

THE GRAMMATICAL FICTION:SELF VS. SUBJECT IN ARTHUR KOESTLER'S *DARKNESS AT NOON*

UDC 821.111-31.09 Kestler A.

Nataša Tučev

University of Niš

Abstract. *The paper starts from the assumption that art is capable of articulating and bringing to the fore the portion of the self from whose standpoint the process of ideological interpellation can be resisted. This experience of personal being is dubbed 'the grammatical fiction' by Rubashov, the protagonist of Koestler's novel **Darkness at Noon**. The Party to which Rubashov has belonged throughout his adult life has taught him to forgo not only his self-interest in the struggle for social change, but also his sensitive self, his mystical experiences of 'oceanic oneness' with the world, and his capacity for self-reliance in making moral decisions. These buried traits come to constitute Rubashov's Other, shadowy self, providing a potent counterpoint to his ideological position, to the subject whose life and political actions have been determined by the internalized doctrines of the Party. The paper focuses on the way Koestler's novel juxtaposes 'the grammatical fiction' and the subject as two mental attitudes within the protagonist's stream of consciousness, and draws on this juxtaposition in reaching its insights. These insights concern not only the mechanisms of the ideology which the novel discusses, but also its inherent notion of the self and of the desirable direction of social progress.*

Key words: *ideology, subject, self, individuality, compassion, conscience, spirituality, society*

In his "Letter on Art in Reply to Andre Daspré", Althusser argues that the capacity of art to transcend ideology is rather limited, and consists in what he calls "internal aesthetic distantiation". Distantiation itself, however, is simply the outcome of the aesthetic treatment of the lived experience of ideology, and does not seem to be dependent on the agency of the author or any insights he might attain through the creative process. Regardless of whether he discusses a writer such as Balzac – who, in his opinion, is completely immersed in the dominant belief system – or Solzhenitsyn, who deliberately sets out to criticize an ideology to which he personally does not adhere, Althusser is equally pessimistic. Ultimately, he considers art incapable of revealing the workings of a mecha-

nism whereby ideology is produced, or of suggesting an agenda conducive to social change. For Althusser, literature's empirical insights into these issues remain in the domain of passive "feeling" and "perception", and are never elevated to the status of active understanding; he holds them inferior to the scientific knowledge of a sociologist, whom he deems the only one competent to define the means by which the dominant doctrines may be transcended.¹

Contrary to Althusser's contention, however, it may be argued that art is capable of going beyond ideology, not by competing with the methodology of science, but by articulating and bringing to the fore the portion of the self from whose standpoint interpellation can be resisted. In Arthur Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*, this possibility is examined through the character of Rubashov, a veteran member of the communist party in the Soviet Union of Stalin's era. It is demonstrated how Rubashov has internalized the doctrine of the Party by simultaneously disowning certain experiences and contents of the psyche which from the point of view of this doctrine are considered negative and undesirable, and which would be incompatible with it. Koestler's narrative implies that interpellation presupposes the impoverishment of consciousness: i.e., that one becomes constituted as a subject-in-ideology only through drastic reduction of one's awareness and knowledge of the self.

The conscious attitude of Koestler's protagonist, upon which his ideological position is based, is characterised by extreme rationalism, a scientific world-view and faith in the omnipotence of social engineering. Rubashov also makes efforts to comply with the Party's principle demanding that he should renounce all egotism and self-interest, and be "useful without vanity". On the other hand, the portion of his self which is suppressed and excluded from the conscious attitude consists of deeply personal, nonverbal, sensual, irrational or suprarational experiences, including also the realm of his emotional life. Together, these buried traits come to constitute Rubashov's Other, shadow-self, which he has dubbed "the grammatical fiction" – referring to the first person singular, the "I" which the Party members have been accustomed to feel ashamed of and avoid as much as possible. "The grammatical fiction" – or, as Rubashov also calls it, "the silent partner" – still surfaces liminally at certain moments, taking the protagonist unawares, "as from an ambush", and in this way repeatedly undermining the illusion of the subject as a unified self.

Among the experiences comprising this subversive Other, the most striking, and possibly the most important, is the one Rubashov calls "oceanic sense". The name refers to a state of mind with which he first became acquainted during his imprisonment in Nazi Germany. Undergoing an ordeal in the hands of the Gestapo, Rubashov, during the periods he spends in his isolated cell, unexpectedly lapses into queer trance-like states of exaltation akin to day-dreaming. These eventually result in a condition which he recognizes as similar to what the mystics call "ecstasy" and saints "contemplation", and which he strives to explain in terms of a curious interplay between the awareness of one's uniqueness and individuality, on the one hand, and the transpersonal sense of oneness with the entire mankind, on the other:

... the greatest and soberest of modern psychologists had recognized this state as a fact and called it the "oceanic sense". And indeed, one's personality dissolved as a

¹ Louis Althusser, "Letter on Art in Reply to Andre Daspre," in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster, 151-5 (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001).

grain of salt in the sea; but at the same time the infinite sea seemed to be contained in the grain of salt. The grain could no longer be localized in time and space. It was a state in which thought lost its direction and started to circle, like the compass needle at the magnetic pole; until finally it cut loose from its axis and travelled freely in space, like a bunch of light in the night; and until it seemed that all thoughts and all sensations, even pain and joy itself, were only the spectrum lines of the same ray of light, disintegrating in the prisma of consciousness.²

The "oceanic sense", i.e., the experience of the psychic level which is transpersonal, timeless and boundless, is indeed recognized by the Jungian psychoanalytical school. In his autobiography, Jung claims that "the psyche at times functions outside of the spatio-temporal law of causality... [W]e must face the fact that at least a part of our psychic existence is characterized by a relativity of space and time. This relativity seems to increase, in proportion to the distance from consciousness, to an absolute condition of timelessness and spacelessness." This deep unconscious realm is related to the Jungian archetype of the Self, or the eternal man, as opposed to the ego or the earthly man, whose locus is in here and now.³ Steven Walker points out that in conceiving the archetype of the Self Jung was very likely inspired by the Hindu term "Atman" (literally "Self" in Sanskrit), "which designates the transpersonal oneness of identity for all beings in the nondualist metaphysics of Vedanta."⁴ Also referred to by the Jungians as "the God within" or "the transpersonal realm within the personal life", the Self represents our link to the infinite, harking back to the ancient Christian view that "self-knowledge is the road to knowledge of God". According to Jung, the awareness of this link, connecting one with something larger than the ego, introduces a sense of purpose and responsibility in life, and therefore makes one rethink one's objectives, attitudes and priorities: "In the final analysis, we count for something only because of the essential we embody, and if we do not embody that, life is wasted. In our relationship to other men, too, the crucial question is whether an element of boundless is expressed in the relationship."⁵

Jung stresses, however, that the relationship between the ego and the Self also brings about one's awareness of the uniqueness and value of an individual, which is equally important to bear in mind. This awareness is likewise a constituent part of Rubashov's mystical experience: while he envisages one's personality as a grain of salt dissolving in the infinite sea, the sea is at the same time paradoxically contained in the grain of salt. Each human being incorporates all of humanity in his or her psychic microcosm, so that the "oceanic sense" does not only make one feel related to the mankind in general, but also awakens one's capacity to sympathize with concrete individuals and intuit their innermost being. Without the simultaneous perception of one's individuality and one's oceanic unity with the rest of creation, Jung maintains, there can be no coming to consciousness, "merely a delusory identity with it, which takes the form of intoxication with large numbers and an avidity for political power".⁶

Also illuminating in understanding this motif is Koestler's own biographical material, presented in his essay in the collection *The God that Failed*. Captured by Franco's troops

² Arthur Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, trans. Daphne Hardy (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982), 203.

³ Carl G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Vintage, 1989), 322-3.

⁴ Steven Walker, *Jung and the Jungians on Myth* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 84.

⁵ Jung, 325.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 325-6.

in the Spanish Civil War, Koestler spent four months in the prisons in Malaga and Seville, "most of the time in solitary confinement and most of the time convinced that [he] was going to be shot." Rubashov's "oceanic sense" is probably modelled on the spiritual insight Koestler had during that period: his essay states this experience is "difficult to describe", "usually referred to in terms borrowed from the vocabulary of mysticism, which would present itself at unexpected moments and induce a state of inner peace which I have known neither before nor since"; an acquaintance with "a different kind of reality, which had altered my outlook and values... profoundly". This condition, Koestler recalls, was also related to his increased capacity to feel pity and sympathy for other inmates, his realization that "men cannot be treated as units in operation of political arithmetic", and that charity "[is] not a petty-bourgeois sentiment but the gravitational force which keeps civilization in its orbit."⁷

These important insights, however, are apparently incompatible with the Party doctrine. It is demonstrated how Rubashov recurrently feels compelled to discard his mystical intimations with a sense of shame, thus severing his link with the deepest psychic layers:

Afterwards he had been ashamed of himself. The Party disapproved of such states. It called them petty bourgeois mysticism, refuge in the ivory tower. It called them "escape from the task", "desertion of the class struggle". The "oceanic sense" was counter-revolutionary.

For in a struggle one must have both legs firmly planted on the earth. The Party taught one how to do it. The infinite was a politically suspect quantity, the "I" a suspect quality.⁸

Both the notion of individuality and the notion of the infinite, derived from the experience of the deepest self, fall prey to indoctrination. As Jung succinctly observes, "the phenomenon of dictators and all the misery they have wrought springs from the fact that man has been robbed of transcendence by the shortsightedness of the super-intellectuals."⁹ Jung's point, however, needs to be elaborated on, since the problem is not exclusively in the extreme rationalism of the Marxist philosophy. There are examples throughout history of how institutional religions also produced authoritarian ideologies: Koestler is aware of this, and recurrently uses the maxims of dogmatic Christian thinkers as epigraphs in the novel, drawing implicit parallels with Stalinism. What these doctrines have in common is that, regardless of whether they recognize the existence of some transcendent realm or not, they all deny an individual his or her capacity for self-insight and undertaking an authentic, self-determined journey of individuation. As opposed to the tradition which teaches about journeying from ego to the Self, such ideologies exact instead the surrender of all individuality to an external authority – or, in Althusser's terms, one's willing subjection to the Subject.

Furthermore, as the narrative demonstrates, the refusal to acknowledge the level of the psyche at which one is capable of experiencing empathy and oneness with another human being may eventually result in the totalitarian disregard for the very life of an individual. Assuming that the individual is 'a multitude of one million divided by one mil-

⁷ Arthur Koestler, "Arthur Koestler," in *The God that Failed*, ed. R. Crossman, 67-8 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001)

⁸ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 204.

⁹ Jung, 326.

lion', it leads to the establishment of what Ivanov, one of Rubashov's interrogators in GPU prison, calls "vivisection morality": "[It] starts from the basic principle that a collective aim justifies all means, and not only allows, but demands, that the individual should in every way be subordinated and sacrificed to the community – which may dispose of it as an experimentation rabbit or a sacrificial lamb."¹⁰ At the personal level, it is the mindset which enables Rubashov to sacrifice cold-heartedly people such as the young German communist Richard or the Belgium dock workers' leader Loewy, who have "sinned" by swerving from the official Party line; eventually, the reliance on this same principle makes him desert his lover Arlova, who is falsely accused and victimized in one of the early Stalinist purges. Even as he considers the prospect of toppling Stalin's government, or at least outliving and eventually reforming it, Rubashov's consciousness remains trapped in the same ideological construct he wishes to oppose: telling himself that his own existence is more valuable to the Revolution than Arlova's, and that it is his duty to keep himself "in reserve for later on", he makes a public declaration of loyalty to the regime and disavows his lover.

When Rubashov's shadow-self, the "grammatical fiction", surfaces and reminds him of these betrayals, it does not communicate its forbidden messages in the language of rational concepts, but in a sign system consisting of images, scents, sounds, involuntary actions and certain physical symptoms:

Rubashov tried to study this newly discovered entity very thoroughly... With the shyness of emphasizing the first person singular customary in the Party, he had christened it the "grammatical fiction"... The realm of the "grammatical fiction" seemed to begin just where "thinking to a conclusion" ended. It was obviously an essential part of its being, to remain out of reach of logical thought...

...direct questions and logical meditations did not induce it to speak; its utterances occurred without visible cause and, strangely enough, always accompanied by a sharp attack of a toothache. Its mental sphere seemed to be composed of such various and disconnected parts as the folded hands of the *Pietà*..., or a particular sentence Arlova had once spoken on a particular occasion. Its means of expression were equally fragmentary: for instance, the compulsion to rub one's pince-nez on one's sleeve, ...the uncontrollable movements of the lips which murmured such senseless sentences as "I shall pay", and the dazed state induced by day-dreams of past episodes in one's life.¹¹

Each of the fragmentary utterances of the "grammatical fiction", however, is pregnant with symbolical meaning. *Pietà* was one of the paintings hanging in the museum where Rubashov excommunicated young Richard from the Party, thus leaving him unprotected against the ongoing Nazi witch-hunt. The folded hands of the *Pietà* appear to be pleading for disregarded human values such as mercy and compassion; she represents the feminine, as a principle suppressed not only in Rubashov's own psyche, but in the occidental civilization in general. The sentence Arlova spoke is, "You will always be able to do what you like with me". It haunts Rubashov as it implies complete trust and surrender, not to an external authority or to an abstract ideal, but to a beloved individual.¹²

¹⁰ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 128.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 91-2.

¹² Throughout the novel, Rubashov also frequently recalls the bodily scent of his lover and the shape of her breasts; these memories trouble him because they cannot be incorporated into the logical formula he uses to justify his act of betrayal.

The phrase "I shall pay", however, does not refer only to Rubashov's need to atone for the acts of sacrificing his comrades and his lover, but also to his feeling of regret regarding all the acts of violence he has committed in his life – including also scores of the czarist soldiers he has had shot during the Civil War. At first he tries to separate mentally these two groups of people: "To you I owe no fare... That was all right; it lay on a different plane to a case like Richard's, and he would do it again today... It was necessary and right."¹³ However, through befriending his next-door neighbour in GPU prison, who happens to be a czarist officer, Rubashov becomes aware of a sense of sympathy surpassing rationalisations for hostility towards one's political opponents. Residing in the realm of the "grammatical fiction" is an all-embracing urge for forgiveness and a feeling of compassion for all human beings, including also those whom his partisan ideology classifies as "enemies":

The old disease again, thought Rubashov. Revolutionaries should not think through other people's minds.

Or, perhaps they should? Or even ought to?

How can one change the world if one identifies oneself with everybody?

How else can one change it?

He who understands and forgives – where would he find a motive to act?

Where would he not?¹⁴

Rubashov's recurrent toothache is an especially interesting motif, as it appears throughout the novel whenever the protagonist does not act in accordance with his inner self. As it is an eye-tooth, the pain in it is related to the idea of moral vision and symbolizes the "stabs of conscience". Similarly, Rubashov's compulsion to repeatedly wipe his pince-nez on his sleeve symbolizes his need to cleanse and improve his moral perception.

With regard to one's moral vision, two psychological theories are offered in the novel. The first is comparable to Freud's notion of the superego, or Lacan's Law: it maintains that our personal concept of morality is established at the psychic level which is structured around the internalized authority of the father – the level at which we have also internalized the commandments of the patriarchal culture and all forms of social and religious authority. This is also similar to Althusser's notion of a "good subject", who does not realize that his "ethical" behaviour is really governed by the internalized ISAs:

The vast majority of (good) subjects work all right "all by themselves", i.e. by ideology (whose concrete forms are realized in the Ideological State Apparatuses [ISAs])... They "recognize" the existing state of affairs, "that it is really true that it is so and not otherwise", and that they must be obedient to God, to their conscience, to the priest, to de Gaulle, to the boss, to the engineer, that thou shalt "love thy neighbour as thyself"...¹⁵

From this point of view, the notion of "conscience" is simply a part of the ideological superstructure, a forgery of the hypocritical bourgeois humanism whose real purpose is to serve the interests of the governing classes and perpetuate status quo: Rubashov's interrogator Ivanov presents it in an image of "a God with the double chin of industrial liber-

¹³ Koestler, *Darkness at noon*, 50.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁵ Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 123.

alism and the charity of the Salvation Army soups". Ivanov concludes that a revolutionary should deconstruct the notion of conscience and discard its concomitant experiences altogether:

...a conscience renders one as unfit for the revolution as a double chin. Conscience eats through the brain like a cancer, until the whole of the grey matter is devoured. ... Sympathy, conscience, disgust, despair, repentance, and atonement are for us repellent debauchery.... When the accursed inner voice speaks to you, hold your hands over your ears... To sell oneself for thirty pieces of silver is an honest transaction; but to sell oneself to one's own conscience is to abandon mankind. History is *a priori* amoral; it has no conscience. To want to conduct history according to the maxims of the Sunday school means to leave everything as it is.¹⁶

Sadly, Ivanov's wholesale and indiscriminate rejection of the humanist tradition eventually turns him into an apologist for gulags and political persecution, which he justifies by claims of revolutionary and historical necessity.¹⁷

The other concept of ethics presented in the novel suggests that, apart from the conventional morality imposed on us by the societal structures, we also possess an innate and authentic will-to-good residing in our deepest self. Jung called this personal moral urge "the two-million-year-old man within us", implying that it is embedded in the primordial layers of the psyche and preserved as an archetypal determinant of human behaviour ever since prehistoric times. "It is the voice of the Self that dictates the right action with a certain conviction, even when it appears to be in conflict with collective codes... In the spiritual literature, this reconciling with the Self has been called aligning with the Tao, living one's dharma, or being in the flow of life."¹⁸

In the novel, this inner moral sense is again represented as a part of Rubashov's "grammatical fiction", the portion of the self suppressed from the conscious attitude and juxtaposed to the ideological position of the subject. In *Man for Himself*, Erich Fromm points out that one of the tenets of the authoritarian ethics is that it denies man's individual capacity to distinguish between good and evil and determine what is in his best interest. The norms determining these are instead established by some external authority surpassing the individual: this authority is consequently considered absolute and must never be questioned.¹⁹

The connection between moral self-reliance and the "grammatical fiction" is implied in the novel through a curious cross-reference. Discussing moral issues with Ivanov, Rubashov reminds him of Raskolnikov, the protagonist of Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, who discovers he cannot justify his act of murder by applying a mathematical equation to it, because "twice two are not four when mathematical units are human

¹⁶ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 122-5.

¹⁷ Rubashov notices that Ivanov, while delivering his extensive speech against conscience and the supremacy of the inner voice, and in defence of totalitarian practices, has emptied a whole bottle of brandy – in an apparent effort to drown the reprimand of his own "grammatical fiction".

¹⁸ Connie Zweig and Steve Wolf, *Romancing the Shadow* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1997), 16.

¹⁹ Erich Fromm, *Covjek za sebe*, trans. H. Lisinski (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1980), 18-9. Fromm also points out that the notion of self-interest needn't necessarily be synonymous with egotism and selfishness, and as such at odds with the interest of the greater Whole – provided that "self-interest" is properly defined as the interest of one's deepest and most authentic self. The genuine interest of the self, according to Fromm, lies in the development of the most valuable human potentials, such as love, productiveness, reason and imagination. Our egotism, he maintains, is really *not* in our best self-interest.

beings". The numbers two and four appear again towards the end of the novel, when Rubashov, awaiting execution, for the first time consciously taps the cipher 2-4 on the wall of his cell. In the "quadratic alphabet" the prisoners use to communicate with each other by tapping on the joint walls of their cells, 2-4 corresponds to the letter "I". Symbolically, the coincidence in numbers suggests that the recognition of one's innermost self and one's capacity to make moral distinctions are essentially related.

The issue of morality is treated in *Darkness at Noon* not only in connection to Rubashov's psyche, but also to the communist movement in general. "We are doing the work of prophets without their gift," Rubashov writes in his diary. "We replaced vision by logical deduction..."; "We have thrown overboard all conventions, our sole guiding principle is that of consequent logics; we are sailing without ethical ballast."²⁰ Disregarding the visions of "oceanic oneness" and proper ethical conduct residing in the inner self, the Party has tried to replace them by logic, science, and social engineering, and in this way lost its moral compass. The archetype underlying Koestler's novel is the Biblical account of Exodus: just like Moses, the communist revolutionaries set out with a noble intention to liberate the masses from slavery and lead them to a utopian Promised Land; but lacking the spiritual guidance of the Biblical prophets, they lose their way in the desert. Rubashov recalls a part in the Bible where the tribes in the desert begin to cry: Let us choose a captain and return unto the fleshpots of Egypt. The desert symbolizes not only the material destitution of living under a totalitarian regime, but also the inner wasteland of the people who have lost their map of meaning.

It follows that Ivanov's idea to simply discard the bourgeois concept of morality, and conduct revolution according to the Machiavellian maxim that the end justifies the means, does not suffice. As Rubashov concludes, "It was obviously not enough to direct man's eyes towards a goal and put a knife in his hand... Perhaps it did not suit mankind to sail without [ethical] ballast. And perhaps reason alone was a defective compass, which led one on such a winding, twisted course that the goal finally disappeared in the mist."²¹ Instead of just deconstructing the previous notion of conscience, the quintessential revolutionary act would be to construct a new one, based on a more comprehensive knowledge of the Self.

*

It would appear that the subject and the "grammatical fiction" are irreconcilable attitudes within the heart and the mind of the protagonist, and that there is an absolute polarity between politics and the concerns of one's personal being. However, there are hints throughout Koestler's novel that it doesn't have to be so.

In order to attain a different perspective, from which some creative synthesis might be attempted, both the terms "I" and "we", "the grain of salt" and "the infinite sea" of Rubashov's vision, need to recover their original meaning. As Rubashov points to Ivanov, the original "great we" of the revolution, for which the "I" was willing to sacrifice, were the masses, the people of one's country or mankind in general. Rubashov recalls that the ideas which have made him join the Party were "the promise of a more dignified form of life for mankind" and the urge "to abolish senseless suffering." Inevitable in human life is

²⁰ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 206.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 205-6.

only such suffering as is rooted in biological fatality; all other kinds of suffering are of social origin, hence pointless and senseless, and may be removed by means of proper social action. Koestler's narrative pays homage to the nobility of this original project and recognizes its inherent altruistic devotion to the welfare of humanity: it accounts for the moving and tragic self-sacrificing behaviour of the Party members, the examples of which abound in *Darkness at Noon*. These include Rubashov himself, who endures two years in the Gestapo prison without betraying his cause. Rubashov feels, however, that the totalitarian regime and the Party dogma have "killed the 'we'"; they no longer duly represent the masses, nor work in the interest of the progress of humanity.

Rubashov's need to recover the original "great we" of the revolution is also evident in the final speech he delivers at his trial. In Orwell's interpretation, Koestler's hero accepts to go through the humiliating public trial and act as a scapegoat for his Party simply out of his long habit of loyalty to it and out of "mental bankruptcy"²²; however, it is important to note that Rubashov concludes his speech with a declaration of loyalty not to the regime, but to the people of the Soviet Union: "On the threshold of my last hour, I bend my knees to the country, to the masses and to the whole people."²³ Similarly, Koestler's account of his involvement with the communist movement in *The God that Failed* does not end on a note of unequivocal break with it. He compares himself to the Biblical Jacob, who works hard to win Laban's beautiful daughter Rachel, and whose love for her is so great that he resumes his efforts even after he has been sorely cheated by her father. Just like Jacob, in spite of his disillusionment with the Party dogma, Koestler persists in his conviction that it is right to work and sacrifice for the benefit of humanity.²⁴

Feeling emotionally reconnected with the "great we" of his country and with mankind in general, Rubashov declares that "his account with history is settled". Overwhelmed by a sense of deep inner peace, he devotes the last hours of his life to the "I", his "silent partner" or "the grammatical fiction", finally recognizing and reintegrating the outlawed portion of his personal being. The restored inner realm provides him with the capacity to balance and reconcile the opposites which hitherto have been irreconcilable. Swept away once more by the "oceanic sense", Rubashov has a beautiful vision of some futuristic movement which will have both political and spiritual concerns, be aware of both the ethical obligation and the historical processes, and respect the needs of an individual as well as those of the community:

Perhaps later, much later, the new movement would arise – with new flags, a new spirit knowing of both: of economic fatality *and* the "oceanic sense". Perhaps the members of the new party will wear monks' cowls, and preach that only purity of means can justify the ends. Perhaps they will teach that the tenet is wrong which says that a man is the product of one million divided by one million, and will introduce a new kind of arithmetic based on multiplication: on the joining of a million individuals to form a new entity which, no longer an amorphous mass, will develop a consciousness and an individuality of its own, with an "oceanic feeling" increased a millionfold, in unlimited yet self-contained space.²⁵

²² George Orwell, "Arthur Koestler," in *Collected Essays* (Adelaide: eBooks, 2004), <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79e/part21.html>

²³ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 199.

²⁴ Koestler, "Arthur Koestler," 74-5.

²⁵ Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*, 207.

REFERENCES

1. Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, translated by Ben Brewster, 85-126. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001.
2. Althusser, Louis. "Letter on Art in Reply to Andre Daspre." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, translated by Ben Brewster, 151-155. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001.
3. Fromm, Erich. *Covjek za sebe*, translated by Hrvoje Lisinski. Zagreb: Naprijed, 1980.
4. Jung, Carl G. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Vintage, 1989.
5. Koestler, Arthur. "Arthur Koestler." In *The God that Failed*, edited by Richard Crossman, 15-75. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
6. -----, *Darkness at Noon*, translated by Daphne Hardy. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.
7. Orwell, George. "Arthur Koestler." In *Collected Essays*. Adelaide: eBooks, 2004.
<http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79e/part21.html>
8. Walker, Steven. *Jung and the Jungians on Myth*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
9. Zweig, C. and S. Wolf. *Romancing the Shadow*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1997.

GRAMATIČKA FIKCIJA: IDEOLOŠKI SUBJEKT I JASTVO U KESTLEROVOM ROMANU TAMA U PODNE

Nataša Tučev

Rad polazi sa stanovišta da je umetnost u stanju da artikulise i iznese na videlo onaj deo ličnosti koji iskoračuje iz okvira ideoloških uslovljenosti, i predstavlja uporište odakle je moguće suprotstaviti se procesu koji Altuzer naziva interpelacijom. Protagonista Kestlerovog romana Tama u podne, Rubašov, tom najprisnijem doživljaju jastva nadenuo je ime "gramatička fikcija". Partija čiji je Rubašov član nalaže mu da se u borbi za društvene promene odrekne ne samo ličnih interesa, već isto tako i mističnih doživljaja unutrašnjeg bića i jedinstva sa čitavim čovečanstvom, duhovnih iskustava i sposobnosti da se osloni na sopstveno moralno rasudjivanje. Ove odbačene vrednosti konstituišu zaseban segment ličnosti, senku ili Drugo, koje postaje važan kontrapunkt ideološkoj poziciji protagoniste. Rad razmatra na koji način Kestlerov roman suprotstavlja "gramatičku fikciju" i ideološki subjekt kao dva mentalna stava u toku svesti glavnog lika, i do kakvih zaključaka kroz to suprotstavljanje dolazi. Pri tom se ističe da Kestlerovo delo ne nudi samo tumačenje jedne ideologije, već i specifičnu koncepciju jastva i smernice za željeni napredak ljudskog društva.

Ključne reči: ideologija, subjekt, jastvo, individualnost, saosećanje, savest, duhovnost, društvo.