a rich, handsome fellow who lived in the Caribbean town where the author grew up. Thus, as a character in his own novel, Garcia Marquez interviews people who remember the murder and studies documents assembled by the court. He accumulates many kinds of data–dreams, weather reports, gossip, and philosophical speculation–and makes a record of what happened.

In novel the marriage of Bayardo San Roman and Angela Vicario ends on their wedding night when she names the young Arab, Santiago Nasar, as her previous lover. She is returned to her parents' house and her bothers– the twins Pedro and Pablo Vicario–are thus faced with the obligation of killing Santiago to salvage their family's good name. It is giving nothing away to reveal that the murder does take place. But the oddness and the quality of this unforgettable myth lies in the twins' reluctance to

do what must be done. They continually reveal their intentions, as if they do not want to kill Santiago, but the towns silence eventually forces the twins to perform their terrible deed.

The most striking thing about this novel is that it is based on the real happening that caused sensation years before. Some twenty-seven years ago in the town of Sucre, Colombia, a man named Miguel Reyes Palencia returned his new bride to her family when he discovered in their wedding bed that she was not a virgin. When her brothers heard that shocking news, they sought out her alleged lover, Cayetano Gentile Chimento, and murdered him. Garcia Marquez has taken the incident and given it fictional life. So, Marquez fictionalizes the facts of the real event and constructed it again in new way. This is the ingenious capacity of Marquez who has invented a vivid group of characters who bear little resemblance to their real life counterparts and has altered the facts to make the case far more dramatic than it actually was. He has "in essence, questioned, reshaped and played with history in such a way that an unusual but decidedly minor event becomes the stuff of myth" (Feo 609).

Gabriel Garcia Marquez is one of Latin Americas most formidable writers, he is a master of 'magic realism' the practice of representing possible events as if they were common place. He begins his career as a journalist and later he devoted himself to fiction writing, becoming celebrated for his craft as well as his rhetorical exuberance and fecund imagination. Among other novels, his *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* offers different perspectives, to its readers, to analyze. And especially after 1982 when he was awarded Nobel Prize for Literature, this novel also becomes main concern for the critics. Salman Rushdie, in his book *Imaginary Homelands*, shows his affinity towards Marquez as he experienced the predicament of 'bearing-across

people. Rushdie comments that magic realism is the technique that expresses a genuinely 'Third World' consciousness, and deals with 'half-made' societies. In this sense, for Rushdie,

> The book and its narrator probe slowly painfully, through the mists of half-accurate memories, equivocation, contradicting versions, trying to establish what happened and why; and achieve only provisional answers. The effects of this retrospective method is to make the *Chronicle* strangely elegiac in tone, as if Marquez feels that he has drifted away from his roots, and can only write about them now through the veils of formal difficulty. (304)

From the contemporary literary heteroglossia, Robert L. Sims analyses *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* "engages in narrative borrowings and exchanges and crosses generic boarders" (27). Showing its departure from the formalistic or the structural analysis, he further asserts:

> Genette's effort to maintain narratology's formalistic parameters, narrativity [. . .] enters other contextual domains (socio-cultural, psychology, psychoanalytical, feminist, and subjective) which requires to its shad its formalistic vestment and don new apparel. (28)

In this sense Marquez also focuses on the contextual factors that show his movement from the formalistic way of seeing the event. This gives new way to see this novel in this postmodern society where nothing remains absolute.

Chronicle of a Death Foretold is a postmodern novel which erodes the posture of ironic skepticism. It treats how different contextual factors determine the condition of life. Society, culture, Psychological factors, etc. are in great abundance, plays vital role; and uniformity and consistency in human life become reducible. Rosanna

Cavallaro, in her *Journal of Woman and the law*, compares *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* with Wilkie Collins' *The Law and the Lady*, and shows how the congruence between these fictions moves and how the transformation occurred in legal institutions. She says, "Collins moves from the subversive to the conventional attitude of fact finding, and Garcia Marquez moves from the conventional to the subversion" (3).

Jorge Olivares tries to do "metaphorical reading"(3) where he finds this *Cronica* is "simply a "novel", but not a "simple" novel. As he states:

> . . . this deceptively simply "fiction" loosely based on the real occurrence is, as I shall argue, a "meta-fiction", a self-conscious novel that uses its title to tease and challenge the reader from the outset to inter into an investigative process of textual reconstruction analogous to the one carried out by the diegetic chronicler. (484)

Olivares instead of showing historical or other contextual complexity in this novel, he, rather, tries to weave meta-fictional quality from its complex scriptural web. In this sense, for Olivares, Marquez even though pretends to expose the crime; this chronicle exposes primarily its novelistic conventions: Copulation, assassination, and writing.

Above mention literature reviews- along with so many other- show that Marquez's *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* really offers many perspectives for its readers. Though critics have been engaging in their job to criticize this novel since its publication, this dissertation tries to focus on its way of reconstructing history. In this case I would rely on how Marquez weaves broken strings of this *Chronicle.* In doing so, Marquez also explores the issue of sexuality where the sexuality of men and women are treated differently. Under this issue how "power" plays vital role and subjective formation happens. In this construction of self or subject, the process of

counseling also plays major role, where self-denial or self-mastery of speaker counts on his/her formation of identity.

So, *Chronicle of a Death foretold* caries the tufted notion of historical reconstruction. The novel can be vision not only as the blend of factual and fictional events, but it presents the history of a small town in the unnamed region of Columbia. Marquez, while reconstructing the murder event, also explores the other factors of that society, culture, and religion.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Methodology

Genealogy

Webster College Dictionary defines genealogy as "a chart or scientifically recorded history of the descent of a person or family from an ancestor or ancestors". Though this term originally was applied in biological science to study the origin of plat or animal organism, later it was barrowed to the history to record the descent of a family, person, society, culture or even religion.

But in the cultural criticism and the literary theory this term first adopted by German philosopher and cultural critic, Fredrick Wilhelm Nietzsche. In the fifth part of *The Gay Science, on the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), Nietzsche had done genealogical inquiry "to evaluate" and "to revaluate all the received values of human beings" (Audi 615). In the later part of the twentieth century Foucault defined and elaborated the nation of 'genealogy'–a word that he borrowed from Nietzsche – in a series of essays and interviews. In his interviews he had taken up the very concept to reintroduce memory and purpose into his own work: "Let us give the term genealogy to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories which allows us to establish a historical knowledge of struggle and to make use of this knowledge tactically today (During 123). So, genealogy is also an "insurrection of subjugated knowledge. Not only does it retrieve the buried texts of those whom history had silenced [. . .], it uses methods that previous historical procedures ignore" (ibid).

So, Foucault applied this term as a method to reconstitute, and to show development and change in historical event – special concerned with material event– because "genealogical investigations were explanatory" (Adams 1334).

But the questions arise: What makes Foucault adopt ‘genealogy’ as methodology? Why Foucault Shifts theoretically from discursive practices to studies of power, and again to ‘Subject’ or ‘Self’? To answer these questions I am trying to show his shift from ‘the history of ideas’ to ‘archaeology’; and again from archaeological method to genealogy, specifically. To show these shifts my focus of study would rely on his concept of archaeology, genealogy and discursive formation of sexuality as such.

History is a written or spoken account of the past events. But the way historical construction happens, it differs according to the varied situations. Therefore, historicism, a philosophical explication of historical knowledge, deals with “a philosophical doctrine originated in the methodological and epistemological presuppositions of critical historiography” (Audi 386). Concerned with the methodological presuppositions of critical historiography, Foucault “resists that kind of ‘continuous history’ which emerged as the central theme of secular humanism” (During 124). This kind of ‘continuous history’ what Foucault calls ‘the history of ideas’ faced a growing series of problems, in Late 1960s and early 1970s, at least “equal to those in Marxism” (McHoul and Grace 7). Though Marxism itself had contributed the critical reading to the history of ideas whenever needed, it had tended to argue that ideas were merely ‘super structural’ effects of ‘real economic forces’. Like Marxist philosophy, prior to Foucault, in 1950s or 1960s in France, the mainstream philosophy was ‘phenomenology’, delivered by and large from Hegel and Husserl respectively. This philosophy deals with human thought or conscious as supreme because of which we can transcend socio-political or ideology of society. But, for Foucault discourse or power determine everything. In this sense this

philosophy also resides in the concept that consciousness is the origin for everything that Foucault doesn't like. Therefore, as Foucault comments:

> The history of ideas, which has its beginnings and ends, with obscure continuities and return, and which reconstitute the development in the linear from of history, which relates work with institutions, social customs or behaviors, techniques "The Archaeology of Knowledge 138".

Archaeological Analysis

Since, the history of ideas couldn't deal with the discontinuities, rupture, discursive formations, etc. which is inherent in history, Foucault adopts archaeology as a methodological tool. According to him, archaeological description is "precisely an abandonment of the history of ideas, a systematic rejection of its postulates and procedures, and attempt to practice a quite different history of what men have said" (138).

This term 'archaeology' is closely associated in contemporary theory with Foucault himself, who uses it to describe the method of historical investigation that he favored during the earlier part of his career. He renounces all truth claims to present a history of system of meaning, or discourses, such as clinical medicine, which are treated as autonomous and rule governed. *Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism* (1995) states:

> Foucauldian archaeology is not restricted by conventional disciplinary boundaries, rather it aims to describe the system of rules that consciously or unconsciously govern the production of knowledge, of social and institutional practices, and of the very objects of study, in the various disciplines, as well as the distinctions between the discipline themselves". (18)

Though, dictionaries define archaeology as the scientific study of the life and culture of past, especially, ancient people, as by excavation of ancient cities, artifacts, etc; but Foucauldian archaeology "treated system of thought as 'discursive formation' independent of the beliefs and intentions of individual thinker" (Audi 320-321). It "departs away from the vast unities like periods or centuries to the phenomena of rupture, of discontinuity" (Flynn) It works "distinctively counter to the telic and evolutionary methods of the traditional history of ideas" (Flynn 4).

Thomas R. Flynn puts, Foucault's archaeology is "diagnostic". By 'diagnostic knowledge' he means "a form of knowledge that defines and determines differences" (16). The physician and even the Saussaurian linguist employ diagnostic techniques which are quite different from Foucauldian diagnostic technique. Foucault does not engage in dialectical model and answer dialectically. Flynn further says, "rather than concepts like 'negation of negation', and 'sublation (Aufhebung)', diagnostic uses 'transformation' and 'displacement', stressing that 'displacement is not depassment'" (17). According to him:

> Archaeology, genealogy and 'problematization', then, are three ways of combating this totalizing model and fragmenting its unity. Archaeology does so by its emphasis on breaks and impersonal functions and above all by its diagnostic and comparatives nature. […] Archaeological study is always in the plural; it operates in a great number of registers; it crosses interstices and gaps; it has its domain where unities are juxtaposed, separated, fix their crests, confront one another, and accentuate the white space between one another (18).

Thomas R. Flynn comments that Foucauldian archaeology is different from those of traditional archaeologists who had defined this term. Foucauldian archaeology

exposes those inner issues that would have forgotten by traditional historians. Though it exposes unexplored issues and brings them to fore, it even ruptures the unities and problematizes them.

Since the archaeology deals with the discursive formation; but the question arises: How can such discourses can be formed? The first thing we need to concern in that formation is the 'statement.' As Foucault put forward: "statements different in form, and dispersed in time, form a group if they refer to one and the same object" (32). For example, the statement belonging to psychopathology all seems to refer to an object that emerges in various ways in individual or social experience and which may be called 'madness.' So, discourses merely objectify those concepts. Therefore archaeology questions those formations.

In formations of discourse, statement plays decisive role – since it is "an elementary unit or an atom of discourse" (AK 85). As the statement emerges in materiality; it enters various networks and fields with certain transformations and modifications, in which its identity is maintained or effaced. Thus "the statement circulates, is used, disappears, allows or prevents the realization of desire; serves or resists various interests" (105). Because of this the totality of discourse can not be traced out or spoken out. So, the greater chronological distance is needed to evaluate them. Therefore these "archives cannot be described in its totality, and in its presence it is unavoidable. It emerges in fragments"(130).

For this reason Foucault had wanted to "cut off" himself "from the history of ideas" and had shown archaeological analysis. He tries to define those discourses themselves; not the thought, representations, images, themes, etc., that are concealed or revealed in discourses. Archaeological study is always in the plural, not in

individual formations. Expanding its area of domain further and further Foucault states:

> The horizon of archaeology, therefore, is not a science, rationality, a mentality, a culture; it is a tangle of interpositivitien whose limits and points of intersection can not be fixed in a single operation. Archaeology is a cooperative analysis that is not intended to reduce the diversity of discourses, and to outline the unity that must totalize them, but is intended to divide up their diversity into different figures. Archaeological comparison does not have a unifying, but a diversifying effect. (159-160)

This horizon of archaeology is beyond the domain of science, rationality, culture, etc. because archaeology cannot be fixed within the single boundary. Archaeology tries to show the diversity effect of discourses, not to unify them or totalize them.

Therefore, to define the rules of formation of a group of statements, and to show how a succession of events may become an object of discourse, Foucault uses archaeological method. To constitute an archaeological history of discourse, Foucault puts forward two pre-requisites from which one must free oneself– "the linear model of speech," and "the model of stream of consciousness" (169). Archaeology speaks of discontinuities, raptures, gaps, entirely new forms of positivity, and of sudden redistributions, to untie all those knots that historians have patiently tied; and blurs the lines of communication by increasing differences. Thus, it breaks out sets to establish analogies, hierarchies, complementarities, coincidences; and shifts "to describe the dispersion of the discontinuities themselves" (175).

In conclusion, by applying the archaeological method to re-constitute the history, Foucault wants himself and even to them who have read this method– "to

dissociate from ‘structuralism’” (199). Showing the differences that lied within the discursive practice he wanted not to exclude the problem of the subject, but to define the positions and functions that the subject could occupy in the diversity of discourse. Therefore he states that his "aim was to cleanse all transcendental narcissism–the circle of the lost origin" (203). So, archaeology in analyzing different discursive practices, will find, what he called, its *‘enveloping theory’* (207).

Genealogy: A Critical Method

Genealogy, which Foucault adopts from Nietzsche, is the effort to develop a critical method that undermines all absolute grounds, that demonstrates the origin of things only in relation with other things. Genealogical method Foucault recognized because “the archaeology provided no account of transition from one method to another” (Audi 321).

Hazard Adams states that the reasons behind Foucault’s departure from archaeological investigations were that they were “descriptive” and had suggested certain fixity and even, perhaps, a temporality. On the other hand genealogy implies development or change and this investigation were “explanatory” (1134).

In the same way Pandey describes archaeology as “quasi-structural’ focus on discourse which does not treat discourse a signs referring to a real content like madness. Showing its betrayal Pandey further analyzes:

> What this task of archaeology betrays is that it is inadequate to the task of explaining the practical conditions that govern the formation of a particular type of discursivity. To prevent this inadequacy, Foucault replaces archaeology with genealogy, where greater emphasis is placed on the unconscious operations of power dispersed throughout the social body, especially in factories, schools, hospitals and prisons.

> Genealogy, which makes Foucault analyze literary, biological, religious and ethical bodies of knowledge, and how such knowledge might, for example, relate to the discourse on heredity or sexuality, allows for historical change: it does not seek to find a truth to history or to describe neutral, archaeological structures interested in history as *will to power*. (9)

For Foucault in his archeological work, analysis is condemned to operate at two interconnected and incompatible levels in the modern epoch: that of the empirical and of the transcendental, of texts and of the interpretations which claim to represent those texts objectively. The problem of archaeology split is between organizing its analysis in terms of discourse's rules of formation and providing a neutral and true description of statements. Therefore, as Simon During puts, Foucault wants to move beyond this aporia of modern knowledge So, Foucault moved,

> First, by avoiding the archaeological assumption that knowledge-as-discourse has internal conditions of possibility, and second, by attempting to avoid theory that is to say, by not producing universal axioms, by not offering statements that claim to account for their own articulation. In this spirit, Foucault finds, two new names for his work: it is a "genealogy" (or "a history of the present"), and it is a "history of problematizations." (During 123)

Therefore, Foucault's early archaeological studies explored the successive "historical episteme that governed theory, practice, and institutions, in things such as psychology, health and the human science" (Bevir 347). This episteme is a set of structural relations between concepts. Since Foucault's concept of an episteme reflects his quasi-structuralist hostility to objectivism and the subject his later histories

focused on discourses composed of endless by proliferating meanings and none of which are stable. Mark Bevir focuses that Foucault's "turn from archaeology to a genealogy designed to follow fluid meanings along chains of interpretations without postulating an essence or origin behind those meanings" (348).

From above comments on Foucault, one finds, his introduction of 'genealogical' approach, which does not replace archaeology but goes beyond it "to explain changes in systems of discourse by connecting them to changes in the non-discursive practices of social power structures" (Audi 321).

As Foucault wanted to see how "the problems of constitution could be resolved within a historical framework rather than referring them back to a constituent object (madness, criminality or whatever)" (Adam 1138). But this historical contextualization needed to be something more than the simple relativization of the phenomenological subject. However, to solve the problem posited by the phenomenologist, Foucault wanted to situate the genealogical approach. In an interview with Alessandro Fontana and Pasquale Pasquino, originally appeared as "Intervista a Michel Foucault", Foucault clearly states:

> I would call genealogy, that is, a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledge, discourses, domains of objects etc. without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history. (Foucault 1138)

Since, genealogy is a form of history which mainly focuses on the constitution of knowledge, or discourses, excluding subjective role, its emphasis rely on the essential connection of knowledge and power. Because "the body of knowledge are not autonomous intellectual structures that happen to be employed as Baconian

instrument of power" (Audi 321). Rather, precisely as bodies of knowledge, they are tied (but not reducible) to systems of social control.

As a critical method, and its focus on history, genealogy mainly critiques the concept of origins; it maps history on the ground of dispersion; as an alternative to the study of history it is an effective history; it shows history merely as a repeated play of domination; it knowledge as perspective, as an interpretation; and at last it shows the knowledge itself as a product of the historical play of domination.

In an essay "Nietzsche la gēnēalogie, l'histoire" (English translation as "Nietzsche Genealogy and History) originally written in 1971 in honor of Hyppolite, Foucault acknowledges his intellectual debt to Nietzsche, and also focus or on the above mentioned points. At the beginning of the essay Foucault defines "genealogy as gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary. It operates on a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times" (Foucault 81).

Focusing on the field of genealogy, let me concern over the critique of origins. That genealogy "requires patience and a knowledge of details," which "depends on a vast accumulation of source material," and "demands relentless erudition" (81). These descriptions tell us that genealogy opposes not itself to the historical research, but to the conceptions of history, that reflected in Marx and Hegel, which dominated in the nineteenth century. This essay also focuses on why the search for origins must be avoided: "because it is an attempt to capture the exact essence of things [. . .] that precede the external world of accident and succession" (83). As Foucault clearly states that genealogy "rejects the meta-historical deployment of ideal significations and indefinite teleologies. It opposes itself to the search for origins" (81-82).

Therefore, what genealogist must replace the search for origins is its emphasis on disparity or dispersion.

For Foucault accidents determine our knowledge and our condition. Therefore he distinguishes the conception of descent from that which would predict the destiny of a people based on their common descent, for that is a form of essentialist thinking. Foucault understands evolution any history not as a ladder of development, but as a bush with twigs. It "follows the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations– or conversely, the complete reversals" (87).

Foucault presents genealogy as an alternative to the study of history in its usual sense, because he argues that it is an effective history which is closer to a practice than a concept. Genealogy finds its place even in the concept like "sentiments, love, conscience, instincts", which were thought to be a historical (81). This as an effective history rejects ideas of system, origin continuity and telos. It even constructs a history of a concept such as love, showing that the concept has no founding origin, no determined telos, and no cultural or metaphysical continuity. Though, in a word, love has no essence genealogy shows love is a heterogeneous assemblage of relationships to external forces (sexual practices and institutions, moral codes). Foucault says "genealogy as an analysis of descent is thus situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history's destruction of the body" (88).

Foucault's new emphasis on genealogy is the conception of history as a single drama [. . .] the endlessly repeated play of dominations" (90). This shows how the concept like 'good' is etymologically identified with the noble, the aristocratic, the dominant, and 'bad' with the low the poor, the unhappy. So, genealogy also traces the

history of his concepts which are culturally formulated and practiced, and shows how they are originated by continuous power domination.

Since the history as a succession of systems is governed by rules or regimes. But these rules are "empty in themselves, violent and unfinalized; they are impersonal and can be bent to any purpose. The successes of history belong to those who are capable of seizing these rules" (91). Therefore interpretation or perspective gives new meaning to this view of history. It no longer attempts to uncover the meaning in an origin, but tries to show the appropriation of an arbitrary and meaningless system of rules. Thus "the development of humanity is a series of interpretations. The role of genealogy is to record its history" (91).

At last, genealogy also puts knowledge back into history and shows how knowledge itself is a product of the historical play of domination. Genealogy "finds that all these forms and transformation are aspects of the will to knowledge: instinct, passion, the inquisitor's devotion, cruel subtlety, and malice" (101). The will to knowledge, or will to truth, is a norm by which power seeks to protect itself by mystifying its control over knowledge. So, knowledge itself is based upon injustices.

Summing up, Foucauldian genealogy finds, its place in discrepancy, it shows that identify of something should contingently constituted. Undermining the absolute grounds, the articulation of genealogy dramatizes the nexus between power and knowledge.

Power, Sexuality, and Formation of the Subject or the Self

As we know that the genealogical analysis also dramatizes the nexus between power and knowledge because knowledge itself as a product of the historical play of domination. But in his later works, Foucault's re-theorization of the concept of power shifts its focus of political analysis away from relation of production or signification

to a study of power relations. For Fouacult, the question of subjection and the political struggles associated with 'identities', "constitute the most important issues of our time. Political practice therefore can not be separated from the fundamental philosophical question of 'being or 'subjectivity' " (McHoul and Grace 57).

Foucault's connection of power and knowledge reflects his later view that "power is not merely repressive but creative, if always dangerous, sources of positive values" (Audi 321). This view of Foucault shows his departure also from Marxist theory of ideology on the one hand and repression on the other. In his interview with Alessandro Fontana and Pasquale Pasquino, Foucault clearly states:

If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold well, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weight on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (Foucault 1139).

For Foucault power produces truth. So, truth is not outside power, or lacking in power. Truth is a "thing of this world, it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constrains. And it induces regular effects of power" (1144). Therefore, each society has its regime of truth. It creates a type of discourse which is based on its culture, religion etc. which is its 'general politics' of truth. It uses different mechanism and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false. In Foucault's words 'truth' is to be understood" as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements" (1145). In this sense truth has a circular relation with system of power which produces

and sustains it, and to effects of power it induces and which extend it. Foucault links the regime of truth to the formation and development of capitalism under which forms of hegemony – social, economic and cultural operates.

Foucault states, under the hegemony of bourgeois society, the concept of ‘sexuality' is also repressed. Under this society, especially in eighteenth century, it even refused to speak of infantile sexuality or acknowledge its existence. But only after Freud's theory on child sexuality the discovery on sexuality had done. Because of this discovery, Foucault thinks, ‘sexuality’ is far more of a positive product of power. In this sense there exists’ a kind of meta-power’ which is structured essentially round a certain number of great prohibition functions” (1140).

In the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* Foucault sketched a project for seeing how, through modern biological and psychological sciences of sexuality, individuals are controlled by their own knowledge as self – scrutinizing and self forming subject. This volume clarifies his rejection of those conceptions of power which relate it to sexual practices only in the form of repression. He focused how “a dispersed system of morals, techniques of power, discourses designed to mould sexual practices towards certain strategic and political ends” (McHoul and Grace 77).

His second and third volumes are projected as a study of the origins of the modern notion of a subject in practices of Christian confession. He even traces the history of Greek and Roman conception of sexuality. These work mainly focus on ethnical project that concerns liberation of human beings from contingent conceptual constraints.

Therefore, in *The History of Sexuality* Foucault is interested in “techniques of the self, techniques by which individual forms themselves related to themselves as subjects of certain practices, discourses and rationalities” (Berard 203). First by

turning to ancient Greece and Rome, Foucault was able to explore a sexual ethics and subject. Secondly he was even able to explore a new topic about 'subjection'. This study on subjection also gives way to the study about male's domination or subjection over women in the formation of sexual self.

These works also manifest new concern over ethical self or subject. As Jeffrey Weeks puts in a journal, "In a world that is simultaneously globalize and challenged by emerging differences and new fundamentalisms, questions about values and ethics inevitably come to fore. Sexuality has always been an arena for moral and cultural conflict" (198).

But, Foucault works problematize our preoccupations with the truth of sexuality and desire by exploring how western man had become the subject of desire in the first place. So, he even problematizes the social, cultural, and even religious beliefs by showing the role of subject in formulating those norms and beliefs.

Concerning the relationship between sexuality and power, Foucault also provides another issue of the confessional self. As Foucault argues that the "confessional has played a role for many centuries of western civilization as the general standard governing the production of the true discourse on sex" (qtd. in HcHoul and Grace 79). This confession is a form of truth telling that constitutes the self. This brings a question: at what price can subjects speak the truth about themselves? (Berard 206).

Following Foucault, A.C. (Tina) Besley argues that confession, as a technology of self, should be based on an ethnic of self – denial than one of self – mastery (365). Foucault's genealogy highlights the politics and ethics in questions of the self, of caring for the self and self – knowledge through counseling. We can even finds that the counseling is merely one set of cultural practice. As we know from

Foucault's stand that power is not simply negative, but also can be productive. This shows that the counselor not only asks how power in the counseling relationship constructs the knowledge of the self for both parties, but also how the relationship might be developed (Besley 367).

In confessing our selves, another person is required as an audience that will hear, understands, judges and punishes and may be accept and forgives us. In confession, we reveal part of our identity. As the audiences have power to judge, there seems a tension between the impulse to confess or reveal the self to others and the desire to keep something hidden.

But, let's come to the point of 'sexual confession.' Foucault's work on sexuality is concerned with problematising how pleasure, desire and sexuality have become discourses that shape the construction of ourselves–which reveal the truth about ourselves. From this assumption, if one tells the truth about one's sexuality, the deepest truth about the self, – though there is prohibition – have resulted in individuals understanding themselves in terms of what was forbidden. In this sense, "power-knowledge resides in confession, not in the person who speaks but in the one who questions and listens." (Besley 374)

Despite this fact, Besley favors self-mastery because it provides a secular model consonant with the demands of a post modern world. It also reconstitutes our self, through self-discipline or self-control. But, self-denial involves renouncing our interests in favor of the interest of others. So, self-denial means denying aspects of one's self.

Chapter Three

Textual Analysis

Reconstruction of History: Reading *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*

Gabriel Garcia Marquez's novels always offer multiple interpretations. Among them the major focus of his writings relies simply on the historical treatment, where he tries to reconstruct the Latin - American culture, society, and politics. In this sense, with its complex family relationships, gender stereotype, cultural phenomena, his novels depict Columbia's development in microcosm.

In the treatment with history, Marquez's journalistic technique influences his novels strongly By adopting this technique he minutely observes each and every events very closely and offers multiple perspectives. These perspectives help readers to analyze that event and also serve with deep awareness. In this respect, *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* adopts complex approach of history. This dissertation focuses on the way Marquez reconstructs the historical events in this fictional work. Marquez's adaptation of genealogical approach, which insurrects the subjugated knowledge and retrieve the buried texts, and presents the different perspectives to a single event. By doing so, he explores the way discourse formulates in a society and creates its own truth and self. The genealogical approach to history is the methodological analysis of Michel Foucault. This analysis is further continuation of archeological method. Archaeology, as Foucault used to method of historical investigation, doesn't adopt a straight forward approach to history. In *Chronicle of Death Foretold* Marquez's version of telling history begins from the "invocation of a violent death in the future and then retreating to consider earlier, extraordinary events"(Rushdie 302). In this sense, the text starts: "On the day they were going to kill him, Santiago Nasar got up at five-thirty in the morning to wait for the boat the bishop was coming on" (Marquez

1). This way of beginning is itself a new way of reconstruction. So Marquez ionizes the title of the novel itself. Because the word "Chronicle" in title means a historical record or register of facts or events arranged chronologically. But this chronology is mere deceptive in chronicle of a Death Foretold". It subverts its apparent intention. Not only does its chronology violate the norms of the genre; in addition, the account neglects to establish the facts that have led to Santiago Nasar's punishment for supposedly having deflowered Angela Vicario" (Olivares 485).

As Olivares states above, this irony in the title itself leads to uncertainty or indeterminacy of fact finding. This uncertainty results not from the lack of evidence but from, what Rosanna Cavallaro says," the transformation of Cultural attitudes about law and legal institutions" (2). This very transformation also caused novelistic genre to take departure from those of traditional one. In this sense, the question of reconstruction from the fictional writing is also new way of looking at history.

As the postmodern phenomena blur the distinction between history and a piece of fictional writing, Marquez waves the factual and fictional narratives in this novel. In this way, Marquez uses magic realism Magic realism, as practiced by Marquez is a development out of surrealism which juxtaposes realism with fantastic, mythic and magical elements. In this context Salman Rushdie writes:

> In the works of Marquez, as in the world he describes impossible things happen constantly, and quite plausibly, out in the open under the midday sun. It would be a mistake to think Marquez's literary universe as an invented, self-referential, closed system. He is not writing about Middle-earth, but about the one we all inhabit. Macondo exists. That is its magic. (302)

As Rushdie says, Marquez makes impossible things plausible. In doing so, Marquez brings different fantastic, mythic and magical elements and gives new twist to them. At the beginning of the novel the retrospective narrator even mentioned the dream that Santiago Nasar had dreamed the night before his death, "He'd dreamed he was going through a grove of timber trees where a gentle drizzle was falling and for an instant he was happy in his dream, but when he awoke he felt completely spattered with bird shit"(1).

This dream also tells about the fatal fortune the Santiago Nasar faced the following morning. The narrator also describes that Placida Linero, the mother of Santiago Nasar, an expert dream interpreter. But the irony is that the same interpret could not interpret her own son's dream fairly. This inclusion of fantastic element like dream also shows Marquez's new way of reconstructing factual event. In doing do he mythifies the historical fact. In this sense, Marquez writes about our own world where we all inhabit, and "tries to foster a myth of 'Gracialand' (Rushdia 302)" like William Faulkner who is mystifying Yoknpatawpha county.

As a method of historical investigation Marquez renounces all the truth claims. Though we find that Santiago Nasar is killed by Pablo Vicario and Padro Vicario, the twins, but the truth about Angela Vicario's lover, who seduced her is not known. Instead, Marquez presents different perspectives to a single event. In this novel we find there are many characters, which personally carry somehow different perspectives or information to that very single event. That is why, the narrator himself states: "I returned to this forgotten village, trying to put the broken mirror of memory back together from so many scattered shards" (Marquez 5). Though the narrator puts those mirrors of memory together but the mirror cannot be a new one.

In the matter of an event total fact can not achieved because "history and fiction entertain different prejudices" (Mano 699). As he further states:

> "Imagination has interfered to organize and point up consequence Chronicle is, at one level, a simile for the fiction-making process. Here we are given events that in some genuine sense, exists - lie formed by history- before they occur. (699)

So, we find that history also weaves so many lies along with truth. In this formation individual perspective plays great abundance, because inner psyche of each one can not be the same. In this sense, townful of people-through their action thought, custom, pride, willful negligence, through their unconscious art- create this plot which was real. But the irony is: having created it they cannot avert it. Here, Marquez renounces all those truth and presents a history of system of meaning.

In the very system of meaning Marquez even describe the system of rules that govern the production of knowledge, of social and institutional practices and his emphasis on the gender issues under that system.

Garcia Marquez reconstructs events associated with the murder 27 years earlier of Santiago Nasar. Thus, as a character in his novel, Marquez interviews people who remember the murder and studies documents by the court. But in his investigation we find that most of the towns people knew Santiago Nasar was to be killed, who would do it, where, when, and why. But the question arises: why do the most of townspeople did not want to stop that horrible murder. Instead, as Prudencia Cotes, Pablo Vicario's fiancée told "I never would have married him if he hadn't done what a man should do" (Marquez 63). In this sense, for most of them this killing was an 'honor killing', because that society already had formulated this kind of practices. For them, as Prudencia's mother say," honor doesn't wait" (ib.id). Though Vicario

brothers always want to escape from that happening by announcing their intentions openly to the villagers, but the silence of the townspeople motivate them to kill Santiago Nasar.

This is apparent insofar as the "Murder is associated with a wedding, an alleged seduction, a whore and a night of general debauch" (Michaels 1), Santiago Nasar is murdered because he was accused by Angela Vicario, of having deflowered her and whose husband had been confident that she was a virgin. The very question of virginity is itself paradoxical. Because some women lose their hymen not through the act of intercourse, but through some sort of mishap or even through the normal rough and even in the course of growing up. There are many women who have lost their hymens who are nonetheless virgins. So, in this matter also, Marquez presents uncertainty.

This issue of woman's virginity also paved the way to discursive formation of gender identification. The gendered identification is always debatable in patriarchal society, where the identification of men with activity and decision, one the one hand, and women with objectification and passivity. This issue of gender identification is also clearly presented in this novel, where Marquez wants to explore the gender issue under Latin- American culture.

The novel opens with Victoria Guzman, the cook, and Divina Flor, her daughter "who was just coming into bloom" (Marquez 7), awaiting, what Rosanna Cavallavo calls "Santiago Nasar's assertion of seigniorial rights" (31). Here, this seigniorial rights of Santiago Nasar means, his right to seduce Divina Flor, who was the daughter of a more recent mate, knew that she was destined for Santiago Nasar's furtive bed and that idea brought her premature anxiety in her" (Marquez-8). Despite this fact Garcia Marquez describes the scene as Nasar leaves his home early on the

morning, on the day of his murder, so that he can see the Bishop pass by the town's dock by boat:

> Divina Flor went ahead of him to open the door, trying not to have him get ahead of her among the cages of sleeping birds in the dining room, [...] but when she took the bar down, she couldn't avoid the butcher hawk hand again. "He grabbed my whole pussy," Divina Flor told me. "It was what he always did when he caught me alone in some corner of the house, but that day I did not feel the usual surprise but an awful urge to cry." (12)

Here, Marquez presents Santiago Nasar and even his father, Ibrahim Nasar as in subject positions, with their activeness, in seducing women. They instead of doing their acts in both parties consent use power or force, as if that was their rights. Women, on the other hand, are presented as servants, devoted mothers, and wives, or prostitutes.

Like Santiago and Ibrahim Nasar, who were operating women through their power, we find other male character who not only individually holding power, but also controlling institution, society, and family. Colonel Lazaro Aponte, mayor of that society is the one who was holding supreme political power and operating that society accordingly. The other symbol of institute power and moral authority in the community is father Amador. We even find Vicario brother, despite their unwillingness, have familial power who have threatened their sister Angela and killed that person who has deflowered their sister. These brothers were the one who could bring their familial lost honor, through they had imprisonment. Cristo Bedoya, and victim's friends, is the epitome of a strong youthful man. Even the wealthy and Foppish, Bayardo San Roman had power to return his married wife to her mother's

house only in the case that his wife has lost virginity. Though there are may male character who heave enjoyed sex to the women they desired, and even have their relations with prostitutes.

Showing this unconscious operations of power that dispersed throughout the social body, especially in institutions, society, family, and even in culture, Marquez also introduce genealogical approach to his novel. He shows systems of discourser connecting them to the practices of social power structures. In this sense Marquez also makes relation of discourses with power and knowledge.

Here Marquez mainly privileges new form of history that is genealogical one. By privileging this Foucauldian model of history, he weaves different discourses by focusing on the constitution of knowledge. Thought, in novel, we find inclusion of subjective role with operates institutions like church, and low court, but Marquez subverts these kinds of issues and shows their connection to the system of society. Marquez offers multiple perspectives to this novel and does not show the determining or the absolute fact. By doing this he even critiques the concept like origin and shows dispersive way.

Therefore, *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* is temporally dislocated text whose narrative fabric is woven of numerous repetitions, conjectures, and versions -generally contradictory" (Olivares 483). For example, did it really rain that fateful Monday is February when Santiago Nasar Was murdered? In the second paragraph of the novel Marquez writes:

> No one was certain if he was referring to the state of the weather. Many people coincided in recalling that it was a radiant morning with a sea breeze coming in through the banana groves as was to be expected in a fine February of that period. But most a greed that the weather was

> funereal, with a cloudy, low sky and the thick smell of still waters, and that at the moment of the misfortune a thin drizzle was falling like the one Santiago Nasar had seen in his dream grove (Marquez 2-3)

Marquez continues this motif of inconsistency about something so self evident, - as the weather writing that Victoria Guzman, the cook, was sure that it hadn't rained that day, or during the whole month of February"(7). Still Colonel Lazaro Aponte testifies later that "it was beginning to rain" at five o'clock on that morning (56). In this way, the writer raises doubt from the very outset about the possibility of knowing with certainty what happened on the day or any other.

Like this, in the case of the seduction of Angela Vicario, Santiago's guilt or innocence goes unresolved, which confirms to the reader that *Chronicle* is not a chronicle. Therefore, fact-finding in *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* "moves, then, from superficial clarity to deeper ambiguity" (Cavallero 28). She further asserts:

> The novel challenges the central question that lies at the heart of detective fiction in general and its own narrative in particular, *Whodunit?* Having revealed both the victim's and killers' identifies from the outset, the question that emerges from the narrator's reconstructions of memory, becomes not *who killed Santiago Nasar?* But, instead, *who was Angela's lover?* (28)

The central question is a question that is never adequately answered. If Angela's answer of Nasar was False, then her brothers' actions are transformed from justifiable (under the rules of the culture they inhabit) to grotesquely brutal.

In this sense, Garcia Marquez weaves the narrative with doubt about Angela's seduction. After Angela Vicario is returned to her parents' home by her husband, Bayordo San Roman, her mother beats her for two hours, and then calls her brothers

home from the marriage festivities. Pedro Vicario threatens Angela forcefully and picked her by the waist and sat her on the dining table and asks her

> "All right, girl", he said to her, trembling with rage, "tell us who it was."
>
> She only took the time necessary to say the name. She looked for it in the shadows, she found it at first sight among the many, many easily confused names from this world and the other, and she nailed it to the wall with her well-aimed dart, like a butterfly with no will whose sentence has always been written. "Santiago Nasar", she said.
>
> (Marquez 47)

This way of identification of Angela's lover itself expresses doubt and confusion about both Angela's virginity and Nasar as the seducer, despite he is being named by her. As we find that Angela was grown up among her sisters and very strict mother. The narrator even says about Angela that no one would have thought that she wasn't a virgin and she hadn't even known any previous lover. And about Santiago Nasar, the narrator says "the four of us (Santiago, Cristo Bedoya, the narrator, and his brother, Luis) had grown up together in school [...] and none of us could have a secret without being shared" (41).

When the narrator encounters Angela, twenty three years after the event, in his process to investigate that very drama, he finds her in her openness who never made mystery out of her misfortune, But he says" except for one item that would never be cleared up: who was the real cause of her damage, and how and why, because no one believed that it had really been Santiago Nasar" (90). In this way Marquez seeds uncertainty with so many certainties. The search for origin, total truth, is to lose oneself in the maze.

As the narrator couldn't find the satisfying detail about the mystery from Angela herself, he suggests that Angela Vicario was really protecting someone who really loved her and she had chosen Santiago Nasar's name because she though that her brothers would never dare go up against him. He also writes:

> Nevertheless, what had alarmed (the magistrate) most at the conclusion of his excessive diligence was not having found a single clue, not even the most improbable, that Santiago Nasar had been the cause of the wrong [. . .] Angela Vicario, for her part, wouldn't budge. When the investigating magistrate asked her with his oblique style if she knew who the decadent Santiago Nasar was, she answered him impassively: "He was my perpetrator." (101)

In this way, Garcia Marquez, what Cavallaro says, "subjects every aspect of the detective novel to doubt and ambiguity, from its narrative structure and trajectory, to its moral and legal significance" (30). Marquez, in his genealogical investigation, places this novel in total discrepancy and he even shows that the matter of truth is something contingently constituted. So, he undermines absolute grounds. As genealogical analysis shows the history as the continuous play of domination, where power has its close link to create a kind of knowledge which itself becomes truth for all. Since this analysis undermines all absolute ground and resists a kind of continuous history, Marquez" kind of history also shows power relations among people and creates a kind of discrepancy among events reconstituted and moves towards indeterminacy.

As we know that the genealogical analysis also dramatizes the nexus between power and knowledge, because knowledge itself is a product of the historical play of domination. But Foucault's concept of power shifts its focus of political analysis to the

study of power relations. This study of power relations reflects his later view that power is not merely repressive but a creative. And it has also had some sources of positive values.

If we consider this concept of power is also inside the genealogical analysis, then Marquez also weaves this shifting balance of power and shows how power also reassigns in gender. As we already mention that the gendered identification of men with decision and activity, on the one hand, and women with objectification and passivity. But this novel interpolates the above concept of identification by the narrative's end. Though we find at the beginning of the novel that the women are presented as servants, devoted mothers and wives or prostitute; it is only later in the narrative that "Garcia Marquez turns the tables and places women at the fulcrum of the plot's event. It is their words and conduct, not those of men, which seal Santiago Nasar's fate" (Cavallaro 31).

Victoria Guzman, we learn, told the investigator at the time of the killing that:

> Neither she nor her daughter knew that the men were waiting for Santiago Nasar to kill him. But in the course of her years she admitted that both knew he came into the kitchen to have his coffee [. . .] Divina Flor confessed to me on a later visit, after her mother had died, that the latter hadn't said anything to Santiago Nasar because in the depths of her heart she wanted them to kill him. (Marquez 11)

In this sense, though Victoria Guzman and Divina Flor Serve at Santiago's house, they would be also accused morally in Santiago's death. As Placida Linero explains why she had locked the door of her son's house against him in the moment before he was chopped in bits: "I locked it because Divina Flor had sworn to me that she had seen

my son com in,' she told me, 'and it was true'" (99). Even at the eyes of Placida Linero Divina Flor is also implicated in Santiago Nasar's murder.

There is even a suggestion that Santiago was chosen by Angela Vicario not because he had seduced her but because "he went about alone, just like his father, nipping the bud of any wayward virgin who began showing up in those woods---" (90-91). The women, then, are the locus of power and control of the events, not the men that they appear, superficially, to serve.

At the same time, though Santiato Nasar appears to be plot's agents, later appear as "passive victims of a set of events over which he have no control" (Cavallaro 32). Likewise, the twin, who quiz their sister about her lover so that they can mete out their punishment. Though they had set out for their sister's lost honor, but, as Pedro Vicario explains, '"There's no way out of this, 'he told him.'It's as if it had already happened"' (Marquez 62). The narrator even observes that:

> ... in reality it seemed that the Vicario brothers had done nothing right in line with killing Santiago Nasar right off and without any public spectacle, but had done much more than could be imagined for someone to stop then from killing him, and they failed. (49)

In this sense the act of Vicario brothers is not a work of bravery but they killed Santiago Nasar because no one has come to stop them from doing that act. By announcing their intension the Vicario brothers really want was to avoid their action in which they had really failed. In reality, instead of showing their superiority, they really felt inferiority with themselves.

The other symbol of institutional power and moral authority in that community, Father Amador, relies upon equally skewed priorities and does nothing to proven the crime, and sin, of murder. The narrator writes that:

> Father Amador confessed to me many years later, [...] that he had in fact received Clotilda Armenta's message and others more peremptory (warning about the murder) while he was getting ready to go to the docks. "The truth is I didn't know what to do," he told me. [...] At the moment of the crime he felt such despair and was so disgusted with himself that the only thing he could think of was to ring the fire alarm. (70-71)

The confession clarifies that, as a guidance of moral authority, Father Amador did nothing, despite the fact that he had got the message. Here, his morality did nothing to save physical body and Santiago Nasar except save his soul. His despair and digestion about the crime shows his self humiliation that was resulted out of his in action.

Even, Cristo Bedoya is ineffectual in his earnest effort to save Santiago Nasar. He searches ion vain in and around the house and the small square, continually making wrong choices and missing his object. Finally, the victim himself, despite his assertions of male power at the novel's opening, is unable to avoid his fate. He becomes literally invisible in the moment before his fate. In this way, as Rosanna Cavallaro analyses:

> Each of the Characters acts against the expectations of gender that the plot has presupposed. This thwarting of stereotype accords with the late twentieth century cultural transformation of gender and power in which the novella is situated; and is all the more resonant for its dissonance with the nineteenth century images of gender that frame the narrative. (34)

This novel also challenges the gender expectations, that we usually presupposed, and presents the late twentieth century cultural transformation of gender and power, that is

outcome of the revolution of different marginal groups - such as Women, blacks, homo-sexual, etc. therefore this centralization of Women's role also tries to creates its own truth, and produces discourse. This kind of power tries to hold its own position, replacing the old one, and creates a type of discourse which is based on its culture, religion, etc. In this sense truth has a circular relation with system of power which produces and sustains it.

Foucault is genealogy link this system of truth which produces a kind of discourse that formats individual self or subject. This formation of individual self is revolving around the concern for truth, which is expressed through confession. Putting the question of confession of truth, genealogical analysis explores the techniques of the self, techniques by which individual forms themselves, relating certain practices, discourse or rationalities. By confessing ourselves, let we explore the sexual ethics and subject in Marquez's reconstruction.

Marquez's novel *Chronicle of a Death Foretold* also concerns this issue of formatting of sexual self where men dominate over women's self. The practice of confession on this novel results when Angela's husband returned Angela to her parent's house. After her return, her brothers asked her who it was that deflowered her. After that Angela Vicario's confessed "Santiago Nasar" (Marquez 47).

Like Angela's brothers, the investigating magistrate, as male counselor, with his oblique style, asks Angela if she knew Santiago Nasar, she answered with a metaphor "he was my perpetrator" (101).

From the above two examples we know that, by confessing Angela about her lover, both parties - Angela's brothers and investigating magistrate- are tying to create a kind of truth and by which they are making a kind of discourse. As A.C. (Tina) Besley says:

> Confession is a deep-seated cultural practice [. . .] that involves a declaration and disclosure, acknowledgement or admission of a fault, weakness or crime and is expected to be the truth that discloses one's actions and private feelings or opinions. (369)

This cultural practice explores the person's identity. If we confess ourselves, other person is also required. In this act that person, as an audience, will hear, understand, judge, punish and may be accept and forgive as s/he reflect back to us who we are. In this sense, person, who hears has the power to control, or manipulated or controlled by the listeners. So, her identity or self is established by those male characters.

Though there is argument that confession is a form of truth telling that constitute (be a part of whole) the self. But, following Foucault's genealogical analysis, A.C. (Tina) Besley argues that "confession as a technology of self should be based less on an ethic of self-denial than one of self-mastery (376). Though Angela Vicario is confession about her sexual self explores her identity through male interpreters, but her self -mastery over herself provides a secular modal consonant with the demands of a postmodern world that recognizes the inescapability of desire and the necessity of pleasure in a new body politics. In this sense she is a postmodern character who has self-mastery over herself.

When Boyardo San Roman refused her, Angela left her village and shifted to Guajira, with her mother. She lived there weaving the thread over embroidery machine. After so many year Angela made her mind to reunite with Boyardo San Roman. "Toward the end of that week, unable to get a moments rest, she wrote him the first letter" (Marquez 93). As the narrator describes her, "She become lucid, over bearing, mistress of her own free will, and she became a virgin again just for him, and

she recognized no other authority than her own or any other service than that of her obsession" (94).

As a woman who has control over her 'self', Angela is governing not by other people but by herself. She, for her feeling of love, obsession toward san Roman, she even became a virgin. She expresses her feeling and emotions freely in those letters that she had written for him. Though, San Roman didn't reply to her, but Angela continued witting to him. As a "mistress of her fate for the first time, Angela Vicario then discover that hate and love are reciprocal passion" (94). As the narrator narrates,

> Early one windy morning in the tenth year, she was awakened by the certainty that he was naked in her bed. Then she wrote him a feverish letter, twenty pages long, in which without shame she let out the bitter truths that she had carried rotting in her heart ever since that ill-fated night.(95)

This confession of feverish desire, which she had been carrying since that night, developed a kind of self-mastery over herself. This mastery further lead to her success on, what Jorge's Olivares says "Seducing Bayordo by an irresistible mail" (492). In her case, like "a text results from an author's penetration, its textual actualization depends on the seductive power of the text to attract an equally penetrating reader" (492) in this way, having self mastery over herself, Angela. Creates her identity herself. She has power over her own self, through self-discipline or self-control.

Chapter Four

Exploring the Historical References in *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*

This thesis explores the new version of history in *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*. While presenting this sense, the novel reveals that Garcia Marquez has Weaved the fabric of the novel by applying Foucauldian model of history. Though in its usual sense Marquez has simply reconstructed the factual event that he himself and other town people had experienced, but the ingenuity of that reconstruction lies in Marquez's power to show that event from so many angles that the reader also may lost him/her self in that maze. Here, my thesis only examines the novel from genealogical analysis.

Chronicle of a Death Foretold presents the history of a community from Columbia - but the name of that community remains unknown. Here, we find, the retrospective narrator turns into an unreliable narrator and, in turn, chosen the gap between himself and the character narrator. This narrative stance corresponds more closely to the fiction writer in which the author has nothing to "know", but who invents everything. This way of presenting the real narrator as the fiction writer, shows, that Marques not only hiding the name of a community and the real narrator but also presents that the history making process is like process of writing a imaginary novel. So, he subverts the apparent in tension of history, which has its beginning or a type of chronology, and user chronological method.

As the narrator says "I had a very confused memory of the festival before decided to rescue piece by piece from the memory of others" (Marquez 45). Therefore the total fact or certainty can't be possible as the traditional history had supposed to present. The irony in the title itself leads to the uncertainty of the fact findings, because Marques presents a chronology in this reconstruction. As the genealogical

analysis the distinction between history and a piece of literature Marquez, instead, mingles both genre by applying magic - realism.

As a genealogical perspective, this thesis also shows how Marquez renounces all the truth claims. He brings different perspectives to fore and offers interpretations. About Angela's seduction and her lover, about the weather, etc. Marquez gives many information, but none of them are totally right. In this history of meanings or perspective, Marquez even explores the system of rules that governs or produces knowledge in this issue; he gives emphasis on gender stereotype. Here, this novel mainly focuses on the Angela's virginity. This issue of sexuality also categorizes the male characters with activeness, action. Vigor, etc., but the female with passivity inaction, etc.

The genealogical analysis also reflects that power is not merely repressive but a creative. In this instances the female characters like Angela Vicario, Victoria Guzman, Divina Flor, who were passive at the beginning, controlled the male characters at the end. Therefore, Marquez explores different dissuasive practices in *Chronicle of Death Foretold*, and shows how individual creates despite this exploration, chronicle of Death foretold presents the narrator who tries to establish what happen and why, but he achieves only provisional answers. As, Rushdie comments "with its uncertainties, with this case history format, *Chronicl*e presents as hunting and as true as anything Marquez has even written" (304).

Works Cited

Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory since 1965*. New York, Rutledge, 1992.

Berard, Michael. "Foucault's Primer." *Contemporary Literature*. 12.2 (Autumn, 2006): 198-240.

Besley, A. C. "Speaking the Unspoken." *Contextual History*. 6.4 (Spring, 2000): 250-281.

Bevir, Mark. "Foucauldian Historicism." *PMLA.* 11.3 (2005): 320- 48.

Cavallaro, Rosanna. "Solution to Dissolution: Detective Fiction from Wilkie Collinsto Gabriel Garcia Marquez." *Texas Journal of Women and Law*. 15.6 (2005):1-41.

Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism. Eds. Joseph Childers and Gary Hentzi. Columbia, Columbia University Press, 1995.

During, Simon. *Histiricism*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1994.

Feo, Ronald De. "Murder into Myth." *The Nation*. May 14, 1983: 609- 610.

Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History*." Intellectual History Reader*. Ed. Beerendra Pandey. Kathmandu: M.K. Publishers, 2005.

Flynn, R. Thomas. *Defining Historicism.* New York: MLA, 1990.

McHoul and Grace. "New Historicism and Marxism" *Contemporary Literature*. 4.2 (Summer, 2004): 28-57.

Marquez, Gabriel Garcia. *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1996.

Miller, Thomas. *Writing History*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1998.

Michaels, Leonardo. "Murder most Foul and Comic." Rev. *The New York Times*. March 27, 1983.

Minta, S. “Marquez and Magic Realism.” *Contemporary Literature*. 4.2 (Summer, 2004): 1-27.

Olivares, Jorge. “Analyzing Marquez.” *Contemporary Literature*. 6.2 (2004): 350-390.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books, 1992.

Sims, Robert L. “From Fictional to Factual Narrative: Contemporary Critical Heteroglossia, Gabriel Garcia Marquez’s Journalism and Bigeneric Writing.” *Critique.* 21- 60. <http://web.ebcohost.com/ehost/detail.