

Chapter I

Inauthenticity of Existence: A Case of *Ironweed*

Ironweed, a novel written by American writer William Kennedy has Francis Phelan as its central figure, and the whole novel moves around him presenting his existential reality, sketching all his activities, his fractured life, thought process, ramblings and different stories of ups and downs that he underwent in course of his living with a quest for "a pure flight as a fulfilling mannerism of the spirit" (75). But this costs dearly him in the capacity of realizing his possibilities of attaining authenticity. As a result he falls into the tight clutch of inauthenticity.

This research work, here, endeavors to analyze how the protagonist Francis's manner, mode and way of living is not proper and how his thinking pattern, striving, behaving, doing and all other constituents constituting his being are continuously pushing him towards the realm of inauthenticity.

Francis Phelan by profession is a baseball player during the 1900's, a part time grave digger, murderer and a longtime vagrant as the story begins. He is fifty eight years old, almost toothless, and dressed in tatters when he returns to Albany in 1938 "only to leave it again" (166). Albany is his birthplace and he has been "on the bum" (168) for twenty two years, leaving his family in lurch and creating another family of bums in bumdom. He is still in run in quest of something- something unattainable i.e. ineffable element of his being, about which, he is unaware, is largely inauthentic.

Before going to elaborate how his being is inauthentic and those constraints barring his possibilities of leading an authentic life, it would be better to explain what, after all, inauthentic living is on the basis of definitions given by different philosophers.

From Plato to Sartre, various philosophers, defining inauthenticity, have presented their views regarding it. In the Platonic view, inauthenticity is often equated with control of "Lower" over the "Higher" parts of the self, appetites over the reason. "He even goes so far as to treat appetites and physical desires as a sort of 'enemy within' as an alien threat to the true, rational self" (Sayers 5).

Nietzsche opines that inauthenticity is caused because of the lack of "self-discipline and strength of will" (qtd. in Nehamas 227). Without having these two traits, affirmation of life as a whole is quite impossible. As a result, harmony of the self cannot be maintained; it breaks into different bits and pieces. Existence becomes inauthentic.

Martin Heidegger has presented his views regarding authenticity and inauthenticity in a full scale. According to him, Dasein which is a mode of existence, exists either in the mode of authenticity or, inauthenticity. Authenticity and inauthenticity are what gives Dasein definite character. It is either Authentic, which in "Its very being, 'choose' itself and win itself", or conversely "it can lose itself and never win itself" (68) which, then, becomes inauthentic. For him, irresoluteness is a cause of inauthenticity; it is not any distinct way of living rather is an activity of every man living in a community; it is a part of "everydayness and averageness" (43) where a person becomes just a member of the mob, community or 'they' and does what others expect him to do. Such a person absorbed in the daily projects invites forgetfulness neglecting the call of conscience and always fleeing away from anxiety and dread, but being victim of it in return.

According to Sartre, freedom if used without consciousness but just being under the influence of bad faith, "neglecting the responsibility and anxiety with it one is acting inauthentically" (Patrik 87). Taking freedom as a license to do anything what

he wants to do but not taking any responsibility of the action performed, he is the victim of bad faith and to be the victim of bad faith is to live life inauthentically as "Sartre's concept of bad faith is clearly based on Heidegger's notion of inauthenticity" (Mautner 29).

For Sartre, if a person thinks that s/he has certain fixed characters which can never be changed and feels as if s/he had no any control over himself/herself and everything happening on or around him predetermined, could not be averted, he is acting inauthentically.

Through all these definitions given by different philosophers what is crystal clear is that inauthenticity is an improper mode of living where a person forgetting his true sense of being remains submerged into the banal day to day affair fulfilling his/her instinctive desires but often being negligent about his own greater role in enhancing authentic existence.

If scrutinized properly the life and way of living of Francis, most of the characteristics of inauthenticity given by different philosophers are applicable to him too. Francis is immersed in the world of its everyday concerns and projects, self-betrayed, self-deceived, alienated with his self scattered in bits not rising above forfeiture and scurrying self-forgetfulness to the vision of wholeness, but constantly being the victim of bad faith.

In the novel, no doubt, to some extent, Francis seems to be keeping himself detached from community life and even seems to be jettisoning the averageness by excluding himself from his society but, he later, ironically has created another community in bumdom where he is always around many bums, drifting with them, the seductive "they"; one of them even being his own beloved Helen with her he has been in relation for the last 9 years. It clearly shows that his escaping from the society

is not the outcome of his independent decision solely taken to lead an authentic life being away from society, rather is an attempt to inauthentically liberate himself from the burden and charges of the bad activities that he had committed there.

After analyzing properly, a lot of contradictions, paradoxes and ironies unfold there, thereby providing myriad of evidences to show how he is leading an improper mode of existence. His fleeing away from home for 22 years and more (as still there is no sign of his returning) is not exercise of his free will nor is it an appropriate use of his freedom, nor is it an attempt to detach himself from "herd" in quest of an authentic existence rather we can interpret that action taken by him to be a compulsive one as an easy and craven escape from confrontation with the external ideologies i.e. circumstances; simply because of the fear of possible (and in his case horrible) consequences, that he had to bear had he remained there. So after dropping and killing his 11 days old son, Gerald at the moment of hallucination, he flees away from his home even not attaining the son's funeral and bearing the responsibility of the crime committed any more.

In other many cases too, he is simply escaping from responsibility. Truly, he has misused his freedom by doing whatever he wants to do but never being detained or punished for that because he is always running from this place to that place to evade the punishment. Every time performing one action that according to him, simply happens and does not seem to be ready to accept the consequences of that and tries to defend himself unsuccessfully blaming the circumstances/events themselves to be imperative behind that happening. With this excuse, he has murdered several persons mercilessly and has committed series of crimes and wrong deeds unabatedly. But, escapism has become only such a medium every time to evade the consequences. So he is always taking flight, not confronting the situation. Flight has, thus become

his neurotic compulsion. It is because of this he is always on the run. He even has no time to repent over the action done as he is always busy in running. This constant running, in fact, is an impulsive urge emerged due to his coward and irresolute nature that he has harbored in the core of his heart despite his claiming himself of not being so.

He is very inconsistent. He changes place, profession, and even relation constantly. This way, he adopts and keeps on distracting continuously seeking novelty but often being failure and discontent. It has led him towards restlessness and rootlessness both. To get sanity, only reliable means he finds at hand again is flight. That flight is purely the flight of unfulfillment directed towards alienation and voidness. He runs and runs but reaches nowhere. His inability to "situate himself in any specific time and place" (13) is seen here, there, and everywhere. Such a shifting of place, profession and even relation in a restless and relentless manner shows his irresoluteness and fickleness without having any decisiveness to create any distinct identity. Not tarrying observantly for long, always moving with the sense of defeat caused by circumstances and believing himself to be the passive creature of fate devoid of strength of will to change his essence and certain characters which could lead him towards proper living has, but, blocked his possibilities to be what he distinctly wants to be; simply because of his own ambiguous, amoebic nature, split personality and fickle identities.

Likewise, Francis's movement in asserting his self does not seem to be genuine one. His breaching of every norms and mores set by community is not necessarily an authentic. Not to be obeying any rules, regulations, pattern and system of society in a conscious way to the extent of furnishing the genuine self may be proper, but in Francis's case it is not proper as he does everything impulsively without using his rationality. He even is not conscious about what he is doing and to get what

he is doing that. He, sometimes, confesses that he himself has no control over his bodily organs. What his one hand does, it does independently without being guided by his mind. It is sheer eccentricity and nothing more. If such is the case then how one can say that he is performing activity with specific intention of enhancing his truer self ! Truly speaking, he has no control over himself simply because of his inability to know his truer self or being which is as elusive as ever.

Thus, misuse of freedom, irresponsibility, ambiguous nature, indecisiveness, eccentricity, violence, guilt, escapism, fatalism, determinism, his inability to know himself, and split personality have combinedly blocked his possibility to hear the voice of conscience and possible return from the realm of inauthenticity to that of authenticity. So he is leading an inauthentic existence. Here, in this research, it will be quite relevant to raise all these aspects and analyze them minutely, thereby proving how Francis Phelon's mode of existence is inauthentic one.

Chapter II

Concept of Inauthenticity in Existential Theory

Existentialism is a mode of philosophy that primarily deals with the interpretation of human existence in the universe. It lays stress on human existence, man's experience in relation with his body, the world and the society. The term existentialism comes from "existence" and has its Latin root *ex* "out" + *sistere* from *stare* "to stand"(Cuddon 251). Thus existence means to stand out in the universe which is hostile and indifferent to us and existentialism means "pertaining to existence". According to Cuddon, "The term now applies to describe a vision of the condition and existence of man, his place and function in the world, and his relationship or lack of it with God" (251).

After the great world wars, existentialism flourished making its base to the dread, holocaust, horror and chaos of the world, which brought a radical change in the concept to look at the human being as a manifestation of an absolute or of an infinite substance. Peoples' belief on rules, regulations, patterns and their leading men towards disciplined and coherent life with certain guideposts and destination to achieve got shattered in shreds and there in its place rather sprouted the concept where people have to create their own values and modes in the world. As a result, the previous traditional belief of an absolute being maintaining order and making the world systematic thereby securing human happiness ceased to work. Because of the devastating effects of the world wars, futility and worthlessness clouded human rationality. Anxiety, uncertainty, instability and chaos loomed large ruling the fragmented world. As a result, people underwent massive sufferings, pangs and trauma thrown into incoherent, disordered and chaotic universe. The belief in the concepts like unity, rationality, morality, value and Christianity no longer existed

there. It appeared that men had driven themselves into a terrestrial nightmare and spiritual wasteland. Now, human being became utterly isolated in the godless, absurd universe without anyone there to lend helping hand in such a situation. And the philosophy that tried to define and incorporate such a human condition was termed as existentialism. Accordingly M.H. Abrams writes:

There was a widespread tendency, especially prominent in the existential philosophy of men of letters such as Jean Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, to view a human being as an isolated existent who is cast into an alien universe; to conceive the human world as possessing no inherent truth, value or meaning and to represent human life in its fruitless search for purpose and significance, as it moves from the nothingness where it come toward the nothingness where it must end- as an existence which is both anguished and absurd. (1)

After the great world wars the term "existentialism" gained momentum particularly in Germany and France as a distinct philosophical and literary movement. It was during the second world war when Europe found itself in the vortex of crisis with death and destruction hanging everywhere, the existentialism movement got a fertile ground to grow. Existentialism as a contemporary philosophical trend reached its zenith in the aftermath of the war. Europe had undergone horrific and devastating effects of war and was clouded with utter despair; people were having pessimistic outlook without any silver lining in their thickly clouded present and uncertain future. Existentialism incorporated all these and other related aspects of viewing the world and man in it making its prominent subject of study. Existentialism, in this way, was the product of experience of living in a world shattered by two world wars,

totalitarianism, the holocaust, the atom bomb and the lost belief in a wise and omnipotent God ruling for the good of all.

Various writers and philosophers began to write about the very condition of the world and human beings carelessly thrown in the godless universe, emphasizing their existence to have been particular and primary. Their views were based on what a man felt experiencing that sort of wretched condition. According to existential philosophers, man is free of routine and conventions, he is laid bare and face to face with his own destiny. They found void of human reality, and human being existing in a world being dictated by pain, frustration, sickness, contempt, malaise and death.

At a time, they even found man, though, crippled by so many malign factors yet facing difficulty boldly, striving to emerge out of that and making his life at least livable. Sartre says "by existentialism we mean a doctrine which makes human life possible and in addition, declares that every truth and every action implies a human setting and human subjectivity" (10). Existentialists hold the view that man as an independent individual with his conscious effort makes decision to choose and prove something worthwhile to do by his own performing the action and later even solely bearing the responsibility of that and proving his essence of "being" with livable existence. Through existentialism, existential philosophers study, investigate and interpret this very existential reality of human being in all its layers.

Existentialism sketches a distinction between essence and existence. Existentialist philosophers believe human existence to be holding supreme importance and they don't think that essence, concepts, universe or thought to be prior to our existence. For them existence undoubtedly is prior to essence. They view that human experience as man lives here in the universe constitutes his existence. Existentialism tries to probe the internalities of such an existence and attempts to understand the

underlying meaning minutely. Idealization of man, conceptualization or dehumanization of him, they don't think, is necessary as what is enough is a thorough interpretation and evaluation of a man living in the world with his actual experience in it. Man's essence is what he performs with his free will and it can be changed. Any individual who thinks that he cannot change his essence and believes that he has certain fixed characteristics that can never be changed with his conscious efforts, then, he is acting inauthentically. To live a life meaningfully, one should be conscious about his existence and should not seek meaning rather he himself should create distinct meaning and value through work.

Existentialism stresses freedom of the individual. No doubt, an individual is determined by the body, the world, the society and past and the present history and culture he has freedom to choose his goal and realize it at least partially. Existence in real sense involves freedom of thought and action. In this context, Sartre says "Man is condemned to be free. Condemned because he did not create himself, yet in other respect, is free because once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything he does" (23). This freedom is related not only to our ability to launch ourselves into action but also to our ability to be self conscious. Man is free to think about his actions and his own being and free to act. But it doesn't mean that he is free to do whatever he feels like doing. Existentialist thinkers no longer recommend acting on personal whim. They don't forward eccentricity in the name of autonomy. Freedom if used recklessly with fickle whim then that leads towards inauthenticity. Conscience-laden freedom opens the door of authenticity. Heidegger, in *The Essence of Truth* says "becoming free means understanding being; becoming more beingful or less beingful is, therefore up to the freedom of man. Genuine freedom means to be a liberator from the dark" (44).

Freedom is not that much free because along with freedom there comes the difficult phase of choosing - choosing one out of multiple yet difficult options and with this comes responsibility. A person is wholly responsible for his decisions, actions and beliefs that he takes or holds. His striving, having and possessing something are the outcome of this very freedom and he has to bear the consequences of the actions done. In such a situation, he is certainly overcome by anxiety. He helplessly tries to escape from the anxiety ignoring or denying his freedom or responsibility. This state compels him to ignore and deny the actual situation but this is self-deception and nothing more. Many existentialists criticize this escapism from freedom and responsibility to self deception. They insist that an individual should shoulder full responsibility for their behaviour, action, no matter how much he has to suffer in the course of doing so. If he becomes unable to do so then he is unlikely to get the state of authenticity. If he is to live authentically he or she should become fully aware of the true character of the human condition and resolutely accept it without staggering and fleeing away from it.

Existentialism focuses on Individual. Individual is the starting point of philosophical speculation. For a man, this world, society, God (if there is any) are how he experiences them. These experiences that he acquires constitute his existence. "Existentialism emphasizes man's interpretation and evaluation of, and active response to the world and the human society" (Smullyan 385). Man is free to choose, decide and act. So existentialist philosophers emphasize this freedom of the individual. The individualism, to some extent, is determined by physical and social milieu but it is wrong to think him to be entirely determined by those factors. In fact

he is free in his choice and action. He can create and appreciate values. He is still the director of the actions rather than the puppet or passive creature who undergoes these actions but not performing any more. But if any individual harbours fatalistic and deterministic view and let things happen without any effort to create something from his own side then his being remains inauthentic.

Many existentialist philosophers opine that man does not have any fixed natures limiting or determining his choices but rather by the possibilities of his choices, a man can bring whatever nature he has into being. Human being must make their choices and decisions consciously without any help of any external standards. His decisions, and choices, his end or ideal give a meaning and value to his life. But, if a man's actions are guided by externalities then he remains just a passive creature surrendering his power to choose before deterministic and fatalistic attitude then he ceases to be authentic. Man leading an authentic life should feel himself to be free to choose and he is responsible for his choices. Mary Warnock, in the preface of *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*, a book written by Sartre, writes:

The central existentialist doctrine is that men are nothing except what they choose to become; their essence consists in what they choose to do. But, it also consists in what they choose to see the world. Emotion arises when they choose to see the world in a particular way. It is an essential part of human nature to be capable of this. (XV)

It is impossible for human being to remain without undertaking the process of choosing as it is believed that not to choose is also to choose the option not to choose. Macintyre says "even if I don't choose, I have chosen not to choose" (149).

Existentialism also gives emphasis on the lack of meaning and purpose in life. According to the existentialist philosophers, human life is devoid of meaning. There is

no newness but always repetition and sameness. The human being cannot find any purpose in life; his existence is only a contingent fact. The world which we are confronted with is utterly arbitrary and unintelligible. There are no basis of the principles, views that we are falsely relying on. Our existence is no more logical and rational. Life can neither be explained or justified. The reality is illusion which is quite mysterious and unknowable. Alienation, meaninglessness, uncertainty, absurdity, illogicality, irrationality are the features of our existence. "Neither god or Nature is at hand to render the universe rational or meaningful, and there is not background of socially established or recognized criteria in either knowledge or morals" (The encyclopedia of philosophy 153).

Existentialism is dominated by pessimism. As the focus of existentialism is always on concrete living experience in its depths, with its solitariness, subjective inwardness, dread, despair, anguish, existentialism is directed towards pessimism. Man, in this bleak universe, without anyone to help even at the time of utter difficulty, is wandering with the sense of alienation, frustration and hopelessness. He has nothing to attain. He has no one to accompany with. He has nowhere to go. He is always in the vortex of uncertainty. However man tries to face evil, makes active endeavours to come out and fight them trying to make his life livable.

Many of these propositions and theses that existentialists defend or illustrate in their analyses are drawn from the wider philosophical tradition. The problem of what man is in himself can be discerned in the Socratic imperative "know thyself" and "Unexamined life is not worth living". This matter, we can find, to have been mentioned in the work of Montague and Pascal too. Montague had said "If my mind could gain a foothold. I would not write essays, I would make decisions, but it is always in apprenticeship and an trial" (qtd. in Britannica 74). Similarly Pascal had

mentioned about the difficult situation of man positioned between being and nothingness "We burn with the desire to find solid ground and an ultimate sure foundation whereon to build a tower reaching to the infinite. But our whole groundwork cracks and the earth opens to abysses" (qtd. in Britannica 74). Pascal had viewed man as a frail creature to whom the universe remains incomprehensible and unintelligible that he cannot grasp its mystery despite his hard labour. Even the Hegelian concept of alienation and estrangement too illustrates his direct affiliation with existentialism.

The main thesis of existentialist theory was no longer unheard to religious thought when concept of existentialism was first introduced with the idea of man being responsible for his own actions. Existentialist roots have been traced back to St. Augustine too. Augustine's ideas regarding truth and its location not being outside but within man himself and his suggestion for man not to go outside in search of truth but recognize himself carries existential feature. "Augustine was concerned with the spiritual nature of the true self as opposed to the inauthentic demands of desire and the body"(Mautner 39). Likewise, the theme of the irreducibility of existence to reason, common to many existentialists was also defended by a leading German idealist Schelling.

Contemporary existentialism reproduces these concepts and cautiously mixes them with newly propounded ideas and presents them in more or less an orderly way. Existentialism as a distinct philosophy began with Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) in the first half of the 19th century. His mode of thought became the source of inspiration to many 20th century existentialist thinkers. So he is called the father of existentialism. Kierkegaard emphasized the concepts of the individual, of choice, of dread, and of paradox. Kierkegaard denied the ability of reasoned thought to arrive at

universal and objective truth on matters of value. For him "truth is subjectivity" (qtd. in Hannay and Marino 55) and it is created by human decisions rather than discovered or known.

He has talked about existence, inwardness, subjectivity, individuality and character. For him, existence denotes the concreteness and individuality of a life lived in time. And requirements on personality that are implied by these features of selfhood are contrasted with and contravened by the efforts of the persons to conduct their lives abstractly. They, neglecting the particular self to be firm in accordance with the old concepts, choose from among the genuine possibilities. "Individual", he defines in polemical contrast to a life oriented to and by "crowd". To be an "Individual" is to be able to act and feel with a high degree of social independency. That is, not to be a subject to the approval and disapproval of one's significant peers and not to be enslaved by them. "He says that genuine existence or subjectivity is proper pathos which is authentic. In Kierkegaardian sense, the authentic person is called the individual" (Coats 230).

Kierkegaard attempted in his literary works to reveal an image of human life as anguished and absurd, difficult and meaningless. "Life can never be meaningful. To be human is just to be caught in this trap and the meaningless of his own life is not something for which he is responsible but is a result of the tragic and unalterable conditions of human existence" (qtd. in Hannay and Marino 146). Life is inescapably meaningless, for Kierkegaard. He gives a strong hint of his own philosophical position. His aim is to deal with the predominant philosophy of his time, the Hegelian philosophy, which had swept Europe. Kierkegaard attacked Hegel's attempt to systematize the whole of existence, declaring that a system of existence cannot be constructed, since existence is incomplete and constantly developing.

Kierkegaard attempted to make us aware of our primal subjectivity, so that we may live authentically without falling under the influence of antecedent social and intellectual guides. "He conveyed the message that one can only live authentically, become a person by bearing the sole responsibility for his decisions rather than by appealing to the authority of custom or even of one's own patterns of thought" (Peterfreud and Denese 194).

During the later portion of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, a number of writers created a favorable cultural climate for the growth of existentialism. Dostoyevsky (1821-1881) examined deeply into human subjectivity and freedom in his works. Poets such as Holderlin and Rilke presented themselves showing the problem of man overcoming his alienation from God. But the prominent figure among the inspirers of existentialism was Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-190).

Nietzsche focused precisely on the non-existence of God as implying the non-existence of all value in one of the most famous sayings in the history of philosophy, 'God is dead' (qtd. in Holligdale 208). For him there is no authority or God to determine our existence. He, proclaiming the death of God, went on to reject the entire Judeo-Christian moral tradition in favour of a heroic pagan ideal. He dubbed Christianity "a slave morality" and even called it "the one immortal blemish of mankind" (James 42). He held the belief that religion no longer provides truth as God is dead and Christianity has become the shelter of those weak and disabled people having feeble minds, he writes:

The Christian conception of God-God as God of the sick, God as a spider, God as a spirit is one of the most corrupt conceptions of the divine ever attained on earth. It may even represent the low-water mark in the descending of divine types. God degenerated into the contradiction of life, instead of being its transfiguration and eternal yes/god as the

declaration of war against life, against nature and against the will of life ! (187)

Nietzsche's concept of superman is also important. He, in fact, replaced God with superman. Superman is free because he does everything according to his own conscious will. He takes what he wants and does what he likes rejecting the repressive factors of the society. He is authentic.

Nietzsche, like Kierkegaard gave emphasis on authenticity. He insisted that the individual must make his decisions entirely on his own, with his conscious effort, without regard for social and religious mores or for suffocating rational systems. That is to say, Nietzsche also emphasized that we can become ourselves only by eschewing all the externalities which try to strangle authentic possibilities. But if things go otherwise, and the person remains failure to do so then it pushes him/her in the abyss of Inauthenticity. Nietzschean man, unrestricted by any conventions and mores, does anything with his free will, and achieves immediate and joyous release of his creative energies while the Kierkegaardian man is left suffering the agony of intense inwardness. Furthermore, a free man, according to Kierkegaard rejects all reasons and institutionalized society, Nietzsche's free man at least accepts them insofar as he can manipulate them for his own purpose. In fact, Nietzsche is in favour of integrating the human self by bringing all the divergent factors constituting a "being" in such a joining point where they can be harmoniously amalgamated and a truer self can be attained thereafter.

Phenomenology and ontology contributed a lot in the flourishing of existentialism. Existentialist philosophers often make use of conceptual scheme derived from the phenomenologist Edmund Husserl. Phenomenological doctrine of intentionality adds a dimension to the existentialist concept of the individual.

Similarly the ontological distinction between beings that live for themselves and the beings that live in themselves is essential in forming the ideas of existentialism.

Beings existing for themselves surely have consciousness; as a result they utilize it in using freedom for the full existence. Contrary to this, beings that live in themselves don't have consciousness of their existence and do not undertake any freedom. As a result they become only objects or things. That is inauthentic. But, existentialists' main concern is directed towards consciousness about the man's absurd existence, awakening man to freedom, preventing man from being rendered into things or objects, and leading him towards the realm of authenticity.

Heidegger, being much influenced by the ideas, concepts and issues related with phenomenology, further shaped and elaborated the development of the 20th century philosophical school of existential phenomenology which studies the relationship between phenomena and individual consciousness. His inquiries regarding authentic or inauthentic existence immensely influenced many existential thinkers like Jean Paul Sartre and others. In his famous and controversial book *Being and Time* published in 1927, he has tried to disclose the ways of being and different modes of living. In that book, he explores what it means for a man to be or how it is to be. With his own speculation and interpretation, he has tried to reach the final truth of existence, the situation of being.

Heidegger was concerned with what he considered the essential philosophical question: what is it to be? This led to the question of what kind of "being" human beings have? Heidegger posited a fundamental relation between the mode of being of objects, of humanity and of the structure of time.

Despite his repudiation regarding his being called an existentialist, he is through and through an existentialist. It is so because of his original treatment of such

themes as human finitude, death, nothingness and authenticity, which are the basic features of existentialism.

Heidegger, more than any other existential philosophers, has talked about authenticity and inauthenticity. "Heidegger's word for 'authentic' is *eigentlich*, which in ordinary German means 'real' or 'proper'. From it, he forms the word *Eigentlichkeit*, authenticity - 'Inauthentic' is *Uneigentliche*-which usually means "not literal, figurative" and inauthenticity is *Uneigentlichkeit*" (Cavalier 4). Dasein is sometimes authentic and sometimes not. Heidegger does not mean that only authentic Dasein is Dasein, truly a human being. That inauthentic, he does not say, is not properly human. "He associates *eigentlich* with the adjective *eigen*, which means 'one's own' that is used in such contexts as 'having a house of one's own', 'having a mind of one's own', and 'being one's own master'" (Cavalier 4). In this way, to be authentic or inauthentic depends on one's own mode of living. If someone becomes true to his self then that leads to authenticity otherwise not. An individual residing in the society and doing everything guided and influenced by others is a part of 'they'-self. At that time, Dasein becomes miserably inauthentic. But it becomes authentic when a person, using his own rationality, does anything properly; the person is able to make himself true to his own self. By saying that one has to possess oneself and do what one feels, Heidegger does not forward eccentricity. Truly, Authenticity need not, of course imply eccentricity. Everything should be performed wisely to uplift the genuine self. But if things are done carelessly that becomes eccentricity. Eccentricity is inauthentic while conformity to standard practices can be authentically chosen.

Conscience and resoluteness are very important aspects that a man should have so as to lead a life in a good way. Conscience about his state of being and resoluteness about doing and facing something with strong decisiveness are what gives Dasein a proper mode. Without having these aspects a person cannot be what he distinctly wants to be and just keeps on trembling with fear which leads him towards

inauthenticity as "the mood of fear is inauthentic mode of anxiety " (smith 10). At that time person remains oblivious about his own role in possessing himself.

He views that an individual is prone to submerge in the world of concerns, everyday routine and conventional behaviour of the world. That individual inextricably attached with the mob gets false joy at being swayed away, thus remaining inauthentic. But only the feeling of 'Angst' gives power to confront with death and any other things boldly, that carries him to the realization of meaninglessness of the world. With this confrontation, but by no means from escapism comes the authentic sense of being.

Everyday Dasein as it remains in a group has no 'self' of its own. It is motivated by others and the person not using his own mind performs the activities coming under others' influence. His sense of self, of what he is to do and of how he is to live, this for the most part, is given from the outside. Heidegger characterizes this as the they world or simply as the they (Das man). "The 'who' of everyday Dasein is Das man" (164). The self of everyday Dasein is the 'they' self. The 'they' self is in contrast to the authentic self, the authentic self is the self that has taken itself up in its own way. In the "they" self, the dasein has been dispensed into the 'they' and must find itself before it can become authentic.

Men are poised between the possibility of an "authentic" human existence, in which the individual faces up to the limits of human existence and especially his own death and the possibility of inauthentic existence, in which the individual retreats from death and Angst and Sorge and so becomes their victim. Heidegger believes that there is no pre-given human essence. Instead, human, as self-interpreting beings, just are what they make of themselves in the course of their active lives. Taking a stand on our own being, we constitute our identity through what we do. And that identity too can be authentic or inauthentic based on its process of attainment. Identity formed

amidst petty concerns of everyday life not emerging from forfeiture is inauthentic. These are two possibilities that exist alongside. Authenticity or inauthenticity, they don't have any permanent state as anything can happen to a person. A person leading authentic life may go astray and may become inauthentic or he can change his course of living totally from inauthentic to authentic. But, what is true is that most part of our life we exist as the *Das man* participating in the historically constituted co-happening of the people. According to Heidegger, there are certain characteristics of both authenticity and inauthenticity.

Heidegger has talked about publicity which for him, is a characteristic of inauthenticity. Human being in its everyday mode is promiscuously public; it is life with others in alienation from the central task of becoming itself. "In publicity man can forget himself and his responsibility [. . .] by identifying himself with the indeterminate impersonal multitude" (Macquarrie 87). Man gets false sense of security by being in the mob, where he thinks, he can save himself from a painful ordeal of self security, but such a life becomes miserably artificial. Publicity is related with facticity which means that human being is always already in a world a world into which, beyond its willing it has been cast. "World" described by Heidegger is a common sphere of activity and interest. Man is surrounded by materials, tools, opportunities and is always within the inescapable limits of contingency.

Fallenness is another characteristic of inauthenticity. Man has fallen into this world. And fallenness or inauthenticity belongs to the inescapable way of human existence. "It is an existential, an essential, potentiality (*Möglichkeit*), but epochs and individuals may be coloured by it in different degrees" (Britannica 739). Here, in the earth, man is attracted towards distracting and disturbing cares of everyday and of the things and people that surround him everyday. "I" is sacrificed to the persistent and

pressing "they". In such a state man becomes what it may, not being what it must be anymore, curtailing the possibilities of leading an authentic life. The driving, integral, all essential "I" is concealed throughout the life by the daily round, the daily care and the daily moods.

There are other several characteristics of dasein in relationship to the others that should be taken into consideration. One such characteristic of dasein is distanciality. Distanciality is the distance of one dasein from other daseins. This distance is disturbing to the care of being -with- one. The next characteristic is subjection. Subjection is the fact that one's possibilities are to be disposed of as others' please. At this state a person has being with one another resulting in his "being" being dissolved into the "they", With this surely there comes the stage of averageness where the person forgets his "self" mixing himself into "they" which leads towards leveling down of dasein. Leveling down of dasein tries not to stand out, not to come up with its own distinct identity. These all characteristics of dasein are all part of the "they" and constitute the publicness of dasein rendering person's life inauthentic.

Heidegger, in his later works went on saying that authentic self cannot become separate from the "they", rather authentic self is a modification of the *existielle*, the category of the "they". And Inauthenticity too is just a different mode of being than authenticity. It is by no means an unqualified blemish. It is normal condition of most of us for most of the time. And it is possible to go from the area of authenticity to that of inauthenticity and vice versa.

Likewise, Heidegger has talked about authenticity and some steps to attain it. But, what is true is that authenticity as an exceptional case of living hardly few can lead such a life. To attain authenticity a man has to be able to face dread, this is a mood which is unique which does recall human being from self-betrayal to self

knowledge. It is a sense of the objects, of nothingness, which lays hold of one when he/she faces, not this or that thing or person but the whole structure of being-in-the-world itself. Dread lifts human being out of its scurrying self-forgetfulness to the vision of its whole-ness-the knowledge of itself as "being to death". If a human being wants to be way from forfeiture he can do so by being in isolation from the seductive "they", Heidegger says "Dread sets free from the illusions of the they, in passionate self-assured, anxious freedom to death" (266). It manifests the freedom of man to choose himself and take hold of himself. In this state, man faces the potentiality of authentic being in isolation but by no means in alienation which Heidegger expresses to be inauthentic way of being.

There is a phenomenon called conscience which is the voice by which human being, speaking in secrecy and silence being isolated from the seductive "they", calls itself out of the distraction of self-forgetfulness to the lonely avowal of its own responsibility for being itself. If a person becomes able to hear the call of conscience then it is sure that he no longer desires to be attached with the daily cares and concerns rather he raises himself up from forfeiture. He travels from inauthenticity to the terrain of authenticity. The person resolutely faces his own inner capability instead of forgetting himself in this and that. He thinks that he has to make his situation vitally his, rather than letting it inflict itself upon him. Call of conscience is thus not a voice from heavens or the "true self" but the existential structure of Dasein manifesting itself as one of the Dasein's. Dread plays a great role in awakening human being to conscience. Truly, conscience comes when a person faces dread; he, using his possibilities, in opposition to losing his resolve and letting himself fall into the banal stupor of merely living day to day existence, rises himself up to face nothingness, to be in nothing before nothing.

Another existential philosopher who contributed a lot in the development of existentialism is Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980). Sartre, as one of the leading exponents of existentialism, focuses on individual human being, freedom, existence and responsibility. Sartre says "existentialism's first move is to make every man aware of what he is and to make the full responsibility of his existence rest on him (16).

Sartre believes that we find ourselves in such a situation where we are limited by different factors and have to confront certain facts but it is always upon us what to make of these facts using our power to choice and of freedom. An individual's way of living amidst them and his response to them constitutes his being whether he is authentic or not. As an individual one can be professor but when he overtly thinks him to be professor and pretends to be identical to his role or the captive of his situation he is in bad faith. Sartre holds the view that an individual does not have any static or fixed traits that cannot be changed. What is essential to a human being is what he makes who he is but not being fixed by his type. He is free to do, to create his own identity. He should not exist shut up in being-in-itself which is self-identical and has no reference beyond itself as opposed to being for itself which is consciousness where man becomes the legislator of his actions and creators of values.

Freedom occupies the central place in Sartre's philosophy. Man is the creator of values. His responsibility is very great for he is legislating for a whole world. He is free to choose and can choose what he deems necessary for enhancing his genuine self and for the whole world indirectly. Sartre says "before you can come alive, life is nothing; it is up to you to give it a meaning and value is nothing else but the meaning that you choose. In that there is a possibility of creating human community" (58).

For Sartre, an individual, not restricted by any externalities in term of choice and freedom if goes ahead creating his own essence then his life becomes proper and

worth living. If not, his life becomes improper. Sartre has even presented certain characteristics of improper living under the title "bad faith". To live authentically, according to Sartre, one should be far away from the influence of bad faith.

Sartre's concept of bad faith is similar to the concept of inauthenticity propounded by Heidegger. Critics are of the opinion that Sartre got influence from Heidegger. According to Sartre, most of our lives are spent being under the shadow of bad faith. "Sartre usually uses the notion of bad faith to characterize individuals who are more self deceived than they should be even though none of us can escape self-deception entirely" (Patrik 87).

He is of the opinion that to be in bad faith means to be self deceived. similarly not acknowledging either one's own freedom or one's responsibility for the actions done in part, denying that they are free, thinking that they have certain fixed character that can never be changed, persons having such sorts of faiths can never lead their life authentically.

Similarly persons performing a certain activity but not owning the responsibility of that action performed, not bearing the consequences and confronting the situation rather feeling comfort in escaping from that are also under the influence of bad faith. According to Mautner, Sartre's bad faith, "consists in viewing oneself as determined by one's relatively fixed character and by external circumstances beyond one's control. This pretence of unfreedom allows a person to disclaim the responsibility in good conscience" (45).

The Sartrean philosophy attaches the self to the genuine choice and a person whether he is leading an authentic or inauthentic life is dependent on the fact, how he carries his daily affairs. When the person starts to be determined by his past, present situation and relationships that he maintains, naturally his ability of making authentic decisions and choices is impaired. Self which is to be attached with independent

choices and decisions as it remains constricted by various factors, fails to get nourishment for the upliftment of genuine and proper life. That self ceases to be itself and leads towards the arena of inauthenticity.

Sartre's opinion about our actions which should not be the products of outside force, his motivation to human being to make their own choices independent of any other externalities should not be taken as a license to do anything carelessly. In fact, our actions should not be guided by our worst instinct, drives and improper desire rather those actions should be based on purely individual and conscious choice. Guided by instinctive and impulsive urges, if a person performs anything just to get transitory satisfaction then that becomes inauthentic.

After analyzing the ideas of different existential philosophers, we can come to the conclusion that despite having few minor differences regarding authenticity or inauthenticity, in most of the standpoints, all of the philosophers agree. For them all, authentic existence is proper and decent way of living. On the contrary, inauthenticity is improper and indecent way of living. To be authentic or inauthentic, it all depends on the person. If the person is conscious about his being and performs his activity with the sense of freedom instilled in his heart in a conscious way and later even bearing the consequences, then, his way of living is in a right track. As opposed to this, if a person, being always immersed into the daily projects, not using his conscience independently but is swayed away by the mob that is inauthentic. Such a person remained forgetful cannot come up from the ground of forfeiture and facticity. He loses the power to hear the call of conscience as he remains the victim of bad faith.

To sum up, inauthenticity is just opposite of what authenticity is. Authenticity which is a matter of harmony, integrity and unity whereas inauthenticity is the condition that emerges when a person cannot hold all parts of the self accepting and acknowledging them all. As the person lacks the power of integrating and joining

them harmoniously due to his own flaws, he fails to realize his authentic possibilities. Then, he forgets himself in the seductive world never being able to know his own existence; his greater role in enhancing a proper mode of living by performing various authentic activities. He, instead, is inclined to fulfill his instinctive desires created by his own inauthentic decisions and choices. With such an utter negligence towards uplifting the stature of his existence as he remains unreformed, his self becomes shattered in various shards and his existence continues to be inauthentic one.

Chapter III

Francis's Life: A Mode of Inauthentic Existence

Francis Phelan's mode of existence presented in *Ironweed* is largely inauthentic despite his embodying the structure of both possibilities in his being: authentic as well as inauthentic. His existence, his relation to the others and the experiences that he is having in course of living in the world clearly expose the stark reality about his state of "being" as inauthentic. Francis Phelan's way of living, his response to the circumstances and happenstances, perceiving, thinking, striving, having and possessing combinedly forming his self, to a greater extent, are improper. As a result his existence based on these elements too is abnormally improper.

Francis Phelan, leaving his family in Albany, is running all the time for the last 22 years to and fro without any specific destination to attain. He is "lost and distorted" (216) as he is unable to understand his truer self and his situation in the world. He is running off incessantly to gain the artifact of his soul which he does not know, is "decayed" (99). It has become so because of his own eccentricity, violent nature, guilt, flight, self-ignorance, fatalism, ambiguity, and split personality which are the serious flaws that he has and they have become parts of his being which he cannot shun. His inability to mitigate those flaws is the main hindrance behind his not getting the life that he truly wants to live locating himself in a "specific place and time" (13). This present study endeavors to analyze topic-wise all those banal traits that Francis has become victim of and their effect in rendering his existence inauthentic one.

Eccentricity

The whole novel chronicles the history of Francis's eccentricity. His activities from murdering to running away are the naked expressions of eccentricity. These actions guided by "worst instincts" (207), needs, drives and desires, no longer, are the

product of his free and purely individual choice rather are the outburst of his blind, violent nature.

Whatever Francis does, does impulsively and frantically without thinking properly about its possible consequence beforehand. His aggressive nature has insinuated him to do whatever he likes. Blinded by eccentricity his way of using freedom wrongly, doing anything with no rhyme and reason and running cowardly not daring to take the aftermath situation under control is, by no means, a proper use of freedom. This is the misuse of freedom; negative freedom indeed. Every time, even in a minor discussion his nature is to resort to physical violence. His impulse is again to attack. At the time when he had gone with Roskam assisting him in collecting junks, he, going against the contract made earlier, asks money for what he did. As Roskam seems a bit reluctant to pay the amount that Francis asks for, he instantly "rubs his hands together" with anger.

"I got the idea that my hands do things on their own, you know what I mean?"

"Not yet" said Roskam

"They don't need me. They do what they goddanrn please"

"Ah ha", said Roskam. (143)

Francis has given self autonomy to his hands and they do what they want, not doing what he wants. Francis's hands, as "he looked at them now, seemed to be messengers from some outlaw corner of his psyche, artificers of some involuntary doom element in his life" (145). His hands as they are involuntary, not guided by his rational mind, perform things on their own, not even seeking and waiting for rational decision from the owner. They have attained "evil autonomy" (146).

For him, his own hands are enemies, traitor and betrayer bringing so many troubles in his life. With the impulsiveness that his hands possess, his attitude has always been belligerent; quarrelling, fighting and murdering and later, even escaping being irresistible. They, as a result of constant involvement in violence, have been left with "full of scars, callused, split fingernails, ill-healed bones broken" (143). His hands, thus, are the clear map to display his eccentricity and violent nature carrying the historicity of his violent past. He is miserably unable to rein and make them do what his conscious will wants. Such a man, having no control over his own bodily organs can never live a normal life. It is the reason why he often goes bananas and kills people mercilessly and runs randomly anywhere he likes. By doing so, he is proving that his bodily organs are just inclined to get instinctive satisfaction and nothing more. With such a banal trait, he is losing the prospect of better living.

Violence

Francis's inability to curb the impulsive nature has turned his life full of violence. It is because of his eccentricity he has not become able to lead his life in the way he likes- "a peaceful, non-violent, non fugitive life" (215). He thinks he is leading a life which he "had never sought" (145). Despite such a realization he continues living a violent life without change just satisfying his illicit and "entropic passion" (142), for that, committing many crimes and murders unabatedly.

In 1901 during a transit strike, Francis's baseball skill of throwing ball betrayed him in his throwing of the "smooth round stone the weight of a baseball" (25) that killed Harold Allen. Before that his own son Gerald became the victim of his hand though accidentally. Fully inebriated as he was after having four bottles of beer, he tried to diaper him carelessly as a result, Gerald fell from his uncontrolled, "traitorous hands" (142) and died. Similarly, Rowdy Dick Dolan is another ill-fated

man killed by him, in what he tried to defend himself calling it to have happened in self defense. Not only this, he even killed a man in the hobo jungle and "watched with all but orgasmic pleasure as the breathless man twisted grotesquely and fell without a sound" (218).

All those whom he killed don't let him live a peaceful life rather make him restless visiting though in memory, frequently. They come time and again seeking justification behind their being killed from him and every time, he presents his own defense unreasonably saying "I had my reasons" (76).

"Why did you kill me?" was the question Harold Allen's eyes put to Francis, "Why you throw that stone the size of a potato and broke open my skull? My brains flowed out and I died?"

"You deserved what you got. Scabs get what they ask for. I was right in what I did". (26)

Fault is his; guilt is his; but even after that Francis does not feel any remorse for what he did, even if that is wrong. In a query of Harold Allen whether he felt any "remorse at all?" he rather goes on chiding him, "you bastards takin' our jobs, what kind of man is that, keeps a man feedin' his family?" (26). There lurks a great irony as a person like Francis who has left his family for so many years without care, but, again saying that he committed that nefarious activity just to feed his family! It is really a bad argument mixed with odd logic which contains no truth at all.

With this condition of his not feeling any repentance over the bad activities performed, he goes on committing murders and other felonies repeatedly. Instead of being remorseful he boastfully says "If it draws bleed or breaks heads, I know how it tastes (28). It clearly shows his lack of restraint in the gratification of his various lusts. To fulfill instinctive desires, his way of employing physicality violently and misusing

freedom, through no angle, can be taken as proper. Its effect is damaging. By doing so, he not only has done enough damage to others but also to himself. As a result, he has missed "in the process two thirds of a right index finger and an estimated one eighth of an inch of flesh from the approximate center of his nose" (74).

He cannot jettison such a violent nature because of his manner of remaining unrepentant over the bad deeds done. Rather, he often runs away trying to be far from the effect of those activities and to forget that. He, no longer, sits, faces, thinks and learns lesson from the past mistakes but often takes flight, "surviving hostility in his flight through strange cities, just as he had always had to survive his own worst instincts" (207).

Guilt and Fickle Confessions

Francis is a man with several guilts attached to his being – guilts of murdering several persons ruthlessly, of leaving family and escaping from familial responsibility, of "hastening the death of Helen" (90) and of being indirect hand behind his brother's death. He has guilt of transgressing moral, societal and natural laws not for the enhancement of genuine self with conscious will but to fulfill his inauthentic desire and get false satisfaction.

He has "lived all his life with guilt over the deaths of the three men, unable to see any other face at work that day beyond his own right hand" (206). He, killing them, escaped every time and is still escaping with a "prolonged humiliation" (19).

No doubt, he is fleeing normal human community just to save himself from the clutch of laws; from possible imprisonment, but by no means being able to save himself from the sense of guilt which tortures him internally. Obsessed with the thought of wrong activities that he did, time and again, he expresses that he is doing

so not because of his intention of doing the things that way but that simply happen in his life where "he has nothing to do with intent" (215).

Sense of guilt festers him. So intending to lessen the burden of it, he even feels "a compulsion to confess his every transgression of natural, moral, or civil law, to relentlessly examine and expose every flaw of his own character however minor" (50). But he does not become able to change the mode of living even after that confession. He cannot bring that confession into practice therein eschewing every flaw that he has in his character. So his every confession "goes wasted" (215) as that lacks sincerity and gravity.

His confessions are not reformatory, just "perception without action" (166). Mere confession but without materialization does not change the course of living. He remains what "he was" (216) without any change in his being and essence as he never tries to wash away the guilt and to live a new reformed, non-fugitive life not repeating the crimes, any more. He, rather, goes berserk performing many more mistakes one after another, and, takes self-protecting flight, running from the scene of incident and community to get false solace and false security from the torture of guilt but ironically being attacked by it time and again.

Flight

Francis is running all the time not being able to confront the situation. He does not have courage to do so, no matter how much he harps on his being courageous. What to talk of other incidents, even after the death of his son Gerald caused by him, he did not attend his funeral, instead fled home. Fleeing was easier for him than facing it. "He had not confronted Gerald directly since the day he let the child slip out of its diaper. He would not confront him now" (2). He is always taking "craven flight" (17) instead.

When he was urgently needed with "steadfast virtues" (17) in the family as there was nobody to look after the family members facing "bad times" (183), he simply escapes without being worried even slightly about the security of them. For him, only his own safety and security is important but not of his family members. He does not have time to think over how his family members will sustain their livelihood and feel secured sans him. Only thing that he does is to flee.

Departure

Flight of a kind, the first.

Flight again, when he killed the scab.

Flight again every summer until it was no long possible

He flees and he longs to flee again and flees. (147)

Fleeing is an inauthentic compulsive urge emerged in his heart because of his coward nature. As Jim, his friend rightly defines- "a coward. He'll cower up. You know what a coward is? He'll run" (10). Indirectly the definition of coward by Jim is directed towards Francis as he, too, is running and cowering himself up. Later in its reaction, Francis tries to prove himself brave by just saying "no Francis is no coward. He will fight anybody" (10).

No doubt he, having immense power, can fight and even take anyone's life easily but cannot bear the consequences of that fight and of any other heinous activities performed anytime. He simply avoids that as it is easier for him to do so. That is not bravery of any sort but brutality and incivility on his part. If he were really brave then he would shoulder the responsibility of his deeds, too, facing the situation boldly, no matter how much he had to suffer for that. But not doing so, why is he running? Answer is simple as he himself utters "I could not handle it that's why I run off" (214).

To live authentically one must take freedom of being and responsibility and guilt of his action without any lame excuse. But, Francis does not seem to be doing so. He is always busy in running away not being able to "face that" (26):

Francis began to run and in so doing, reconstituted a condition that was pleasurable to his being: running of bases after the crack of the bat, the running from accusation, the running from the calumny of men and women, the running from family, from bandage, from destitution of spirit through ritualistic strengthenings'. (75)

Francis flees and from this habit of fleeing he is expressing his inconsistency, unreliability, dereliction and dissatisfaction, all at once. He even is expressing his timid nature not having courage to face the external ideologies. This fleeing as it is "the familiar notion" (75) for him, even is an expression of his never ending search for novelty—something unattainable—the ineffable part of his being or an artifact of his soul taken relentlessly yet inconsistently by shifting place, job and inter-personal relationship.

He has shifted places aimlessly. Sometimes he is seen in this town and next time rambling in another. For the last 22 years, Colonie street, Broadway, North pearl street, Menands, Dong Avenue, Hawkins, Madison Avenues have become the roads that he is moving in or around continually. Through these roads he has visited many places walking many times, but they are leading him nowhere—not in that place where he can stay long with joy. He is still there where he was earlier. No change has occurred in the speed of his movement—it is as it was; nor has occurred any genuine change in his self which, instead, has become more "polluted" (33) never being uplifted. So his physical movement aimed towards "somewheres" (211) in a real sense is directed towards nowhere. Such a "random movement" (169) has not helped

him in enhancing genuine self, or in getting ineffable element of his being. Ignorantly with an aim of getting it he is still running and changing places with much inconsistency.

He is drifting in matter of holding job too. During his 22 years of time he became basketball player, grave digger, garbage collector, fixit man, mechanic, beggar, runner "thief, killer and bum" (153) It shows his fickleness and instability. This changing in job regularly is the result of his dissatisfaction. He cannot be satisfied with anything that he does. So, he cannot tarry long in any job observantly and keeps on changing trying to get novelty in everything which is not possible.

In matter of inter-personal relationship, too, he seems to be shifty. Maintaining mutual and long lasting relation with anybody is quite impossible for him. First of all, he detached himself from his mother as "just after Francis married Annie, that neither he nor his common little woman would ever be welcome in her house again" (146), next from the relationship with his sister, Martha, who, later even did not give him any chance to touch the body of his dead brother accusing Francis of being a causative agent behind his death. Martha said, " Your hands have done enough damage, you'll not touch my brother's coffin" (142). Similarly Katrina, first love of his life, who first "awakened in him the urge for a love of his own" and "interposed herself in his life" could no longer be his love for long. "Love is always insufficient, always a lie, stupid love, silly love" (115) to him. He ran off from this relation.

His relation to his wife and children too is not good. His not visiting his own home for 22 years is a clear example of it. He has become utterly failure to bear the responsibility as a head of family. Every time, he just tried to escape from the home and his familial responsibility as for him "everything was easier than coming home"

(160) because it would restrict his inauthentic flight taken to avoid every sort of logical and stable connections just to fulfill instinctive urges and nothing more. Since his family members suffered a lot because of his obnoxious behavior they are not happy with him. Even when he goes in his home once after 22 years buying a turkey for them, his daughter, Peg vents her anger, "Why've you come back like a ghost we buried years ago to force a scrawny turkey on us? Is that your idea of restitution for letting us fend for ourselves for twenty two years" (179). She does not leave him only on that rather goes on asking, "You've moving on?" Francis replies "positively". In its reaction, she says "fine" (179). It clearly shows how much irate his family members are for their being left in difficulty by him for so long. So, thinking "I'd never fit in", he leaves home again with "not much chance of returning" (174).

Helen, a fellow drifter with whom he remains in relation for 9 years but not properly fulfilling his responsibility over her. Despite having a sense that if he "runs off or dropped death Helen'd probably go crazy" (60) he leaves her. Even after knowing that "she'll be like a little kid in the world" (90) without him, however, becoming unable to give any security he runs "scores over scores time making her walk alone" just "to be fingered" by others and "cuckolding himself willfully, debasing her, and withal separating them both from what still survived of their mutual love and esteem" (121). He escapes from her, from that relation. Later, she dies alone in a hotel room. Beside feeling "sorry for her" (190) he could do nothing to save which any genuine friend would at least try to do.

His relation with his male friends also does not seem to be that much mutual. He fears to share anything about him to his friends owing to his little trust over them. "He had no desire to tell Rudy anything intimate about his life" (23). Quarreling and fighting with his "fellow travelers on a journey to a nameless destination" (23) are his

daily phenomena. "Don't holler at me" says Francis to Moose, one of his friends "I'll crack your god-damn head and step on your brains. You will die younger'n I will" (195). He seems more stronger than his friends and all the time even in minor discussion tries to dominate them not by words but by hands, not by persuasion but by coercion.

Thus, taking circuitous flight in search of so-called novelty but not getting it anymore, anywhere, by any means just drifting hopelessly without any stability often changing place, job and relationship has been his predicament. Owing to his own instable and fickle nature, his relation to anything or anybody hasnot become sound and it has brought only dissatisfaction and that in turn frustration in him. Instead of bringing certain changes in his being so that he could be adaptable to any sort of situation, he rather takes flight only to meet new situation ahead, that too finding harsh and unsuitable, again takes flight from there. He cannot make any sense out of all the happenings where he himself is principal agent and even cannot step ahead appropriately integrating his scattered selves in a unified whole as coherently as possible.

Inauthentic Choices and Decisions

Francis is leading such a life simply because of his inability to decide properly what is right and what is wrong in the nick of the time. His inability to choose right one out of different possibilities is the result of his irresolution, diffidence, dependency and irrationality. So, his life has, in turn, become a long chain of improper decisions. He seems to have become the victim of his wrong decisions though he says himself of being "never a victim" (216).

Francis is impulsive and instinctive doing anything before deciding to do that. Hardly exercising his mind, he always remains busy in exercising his body wrongly.

Such a habit once "inspired Francis Phelan to throw the stone that changed the course of life, even for the people not yet born" (205). That stone thrown impulsively without properly thinking the possible outcome of that action cost him dearly. The man, Harold Allen died on the spot and Francis ran away from the scene to avoid the fatal result that was sure to befall over him. In other several occasions too, he feels "a compulsion to flee" (75) as a last option left for him to opt.

He, not being able to choose anything properly and decide correctly, has committed many more crimes one after another. Whatever he tries to do that turns out to be wrong. It is so because of his inability to think rationally and do properly. He realizes, "he could not choose among all the possibilities that were his" (224). Throwing a stone from a crowd of strikers and running away from the consequences of the destruction it caused, abandoning his family after dropping Gerald and making them fend themselves, killing Rowdy Dick Dolan, taking a bite out of the neck of a "runt" who had stolen a bottle of orange soda from him, "screwing so many women he really wanted nothing to do with" (160), abandoning the weak and vulnerable Helen to the humiliation and potential danger of Finney's car, even after knowing that she will be fingered by others and his never ending marathon are the wrong actions taken by him without deciding properly beforehand, whose results in all cases became horrible and lethal to his being. Analyzing all these activities performed in course of living, Francis concludes towards the end of novel:

That he was not capable of making a right decision, that he was as wrong headed a man as ever lived. He felt certain that he would never attain the balance that allowed so many other men to live peaceful, nonviolent, non fugitive lives that spawned at least a modicum of happiness in old age. (215)

Thus, there is no doubt in his being unable to choose and decide. Another flaw attached with him is of not accepting the responsibilities of his decisions seriously. If compared him with Helen, it will be more clear to show his irresponsibility. Helen takes everything that she does as the result of her own independent decisions and bears the consequences, no matter how much she has to suffer for that. Francis is in stark contrast with her. His habit is of taking the actions done not as done but as happened; not out of his decisions but as a result of coincidence and "unintention". In other words, those are not decisions but sins committed without intention. So he feels compulsion to confess his sins and confesses as opposed to Helen who "has no compulsion to confess them [her sins]" as she "prefers to call them decisions" (138) and seeks not "to gain absolution" (137). Such is not the case of Francis since he is with expiation that needs absolution. However he is not getting it anymore as he lacks seriousness and goes on committing sins even more.

Fatalism and Determinism

Francis is indecisive in many cases and even if he decides, decides wrongly. Behind that remains an immanent reason, playing its part, that is his own mentality laden with the (mis)conception that human choices, possibilities are constrained and determined by fate and circumstances; with man being unable to change the course of events or any other happenings and just remaining passive observer. Having such a view, or bad faith in Sartrean term he moves ahead.

Francis with fatalistic and deterministic view about life and world often shows irresolute nature before fate. Disheartened with for his failure to act as a free agent, and thinking that everything happening there in his world is because of fate, he cannot do anything to change the course of event even slightly. Thus he has "stood staunchly irresolute in the face of capricious and adverse fate" (75).

When Sandra, a minor character in the novel, died, in the reaction of it, Francis, says "her time was up". In response to it, Helen replies "No I don't believe that is fatalism. We die when we can't stand it anymore. I believe we stand as much as we can and then we die when we can, and Sandra decided she could die" (65). The basic difference between Francis and Helen is that they view the action done differently. Helen calls them the outcome of an individual's decision but Francis goes to accept them as the outcome of "larger fate" (205) and seems reluctant to bear the responsibility and the consequences of that.

Francis is not being able to make his situation vitally his, rather is letting it inflict itself upon him ignorantly supposing himself to be the victim of circumstances "living in a world where events decided themselves and that all a man could do was to stay one jump into their mystery" (224). It is the reason why he has not taken freedom of being and the responsibility and guilt of actions seriously. Every time he seems to be slipping away from his responsibility blaming the circumstances and fate to be responsible behind that happening, not being himself. From killing to running, whatever activities he has performed so far in his "arena of existence" (181), he takes all to have happened not because of his own "conscious will" (145) or choice but takes them to have occurred at others' instigation, imperative and will. Such a passivity on his part has rendered his life pathetic.

Francis has utterly failed to take the course of living in the way he likes, conversely leading a life "that had not been intentional"(76). It is simply because of his inability to change the perspective to view the world and to think himself as a free agent to perform the authentic activity deemed necessary. So Francis, it seems, is more fated than any other characters in the novel, for his hands are "artificers of some involuntary doom element in his life" (145) and they "do things on their own"(43)

without his control. As a result, on that fateful day of June, 1901, too, his hands "betrayed" (143) him in throwing stone that killed a man which, later, changed his whole life. He blames that wretched stone to be responsible for his miserable life. That stone, thus, has become fate in itself, changing the shape of his life drastically.

Similarly, in Francis life, women seem to be playing the part of fates, thereby determining his way of living. Francis's life, Francis's tragic life; where he does not seem to be using his own self-determination rather is doing everything guided by women; in their tuning dancing unconsciously. He, on the surface it seems that, has spent much of his life literally on the run from women- first from his mother, next from Katrina Daugherty following that from his wife Annie, and, later still from Helen. No matter how much he tries to be far away from their influence, but, in shaping his movement of life their effect is detrimental and unavoidable.

First it is his mother, "denier of Life" (90), with whom he had strained relation. As a result, he could not remain with her under the same roof in Colonie street and moved to the North end with his newly wed wife Annie. Literally it was his first flight.-"Flight of a kind, the first" (147). Thereafter he started taking flight frequently making different excuses. He became a chronic runner. So, in making him lead such a flighty life, her role is principal.

In 1987, he had been in relation with "seductive" Katrina, a married next door neighbour. It is Katrina who first cultivated in him the habit of drinking saying "you will learn to like it, it is exquisite" (108). Then he became life long alcoholic with the habit of drinking in such a way that most of the time he remained without having a single penny left in his pocket to have soup and bread. She even seduced him compelling him to commit "retributive sin" (116) and turning him into a philanderer.

His wife Annie with whom he remained in relation for few years and later realizing that she would imprison him all the time in her single relation therein casting his manhood, masculinity and valour in peril, he runs away to experiment himself with other different women.

Another woman who is behind him determining his course of living is Helen. As to Helen, he says, "Helen's got me on the bum" (201). In his relation with her for almost 9 years she reins him, guides him and tries to bring him in right track by making him quit the alcoholism. He too in return, seems to be always roaming around her, drifting with her alongside.

No matter how much he tries not to be influenced, these women don't leave Francis even at the time when he is physically far away from them. They occasionally enter into his imagination as their influence is deeply rooted into his mind.

The faces of all the women Francis had even known change with kaleidoscopic swiftness from one to the other to the other on the three female figures in the far corner. The trio sat on straight-backed chairs, witnesses all to the whole Fabric on the three female figures in the far corner. (202)

They, in fact, are directly or indirectly responsible behind Francis's leading such a life, where "he had nothing to do with intent" (215). All these women coming in Francis's life one after another, have moulded Francis in the way they like. It is Francis's plight that whenever he wants to escape from one relation not because of his genuine consciousness but because of his being fed up with the relation, another women seems waiting ahead to draw him in her snare and the vulnerable Francis can do nothing except falling in the clutch. When he has an appropriate time to liberate himself properly he seems rejoicing that forgetting everything but when time becomes

critical with the female seeking his help, he breaks the relation making the fairer sex more helpless. Such a nature he bears. Anyway, what is true is that even if Francis stays with any female he is influenced and shaped by her and even if he runs intending not to be influenced, he is influenced with the fear of influence that leading him towards a complete run-away life.

It seems as if Francis is just fulfilling his destiny. He examines his own character and the people and events in his life relentlessly, yet, finds nowhere a rational, causal explanation for life's broken promise. The life for him seems exactly like what his one friend, said "full of caprice and missed connections" (28). The world, finally, strikes Francis as one in which events decide themselves and man can do nothing against the will of fate except being a constant sufferer. The effect of fate in his life is still visible even towards the end of the novel when he realizes "a larger fate had moved him west yard and shaped in him all that he has to become, and that moving and shaping was what Francis now understood, for he perceived the fugitive thrust that had come to be so much a part of his own spirit" (205).

Francis's inability to use his power to choose and decide right one among different possibilities for the betterment of his being, his narrow mind-set regarding events, their happening and his constrained mentality about his ability to change the course of life if not that of event, his being guided by larger fate and determined by women folk have greater impact on his being, in making that vile and corrupt. He realizes the total impact and his life being turned wretched by fate working from different level. "It was a force whose name did not matter, if it had a name, but whose effect was devastating [on him]" (205).

Alcoholism

Alcoholism is an obsession of Francis. Behind his involvement in "Compulsive violence" (160), though, it cannot be said that this very alcoholism is always responsible, yet, its impact in few cases even cannot be neglected. Particularly, in his son's death, and other time, in his nature of inviting scuffle with fellow drifters, this alcoholism is responsible. To make him even more reckless and careless about his life, his doing, behaving and above all, in making his life miserable with empty pocket, its role is primary.

For the last twenty years Francis undergoes immense suffering often struggling to have his basic necessities fulfilled. As he is in bum, he lacks stable source of income and is seen every time begging everything from soup and bread to socks and shirts. To "appreciate a pair of socks" (38) provided by preacher, to be worried about the "place to flop" and "sleeps in the weeds" (38) are his routine. He goes to Jack's house asking "Jack old buddy you got an old pair of shirts? Any old pair. Mine just ripped all the hell" (71). It is the predicament of Francis.

Such a situation of Francis arouses certain amount of sympathy in the heart of reader. But analyzing everything what Francis is doing in his life, one comes to the conclusion that, in pushing him to the present state nobody is so responsible more than he himself. It is his own fate that he himself created; it is the condition that he himself invited and to believe himself to be the victim of larger fate is the result of his weaker mind. Behind his not having "a damn penny" and "no place to flop" (66) he himself is responsible not others, not even his fate.

His habit of spending every single penny if he happens to have by any means in alcohol, not giving a single thought towards fulfilling his basic essential needs like fooding and clothing is the main reason behind his facing the problem of a damn

penny and place to flop. Helen cautions him time and again about the impact of alcoholism and its resultant effect being scarcity of money. She always wants him "straight" (64) but he pays little heed at what she says and goes on feeling "good then but not healthy" (8) by having liquor continuously. When it becomes excessive she even expresses her ire, "stay drunk for the rest of your life. I'm leaving you, Francis. You're crazy. All you want is to guzzle wine. You're insane!" (80).

Retreat to Fantasy, Hallucination and Past

Alcoholism, fantasy and hallucination, through these means, he wants to get solace from his torturing present. His retreat to fantasy and hallucination with his whisked mind provides momentary pleasure, carrying him away from the harsh present. Once lying on the bare boards of a dilapidated horse barn, with only newspapers and a broken roof between himself and the cold, uncompanionable night, Francis has an epiphany of deliverance—a vision of entering into heaven to the sound of "ethereal trumpets" (90).

When he is with Roskam collecting Junks in a city area, he fantasizes his youthful mother's reluctant first sex with his father and his own subsequent conception and later his being "slapped into being and swiftly moulded him into a bestial weed" (99). This weed later becomes virile young and, at this time but in imagination, enters into the room of Katrina, his next door neighbour and romances with her imagining himself and Katrina "in a ravenous lunge that never was, and then in a blissful stroking that might have been and then in a sublime fusion of desire that would always be" (115). But with "giddap", a sound uttered by Roskam to make his horse move ahead, he gets awoken to reality.

Similarly, he takes retreat to past. Francis cannot face the present because it requires courage and certain changes into his being so as to be adaptable and face it

boldly and frequently takes flight to the past that, too, in its present form, Francis could not face but, now, he goes to that because that does not require any changes and he has nothing there to do except observing the events and its result he has already known. Basically, he fears from present because he thinks he cannot do what he wants and the possible result of his doing, that he suspects, won't be good.

His past is undoubtedly more horrible and chaotic than present as that is full of violence. So that, his first impulse is always to detach himself from the past but cannot do so forever. He enters into the realm of past wallowing in dismay. In the past, he did everything being swayed away by eccentricity. There, he committed many murders and crimes and now seems to be going there to present his own reasons with "odd logic" (28) behind his doing so. All the persons that he killed enter into his mind. His retrospective mind goes back to the past to observe the place, situation and his way of killing them. He converses with them, and tries to "diminish" (215) the amount of guilt by giving justification to them. In Jack's home, while shaving his beard, there in his mind, enters Rowdy Dick with whom he starts to talk. "yes, I broke your head so bad but I hope you remember I had my reasons" (76), later sensing something wrong going on inside, Helen, from outside the bathroom, asks, "you all right there Francis? Who are you talking to?" (76).

Such a flight to the realm of past, hallucination, and fantasy, is a detachment from his present. His surrender to them is a clear sign of his unwillingness to face his present situation- an alienation from present life. With his own different world-a world of fantasy and esoteric past, which other drifters don't have, he is different and unusual from rest of others. Though, outwardly, it seems, "he lets him dance on the earth to the din of brass bands, raucous cheers and voluptuous approval of the crowd" (147) yet, inwardly, is alienated from them too. They are with him, but he is not with

them nor is he fully with himself in his own possession. He is "lost" (23) somewhere; his self is scattered everywhere.

Francis, in a real sense, is alienated from his own real self. It is so because of his ignorance about his own self. With little knowledge about his own being, he says that "Rudy and Helen had far more insight into his being than he himself ever had" (223). If a person does not know properly about his own reality, own state of being and thinks that others have more insight about who he is and everything that he possesses internal or external then such a person is sure to lose himself and then never win himself, thereby falling in the ditch of self ignorance. So is Francis.

This way, his self has become the victim of these different flaws; it is decayed. Ironically he is still unaware about this fact. Having lost himself in his own eccentric world, he never tries to enhance the genuine self by purging it, by improving his mode of thinking, behaving and doing. Without bringing any reformation into his being, he just tries to touch "the Untouchable artifacts of a self" unsuccessfully, that "he did not yet know was ruined, just as the ball, in its inanimate ignorance, did not know yet that it was going nowhere, was caught" (169).

Francis glances back along the thread of his life to realize that he looks "only into his own repetitive and fallible memory" (223). Francis nowhere finds purity in his self as it is full of vices. The life how much he lived so far has not gone farther from the realm of inauthenticity. "Ruined ravaged and failed" (169) he has been, just because of his inability to uplift his self which is diluted with inauthenticity. "Francis says to his unavailed for self and he smelled his own uncancelled stink again. All this lay in foul encrustation atop the private pestilence of his being [. . .] up rush of a polluted life all but asphyxiated him" (33).

Thus Francis is alienated from his own genuine self; it is never available for him. This is the reason for why he is leading that sort of wretched life.

Contradictoriness

Francis suffers a lot in search of never-to-be achieved novelty into his self. He is questing. For that he is still running, but getting that nowhere often forgetting who he is and why he is doing so. That search remains unfulfilled as other "unutterable dreams" (23) bringing instability in his nature, split personality in self and great difficulty in life instead.

He is rootless and restless due to his inability to situate himself in any place and time. It is so because of his so-called flight which is taking him sometimes here and sometimes there, not giving him any place to stay and stable identity to define himself. His flight therefore seems purposeless in the sense that he has achieved nothing so far and there does not seem anything great waiting ahead. So his so called "quest for a pure flight"(75) turns out to be a complete sham. It is his eccentricity that is instigating him to move randomly but with no visible guidepost to achieve. Furthermore his movement is not conscience-laden. It has led him towards restlessness- restlessness because of purposelessness and devoid of any achievement and uncertainty lingering all the time, everywhere that he tends to go.

Since Francis becomes unable to define himself by presenting as a man with a unified self, he bears split personality. Split personality disorder is because of his ambiguous nature clearly seen through his doings, from the habit of performing activities contradictorily. He is contradictory simply because of his nature of, sometimes, doing this thing and next time presenting himself just opposite of that. It is the outcome of his inability to decide and do right things in right time resolutely. Therefore he seems to be hero and villain, innocent self-convicted sinner and wanted murderer, courtly lover and misogynist, child lover and child abandoner,

stonehearted and sentimentalist, coward and stalwart. He, with these multiple definitions and multiple identifications, is simply unpredictable. Nobody can say even he himself can't, about which role he will play next either of villain or hero in any specific situation. He is scattered everywhere so is his self. Such a scatteredness has made his life difficult.

Francis is still wandering, untiredly but reaching not any specific destination. He rightly defines himself as a man from "nowhere". Leaving his "nowhere" he can't go "somewhere" (176) with an empty soul" (87). His every step is stepped through broken glass, empty wine and soda bottle, card board boxes, human droppings" (189) and his eyes are compelled to "rove over a covetry of dead things, rusted-out gas stoves, broken wood stoves, dead ice boxes and bicycles with twisted wheels"(91). There is nowhere to go and nothing to get. He is simply "Lost and distorted soul" (260) and can "never articulate himself" as his "insight into his being" (223) is far less than needed.

To get rid of such a life, sometimes thought of suicide comes in his mind. "Why was it that suicide kept rising up in Francis's mind?" (146). Suicidal thought is an outcome of his wretched and pathetic life-a life that he could not live properly. He is solely responsible behind his own life and in its becoming improper. Though being surprised with the thought of suicide, he cannot "understand his flirtation with it" (146). It is the sudden impulse that comes and tries to attack him but remains unsuccessful because more than suicide he has another intense desire to fulfill that is flight; its language he understands perfectly but not of suicide. Therefore, not taking flight from life rather, overcoming suicidal thought, takes another flight-"flight from it-for he is the kind of fella, just kept running when things went bust; never had the time to stop any place easy just to die" (146).

Despite that much difficult and harrowing condition of his life Francis is alive as he does not seem "ruined yet except as an appearance in process" (169). He does not die. "The ball flies. Francis still lives to play another day" (169). But up to now how many matches he played, most of the time, played wrongly. Analyzing his playing style in the field of larger life, he is a bad player worthy to get red card. However he is still in the play ground playing the game but with no reasonable prospect of another day's play being that much good. As it has become his habit to play foul, he is inclined to do so forever. And even at the end of novel too he desires to take flight towards "the place where the bluebird sings" (225).

As in 1901 and so many times subsequently, Francis's impulse is once again to flee. After killing a man in a jungle and carrying the wounded Rudy to a hospital, where he dies before he can receive treatment, and after discovering Helen's body in her room at a Palumbo hotel where she had died earlier Francis heads to the train yards and jumps a Delaware 4 Hudson freight train "heading south toward the lemonade springs" (224). Within hours, the promise of real peace in the Phelan house that would come with his returning there seems to be faded into the pathetically fanciful inauthentic wishes of the "the Big Rock candy Mountain" (203), the song that Rudy would sing incessantly. The "resurrectible" (172) Francis but "with his fear of Justice" (160) and consequence descends once again into the shadowy unreality of his previous life on run leading an inauthentic existence.

Thus, Francis still continues taking the craven flight without bringing any substantial changes in his character and, therefore, not being able to know himself and his relation to the world in a truer sense. As a result, his mode of living remains same as it was before with the same improper nature yet remaining unchanged.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

Francis Phelan is unable to live his life authentically as he miserably fails to realize and exploit his authentic possibilities in course of living and remains submerged in the realm of inauthenticity.

Francis has already spent a larger part of his life, running continually and still there is no sign of stopping. He is running but always being ignorant about his searching, striving and things for having. His running from home after the fall of Gerald, from the scenes after committing bad activities and from any places where the "stead-fast virtues" (17) are called for, is due to his timidity-inability to confront the situation and bear the result of anything performed.

He runs. Time runs. Along side runs his life, too, but with serious flaws in his character. Enchained with these flaws like eccentricity, guilt, violence, fatalism, ambiguity and split personality which are inextricably attached to his being, he is moving. He is clutching them as a self pride, but at the cost of his authentic possibility. With these banal traits, his way of thinking, behaving and doing has been adversely affected. As a result, he is unable to hear the call of conscience thus remaining oblivious about his own self and its being drenched in a shadowy unreality of his fuzzy world.

Along with his ignorance about his self being decayed, Francis has become the victim of various malaises. Not having genuine courage and conscience to purge it by adopting certain authentic changes into his being, he simply has immersed himself into the world of bums, leaving his family in Albany, and all the time drifting with his fellow drifters, forgetting that he can win himself and truly be himself solely possessing one unified, unscattered self.

He rather moves ahead committing different sorts of bad activities without thinking properly about the impact of his doing so to himself. Because of his recklessness and carelessness, he continues committing many more crimes and taking flight as an easy option to evade the possible imprisonment. With the sense of guilt of those various felonies, he has fallen in the tight clutch of "prolonged humiliation" (215) and is absconding normal community feeling himself "too, profane a being to live among them" (216) and, later bringing himself down to the street in the malicious circle of bums. Despite suffering elongated humiliation and having instant realization of his living a life never sought, he is still unable to change the direction of it, simply because of his narrow mind-set laden with fatalistic, deterministic and whimsical attitude towards life and the world.

With a mis (conception) that he is living in the place where events decide themselves, he remains passive having nothing to do "with his intent" (215) in his own life. His habit of taking everything happening in his world not because of his conscientious effort but because of fate or any other element has pushed him towards neglecting his own active role in enhancing a genuine self. He is simply fated. His bodily organs primarily his hands are free as they have gotten evil autonomy and do the things on their own, not seeking any rational decision from him. Guided by some "larger fate" (205) but not by him, they are inclined to throw stones, take others' lives, commit different sorts of bad activities and resultant effect of it being his flight. Thus hands, stone, fight and flight nothing remaining under his control have rendered his life pathetic.

After analyzing all the major incidents of his life, it can be said that behind his leading such an improper life, there remains the active role of his inability to decide, choose and do right things in right time authentically. From running to murdering

whatever activities he has performed hitherto, are the outcome of his wrong decisions. He himself confesses so. But even after having realization of that sort too, he cannot reform himself rather ironically goes on repeating many more crimes and subsequently runs not daring to bear any thing likely to befall before him and even not learning any lesson from his past mistakes either.

To wind up, Francis, not being able to bring any genuine transformations in his way of behaving, thinking and doing, remains unreformed with the same asphyxiating flaws attached to his being. Yet he continues living that sort of life taking random flight, bearing innumerable hardships but utterly failing to realize the authentic possibilities in his quest.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Banglore: Prism, 2004.
- Cavalier, Robert. *SZ Home Page*. 1 May. 2003
<<http://caae.phil.conu.edu/cavalier/80254/introductions/overview/>>.
- Coats, J.B. "Existentialism." *In Philosophy* 106 (1953): 230-38.
- Cuddon, Anthony J. *A Dictionary of Literary terms*. 2nd Ed. Delhi: Clarion Books, 1980.
- "Existentialism." *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. 15th ed. 1981.
- "Existentialism." *The encyclopedia of philosophy*. New York: Macmillian Publishing Co. Inc. & The free Press, 1972.
- Hannay, Alastair and Gorden D. Marino. *Cambridge Companion to Kierkegaard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. J. Macquarie and E.S. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- - - *The Essence of Truth*. Trans. Ted Sadler. New York: Continuum, 2002.
- James, B. *Dictionary of Quotations*. New Delhi: Good will Publishing House, 2004.
- Macintyre, Alasdair. "Existentialism." *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Macquarrie, John. *An Existentlualist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1955.
- "Martin Heidegger." *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Mautner, Thomas. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Cowley: Blackwell, 1996.
- Nehamas, A. *Nietzsche: Life as literature*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Religion." *A Nietzsche Reader, Selected and Translated with an Introduction*. Ed. R.J. Holligdale. London: Penguin Books, 2003, 167-93.
- Patrik, Linda E. *Existential Literature*. Toronto: Wordsworth, 2001.
- Peterfreund, P. Sheldon and Theodore C. Denese. *Contemporary Philosophy and its origins*. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1967.
- Sartre, Jean Paul. *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. Trans. Bernard Frenchman. New York: Castle, 1948.
- Sayers, Sean. "The concept of Authenticity." 11 Feb. 1999
<<http://www.kent.ac.UK/secl/philosophy/ss/authenticity.rtf>>.
- Smith, Quentin. "On Heidegger's Theory of Moods." *The Modern Schoolman: A Quarterly Journal in Philosophy*. LVIII: 4 (1981).
- Smullyan, Arthur. *Introduction to Philosophy*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Warnock, Mary. Preface. *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*. By Jean Paul Sartre. New York: Routledge Classics, 2002. VI-XVI.