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Abstract
This paper tries to analyze the language and the dialogue between characters in William Faulkner’s The Sound and The Fury and its conflict with the reality of the author. The tradition of the Compson family implies duality in this novel. Except Dilsey, the corrupted aristocratic values in the Compson family reflect the author’s “dramatization of what he understood as a reality” (1). Faulkner is aware of the corrupted traditions that the family adopt, yet this awareness failed to convey his real narrative voice. This contradiction identifies “the conflict between the autonomy of the artist and his immersion in the history” (1). This conflict is revealed in Faulkner’s characters in their struggle between order and chaos, and resurrection and renewal. Each one of this family defines the chaos in different way. For instance, Quentin relies on his old tradition to provide order; Jason attempts to use the old tradition for his personal gain; Benjy also attempts to rely on his old traditions, but he becomes upset when he fails in providing this order. The only person who represents the real aim of the author is Dilsey. Dilsey wants to renew the old values by relying on love, faith, and hard work. Yet, Faulkner does not focus on specific perspective. He uses different perspectives and narratives and that creates difficulty in conveying Faulkner’s real voice. The Sound and The Fury may be represented as an important novel in exploring the old Christian traditions and the aristocratic values, the modern society that adopt these values, and the real aim of the author in leaving these values and renew them. The result as Bakhtin argues that basic reality of this conflict could be found in the author’s character rather than the speech and the discourse of the other character.
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A Bakhtinian Reading of William Faulkner’s The Sound and the Fury

In The Sound and the Fury, Quentin refers to the philosophical idea that time, victory, and purity are all worthless. He refers to these ideas while remembering the watch that was given to him by his father:

When the shadow of the sash appeared on the curtains it was between seven and eight oclock and then I was in time again, hearing the watch. It was Grandfather’s and when Father gave it to me he said I give you the mausoleum of all hope and desire; it’s rather excruciating-ly apt that you will use it to gain the reducto absurdum of all human experience which can fit your individual needs no better than it fitted his or his father’s. I give it to you not that you may remember time, but that you might forget it now and then for a moment and not spend all your breath trying to conquer it. Because no battle is ever won he said. They are not even fought. The field only reveals to man his own folly and despair, and victory is an illusion of philosophers and fools. (Faulkner, 1984, p. 76)

The apparent idea in these lines is clear but not what its author wants to say. When Quentin’s father, Mr. Compson, gives his son the advice that time is a lie, he only retells what his father told him about time. This advice is not from Mr. Compson but from his father. He decides to retell it to his son Quentin. The narrative technique is complicated in this novel. There are multiple voices that express their reactions about time, victory, and purity. This kind of narrative provides a picture about how the Compson family members consider the heritage of their social relations: that they speak and retell their beliefs and convictions unconsciously.

The result is the theory of polyglossia, heteroglossia, and the chronotope in Bakhtin’s sense. Bakhtin’s interpretation of heteroglossia, polyglossia, and the chronotope is quite clear in Faulkner’s The Sound and the Fury. Faulkner’s novels are excellent for studying Bakhtin’s theory of heteroglossia, polyglossia, and the chronotope, which is what this paper aims to do. It will apply these concepts by studying and analyzing the language of many characters: Quentin, Benjy, Jason, Mr. Compson, Caddy, and Dilsey. It will analyze the language of social groups, which is an aristocratic and racial language. These characters are raised in an aristocratic society and thus, their language and manners are incorporated and combined with their patriarchal culture. This leads to creating different and various voices and identities in each of these characters: Quentin, Benjy, Jason, Mr. Compson, Caddy, and Dilsey.

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, a Russian philosopher and critic, was a prominent figure in the thought of the twentieth century. He is well known for his essays about the dialogue of imagination; in these essays, Bakhtin analyzes the
language and discourse in the novel. First, by heteroglossia, he means the variations of meanings and codes within a single linguistic code. That is to say, there is a conflict between the speech of characters, the speech of the narrator, and the speech of the author. Second, Bakhtin refers to dialogism as the hybrid language of a work. Through this concept, Bakhtin means that the novel has a continual dialogue with other works, writers, and philosophies. These two concepts are highly apparent in Faulkner’s The Sound and the Fury.

Bakhtin argues that “all of life [is] ongoing dialogue which takes place at every moment of daily existence” (Sanchez, 1998, p. 52). Thus, our language refers to other dialogues and thus creates a discourse. Maria Ruth Noriega Sanchez (1998) explains the Bakhtinian notion that literary language is one of the heteroglot languages. Bakhtin writes:

Language is heteroglot from top to bottom: It represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the past and the present...between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, aligven a bodily form. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 291)

Bakhtin describes another kind of heteroglossia, which is the incorporated genre in the novel, i.e., polyglossia. According to Bakhtin, the novel incorporates different kinds of genres, both artistic and extra-artistic. Bakhtin (2008a) said that “any genre could be included in the construction of the novel, and in fact it is difficult to find any genres that have not at some point been incorporated into a novel by someone” (p. 321); for instance, there is “philosophical digression” that enters the novel, brings its own language and therefore “stratif[es] the linguistic unity of the novel” (p. 321). Faulkner brings a Dostoyevskian philosophical idea into the novel: Quentin says that a girl “glared at me. She just needed a bunch of switches, a blackboard behind her 2 x 2 e 5” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 126). This is the same digression that Dostoyevsky (2001) incorporated into his novel, Notes from Underground: “but if we are to give everything its due, twice two makes five is sometimes a very charming thing too” (p. 30). This philosophical digression that is fused with Faulkner’s dialogue refers to the genre that is incorporated into the novel and how Dostoyevsky’s novel is incorporated with Faulkner’s. This incorporation produces a dialogue that does not belong to reality but to internal dialogue and philosophy. These two ideas actually “defy the generic classification” of the novel (Sanchez, 1998, p. 57). Quentin’s reference to this philosophy is incorporated into the novel and applies the uncertainty and power of isolation that both Quentin and the unnamed narrator in Notes from Underground share. In other words, both Quentin and the unnamed narrator refuse the general concept of 2 x 2 e 4 and try to create another concept that does not relate to their real external world because they refuse to communicate with it. Therefore, both of them establish a new charming philosophy. Thus, it is difficult to see a single category in the novel because it mixes with and incorporates other novels and genres. This is the same as the idea of the internal dialogue.

In The Sound and the Fury, many dialogical relationships are established. There are many dialogues that occur either between the author and a character or between a character and another character. The reader can also find a great deal of monologue among the different dialogues. Faulkner’s novels are well known for these monologues and the “absolute word” that controls humans (Lockyer, 1991a, p. xi). Judith Lockyer (1991a) argued that although the reader might disagree with the word he wants to say, he/she cannot escape the word itself. She argued that “we can choose to disobey, but we cannot alter the words themselves” (p. xi). Each time Faulkner tries to create a dialogue, he shifts to an internal dialogue or monologue that keeps him from connecting with his characters. In this novel, Faulkner struggles to make an authorial dialogue; he “makes the struggle for authority also a struggle for an issue beyond individual control” (Lockyer, 1991a, p. xi). This conflict between Faulkner’s internal dialogue and his efforts to create a dialogue among characters clearly appears in Quentin’s many speeches.

Quentin’s struggle with words is that the word cannot express the reality of what he wants to say. For Quentin, words are different from their referents. Many critics have discussed that Quentin’s isolation is the reason that leads to this kind of language, “with his knowledge that all language exists in the world and the world exists in language” (Lockyer, 1991b, p. 33):

I didn’t look back the tree frogs didn’t pay me any mind the gray light lie moss in the trees drizzling but still it wouldn’t rain after a while I returned went back to the edge of the woods as soon as I got there I began to smell honeysuckle again I could see the lights on the courthouse clock and the glare of town….I went thinking about anything at all she came along the bank and stopped I didn’t move. (Faulkner, 1984, p. 156)

Quentin’s words reflect that he cannot establish a clear dialogue because of his inner struggle with his feelings. He sees the reality of life only in his inner soul. The world that Quentin wants to create can only be found in his mind. Lockyer (1991b) suggests, “Quentin’s growing isolation is teeming with thought and concerns relational possibilities; it also reinforces the fact that Quentin’s real life is in his mind” (p. 33). Quentin’s dialogue is not rhetorical. Faulkner here cannot achieve rhetorical success in this dialogue; however, he is aware of this problem. Quentin has a desire to convey absolute reality, but the world that is available and the language of that world does not fit with Quentin’s monologue and his demand to convey the reality that he sees. Quentin cannot articulate his experience, and there is a gap between his consciousness and the external world.

However, in the previous lines, Quentin’s words do not fit with his insanity. This refers to a gap between Faulkner, the author, and Quentin, the character. In these lines, we hear Quentin’s words, “but only as [they are] interwoven and permeated by the author accent” (Sanchez, 1998, p. 45). Therefore, this last speech provides an interpretation of what Bakhtin means by an intentional semantic hybrid. According to Bakhtin (2008a), it is “internally dialogic...Two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically” (p. 360). This dialogue is a Bakhtinian discourse of double-voiced dialogue in which “two potential utterances are fused, two responses are, as it were, harnessed in a potential dialogue” (Bakhtin, 2008a, p. 361). Sanchez (1998) points out that “for Bakhtin as for Faulkner, realism lies...
not in the illusion of unmediated representation but in the picturing of social voices within language” (p. 54). Faulkner’s words and their interaction with Quentin’s speech “create a perspective for it...[and]create the situation and conditions necessary for it to sound” (p. 358). There is also another kind of Bakhtinian dialogue, and it appears when a character enters a dialogue with another character.

There is a hypothetical dialogue that appears between Quentin and his father. He repeats his father’s words because he wants to possess authority. He associates his forgetfulness with the sound of a watch in his memory of his father. His father told him that “down the long and lonely light-rays you might see Jesus walking, like” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 76). Quentin moves from describing the sphere, the place, and the time he was connected to an explanation of his father’s reaction toward time and the watch’s clicks. Quentin calls “Father said” each time he refers to or ends his speech. He always recalls his father’s words to give his voice an authority. Because Quentin wants to strengthen the power of his words, and because “he denies any separation between word and referent” (Lockyer, 1991b, p. 31), he uses his father’s words to give himself authority and give his emotions a voice. Again, he finds that only through his father’s words and voice can he speak and communicate.

Bakhtin defines the “internally persuasive discourse” as a term that refers to a struggle between the characters and the author. It is the struggle between the individual’s discourse and his authority. Lockyer (1991b) interpreted Bakhtin’s theory by stating, “Bakhtin frames his definition of this discourse in terms of the struggle of individual discourse, inseparable as it is from individual ideology, with the word of an authority” (p. 43). Both the author and the character attempt to empower their own words and give themselves authority over each other. Because Faulkner has authoritative knowledge of the southern accent and rhetoric, his writing and voice both depend on authoritative discourse. The reader finds that this impulse is given a voice through Quentin. Faulkner contends with the other characters to exercise and apply this authority. It is Quentin “who allows Faulkner to confront directly the dangers of closed, monologic narrative” (Lockyer, 1991b, p. 43).

As he contends with Faulkner, Quentin also “contends” with his father’s words. Indeed, Faulkner manifests this idea through Quentin. Quentin interprets exactly what Bakhtin means by authoritative discourse. Each time, Quentin’s voice begins to sound like his father’s. Quentin says “Roses, Roses. Mr. and Mrs. Jason Richmond Compson announce the marriage of Roses. Not virgins like dogwood, milkweed. I said I have committed incest, Father I said” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 77). Here, Quentin’s voice begins to sound like his father’s. This is the same technique that Faulkner uses in Absalom, Absalom. Quentin thinks, “Maybe nothing ever happens one and is finished...maybe it took father and me both to make Sherve or Sherve and me both to make Father or maybe Thomas Sutpen to make all of us” (as cited in Lockyer, 1991b, p. 43). In both of the novels, the character Quentin tries to say that articulation and speech cannot occur unless people connect with each other. As Lockyer (1991b) states, “[Quentin] theorizes that it is not events that connect people, but what people make of events that connects them” (p. 43). People can only communicate through language, and language and articulation give people the power to communicate. By articulating and transcribing the words of the other characters, the personality of each character is shaped and distinguished. Faulkner attempts to say that “collaborative efforts of telling the story of the marriage of Roses and Thomas Sutpen ‘shaped and distinguished the people who tell as well’” (Lockyer, 1991b, p. 43). While characters and people in the two novels try to collaborate and communicate among each other, the voice of one of the characters always tries to gain authority by forming an authoritative discourse. Therefore, Faulkner attempts to gain authority or communicate his authority through his works. However, he never fully gains this authority by collaborating with another character. Faulkner structures these novels through a “series of retelling that vie for authority” (Lockyer, 1991b, p. 43), but he struggles with his characters and competes with them to assert his authority. Because Faulkner is too authoritative on the legacy of southern rhetoric, his novel is filled with authoritative discourses. He contends to show this struggle through his characters.

Quentin’s death explains what Bakhtin means by the idea of heteroglossia. Bakhtin argues that heteroglossia is the socio-ideological contradictions among different groups “in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form” (Sanchez, 1998, p. 53). Quentin represents what Bakhtin means by the authorial voice. When Quentin decides to commit suicide, he attempts to bring in his grandfather’s authorial voice. Quentin’s grandfather is “one of the aristocratic, slave-owning South; he is also identified with the classical fathers of Western civilization” (Pearce, 1991, p. 83). This position gives him the power to convince Quentin’s father that time is “the mausoleum of all hope and desire” and that time “is a symptom of mind-function” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 76). This authorial advice lets Quentin “[order] every moment of his day...from the moment he wakes up until the moment before the clock strikes his last hour. Quentin ‘breaks the storyline and drifts back to moments from the past’” (Pearce, 1991, p. 83). Quentin’s breaking for the storyline makes anxious about time; it appears that he does not want to waste his time. However, Quentin finds that time has been a problem for him all his life, so he decides to “stop the clock by committing suicide” (Pearce, 1991, p. 83). Therefore, Quentin’s death refers to his father’s belief that words and language have power. Because Quentin does not have the words to speak and express his emotions, his father, Mr. Compson, is more powerful and is able to shape Quentin’s beliefs. Moreover, through Mr. Compson’s powerful words, he convinces Quentin to believe that victory is “an illusion of philosophers and fools” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 76). In addition, his father tells him that purity is a lie. This is another reason why Quentin tells his father about Caddy’s incest story: he does not want to waste his time. Telling Caddy’s story and committing suicide refer to Mr. Compson’s powerful authorial voice. Because of Mr. Compson’s powerful authorial voice, Quentin chooses to believe that purity is a lie. Therefore, he decides to tell his father about the incest. Quentin finally realizes his father’s southern masculine personality and thus he disappears in his father’s identity by committing suicide. Quentin decides that he is no longer significant in his society. James McAdams (2012) says, “The significance of ‘Quentin’ no longer functions as it did in former times of glory and social order” (p. 20). Again, because Quentin is aware of Caddy’s purity and innocence, he
chooses to be merged with her innocence and purity. That is Quentin “commits suicide, drowning himself in Boston’s Charles River in a state of virginity” (as cited in McAdams, 2012, p. 20). McAdams (2012) says, “The three defining effeminate predicates for Quentin thus become: suicide, virgin, and sister-love.” (p. 20). Quentin and Caddy are not powerful as Quentin’s father, Mr. Compson, and his grandfather. Therefore, Quentin and Caddy’s voices disappear and merged with the authorial voice of Mr. Compson and the grandfather.

There is another inner dialogism that Faulkner introduced in his novel, *The Sound and the Fury*. To be precise, it is the polyglossia that was introduced in Dostoyevsky. This is one of the most important characteristics in Faulkner’s novel. The characters lapse and deviate to an inner dialogue. Sergie Charkovsky (1984) argues that the arguments in all of Faulkner’s novels are “multisided” (p. 294). It is clearly evident in *The Sound and the Fury*. All the arguments of the characters, such as Quentin, Benjy, Jason, Caddy and Dilsey, are inclined to be unclear in the beginning, but they become very clear in the end. For example, Jason tries to use a certain word, but he uses it incorrectly. The word becomes vague, but then his thoughts and ideas become clear. Like, Quentin, Jason uses a language that is not his own. Jason alienates himself of the disintegration of the shopkeeper in his country because he believes in his family’s aristocracy. He tries to speak in “the markedly vulgar manner of a country shopkeeper in order to alienate himself from his disintegrating, despite its ‘aristocracy of the spirit,’ family” (Charkovsky, 1984, p. 294). The words for Jason become for him “temptation and a trial” (Charkovsky, 1984, p. 294). Jason has the authority over his words and his words become subjected to his needs. Jason feels that there is no limitation to using any kind of word in any capacity. Charkovsky (1984) discusses that Faulkner’s characters require “more words, more punctuation marks, more types of print so that he can preserve the crumbling unity of his story...prolong the desired event and ‘erase’ the unwanted one” (p. 295). Jason is in conflict with the people around him, the events, and the words. His feelings and thoughts change frequently and sometimes at the same moment that he speaks with another character. However, he bends his words to his needs and shows authority over his people and events. Although Jason slips and deviates from his speech, he is authoritative. Jason’s clear authority appears when he talks about his family’s craziness:

“All the time I could see them watching me like a hawk, waiting for a chance to say Well I’m not surprised I expected it all the time the whole family’s crazy. Selling land to send him to Harvard and paying taxes to support a state University all the time that I never saw except twice at a baseball game and not letting her daughter’s name be spoken on the place until after a while Father wouldn’t even be spoken in the place until after a while Father wouldn’t even come down town anymore but just sat there all day with the decanter I could see the bottom of his night-shirt and his bare legs and hear the decanter clinking until finally T.P had to pour it for him and he says You have no respect for your Father’s memory and I says I don’t know why not it sure is preserved well enough to last only if I’m crazy too God knows what I’ll do about it just to look at water makes me sick and I’d just as soon swallow gasoline as a glass of whiskey and Lorraine telling them…” (Faulkner, 1984, pp. 290–91)

When Jason talks about paying taxes in order to support Harvard University, he slips to another story because it is inappropriate to say Caddy’s name in public. Caddy’s name could not “be spoken on the place” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 290). Jason attempts to create his own world by creating inner dialogue. Moving from one dialogue to another causes confusion in narration. However, this is the only way for Jason to represent his authority. Charkovsky (1984) argued, “Jason seeks to erect a shield of words...between himself and the real world. The words remain subject to Jason” (p. 298).

Bakhtin also refers to another theme in Heteroglossia, which is unitary language. Bakhtin refers to it as the “internal politics of style” (as cited in Pearce, 1991, p. 77). Unitary language becomes a part of the historical and ideological elements of any society. Richard Pearce (1991) argued that the unitary language represents “the power of the authorial voice” (p. 77). Faulkner’s southern accent is greatly contradicted. Because he wants to argue against racism in the South by using the southern accent and because he is under the influence of the language of a social group, he “idealize[s] and satirize[s]” the southern accent and language (Pearce, 1991, p. 77). Faulkner attempts to “deictic racial injustice, but perpetuated the values of the Southern ‘community’ and argued against national desegregation” (Pearce, 1991, p. 77). On one hand, he caricatures southern heroism but imitates the southern accent in order to “energize British imperialism” (Pearce, 1991, p. 77). By using his authorial voices, Faulkner attributes his opinions to different characters in different events. Faulkner establishes his authorial voice through the voices of many characters because he wants to tell his own story. Faulkner denies many voices in his novels and limits the chance for other characters to tell their stories.

In *The Sound and the Fury*, Faulkner uses unitary language in order to tell the story of a girl that is marginalized by her society and its old traditions. The main heroine for Faulkner is Caddy. This story is simply “of a muddy seat of a little girl’s drawers in a pear tree, where she could see through a window where her grandmother’s funeral was taking place” (as cited in Pearce, 1991, p. 80). Faulkner mainly wants to reflect the social problems that shape Caddy’s life. Because the society identifies a woman by her body, it is impossible to tell the story in a certain and single voice. Therefore, he decides to tell the story “through four voices- though not one of them is hers, and all of them...are male” (Pearce, 1991, p. 80). Minrose Gwin, Benjy, Jason, and Quentin all tell the story of Caddy. Indeed, Caddy’s voice is totally marginalized and these four males are the narrators of Caddy’s story. Minrose Gwin focuses on Caddy’s story and incorporates her voice “in a sensitive, eloquent, and important new reading” (Pearce, 1991, p. 80). Gwin himself brings Benjy to speak about her love and passion. Moreover, when Quentin “recalls his fear of the dark house...Caddy bursts into his thoughts, declaring she would become ‘king’ and ‘break that place open and drag them out’” (Pearce, 1991, p. 80)
By referring to the dark house while he thinks of Caddy, Quentin indicates her purity, “unending pleasure,” and desire for Dalton Ames. That is to say, Caddy’s purity refers to her marginalization and that she cannot adopt to her masculine society. Moreover, when Quentin remembers the dark house, he indicates to his patriarchal culture and tradition that causes Caddy’s marginalization. In other words, Quentin could not escape the other authorial voice inside him. Also, Jason narratives show Caddy as a helpless girl. Thus, those four voices represent Caddy’s voice in protesting against her powerless and helpless role. Yet, Faulkner empowers Caddy’s role by using four male voices. Caddy’s story “restores the social, psychological, and aesthetic order” of her family and masculine society (Pearce, 1991, p. 80). It is a very patriarchal thought that by empowering men, women themselves are empowered. By empowering the voices of the four males leads to empowering Caddy’s authoritative situation.

Faulkner also brings another Bakhtinian concept: the chronotope. In chronotopic motifs, there is a unity between space and time. Time and space are fused together. In The Sound and the Fury, it could be argued that the chronotope “serve[s] as a metaphor of ‘the path of death’” (as cited in Sanchez, 1998, p. 62). When Quentin listens to the sound of a watch, he visualizes Jesus walking. Quentin says, “Like Father said down the long and lonely light-rays you might see Jesus walking, like. And the good Saint Francis that said Little Sister Death, that never had a sister” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 76). Quentin’s walking and listening to a watch implies movement and predestination. There is a transition from walking to death. This interprets the concept of the chronotope that space infuses with time.

Even the title of the novel, The Sound and the Fury, by referring to the work that William Faulkner borrowed the title from, explains what Bakhtin means by the “philosophical digression” that enters the novel and is fused in Faulkner’s genre. In fact, William Faulkner takes the title of this novel from Shakespeare’s (1606) Macbeth soliloquy:

Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
To the last syllable of recorded time,
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life’s but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing. (5.5.120)

In this play, Shakespeare (1606) said that this is a “tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury” (5.5.120). Faulkner’s novel is also narrated by idiots: Quentin, Jason, and Benjy. Like Shakespeare, through various characters, Faulkner shows the idioy of life and protests against the old tradition, racism, and woman’s subversion. Faulkner “deconstruct[s] the male messages of a world full of sound and fury” (Pearce, 1991, p. 80). Therefore, the title of Faulkner’s novel signifies Faulkner’s philosophy about the world, which is similar to what Shakespeare refers to. Thus, the title of the novel refers to what Bakhtin means by the philosophical digression that the one genre is incorporated by the other genre. Shakespeare’s philosophy is also incorporated into the title of Faulkner’s novel.

Faulkner’s authorial voice appears in Dilsey’s voice as well. Faulkner’s own voice calls for purity of women and reflects problems of racism, which is implied in Dilsey’s final section. Faulkner shows Dilsey as “a figure of strength, selfless love, and piety…[and] a servant who can hold the family together and maintain its tie with the past” (Pearce, 1991, p. 86). Dilsey is a Black woman and is the only person who protects the Compson family. Indeed, the main issue that Faulkner wants to convey is racism, and he applies his voice to one of Black society’s people. He wants to know how they “endured.” Pearce (1991) said that “‘they’ imply that there is more than one Dilsey in the world” (p. 86). It could also refer to “Faulkner’s own ‘mammy’ Caroline Barr… and all the black ‘mammies’ who maintain…the very order that originally enslaved them” (Pearce, 1991, p. 86). Faulkner’s real voice might not be implied in Quentin, Jason, and Benjy, but it might be implied in Dilsey. If the reader considers what Bakhtin means by the author’s zone that cannot be invaded by other characters, the reader will find that Faulkner finally succeeds in conveying his own voice at the end of the novel; thus, they “endured.” Bakhtin says that the character “will never be allowed to assert his own…authorial voice…let alone be given a chance to ‘have the last word’” (Scherer, 1990, p. 303).

However, Faulkner still conflicts with their opinions and voices. His voice “efface[s]…in the disorder and irrationality of the sections ostensibly narrated by three males of the family” (Pearce, 1991, p. 86). The reader might argue that Faulkner has a racial scorn for the Black society in Mississippi, but “this does not mean that it comes directly from Faulkner” (Hannon, 2005, p. 7). Based on Bakhtin’s interpretation of the social origin of the novel’s dialogue, this racial scorn is “part of the discourse of race that was available to this white southern writer as he sought to represent the lived experiences of the people whom he inhabited Yoknapatwpha Country” (Hannon, 2005, p. 7).

Bakhtin argues that each character has his own zone. This zone has an influence on the authorial context that surrounds him. Bakhtin (2008a) said that this zone or sphere “extends…beyond the boundaries of the direct discourse allotted to him” (p. 320). Faulkner succeeds in applying this zone in his novel. Jason has an accurate and a sharp voice in the novel. Pearce (1991) mentioned that his “reliability…allied him with the authorial voice” (p. 85). Jason does not want to go to Harvard like Quentin or “drink [himself] into the ground like Father” (Faulkner, 1984, p. 224). That is to say, Jason never allowed other voices to be asserted in his own voice.

Thus, as discussed above, The Sound and the Fury represents a good example for studying the Bakhtinian theory of heteroglossia, polyglossia, and the chronotope. Quentin struggles to express his inner dialogue. However, he fails to
create his own dialogue. He cannot articulate his own story. He repeats his father’s words to possess an authority. And he fails. He dies because he cannot communicate with other characters. Moreover, Jason tries to use certain words, but he also fails to use them correctly. However, Jason begins to have an authorial voice. He bends his words for his own needs. Based on the concept of the character zone, Jason succeeds in developing or forming sharp voice. Unlike Quentin, he does not want to go to Harvard. In addition, Faulkner succeeds in using another Bakhtinian concept: unitary language. Quentin, Jason, and Benjy tell the story of Caddy. Caddy has no voice, and the voices of the three males represent Caddy’s voice. Also, Faulkner’s own authorial voice appears to be incorporated with Dilsey’s. Through Dilsey’s voice, Faulkner demonstrates his own voice, which calls for purity of women and criticizes racism and aristocratic value.

The concept of chronotope also appeared in the novel. Time and space are fused together. A transition from walking to death is represented when Quentin walks and visualizes Jesus walking.

Faulkner also applies polyglossia by incorporating his novel with other genres: Dostoevsky’s Notes from Underground and Shakespeare’s Macbeth. The title of the novel is taken from Shakespeare’s soliloquy in Macbeth and represents the Shakespearean philosophy that life is “full of sound and fury.”
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