

Chapter One

I. Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Topic

This research work is an attempt to prove John Yossarian, the protagonist, as an antihero in Joseph Heller's novel *Catch-22*. Yossarian is engaged in a struggle with the entrenched army culture and with examination of his own conflicting feelings about war and the role of the soldier. His existence centered around comic vitality, hypocrisy and dissatisfaction with the people where he is surrounded. He is not morally upstanding. His quest is not altruistic; he is in self serving moves. Thus, he lacks the attributes of the traditional heroic protagonist who is known for his deeds of bravery, generosity and goodness.

Catch-22, published in 1961, is a story about Yossarian, who is a captain in the Air Force and a leading bombardier in his squadron and his attempt to avoid serving in World War II by feigning insanity. His appearance, his accomplishment and his talent are absolutely unremarkable. He desperately tries to avoid the combat mission on different pretexts. He doesn't risk his life to save others; in fact, his primary goal throughout the novel is to avoid risking his life whenever possible.

He has no courage to show his revolt in front of his senior officers. He channels and diverts his anger humorously by himself or with the junior staff. Sometimes, he appeals to the doctor to approve him as if he is insane. He says nothing against increased mission during briefing.

Yossarian demonstrates his contempt about military bureaucracy and war. From the very beginning of the novel, he disagrees to fly more missions and feigns insanity. He always thinks to save his life. Although, his professional integrity demands to fight against the enemies to save the nation, his motto quite contrary to

this throughout the novel. Being a captain, he has to show his hatred towards the authority but he does never because of his antiheroic characteristics. Since the novel deals with an antiheroic issue, it deserves genuine discussion.

1.2 Joseph Heller: Life and Works

Joseph Heller was born in 1923 in Coney Island, a neighborhood in the southernmost part of Brooklyn, New York. He lived there with his family throughout his childhood, in a Jewish working-class neighborhood. His father, a bakery-truck driver died after a surgical operation when Heller was only five years old. While his family lived only upon the meager income earned by his mother as a seamstress during the years of the Great Depression, Heller got through childhood without ever feeling the effects of extreme poverty. Through his memories, we come to know that the social upheavals of the time-lynching, strikes, mass poverty and unemployment-were distant from his secluded neighbored. During World War II, he served in the U.S. Air Force as a bombardier in Italy and flew sixty missions. These experiences later became the basis for this novel *Catch-22*. He earned an M.A. from Columbia University in 1949. He became a professor of English at Pennsylvania State University (1950-1952) and instructed the feminist playwright Wendy Wasserstein. His later jobs included working as an advertising copywriter for *Time* (1952-1956) and *Look* (1956-1958) as well as a promotion manager McCall's (1958-1961). Increasingly during the postwar era, Heller, while maintaining disgust for social inequality and injustices, developed a cynical attitude towards all social movements. This pessimism towards attempts at social change has colored his literary writings.

He began working on *Catch-22* shortly after returning from the conflict itself. After the war, he spent seven years writing a novel that reflected his experience, and what he saw as the insanity of military life. In addition to this novel, Heller's other

novels include *Something Happened* (1974), *Good as Gold* (1979), *God Knows* (1984), *No Laughing Matter*, (1986) *Picture This* (1988) and *Closing Time* (1994). *Something Happened* describes the mean and narrow life of a fast-track corporate executive and his fears and dreams. Bob Slocum, the protagonist, is an insensitive man who knows himself quite well. He says, "A friend in need is no friend of mine" (*Something Happened* 32). Slocum is a mimic who cannot resist imitating the defects of those who suffer at his hands. We can recognize the comic techniques of *Catch-22* grimly transformed in *Something Happened*, which is deadlier and more polished than Heller's undoubted masterpiece.

Good as Gold, Heller's next novel, marks Heller's first fictional use of his Jewish heritage childhood experiences in Coney Island. It recounts the life of a middle-aged English professor Dr. Bruce Gold and his encounter with White House politics. This novel is funnier than *Catch-22* and *Something Happened*, but it is also an uneasy mixture of two comic inspirations. On the one hand, it satirizes the leading politicians such as Henry Kissinger and on the other hand, it delves into the Jewish experience in Contemporary America. Gold is a plodding intellectual who even-handedly covets power in Washington and tall gentile girls. His father bullies him and his prospective father-in-law addresses him with anti-Semitic epithets; his closest gentile friend admits that if worst came to worst he would not hide him. The Washington fantasies are less effective than the bitter comedy involving Gold and his father, which is a little surprising given the similarities between Heller's top brass in government and the military of *Catch-22*.

God Knows, another novel, is a hilarious, ribald modern account of King David's life in the Old Testament and serves as an allegory for a Jewish person's life in the real, often antagonistic world. The narrator is the psalmist, the king of Israel,

and the archetypal Jewish ironist, wit and standup comic. His narration is a torrent of anachronism that flows brilliantly as when, for example, David's modernism give the reader a precise notion of the scruffy little town that he handed on to Solomon as Jerusalem, site for the temple God has forbidden him to build. The rapid-fire anachronisms are such as David's view of another town: "The city of Hebron is not Versailles, you know" (37). Here, Heller has used the richest language on his anachronisms as when the psalmist plodding Solomon.

In 1986, Heller developed the neurological disease Guillain-Barre syndrome. After his recovery, he wrote the novel *No Laughing Matter* with Speed Vogel. This novel is an optimistic, autobiographical account of his personal battle against this illness. *Picture This* (1988), describes the painting of a bust of the philosopher Aristotle by the artist Rembrandt. As Rembrandt paints, the bust comes to life and his episode initiates a highly creative work recounting the past 2,500 years of Western civilization. Heller's last novel, *Closing Time* (1994), is a sequel to *Catch-22* that updates the lives of the characters from his first novel.

In the same way, Heller's final book, *Now and Then: From Coney Island to Here* (1998), is a touching memoir recalling his boyhood experiences growing up on Coney Island during the 1920s and 1930s.

Now, the book- which was originally titled as *Catch-18* tells the story of Captain Joseph Yossarian, a member of a U.S. bomber crew stationed on the Mediterranean Island of Pionosa. Yossarian is convinced that the military is trying to get him killed, and that those around him are insane, and trying to get out of flying any more seemingly suicidal missions. Yossarian is accompanying with the characters, including Colonel Scheisskopf, obsessed with winning military parades at the expense of just about everything else., the newly promoted Major Major, who

spends most of the war trying to hide from his men, Arafy, who rapes and kills the innocent girls without taking them as human beings, the Soldier in White, who is nourished by his own waste i.e. his own urine, and the profiteer Lieutenant Milo Minderbinder, a pure capitalist whose only ambition is to make money out of the war, and who ends up charging a commission on every military engagement. Using satire, black humor and seemingly undefeatable logic, the book argues that war is fruitless, that the military is absurd.

As Yossarian, the protagonist, struggles against the self-serving bureaucracy at the heart of the military machine, Heller argues that the individual will always struggle against the vested interests that control the world. And, perhaps, that madness is an entirely relevant reaction to this, "*Catch-22*" of the air force's code of practice sums up Yossarian's dilemma, "which specified that a concern for one's safety in the face of dangers that were real and immediate was the process of a rational mind" (62), What this means, as Doc Daneeka explains to Yossarian of another flyer's situation, is that "Orr would be crazy to fly more missions and sane if he didn't, but if he was sane he had to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn't have to; but if he didn't want to he was sane and had to"(46). In other words, the only sane reaction to war is to recognize its madness and absurdity. But in doing so, and proving his sanity, Yossarian makes himself eligible to flight. As Yossarian puts it: "That's some catch, that *Catch-22*," (46). The doctor, whose job is to save lives so that, they can be put in danger again, can only agree "it's the best there is" (46).

Speaking about the nerve he had touched, Heller would later say, "A large part of the public sentiment was my own. They saw an absurd quality, a mendacious quality in many of our political leaders and business leaders" (*Catching Joseph Heller*" 24). Summing up his intentions in writing the book- which has now sold more

than 15 million copies- he pointed out that "everyone in my book accuses everyone else of being crazy. Frankly, I think the whole society is nuts- and the question is: What does a sane man do in an insane society?" (24).

To sum up Heller's career, one explanation is that he is the product of his period. His era is in favor of war and he himself forcibly involved on World War II, but he is always against it. *Catch-22* is the result of this view and during many interviews he proved it. He presented new terms "catch-22" on literature which is applicable on everybody's lifetime. Realistically, there will be no winner in war game. The topic is matched on the very sense that all the characters are clinging on this futility of war. The then bizarre situation of war is vividly portrayed during the course of novel. All the books which he produced are lifelike to consume. He was a writer all through, a master exemplar of his trade.

1.3 Historical Context

1960s is the decade of massive protests against the Vietnam War, militant demands for the rights of Black. Beat Generation, feminist movement, hippies, Black movement etc. are the terms of the decade. On the early 1960s, Beat writers play the central role on American Literature. There are few poets and novelists, who share a set of social attitudes- antiestablishment, anti-political, anti-intellectual, and opposed to the prevailing cultural, literary and moral values and in favor of unfettered self-realization and self expression. They often perform in coffee houses and other public places with drums and jazz music. The group included poets Allen Ginsberg, Gregory Corso and Lawrence Ferlinghetti and the novelists William Burroughs and Jock Kerouac. Ginsberg's *Howl* (1956) is a central Beat achievement. Similarly, feminist movement reached the climax in this decade. They demanded equal rights for women, at a par with men and freedom to decide their own careers. *The Feminine Mystique*

1963 by Betty Friedan is the major work on the subject. She attacked deadening domesticity- the conditioning of women to accept passive roles and depend on male dominance. In 1966, Friedan and other feminists founded the National Organization for women which sought to overturn laws and practices that enforced the inferior status of women by discrimination in such matters as contract and property rights, employment and pay issues, and management of earnings and in matters related to sex and childbearing. The African-American Civil Rights Movement is another protest against racial discrimination and restoring suffrage in Southern state. When United States government supported the then South Vietnam on the Vietnam War, the mass Americans protested.

Hippies, University protests, and the civil rights movement all marked the 1960s as a decade of revolution and Heller's novel fit in perfectly with the spirit of the times. Heller presented a key concept with the title of his novel *Catch-22* giving the English language a popular phrase in the process. He introduced this no-win dilemma into the English language. A catch-22 situation is one, where someone must complete two tasks, but they are both interdependent on the other being completed first. Many people face this kinds of challenges in their life- one of the most common faces job seekers, you cannot get a job unless you have work experience but you cannot get work experience unless you have a job. It is especially a situation you were damned if you do and damned if you don't. Heller's main idea of *Catch-22* is revealing the ironic brutality of war, with the hoping of ending or preventing future wars. How many poor soldiers, like Yossarian would do anything to get out? But they are all trapped in this "Catch-22" situation. Who really wins a war? It is fact that no one wins the war. Heller' newness seems on the content of the novel as well. There are usages of many slang words.

1.4 Critical Reception

Catch-22 has been analyzed from various perspectives since its publication. However, Heller's treatment of the war itself has received scant attention by most critics. A few critics have compared *Catch-22* to other war novels. David M. Craig has written two essays for *War Literature and the Arts* demonstrating how *Catch-22* incorporates some of Heller's own combat experiences (Craig "Revisited", 33-41; "Avignon", 27-54). But the Heller's critics have taken the stance that *Catch-22* has very little to do with World War II and is, in fact, not a war novel at all (Kiley and McDonald Merrill Joseph Heller, 11). Heller himself consistently minimized the war's influence on the novel in many of his statements and interviews. For instance, in a 1970 speech in New York City, he told his audience that "*Catch-22* is not really about World War II" (Heller "Translating" 357), and in a 1975 interview he reiterated those sentiments: "As I've said, *Catch-22* wasn't really about World War II. It was really about American society during the Cold War, during the Korean War, and about the possibility of a Vietnam" (Merrill "Interview," 68).

Some critics think that *Catch-22* leads to savage indignation of human responsibility. As Robert Merrill writes, "Yossarian deserts because he finally realizes there are greater horrors than physical pain and death" (50). In Heller's own estimate, those greater horrors are "the guilt and responsibility for never intervening in the injustices he [Yossarian] knows exist everywhere" (qtd. in Merrill 51). At the end of the novel, when Yossarian decides to go to Sweden, he does so specifically to run to his responsibilities: "Let the bastards thrive," says Yossarian, "since I can't do a thing to stop them but embarrass them by running away" (Heller 452). Some critics say that *Catch-22* is full of comedy. Leon F. Seltzer says "the novel's absurdities-comic and otherwise-operate almost always to expose the alarming inhumanities which

pollute our political, social, and economic systems." But Morton Gurewitch's view is different. He sees *Catch-22* as above all a "mad farce" so unrelenting as to effectively overwhelm any narrower didactic or satiric impulses. "The satire," writes Gurewitch, "is devoured... by omnivorous nonsense." David Seed has analyzed the lesson of Snowden's death, as finally recollected by Yossarian which is the attempt to induce a philosophical acceptance of death. Men are merely the grain. He further says:

One important metaphysical theme of *Catch-22* is the physical vulnerability of man. [. . .] Death in this novel is presented as a conversion process whereby human beings become mere matter and are assimilated into the non-human. [. . .] Snowden [. . .] spills his guts, which happen to be full of ripe tomatoes, and so Heller implies that man may become no more than the fruit, vegetables and meat he consumes. (41)

Robert Young and Peter B. High have commented on the novel as a fine expression of black humor. Robert Young, in his critical essay "*Deadly Unconscious Logics in Joseph Heller's Catch-22*" comments the novel as "a black comedy novel about what people do when faced with the daily likelihood of annihilation. For the most part they do is trying to survive in any way they can" (71). The main conflict that Young finds lies in the relationship between the Army and its rules and the humanity, which plays the price for the defenses of those in charge and maintains at the expense of human decency.

Likewise, Robert Brustein, in his "*The Logic of Survival in a Lunatic World*" has commented on the novel as based on an unconventional but utterly convincing internal logic. For him, it is a triumph of Mr. Heller's skill that he is so quickly able to

persuade us (1) the most lunatic are the most logical, and (2) that it is our conventional standards, which lack any logical consistency, Brustein further insists:

This gives the reader an effect of surrealist dislocation, full of complicated reversals, swift transitions, abrupt shifts in chronological time and manipulated identities... as if all human kind was determined by a mad and merciless mechanism. (13)

Robert M. Scotto, in *Three Contemporary Novelists*, explores the absurd side of the novel. He supports that the inhumanity of the power and its agents, the violence and barbarity that lurk beneath normal routine are the hindrances in the free choices of an individual. The villains as Scotto reveals are not what Americans thought, "*Catch-22* is about more than the conflict it depicts; very few pieces of contemporary literature have illustrated so profoundly that the enemy is within. The villains are not the Germans or Japanese... they are the power brokers who gains from the war... (74).

Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury in *From Puritanism to Postmodernism* present the similar view, "the enemy seemed less the Germans, Italians or the Japanese than the American military machine itself and its continuance into the cold-war world to follow" (374). Bradbury and his co-writer view the novel as a cult classic and insist; "*Catch-22* described America in a fantastic and widely comic parable" (381).

Accordingly, Melvin Seiden shows the new possibility of defining heroism in the notion of self-preservation of the unpatriotic and Falstaffian protagonist, Yossarian when he writes, "*Catch-22* is completely unpatriotic and thrives on the Falstaffian proposition that it is better to be a live coward than the dead hero" (408-9).

Some other critics view it as a piece of satire. These critics include John H. Muste, Marcus White, and Frederick R. Karl. The disparity between what the political and military leaders say and supports their view.

John H. Muste compares the novel with Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal*. He finds out that *Catch-22* is more real than Swiftian proposal to convince the reader that the fundamental horror is true. Making the point clear Muste writes:

In *A Modest Proposal*, however horrifying Swift's suggestions may be, however explicit his instructions for braising or roasting a fat infant, author and reader are fully aware that the suggestions are unreal, that Swift writes as he does precisely because he knows that his readers will agree with him that such things are beyond comprehension, and will agree with him that other real attitudes and acts are equally intolerable and must be reformed. No such sense sustains us in *Catch-22*. The scenes Heller describes are real; they are close enough to our experience to convince us that the fundamental horror is true. (22)

These critical views show that the issue of anti-hero in the novel *Catch-22* needs serious attention. The critics, despite differences in their findings, agree on the fact that John Yossarian is morally unappealing and his character is completely opposite to the characters of traditional heroes. Thus, he is truly an antihero.

Chapter Two

II. Concept of Antihero

2.1 Aristotle's Concept of Hero

The supreme form of individual being seeks to fulfill its purpose to grow and mature. Because an individual's highest faculty is his intellect and that intellect brings himself into a kind of communication with god. Aristotle's renunciation of self subsistent ideas has major implications for his ethical theory. The proper aim in ethics is not to determine the nature of absolute virtue but to be a virtuous person. The goal of human life is happiness; the necessary precondition for happiness is virtue. But virtue itself has to be defined in terms of rational choices, in a concrete situation, where virtue laid in the mean between two extremes. Good is always balanced between two opposite evils: the midpoint between excess and defect. He says:

Temperament is a mean between courtesy and indulgence; courage a mean between cowardice and fool. Hardiness; proper pride a mean between arrogance and abasement and so forth. Such a mean can be found only in practice in individual cases relative to their specific condition. (67)

Aristotle emphasizes physical body's active involvement in love, war and feasting as the essence of hero. His attention is a high valuation of the body which is more directly reflected in the widespread classical Greek, appreciation for the human body as expressed athletic prowess, personal beauty or artistic creation. In *Poetics*, he talks about the ideal hero, whose tragedy arouses in us pity and fear without our likeness to the tragic sufferer, our sympathy wouldn't be out listed. The remembrance on which Aristotle insists on is one of the moral characters where his hero is not a man of flawless perfection, nor yet does one of the consummate villainy; by which

we must not understand that he has merely arranged or mediocre qualities. He rises, indeed, among the common lender moral elevation and dignity but he is not free from frailties and imperfections. S. H. Butcher in his book *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* opines:

Aristotle's hero is rich and full in humanity, composed of elements which other men possess, but blended more harmoniously or more potent quality. So much human nature must there in him that we are able to sense some of identification ourselves with him, to make his misfortunes our own. At the same time, he is raised above us in external dignity and station. He is a prince or famous man, who falls from the height of greatness. (277)

Apart from the impressive effect of contrast so presented, there is a gain in the hero being placed at an ideal distance from the spectator. He is disengaged from his petty interests of self, and is on the way to being universalized. If his quest ends in tragedy, he is blamed because he sacrificed for a much higher duty. He has self-assertive energy, single direction, goodness and at the same time, he is unselfish. The death of the hero who leads a farlon home of the benefactor of mankind who bears suffering with unbinding fortitude and through suffering he achieves moral victory - this fills us with emotions of wonder and admiration for him. He is a man of noble nature, like emotional feelings and emotions; idealized indeed, but with so large a share of our common humanity as to eager our interest and sympathy.

The fate of the hero is determined by forces, outside the control of the human will which constitutes his destiny. So ideal hero has ideal tragedy because the great frailty is moral frailty in which hero does sinless crime. Aristotle's hero is ideal in the sense that he has been raised above the trivial and accidental, by virtue of a universal

element which answers to the true idea of the object and it transcends the limitation of the individual. Aristotle adds that comedy which concerns itself with the foibles, the flaws and imperfections of mankind, cannot on this reasoning idealize or universalize it. He says "good fortunes following upon a course of bad action is frequent enough in life, none the less it is to be rigorously excluded from tragic and indeed from all art" (213).

Aristotle aims at four things for his hero. The hero must be good, appropriate, true to type and consistent or true to his action and nature. There should not be sudden changes in the nature of the character. Then only the character is appropriate for plot. The hero is like us having infirmities and virtues, tilted more to the side of good than evil. He is neither a blameless character nor a notorious villain. Aristotle's concept of the hero of high rank goes unquestioned in classical tragedy. The principle of Aristotle about the plot allows the hero passing by a series of probable or necessary stages from misfortunes to happiness or from happiness to misfortune. So, there should be unity in time, place and action. For Aristotle, plot is the most important formative element. The action of the story is not there to portray but characters. Characters exist for the sake of the action.

Characters and their actions will be either good or bad, either superior or inferior to us, and this is what distinguishes tragedy from comedy. But Aristotle does not proceed to press a theory of moral value on this basis. He is careful to explain that in comedy the imitation of men becomes worse than us but it does not mean worse as regards of any and every sort of faulty. It only regards as one particular kind, the ridiculous. And the ridiculous may be defined as a mistake or deformity not productive of pain or harm to others. Aristotle allows an aesthetic value even in

descriptions of what is unpleasant. He identifies characters as what makes us ascribe certain moral qualities to the agents and thoughts.

Aristotle's moral argument describes the purpose of life and the various qualities of mind for characters that are supposed to be necessary for moral conduct. It continues with a detailed description of friendship before concluding with the view that contemplation of good is the highest form of happiness. For those who are not fully committed or suited to the life of pure contemplation, the friendship becomes the ideal forum to exercise all the virtues; the virtue being those morale and intellectual characteristics, which have been fashioned by habit and education. Morality finds part of its true expression in friendship. In *Nicomachean Ethics*, he says, "every art and every investigation and similarly every action and pursuits is considered to aim at some good" (63). For Aristotle, final aim of life is good; not only the good for oneself but the good for all humanity.

For Aristotle, a person is primarily a member of a group, be it a family, a household, a village or a city state. There is no such thing as a purely free thinking individual. Our individuality is already partly decided for us by a group or groups of which we are only a part. Hence, the overall well being of a group is more important than the well being of any single member within it:

For even if the good of the community coincides with that of the individual, it is clearly a greater and more perfect thing to achieve and preserve that of a community; for while it is desirable to secure what is good in the case of an individual, to do so in the case of a people or a state is something finer and more sublime. (64)

According to Aristotle, moral virtue and the characters include courage, liberality, temperance, modesty and so on. And inside intellectual virtue he includes

art or technical skills and scientific knowledge. To cultivate these entire virtues one must be aware about the doctrine of mean. One must regulate own emotions and responses to people and situation so that one is eventually able to conduct himself with dignity. According to Aristotle by constantly learning through habit to control feelings one should begin to:

Have these feelings at the right times on the right grounds towards the right people for the right motive in the right way [. . .] this is to feel them to an intermediated, that is the best degree; and this is the mark of virtue. (101)

Finally, without friendship, none of the virtues either moral or intellectual would be of any value. For Aristotle, friendship is essential for every individual that is the supreme good of human beings called hero.

2.2 Traits of Antihero

Antihero is a protagonist of the play and the novel who lacks traditional heroic virtues and noble qualities and he is sometimes inept, cowardly, stupid or dishonest, yet sensitive. The anti-heroes' entire motivation is selfish because they feel the need to live against society's code for their own will. Selfishness enforces the antihero's break from the code of the traditional hero. Antiheroes refuse to serve society to serve only for themselves. The antihero has an ego and pride to go against the society. But he judges that his way is the right way. M. H. Abrams in *The Glossary of Literary Terms* defines anti hero as:

The chief person in a modern novel or play whose character is widely discrepant from that which we associate with the traditional protagonist or hero of a serious literary work. Instead of manifesting

largeness, dignity, power or heroism, the antihero is petty, ignominious, passive, ineffectual or dishonest. (11)

Antihero lacks the superior capabilities which tradition has guaranteed to him. Low level of human capability and little sincerity reflects the special gift of antihero. He has the power to hypnotize his victim by subverting family feelings or religion. The successful quests of antihero turn vile towards heroic wisdom as he transforms heroism and fortitude into hypocrisy and tyranny. His primordial nature links to his physical side, with his animalistic nature. The journeys of antihero reveal the dark and downside of the cycle. He personifies the negative selfish side of his ego. He wants to possess everything without limit; his characters define as large number of greed, temptation, lower self impulses and regression. The goal of antihero is to fulfil his desires and needs which have to be accumulated, controlled and enjoyed. He is obsessed to enhance security, wealth and territory. The antihero's humanity has been shut down. His generosity has become uncontrolled greed; his compassion has become hatred and loathing.

The hallmark standpoints of antihero are his anti-social act that marches, or dwells, to be a different drumbeat, the cadence of his own iconoclastic sensibility. His quest gradually narrows from common humanity to the single good life to self-knowledge. Antihero is observed by his desire to hurt and be hurt, blindly imitating the desires and movements of those he hates; he remains a coward and a slave. He lives only with earthbound self. Rather than facing more difficult challenges requiring the hero to rely on his own sense of judgement, antihero takes advantage of his inside knowledge. He has been flashed or dominated by negative traits or questionable behaviour.

The anti-hero has occasionally been conflated with the role of antagonist or villain, by definition the antagonists' limited role is clearly intended as an ultimately opposing force to the hero's quest. In this context, Victor Bromberg in *Praise of Antiheroes* writes:

The appeal of antihero resides in his 'human all too human' characters, his virtue often amounting to pointed inversions or ironic twists of the heroic ideals. The aesthetic effectiveness of the anti hero depends on the very absence or negative presence of the heroic paragons of tradition. (168)

Antihero accepts life and the process of change instead of struggling against nature and his own nature. His struggle against society occurs only when he finds himself at odds with a particular social force or condition produced by society, such as poverty, political revolution, a social convention, or set of values. If this seems to denote passivity, it is not negative, not death bearing. There is, of course, a good measure of irony implicit in this objective way of seeing one's role in society - wisdom permeates the awareness of dichotomy between the world of appearances, of illusion and metaphysical reality as well as healthy humour. The latter results from the antihero's feeling that he is not different from any one else, that he shares in the general human condition. So, it's not true to say that antihero is not heroic as Bromberg suggests, "they evolve from the traditional hero with a new code of ethics" (168).

The birth of antihero arises to rebel against history and to change the emptiness of society. But his rebel is for his own sake not for the interests of community.

The element that makes it more than simple heroes and villainies lies within the character of antihero. The antihero probably existed first (before conventional heroes) perhaps predating the sanctifying influence of organized religion. Many of the protagonists of western and eastern literature and classical mythological stories fit into the broad antihero model, especially those who are shown as having turbulent, violent and conflicting motivations. Frequently, it is the mental conflict that serves to the discrete episodes which compose such stories. So, antihero is a parody of hero as Hegel in *The Philosophy of Fine Art* defines "anti hero is a person whose life is not so circumscribed that he cannot take personal vengeance, a person who acts for himself and takes responsibility for everything that he does (248).

Such characters often behave immorally or in a cowardly fashion, and do not always have good intentions which distinguish them from the typical everyman or reluctant heroic characters; for anti-hero 'the ends justify the means'. He wants to preserve himself and his integrity by compromising to the people and situation. For this he manages to label himself simultaneously as a scholar, a social idealist, and an excellent employer. But he feels distrust with conventional values and is often unable to commit to any ideals. The antihero feels that he is no different from anyone else that he shares in the general human condition. Thus, he is a common man of comic, or tragic comic mode.

The hero/antihero dialectic is one of the basic manifestations of the opposition between the tragic and the comic. The consciousness of these polar modes is embodied in the balance between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the tragic and comic epic of Homer. The protagonist of tragedy defines his individual code of behaviour in regard to the nearness of death, giving up his life to safeguard the survival of his

society; the comic hero leaps into the heart of chaos, armed with sanity and imagination. Katherine Lever in her book *The Art of Greek Comedy* states:

The *Odyssey* despite its tragic implications is essentially comic in character and technique: the crafty hero, the romantic episodes, the humorous situation, who escapes from the dangers of war by craft and above all, a belief in survival, is the first antihero. (19)

Supporting this idea of anti-hero in *Odyssey* Albert Cook points out Odysseus' crafts made him unheroic. He says:

The success of Odysseus is not self-destructive, as that of Achilles, or Oedipus; it is a comic success. Then we added lover, the ingenious adulterer who eats, drinks makes love to Calypso and Circe without for one moment that he is due home, a wanderer, a passionate realistic [...]. The man who dwelt with the witch, 'the hawk' . . . (165)

Thus, in the heroic tradition, there may be found the seeds of antiheroes.

Aristophanes, a dramatist shows his audience not merely a human antihero, but an antiheroic god. Rosette C. Lamont in his essay "From Hero to Antihero" writes: "The wonderings of Dionysus, a divinity in search of his own and the city's solution are a parody of the heroic voyage" (16).

With the human evolution the early cave man ran from danger instead of facing it to protect himself, his family or his clan. Historically embedded as it is in a century and a half of industrial and political revolution, the ascendancy of materialistic bourgeoisies, the human nature carried out by Darwin and psycho analysis and the catalysms of the World Wars, post-romantic literature has been teaching that the traditional idea of the literary hero has become not only alien but dangerous to the culture. So, the antecedents of antiheroes can clearly be seen in the

novels of picaresque tradition especially of Cervant's *Don Quixote*, Defoe's *Moll Flanders*, Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* and the literature of post-war Britain. As Rosette Lamout claims, our is the age of antihero. He quotes the voice of Frederick the Great, "We do not like heroes; they make too much noise in the world . . . the more radiant their glory, the more odious they are" (22).

2.3 Antiheroic Characters in Picaresque Novels

In literature, the first of the picaresque, a genre often defined as having a protagonist called an antihero. 'Picaro' is Spanish for 'rouge', and a typical story concerns the escapades of an insouciant rascal who lies by his wits and shows little if any alteration of character through the long succession of his adventures. Picaresque fiction is realistic in manner, episodic in structure and often satiric in aim. The great quasi-picaresque narrative *Don Quixote* (1605) was the single most important progenitor of the modern novel; in it, an engaging madman who tries to live by the ideas of chivalric romance in the everyday world is used to explore the relations of illusion and reality in human life. After these precedents and many others -including eighteenth century characters of Defoe's *Moll Flanders* which is still picaresque in type, in the sense that its structure is episodic rather than in the organized form of a plot; while Moll is herself a colourful female version of the old Picaro - twelve years a whore, five times a wife, twelve years a thief, eight years a transported felon in Virginia.

Eventually, the Picaro's life as an outsider was accurately identified with modern man's despair and existential anguish. The disparities between the sensibilities and moral promises of various epochs did not seem to be taken into account. Another important feature of the genre is the singleness of view point. The picaresque singleness of view point consists in distinguishing appearance from reality and fiction

from fact with exaggeration. The most trivial detail or insignificant action is integrated into this overall perspective, sometimes seeming to be more important than the narrative itself. This effect requires a consistency of style. Moreover, truthfulness in the picaresque novel is achieved through doubt, insecurity and cynicism of the Picaro. With the help of its unique style, Picaro is able to work upwards and laugh quietly, simply indicating the hypocrisy and false pretension. More clearly, it brings together many loose ends and blends different sections of the narrative which strictly presents moral decay of the characters.

The basic situation of the picaresque novel is solitude in the world, of its principal character. This is not the retreat of the hermit or exclusion from society. The Picaro is lonely in the world totally isolated from society, and cut off from any foundation of security such as family, money and friends or social position because of his poor ability for friendship. Similarly, he is unattached, boundless, at a loss in a hostile as special position. The extent of his isolation includes solitude, insecurity and restlessness. In addition, life appears to him primarily as a long wondering without end. Therefore, solitude, confusion, disaster and misery are some of the most widely used terms used to describe the situation of the Picaro. He is not heroic in its character traits. He is simply faced with the immediate problem of his existence such as food, shelter and heating.

The Picaro has not past nor any trust in the future. But for survival he is equipped with both offensive and defensive weapons. His greatest defensive weapons are his resiliency or capacity for adaptation as well as his stoical good humour. He is not willing to learn and make concessions, but in case of failure, he will not whine and brood, but forget and be merry. Sacrifice does not appeal to him very long, as he shirks responsibility or permanence and laughs at honour or reputation. He needs two

things: comfort and ease; yet, by temperament he is willing to obtain them by deceitful and improvised means which are closer to anti-heroic acts.

For Picaro, each master becomes enemy and each colleague a new rival and the cruelty of the world is progressively shown by each situation. He achieves through his suffering a measure of wisdom as well as a final liberation from the strokes of fortune. Miller, S. in his book *The Picaresque Novel* writes about the episodes of Picaro which links with his occurrence. He says,

The picaresque novel has the highly episodic plot whose sole link was their occurrence in the life of the Picaro, the agile antihero who joins together all the events by sole reason of the fact that he is the important actor in them all. (12)

The episodes in the picaresque novel are rarely linked by rationally comprehended cause and effect. And since there is only evolvment, not development of the Picaro's character, the potentially unifying factor is missing as well. Fortune also plays a special role in the picaresque novel. As to fortune, Miller puts his idea, "In the picaresque novel the Classical and Renaissance motive of fortune dominates the entire action which is full of statements, laments, and complaints about fortune" (9).

For the Picaro, there is no grand providence, no logical cause and effect, no obvious author hovering about to shape the plot of life. Only fortune dominates, and fortune holds continuation. The Picaro can not be reconciled to it in a dynamic, organic relationship. He can only wend his way as best as he can through the obstacles which fortune has set up for him. The life of Picaro is never static, full of cycles, events following events with many characters. But without establishing any meaningful relationship to the characters, Picaro appears mechanical encounters to

them. Therefore, the Picaro's world is inherently chaotic. As Miller points out, "it is a world fully beyond the creative scope of human action and relationship" (36).

The Picaro dramatizes chaos; he is the offspring of a chaotic world and has a fundamental will to survive. For survival, he uses masking and wit as his main trait. Picaro learns that society allows no survival to those who have no sense of belongingness to any section of society he lives. The Picaro also displays some inner characteristics which enable him to survive in his disjointed world. For instance as anti-hero, his wit is one of his traits, the word 'wit' has double duty; it means both humour and mental quickness luckily, the Picaro usually has both.

Sean O' Faolain, in his book *The Vanishing Hero* implies that, as a form of Picaro, the antihero begins with *Don Quixote*. He says, "the interpretation of Don Quixote as a character, it has been shown, has evolved through the centuries to generalize he has and bolt of ridicule to a twentieth century Christ figure" (32).

Here, O' Faolain does not go back far enough when he traces the antihero to *Don Quixote* and at the same time P. G. Walsh in his book *The Roman Novel* claims that "The Romans rather than the Spaniards invented the picaresque novel around the travels and adventures of an antihero" (2). These ideas make clear that Anti-hero includes almost all characteristics of Picaro, which does not bear heroic ideals; he is founding, immoral, wanton and who believes in fortune. The heroic tradition left the seeds of antihero in form of new tastes, new form and new heroes in fiction.

A. J. Close in his essay "Introduction to Don Quixote" presents Quixote as the reflection of vanity of worldly ambitions, who is completely unheroic in nature. He further writes:

The individuality on Don Quixote and sacho - the folly of building castle in the air of empty position of honour of opportunistic social

climbing and his quasi-epic of rebellion against the social order and common sense are misapplication of heroic traits. (X)

Don Quixote was reading his books of chivalry and really, really wanted to be a knight. He decides he is a knight, what was so touching and pathetic about Don Quixote was that he didn't realize that he wasn't really a knight. The episodes are romantic but ridiculous. So, he is an antihero because of the traits he exemplifies including his inability to learn from the mistakes and his careless action. He is coward and incompetent. He is alienated passive and completely unheroic. All these standpoints make him antihero.

Though antihero is not completely a villain, however sometimes able to feel pricks of conscience, nearly always a man of intellectual powers, a dominating person who brooks no opposition, sometimes unholy schemes even murderers. As Byronic hero and other immoral, selfish and an opportunistic characters presented in Defoe's *Moll Flanders*. Moll, of even lower birth, receives a genteel education, is seduced and then, in what she considers self-defence goes through the series of husbands and gains a supreme knowledge of the London under world - prostitution, thievery, new gate - unconvincingly achieving a kind of peace in old age. Perhaps the best known anti-heroine modeled in *Picaro*, who lives a wrong kind of life what society calls. So it can be said that like Moll, antihero is an ordinary man and woman of low life who completely lacks the particular heroic quality.

Moll uses her beauty to try and achieve financial security. Here, sex is commodity for her. She has no moral sense at all, only a deep and constant sense of the value of money. She says "I was more confounded with the money then I was before with love" (*Moll Flanders*, 13). She continually applies the vocabulary of

finance and commercial negotiation to the affairs of the heart. 'Stock', 'contract' and 'credit' are words that reoccur in accounts of her relationship.

She is continuously anxious about the uncertainty of her arising and her identity. She may be a homeless and a wonderer but she says "I knew that with money in the pocket one is at home anywhere" (17).

The most advanced, quintessential stage of antiheroism remains by and large foreign to the romantic hero. The obvious example is of course Byron, whose constant sardonic commentary on his titular hero's adventures in *Don Juan* effectively pricks the heroic bubble and cuts his characters' size to antiheroic size. Thorslev, Peter in *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes* writes that, Byronic hero is the true representation of an antihero. He forwards his ideas:

A Byronic hero exhibits several characteristic traits and in many ways he can be considered a rebel. But Byronic hero does not possess 'heroic virtue' in usual sense; instead he has many dark qualities. With regard to his intellectual capacity, self-respect and hypersensitive, the Byronic hero is larger than life and with the loss of titanic passions, his pride, and his certainty of self identity he loses his status as a [traditional hero]. (185)

The Byronic hero is moody by nature or passionate about a particular issue. He rejects the values of moral codes of society. Quite often the Byronic hero is characterized by a guilty memory of some unnamed sexual crime. Byronic hero's dominance stems not from his activity, but from the interest in the psyche. Since his heroic assertion is the egocentric one of his own personality, far indeed from the hero's traditional commitment to a cause outside of himself. This reversal is, of

course, the outcome of the romantic cult of the exceptional individual, who is called antihero.

Physical passion plays a crucial role to anti-hero which appears dominant in the Byronic hero. It represents ultimate loss of identity. Like Henry Fielding's famous protagonist Tom Jones comes close to incestuous passion, only to be rescued by comically elaborate twists of the plot. Tom Jones is a lusty, passionate highly sexed young man, as well as impulsively generous and easily moved by others sufferings. David Daiches points out the characteristics of Tom Jones, he says, "Tom was besides active, genteel, gay and good humoured and had a flow of animal spirits which enlivened every conversation where he was present" (719).

Therefore, the picaresque form offered the opportunity to expose the protagonist of the corrupt influence of the world. Picaro is an antihero because of his character traits .The characters are shown to be self -deceived pursuing phantoms which elude their grasp ,or when achieved bring no satisfaction or sense of fulfilment of hero. Picaro is not on hero model. Picaro is purely antihero because he lacks Aristotelian heroic virtues.

2.4 Antiheroes in Post War Literature

As the racing motion of an ideal pursuit slows down, there emerges the figure of the antihero. The earlier heroes of Evelyn's brilliantly explored the possibility of such hero as fool, reversing the traditional English view, as old at least as Henry Fielding, that ignorance of the wicked world, innocence, virtue and heroism go together. This produced an extremely sophisticated and cruelly ironical kind of comedy. He remains witty in his inventiveness of character and incident. The novels of Graham Greene explored the disparities between human decency and theological

virtue, between moral intention and irreligious so as to produce impossibility of heroism in the modern world.

With the establishment of the welfare state and the emergence of the generation of young writer such as Aldus Huxley and Waugh, they reflected the theme of heroic parody. The sensitive young man looked back to the promise of a world of high culture, which never was and never will be his world, with the sense of having been cheated. This effect is closely seen on the drama of fifties; it can be seen in less degree in the novels. One begins to see in English fiction from the beer drinking provincial student, schoolmaster or university lecturer surrounded by a philistine affluent society which is utterly indifferent to the job they are doing and implicitly denies the value which such a job stands for, mocking his own cultural pretensions and playing the role of compromiser. This theme and attitude, which touched the new generation closely, led them, towards the larger problem of possibilities of life and art of modern individual. The characteristic novelist's attitude here is not anger but partly self-pity masochism, partly concern.

The general mood of the people in Britain during 1950s was that of frustration, disillusionment, cynic, rebellion and even despair. Jimmy Porter, a protagonist of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*, who explored the status of protagonist as an anti-hero, cleverly represents this mood of people.

He is raw, unpolished even unwashed, certainly unwilling to take the role assigned to him by society and his parent's expectations. He is a bore; a self-pitying, self-dramatizing intellectual rebel who drives his wife away, taken a mistress and then drops her. He is perhaps a character who should have gone on a psychiatrist than have come to a dramatist. He is insufferable, but the author intended him to be representative of the younger generation. Jimmy, a provincial graduate, who most of

the time is roaring his contempt for the middle and upper classes and intended for any orderly plan of living. He has chosen to quarrel with everyone, run a sweet-stall, and live in an animal way in an extremely sordid one-room flat. There is no ordered society into which he can enter, no tradition that he can inherit. The war has left him a derelict character, and he sees society such as it is, as some thing hostile. The old standards have broken down and their old opportunities are missing. He has had some sort of university education. But society is so mixed and he himself so weak, hysterical and rudderless that he is unable to make any use of his education. Osborne portrays him as living a mean and ineffective way with a friend on the proceeds of a sweet-stall.

Still, the fifties was the decade when post-war generation began to feel itself energetic in the cultural mood. Some of the signs of new energy appeared in the writing of Graham Greene and Philip Larkin. John Wains' protagonist Charles Lumley, on completing education becomes a window cleaner; a hospital orderly, chauffeur drug courier, nightclub bouncer-to end up finally in the highly fashionable but classless occupation of a BBC radio comedy script writer. Lumley is another common-sense anti-hero, with a lot of social and literary hostilities to gratify; he has giving truthfulness too, which makes the story closer to realistic picaresque. He is in revolt against his grammar-school upbringing and his university education, which promises a life of convention. He decides not to go 'up' to a conventional life in society, but 'down'. So he tries to purge his class background by taking a variety of odd jobs.

On a different plane more directly, but no less potently, the antihero may and does become the object of implicit or explicit critique on the part of the author. The anxiety or dilemma seems very characteristics of many novelists of the period. They

persist and even attain a form of anti-heroic success by steadfastly changing their goals. Victor Brombert shows how a new kind of hero has risen from the anti-heroic model. He says:

Post-war hero fails by design to live up to conventional expectation of mythic heroes. Coming from diverse cultural and linguistic tradition they are all figured as anti-hero by embodying the spirit of an uneasy age. (27)

To sum up with antihero and its traits from picaresque narratives to modern period is confined to individual quality of disillusioned, trickery, inept and wanton. Post-war literature like of angry young man and many other social writers played an influential role in formulating antiheroic concept. At present the antihero comes from the gap what one thinks a precious gift to perform anti-social acts. He is as a mirror for social commentary and political critique. His character is taken as fatal role in the story, skirting potentially negative attention that lacks any last-minute salvation.

Chapter Three

III. Ideas of Antihero and John Yossarian

3.1 Portrayal of Yossarian

The narrative of *Catch-22* centers on the thoughts and doings of John Yossarian. He is a bombardier in US force during the World War II in Italy. His world and actions throughout the course of the novel is not heroic. He expresses his frustration with others through faces he makes to himself in private. Being a captain, he plays some roles dutifully but most of the time he is self centered. In general, he spends most of the novel trying hard to fulfill his duty on the outside when on the inside a different voice urges.

Although he flies and lives with the men, he is marked as an outsider by the fact that many of the men think he is insane. His difference from rest of the other men makes us expect something exceptional from him. His characteristics are not those of the typical hero. He does not risk his life to save others; in fact, his primary goal throughout the novel is to avoid risking his life whenever possible. But the system of values around him is so skewed that this approach seems to be the only truly moral stance he can take. In a world where life itself is so undervalued and so casually lost, it is possible to redefine heroism as simple self-preservation.

At the beginning of the novel, Yossarian is in the hospital. He is tired of flying the combat missions. So, he determines not to fly any further bombing combat missions. When they nearly finish the mission fixed for the squadron, Colonel Catchcart increases more again. That's why he goes to hospital and requests Doc Daneeka to ground him and send back to States. There should match two conditions for grounding the soldier: firstly, he/she should be finished the given number of missions and secondly, he/she should be physically unable to fight. So, he goes to the

hospital and pretends as if he is insane. Sometimes, he tells he has pain on appendix and problem on liver and some other times he says he sees 'everything twice' like other patients who suffer from this problem. But after the doctor's check up, they seem all false. In this way, he lies whatsoever and whenever possible. His purpose throughout the novel is just to escape from the war. He expresses his rage with the men around him.

He is self centered that he always thinks for himself. He fights just to save him not to the others around him or for the nation. He damns the prevailing tradition of the army that he stands on medal distributing ceremony nakedly and loves to roam on the same manner. He flirts with the prostitutes and even a nurse as if they are inhuman. He converses nonsensical and illogical way with other men. On the same way, other minor characters behave on crazy manner. Havermeyer shoots tiny field mice every night with huge bullets from the .45. Doc Daneeka hates to fly. He feels imprisoned in an airplane. Hungry Joe always tries to capture pictures of naked girls. Major Major loves to sign on the name of Washington Irving instead of his own. He doesn't want to visit the people at his office. Aarfy rapes the girl and kills her. In this way, all the characters show the un-heroic characteristics. The protagonist of the novel John Yossarian loves himself and always thinking to save himself than the other.

Yossarian is a protagonist, who is preserved on unheroic culture. He is just what Abrams said, "Self-centered". Abrams emphasizes the selfishness as vital characteristics of the antihero when he says, "Instead of manifesting largeness, dignity, power, or heroism, the antihero is petty, ignominious, passive or dishonest" (11).

Therefore, the present study attempts to analyze this text with the help of theoretical modalities taken from the concept of antihero.

3.2 Self-Centrism

Self-centrism refers to the state in which a person gives priority to oneself at each and every decision. When one talks about self-centrism, it refers to that sort of behaviour which is oriented towards the self. Self centered man does not care for others' pains and pleasures, and only thinks of what pleases and pains him. Yossarian gives priority to himself, rather than his superiors, colleagues, girls and the nation. Therefore, he is a self-centered man. Yossarian does not want to fly more missions. At the last chapter of the novel, Danby persuades Yossarian to fly and says, "This is not World War One. You must never forget that we're at war with aggressors who would not let either one of us live if they won" (445). He ignores it and tells, "Don't talk to me about fighting to save my country. I've been fighting all along to save my country. Now I am going to fight a little to save myself. The country's not in danger anymore, but I am" (446). He further says:

The Germans will be beaten in a few months. And Japan will be beaten a few months after that. If I were to give up my life now, it wouldn't be for my country. It would be for Catchcart and Korn. So I'm turning my bombsight in for the duration. From now on I'm thinking only of me. (446)

When Danby asks him not to go to Rome escaping from responsibilities, and he will be alone and live in danger of betrayal, he says, "I'm not running away from my responsibilities. I'm running to them. There's nothing negative about running away to save my life" (451). Danby also suggests him to ask the colonel, but he rejects it outright. "Let the bastards thrive, for all I care, since I can't do a thing to stop them but

embarrass them by running away. I've got responsibilities of my own now, Danby. I've got to get to Sweden" (452).

Doc Daneeka narrates the story about Havermeyer and Yossarian. According to him both of them are leading bombardiers: the first one never missed and the second one is demoted because he damn cares whether he missed or not. He argues, "He had decided to live forever or die in the attempt, and his only mission each time he went up was to come down alive" (29). When he hears, Colonel Catchcart raised the number of missions to fifty-five, he responds, "Well, I don't have to fly them, I'll go to see Major Major [...] then I'll go back into the hospital" (65). On the same way, he goes towards Major Major and requests that he doesn't want to be in the war anymore. When Major Major asks, "Would you like to see our country lose?" then he persuasively says, "We won't lose. We've got more men, more money and more material. There are ten million men in uniform who could replace me" (103).

He is ruthless in his love affairs and has no conscience. He flirts with all the prostitutes of the city. Flirting seems as if daily routine of the soldiers because all of them are busy to search and bargain with the city prostitutes. He gives words to marry them during fornication but does never. He flirts with many girls and a nurse as well, but he never tries to know them. During fornication with Luciana, he says, "I will. I'll marry you". She is persuaded and says, "Now I will let you sleep with me" (154). But when Hungry Joe knows it and knocks to take naked scene, Yossarian starts to scold her. He says, "Vite! Vite! Get your things on! [...] Fast! Fast! Can't you understand English? Get your clothes on fast!" (161). In fact, he takes the girls as if they are consumable things like other goods. He does whatsoever to fulfill his desire.

Yossarian is ready to do anything to save his life. At first, he feels pain on his liver and the doctors assumed as if it is 'jaundice' but later on they firmed that it is not

jaundice because if it is jaundice they can cure it. Later on he says, "I think it's my appendix that's bothering me" (176). But when the doctors say if it is bad on his appendix then they can take it out and discharge him. Then he immediately says, "I see everything twice!" (180) like other patients who suffered from this problem. In such way, every time when the doctors find him he is in good health and wants to discharge, he pretends as if he is not well. He does everything to preserve his personal happiness, uses deceptive language to implement his self-centered strategy.

Here, Yossarian is just what Lever said, "escapist". Lever further clarifies the escaping nature of antihero on her book *The Art of Greek Comedy* when she says, "the crafty hero, who escapes from the dangers of war by craft is the first antihero" (19).

3.3 Un-heroic Journey and Misadventures

John Yossarian shows many un-heroic activities throughout the novel. Among them, few will be explained here. From the very beginning of the novel, he is hospitalized to avoid the upcoming fly missions. He lies many times to save his life. Chaplain visits him in the hospital and asks him whether he needs anything there, but in response he says, "Now I'm sorry. I have everything I need and I'm quite comfortable. In fact, I'm not even sick"(13). As the conversation continues, Chaplain wants to know about the condition of Lieutenant Dunbar who is next to his bed, he says, 'No, he isn't very sick. In fact, he isn't sick at all' (14). In fact, nobody loves to be hospitalized if he/she is fine. He lies the doctors saying he is 'insane', having pain on his 'appendix', 'liver' and 'sees everything twice'. These all activities are just pretensions. His motifs to fake are just to save his life which is against the heroic virtues. Initially, he loves to stay undressed. "He felt much better as soon as he was naked. He never felt comfortable in clothes" (143). In the same way, he stays nakedly on the tree like the monkeys during Snowden's funeral. It is true, that every human

born naked, but it is dressed soon after. Because of the human civilization, we cover the body with the clothes. What difference does it make between us and other animals if we do not wear clothes? On the same manner, he stands nakedly to receive medal on the medal distributing ceremony. This conversation is very meaningful here. When General Dreedle surprisingly asks:

"Why aren't you wearing clothes, Yossarian?"

"I don't want to".

"What do you mean you don't want to? Why the hell don't you want to?"

"I just don't want to, sir." (218)

Every personnel feels happy to receive the medals and presents on tiptop manner during the ceremony but his deeds are extraordinary. Medal is the prestige of the person and the glory of the nation. But he gives it to his prostitute Luciana. This is unnatural. In the very sense, he loves to be undressed which is not a heroic act.

Yossarian is not a teenage boy to be shy and emotive at once when he watches a glamorous scene. He is an active veteran to play with city prostitutes but he shows such a childish behavior. General Dreedle's nurse is a beautiful girl, who always gives company to Dreedle. During the army briefing, she is the centre of attraction to the soldiers including Yossarian. She is on her miniskirt. When Yossarian and other soldiers look her glamorous body, he seems as if he is going to be mad. They whisper in a loud voice that the briefing is halted. "Ooooooh," Yossarian moaned a fourth time, this time loudly enough for everyone to hear him distinctly" (220).

In short, Yossarian's activities throughout the novel, are not the acts which heroes normally do. He is a liar, rebellious not only on his squadron but on all the human civilization. And what he does is not for the welfare of others but only for him.

Here, Yossarian is a parody of hero as Hegel in *The Philosophy of Fine Art* defines "antihero is a person, who cannot take personal vengeance, a person who acts for himself" (248).

3.4 Antiheroic Role of other Characters

Not only the role of protagonist of the novel but also other characters' role is anti-heroic. They are all crazy in the sense that they never play heroic role. Major Major doesn't want to see people at his office. He summons Sergeant Towser and said, "From now on, I don't want anyone to come in to see me while I'm here" (98). Their conversation makes us clear that he does not love people to see during office hour. Sergeant Towser further inquires:

What shall I say to the people who do come to see you while you're here?

Tell them I'm in and ask them to wait.

Yes, sir. For how long?

Until I've left.

And then what shall I do with them?

I don't care.

May I send them in to see you after you've left?

Yes. (98)

Hungry Joe on the other hand, loves to take naked picture of the girls as if he is a photographer of renowned magazine rather than the soldier. When Yossarian is busy in flirting with his girl Luciana in his room, Hungry Joe knows it and knocks the door saying he is not Hungry Joe. He says, " Me no Hungry Joe, Me heap big photographer from Life magazine. Heap big picture on heap big cover. I make you big Hollywood star, Yossarian. Multi dinero. Multi divorces. Multi ficky-fick all day

long" (160). During General Dreedle's visit, he is busy on snapping glamorous body structure of his nurse. Doc Daneeka is a doctor by profession, but he ignores to save the people, who are in danger. When Yossarian requests him to save his life, he replies, "It's not my business to save lives... I don't know what my business is" (174). Colonel Catchcart raises the missions one after another. He never thinks the problem of the soldiers. He always thinks for the betterment of his own. He wants profit so that he gives permission to Milo to do his syndicate business freely. He is busy to suppress the soldiers and longing for good position. He summons Chaplain and orders to think about publishing his name on *The Saturday Evening Post*. Doc Daneeka knows that he is dead although he is at hospital. Sergeant Towser informs Colonel Catchcart that Doc Daneeka is dead on the mission because there is his name on the roster list, that McWatt's plane is crashed. When Doc Daneeka is in hospital checking his temperature he says, "Just look how cold I am right now"(341). One of his enlisted man says:

You're dead, sir, that's probably the reason you always feel so cool.

What the hell are you both talking about? Doc Daneeka cried.

It's true, sir, The records show that you went up in McWatt's plane to collect some flight time. You didn't come down in a parachute, so you must have been killed in the crash. (341)

His wife gets the information of the deadening news that her husband has been killed on the mission. She gets thousands of dollars as compensation from different Insurance companies. She writes a letter to her husband to confirm whether its error, but on response, the War Department says:

There had been no error and that she was undoubtedly the victim of some sadistic and psychotic forger in her husband's squadron. The

letter to her husband was returned unopened, stamped KILLED IN ACTION. (342)

In this way, Doc Daneeka is the victim of the irresponsible authority. He is passing corpus although he is alive. When Yossarian is moving towards the place, where Aarfy has raped and killed the girl, he witnesses the bizarre situation during the whole way. He sees 'a man was beating a dog with a stick like the man who was beating the horse with a whip in Raskolnikov's dream'. A woman persuades him not to do like that but the man says, "Mind your own business" (414). A little further, he sees the same kind of scene, that a man is beating a small child 'the man kept knocking him down with hard, resounding open-palm blows to the head, then jerking him up to his feet in order to knock him down again' (415). The child was crying and weeping.

3.5 Failure, Frustration and Anger

John Yossarian, soon to be labeled the Angry young man, who is an unlikely hero-discontented, graceless, exasperated, impatient, and above all suspicious of anything that seems phony. Anger is crucial to Yossarian's survival and sanity, it contains more anarchic fury than he realizes or compromises. The aggression we see so often is a far more dangerous quality than comic justice of Yossarian. On each and every time when he knows Colonel Catchcart has raised the flight mission more than the given to the squadron, he does not control his anger and starts to scream. When Doc Daneeka says Colonel Catchcart has raised the missions to forty then Yossarian feels relief that he has finished almost of them and asks with Daneeka 'Then I can go home, right? I've got forty-eight.' On the meantime, ex-P.F.C. Wintergreen corrects him that he can't go home then his anger bursts and says, "Are you crazy or something" (58)? Similarly, when Yossarian got success to destroy the bridge second

time, he timidly asks with Colonel Catchcart and colonel Korn, "Why don't you give me a medal" (138). In fact, they wanted to destroy the bridge at once. In the hospital as well, he is angry with nurses, doctors, other patients and Chaplain. When Chaplain asks him whether he needs anything then he angrily forces him to request with Major Major to ground him. He asks to Doc Daneeka to ground him as if he is insane, but he ignores then he becomes too much angry. He becomes angry with all the people around him. He is much furious and frustrated person in his squadron. Major Sanderson's remarks to Yossarian, is quotable here. He says, "You're a frustrated, unhappy, disillusioned, undisciplined, maladjusted young man" (302)!

3.6 Catch-22 Situation

Catch-22 is the term applied by Joseph Heller in English literature. It is no-win situation. Most characters are victimized by this term, that they are unhappy by the decision of the authority but they cannot disobey it, they are compelled to fulfill it. There is tense conversation between Yossarian and Doc Daneeka about grounding him and Orr. Doc Daneeka ignores to ground them saying, "Sure there's a catch, Catch-22" (46). He further says:

Orr was crazy and could be grounded. All he had to do was ask; and as soon as he did, he would no longer be crazy and would have to fly more missions. Orr would be crazy to fly more missions and sane if he didn't but if he was sane he had to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn't have to; but if he didn't want to he was sane and had to. (46)

In this way, Doc Daneeka says he is trapped on the rule of catch-22. Yossarian is a tiny creature in the mouth of this clause. He is trapped on this catch-22 situation, so that he either continues the missions or return to home. When Yossarian hears

colonel Catchcart has increased the mission to fifty-five, he says, "Well, I don't have to fly them, I'll go see Major Major... then I'll go back into hospital" (65). This catch-22 situation also appears on love making process of Yossarian with his prostitute. The dialogue between Yossarian and Luciana is interesting on this regard. The dialogue goes:

Why can't you get married ?

Because I am not a virgin, she answered.

What has that got to do with it?

Who will marry me? No one wants a girl who is not a virgin.

I will. I'll marry you.

You won't marry me because I'm crazy, and you say I'm crazy because

I want to marry you? Is that right? (159)

Simply, everybody wants to marry with a girl who is a virgin but at the same time; it is difficult for the prostitute to be virgin. In the same way, When Nately visits a whorehouse searching other friends, a hundred and seven years old man is busied to talk with him. He gives him as prophesy, that American will loss war. He further says:

Rome was destroyed, Greece was destroyed, Persia was destroyed,
Spain was destroyed. All great countries are destroyed. Why not
yours? How much longer do you really think your own country will
last? Forever? Keep in mind that the earth itself is destined to be
destroyed by the sun in twenty-five millions years or so. (243)

Realistically, his idea is true that nothing will remain in constant on the phase of time and will sure loss its structure. No one always remains on power. The old man feels he is trapped on catch-22 situation that he is pro-Americans now, but it is his compulsion:

But I live like a same one. I was a fascist when Mussolini was on top, and I am an anti-fascist now that he has been deposed. I was frantically pro-Germans when the Germans were here to protect us against the Americans, and now that the Americans are here to protect us against the Germans I am frantically pro-Americans. I can assure you, my outraged young friend- that you and your country will have no more loyal partisan in Italy than me- but only as long as you remain in Italy.

(245)

The old man gives philosophical ideas about the futility of wars. Nobody wins the war. War is not fruitful for the human beings. He gives emphasis on the futility of war. He further presents the bitter fact of the wars. He says, "The real trick lies in losing wars...Italy has been losing wars for centuries, and splendidly we've done nonetheless. France wins wars and is in a continual state of crisis. Germany loses and prospers" (245). His ideas are genuine to give light on the futile nature of war. He is revealing all such ideas because he is trapped on this no win situation. He couldn't go against the US, because they are protecting him and his country. On the other hand, Nately can either go against the old man's view or support it. He is trapped in catch-22 situation that he neither disagrees with the authority nor agrees with the old man. When Yossarian visits on whorehouse at the end of the novel, he is amazed to see the gloomy scene. The old man is dead and the old woman is sobbing. The girls are chased away by the soldiers. Yossarian wants to know the reason why the soldiers chased them away, the old woman replies, "Catch-22". Yossarian is puzzled by the repeated answer of the old woman. She further clarifies:

The soldiers with the hard white hats and clubs. The girls were crying. Did we do anything wrong? They said. The men said no and pushed

them away out the door with the ends of their clubs. 'Then why are you chasing us out?' the girls said. 'Catch-22,' the men said. All they kept saying was 'Catch-22, Catch-22'. (407)

So, the girls are also victimized by the catch-22 phrase. Although they can run the whorehouse, they are chased away. Not only these short listed characters but all of the characters of the novel are clinging on this catch-22 situation. Havermeyer is trapped on this situation and shot tiny field mice on his outrage. Doc Daneeka is trapped in this situation and can not ground Yossarian. Aarfy is trapped on this situation he rapes the girl and kills her inhumanly. Yossarian is trapped on it and can not continue the missions. Hungry Joe trapped on it and screams on midnight. Major Major is trapped on it and does not want to visit people on his office when he is in. In such way, every character is trapped on this situation and they can not take further action. There is no further progression; it is because of the catch-22.

3.6 Illogical Structure and Use of Debased Language

There are plenty of un-heroic logics and uses of low level language. We find many vulgar words, sexual jargons, repetition of words and sentences, illogical arguments throughout the novel. Yossarian shows his vulgarity not through his words but also he stands nakedly in public. It is not only his nudity but also his rebellious activity towards authority. The characters speak meaningless sentences. During in the hospital, Yossarian talks with his side patients on a silly way. When a patient talks about Appleby and colonel Catchcart, Yossarian angrily says, "What son of a bitch is here" (19). He thinks somebody is poisoning him, and he wants to hate. The conversation between Yossarian and Clevinger goes like this way:

I'm not going to argue with you, Clevinger decided. You don't know who you hate.

Whoever's trying to poison me, Yossarian told him.

Nobody's trying to poison you.

They poisoned my food twice, didn't they? Didn't they put poison in my food during Ferrara and during the Great Big Siege of Bologna?

They put poison in everybody's food, Clevinger explained.

And what difference does that make? (19)

This dialogue shows how nonsensical conversation do they make. Milo presents the foolish idea that everyone evens a dead man has share in syndicate and get profit. In the same why, there is use of farcical expression on the novel. There is comic expression which goes like this:

Metcalf, is that your foot I'm stepping on?

No, sir. It must be Lieutenant Scheisskopf's foot.

It isn't my foot, said Lieutenant Scheisskopf.

Then may be it is my foot after all, said Major Metcalf.

Move it.

Yes, sir. You'll have to move your foot first, Colonel. It's on top of mine. (77)

How the hellish soldier is he, who does not know somebody is stepping on his foot. There is illogical conversation between Sergeant Towser and Appleby which is meaningless too. They talk:

About how long will I have to wait before I can go in to see the Major?

Just until he goes out to lunch, Sergeant Towser replied. Then you can go right in.

But he won't be there then. Will he?

No, sir. Major Major won't be back in his office until after lunch.

Thank you Sergeant. Will he be back soon?

He'll be back right after lunch. Then you'll have to go right out and wait for him in front till he leaves for dinner. Major Major never sees anyone in his office while he's in his office. (106)

The question here is why Major doesn't want to see people at his office although he is a Major. It is meaningless to the people like Appleby to wait for Major. This conversation is repeated many times on other chapters as well. There is no heroism on the talking between Yossarian and Luciana. Their talks go on this way:

All right, I will dance with you, she said, before Yossarian could even speak, But I won't let you sleep with me.

Who asked you? Yossarian asked her.

You don't want to sleep with me? She exclaimed with surprise.

I don't want to dance with you. (153)

There is vulgar expression during briefing. All the soldiers are crazy looking General Dreedle's nurse's glamorous body structure. Then in rage Dreedle scold to soldiers, "You should see her naked...back at wing she's got a uniform in my room made of purple silk that's so tight her nipples stand out like bing cherries. There isn't room enough for panties or a brassiere underneath" (216).

Gradually, use of dialogue goes on un-heroic ways. On the same way, there is repetition of much conversation. Yossarian requests meaninglessly on same theme to ground him many times with Doc Daneeka, Major Major and Chaplain. There are illogical conversation with prostitutes. Low level words like 'bastard', 'son of bitch', 'hell' etc. are used throughout the novel. All of such activities are against the heroism.

Chapter Four

IV: Conclusion

This research has made attempts to study Yossarian, the protagonist of *Catch-22*, in the light of antihero. The study examines the character traits of Yossarian what he does, how he does and why he does is the central question.

Heller, in most cases, deals with problems of an individual inside the norms of society. Most of the characters of his novels reflect the mood of the people around him. Heller himself was on war during the World War II. Heller indicates Yossarian to stress on his characteristics motive and the society in which he has to act. The American authority was happy to fight although the public like Heller was against it. In the interview with Kathi A. Vosevich, he favors Yossarian more than other characters. Heller further says, "My favorite character in *Catch-22*? It would have to be Yossarian because he is central character, and he is also not a person I approve of uncritically" (Conversation). Yossarian stands against the authority, which is impossible in the army culture. He hates to fight with the enemies. He hates colonel Catchcart and Korn for their inhuman behaviors with the soldiers. He hates the people surrounding him. But he does not expose his hatred with the senior staff; rather he shares with his colleagues. He is very coward and incompetent in his behavior. He loathes his duty, and all the social norms which a human being has to do. He is equipped with nothing better. He is a frustrated angry man. At last, when he moves to Sweden to save his sister is not heroism. It is his act of running away from the squadron. This underscores his irresponsibility and timidity. Heller himself agrees the antiheroic qualities of Yossarian. During the interview, he stands in the favour of antihero. On the question whether Yossarian is a hero or antihero, he further says, "I'd

say yes to both. Yossarian has heroic qualities, but he acts anti-heroically as well" (Conversation).

Yossarian is a wanderer like a picaro or rogue. Heller gives him major role, but he never puts it in action. Much of the comedy can be derived from his action. He tries to fake the doctors saying he is suffered from many types of illness. He is consistent to type, status, rank and character traits. His journey from flying mission to hospital is the journey from light to dark. The soldier in the flying mission has to fight and save the nation rather than to remain on the hospital. He is very selfish in his action. He doesn't care his profession nor is he accountable to professional obligations. He moves to hospital and persuades Doc Daneeka to ground him although he is in good health. He does not care his profession. All of his actions simply justify his self-centeredness and in accountability that his responsibility towards the self is more important than towards that the society, community and nation. Even though does not take undue advantage from the nation, he has been always conflicting upon tiny incidents and trivial subject matters. He is inwardly and comically at odds with artistic and social-culture of his elders. He perpetrates a succession of fakery, irritable and deceptions to the people around him. He is frustrated and infuriated by established traditional values. His social status as an outsider is lonely and boring. He says, "From now on I'm thinking only of me" (446). He feels as a helpless victim of his seniors, when they force him to continue the mission.

In the meantime, he gets succession to fake the doctors at first, but at last, it proves, he is in good health. The proof is for the authority than his personal desire. Therefore, Yossarian, at the end, enters into the same culture which he used to hate. He is compelled to continue the mission.

Yossarian's thoughts are narrow; he defines the relationship on the basis of personal benefit. His decision to prolong his stay in hospital is just for his personal satisfaction. It is against the professional integrity of the army and the interest of the nation. He does not believe on fighting to save the country. Therefore, he is simply not a hero material. He does not stand up enough to be a hero. He is an antihero charting his social gaffs, cultural philistinism, inept relationships and crawling to superiors.

Yossarian seems malicious, mean, envious, and scum in his activities, who chronicles the misadventures and soon finds out that his interest is not to fight as a soldier. He flirts with prostitutes, loves to be naked, and combines with disrespect for the traditional army system and human life. He is not particularly dedicated to his job, having taken it because he feels that he would be no use as a soldier, having made a particularly bad impression he is concerned about being killed, he has been frustrated and humiliated. He evaluates his profession as a bundle of frustration. In course of the novel, he is always unhappy, frustrated and unsuccessful. At the end, he fulfills his wishes to run to Sweden but it does not measure merit.

Yossarian's character is far from being simple. He mocks the authority, superiors and humanism, but he himself is not free from mockery. For him, it is self mockery, and demonstrates his critical attitude towards himself. Slowly and relentlessly he develops himself into an unforgettably odious character. He does nothing good for himself and more importantly to others.

He is all the time clueless and subtly hilarious. He is a captain and his duty is to save the nation. He mostly does not know what he is doing, and often falls into embarrassing situation, escaping just in the nick of time.

Heller's trick to use the term catch-22, plays the vital role throughout the novel. All the characters are clinging to it. No character shows heroic acts in the novel. They are all crazy and do not fulfill their duty properly. They perform unheroic acts, which are neither for themselves nor for others. Their role is self-centered.

Yossarian is solely an antihero as evident in his actions, attitudes and intentions. His philistine values, selfishness, tricks and vain glory make him unappealing. Therefore, he is truly an antihero.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. New Delhi, India: Hartcourt Asia Pvt. Ltd., 1999.
- A.J. Close. "Introduction to Don Quixote". *Don Quixote*. London: David Campbell Publisher Ltd., 1991.
- Bromberd, Victor. In *Praise of Antiheroes: Figures and Themes in Modern European Literature (1830-1890)*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999.
- Brustein, Robert. "The Logic of Survival in a Lunatic World". *Critique*. 13 Nov. 1961:13-21.
- Butcher, S.H. *Aristotle's Theory of Fine Arts*. New York, Dover Publication, 1951.
- Cook, Albert. *The Dark Voyage and the Golden Mean: A Philosophy of Comedy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Craig, David M. "From Avignon to Catch-22." *War, Literature and the Arts*. 6 (Fall-Winter 1994): 27-54.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1979.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Moll Flanders*. Britain: Penguin Books Ltd., 1994.
- Faolain, Sean O'. *The Vanishing Hero*. Bostani: Little Brown, 1956.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *The Philosophy of Fine Arts*. London: G. Bells and Sons, 1920.
- Heller, Joseph. *Catch-22*. New York: Simon, 1961.
- Kiley, Frederick, and Walter Mcdonald. *On Translating Catch-22 into a Movie, A Catch-22 Casebook*, Eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973.
- Kiley, Frederick, and Walter Mcdonald. *A Catch-22 Casebook*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973.

- Lamont, Rosette C. "From Hero to Anti-hero". *The Literary Imagination*. IX, 1 (Spring 1977). 65-73.
- Leon F. Seltzer. *Absurdity as Moral Insanity in Catch-22*, Boston: G. R. Hall & Co., 1984.
- Lever, Katherine. *The Art of Greek Comedy*. London: Methuen, 1956.
- Merrill, Robert. Joseph Heller. *Twayne's United States Authors Series*. Boston: Twayne, 1987.
- Miller, S. *The Picaresque Novel Cleveland: Case Western*. London: Reserve University Press, 1907.
- Mitchell, Julian. "Catch-22 and the Iliad". *Spectator*. 15 June 1962:309-346.
- Morton, Gurewitch, *Comedy: The Irrational Vision*. (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1975.
- Muste, John H. "A Modest Proposal and Catch-22". *Critique*. Fall, 1962:22-61.
- Ruland, Richard, and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Seed, David. *The Fiction of Joseph Heller: Against the Grain*. New York: St. Martin's, 1989.
- Scotto, Robert M. *Three Contemporary Novelists: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland, 1977.
- Seiden, Melvin. "Yossarian as Anti-Hero". *The Nation*. 18 Nov. 1961: 408-9.
- Thorslev, Peter L. *The Byronic Hero. Types and Prototypes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962.
- Vosevich, Kathi A. *Conversations with Joseph Heller*. New York, 1997.
- Walsh, P.G. *The Roman Novel*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1970.