Tribhuvan University

Discourse in Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

By

Chakrapani Pathak

University Campus

Kirtipur

February 2007

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Approval Letter

This thesis submitted to the Central Department of English Tribhuvan University, by Chakrapani Pathak, titled "Discourse in Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*" has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

_____ _____
Internal Examiner

_____

_____

_____ _____
External Examiner

_____

_____ _____
Head
Central Department of English

_____

_____

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of the Central Department of English, for his infinite scholarly guidance, inspiring suggestions and providing materials to prepare this thesis.

I am grateful to Dr. Shreedhar Lohani, Dr. Arun Gupto and Dr. Sanjeev Upreti who encouraged me providing unfathomable suggestions.

I am equally indebted to my respected teachers Dr. Sangita Rayamajhi, Mr. Puspa Acharya, Mr. Dipak Shrestha and others who, explicitly or implicitly, always inspired me for the completion of the study. Similarly, I am thankful to Saru who prevented me from being too late to submit this thesis.

I express my thanks to my parents Megh Prasad and Parbati Pathak, brothers Kamal and Tara, sisters Kala, Saraswati and Jeevan and relatives who helped me to keep patience on the procedure of thesis writing.

Words fail to express my deeper gratitude to my nearest and dearest friends Suraj Panth, Sarita Gautam, Hari Poudel, Krishna Gautam and others who are in touch and out of touch with me. Words again fail to describe my thanks to my Mama Bharat Raj Bhoosal.

I owe much to British Council – Lainchaur, American Center – Durbar Marg, Central Library and Department Library – Kirtipur from where I collected materials to complete the thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Deepak and Narayan Basnet of Resunga Computer Service, Kirtipur for their technical support.

Kirtipur, Kathmandu Chakrapani Pathak

February 2007

0Abstract

Presenting pre – and post revolutionary Russia, Boris Pasternak's historical novel *Dr. Zhivago* portrays the picture of a doctor, poet and philosopher whose life is eventually destroyed by various discourses and counter-discourses practiced by monolithic state and its agencies. Yearning for the betterment of society and family, protagonist Yury Zhivago experiences war and revolutions the state faces but loses all of his hopes and beloved ones and achieves nothing more than utter poverty and death on the street. Thus, Yury loses his pursuit of freedom, individuality and becomes a victim of power exercise.

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

Pasternak, His literary Devotion and Russian Political Upheaval

"You may not be interested in war, but war is interested in you."

– Leon Trotsky

Russian literature is mainly developed from the late eighteenth century as the country's social and political conscience. Repeatedly since then, writers have reworked key historical events and relived tragic political epochs. Their constant question is : how should we live? The burning desire for social reform and speculation about Russia's identity and future tends to be expressed in literary works.

Revolution as a theme bursts upon Russian literature with the beginning of the twentieth century. Boris Pasternak is one of the most noted literary figures of the twentieth century Russia. He began his literary activity in 1913, was born in Mosco in 1890. As an author, Pasternak began as a futurist. His individualistic and anti-social tendencies have earned him unpopularity with the orthodox followers of communism.

With the publication of his poems in *My Sister, Life* (1922) Pasternak gained self-confidence. After the WW II he was forced to turn to literary translation in order to make a living without the risks and compromises of producing politically acceptable original works. His translations of Shakespeare's plays, as well as poetry from many languages are a significant part of the Russian literary heritage. At the same time he wrote his most popular novel *Doctor Zhivago* (1957) which was largely responsible for Pasternak's receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1958. He refused it because of government's threat but was awarded posthumously to his son in 1987.

Pasternak was expelled from Writers' Union in which he had been a member since 1932. No writer who did not belong to the Union could make money as a writer

or translator or published any literary work. Harassed by former friends, colleagues, attacked in published letters and articles which Pasternak and his family experienced must have heavily contributed to his death in 1960.

Pasternak studied philosophy at the Marburg University in Germany and returned to Moscow in 1913. During World War I he worked as a private tutor, librarian and at a chemical factory in the Ural mountains. Due to a leg injury he did not serve in the army. The journey to the Urals gave him material for *Doctor Zhivago.* Although Pasternak was horrified by the brutality of the new government, he supported Revolution. His parents and sisters migrated to Germany in 1921, but he remained in Russia and was fascinated with the new ideas and possibilities the revolution had brought to life.

With the books *Above the Barriers* (1917) and *My Sister Life* (1922) he gained fame as a prominent new poet. In the early 1920s he wrote autobiographical and political poetry and some short stories which were collected in *The Childhood of Luvers* (1922). *Safe Conduct* (1930) was his memoir.

From the mid-1920s Pasternak moved away from personal themes and focused his attention to the meaning of revolution. He began to study historical and moral problems. When the Writers' Union increasingly imposed on the doctrine of socialist realism, he gradually ceased to produce original work. Socialist themes did not attract Pasternak who was interested in ethical-philosophical issues.

In the 1930s and 40s Pasternak's works did not gain the favour of authorities and they were not printed. In 1954, the soviet literary journal *Znamya* published his lyrics under the title "Poems from a Novel" where the novel referred to *Doctor Zhivago.* His last complete book of poetry was *When the Weather Clears* (1959). He

began *The Blind Beauty*, a play about an enslaved artist during the period of serfdom in Russia, but fell ill with lung cancer before he would complete it.

Doctor Zhivago was rejected by the Soviet journal *Novye Mir* and it was first published in Russian and in Italian translation in Italy in 1957. English translation appeared in 1958. Pasternak's disagreement with Soviet communism was not political but rather based on his aesthetic views. He couldn't fully accept official literary doctrines developed from a theory of class struggle but followed his own principles.

Although Pasternak initially welcomed the Bolshevik Revolution, the brutality of new government came to horrify him. *Aerial Ways* (1924) is his collection that showed his growing disregard for politics as a primary human and artistic concern. Lenin's new government maintained that art should motivate political change while Pasternak insisted that art should focus on eternal truths rather than historical or societal issues.

After the death of Lenin in 1924 Stalin emerged as a successor to Lenin. By 1932, the doctrine of Socialist Realism, the principle that the arts should glorify the ideals of communism, was established. Independent artistic groups were disbanded in 1932 and the new Union of Soviet Writers assumed control of literary affairs, imposing adherence to socialist realism.

Like many Russian intellectuals of his time, Pasternak lived a life of fear and insecurity. As a poet in Post-revolutionary Soviet Russia, he had to walk a very delicate line between obeying the dictates of the all-encompassing State and those of his own artistic conscience.

Pasternak portrays life as shaped less by man and his actions than by the deeper currents of love, faith and destiny. This was against the prevailing notion of Lenin and the Bolsheviks which saw human life in socialist terms of revolution. The

authorities did not allow his works to be published for many years because of his failure to 'embrace' social issues.

Yet he managed to make his living by translating the work of Goethe, Shakespeare and other poets into Russian . After the end of World War II, he began to write his masterpiece *Doctor Zhivago*. It was not published in Russia until 1988. Here is an irony that one can take solace in the fact that this brave novel lived a longer life than did Bolshevism in Russia. Cicero and Petrarch have famously pronounced it and Pasternak himself is a living proof: ars longa, vita brevis (life is short but art is lasting).

Pasternak's poetic appearance was *Twin in the Storm clouds* (1913). Though influenced by topical urban, symbolist and futurist elements, his early poetry was distinguished by its alliteration, rhyme, rhythm and use of metaphor. He wrote *Themes and Variations* in 1917. *Second Birth* is a collection of love poems that addressed a change in Pasternak's personal life. In 1927 he published *Nineteen Five* and *Lieutenant Schmidt*, collection of poems. *Second Birth* and autobiography *Safe Conduct* (1931) were his last original works before the state forbade him to publish, considering his work contrary to the aims of communism. During World War II he published two new poetry collections, *On Early* (1942) and *The Terrestrial Expanse* (1945). By the time Pasternak came to plan and write *Doctor Zhivago,* it had become obvious to him that the revolution which had seemed to promise high hopes had developed under Stalin into a soulless tyranny.

Short Summary of *Doctor Zhivago*

Doctor Zhivago is difficult to summarize. It starts from the year 1903.The central figure Doctor Yury Zhivago (Yura/Yury) is introduced when he is ten at the death of his mother. His father, a rich industrialist, commits suicide through the

malign influence of his lawyer Komarovsky. The boy is brought up in the Gormeko family. During this time Zhivago finds his call to poetry and decides to become a doctor. Simultaneously, Lara Guishar is seduced in her teens by Komarovsky and she marries Pasha Antipov. Zhivago qualifies as a doctor, falls in love with Tonya, marries her and they have a child. Yura leaves them to serve as a medic in the war.

Pasha Antipov, who became disenchanted with Lara, enlists in the army. His group is cut of behind enemy lines and Lara becomes a nurse in order to look for him. He is presumed dead, but is actually a prisoner of the Germans. During World War I Yura meets Lara and they feel attracted to one another but can't express it. Throughout the story Yura and Lara are repeatedly separated.

As the war ends, Yura returns home to Moscow and to his old job at the hospital, his co-workers are suspicious of him. Influenced by Bolshevism, they dislike his use of intuition instead of logic. He moves with his family to Urals after the 1917 Revolution to escape the famine and the communists as the Marxists rebellions are breaking out. Throughout the journey to Urals Yura sees the suffering peasants and prisoners caused by the Russian Revolution. Yura shares the period's desire for equality and freedom but is disenchanted by the pedantic opinions of revolutionaries.

The family safely arrives in the Urals and sets up a farm. Yura manages time in writing poetry. While visiting the local library, he re-encounters Lara. They begin an affair, sharing a common joy in a fully-lived existence. Yura decides to tell his wife Tonya about his unfaithfulness and to ask forgiveness but as he rides home he is kidnapped by a group of rebels (Bolshevik Partisan), fighting in the Russian civil war, and forced to serve as their doctor. Yura spends many years in their forest camp then one day escapes and walks back to where he stayed with Lara. Lara still lives there. Meanwhile his family has returned to Moscow. Lara has discovered that her husband

was not killed, but has returned from the prison camp and taken a pseudonym, Strelnikov. He is a major figure in the new government. Though shortly stayed in Lara's town, he does not visit her or his daughter, resolving to finish the task he has set himself first.

Lara and Yura live together but find out that they are suspected by the villagers. They flee to the farm house where Yura and his family once lived. Yura turns to his poetry, expressing his fears, courage and love for Lara. One night, Lara's old lover Komarovsky appears. He tells them that the revolutionaries know where they are and will kill them both. He offers to take them abroad. Yura does not want to leave Lara and longs to see his family but refuses to accept help from Komarovsky. To save Lara's life he tells her that he will follow her and Komarovsky, but remains behind. Alone, he turns to drink.

One night Lara's husband Pasha arrives and learns how much Yura and Lara love each other. Disillusioned with the Revolution and Lara, he leaves the house and shoots himself. Yura, a broken man, returns to Moscow in 1922 and attempts to start a new life. There he becomes a writer of literary booklets. His brother finds him a job at a hospital, but as he takes the trolley for his first day at work, he dies in the street in 1929. Lara reappears accidentally where his body lies waiting burial. Zhivago's friends collect his poetry. Lara is crushed, but helps his brother compile Yura's writing. The story ends with a short epilogue occurring after World War II, in which Zhivago's old friends contemplate the fate of their country.

For Yura Zhivago, philosophy, literature and medicine are all parts of the same thing. They all are spaces in which he can express his love and respect for the beauty of life. In all these spheres, he is undogmatic, irrational but wholly devoted to justice. He emphasizes sensory experience over dogmatism or logical argument.

Characters are lost only to appear again. All people and events seem tied together at a fundamental level. The disregard for the war and the revolution seems only interruptions of a far vaster programme. Nevertheless, the interruption is enough to kill Yura.

Critical Review

Doctor Zhivago is a historical novel that portrays pre-and post revolutionary Russia. It covers the 1905 revolution, the 1917 revolutions and the civil war of 1918-1921. It ends with an epilogue in the 1940s. Pasternak challenged the official history of the period and provided a different perspective on the Russian revolution and civil war in the form of a novel. First accepted and then rejected in Russia, the novel appeared in an Italian translation in 1957. Pasternak was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1958 which he had to refuse. These events provoked a storm of criticism of Pasternak, who was expelled from Writers' Union.

Gerald Carpenter, in *American Film,* perceives the novel as "a love story, a historical novel" (61). Like Carpenter, Lesley Chamberlain focuses on the literary mode. He argues "Boris Pastenak's *Dr. Zhivago* (1957) is a great love-story and poetic meditation set in divided and famine stricken Russia" (88).

People Weekly emphasizes autobiographical and revolutionary aspects of the novel asserting "Neither prison walls nor the winds of communism were enough to diminish the love between author Boris Pasternak and his mistress, Olga Ivinskaya. Today, their love lives in *Doctor Zhivago,* a novel of the Bolshevik Revolution" (137).

In the introduction of *Doctor Zhivago* John Bayley summarizes the responses of critics who circle around the aspect of sentimental romance and love story:

> Vladimir Nabokov [. . .] poohpoohed the novel. For him it was a piece of muddled and sentimental romance ill-advisedly composed by a man who was a talented poet. [. . .] Nabokov's deprecation of *Doctor Zhivago* is none the less significant, because it concentrated on what might vulgarly be called 'the love-interest' in the novel, the interest that was of course seized upon by the makers of the film. (xxi)

What seemed mere sentimentality to Nabokov could seem to other critics a deeply moving love story as Stuart Hampshire calls it "one of the most profound descriptions of love in the whole range of modern literature" (qutd. in Bayle, xxi).

Dmitri Likhachov analyses *Doctor Zhivago* not only as novel but also as "what we have here is a particular kind of autobiography–one in which external facts corresponding to the authors actual life are quite surprisingly absent" (30).

The central characters Yury Zhivago is understood to be semi autobiographical and perhaps he is intended to convey Pasternak's own ambivalence about the role he had played by remaining in Soviet Union and continuing to work. The novel glorifies the life of the physician and poet "Zhivago, like Pasternak's own, is closely identified with the exalted and tragic upheavals of 20th– century Russia" (Columbia Encyclopedia, 2083).

Good Fiction Guide emphasizes on the heroic nature of Zhivago and his embodiment of life force in opposition to ideology of monolithic state. It sates:

> Zhivago is a particularly Russian hero [. . .], his task to celebrate life through poetry. Restlessly seeking after truth, his rebellion is one of peace through the example of his own life and work. He embodies the life force as opposed to blind ideology and the life-denying powers of the monolithic state. (388)

The novel is also seen as an 'epic of wandering, spiritual isolation, and love amid the harshness of the Russian Revolution and its aftermath" (Encyclopedia of Literature, 862).

Sometimes referred as poetic prose, *Doctor Zhivago* includes poetry by Yury. Andrei Navrozov describes Pasternak's skill in handling poetic style that his:

> literature which invites comparison with Shakespeare in English; if the place of 'Russian Shakespeare' is permanently reserved for Puskin, it can only be said that the English equivalent of Pasternak is yet to appear, like Shakespeare, Pasternak transformed the existing poetic vocabulary. (28)

According to Likhachov, Yury Zhivago, the protagonist of the novel, is an individual who was meant to be fully sensible of his era without intervening in it. The prime mover of he novel is the elemental force of revolution and the events of the "October Revolution enter Yury Zhivago just as nature itself enters him . . . What is Russia for Zhivago? It is the entire world around him" (32).

Thus, for Likhachov, Zhivago is acted upon by revolution and other elements of nature rather than acting himself. The protagonist does not affect it or even try to affect it. He does not intervene in the course of events and he serves to whom he falls captive.

Above mentioned critics have viewed *Doctor Zhivago* as historical romance, love story, autobiographical account, sentimental romance, poetic meditation. Some of them pointed out Pasternak's poetic skill and others on the passive nature of Yuri Zhivago. Only few of them talked about the revolution and power of monolithic state. But they are all silent about how monolithic state with its discursive practices destroys the individual –Yury Zhivago.

Thus, the researcher's intention is to depart from all the above studies and to demonstrate the novel as an indicator of discursive practices in monolithic state that makes the protagonist a helpless creature. To excavate discursive practices which limit individual freedom, Foucauldian notion of power and discourse is taken as theoretical tool which will be helpful in analyzing the text.

Chapter Two

Foucault and New Historicism: Theoretical Framework

New Historicism emerged in the early 1980s as a turn to history in literary studies after the formalism of New Criticism, structuralism and deconstruction. New historicism represents a sustained negotiation of the complex cultural, textual and political forces which intervene between the past and the present. The question of how to interpret the meanings of the past while respecting their differences leads, therefore, to more complex consideration of power as language, culture and ideology that come into conflict with one another.

New Historicism is anti-establishment, and always implicitly on the side of liberal ideals of personal freedom. It is also in the side of accepting and celebrating all forms of difference and deviance. At the same time it sees power of the repressive State that reveals and penetrates the most intimate areas of personal life. This notion of the State as all-powerful and all-seeing comes up from the post-structuralist cultural historian Michel Foucault. Peter Barry describes Foucault:

> whose pervasive image of the State is that of 'panoptic' (meaning 'all-seeing') surveillance. The panopticon was a design for a circular prison conceived by the eighteenth century utilitarian Jeremy Bentham: the design consisted of tiered ranks of cells which could all be surveyed by a single warder positioned at the center of the circle. The panoptic State, however, maintains its surveillance not by physical force and intimidation, but by the power of its 'discursive practices' (to use Foucault's terminology—'discursive' is the adjective derived from the noun 'discourse') which circulates its ideology throughout the body politic. (2002:175-6)

New Historicism is an American counterpart of British Cultural Materialism. Though the two movements belong to the same family, there is an ongoing family quarrel between them. The new historicist situates the literary text in the political situation of its own day, while the cultural materialist situates it within that of present. The difference between these two approaches is:

> . . . partly the result of their different intellectual frameworks. New historicism was much influenced by Foucault whose 'discursive practices' are frequently a reinforcement of dominant ideology. Cultural materialism, on the other hand, owes much to Raymond Williams, whose 'structures of feeling' contain the seeds from which grows resistance to the dominant ideology (ibid:186)

New historicism borrows different works in cultural history, Marxism, psychoanalysis, theory of language and semiotics. The key influence behind this approach to literature is the French historicist of discourse Michel Foucault. Duncan Salkeld in 'New Historicism' summarizes Foucault as:

> Foucault argued, in studies of the histories of madness, medicine, representation, punishment and sexuality, that socially organizing vocabularies ('discourses') voiced and guaranteed by powerful institutions, have constituted the body of knowledge which constitutes western subjectivity. (2001:61)

Foucault argues that those masterful discourse operative throughout history denied a voice to socially rejected – the mad or the criminals. Discourse is not just a way of speaking or writing, but the whole mental set and ideology which encloses the thinking of all members of a given society. It is not singular and monolithic. Barry further writes "Foucault's work looks at the institutions which enable this power to be

maintained, such as State punishment, prisons, the medical profession and legislation about sexuality" (176).

Discourse, Power, Truth, Knowledge, Subjectivity: Complex Network

Since this research is mainly concerned with Foucauldian ideas related to power, truth, knowledge, discourse subjectivity and governmentality it is necessary to understand his concepts about the terms.

'Discourse' is a term widely used in analysing literary and non-literary texts. It has become common currency in a variety of disciplines: critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many others. Foucault has used widely the term 'discourse' in his discussions of power, knowledge and truth. Discourse, for him, is the "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak". (1972:49). In this sense, a discourse is something which produces something else such as utterance, concept, an effect rather than something which exists in itself and which can be analysed in isolation.

Foucault's influence in literary theory has been strong among revisionist literary historians known as "new historicists" who study the circulation of power through society and the literary texts that are part of it.

Truth, power and knowledge are essential in analyzing discourse for discourse has effects through these elements. Foucault sees truth as being something far more worldly and more negative:

> Truth is of the world: it is produced there by virtue of multiple constraints [. . .] Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is the types of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true; the mechanism and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which each is

> sanctioned; the techniques and procedures which are valorized for obtaining truth: the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (1979:46)

Truth for Foucault, is therefore not something essential to an utterance nor is it an ideal abstract quality but is something which societies have to work to produce. Discourses do not exist in a vacuum but are in constant conflict with other discourses and other social practices which inform them over a question of truth and authority.

The role of power is of great importance in discussion of discourse for discourses are produced as the dominant and marginal: respectively which are supported by social institutions, State and which are not supported.

Unlike Marxist theorists who have assumed that power relations are determined by economic relation, Foucault's attempt can be summed up as the range of practices under the term 'power'. Foucault is critical of the repressive power which prevents someone from carrying out their wishes and limiting people's freedom. His analysis of power is that it is dispersed throughout social relations. Power produces possible forms of behaviour as well as restricting behaviours. Thus power is not always repressive but productive as well.

For Foucault, power is never monolithic. Power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also of resistance. Such sites of resistance are of variable configuration and intensity:

> Resistance [. . .] can only exist in the strategic field of power relations. But this does not mean that they are only a reaction or rebound, forming with respect to the basic domination an underside that is in the end always passive, doomed to perpetual defeat.[. . .] It is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a

> revolution possible, somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. (History 1:95-6)

This flexible conception of power relations acknowledges revolutionary social transformations and other possible modalities of power and resistance. Foucault attempts to rethink the nature of modern power in a non-totalizing, non-representational way. He rejects all modern theories that see power to be anchored in macro structures or ruling classes and to be repressive in nature. He develops new post-modern perspectives that interpret power as dispersed, indeterminate, subjectless and productive that constitutes individual's identities.

Foucault marks power as productive not repressive in nature. Power is "bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them" (1980:136).

This power, for him, operates not through physical forces or representation by law, but through the hegemony of norms and political technologies.

Foucault defines power as "a multiple and mobile field of force relations where far-reaching, but never completely stable effects of domination are produced" (ibid 102). It means that power is relational that is exercised from innumerable points and is indeterminate in character. Power is never something acquired, seized or shared. There is no source or center of power to contest, nor are there any subjects holding it. Power is purely structural activity for which subjects are anonymous by-products. He conceives power as purely fragmentary and indeterminate. His subjectivity is nothing but a construct of domination.

Foucault argues knowledge in relation to power so that all of the knowledge we have is the result or the effect of power struggle. Knowledge is often the product

of the subjugation of objects. He has described this connection between the production of knowledge and power relations as 'power/knowledge'. Knowledge for him is indissociable from the regimes of power. Through practices and technologies of exclusion, confinement, surveillance, disciplines such as psychiatry, sociology and criminology in turn contributed to the development and refinement of new techniques of power. Institutions such as the asylum, hospitals or prison functioned as laboratories for observation of individuals. Thus the modern individual became both an object and subject of knowledge, not repressed but positively shaped and formed within disciplinary mechanisms.

Domination and Resistance

In Foucault's description, power is diffused throughout the social field, constituting individual subjectivities and their knowledge and pleasures. For him, individuals have been caught within a complex web of disciplinary, panoptic powers that survey, judge, measure and correct their every move. Foucauldian power is everywhere and every human relation is to some degree a power relation. This does not mean that there is no way out from the pervasive power. It also does not mean that there is no chance of resistance from domination. As soon as there is power relation, there is possibility of resistance. One can always modify its grip in determinate conditions and according to a precise strategy.

Many theorist of power have seen individuals as oppressed by power relation, but Foucault sees them as the effects of power relation:

> The individual is not to be conceived of as a sort of elementary nucleus [. . .] on which power comes to fasten [. . .]. In fact, it is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures,

> certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals. (1978:98)

The individual here is seen as constituted by power relations and as simply that which is acted upon or oppressed by power. Foucault assumes that the real political task in a society is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent. It also includes criticizing them in such a manner that the political violence which has exercised itself through them can unmask them so that one can fight against them.

In any society discourse is power because the rules determining discourse enforce norms of what is rational, sane or true. And to speak from outside these rules is to risk marginalization and exclusion. All discourses are produced by power, but they are not wholly subservient to it and can be used as "a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy" (1980:101). To describe it plainly, counter-discourses provide background for political resistance.

Foucault claims that the subject is discursively and socially conditioned and situated within power relations. He sees that individuals also have the power to define their own identity, to master their body and desires and to forge a practice of freedom. For him freedom is achieved while one can overcome socially imposed limitations and that is possible only through ethics of self.

Ethics, for Foucault, suggests the struggle of individual against the forces that dominate, subjugate and subjectify them. He characterizes all social relations in terms of power and resistance. And sees domination as the solidification of power relations which becomes relatively fixed and the space of liberty and resistance thus become limited. Foucault describes the ways in which the subject constitutes himself in an active fashion by the practices of the self. These practices are nevertheless not

something that the individual invents by himself. They are patterns that he/she finds in his/her culture, society and social group.

Foucault especially sees modern rationality as a coercive force. He "concentrates on the domination of the individuals through social institutions, discourses, and practices" (Post Modern Theory, 1991:38). Foucault owes much from Nietzsche who "taught (him) that one could write a 'genealogical' history of unconventional topics such as reason, madness, and the subject which located their emergence within sites of domination" (ibid 35). And Nietzsche "demonstrated that the will to truth and knowledge is indissociable from the will to power, and Foucault developed these claims in his critique of liberal humanism, the human science, and in his later work on ethics" (ibid 35).

Foucault's concepts have had a profound impact on various fields. One of the most valuable aspects of his work is to sensitize theorist to the pervasive operation of power and to highlight the problematic aspects of rationality, knowledge, subjectivity and the production of social norms. He demonstrated how power is woven into all aspects of social and personal life.

Following Nietzsche, Foucault questions forms of thought and value such as humanism, self-identity and utopian schemes. Nietzsche showed how the highest values have the lowliest origins, for example, how morality is rooted in immorality and how all values and knowledge are manifestations of the will to power. Foucault exposes the links between power, truth and knowledge. He describes how liberal humanist values are intertwined technologies of domination. Foucault's concept is a powerful critique both of macrotheorist who see power only in terms of class or the State and microtheorist who analyze institutions while ignoring power altogether.

In general, Foucault's archaeological writings tend to privilege discourse over institutions and practices. His genealogical works emphasize domination over resistance and self-formation. He has argued that power breeds resistance.

Literature, Language, Ideology and Discourse

Literature has variously been designated by different theorist as a privileged site of critique or as an arbitrary set of conventions which is learnt to read as literary. Macdonnell puts it:

> The methods and concepts of recent study of discourse make possible an analysis of the discourses, in their relation to institutional practices, through which a division of texts, has been marked out and has been constituted as the object of a certain enshrinement. (1986:7)

The study of discourse does not differentiate between those texts which are designated as literary and those which are designated as non-literary, although discourse theorists are keenly aware of the institutionalized differences that exist between the two sets of texts. Sara Mills explains the complex relation of literary text in providing truth:

> History texts are privileged in their relation to truth; autobiographical writings are privileged in terms of their supposed authenticity in relation to an authorial voice; and literary texts have a complex relation to both truth and value, on the one hand being seen as providing a 'truth' about the human condition, and yet doing so within a fictional and therefore 'untrue' form. (2004:20)

Foucault seems to be characterizing literature as a particular type of self-reflexive writing since he describes literature as "a silent, cautious, deposition of the word upon the whiteness of a piece of paper, where it can posses neither sound nor

interlocutor, where it has nothing to say but itself, nothing to do but shine in the brightness of its being" (1970:300).

Louis Montrose balances the hierarchy of literary and non-literary text characterizing them "a reciprocal concerned with the historicity of texts and the textuality of histories" (New Historicism: 410)

In terms of 'ideology', Marxist-inflected theorists use the term to denote the domination of powerless by powerful one. Marxist views of history and progress tend to lead a fairly clear-cut utopian idea of achieving revolution, remodeling of the economy, an alleviation of oppression of the working class, change of attitude towards consumerism and capitalism. Models of action formulated using discourse tend to formulate complex visions of the future.

Foucault sought to distinguish and distance his work from Marxist thinking though he openly acknowledged his debt to Marxist thought. What is clear is that Marxism and notions of ideology were crucial for him in the development of the notion of discourse.

The notion within ideology of false consciousness assumes that there is a consciousness which is not false, that position is of critique. Traditionally, ideology has referred to the system of ideas, values and beliefs common to any social group. Louis Montrose from Althusser's essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" quotes that "Ideology is a 'Representation' of the imaginary Relationship of Individual to their Real Conditions of Existence" (ibid 396). For Foucault there is no space for critique outside the false consciousness.

Foucault's another distinguishing element between ideology and discourse is the subject. He was concerned to write about the history of ideas without referring to the sovereign subject, the individual. He tried to move away from the notion of the

Cartesian subject–the subject whose existence depends on its ability to see itself as unique and self-contained, distinct from others, because it can think and reason. Foucault tried to formulate a way of examining historical processes without relying on the notion of the subject. Mills writes, "Foucault chose rather to ignore the subject in itself, and concentrate on the processes which he considered to be important in the constitution of our very notion of subjectivity" (30).

An ideological analysis may minimize the importance of the subject because of its concern with groups or classes of individuals and because of its interest in the construction of individual subjectivity through the actions of institutions such as the State. However, an ideological analysis still retains the notion of the individual subject who is capable of resisting ideological pressures and controlling his/her actions. Discourse theory has far more difficulty in locating and describing for this individual subject who resists power.

The third element in Foucault's discussion of the differences between ideology and discourse is the role of the economy. Some Marxists believe that the economic base determines what can be said and thought at particular time. But Foucault saw the relation between economics, social structures and discourses as being a complex interaction with none of the terms of the equation being dominant. While he was very aware of the importance of State control and power relations based on economic imbalance, he did not see economic relations as primary, but as one type of power relation within a range of power relations. Foucault tried to move the analysis of power relations within capitalism away from assuming that certain structures of power and capitalism are the same as Patton comments:

> It is not, perhaps, capitalist production which is autocratic and hierarchised, but disciplinary production which is capitalist. We know

> after all that disciplinary organizations of the workforce persists even when production is no longer strictly speaking capitalist. (1979:124)

Further difference between the conceptions of ideology and Foucault's notion of discourse is the relation of discourse and ideology to notions of power. Foucault asserts, "If power was never anything but repressive, if never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it?" (1979:36). Marxist thought in general seems to characterize power within what Foucault termed the 'repressive hypothesis' that it sees power as negative infringement on someone else's rights. For Marxists power is taken or seized from others and it is viewed as something which one can possess or hold. But Foucault emphasizes on the productive nature of power which produces certain norms, behaviours as well as represses. In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault argues children's sexuality in nineteenth century which aimed to regulate their masturbation but that produced the very sexuality which they were trying to eradicate.

While Marxists theorists tend to stress the importance of the State in the maintenance of power relations and in the distribution of access to the means of the mode of production. And they locate power as a possession within the hands of monolithic State. Instead of this institutional focus, Foucault clarifies, " I don't want to say that the State isn't important; what I want to say is that relations of power [. . .] necessarily extend beyond the limits of the state" (1979: 38) This notion of moving views of power away from a fixation on the state and hence on a top-down model of power is important in a sense that it enables one to see power as a relation rather than a simple imposition. This relation involves more possible role positions than that of master-slave presupposed in the State power model. It also involves an analysis of the

degree of power involved in the relation rather than an assumption that in any power relation there is simply a powerful and powerless participant.

Foucault deals that power circulates through society rather than being owned by one group. Power is a form of action or relation between people which is negotiated in each interaction and is never fixed and stable. He does not minimize the importance of the power of the State, rather suggests that power operates around and through the networks which are generated around the institutions of the State. He is more concerned with the ways in which people negotiate power relations, rather than assuming that the powerful person in an institutionalized relation is in fact all powerful.

Theory of ideology stresses on the overthrow of repressive power relations. The notion of revolutionary subject is central to this process because of the characterization of power as repressive. It is sometimes difficult to understand how subjects can develop a revolutionary consciousness, how they can resist oppression. Foucault argues that resistance is already contained within the notion of power.

Some Marxist theorists have tended to view language as vehicle and people are forced to believe ideas which are not true or not in their interest. But within discourse theory, language is the site where the struggles are acted out as Foucault states, "as history constantly teaches us, discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle" (1981:52-53).

Discourses, for Foucault, are not always subservient to power. Discourses are not also raised up against power for all. Foucault mentions:

> Discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point

> for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. (1978:100-101)

Hence Foucauldian concept of power here is important that enables one to see the complexities of power– that power is not simply an imposition. Discourse sometimes stands to produce power and sometimes stands as starting point against it.

Discursive Structure

Foucault's assertion in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) is that discourses are not simply groupings of utterances grouped around a theme or an issue, nor are they simply sets of utterances which emanate from a particular institutional setting. But they are highly regulated groupings of utterances or statements with internal rules which are specific to discourse itself. Discourses are also regulated by their relation with other discourses. As Julian Henriques puts "rules are not confined to those internal to discourse, but include rules of combination with other discourses, rules that establish differences from other categories of discourses". He further asserts "systematic character of a discourse includes its systematic articulation with other discourses" (cited in Kendall and Wickham: 41). For him discourse is the result of a practice of production which is at once material, discursive and complex. Every discourse is part of a discursive complexity.

Discourse as a whole consists of regulated discourses. Discursive rules and structures do not originate from socio-economic or political factors although they may be shaped by these factors. They are a feature of discourse itself and are shaped by the internal mechanisms of discourse and the relation between discourses. Thus, the study of discourse is not just an analysis of utterances and statements, it is also a

concern with the structures and rules of discourse. Foucault has termed such type of analysis of discursive structures, 'archaeology'. He says that archaeology:

> does not imply the search for a beginning; it does not relate to geological excavation. It designates the general theme of a description that questions the already-said at the level of its existence, of the enuntiative function that operates within it, of the discursive formation, and the general archive system to which it belongs, Archaeology describes discourses as practices specified in the element of the archive. (1972:131)

Foucault's analysis of the structure of discourse is not to uncover the truth or the origin of a statement but to discover the support mechanism which allow it to be said and keep it in place. These support mechanisms are both intrinsic to discourse itself and also extrinsic in the sense that they are socio-cultural. Foucault sets statements in their discursive frameworks. Thus, statements do not exist in isolation since there is a set of structures which makes those statements make sense and gives them their force.

Foucault suggests that discourses structure our sense of reality. He is concerned with the way that discourses inform the extent to which we can think and act only within certain parameters at each historical conjuncture. For him, our perception of objects is formed within the limits of discursive constraints. He characterizes discourse as a "delimitation of a field of objects, the definition of a legitimate perspective for the agent of knowledge, and the fixing of norms for the elaboration of concepts or theories" (1977:199). In this statement we can find three points to be noted: i) discourse causes a narrowing of one's field of vision; ii) the

knower has to establish a right to speak for the existence of discourse; and iii) each statement leads to others.

Discourse constitutes objects for us. That is there is not intrinsic order to the world itself other than the ordering which we impose on it through our linguistic description of it. Foucault puts it:

> We must not imagine that the world turns towards us legible face which we would have only to decipher. The world is not the accomplice of our knowledge; there is no prediscursive providence which disposes the world in our favour. (1981:67)

For this Foucault's position has been criticized because it suggests that objects and ideas are created by humans and institutions and it is this which constitutes reality for us. His position seems to suggest that there is nothing which is non-discursive and outside discourse. But Foucault is not denying that these is a reality which pre-exists humans, nor is he denying the materiality of events and experience. Rather it is simply that the way we have to apprehend reality is through discourse and discursive structures.

Foucault does not consider these structures to be simply the invention of institutions or powerful groups of people, as some Marxist thinkers have suggested in their formulation of the notion of ideology. Nor does he propose that they are abstract and arbitrary. Rather, he considers that there is a combined force of institutional and cultural pressure, together with the intrinsic structure of discourse that leads us to interpret the 'real' through preconceived discursive structures.

Foucault counters the idea of the cultural progression proposed by the European history that sees progression from ignorance to greater truth. European history sees previous stages in relation to the improved present. In such context, he

differs in his thinking from both conservative and Marxist accounts of history for both hold the notion of improvement and progress. For conservatives, greater scientific knowledge brings inevitable improvement to humankind and for Marxist, revolutionary change can only bring about improvement to the conditions of the working classes.

Exclusion within Discourse

Discourse not only operates power, it also excludes some of its dangers. In an article "The Order of Discourse" (1981), Foucault discusses the way that discourse is regulated by institutions in order to defend against its dangers. He describes the processes of exclusion which operate on discourse to limit what can be said and what can be counted as knowledge.

The first of the procedures of exclusion he calls is 'prohibition' or taboo. There are certain subjects which are difficult to discuss within western societies, such as death and sex. Within Victorian Britain, it was very difficult to discuss sex openly and sexual subjects were avoided at all costs within 'polite' society and mixed groups. Some of the cultures which British subjects encountered within the colonial sphere had very different views on sexuality: for example in India, as Macmillan notes:

> some temples had carvings which were obscene (or erotic, depending on your point of view). Memsahibs who went sightseeing were carefully stressed away from them by their escorts; indeed a popular nineteenth century guidebook advised tipping local guides at a particularly notorious temple so that they would not call attention to shocking scenes. (105)

In the basis of power, truth is created in opposite to false which is not counted as truth. Foucault demonstrates that there is will to truth which is supported by a range of intuitions: educational establishment, publishing houses, legal institutions, libraries and so on. For this, exclusion is one of the most important ways in which discourse is produced.

Circulation of Discourse

Foucault remarks that the constitution of discourse has internal as well as external mechanisms which keep certain discourses in existence. The one of the mechanisms is commentary. Those discourses which are commented upon by others are the discourses which we consider to have worth and validity:

> we may suspect that there is in all societies, with great consistency, a kind of gradation among discourses: those which are said in the ordinary course of days and exchanges, and which vanish as soon as they have been pronounced; and those which give rise to a certain number of new speech acts which take them up, transform them or speak of them, in short, those discourses which, over and above their formulation, are said indefinitely, remain said, and are to be said again. (1981:57)

Commentary attributes richness, density and permanence to the text at the very moment when it is creating those values by the act of commentary. The Bible could be considered a text of this nature, upon which commentaries have been written and will continue to be written. In this sense, those commentaries keep the Bible in existence, ensure that it keeps in circulation as legitimate knowledge.

Because of this tendency to work on canonical texts, those texts which have been excluded from the canon tend not to be seen as worthy of analysis. Non-

canonical texts are often not in print and are therefore difficult for the student or researcher to access. Thus, commentary serves not only to ensure that certain texts will always be in print, will always be taught in educational establishments and will always be worked upon by researchers, but also makes it very difficult to legitimize the analysis of those texts about which little has been written.

Another internal regulator of discourse is the notion of the academic discipline. Because of the academic discipline, philosophers, psychologists, linguists and semioticians who are all engaged in the study of the same subject – language – may be largely unaware of each others work. It demarcates certain types of knowledge as belonging to particular domains and also leads to the construction of distinct methodologies for analysis.

The next regulator of discourse is ritualization. Discourse is bound about by rituals which limit the number of people who can utter certain types of utterances: for example, in Nepal, only a priest or lawyer can legally marry a couple. If some one who is not sanctioned uttered the same words, the statement would not have an effect. Thus, an actor who marries someone on stage is not legally married to them. Foucault asks:

> What, after all, is an education system, other than a ritualization of speech, a qualification and fixing of the roles for speaking subjects, the constitution of a doctrinal group, however diffuse, a distribution and an appropriation of discourse with its powers and knowledge. (ibid 64)

Thus Foucault sees education system as a form of regulation of discourse rather than being seen as an enlightening institution where free inquiry after the truth is encouraged.

In analyzing the structures of discourses, Foucault's analysis of the author is also important since the author ceases to be the ratifier of the meaning of the texts, but becomes a form of organization for groups of texts. The author is no longer "the speaking individual who pronounced or wrote a text [. . .] a principle of grouping of discourses, conceived as the unity and origin of their meaning" (ibid 58). It is common tendency that Shakespeare's works are grouped together and discussed in terms of their common stylistic features, even though the authorship of some of the plays and poems is in doubt. Foucault's critique of the author enables us to move away from analyzing texts in terms of the authors life, which for Foucault would be another and different set of texts.

Foucault examines the way that some discourses have authors while for others the concept of authorship is almost irrelevant. A legal document is not authored since its authority comes from the institution, the government who sanctions it, rather than from the individual who wrote and edited it. An advertisement is not authored because it is seen as created by teams of people rather than by single person. But literary texts are categorized as authored texts even though their creative ownership is problematic.

Chapter Three

Practice of Discourse: Hindrance for Achieving Individual Perfection

Dr. Zhivago provides us a gloomy picture of life that is caught up between the complex network of discourses and counter-discourses practiced by the institutions such as hospitals, academies, revolutionary groups, the state and so on. Starting in 1901, with the funeral procession of Yury Zhivago's mother whose "coffin was closed, nailed and lowered into the ground. [. . .]. A mound grew up in it and ten-year-old boy climbed on top" (13), the novel's denouement comes with the death of protagonist Yury, who "tore himself free of the crowd, climbed down from the stationary train into the roadway, took a step, another, a third, fell down on the cobbles and did not get up again" (438). Only remaining are the poems composed byYury Zhivago.

The tragedy here is not because of institutional domination over individual nor is a disobedience of an individual against such institutions but because of imbalance between them or because of uneven power relation between them.

While his mother was alive, Yury did not know that his father had abandoned them "long ago and spent his time wenching and carousing in Siberia and abroad" (14) and he was told that his father was away on business in Petersburg or at one of the big fairs, usually at Irbit. In his early age Yury could remember a time when variety of objects were known by his father's surname. There were "Zhivago factories, a Zhivago bank, Zhivago buildings, a Zhivago tie-pin," but now "suddenly it all vanished" and they "became poor" (15).

After his mother's death Yury is brought up by his Uncle Kolya who shapes his mind. Kolya is a brilliant man who philosophizes:

> The fashion nowadays is all for groups and societies of every sort. — It is always a sign of mediocrity in people when they herd together,

> whether their group loyalty is to Solovyev or Kant or Marx. The truth is only sought by individuals, and they break with those who don't love it enough. (18)

Kolya believes on pursuit of individual freedom that "the two concepts which are the main part of the make-up of modern man – without them he is inconceivable – the ideas of free personality and of life regarded as sacrifice" (19).

For Kolya Jails and punishments are not for moral human being. He asserts that "the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats – any kind of threat, whether of jail or of retribution after death" but "what has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music: the irrestible power of unarmed truth, the attraction of its example" (47).

Along with such ideas of his uncle, Yury experiences war and revolution from his early age, "The war with Japan was not yet finished but it was unexpectedly overshadowed by other events. Waves of revolution swept across Russia, each greater and more extra ordinary than the last" (29). The reference of the "war with Japan" is of 1905 and at that time there was unrest among the railway workers on the Moscow surroundings. People "knew that a strike was coming and only a pretext was needed for it to break out" (34). Finally strike breaks out and more people joint the crowd, including railway workers.

Yury has grown up within those circumstances and such events certainly have affected and shaped his thought about war and revolutions.

Yury's friends Pasha Antipov and Nicky Dudorov also participate in revolution as it proceeds. They play the "most terrible and adult of games, war, and in this particular war they faced not only the normal risks of battle, but the danger of

exile or hanging as well" (55). The whole of Moscow, not only Nicky and Pasha, has engaged in revolution shooting all over Moscow.

The discourse of revolutionary trend compels everyone to participate in it. Willingly or not, all people engage in it but all hopes and aspirations vanish as it ends and one group exercises power in its own interest. And who are not in power resist it in their own way. Even after such revolutions no peace is established totally as "there were still occasional shots here and there and the new fires, such as are always starting in the ordinary way" (61) that disturbs the normal flow of life.

As Yury grows up, he develops his habits and inclinations which are sharply his own. He is "interested in physics and natural science" and believes that "man should do something useful in his practical life" (67). As a result he settles in studying medicine while Tonya settles in law. In addition to medicine he is also interested in writing prose and poetry. He realizes how great a part his Uncle Kolya has played in forming his character. Kolya views "history as another universe – a universe built by man with the help of time and memory in answer to the challenge of death" (68).

Under his uncle's influence, Yury develops his own brand of philosophy for himself:

> To try consciously to go to sleep is a sure way to have insomnia, to try to be conscious of one's own digestion is a sure way to upset the stomach. Consciousness is a poison when we apply it to ourselves. Consciousness is a beam of light directed outwards, it lights up the way ahead of us so that we don't trip up. It's like the headlamps on a railway engine– if you turned the beam inwards there would be a catastrophe. (70)

On the other hand, the discourse of socialist vision is widespread in Russia as revolutionaries propagate revolution as a flood that reaches everyone and submerges all who stayed out of the war. Shura Schlesinger expresses views of revolution to Yury that "When this happens it will seem to you, as it seemed to us in the army, that life has stopped, that there is nothing personal left, that there is nothing going on in the world except killing and dying" (166).

She is optimistic about the changes in Russia as she expresses it:

> [. . .] Russia is destined to become the first socialist country since the beginning of the world [. . .]. The new order of things will be all round us and as familiar to us as the woods on the skyline or the clouds over our heads. There will be nothing else left. (167)

Instead of such socialist optimistic outcomes the people in the towns are as helpless as children in the face of the unknown. Worsening situation compels Yury to count his days of living as these days are running out before his eyes. He both "feared and loved that future and was proud of it" (168). But this imagined bright future of socialism brings nothing new and "the world becomes more visible and more audible" (169).

In the midst of 1917 revolution Yury's son becomes ill. Sound of rifle and gunfire is everywhere that stops him to cross the battle zone at the risk of his life. He is unable to take his son to the hospital. At the same time he misses "his work and the research notes and the manuscripts" (175) in the hospital.

Yury gets newspaper from the newsboy on the street. It gives "official announcement from Petersburg that a Soviet of People's Commissars had been formed and that Soviet power and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat were established in Russia" (176). Reading news Yury is shaken and overwhelmed by the greatness of the

moment and the thought of its significance for centuries to come. These were only the hopes and aspirations of Russian people.

New elections are held for the running of housing, trading, industry and municipal services. Commissars are being appointed with unlimited power, armed with revolver. But the aftermath of revolution is serious one. Though the state has abolished private trade but gives them certain facilities at the moments of economic crisis, the shops are all empty and locked. The reason is not only that there are no goods but the "reorganization of all sides of life, including trade, had so far remained largely on paper and had not yet affected such trifling details as these boarded-up shops" (18).

Experiencing the war and revolution of 1917, Yury's family has nothing more than to endure the suffering of lodging and fooding as they get nothing and are starving.

Again after revolution Russia undergoes civil war and the situation becomes worst. Even in this period of crisis, Yury manages to write poetry in which he has space for his expressions. The subject of his poems are "neither the entombment nor the resurrection but the days between; the title was 'Turmoil'" (188). 'Turmoil' here refers to the political upheaval of Russia in the period between WWI and Russian Revolution of 1917.

In the flood of revolutions there is also peasants' revolution against the oppression of the state. They understand that they have exchanged one sort of oppression with other one. While the revolution woke the peasants up, they knew what they had wanted and they:

> decided that this was the fulfillment of his dream, his ancient dream of living anarchically on his own land by the work of his hands, in

> complete independence and without owing anything to anyone. Instead of that, he found he had only exchanged the old oppression of the tsarist state for the new, much harsher yoke of the revolutionary super-state. (202)

Unable to bear the problem in Moscow, Yury sets out with his whole family for the former Varykino estate, near the town of Yuratin, far away in the Urals.

In the revolution of 1917 Pasha changes his name into Strelnikov and participates as non-party man. He was captured by Germans and "reported missing, believed killed" (225) in the war. His father was a worker who had been sent to prison for taking part in the revolution of 1905. Strelnikov freed himself from the Germans in 1917 and joined the revolution. His "unbridled revolutionary fervor fitted the spirit of the times" (225) and was "armed by the revolution" (227).

Later on Pasha reveals to Yury why he changed his name into Streinikov. He is different in heart and appearance that is because of "the disease, the revolutionary madness of the age" (40). In his meeting with Yury, Pasha describes how he escaped from the war and Germans. He explains to Yury that he left his family:

> To win (Lara) back after three years of marriage I went to the war, and when the war was over and I returned from captivity, I took advantage of the fact that I was thought to be dead, and under an assumed name plunged headlong into the revolution, to pay back in full all her wrongs, all that she had suffered, to wash her mind clean of these memories, [. . .]. (413)

Pasha perceives revolution in different way than Yury. He opines that revolution has no place for sympathy and loyalty. And the discourse of revolution sweeps people as the propagation of its period as "Last Judgement" and "a time for

angels with flaming swords and winged beasts from the abyss, not for sympathizers and loyal doctors" (227).

Depressed by political turmoil and his separation from Lara Pasha "Shot himself" (415) lying across the path. About Pasha and their separation, Lara says to Yury, "I married him, he's my husband. He has a wonderful, upright, shining personality" (356). Pasha and Lara were married two years before the war and they were just beginning to make a life for themselves. But as they set up their home, the war broke out. Lara now believes that "the war is to blame for everything, for all the misfortunes that followed and that dog our generation to this day" (363). As mentioned by Lara, war intervened their happy married life.

Before the war, murders happened only in plays, newspapers and detective stories, not in everyday life. But "there was a jump from this calm, innocent, measured way of living to blood and tears, to mass insanity and to the savagery of daily, legalized, rewarded slaughter" (363).

While other people consider Marxism as a doctrine of reality, a philosophy of history, Yury opines that "Marxism is not sufficiently master of itself to be a science. Science is more balanced" (235). Here lies Yury's confutation with the views on Marxism. He was revolutionary-minded earlier, but now understands "nothing can be gained by violence. People must be drawn to good by goodness" (237).

Yury also confutes with the views of socialism which is optimistic to the betterment of future. For Yury," Man is born to live not to prepare for life. Life itself – the gift of life – is such a breathtakingly serious thing!" (269).

Many people were attracted with the truths proclaimed by the revolution. But Yury perceives it as obscuring imagery that is "the voice of error, doomed, conscious of its weakness and therefore evasive" (425). During those periods nothing new had

been changed and only one sorts of control had been replaced by other forms of control.

Yury disregards the "political mysticism of the soviet intelligentia, though it was the very thing they regarded as the highest of their achievements and described in the language of the day as 'the spiritual top-flight of the age'" (431). Yury does not oppose it directly for it could hurt the feelings of his friends. His greatest regard is for an indescribable passionate desire to live and living of course means for him struggling, going further, higher striving for perfection and achieving it.

After the revolution of 1917, there begins civil war in Russian soil. Fed up with war and revolutionary fervor of the time, Yury longs to go to Varykino "In search of quiet, retirement" (227) life. And within such political crisis Yury has also space for Lara in his heart. He thinks about her time and again. As he thought "of seeing Lara once more his heart leapt for joy. In anticipation he lived through his meeting with her" (175).

While returning to home Yury is kidnapped by 'Forest Brotherhood'. Forest Brotherhood is a group of the partisans and backbone of revolutionary army in the civil war. This is the combined force of two factors: on the one hand, the political organization which assumed the leadership of the revolutions, on the other, the group of army who refused to obey the old authorities once the war was lost. Out of these two fronts the partisan army comes into being. Most of them are middle class peasants.

Yury tried to escape thrice but was captured again and again and served them as their doctor. The place of his captivity is not surrounded by walls, no guard is kept over him and no one watches his movements. More than physical force he is

captivated by the ideas of the group for it has become the part of local population and dissolved in them and:

> It looked as if Yury's captivity, his dependence, were an illusion, as though he were free, and merely failed to take advantage of his freedom. His captivity, his freedom, were not in fact different from other forms of compulsion in life, which are often equally invisible and intangible, and which also seem to be non-existent and to be merely a figment of the imagination, a chimera. (298)

Although Yury is not watched or chained, he has to submit to his captivity and dependence, though it appears imaginary. In his captivity Yury has to serve the combatants. They force him to take part in military operation while:

> According to the Red Cross International Convention, army medical personnel must not take part in the military operations of the belligerents. But on one occasion Yury was forced to break this rule. He was in the field when an engagement started and had to share the fate of the combatants. (301)

Violating the rules this partisan group goes "through a period of disturbances – anxieties and uncertainties, confused, threatening situations and absurd, illogical events" (323). Taking benefit of such situation Yury makes "his way further into the *tagya* to the marked tree, dug his things out and left the camp" (338). Even in his captivity Yury remembers Lara and mutters senselessly, "I'll find you, my beauty, my love, my rowan tree, my own flesh and blood" (338).

After his escape from captivity Yury prepares for the most bitter moments of life. He gets letter from Lara mentioning to meet in Varykino. In the letter she also mentions that his wife Tonya and their children are in Moscow. While Yury spends

time with Lara in Yuratin, he gets letter from Tonya, his wife who writes that she is "being deported from Russia" (373) including her father and Yury's uncle Kolya. She also writes, "whole trouble is that I love you and that you don't love me" (374). After reading the letter Yury feels that he is fainting and falls down unconscious on the sofa.

Lara cares for him while Yury becomes ill. She "fed him, nursed him, built him up by her care, her snow-white loveliness, the warm, living breath of her widespread conversation." They loved each other greatly. "Their low-voiced talk, however unimportant, was as full of meaning as the Dialogues of Plato " and "they were united by what separated them from the rest of the world" (355). This inspiring love between them can't last long and eventually are separated by various circumstances around them.

Lara reminds Yury about his past whose "father was a Siberian millionaire who committed suicide" and Yury's wife Tonya is "the daughter of a local landowner"(356). She suggests him to do something because it would be dangerous for him to be unemployed as he left the rank of revolutionary army.

Yury himself recalls his past as his school friend Misha Gordon witnessed the suicide of his father who was the millionaire industrialist. Yury talks to her that his :

> Father threw himself out of the moving train meaning to end his life and was killed .Father was accompanied on this journey by Komarovsky, who was his lawyer. He made father drink, he brought him to the point of bankruptcy and drove him to suicide. It was his fault that my father killed himself and that I was left an orphan. (360)

Various Power Exercises & Individual Subjection

Power is not stable as it flows or diffuses throughout the society. Power, once at the hand of Tsar is now held by common people after the revolution. The Tsar has signed a "manifesto and everything's to be treated right, the peasants are to have land" (40).It denotes the nature of power which is now dismantled by the flood of revolution.

Power is relational as well and who is powerful depends on how one exercises it. Therefore, for sometimes even the "strong are ruled by the weak and treacherous" (53).

In exercising power among the nations, the civilians are in great risk. The value of those people's lives is minimized. During WWI the Moscow hospitals were overcrowded. The wounded were put in the passages and on landings and "general overcrowding was beginning to affect the women's wards" (99).

Creating truths and knowledge is another aspect of power that serves discourse. As Yury completes his graduation in medicine, he serves as a medic. He is attached to a unit of army which holds the "mouth of a valley in the Carpathian mountains, blocking it to the Hungarians" (114-15). For Yury war never brings fruitful results. It is a way of exercising power and creating truths and facts which don't "exist until man puts into them something of his own" (116). Putting into them something is the context of discourse that exhibits the authenticity of power one imposes. 'Something' is the meaning that one puts into the facts to make them relevant to human beings and human beings put meaning for their own interest.

As WWI proceeds, Yury hears that the Germans have broken through. He hurries off to the hospital which is being moved at once, without waiting for the evacuation order. In hurrying back to the shelter he is " knocked off his feet by the

blast of an explosion and hit by a shell splinter. He fell in the middle of the road, bleeding and unconscious. He is admitted at the hospital where Lara is doing her first round that day as a new nurse.

During the war state imposes ideas over individuals that their sacred duty is to the country, to the army, to the society but "now the war was lost (and that misfortunes was at the bottom of all the rest) everything seemed to have been deposed, nothing was any longer sacred" (121).

The whole of Russia undergoes war and revolution that disrupt individual life. Revolution starts before the WWI ends and it is impossible to tell if the war were still going on or had already ceased. People were confused because of war and revolution.

State imposes its own brand of discourse. It propagates that peace and prosperity will be established after war. But the real situation is vice versa. Mentioning such illusions of officials Yury writes to his wife, " The Chaos keeps on getting worse in spite of everything they do to improve discipline and morale" (123).

During the war Lara works at the hospital where Yury had been a patient and now a doctor. They work together by their professions. He shares his feelings with Lara. He opines that Russia is not stable and its roof is torn off. People are out in the open hoping freedom beyond their expectation. These all happening are because of war and revolution as he puts:

> It was partly the war, the revolution did the rest. The war made an artificial break in life – as if life could be put off for a time. [. . .]. Everyone was revived, reborn, changed, transformed. You might say that everyone has been through two revolutions – his own personal revolution as well as the general one. It seems to me that socialism is the sea, and all these separate streams, these private, individual

> revolutions are flowing into it – the sea of life, of life in its own right. (136)

Yury's mind is full of thoughts. In one circle there are thought of Tanya: their home and former settled life. He longs to be with her after two years of separation. In another circle of his mind he has the thoughts of loyalty for revolution and his admiration for it. This circle also contains the "omens and promises which before war, between 1919 and 1914, had appeared in Russian thought, art and life, in the destiny of Russia as a whole and in his own, Zhivago's". But this new revolution is "not one idealized in students fashion in 1905, but this new upheaval, to-day's born of the war, bloody, pitiless, elemental, the soldiers' revolution, led by the professionals, the bolsheviks" (148).

In other circle he has the thought of war with its bloodshed and its horrors, its homelessness, savagery and isolation and its trials. Along with these thoughts Yury has also space for Lara, a nurse caught by the war with her completely unknown life.

Yury realizes the bitter realities of war and revolution and their aftermath. But his friends are optimistic about the betterment of future as socialism believes. As revolution starts before the end of WWI, Yury thinks state has to get over one upheaval before plunging into another. But his friend Pogorevshikh's idea is quite opposing with him. According to Pogorevshikh:

> All this destruction – it's the right and proper preliminary stage of wide constructive plan. Society has not get disintegrated sufficiently. It must fall to pieces completely, then a genuinely revolutionary government will put the pieces together on a completely new basis. (151)

Instead, such optimistic visions went upside-down after Russia experienced the "changes, moves, uncertainties, upheavals; the war, the revolution; scenes of destruction, scenes of death, shelling, blowing-up bridges, fires, ruins – all this turned suddenly into a huge, empty, waste space" (151).

After serving in war as a doctor Yury returns to his home in Urals. There he faces hardships of life with his wife Tonya. Separation of two years makes them so close that "as the door, held wide open by Tonya, was in itself a welcome and almost an embrace, they soon recovered and rushed into each other's arms" (154). They listen the rumor of bad times coming. People everywhere are talking about hardships, dangers and insecurity. People face the scarcity of food and wood as Yury says, "You can burn a newspaper and cook a meal" (157). Thus, war resulted various kinds of problems such as economic, political, in public as well as individual life.

During and after the war and revolution, individual self is lost and subject becomes a part of group, not an entity in itself. One has to live "like everyone else, to be lost in other people's lives without leaving a trace, and that an unshared happiness was not happiness" (161) in which Yury and others have to adjust losing their individual freedom.

The bloodshed and mass slaughter caused by war and revolution are because of individual subjection and loss of personal opinions. As Lara mentions, the misfortune and root of evil:

> was the loss of faith in the value of personal opinions. People imagined that it was out of date to follow their own moral sense, that they must all sing the same tune in chorus, and live by other people's notions, the notions which were being crammed down everybody's throat. And

> there arose the power of glittering phrase, first tsarist, then revolutionary. (363)

The individual subject is of less importance in comparison to the group. Such loss of personal opinion and 'tune in chorus' became an epidemic which affected everything and nothing was left untouched by it.

In the course of his life Yury takes up three temporary jobs but the "rapid fall in the value of money made it difficult to make ends meet" (364). For Yury what the revolutionaries meant "by ideas is nothing but words – claptrap in praise of the revolution and the regime" (365) and in praising the revolution they are right from their point of view.

The regime is hostile to them as Yury and Lara live together. Komarovsky appears in front of them and assures them to save. Komarovsky intervenes their happiness. In their meeting Komarovsky says to Yury.

> In two days here I've learned more about you than you know or suspect about yourselves. Without knowing it, you are walking on the edge of precipice. Unless you do something about it, the days of your freedom and even of your lives are numbered. (377)

Once again in their life, Yury and Lara are in the grip of Komarovsky's power. He has convincing power who asserts that Yury is his own master and has perfect right to play risk of his life but Lara "is not a free agent" (378). He also assures them that he could take them with him and they could easily get a boat and join their family overseas.

Yury neglects help from Komarovsky but worries about Lara's life. He tries to convince for their separation but Lara can't leave him and says," you are my strength

and my refuse" (383). Even in such days of horror Yury keeps "passion to write" (386) poetry.

Though both Lara and Yury are married to Pasha and Tonya respectively, they love each other more than they love their husband and wife. Lara says it to Yury, "your Tonya and my Pasha are a thousand times better than we are, but that isn't the point. The point is that the gift of love is like any other great. However great it is it needs a blessing to express itself" (389). Lara feels that she is not in the same positon as Yury is. She compares that Yury is "given wings to fly above the clouds, but I'm a woman mine are given me to stay close to the ground and to shelter my young" (390).

Yury feels that his dream of remaining with Lara would not come true as their parting is at hand. With her separation Yury would have to lose the will to live with her and even his life itself. He remembers the wolves at night which were "no longer wolves on the snowy plain under the moon: they had become a theme, they represented the hostile force which intended his and Lara's destruction and was resolved to drive them from Varykino" (394). These wolves become the symbol of hostile regime.

Being sad, Yury imagines that he is standing in some dark forest of his life. For him such situation is the omen of separation and an image of solitude. He curses his fate and prays for Lara "that God might spare the life of lovely, sad, humble and simple-hearted woman he loved" (398).

In order to save Lara's life Yury agrees to pretend that he will follow her and Komarovsky later. Komarvosky also tells that he has heard about Pasha who has been captured, condemned to death and shot. Lara leaves Yury and goes with Komarovsky according to their plan. In their separation Yury mutters "Good-bye, my

only love, my love for ever lost" (403). For him, Lara is his ever lasting joy and "bright sun" which has set. As he loses the sight of Lara, Yury speaks to himself. "Good-bye, Lara, until we meet in the next world, good-bye, my love, my inexhaustible, ever-lasting joy" (404).

To spend last years of his life Yury goes to Moscow. Throughout the way he sees that Russia has undergone many changes: changes of war, revolution and civil war. The village he crosses are "empty, the fields abandoned and unharvested as after an enemy envasion – such were the effects of war: the civil war" (417). Yury "arrived in Moscow in the spring of 1922 at the beginning of the NEP" (423) which is conceived as the most false and ambiguous of all Soviet periods.

In Moscow Marina helps Yury with his house work. She becomes Yury's "third wife, though he was not divorced from the first, and they did not register their marriage" (428). Yury blames himself for being unable to unite his family. He expresses it in his poem, "I have allowed my family to scatter / All my dear ones are dispersed /A life-long loneliness / Fills nature and my heart" (482).

Yury wishes to rebuild his life as completely and rapidly as possible concentrating on his affairs but it does not come true for he feels sick and faint. Yury, by an inhumane effort of the will, makes:

> His way through the crush on the rear platform, provoking more snarls, curses and kicks. He paid no attention to them, tore himself free of the crowd, climbed down from the stationary train into the roadway, took a step, another, a third, fell down on the cobbles and did not get up again. (438)

Once celebrated doctor-cum-poet dies on the street and the "news of the death of this almost unknown man had flown round" the circle of men "who had known him

at different times in his life, though he had afterward lost touch with them and forgotten them" (440).

In Moscow Lara sees Yury's dead body and feels loneliness. She needed him to escape into freedom, into the open, out of sorrow which imprisoned her to feel again the joy of liberation. Their love was not passionate but the mutual understanding of their heart and :

> It was not out of necessity that they loved each other, 'enslaved by passion', as lovers are described. They loved each other because everything around them willed it, the trees and the clouds and the sky over their heads and the earth under their feet. Perhaps their surrounding world, the strangers they met in the street, the landscapes drawn up for them to see on their walks, the rooms in which they lived or met, were even more pleased with their love than themselves. (447)

Now for Lara no one of those who were near and dear are left. Her husband Pasha Killed himself and her lover Yury died. Only Komarovsky "is left alive who should have been killed whom she had tried to kill and missed, the stranger who had nothing in common with her, the useless nonentity who had turned her life into a chain of crimes beyond her knowing" (445).

As a last token of love for Yury, Lara goes up to the table with the coffin on it, makes three broad signs of the cross over the body and presses her lips to the cold forehead and hands of the Yury's dead body.

The scene proceeds to the period of WWII while Yury's friends Dudorov and Gordon repent. Dudorov explains, "We were unlucky" (451) and he further descries WWII that attack after attack, mile after mile of electrified barbed wire, mines, mortars, month after month of artillery barrage destroyed the public life into

uncertainties. The government compelled them "to see what wasn't there, and to maintain the contrary of what their eyes told them" (453).

Within a short span of time Russian people faced various changes from Russian Revolution of 1905 to WWI, Bolshevik Revolution, Civil war and WWII. They perceived those changes, as Gordon expresses, "This has happened several times in the course of history. A thing which has been conceived in a lofty, ideal manner becomes coarse and material. Thus Rome came out of Greece and Russian Revolution came out of the Russian enlightenment" (463).

But reality comes just opposite of their expectation as the enlightenment and liberation which had been expected to come after the war had not come with victory, a presage of freedom was in the air throughout these post war years, and it was their only historical meaning.

Exclusion and Ritualization: Regulators of Discourse

Discourse is regulated by the institutions to defend against its dangers and to operate power discourse also excludes some of its challenges. Uncle Kolya leaves Yury in Moscow with the relatives then transfers him to Gromeko family where the atmosphere is suitable and their daughter, Tonya, is of Yura's age. Gromekos are obsessed with sex and they "labeled everything to do with it as 'vulgar', and used the word *ad nauseam,* blushing or growing pale as they uttered it. 'Vulgar' was applied to instinct, to pornography, to prostitution and almost to the whole physical world" (46). This is the instance of exclusion within discourse that helps keeping the discourse of sexuality in existence.

Another regulator of discourse is ritualization. Discourse is bound by rituals that limit people's utterances. Anna Gromeko insists her daughter Tonya and Yury to get married. She "caught their hands in hers and kept them joined a moment longer."

She is bed-ridden and "when she was able to speak she said: If I die, stay together. You're meant for each other. Get married. There now, I've betrothed you', she added and began to cry" (73). Parents' approval for marriage is an another instance of ritualization that serves as regulator of discourse. Without such approval, marriage is considered illegal in some cultures.

As mentioned earlier, ritualization is one of the regulators of discourse. In Christian society Whit Monday is the day for communal marriage. Thousands of weddings are to be held this day. It maintains the power of Church or religious institutions that other days are not sanctioned as Whit Monday. "They were married on whit Monday" (94) means that Lara and Pasha Antipov were married legally or on the day that is officially sanctioned.

Ritualization not only helps maintaining power but also helps subverting it as Lara is told "to hold her candle high in order to have authority in her house. But Lara sacrificing her future to Pasha's, held her candle as low as she could, yet all in vain, because however low she held it, Pasha held his lower still" (95).

Lara and Pasha live happily for three years but their relationship degrades as both of them "tried to behave more generously than the other and this made things complicated" (103). Eventually Pasha receives order to go to the military training school. As he participates in war, he continues writing letter to Lara. But later on, massive attacks stop his writing which depressed Lara. In search of him, she "trained seriously and qualified as nurse, got permission to be absent from her school" (106). According to her decision to look for Pasha in Moscow, she gets a job as a nurse on a hospital train going to the Hungarian border, the last address Pasha had given her.

Domination and Resistance

Wherever power is present there is chance of domination and domination results in resistance. As Komarovsky seduces Lara that compels her to take a sudden decision which alters the course of her life. Komarovsky is a wretched villain who spoils her life. He is her father's friend, as she asserts, "when father died and we were badly off he supported my mother. He was unmarried, rich" (359). Lara wants to get rid of the grip of Komarovsky and writes a letter to her friend mentioning her wish "to live away from mother" (74). She desired it because her mother is much dependent on Komarovsky. Lara's action is a kind of resistance against the power of Komarovsky hence against her mother's.

Because of his scandal, Komarovsky's "position was threatened, his reputation was endangered by the incident" (90). It proves that maintaining ones' power/ position is a challenging task. Even a minor incident can threat power as of Komarovsky. His infidelity with Lara is the main reason for his endangered position. At the same time he has the feelings that "he had once again experienced the irresistible attraction of this wild, desperate girl" (90).

This shows the attraction of Lara and his earlier relation with her makes Komarovsky's mind full of stormy feelings as well as threatens his power as her prisoner for life. Lara felt his power earlier while she arrived in Moscow. At that time, even a "water-melon of incredible size [. . .] seemed to her to be a symbol of his power and wealth" (92).

To some extent, Yury also resists against the agencies of state that operate power through discourses. Yury views that "salvation lay not in loyalty to forms and uniforms, but in throwing them away" (224). It is a kind of his ideological resistance

against state apparatus but his resistance fails in practice as he is a tiny creature in front of the giant state.

Equal Weight of Various Disciplines: New Historicist Perspective

The novel *Dr Zhivago* tries to balance the weight of literary and non-literary texts providing historical facts in the form of novel. It mentions "one day in summer 1903, two years after his mother's death, Yura was driving across fields in a two-horse open carriage with his uncle Kolya" (15). By mentioning date Pasternak attempts to create his own brand of history discarding official one and valuing equal importance of literary text which also presents facts in the form of novel.

Though he is a doctor, Yury values many areas of studies equally. In his school and college periods Yury "studied the classics and scripture, legends and poets, history and natural science, reading all these things as if they were the chronicles of his house, his family tree" (87).

Yury balances the value of art as of medicine and philosophy . He opines that the work of art can appeal one in all sort of ways – by its theme, subject, situation, characters as he puts it "one is much more shaken by the presence of art in *Crime and Punishment* than by Raskolonikov's crime" (256). Yury not only philosophizes about art and life but he is also a man of action "doing things about the house, looking after patients, thinking, studying, writing" (355).

True expression of art, for Yury, is no longer with artist or with his state of mind:

> Which is trying to express, but with language, his instrument of expression. Language, the home and dwelling of beauty and meaning, itself begins to think and speak for man and turns wholly into music,

> not in the sense of inward, audible sounds but by virtue of the power and momentum of its inward music. (391)

In his loneliness, Yury sinks in deep feelings. Unable to control himself Yury begins to drink and write poetry. He takes history not in the accepted way, but in the form of images taken from the vegetable kingdom. For him, history is not made by anyone nor can one see it. History is like watching the grass growing and other elements constitute the course of history as:

> Wars and revolutions, kings and Robespierres, are, history's organic agents, its yeast. But revolutions are made by fanatical men of action with one-track-minds, men who are narrow-minded to the point of genius. They overturn the old order in a few hours or days; the whole upheaval takes a few weeks or at most years, but for decades there-after, for centuries, the spirit of narrowness which led to the upheaval is worshiped as holy. (406)

Chapter Four

Conclusion

Since the researcher has studied the tragic failure of the protagonist in the light of different aspects in previous chapters in detail, this chapter deals with the findings of the study. Its focal point is not merely to trace a brief summary of what has already been done but to present a resolution that clarifies the character's life-long love and individual freedom intervened by various discourses exercised by and within a monolithic state.

Boris Pasternak portrays Yury Zhivago, the protagonist of *Dr. Zhivago* as a tragic failure. Yury lives in the middle of political and revolutionary upheaval of Russia in the first half of the twentieth century. His affection to life and desire to live with his beloved Lara are all shattered and he becomes a victim of power exercised by many sphere of social life such as revolutions, wars, imposition of rules and regulations by state. Wars, revolutions, domination, impositions of rules and regulations are the instance of power exercise in higher level and family relation, disintegration, struggle for living among characters are the instance of power exercise in lower or individual level.

People can't remain passive onlooker when state plunges into war and revolutions. Yury is one who bears all the sufferings, changes and outcomes that state invites. A poet, philosopher and physician, Yury's life is disrupted by the war and revolutions. He spends the life of wandering and love amid the harshness of Russian Revolution and its aftermath. The regime wants Yury to hate what he loves and love what he hates. In such difficult situation he keeps on his struggle for living and getting love of Lara.

Yury is an individual who is sensible of his era and desires to live without intervening in it. The prime mover of the novel is the elemental force of revolution.

He does not intervene in the course of events and he serves those to whom he falls captive.

Revolution is inescapable and intervention in its events is almost impossible for a common man like Yury. In those days of hardships, he wants to celebrate life through poetry. He embodies the life force as opposed to the life-denying powers of the monolithic state. For Yury, literature, philosophy and medicine are all part of the same thing. They all are spaces in which he can express his love and respect for the beauty of life. He values sensory experience more than dogmatism or logical argument.

In *Dr. Zhivago* Pasternak wants to show the ugly face of communism in Russia through his spokesman Yury Zhivago. Yury's first and foremost impulse is to live today. His views and poems are the voice of the living, opposed to those voices of authority who will not live at present but only in the glorious vision of socialist future. Yury himself asserts that, "Man is born to live not to prepare for life. Life itself – the gift of life – is such a breathtakingly serious thing !" (269).

Yury's living impulse is paralysed when he becomes one of the participants in revolution. Revolutionaries propagate about human welfare but the results are just opposite of it and casualties in quest of that ideal are on an even vaster scale.

Yury also cannot remain outside the power of Komarovsky. Komarovsky is a puppeteer for Yury and Lara, who seduces Lara in her early age. So, Yury is in the grip of various power diffused throughout the society.

Thus, from the above study it can be concluded that Yury Zhivago's life-long suffering and tragic failure are the outcome of state's discursive practices and power relation between institutions and individuals that intervene his pursuit of freedom and disrupt his individuality as well.

Works Cited

Best, Steven and Kellner, Douglas. "Foucault and the Critique of Modernity". *Post Modern Theory.* Macmillan, 1991.

Barry, Peter. *An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory.* 2nd ed. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.

Bayley, John. "Introduction." *Doctor Zivago.* Trans. Manya Harari and Max Hayward. London: David Campbell, 1991. ix-xxix.

"Boris Pasternak & Olga Ivinskaya." *People Weekly.* 12 Feb. 1996. 137.

Carpenter, Gerland. "Doctor Zhivago." *American Film* 14.10 (1989): 61.

Chamberlain, Lesley. "Russia." *Good Fiction Guide*. Ed. Jane Rogers. NY: Oxford, 2001. 86-89.

Columbia Encyclopedia. Ed. Brabara A. Chernow and George A. Vallasi. 5th ed. Columbia UP, 1993. 2083.

Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed. Florida: Harcourt, 1992. 1134-45.

- - -. *Language Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. D.F. Bouchard. Trans. Bouchard and S. Sherry. Black Well: Oxford, 1977.

- - -. *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* Trans. Sherdan Smith and A.M. London: Tavistock, 1972.

- - -. Truth and Power: An Interview with Alessandro Fontano and Pasquale Pasquino". Ed. M. Morris and P. Patton. *Michel Foucault: Power/Trugh/ Strategy*. Sydney: Feral Publications, 1979.

- - -. *The Order of Discourse: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock, 1970.

- - - . *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction.* Vol. 2 Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1978.

- - - . "What is an Author?" Ed. J.V. Harrari. *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. London : Methuen, 1980.

- - - . "The Order of Discourse". Ed. R. Young. *Untying the Text: A Post Structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge, 1981.

- - - . *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction.* Trans. Robert Hurley. Vo. 1. New York : Pantheon, 1997.

Guerin, Wilfred L., et al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4th ed. NY: Oxford, 1999.

Hawtharn, Jermy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory.* 4th ed, London, 2000.

Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. *Using Foucault's Methods.* London : Sage, 1999. 41.

Likhachov, Dmitri . "The Glasnost Papers: 'Doctor Zhivago' by Boris Pasternak." *The New Republic.* 200.8 (1989): 30.

Macdonnel, D. *Theories of Discourse.* Blackwell: Oxford, 1986. 7.

Macmillan, M. *Women of the Rai*. London : Thames and Hudson, 1988. 105.

Mills, Sara. *Discourse.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism". *Redrawing the Boundaries. Ed.* Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York, 1992. 410.

Navrozov, Andrei. "After the Poet Fell Silent." *The Spectator*. 2 Jan. 1988. 28.

Pasternak, Boris. *Doctor Zhivago.* Trans. Manya Harari and Max Hayward. London: Collins and Harvill Press, 1958.

Patton, P. "Of Power and Prisons". *Michel Foucault Power/Truth/ Strategy.* Ed. M. Morris and P. Patton. Sydney: Feral Publication, 1979. 109-146.

Salkeld, Duncan. "New Historicism." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism.* Ed. Christa Knellwolf and Christopher Norris. Vol. 9. UK: Cambridge, 2001. 59-70.

Samoylov, A. "Boris Pasternak: Fate and Predestination: Biographical Essay." *Social Science.* 33.4 (2002): 160.

Silbarijoris, Rimvydas. "Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography. 2: 1928-1960." *World Literature Today.* 73.4 (1999): 769.

Springfield. *Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of Literature*. Massachussetts, 1995. 862.