

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
FIRAT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**



**THE ETHICS OF MEMORY IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S
*THE BURIED GIANT***

MASTER'S THESIS

SUPERVISOR
Assoc. Prof. Seda ARIKAN

PREPARED BY
Esra KARATEPE

ELAZIĞ – 2020

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
FIRAT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE ETHICS OF MEMORY IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S
THE BURIED GIANT

MASTER'S THESIS

SUPERVISOR
Assoc. Prof. Seda ARIKAN

PREPARED BY
Esra KARATEPE

Jürimiz, tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavı sonunda bu yüksek lisans / doktora tezini oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile başarılı saymıştır.

Jüri Üyeleri:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

F. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulunun tarih ve sayılı kararıyla bu tezin kabulü onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Ömer Osman UMAR
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitü Müdürü

ABSTRACT**Master's Thesis****The Ethics of Memory in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*****Esra KARATEPE****Fırat University****Institute of Social Sciences****Department of Western Languages and Literatures****English Language and Literature****Elazığ – 2020; Page: V+96**

This study aims to examine Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant* (2015) in the light of the ethics of memory which has become a significant matter of debate especially after the disastrous crimes of the twentieth century. While traumatic memories constitute the subject matter, how individuals and societies need to remember the past or whether they are obliged to remember the past to comprehend sufferings of the earlier generations have appeared as important questions that are related to the field of the ethics of memory. In the novel, Ishiguro depicts a world of oblivion where all the atrocities of the past are erased by a forgetting mist which covers personal and collective past of individuals and communities. Set in aftermath of a genocide in post-Arthurian Britain, the novel paves the way for analysing the loss of memory and the struggle to remember the past from the perspective of the ethics of memory. In this sense, by analysing Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant* –which deals with the nature of remembering and forgetting– in terms of its relation to the ethics of memory, this study reveals the novel presents that remembering the past without feeling hatred and revenge after a process of confrontation/carefrontation is the moral way of memory making and memory work.

Keywords: Kazuo Ishiguro, *The Buried Giant*, The Ethics of Memory, Memory, Remembering, Forgetting

ÖZET

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *The Buried Giant* Adlı Romanında Bellek Etiği

Esra KARATEPE

Fırat Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Anabilim Dalı

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı

Elazığ-2020; Sayfa: V+96

Bu çalışma, Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Gömülü Dev* (2015) adlı eserini, özellikle yirminci yüzyılın korkunç suçlarından sonra önemli bir tartışma konusu haline gelmiş olan bellek etiği ışığında incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Travmatik anılar temel konuyu oluştururken, bireylerin ve toplumların geçmişi nasıl hatırlamaları gerektiği ya da önceki nesillerin çektiği acıları anlamak için geçmişi hatırlamak zorunda olup olmadıkları bellek etiği alanı ile ilgili önemli sorular olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Romanda Ishiguro, bireylerin ve toplumların bireysel ve kolektif geçmişlerini örten bir unutuş sisi ile geçmişin bütün zulümlerinin silindiği bir unutma dünyası tasvir etmektedir. Kral Arthur sonrası Britanya'da meydana gelen bir soykırımdan sonra geçen roman, bellek kaybını ve geçmişi hatırlama mücadelesini bellek etiği perspektifinden analiz etmenin yolunu açmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Ishiguro'nun hatırlama ve unutmanın doğasını ele alan *Gömülü Dev* romanını bellek etiğiyle ilişkisi açısından analiz eden bu çalışma, romanın, bir yüzleşme/sevgi ve saygı ile gerçekleşen bir yüzleşme sürecinden sonra geçmişi nefret ve intikam hissetmeden hatırlamayı, hafıza oluşumunun ve geçmişle yüzleşmenin ahlaki yolu olarak tasvir ettiğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kazuo Ishiguro, *Gömülü Dev*, Bellek Etiği, Bellek, Hatırlama, Unutma

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	II
ÖZET	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE	
1. THE ETHICS OF MEMORY	4
1.1. Duty of Remembering.....	7
1.2. Duty of Forgetting.....	17
1.3. Duty of Confrontation and Forgiving the Past.....	25
CHAPTER TWO	
2. MEMORY AND LITERATURE	30
2.1. Kazuo Ishiguro’s Life, Works and Literary Career	33
2.2. The Buried Giant.....	36
2.3. Ishiguro and Memory.....	38
CHAPTER THREE	
3. THE ETHICS OF MEMORY IN <i>THE BURIED GIANT</i>.....	41
3.1. Individual and Social Amnesia in <i>The Buried Giant</i>	41
3.2. Duty of Remembering in <i>The Buried Giant</i>	51
3.3. Duty of Forgetting in <i>The Buried Giant</i>	62
3.4. Facing the Past and Mourning for the Losses	71
3.5. Forgiving and Releasing the Past.....	80
CONCLUSION	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
APPENDIX.....	95
App. 1. Originality Report	95
CURRICULUM VITAE	96

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Seda Arıkan for her support, guidance and patience throughout the completion of this study. Without her support, it would be impossible to complete this thesis. She has been a great model for me, and it has been a great experience to work under her guidance. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Abdulhalim AYDIN and Assoc.Prof. F. Gül KOÇSOY for their contributions to my academic competence.

I would like to extend my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Mukadder ERKAN for being in my thesis committee, for her valuable comments and feedback.

I want to thank my dear parents Nebahat and M. Nuri OKUYUCU for their love and faith throughout my life. I am grateful to my siblings, my friends, my colleagues and my students for being in my life.

Finally, I am indebted to my beloved husband Halil KARATEPE and my little angel Elis Gülce for their endless love and support. I dedicate this thesis to my family.

INTRODUCTION

With the effect of interdisciplinarity, the relation of memory and literature has been widely dealt with in contemporary literary studies. Having its own methods of preserving the past, literature itself is component of cultural memory. However, the position of literature is not limited to being a component of cultural memory since literature is a form of memory making. With its distinctive methods, literature preserves and reshapes the past; and while doing this, it constructs a meaningful pattern for individual and collective memories. The individual and socio-cultural context in which literature emerges is reconstructed in the literary world in turn.

While events and people are forgotten, literary texts remember and remind individual and collective past of humanity in an aesthetic manner. Similar to archives and documents, literature recollects past; however, unlike them it preserves past in a special way with its various genres. It is possible to trace back to the traumatic historical events by reading the texts written on them. In that sense, literature turns the past memories into a narrative to be transmitted among generations. The collective memory of communities is reflected through the narration that literature provides. In addition to being a tool for transmitting cultural knowledge, literature forms collective memory by recreating the reality. It is the formative aspect of literature which determines how the memories will be transmitted as reality is reshaped in literature. Like memory chooses what is to be remembered and what is to be forgotten, with the help of selectivity function of narration, literature chooses what is to be remembered via texts. As a result of the mutual affinity of literature and memory, individual and collective memories construct individual and collective identities.

The Nobel Prize awarded writer Kazuo Ishiguro, by elaborating the notion of memory through his works, brings memory and literature together. Being one of the most important contemporary writers, Ishiguro deals with memory in his writing repetitiously. His interest in memory turns his works into a depiction of memory processes and his characters frequently try to remember their repressed traumatic pasts to refind their identities. Besides his books about individual memories, Ishiguro writes a novel about meeting of individual and collective memory in his latest novel *The Buried Giant*. While discussing memory, Ishiguro does not handle memory on its own but together with other themes. Especially in his latest novel, he deals with the ethics of memory besides memory

that is the subject matter of his earlier novels. Although his works have been widely approached from the perspective of memory, the perspective of the ethics of memory is a new direction in terms of analysis of his writing. In this sense, this study aims to analyse *The Buried Giant* with its relation to the ethics of memory. In his last novel, Ishiguro puts the topics which coincide with the issues that the ethics of memory discusses. This study targets to trace those topics that Ishiguro explicitly or implicitly proposes. Within the scope of individual and collective memory, this study examines how memory –operating with the mechanisms of remembering and forgetting– is inevitably related to the realm of ethics and morality, and how the ethics of memory infuses into the novel.

Starting from the significance of the concept of memory, the first chapter aims to present a theoretical framework of the ethics of memory by utilizing the ideas of major thinkers and philosophers in the field. After dealing with traditional ideas on memory and its relation with other issues like self and identity construction, social and moral aspect of memory, the scope of the ethics of memory is provided. The ethics of memory focuses on how to remember and forget past properly on individual and collective level by questioning the existence of ethical obligations about memory. In line with this purpose, firstly, duty of remembering which argues how humans are obliged to remember victims of disastrous crimes like genocide and war is handled. Then, duty of forgetting which accepts forgetting as a solution to end the vicious cycle of vengeance in order to save future generations from the burden of inherited hatred is discussed. Including the ideas of psychoanalysis on repression of undesired memories, this chapter lastly discusses the necessity of remembering and facing the past in order to reconcile and forgive the past and its atrocities.

The second chapter opens with the discussion about how memory and literature are related, and how both nourish each other. Then, the life and the literary career of Kazuo Ishiguro is given, and a brief overview of his works is provided including *The Buried Giant* (2015) in order to present how Ishiguro has been a writer of memory. In the last part of this chapter, how memory has been a recurring theme in Ishiguro's oeuvre is handled by giving place to the ideas of critics.

Third chapter, which is the main body of this study, focuses on the reflections of the ethics of memory in the novel. Firstly, the individual and collective amnesia which cover individual and collective memories are discussed together with their ethical results. While the individual amnesia is argued through the old couple Axl and Beatrice, the

collective amnesia is handled through the communities of Britons and Saxons. In this chapter, through the characters who support duty of remembering, the moral aspect of duty of remembering and its moral results are discussed. After dealing with duty of remembering, duty of forgetting is examined through the characters who support forgetting of the earlier atrocities. Since the supporters of duty of remembering struggle to remember their buried memories, the significance of facing the old memories and mourning for them are discussed related to its moral side. The last section of this chapter focuses on the significance of forgiving and reconciliation when the individual and collective traumas are the subject matter.

Consequently, analyzing *The Buried Giant* from the perspective of the ethics of memory, this study aims to examine how literary works –as a way of memory making– function to reflect the moral way of forming individual and collective memories. By giving place to the opposing ideas on duty of remembering and forgetting in terms of the ethics of memory, this study examines how *The Buried Giant* proposes remembering the past without feeling hatred and revenge after a process of confrontation/carefrontation which is named “happy memory” or “peaceful memory” by Ricoeur and “free mind” by Freud as the moral way of memory work.

CHAPTER ONE

1. THE ETHICS OF MEMORY

In American Psychological Association's Dictionary, memory is defined as “the ability to retain information or a representation of past experience, based on the mental processes of learning or encoding, retention across some interval of time, and retrieval or reactivation of the memory” (2018). In this sense, memory is a cognitive process which includes different complex mental mechanisms, and each process is a matter of various studies and debates.

The interest which has always remained dynamic in memory could be traced back to the ancient times as memory has much to do with mind that has a significant role in the domain of philosophy. Plato's definition of memory in *Theatetus* (1921) has been the first step taken towards the inquiry of memory. In *Theatetus* 191c, memory is defined as a wax tablet which is in different shapes and features existing in each person's mind. The things and events leave a trace on this wax; and as long as the trace is there, remembering the events or things is possible. When the trace is not accessible, then, the situation results in forgetting. By employing the metaphor of wax, memory is accepted as something similar to perception or knowledge. Plato's understanding of memory is divine since memory is perceived as the divine source of knowledge and reality through which mind can remember what the soul once knew before coming to the material world.

Following Plato, Aristotle handles memory as a store which collects various memories. Aristotle's understanding of memory is not as divine as Plato's, but rather physical. Although Plato deals with soul, Aristotle deals with the relation of body and soul; but still he uses “the metaphor of wax tablet, which in Plato a playful image, a more literal meaning” (quoted in Whitehead 2008: 23). John Locke and David Hume develop the idea of memory as the store house model and emphasize the role of revivification memory plays in recollecting memories.

While the earlier debates on memory have been significant to understand the nature of memory and the basic assumptions in the field of memory, at the the end of twentieth century, with the development of interdisciplinarity memory studies expanding to a broader dimension, philosophy of memory has become an independent field of inquiry. Memory is no more seen as a passive store house of memories but rather it is

accepted as an active system which processes information, and at the same time operates selectively while retrieving memories. In this respect, memory becomes a broad area studied in different fields. Today, the debates around memory are numerous varying from the relation of self and memory, memory's effect on identity construction, memory and emotion, to social, political and moral aspects of memory.

As memory is a constituent part of the identity of individuals, without memory it is not possible to have an idea about the past which constitutes the identity. Thus, without knowing the past, it does not seem possible to have a control on future which makes individuals lose their touch with their past selves. Memory bonds the present self of both an individual and a group to their past selves.

Memory's relations with other issues like imagination, emotion, consciousness, and forgetting are frequently studied. As how people remember emotions and if the remembered thing itself is an emotion or not are not easy questions to answer, it is not easy to reach an ultimate result about the relation between memory and emotion. It is known that human mind remembers events and emotions which are associated with them. In Daniel Reisberg and Paula Hertel's book *Memory and Emotion* (2004), the relation of memory and emotion has been widely investigated with different experiments and different types of memories on different groups. It is put forward that when the memory is associated with intense emotions, it is more probable to remember with more details. When it comes to the traumatic memories and feelings bound to them, Freud is the prominent figure who examines the repression of traumatic memories and feelings. Freud's distinction of conscious, unconscious and subconscious is important to understand how people deal with different kinds of memories and how they preserve them.

The other debate which needs to be discussed is social aspect of memory. Societies as well as individuals have memories. Maurice Halbwachs, in his book *On Collective Memory* (1925) handles memory as a collective entity. Important events in a community's past shape collective memory of that group, and furthermore, collective memory shapes individual memories and identities of members of that group. Nations, like individuals, have their own memories and similar to individual memories, collective memories of nations form a bond between past and present. Nations have their own mechanisms of remembering and preserving their past. Although collective memory is vulnerable to

change –as the groups change over the time–, it is important for solidarity of a group to remember the earlier events.

When it comes to the contemporary attention to the memory studies, memory is pervasive in different fields. Especially after the world wars with the effect of technology, a great number of people witnessed the crimes of the century. Jay Winter in his article handles the term of “memory boom” and defines this tendency as an “obsession with memory” (2006: 55). To remember past victims, the governments build monuments and arrange commemorations. Nations create their own remembering methods hence they found archives, museums and statues to preserve the past memories of their ancestors. With the effect of wars memory begins to be examined in terms of trauma as a war has a traumatic effect on people. War context brings to the mind the idea of justice and necessitates the questioning of justice towards past victims. In contemporary context, memory is closely related to the politics of countries.

The moral aspect of memory is a matter of debate which has begun to gain importance especially after the great crimes of the twentieth century. As a result of the destructive effect of the crimes against humanity, the moral aspect of memory has started to be questioned. The ethics of memory which shows parallelism with memory studies has gained importance since it provides an insight into understanding moral responsibilities related to individual and collective memories. While the moral role of memory in securing justice and the moral role of duty felt towards remembering the sufferings of the earlier generations are related to the obligation of remembering, the vicious circle of remembering the past atrocities constantly which can cause a renewed hatred is related to the obligation of forgetting.

The theories related to the ethics of memory includes duty of remembering as well as duty of forgetting, in the general sense. In this respect, some philosophers defend duty of remembering while others defend duty of forgetting. Avishai Margalit’s book *The Ethics of Memory* (2002) is a significant study which distinguishes ethics and morality – that will be defined in detail later on–, and defends duty of remembering the victims of great crimes during the two World Wars. In that sense, Holocaust has been a pivotal element to discuss the great crimes of the twentieth century. As a debt to those victims, what is needed is remembering their sufferings to avoid any repetition of the same evil deeds. The debt that is to be paid is not only to the past victims, but also to the future generations that have the right to know about the past.

In terms of the ethics of memory, forgetting as well as remembering is accepted as a moral attitude. Memory in its nature includes forgetting as well as remembering. Forgetting is generally defined with the opposite expressions of remembering. Related to the wax tablet idea, forgetting is explained as something that occurs when remembering cannot be accomplished. It has been seen as a kind of failure of remembering when the stored information could not be reached. When the forgotten thing is remembered, it is seen as an accomplishment. To be able to gain a clear understanding of memory, it is a necessity to examine the fact of forgetting. Paul Ricoeur's book *Memory, History and Forgetting* (2004) is noteworthy to recognize the importance of forgetting in memory studies. This book is influential to examine the three distinct themes –that are memory, history and forgetting– on memory and their relations with one another. In the part of “forgetting”, Ricoeur handles the moral problem about memory and forgetting. To Ricoeur, forgetting is used to control both individual and collective memory; in this respect, he gives place to three forms unpreferable forgetting as a result of the abuses of memory, which are “blocked”, “obligated” and “manipulated”. Ricoeur puts forward a negative approach to the abuses of memory which result in forgetting; hence, he suggests a constitutive and positive idea of memory that can be accomplished through “happy memory”.

Within this scope, the ethics of memory –which deals with how individuals and societies need to remember the past or whether they are obliged to forget the past– includes the following study areas: duty of remembering, duty of forgetting, duty of confrontation and forgiving the past.

1.1. Duty of Remembering

In the domain of the ethics of memory, the first issue to be elucidated is the morality of memory. The ethicality stems from the fact that memory is vulnerable to use and misuse. Ricoeur based this idea upon the feature of memory as an action, “it is because memory is an exercise that we can talk of the *use* of memory, which in turn permits us to speak of the *abuses* of memory” (2002: 5). As an exercise, it is open to different interpretations, that is to say, one may remember well while others may forget the important events. The forgetting of important events may lead to problems in identity formation which makes abuses of memory as a threat to identity.

Avishai Margalit is a significant philosopher who deals with the ethics of memory. In English language there are two words; one is *ethics* from the Greek, the other one is *morality* from Latin: To Margalit, although morality is about shared humanity and connected to “thin relations”, ethics which leads to “thick relations” is about relations with people we are close to (2002: 7). In morality, we tend to group people such as the child, the poor, and the rich. To Margalit, these labellings “call for a moral response” (2002: 37). However; as caring comes with memory, memory is pertained to ethics. On the preface of the book *The Ethics of Memory* (2002), Margalit gives place to a story he reads on the newspaper about a soldier who was killed. His commander could not remember the name of the soldier. Forgetting the name of the soldier is not different from forgetting the soldier himself. The commander did not give importance to the soldier under his command; that’s why, he easily forgot the soldier who sacrificed himself for his country. Another event that leads Margalit to think about memory is his parents’ dialogue about people who died in the war and how they need to remember them. After introducing these two examples, Margalit begins to ask questions on the ethics of memory. Margalit questions the ethics of memory on the level of *microethics* defined as the ethics of individuals and *macroethics* attributed to ethics of collectives. After questioning the possibility of the ethics of memory, he concludes that the ethics of memory should exist; however, when it comes to the moral side of memory it is vaguely moral. To Margalit, the ethical or moral aspect of memory are different and they are related to the types of the relations. Though the common point of ethics and morality is human relations, the former is about *thick relations* while the later is related to *thin relations*. As mentioned before, Margalit divides the relations into two: One group of relation is thick relations which are formed with people we know and love, and the other group is thin relations which are formed with distant others. He relates ethics with thick relations and morality with thin relations:

Because it encompasses all humanity, morality is long on geography and short on memory. Ethics is typically short on geography and long on memory. Memory is the cement that holds thick relations together, and communities of memory are the obvious habitat for thick relations and thus for ethics. (2002: 8)

Although Margalit relates memory primarily to ethics, it is possible in some cases to associate memory to morality. To exemplify it, Margalit gives the example of the Nazis,

a threat to humanity on behalf of an ideology. His idea that great crimes should be remembered is supported by Jeffry Blustein on his book *The Moral Demands of Memory* (2008). Blustein suggests that duties of memory depend on the historical and social circumstances. The crimes committed against humanity generate the events which are obligated to be remembered by people. Although Margalit differentiates ethics and morality, Blustein does not show the same approach to the issue using the same distinction. The thing to be highlighted is that humans owe a duty of remembering to the victims of the past; otherwise, their sufferings would lose the meaning which accompanies the event.

The obligation to remember stems from the fact of identity as identity is closely related to memory. “Identity, which shapes, and is shaped by, memory, is a source of these and other responsibilities...” (Blustein 2008: 2). In the domain of the ethics of memory, the ethical aspect of memory is significant. The ethical aspect stems from the fact that memory is vulnerable to use and misuse. Distortion of realities, hiding some events, ignoring some parts of events, and changing the actors of events can be thought as various ways of abuses of memory. Memory as an exercise is open to different interpretations; that is to say, one may remember well while others may forget the important events. The forgetting of important events may lead to problems in identity formation which makes abuses of memory as a threat to identity.

Duty of remembering should be approached within the historical conditions as well as the individual formations. As Ricoeur states, “[t]o say: you will remember, is also to say: you will not forget. It may even be that the duty of memory constitutes, at one and the same time, the epitome of good use and of abuse in the exercise of memory” (2004: 87). Ricoeur connects the obligatory function found in duty of remembering to justice. When obligation of justice is not fulfilled, the debt to past cannot be paid. The moral obligation is not felt just towards past but towards future generations that need to know their past to form a compatible identity. Ricoeur questions the relation of justice and duty of remembering, and he suggests three explanations: The first feature of justice is its being felt towards other people; the second one is the debt we have towards people who lived before us and contributed to our present; and the third one is the debt we should pay to moral victims (2004: 89). When the past is remembered rightly, then, neither the memories of past nor the feeling of justice will be eliminated.

As an answer to the question to whom we have a duty of remembering, the first answer encountered is to the victims of great crimes such as the war crimes and crimes against humanity. However, people have an obligation to remember their personal past as well as their communal past. Blustein does not limit duty of remembering to great crimes as there is a place of obligation in ordinary life as well. He states the various kinds of duties of remembering: *Individualized duties* are “duties to remember individuals under descriptions that assign them particular identities”, unlike individual type, there is a communal type like remembering people as a group; the other one is remembering *events* not people; and Blustein places remembering the victims of great crimes to the category of *non-individualized duties* (2017: 353). The duty to remember is both an individual and a communal duty which makes it broader, even broader than death. Death is not enough to annihilate the obligation to remember either for the individual or community. The obligation of memory encompasses families, friends, and all other people who are loved and cared, and ancestors who struggled for the well being of the community. About the last category, Margalit asks an important question if all people in a community need to remember each of the important past events and victims or not. The answer is that all people are responsible for conceiving that their memories are protected; however, they do not have to remember them personally. If there are enough people to do the task, then, each member is not personally responsible. The important point is the memory which must be “kept alive” (Margalit 2002: 58). In communal type of duty, the most sensitive spot is the event itself, not the individuals. However, if significant individuals who contribute to the community are at stake, they need to be remembered by their names besides the event.

When the memories continue to live in spite of the reality of death, it means the relationship between the living and the dead is stronger than death itself. Memory prevails against the effacing power of death, and death cannot obliterate the traces of people who passed away. In this respect, Blustein relates remembering to “a manifestation of ongoing caring” (2017: 352). The notion of caring and keeping to care for people even after their deaths is a duty and a debt to the past. The idea is that the bond between generations and people will continue via remembering although time passes and people die. Thus, death is not enough to abolish the relations between people. All the people expect to be remembered after death and nobody wants to be forgotten by the people cared in this world. Forgetting people means uncaring for them and it means destorying traces of dead

ones. The memories should be alive as the contrary situation signifies the second death of victims. The memories of victims are disrespected when they are forgotten. In some cases, this happens and they die without leaving a trace.

Related to this situation, in “Intensive Care” part, Margalit questions the existence of a name by asking a range of questions in order to argue the relation between a name and remembering. Remembering the names of people is not different from remembering their essence; that is why, names are significant in memory. Margalit presents an appealing example from David Edgar’s play *Pentecost* which is about a group of children in the cattle truck who died from starving after eating their own nametags. Margalit comments this situation as “double murder” (2002: 21) since the children died without leaving a trace. In this event, both those children’s bodies and names are murdered. They are forgotten and hurt twice. Their lives vanish, their essence turns into the ashes, and their lives end anonymously. No human being deserves to die anonymously; at least for a while, everyone expects to be in the memories of people they know in this world. As people care for the other people while they are still alive, they want to be cared by those after their deaths. At this point, it is necessary to touch upon the collective relations for Margalit in order to form relations. However, those relations are not always required to be face to face interactions; rather, humans have the ability to form symbolic relations as well. What Margalit points out is that by using the contribution of shared memories humans can develop thick relations and have a feeling of collective “we” that is capable of living after personal deaths. The collective “we” that is shaped with the important acts of humans and would be permanent in a way attains immortality at the expense of losing individuality (Margalit 2002: 93-96). What must be kept alive is the collective “we” which has been accepted as a sacred aim for ages. For the sake of collective “we”, many wars were fought, many heroes sacrificed themselves and the sufferings were endured throughout the history. The collective spirit stands for the collective identity of the communities; in the same way, it constitutes the feeling of solidarity for the communities.

To Ricoeur, “diseases of memory are basically diseases of identity” (2002: 7). In this sense, the abuses of memory actually aim to attack the collective identities. Collective identity is open to changes; everytime reformed, sometimes protected, and other times violated, which makes it fragile and open to attacks. Throughout history, communities pose a threat to one another’s identities by using different ways of violence. “[C]ollective identity is rooted in founding events which are violent events. In a sense, collective

memory is a kind of storage of such violent blows, wounds and scar” (Ricoeur 2002: 8). If collective memory is formed with violent memories and collective identity is the outcome of this process, then, the events stored in collective memory are highly significant. As known, the stored events shape the collective memory and by using those events nations transmit their collective memories to the next generations. The events not only shape the present and personal identity of nations, but also their collective and the future identity; that’s why, the attacks on memory become a threat for present and future at the same time.

What Margalit finds mysterious about collective memory is that some agents like writers or elites manipulate collective memories by manipulating people. They do it as they think it is the true form of the event and “all they do is give it some color to make it more evocative” (Margalit 2002: 99). This manipulation brings to mind the impact of narration on memory. In the nature of narration, the process is to eliminate some parts while putting forward some other parts. There are always alternative ways to tell a story that could be considered problematic when memory construction is at stake. It is also possible that different narrations of some events by different countries appear as they can narrate the events according to their needs and policies. The authority needs narration to secure its power. The narration is used to transmit the stories about those events, and thus, it is possible to observe “the selective function of the narrative that opens to manipulation the opportunity” (Ricoeur 2004: 85). Nations hide some parts of events and manipulate other parts to glorify their victories in the eyes of public. By doing so, nations create their collective memories and an image to preserve their collective identities. In this respect, it is possible that some evildoers may manipulate the past to hide their evil crimes. At that point, in terms of the ethics of memory, remembering rightly is important. Miroslav Volf underlines that the significant thing is not mere remembering but remembering rightly: “To remember a wrongdoing is to struggle against it” (2006: 11). When the past could not be remembered rightly, then, the past becomes vulnerable to abuses. Volf in his book refers to Nazis as the “most celebrated whitewashers of crime” (2006: 18), which points to the abuse of memory. Evildoers can efface the traces of the evil acts they committed, which can mislead people. To refer to this situation, Volf chooses to use the expression of “the moral fickleness of memory” (2006: 18) which displays the potential of memory to manipulate reality. In this sense, duty of remembering is revised as the duty to remember rightly, without manipulations and distortions.

The ethical position memory holds compels thinkers to consider about the nature of history and its relation to memory. Memory has a critical position on individual and collective identities, and it is like a bridge between past and future generations. If that is the case, then, the position of history should be reconsidered. Ricoeur touches upon the ideas of considering memory as a “womb of history” and one of the aims of “historical knowledge” (2004: 95). Memory is very much like consciousness unlike history that is written by people. By referring to Krzysztof Pomian’s idea, Ricoeur emphasizes the dissimilarities between history and memory being “maximum where it is a matter of a very distant past, the past of nature, and reduced to the minimum where the past is close to history in every respect” (2004: 389). The truthfulness of history is the problem which needs to be solved. In order to talk about a duty of memory, people need to be certain about truthfulness of the events reported. The past seems unattainable when it is in the domain of history; but in the meantime, it appears probable to attain the past when it is in the field of memory. Humans inherit the memory of preceding generations, and by following the previous generations which remember and transmit the event correctly, it is possible to attain the event itself. The door to question the reality of events is open in the field of memory. Ricoeur puts forward a dialectic of the relation between history and memory commenting on them;

[...]on the one hand, history's claim to reduce memory to the level of one of its objects, and on the other hand, the claim of collective memory to subjugate history by means of the abuses of memory that the commemorations imposed by political powers or by pressure groups can turn into. (2004: 393)

As Ricoeur comments, history and memory are not pure reflections of each other, but they have manipulating effects on one another.

In “Past Continuous” part of his book *The Ethics of Memory* (2002), Margalit compares history and memory adding that while history is seen as cold or dead, memory is considered alive. Especially, in terms of shared memory, it is possible to talk about a vivid form of memory unlike the one in myth. At that point, memory is alive unlike history. “History [...] is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is a perpetually actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history is a representation of the past” (Nora 1989: 8). Memory lives at present embracing the past and flowing into the future; however, history belongs to past times.

The history learned from ancestors contributes to the formation of collective identities. Thus, the relation of history and collective memory should be reciprocal in a way. “[H]istory has to present itself as an enlightened, corrected memory” (Ricoeur 2004: 405). History operates with findings of memory with its various methods and utilizes them according to its needs. History emerges in a national atmosphere and serves aims of solidarity of a nation. In its methods, it has a tendency to generalize the events to form a general narration. This general narration is used to educate next generations to preserve the collective identity and collective memory.

In terms of narrating events, history and duty of remembering have different approaches. Ricoeur underlines a feature of history which needs to be discussed: “[A] basic reason for cherishing the duty to remember is to keep alive the memory of suffering over against the general tendency of history to celebrate the victors” (2002: 10). History mostly disregards the victims of past while putting forward the victors of past events. Although past is full of atrocities, not everyone remembers what victims endure. At this point, duty of remembering is significant to preserve memories of the victims of atrocities. Neglecting their memories means silencing their sufferings. The function of history and duty of remembering might vary from each other with regard to their standpoints. To Margalit, in terms of collective memory, mostly remembered ones are heroes, not the ordinary ones. Margalit gives the example of September 11 on which the firefighters are remembered more than other people (2002: 102). While official history tends to remember the firefighters as they are seen the heroes of the authority, duty of remembering proposes to remember the victims of the event.

At this point, Margalit argues that the firefighters’ belonging to a gild is the other reason why they are mostly being remembered. To Margalit: The gild is a community of memory which has its own way of remembering its members (2002: 102). To Margalit, nations are not the only possible forms of the community of memory as there exist various forms of it. The gild forms a kind of brotherhood relation to secure loyalty. At this point, in a way, all thick relations are the extended forms of family relations. When it comes to the national relations, the ones which have a common origin can be assessed. The relation should be good as well as thick. One question which must be directed is whether the bonds among members of nations are based upon hatred towards the other nations or not. Unlike Margalit, David Hume and Adam Smith argue that the basis of thick relations is

not the family relations but friendship relations as people can choose their friends not their families (Margalit 2002: 103-104).

Margalit draws “a triangle of relations that is at the center of the ethics of memory. One side of the triangle connects memory and caring, the second connects caring and ethics, and only then we are ready to connect memory with ethics” (2002: 27). First part of the triangle is ethics and caring; caring and not caring are related to morality. Memory is not an essential condition for caring and vice versa. Caring in its nature has a connotation of attention. The question which must be asked is if we really care for all people or not. Margalit discusses the nature of caring and suggests that we do not care for all the people as we are mostly indifferent to many of them. Caring is not about showing love to people, it is about “attention”. People need morality to come through “natural indifference to others” (2002: 33). Morality becomes prominent for humanity as a whole. In the part of “Communities of Memory” (2002), Margalit gives an example of murdered peasants killed by the order of Stalin and from this point he asks questions about communities’ remembering. Why humanity is not a community of memory and why there is not an ethical community being founded on thick relations are the questions presented. Then, the questions are answered from the religious perspectives of Judaism and Christianity, respectively. In Christianity, there is an aim to constitute “an ethical community based on love” (2002: 71). The community should include all humanity. In Jewish understanding, the universal ethical community belongs to the time when Messiah will come. In both religions, the idea is that people should remember their gratitude to God as God protects them in hard situations saving them, which means the memories of humans are mostly good ones. However, to Margalit, there are also bad memories which revive not gratitude but a feeling of vengeance; at the core of ethical relations, there is caring not gratitude as in the case of religion, and that means people are in debt of two things, “in morality human respect; in ethics, caring and loyalty” (2002: 73). After giving the religious approaches about community of memory, Margalit gives two other secular ideas and the common feature of these ideas is that “no gratitude should be felt towards the past and there is no room for a community of memory” (2002: 74). Margalit questions the possibility of a universal ethical community. If everybody becomes friends without having foes, would it mean a real feeling of friendship or a futile floating sense? For Margalit, people need contrastness to feel the friendship; that’s why, caring for all humanity would be illogical. The feeling of unity of nations are fed with hatred towards

their enemies (2002: 77). Although it does not seem possible to found a universal ethical community to remember each of the past events, there are events which should be remembered by all people. These events are radical crimes which are committed against humanity.

As known, it is not possible for human beings to control completely what to forget or remember. It is true that there are various methods to help remembering, however remembering or forgetting are beyond humans' control. If they are beyond human's control, can there be an ethical or moral aspect of remembering or forgetting? Although Margalit in his book *The Ethics of Memory* (2002) answers the question negatively, when it comes to the events in the domain of shared memory the situation changes. Those events are radical crimes which are committed against all humanity. In this sense, unfulfilling the duty of remembering the victims of the radical crimes is "morally criticizable" (Blustein 2017: 352).

Ignoring the duty of remembering or submitting it without any exception basically stems from two contradicting moral sources which put different ideas about remembering and its relation to morality. Basically, deontological and utilitarian ethics have different approaches to remembering.

Utilitarian ethics argues that consequences of an action determine its being moral or not; that's to say, if an action provides maximum good for maximum number of people, then, the action is moral and good. When an action does not bring good to the maximum number of people, then, that action is not moral. It is a widely accepted fact that the basic principle of utilitarianism is the idea of the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people. In that sense, in order to behave rightly, humans must think the probable consequences of an action. Pleasure and pain are the basis of all humans' behaviours, and ultimate aim of all human beings is to achieve happiness. Thus, if remembering would give pain and forgetting would give happiness to the greatest number, then remembering would not be preferred by the utilitarian point of view.

Generally contrasted with utilitarian ethics, deontological ethics is not based on consequences, but intention that makes the action moral or not. An action can be good or bad in itself regardless of its consequences; for instance, killing a person is bad in its nature, and nothing can make the act of killing good. Immanuel Kant is the prominent figure of deontology; that's why, it is also known as Kantian ethics. *Good will* and *duty* are the two important sources which make an action moral; in other words, if the

motivation behind an action is based on those, that action is good and moral. Kant values the universal laws, and applying those laws brings morality. Unlike utilitarianism, deontology accepts humans as worthy beings; however, there is no place for individualism as duty is the most important thing. If a person behaves according to the moral laws due to commitment to duty, then, it means the person has good will; hence, good will determines whether the action is morally right or not. In this respect, if deontological ethics would determine remembering as a moral duty, it would not be possible in any way to choose forgetting though it would create new discomforts in individual or collective realm.

Duty of remembering is still a controversial issue in the domain of the ethics of memory as due to different ethical sources, some thinkers accept remembering the past as a solution for the conflicts in memory while some others find the solution in forgetting.

1.2. Duty of Forgetting

In human mind, forgetting and remembering are interrelated. After dealing with duty of remembering in terms of the ethics of memory, it is necessary to handle forgetting and duty of forgetting. Ricoeur states that “there is no symmetry between the duty to remember and the duty to forget, because the duty to remember is a duty to teach, whereas the duty to forget is a duty to go beyond anger and hatred” (2002: 11). In other words, their functions are different, and they serve distinct purposes. A duty to remember has an educative feature whereas duty to forget can be evaluated as a path towards reconciliation. Leaving aside differences, there are similarities between them. If there are some situations which are needed to be remembered, then, there can be some other situations which should be forgotten. For Margalit, it is the duty of communities to form structures which encourages not only remembering but also forgetting. To support his argument, Margalit gives the example of Germany which destroys the private collective records of the secret service to forget its past which “is an example of a communal decision to forget” (2002: 13). If there is the ethics of memory, then there should be the ethics of forgetting as well. To Margalit, the ethics of memory is a term which includes “ethics of forgetting” (2002: 17). Similar to remembering, forgetting is vulnerable to various forms of abuses which means powerful ones can manipulate forgetting like they manipulate remembering. Forgetting can be used as a tool to serve the authority which aims to hide some events that are accepted as threats to their power to be learned by public.

In the domain of forgetting, the problems of memory and faithfulness to past are inherent. Forgetting is sometimes a threat against trustworthiness of memory. Although forgetting is seen as a threat to memory, remembering everything without forgetting could be a terrifying idea as well. To illustrate that point, Ricoeur mentions Jorge Luis Borges's story "Funes the Memorious" which is about a man who remembers everything, even the trivial ones, with every detail after an accident. The man cannot forget anything as everything is stored in his mind which is always full of details; that's why, he cannot even sleep. Funes's life is like a nightmare as he cannot generalize the events. To Borges, "To think is to forget a difference, to generalize, to abstract" (1962: 115); however, his protagonist cannot achieve it. The story is significant to understand the necessity of forgetting for the human mind and Ricoeur refers to this story to mention forgetting as another important mechanism in memory.

Two types of forgetting are introduced by Ricoeur: The first one is *profound forgetting* which means a kind of forgetting by "erasing of the traces" and the second one is *back up forgetting* which means "a sort of forgetting kept in reserve" (2004: 414). In reserve of forgetting, Ricoeur defends that the memories are hidden in the unconscious. He points out that in this type of forgetting it is possible to bring back the memories; that is to say, they are accessible unlike profound forgetting in which memories are inaccessible as the traces are unattainable.

The theorists evaluate the traces in terms of remembering or forgetting. Sometimes it is claimed that the traces are important to remember past events; that is why, communities form numerous monuments to ensure remembering. Contrary to the general assumption of building monuments to serve the purpose of remembering, Whitehead disagrees with this assumption. In the last part of her book *Memory* (2008), Anne Whitehead links the growing number of museums and monuments to forgetting. As their number increases, human beings burden the duty of remembering on museums and the result is forgetting. Whitehead gives a range of examples related to the countries' repenting for their earlier crimes. At this point, Whitehead poses a question on the possibility of a collective forgetting (2008: 154). Although communities build monuments to remember the past atrocities, humans tend to forget those events. David Rieff, in his book *In Praise of Forgetting* (2016), deals with this aspect of forgetting and he puts forward that even the recent past events are eventually doomed to be forgotten. Even the most traumatic ones will not be permanently remembered. According to Rieff,

remembering those events brings no good to individuals or societies. He exemplifies the Americans who reject to help Japanese affected by the tsunami. To him, the reason behind their rejection is that Americans still carry a grudge against the Japanese due to Pearl Harbor. To support his argument, Rieff introduces various examples from history; for instance, he mentions Osama bin Laden and how he abuses the memory of crusader wars to justify the September 11 attacks. What should be understood here is that to Rieff, remembering past atrocities just fuel their hatred.

Memory can be used to transform “the wound into the weapon” (Rieff 2016: 119). The past does not function as a standpoint from which individuals and societies take a lesson; instead, it serves the purpose of vengeance for the past wounds. Related to this point, Jasna Ćurković Nimac draws a slight dividing line between good and bad usage of memory and adds that “in some cases, memory can prevent violence, whereas it can breed violence in others” (2004: 27). Citing Todorov, Rieff thinks that what Osama bin Laden learns is a lesson despite being an evil one (Rieff 2016: 121), in other words, no one can guarantee the lessons learnt will be positive ones. While expecting to be remembered by future generations, the expectation can result in worse situations if hatred is inherited. Margalit touches on the subject and asks important questions about ethics and politics: Is it necessary to remember our ancestors’ hatred towards to other communities which humiliate them? If our answer is positive, then, could this hatred create negative relationships with these communities? Is it necessary to remember past emotions? How is an emotion remembered? When we remember an emotion, do we remember the emotion itself or how do we deal with the emotion? (2002: 110) These are the important questions asked by Margalit. To deal with those *negative moral emotions*, Margalit mentions two politics, negative and positive. About politics, Margalit thinks that rather than positive politics negative politics should be firstly dealt with as what should be solved is the negative situations; tyranny, cruelty or injustice are the problems which must be solved immediately (2002: 114). In order to reach a positive dimension, the first step should be eliminating the risk of evil emotions. Rieff ends his book with the same thought that it is an ethical obligation to forget past evils to move on. To break the vicious circle of repeated evils and to go on life, one must forget the past. According to Rieff, “whereas forgetting does an injustice to the past, remembering does an injustice to the present” (2016: 108). Remembering can lead the present relations to a problematic position; due

to this, forgetting can be seen as a new path towards a better future. To those theorists, forgetting may contain within itself a feeling of hope and morality as well.

Considering forgetting as happiness, Nietzsche was a defender of forgetting. To him, to experience happiness, one should forget the past not just for her/his own happiness, but also for the happiness of the others. He gives the example of children who are not aware of the past playing happily between the bounds of past and future. When children's play end and they wake up from the oblivion, they begin to understand the "strife, suffering and boredom" of humans (1995: 88). Nietzsche invites the reader to think about the nature of animals who are unaware of past and present living unhistorically. No one is as happy as animals since they do not have past memories or future expectations. They are clear examples of the possibility of living without memories. Although it is probable for animals to live without memories, the same thing is not valid for human beings. Nietzsche determines an indispensable position for forgetting. According to him, forgetting is essential as "all action requires forgetting, just as the existence of all organic things requires not only light, but darkness as well" (1995: 89). Just all actions, happiness presupposes forgetting in Nietzschean philosophy.

Like Nietzsche, French anthropologist Marc Augé in his book *Oblivion* (2004) handles forgetting as a positive concept. Unlike considering forgetting as the loss of memories and explaining it as a direct opposite of memory, Augé approaches forgetting as a complementary part of memory, which means forgetting is not the enemy of memory. Forgetting is necessary for the well being of both individual and collective psychology. Humans should know how to forget to be able to live the present and to perceive the past. To him, it is also necessary to forget the recent past in order to grasp the earlier past. Augé states that "memories are crafted by oblivion as the outlines of the shore are created by the sea... Oblivion is the life force of memory and remembrance is its product" (qtd in Galloway 2006:3). Similar to Nietzsche's idea of memory and forgetting, light and dark respectively as two parts of a whole, Augé represents memory as land and oblivion as sea. Oblivion shapes memory and turns it into a meaningful form. When considered from this aspect, approaching forgetting as reverse expressions of remembering limits our understanding of forgetting. If memory and forgetting are handled as complementary parts of each other, instead of thinking forgetting as hostile to memory, it would be obvious to see they are interrelated. Augé mentions about three images of forgetting: 1- It is necessary to forget the present to go back to the past. 2- In order to go back to the

present, it is necessary to defer the past and the future. 3- “To embrace the future, one must forget the past in a gesture of inauguration, beginning, and rebeginning... And it is always in the present, finally, that forgetting is conjugated” (qtd in Ricoeur 2004: 504). Those three images of forgetting affect both individuals and communities, and each time a version of forgetting is needed. Both individuals and communities require to forget in order to make room for new beginnings.

Throughout the history, communities try different ways to forget their past in order to leave aside the burden of remembering past wounds. In this sense, amnesty is a way of forgetting and making people forget their past. Amnesty is a political form of pardon which is aimed to end the serious problems affecting the civil peace. The purpose of amnesty is leading to forget the past wounds. The purpose of this ordered forgetting is protecting the future generations from the effects of past evils. Ricoeur gives an example of amnesty of Athens, where the citizens were ordered not to recall the past; and he defines it not an actual forgetting but just silencing the memory (2004: 501). It was forbidden to remember those events and also the people who committed offenses. Tzvetan Todorov gives the example of Henry IV who considered collective amnesia as a solution in 1598 (2009: 456). Henry IV signed “Edict of Nantes” which offers amnesty to end the religious wars between Catholics and Protestants. Derrida in *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* gives the example of French law of great amnesty of 1951 which aimed for “reconciliation by amnesty, and thus to reconstitute the national unity” (2005: 40). Following World War Two, to ensure the national unity, France accepted the law of amnesty which means forgiving the war crimes committed under the German Occupation. Parliament members offered amnesty to ensure forgetting for the sake of unity. After the wars, different countries at different times grant amnesty not just to their people but also to their enemies to end the conflicts between them. Amnesties are mostly granted for political crimes which are committed against administrations. The reason behind amnesty is to take a step towards reconciliation. As wars are traumatic for citizens of countries, it is necessary to cure the wounds of war trauma. At war times, the feeling of unity in a nation may be damaged and amnesty which is based on forgetting is thought as a solution in several occasions to restore the feeling of unity and peace.

In “Forgetting” chapter of his book *Memory, History, Forgetting* (2004), Ricoeur evaluates amnesty as one of three forms of abuses of forgetting, under the title of *Commanded Forgetting* underlining the phonetic similarity between amnesty and

amnesia. Like Todorov, Ricoeur gives the example of Henry IV and cites from the “Edict of Nantes”, which is declared by the king. King commands that no one would remember the past, whoever violates the law would be punished. Catholics and Protestants have to live in peace; otherwise, they would be punished. Ricoeur disapproves amnesty as it is a way of abuse of forgetting and states that “if a form of forgetting could then be legitimately invoked, it would not be as a duty to silence evil but to state it in a pacified mode, without anger” (2004: 456). To Ricoeur, the other type of abuse is *blocked memory* which means obstacles encountered while remembering the events (2004: 444). In this case, memory traces cannot be achieved due to the traumas or some illnesses. This type of abuse is approached with findings of psychoanalysis. The third type is totally related to ideological construction. This type of abuse is named *manipulated memory* which serves the purpose of controlling collective identity through ideology by manipulating memory (2004: 448).

While narrating the events, they are manipulated by the powerful authorities. As narrative is susceptible to different ways of expressions, it is open to the manipulations of ideologies. “A devious form of forgetting is at work here, resulting from stripping the social actors of their original power to recount their actions themselves” (Ricoeur 2004: 448). Under the effect of ideology, the manipulated narration constitutes not only personal identity but also communal identities. The powerful ones capture the narrative and use it to “impose a canonical narrative by means of intimidation, fear or flattery” (Ricoeur 2004: 448). In this respect, forgetting functions to shape the official memory of powerful actors. Although there seems to be caring for memory, in the forming process of that *manipulated memory*, the care is sacrificed in the name of power. The power is secured with the help of constituted narrative which serves forgetting. This memory making is related to construction of official histories; while some events are highlighted, the other ones are eliminated. In the construction process, it is possible to change the agents of events and recount the story from different perspectives. There are various ways to manipulate narration, thus, repression and rejection can be thought as other ways to achieve this goal. In this sense, forgetting and its moral aspect is problematic as it is not intended by people but forced by the authorities.

Repression is not only applied in the process of manipulation of narration, but also found in the process of forgetting, which means repression itself is, in a way, forgetting. At this point, it is necessary to utilise Nietzsche’s idea of forgetting in his

book *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1989). According to Nietzsche, forgetting should not be seen as inertia; it is “rather an active and in the strictest sense positive faculty of repression” (1989: 57). Nietzsche mentions an active forgetting which operates like the keeper of psychic order; in other words, forgetting is a repression mechanism which is used to preserve psychic order. Sometimes it is necessary to forget the disturbing events in order to restart. Humans are inclined to forget their traumatic memories if remembering them is too painful to endure. Consciousness is under the pressure of disturbing events and forgetting those events are required to be able to feel positive things again. Hope, joy, happiness, and being in the present are among the positive things mentioned by Nietzsche, and without forgetting it is not possible to experience those positive things (1989: 58). To be able to embrace the positive things at the present time, individuals need to turn their attention away from the past by repressing it. Past is full of stories of murders, traumas, atrocities, sufferings and wars; hence, not only individuals but also communities need forgetting. Nietzsche emphasizes that idea with the following statement: “How little the world would look moral without forgetfulness!” (1989: 169). Even the world needs to forget to revolve; otherwise, no one can lead a life living with all those painful memories of past. Nietzsche is not the only one who handles forgetting as an active notion. Ricoeur also gives two forms of forgetting at this point; one is passive forgetting which means having too little memory, the other one is forgetting by avoidance which is both active and passive at the same time (Ricoeur 2004: 448). In the second form, the memory is evaded. Evading the past means refraining from past by creating a distance between past memories and present. If it is possible to forget the self when the distance is achieved is still a question that needs to be opened to discussion.

In that frame, Ricoeur questions the possibility of a *happy forgetting* by terming *happy memory*. About happy forgetting, Ricoeur asks “would there not then be a supreme form of forgetting, as a disposition and a way of being in the world, which would be insouciance, carefreeness?” (2004: 505) Kierkegaard’s idea of forgetting shows paralelism with this question. In his book *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits* (2009), Kierkegaard celebrates forgetting by giving the example of lilies and birds that do not have anything to worry about unlike human beings. If people observe lilies and birds, they can draw a lot of lessons from their carefree lives: If man “forgets himself in contemplation of them and their life, while in his absorption in them he, unnoticed, by himself learns something about himself” (2009: 161). In this mood, it is possible to forget the self in a

positive way. Ricoeur answers his question about happy forgetting by comparing it with happy memory. He thinks that if a balance can be achieved between the two forms of forgetting, which are *forgetting through erasing of the traces* and *back up forgetting*, then there can be a place for happy forgetting. Even if there can be a possibility for happy forgetting, it would be different from happy memory as the return of memory is an event, while forgetting is not (2004: 502).

Forgetting has a different mechanism from remembering. The mechanism of forgetting is operated in various ways by individual and communities. While some attitudes towards forgetting are at a positive pole, other approaches are at a negative pole. Although some theorists consider forgetting as enemy of memory which efface past, others view forgetting as the forming part of memory which shapes it by selecting past events. There are some views which accept the relation between memory and forgetting as inseparable, just like there are some ideas which mention forgetting as the opposite side of memory. Sometimes, both individuals and societies want to forget a traumatic past event, and by not remembering it they achieve their goal. Sometimes to make a fresh beginning, people willingly forget an event. When there is too much memory, the brain chooses those memories unconsciously to preserve order without the notice of individuals. Other times, forgetting may be a tool for abuses of memory. Power mechanisms may misuse forgetting to guarantee their strength in exactly the same way they misuse remembering. To reach their goal, via narrations they can efface some parts of past. That is not the only way to abuse forgetting, it has been probable to officialise forgetting by amnesty. When the past is used to serve violence in a repetitive manner for nations, amnesty has been seen as a solution to end the ongoing conflicts between opposite parties. In this respect, as mentioned before, the consequences of amnesty remain open to discussion.

The phonetic similarity between amnesty and amnesia brings to mind the relation between the two. Although amnesia is a kind of memory loss which stems from brain damage or an injury, sometimes the outcome of amnesty can be very similar to the result of amnesia. In some circumstances, the underlying reason behind amnesty is reaching a level of forgetfulness which can only be observed in amnesia. Amnesty can be thought as a step towards amnesia. In Russell Jacoby's book *Social Amnesia* (1975), amnesia is discussed on the level of communities. Social or collective amnesia is the collective forgetting of events by groups of people. Russell defines social amnesia as "memory

driven out of mind by the social and economic dynamic of [the] society” (1975: 4). In that sense, societies leave aside some memories due to some reasons. There may be several reasons behind social amnesia: ignoring, evading, time passing, changing of situations or amnesty can be considered among the reasons. Society with its internal mechanism chooses what to forget and what should be remembered, which means society shapes its own past. In this sense, the motivation behind forgetfulness is that society believes the evil past has been left behind, and better days are ahead. To achieve this idea, like individuals, societies operate with repression mechanism to cope with the painful past. Whether all the events can be forgotten or there may be some events which must be preserved in collective memory are still being discussed.

Ricoeur thinks that there are some events which are unforgettable. Apart from the pressure of necessity of forgetting, there exist some events memory cannot forget. He underlines “the unforgetting memory, excluded from the arena of power by the forgetful memory” (2004: 501). It is possible to place the crimes against humanity into the area of unforgettable as what is attacked is humanity itself. Dignity of humanity has been deeply hurt with the great crimes of the twentieth century. Whether great crimes of the century should be remembered or forgotten is a significant question which must be reconsidered. As it was explained, although some thinkers accept forgetting as a solution, there are some others who think remembering as an answer. At that point, there is a third group which finds the solution in balancing of the memories. This group puts forward that past should be remembered, forgiven, and then finally forgotten. They emphasize the importance and necessity of reconciliation.

1.3. Duty of Confrontation and Forgiving the Past

As a result of the contributions of psychoanalysis, it is a widely accepted fact that the forgotten or repressed returns back. Repression of traumatic or unwanted memories is not actually effacing them permanently. Sooner or later, the repressed memories return to the mind. To Volf, “repressed memory does not simply disappear into the night of forgetfulness” (2006: 73). Repressing the past means blocking the traces of the events to by removing it from the region of consciousness, which means that it is not a total forgetfulness. Human mind operates with various repression mechanism to cope with the traumatic past. In order to elucidate the subject, Ricoeur refers to Freudian understanding of blocked memory, which explains that repetition observed in patient is related to

repression and forgetting. To repress the trauma, the patient substitutes repetition for remembering which means that trauma is there though it is not accessible (Ricoeur 2004: 445). Unlike it is traditional understanding, the forgotten does not disappear. Repetition keeps the trauma away from the conscious. When the traumatic memories burden the consciousness, the mind uses repression as a solution to remove the undesirable memories. However, repressed things will later on bother the individual. In terms of Freudian understanding of trauma, verbalising the traumatic memories is suggested as a treatment for it. That is to say, no matter how painful is the past, it must be faced honestly. Blustein gives the example of Tulsa Race Riot of 1921, in which black people were killed by whites. Nevertheless, the riot was covered by the state or the people as they wanted to forget it.

Local newspapers rarely mentioned the riot, the state's historical establishment essentially ignored it, and generations of Oklahoma school children were given a sanitized version of Oklahoma history that either said nothing about the riot or treated it as an unfortunate, but not very significant, event in the state's past. (Blustein 2008: 111)

The state and the people try to erase the past by ignoring it. However, Blustein and many others claim that what is proper is admitting the past wrongs and taking responsibility for them. It is necessary to face the past to ensure justice towards the victims of the past. Blustein argues that remembering past wrongs can compensate the wrongs of the past. Remembering can heal past wrongs, and it is significant to show respect to the losses. Blustein explains that peace cannot be achieved without knowing past and past should be visited even though this visit risks the achievement itself: "[E]limination of all traces of the past is not usually a wise or ultimately successful strategy. Rather, it has to do with managing the influence of the past so that it does not become an exaggerated focus of social and political concern" (2008: 22). In other words, the problems of past should be solved, otherwise it can lead future relationships to conflicts. Furthermore, revealing the past wrongs can result in preventing the repetition of evils of past and besides promote being just to past generations. Blustein puts forward that when individuals and communities are unable to remember the events or important details of the events which they need to remember, these situations bring to mind moral questions about remembering. Remembering "too much" or "too little" cause problems about memory. At this point, Blustein refers to Nietzschean idea of balancing between remembering and

forgetting. When a community persistently deals with the crimes committed to itself and does not deal with the wrongs done to others, then, too much memory is valid for that community. “In another sense, there is too much memory when preoccupation with the past hinders the collective action that is required for desirable social and political transformations” (Blustein 2008: 17). If there exist some wrongs done to other people, then they should be accepted in order to heal the past wounds. When there is a memory of loss, it is required to face that loss even if the memory is painful.

Remembering the past does not only mean remembering the events from the past; but, it also involves sentiments attributed to the events or people. Margalit takes Freudian concept of “memory prison” and approaches the term from a collective level: French people with the hand of Charles De Gaulle repressed their traumatic “Vichy memories” (2002: 5) which return and bother people. However, in order to have a peaceful conscious and society, one must return and revisit those memories. Otherwise, mind would be captured by the effect of repressed memories. About the losses, they should also be remembered, and the mourning process should be completed. On this level, Ricoeur touches upon Freud’s *Mourning and Melancholia*, and states that “the work of mourning is the cost of the work of remembering, but the work of remembering is the benefit of the work of mourning” (2004: 72). To Freud, the result of mourning is a free mind, and to Ricoeur it is a “happy memory”. Ricoeur expands Freud’s mourning to the collective level of trauma. Like the wounds and the traumas of an individual, there exist the wounds and the traumas in collective memory. War is a common example of trauma which exists in the history of all communities. In this sense, to get a “happy memory”, the traumatic war memories should be revisited and faced; at the same time, some ways should be tried to heal the past wounds. On Blustein’s view, in order to heal past wounds, a person needs to mourn and “mourning itself is a way of remembering” (2008: 265). One must experience the mourning process in order to move on. After completing mourning process, it is accepted normal to experience the fading of memories of the lost ones.

The normalisation and the mourning processes serve the purpose of forgiveness. Derrida points out that the aim of forgiveness is “to re-establish a normality (social, national, political, psychological) by a work of mourning, by some therapy or ecology of memory” (2005: 32). Forgiveness stands between memory and forgetting. In order to talk about forgiveness, there should be a fault, an offender and an offended. Forgiveness is something asked and granted. Refusing forgiveness requires a reason which waits for an

explanation. Margalit likens that situation to refusing a gift. There seems to be a kind of obligation in the nature of forgiveness, and it is possible to link this nature to the religious origin of forgiveness. To Margalit, not only forgiveness, but also sin and forgetting stem from a religious idea. He defines two ways of forgiveness: one is *blotting out the sin* and the other is *covering it up*. In *covering it up* model, the sin is ignored, slighted without forgetting; however, in *blotting out* model the sin is forgotten completely. To Margalit, of the two types of forgiving (*blotting out* and *covering up*), morally and psychologically proper one is *covering up* model as “it is better to cross out than to delete the memories of an offense” (2002: 197). While totally forgetting, namely *blotting out* model of forgiveness is related to God’s forgiveness, human forgiveness should be *covering up* model. The proper way is changing the outlook towards the past. If people exhibit remorse, it would be possible to talk about a forgiveness. If they accept the evil thing they have committed, then, it would be possible to restore it. While there is a chance of restoring the wrong deed with *covering up* model, which is supported by Margalit; in *blotting out* model, it is not possible. In the act of forgiving, a person stop remembering the past wrong with offense and s/he begins to forget the deed. This kind of forgetting is important morally and requires forgiving.

Derrida does not draw any limits for forgiveness. Since world wars, not only individuals but also groups and communities have increasingly begun to ask for forgiveness which has become a universally accepted notion in spite of its religious origin. Unlike the past crimes which are away from the judgment, the crimes of this age which are defined by Derrida as “monstrous” are recorded; and thereby, forgiveness is awakened (2005: 33). The idea whether there are some unforgivable crimes or not, is argued by Derrida. He discusses Jankélévitch’s ideas on forgiveness which disapprove forgiveness of the crimes against humanity. Jankélévitch’s ideas of forgiveness are in a reciprocal manner, that is to say, if someone asks for forgiveness after understanding her/his fault, only at this point it is possible to think about forgiveness. Derrida disagrees with Jankélévitch on this reciprocal understanding of forgiveness. To Derrida, Jankélévitch’s understanding of forgiveness is “conditional”, unlike the religious understanding of forgiveness which is “unconditional” (2005: 34). At that point, Derrida supports unconditional forgiveness that is valid for all crimes as there is nothing unforgivable. In this sense, instead of carrying the emotional burden of the past, forgiving and freeing oneself from the burden are accepted as the correct ways to deal with the past.

For Margalit, while forgiving is voluntary, forgetting is involuntary. In forgiving, the offended person accepts some reasons to justify the wrong done by the offender. This situation is linked to the covering up picture. However, in sole forgetting, the person does not have control on remembering or forgetting processes. Although the decision to forgive is voluntary, the result is not. If forgiveness is achieved, then it concludes in forgetting. Asking a person not to remember something strenghtens the possibility of remembering it. If the offended does not forget the traces voluntarily, then, forgiveness is not achieved. The ideal form of forgiveness is forgetting the traces and restoring the relationship between the offender and the offended. If a person forgets naturally without facing the past, that cannot be accepted as forgiving and not morally worthy (Margalit 2002: 205).

The morally worthy way of forgiveness frees not only the offended, but also the offender from the burden of the fault or crime. To Ricoeur, forgiveness releases “the agent from his act” (2004: 459), and he thinks that it has nothing to do with justice. After forgiving the fault, it is considered as proper to forget the past. It is the proper way to deal with the past. Otherwise, it would be an unhealthy way to cope with the past which means repressing it is a futile way. In that frame, Volf draws a path of forgetting

that starts with remembering truthfully, condemning wrong deeds, healing inner wounds, releasing wrongdoers from punishment and guilt, repentance by and transformation of wrongdoers, and reconciliation between the wronged and their wrongdoers; and it ends with the letting go of the memory of wrongdoing. (2006: 151)

This path is considered as a proper and healthy way which is proposed to be followed. When a wrong path followed, the outcomes would be problematic for not only individual, but also communities. The morally wrong way of forgetting and remembering, which does not include facing the past –and if necessary, forgiving the earlier failures–, would inevitably result in defected memories.

CHAPTER TWO

2. MEMORY AND LITERATURE

Literature is a means of expression through which memory is transmitted and constructed. As much as being an instrument of collective memory, literature has its own way of remembering the past. The way literature presents any past events shapes the way of how the events would be remembered in the future. In its oral and written form, literature constructs individual and collective memory. Collective memory has used oral and written literature to transmit the important events which constitute identity of communities. In a similar way, literature is shaped in the social context of communities. Born in this context, literature with all different genres and through different media technologies is a powerful instrument of collective memory. Three roles that literature plays in the forming process of cultural memory are discussed by Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney: 1- Literature as a medium of remembrance; 2- Literature as an object of remembrance; and 3- Literature as a medium for observing the production of cultural memory (2006: 112). The first one is related to the role literature plays on remembering the past through earlier narratives. Past is not only preserved with events or people, but it is also conserved within various narrative forms. The second role is about how a literary text becomes an object of the recollection. The texts are transmitted from one generation to another; that's why, they shape and reshape cultural memory. The last role is about the outcomes of the forming process of cultural memory. Literature is not just a producer of cultural memory, it also provides cultural knowledge for the individuals who live in the community. In that sense, Erll and Rigney state that literature is "mimesis of cultural memory [...] literature reflects upon the epistemology, ethics, and workings of collective memory and, as such, it engages in a dialogue with historians and sociologists regarding the interpretation of the past and the forms appropriate to it" (2006: 113). Throughout the formation of cultural memory, literature is interrelated to other fields to remember and remind the past.

If literature imitates cultural memory, it means a similarity must be found in their nature. As stated earlier, memory has a selective nature like literature. Human memory and collective memory do not record or remember every events occurred in the past. While some events are remembered, others are not taken into account. Via the chosen events,

not every details are remembered, but they are brought back in an organized structure of narrative. That process is very similar to the creation of literature in which the same selective nature is observed. Astrid Erll in her book *Memory in Culture* (2011) mentions the three points that are condensation, narration and genres where memory and literature meet. Condensation which is widely used within different literary devices, for instance metaphors and symbols, has a significant role in the field of memory as well. Like in literature, in the formation of memory, condensation means condensing various ideas, feelings, and figures into one entity. In other words, just one condensed entity can function to remind some important past events. In terms of narration, in collective and individual memory, the events are chosen and constructed in a certain form just like in literature. Some events, details, and names are left aside as it is not possible to remember every aspect of a past event. Even the fictional dimension of literature is similar to cultural memory as fictionality of cultural memory is still in question. Although the genre seems to be the feature of literature at first sight, genre is also found in the domain of memory. Historical novels, epics, tragedies, and novels provide certain models to construct memory. Without those genres, it would be difficult to convey past events in a meaningful pattern. "Literature takes up existing patterns, shapes and transforms them, and feeds them back into memory culture" (Erll 2011: 148). There is a reciprocal relationship between literature and memory culture, that is to say, they nourish each other in terms of preserving the past.

Bart Keunen in his article "Cultural Thematics and Cultural Memory: Towards a Culture Sociological Approach of Literary Themes" (2000) handles the idea that themes in literature can be considered as the signs of cultural memory. Literature emerges in the socio-political environment of communities, and that's why, it carries elements of ideology, economy, social and political issues of the related culture. Keunen defines *cultural thematology* as a concept which helps to "understand thematic studies as the study of cultural memories and as the study of the interaction between literature and cultural life" (2000: 20). Both literature and culture form social identities of groups, and besides, they transmit the values and patterns, would result in the formation of cultural memory.

Besides its relationship with cultural memory, literature itself is a way of remembering the past. Literary texts with various genres remember and remind the past in their literary world. Intertextuality can be considered as an indicator of remembering

of literary texts and constructing cultural memory. Each text consciously or unconsciously remembers the previous texts written before. Not only texts, but also readers and writers remember the past each time when literary texts circulate between generations. According to Renate Lachmann, “the memory of a text is its intertextuality” (2004: 173) since literary texts comment and reshape both the earlier texts and the earlier genres.

Being a way of remembering the past, literature contributes to cultural memory in a very special way as it gives place not only to the obvious realities but also to the repressed past. “Literature is a mnemonic medium that not only creates new texts to be remembered but also recovers suppressed knowledge, revives obsolete knowledge and reincorporates formerly rejected unofficial or arcane traditions of knowledge” (Lachmann 2004: 173). Literature provides an immense scope to express both known and hidden realities of the past. Especially, the repressed materials can find a way of expression in the domain of literary texts.

Reality is reproduced in literary world, and it gains a new dimension which is open to different interpretations. That is to say, the fictional aspect of literature makes it open to recreate various realities that contribute to cultural memory. “Through this interplay between the real and the imaginary, fictional texts restructure cultural perception” (Erl 2011: 150). In this way, by operating with various genres, literature provides different perspectives for individuals and communities. It unveils both hidden and repressed realities by blurring the distinction between real and imaginary. The fictional aspect of literature should be considered not as a negative and unreal feature but a positive one which is a way of revealing, reproducing and even creating reality and memory. While remembering the past, literature creates a critical and a profound position for the readers to handle the past. Literature reconstructs the past, and by doing so, constructs and reconstructs cultural memory of societies. “Literature fills a niche in memory culture [...] it is characterized by its ability – and indeed tendency – to refer to the forgotten and repressed as well as the unnoticed, unconscious, and unintentional aspects of our dealings with the past” (Erl 2011: 153). In that sense, literature becomes the voice of the earlier events which are difficult to address and as much as being a tool of creating cultural memory, literature is a unique way of remembering past in its own right.

2.1. Kazuo Ishiguro's Life, Works and Literary Career

Japanese origin British writer, Kazuo Ishiguro was born in 1954 in Nagasaki, Japan. When Ishiguro was five years old, his family moved to England where his father, who was an oceanographer, admitted a job offer. Although they planned to live there for a while, they changed their mind and did not return to Japan. In their home, they spoke Japanese, and lived according to their Japanese culture. Japan has been very significant in Ishiguro's life; that's why, in his Nobel Lecture (2017) he mentions that he always wanted to return to his birthplace. However, he cannot visit Japan till his mid-thirties. Japan has lived as an imaginary place in the writer's mind, and at the same time has become a source of inspiration for him. In his Nobel Lecture, Ishiguro underlines the importance of Japan in his writing: "It was my wish to re-build my Japan in fiction, to make it safe, so that I could thereafter point to a book and say: Yes, there's my Japan, inside there" (2017: 6). It is clear that the writer wants to preserve his memory of Japan through his art. Although in his last novel *The Buried Giant* Japan does not function as a setting explicitly, it implicitly continues to exist in individual and collective memory of the writer. The distant setting of the novel could be interpreted as a reference to the atrocities happened in Nagasaki and Hiroshima during the World War Two. Setting his novels in pre-war or post-war periods, Ishiguro tries to remind, but also, heal individual and collective war traumas through his writing.

After completing his BA education in English and Philosophy at the University of Kent, he attended the University of East Anglia to complete his master in Creative Writing. During his master of education, he began to write short stories about Japan. Being tutored by Angela Carter and Malcolm Bradbury, Ishiguro got the support that he needed to improve his writing skills. As a result of this process, he wrote his first novel *A Pale View of Hills* (1982) which is about a Japanese woman named Etsuko, who moves to England with her daughter Keiko following her second marriage to a British man. Etsuko and her second husband have a daughter named Niki which seems as an English name for Etsuko. Etsuko does not want to remember post-war Japan or anything from her past because it is painful. Being unhappy and neglected in England, Keiko hangs herself; due to this reason, Niki visits her mother and they talk about the past. Although Etsuko seems to repress her past, she is haunted by Keiko's ghost in her dreams. The ghost and the dreams haunt Etsuko until she understands her neglect of Keiko. Ishiguro depicts the inner world of the mother who feels guilty within the details of Etsuko's dreams. It is

significant that the theme of memory and loss are presented by Ishiguro beginning with his first novel for which he is awarded Winifred Holtby Memorial Prize.

Ishiguro's second novel is *An Artist of the Floating World* (1986) which tells the story of a retired artist, Masuji Ono, who loses his wife when his house is bombed in the war, and the traces of the bombing left unrepaired. He loses his son during the Second World War, too. Ono begins to question his past to recover his identity. He visits other artists he knows to figure out his past. The last artist he talks is Matsuda, who has been badly influenced by politicising of his art during the war, like Ono. As they remember their war memories, two men accept their faults in the past. Like in his previous novel *A Pale View of Hills*, Ishiguro chooses the post-war Japan as his setting. The themes of memory, loss, facing the past and searching for the identity are elaborated in his first two novels. Ishiguro won Whitbread Book Awards for his second novel *An Artist of the Floating World* in 1986. The novel was also shortlisted for Man Booker Prize. The same year he was married to Lorna MacDougall, and the couple had a daughter named Naomi in 1992.

His third novel, *The Remains of the Day* (1989), which was adapted into a film, is set in England after the Second World War unlike his first two novels that use Japan as setting. The novel is narrated by Mr. Stevens who is a loyal butler taking a trip to visit his former co-worker Miss Kenton. Although Mr. Stevens has feelings for Miss Kenton, he cannot express them due to his loyalty and dignity. During his trip, he remembers and thinks about his life. All his life, Mr. Stevens has served Mr. Darlington, who supports Nazis and kills two Jewish men with the order of his master. Nevertheless, Mr. Stevens could not have even accepted the fact that he served for the wrong person. When Mr. Stevens and Miss Kenton talk, he understands how he deprives himself from love and possibility of a better life. In the cause of a false dignity and loyalty, he has lived all his life in vain. He has repressed his real feelings under his serious outlook in the name of his loyalty to his master. As the earlier ignored events are narrated through Mr. Stevens's past memories, the theme of memory is again elaborated in the novel just like in the previous novels. Ishiguro won The Booker Prize for his third novel in 1989.

Ishiguro's next novel is *The Unconsoled* (1995) which is about a famous pianist coming to Europe three days before his concert. The pianist Ryder is unable to remember the details of his concert schedule. Ryder can remember neither the people around him nor himself; the boundary between real and imaginary blurs. Everybody around him asks

for a favour; and through this interaction with other people, he begins to remember his past. Although the city and people seem strangers to Ryder, later on, he thinks that he has been there before. Ryder realizes that he even has a lover and a probable son in this city. Ishiguro portrays Ryder's identity crisis in a dream like setting. The way Ishiguro uses dreams is similar to his use of memory. In *The Paris Review* he states that: "And I started to see parallels between memory and dream, the way you manipulate both according to your emotional needs at the time" (qtd in Jordison 2015). He won Cheltenham Prize for this surrealistic novel.

Ishiguro's *When We Were Orphans* (2000), which was shortlisted for Man Booker Prize, can be classified as a detective story through which Banks tries to solve the enigmatic disappearance of his parents. Banks is a famous middle-aged detective who is haunted by his past. It can be understood that Banks's traumatic past shapes his present actions; even his choice of profession is the result of his past. Banks adopts an orphan girl like himself which intensifies his thoughts about the past. Before coming to England at the age of nine, Banks was living with his parents in Shanghai. Due to their involvement in an opium trade, his parents disappear; that's why, Banks returns to Shanghai twenty years later to solve the event. However, Shanghai is at war and solving the case will not be easy. After all, he unravels the mystery at the end by facing his past.

Ishiguro writes *Never Let Me Go* in 2005, which was also adapted into a film. Set in a dystopic world, the novel can be accepted as a science fiction novel. In the dystopic world of the novel, people create clones to transplant their organs to real human beings. The events are narrated from the view point of a carer named Kathy H, who remembers her earlier days in Hailsham, where the students like Kathy are raised and educated, but actually grown to be donors. In Hailsham, of which real function the students are unaware, art education is highly given importance. The underlying reason of art education is to show that the clones like normal people have souls. The clones like Kathy H are doomed to die at a young age after a few medical operations while they care for other donors until that time. Following the deaths of her friends and her love, Kathy thinks about her own life. Although she is informed to be operated for her organs, she finds herself lucky to have spent time with her love and she is still happy to have memories with him. In the novel, all the clones do is completing their mission which is in fact very much like all people do in their lives. The novel takes place in the list of *Time's* best 100 novels. Following *Never Let Me Go*, Ishiguro publishes *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and*

Nightfall in 2009. He has also written screen plays, short stories and lyrics throughout his literary career. In 2017, he received Nobel Prize in Literature, and in 2019 he is knighted for his contributions to literature. His last novel *The Buried Giant* (2015) takes a long time to write. It is known that he rewrites the novel after a few years of the first version as his wife does not like it. The theme of memory, which had been handled in his earlier novels, is reembraced in this novel.

2.2. The Buried Giant

Ishiguro's last book *The Buried Giant*, which is a fantasy novel, was published in 2015. Unlike in his previous novels that handle individual memory, Ishiguro elaborates collective memory in *The Buried Giant* as well as the individual. In his Nobel Lecture, Ishiguro states: "I'd often written about such individuals struggling between forgetting and remembering. But in the future, what I really wished to do was to write a story about how a nation or a community faced these same questions" (2017: 11). His motivation behind *The Buried Giant* is his wish to create a novel in terms of collective forgetting and remembering of nations as well as the individuals'. In order to find a proper setting for his novel, Ishiguro thinks for a long time that it takes ten years to finish *The Buried Giant*. At last, after re-reading *Sir Gawain and The Green Knight*, he decides that the proper setting should be the fifth or the sixth century, Post-Arthurian period of England. As not much is known about the period, Ishiguro can depict his fantastic world for his novel within a creative manner.

The novel is set in a period following the war between Britons and Saxons. The story begins in this period with an old Briton couple Axl and Beatrice who want to find their lost son. However, the land is under the influence of amnesia which causes everyone to forget the past. Axl and Beatrice think their son is living in a village a few days away, and for that reason they set out on a journey. On their way, they come across with an old woman, who foretells them about a ferryman that will drive Axl across the river leaving Beatrice alone. It is revealed that the only way for a couple to go across the river together is proving their love to the ferryman. The old woman also mentions that the land is covered with a forgetting mist; that's why, they cannot remember their past. Not only the old couple but also everyone suffers from forgetting. The problem is Axl and Beatrice think about how they can prove their love when they cannot remember their memories.

The old couple gets back on the road and arrives in a Saxon village. They learn that a child named Edwin is attacked by ogres and saved by Wistan, who is a warrior. Noticing a bite in Edwin's body, villagers want him to be killed as they believe that he would transform into a monster. Later on, they agree to send the child with Axl instead of killing him. Wistan, Edwin and the old couple head for a monastery to get information about the mist and have Beatrice treated for the pain in her body. On the road, they meet a knight called Sir Gawain who is tasked with killing Querig-she dragon by the King. Thereafter, it is understood that Wistan is also tasked with the same duty. When they arrive in the monastery, they notice that the place is unusual. They understand the monastery is similar to a castle, and the priests actually protect the dragon whose breath steals their memories. After a priest traps and leads the old couple and Edwin to a tunnel, which represents the past and past atrocities, Wistan and the rest of the group are separated.

On their way, Axl and Beatrice see a house on the mountain and talk to children living there. As the children's parents have forgotten them, they want the old couple to help them to kill Querig with a poisonous goat the children have. The old couple accepts the offer and takes the goat. Wistan and Edwin are also on the way towards the place where the dragon lives. When the old couple climbs the hill, they encounter with Sir Gawain. Soon, they see Wistan and Edwin. Axl asks Sir Gawain whether his main duty is protecting the dragon or not; Sir Gawain admits that not only he but also the priests are protecting the dragon. Since there is a disagreement between Gawain and the priests, he becomes the dragon's only friend. Sir Gawain shows the rest of the road to the old couple, and wants to stop Wistan from killing the dragon though Wistan does not accept it. Beatrice suggests to use the poisonous goat that would at least slow down the dragon even if it cannot kill it. However, being a warrior, Wistan does not prefer to use poison. When the group see the old Querig breathing hard, they are taken aback by the situation. Sir Gawain mentions that peace was achieved by the King's order as a result of the spell the wizard casted on the dragon's breath. Sir Gawain explains that he cannot predict what types of memories would return when the dragon is dead. Then, unconvinced Wistan and Sir Gawain start fighting; Wistan kills Sir Gawain and beheads the dragon. The Saxon warrior Wistan explains that his community would revenge on Britons.

Following the death of dragon, Axl and Beatrice begin to remember their son who in fact died years ago. On the way, the old couple runs into a ferryman who suggests to

take them to an island. The ferryman tries to convince Axl and Beatrice by saying that it would be possible for them to see their son. The ferryman mentions that his boat is too small for ferrying them at the same time; however, he can take them separately and they can be together again when they reach the island. Despite being doubtful at first, the old couple finally accepts the offer of the ferryman. They say their sad farewells and huddle, then the ferryman takes Beatrice across the river leaving Axl alone. The ferryman reminds Axl to wait for him; however, sorrowful Axl does not hear the ferryman and keeps walking.

As the story reveals, in *The Buried Giant*, the significance of memory and memory construction are handled through individual and collective levels. The basic conflict that is to experience a compulsory amnesia erasing both individual and collective memories. The question Ishiguro presents is whether it is better to forget the earlier sorrowful and traumatic memories not only of the individuals but also societies. In this sense, Ishiguro's questioning of the moral aspect of remembering and forgetting in memory making frames novel in the domain of the ethics of memory.

2.3. Ishiguro and Memory

In all his novels, Kazuo Ishiguro elaborates the theme of memory in one way or another. Sometimes on individual level, sometimes like in *The Buried Giant* on collective and individual level, Ishiguro handles the notion of memory. Wojciech Drąg in his book *Revisiting Loss: Memory, Trauma and Nostalgia in the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro* (2014) addresses Ishiguro as “a writer of memory and loss” (2014: 1). Although he writes in different contexts, memory is a significant theme in all of his novels in which past is repressed and later on faced by his characters. Many of his characters have some conflicts in their past which affect their present lives. Brian W. Shaffer in his book *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro* notes:

Indeed, all of Ishiguro's protagonists are haunted by something ‘unresolved somewhere deep down’; all of them use their selfnarratives as a ‘kind of consolation or therapy’. For each of Ishiguro's narrators the world and the self are not quite as they should be; and each of them responds to this disappointment by fabricating narratives that pretend circumstances are otherwise. Perhaps this, above all, is Kazuo Ishiguro's master theme. (1998: 122)

His characters generally repress their pasts; however, their memories haunt and bother them. In order to find some relief, they need to revisit their pasts and deal with their past conflicts. Through those novels, it is like the characters reveal their past to the readers and expect to be understood. It is possible to comment that the revealing is like a confession. By revisiting the past memories, the characters try to take a new perspective into the interpretation of their past inviting the reader to get a similar perspective. When the past is revisited, they rediscover their identities and their relations with other people.

In the interview “A Conversation with Kazuo Ishiguro about *When We Were Orphans*”, Ishiguro explains the relation of memory and identity as follows:

I’ve always been interested in memory, because it’s the filter through which we read our past. It’s always tinted – with self-deception, guilt, pride, nostalgia, whatever. I find memory endlessly fascinating, not so much from a neurological or philosophical viewpoint, but as this tool by which people tell themselves things about the lives they’ve led and about who they’ve become. (qtd in Drag 2014: 2)

Memory has become a useful tool for Ishiguro to reveal identities through his characters. Sometimes his characters want to forget their pasts by using repression mechanism, and some other times they want to remember their pasts in full picture as it is the only possible place which can be a home to their losses. Some of his characters want to evade their pasts by ignoring while some others want to revive their pasts to be with their lost loved ones. Some of his protagonists want to correct their earlier wrong deeds by facing them. Although the characters’ motivations to remember their memories could be different, all of them need to revisit their pasts due to their particular reasons. While remembering their memories, characters reflect their versions of the past; hence, whether their versions are reliable or not remain ambiguous.

Memory in Ishiguro’s writing is not a peaceful notion; that’s to say, memory transmits many problems which are inherent in Ishiguro’s works. Matthew Beedham in his book *The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro* states:

In all of his novels, Ishiguro foregrounds the role and processes of memory. Shaffer perhaps summarises memory's role best: 'Ishiguro's novels are psychological mystery-voyages into the protagonist's problematic or compromised past', but in portraying these voyages, Ishiguro also

demonstrates memory's 'stratagems, its selectivity, its obsessional quality, its refinements, its expedience and use'. (2010: 133)

By revealing the memory processes, Ishiguro both depicts the psychology of the characters which is shaped by their memories and presents how memory operates in human life.

Ishiguro's characters have many issues with their pasts. In that respect, Ishiguro imposes a psychological burden on the processes of memory in his books. For his characters, forgetting, remembering and facing past are mostly laden with emotional burden. In order to disburden, his characters need to come to terms with the past; that's why, their minds go back and forth between memories. Ishiguro's narration is the outcome of that back and forth. The narration in his novels mostly makes the readers familiar with the characters' pasts, and how they deal with those past memories. In this sense, dealing with the past is related to the ethics of memory which is the focus of this study. Besides, dealing with the theme of memory like in his earlier novels, Ishiguro deals with the debates which are directly related to the scope of the ethics of memory in *The Buried Giant* which problematizes how to remember and forget the past properly. The novel addresses how to forget and remember traumatic memories by presenting readers the ethical dilemma of forgetting or remembering of individual and collective past. Those issues the novel raises require to apply the theories in the ethics of memory. Within this scope, the subject matters of the ethics of memory, –duty of forgetting, duty of remembering, facing and forgiving the past– will be examined based on the novel.

CHAPTER THREE

3. THE ETHICS OF MEMORY IN *THE BURIED GIANT*

3.1. Individual and Social Amnesia in *The Buried Giant*

The novel *The Buried Giant*¹ (2015) by Kazuo Ishiguro opens with a description of a vast area that is home to ogres; and later on, it becomes clear that the depicted area is a part of distant Britain. The novel is set in “not much beyond the Iron Age” (TBG 4). The home of Ishiguro’s main characters, Axl and Beatrice, is depicted as an isolated one which is set away from the fire where everyone gathers around. Axl cannot sleep in the beginning of the novel due to “a sense of unnamed loss” (TBG 5). This “unnamed loss” is related to his lost memories. After wandering around for a while, he accomplishes to remember some thing that he leaves over for a long time. Axl thinks whether he and his wife Beatrice have lived in this way throughout their lives, without having a child, in this community. Though he tries to remember, “nothing would quite settle in his mind, and the more he concentrated, the fainter the fragments seemed to grow. Perhaps these were just an elderly fool’s imaginings. Perhaps it was that God had never given them children” (TBG 7). The main problem is that they cannot remember whether they have had a child or not. The amnesia in the novel is everywhere not just the old couple, but all of the people in the community cannot remember their pasts. Ishiguro’s narrator points out the amnesia as follows at the beginning of the novel: “For in this community the past was rarely discussed. I do not mean that it was taboo. I mean that it had somehow faded into a mist as dense as that which hung over the marshes. It simply did not occur to these villagers to think about the past — even the recent one” (TBG 7). The chronic amnesia is related, on the surface, to the mist of oblivion which covers their individual and collective past. However, on a deeper level, Ishiguro invites the reader to think about the loss of memory and the struggle to remember the past in relation to ethics.

There are various examples of collective amnesia in the novel. Axl asks some of his neighbours about a red-haired woman who heals people; but, he cannot find an

¹ The references to the novel will be given with the abbreviation of *TBG* and page numbers henceforth.

answer. They utter that the event Axl is asking was probably lived very long time ago. Even though the woman is important for the community –because she heals people–, they have forgotten her. Beatrice thinks there was not such a woman as Axl claims her to have existed and she considers he probably saw the woman in his dream. Axl explains that it was not a dream, and if she tries, she will definitely remember her because the woman sometimes came and asked whether they needed something. Beatrice is not sure whether the red-haired woman was their relative or not. It is clear that they do not remember their children or relatives since they do not remember near or distant past. Axl cannot confirm his memory and states that: “Everyone here knew her a month ago and had a good word for her. What can it be makes everyone, yourself included, forget she ever lived?” (*TBG* 10). Since he cannot confirm the accuracy of his memory, Axl thinks that he misremembers due to his old age. The red-haired woman is not the only case; there is also the case of Martha, who is a lost girl. At first, everybody searches for the missing girl; then, they forget her in a short time. When the girl shows up, Axl warns her about her misbehaviour; however, the little girl is sure that her society has already forgotten her, and she is right in her prediction. It is revealed that they have already forgotten the little girl and argue about something else. Even her mother does not show a sign of relief and she just warns her saying not do this again. The events expose that the forgetting in the novel is not a result of the passing of time or coming of age. It is mostly related to an uncanny individual and collective forgetting which makes the reader think about the threatening and frightening aspects of forgetting.

Following Axl’s reminding Beatrice the cases of the red-haired woman and Martha, Beatrice agrees with her husband by saying: “It’s queer the way the world’s forgetting people and things from only yesterday and the day before that. Like a sickness come over us all” (*TBG* 20). Beatrice is anxious that apart from the red-haired woman, what if they have forgotten more important things about their past. Then, she remembers the trip they planned for a long time; however, delayed as the forgetting invades their world. She remembers their son whom she thinks to live in a village in a few days distance. Axl does not remember whether they have children or not; but it is Beatrice who remembers their son following her speech with a stranger woman. Although Beatrice thinks the reason behind their delay is Axl, she cannot remember the other details. She thinks that probably they had a quarrel; however, she cannot remember even what it was. The forgetting in the novel is not a kind of forgetting that is observed in old people. As it

is understood, not just the old couple but all of the people in the community forget their past. While Beatrice asks other people about her son, no one remembers even his existence. Axl cannot remember any physical or characteristic properties of him which seems odd to him: “It must all be the work of this mist. Many things I’ll happily let go to it, but it’s cruel when we can’t remember a precious thing like that” (*TBG* 34). Ishiguro uses the adjective “precious” a few times to refer to memories. It is very tragic that the precious thing that they have lost is not just their son’s memory but also his existence. Until the end of the novel, they cannot remember that their son actually died years ago. Jeffrey Blustein in his book *The Moral Demands of Memory* points out that remembering our loved dead ones does not mean just remembering them like an image but also “cherish[ing] at least some of their memories” (2008: 258). In the novel, they do not have an image or the memories of their dear son including the memory about his death. At that point, the reader is led to think whether forgetting may be a righteous act under some circumstances because the reader is implied that there should be a reason for the amnesia in the novel.

Beatrice and Axl are not the only parents who forget their children. The children living on the mountain, who give them a goat, are also forgotten by their parents due to the mist. Beatrice learns from a stranger woman, who comes to their village, that their land is “cursed with a mist of forgetfulness” (*TBG* 51). Although the old couple talks about the mist before, when the stranger woman confirms it, they become certain. Beatrice says: “We don’t remember our fierce quarrels or the small moments we enjoyed and treasured. We don’t remember our son or why he’s away from us” (*TBG* 51). What those people have is just a blank present that lacks both good and bad memories.

In the world of *The Buried Giant*, people living in those communities forget their children, relatives, friends, and enemies. Despite being hostile to each other earlier, Britons and Saxons live side by side in the novel. It can be understood that they do not like each other; however, in some way, they manage not to fight any more. During their journey, Axl and Beatrice spend the night in a Saxon village, which depicts the probable positive aspect of amnesia despite the negative ones. In one of his interviews for *Light Speed Magazine* (2015), Ishiguro states that in the novel two communities, Britons and Saxons, “have learned to coexist — they’re kind of friendly, they’re intermingling, but their coexistence depends on them not remembering what happened a generation back, because some awful atrocities were committed in order to win this peace”. It is understood

that the peace they have is nothing more than a fragile one which is founded on amnesia. Actually, the amnesia they suffer is the result of the forgetting magic that is commanded by King Arthur upon societies. In the same interview, Ishiguro indicates that using this story he wants to handle collective amnesia: “Not dementia or anything like that, or Alzheimer’s —some kind of very selective amnesia so that whenever anyone tried to remember things around a certain area, a certain topic, everyone would blank out” (2015). To achieve his goal, Ishiguro chooses Arthurian Britain and King Arthur’s command, which means the amnesia in the novel can be thought as a metaphor for all of the compulsory amnesias or amnesties created by power holders or authorities throughout the history.

Arthur, as a figure of power, manipulates the past events by the help of magic, and he erases the traces of the slaughter he commanded before. The King, in order to save his people from the war, orders Merlin the magician, to cast a forgetting spell over Querig’s breath. By doing so, the past is buried within all the sins it witnessed. In both communities, due to the mist, people start to behave as if nothing evil had happened between them though that action is unable to set the seal on the problems. In the article “National Identities, Personal Crises: Amnesia in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Buried Giant*”, Catherine Charlwood puts forward that “dragon Querig is designed to do: provide a tabula rasa through amnesia so that the past cannot ruin the present and future” (2018: 28). Arthur tries to provide a fresh beginning for the people by covering the traces of the atrocities. The new leaf that the King turns over for the communities manages to stop the war for a while. However, Arthur establishes the dream-like peace after slaughtering a lot of people of Britons. Britons violate The Law of Innocents that was protecting women, children and old people from the attacks of the both sides; then, Britons break the law and kill innocents, even babies. After carrying out genocide, Arthur commands the oblivion magic to protect his own people from the risk of revenge.

Based on this story, the ethics of memory appears in the novel in relation to the rightness or wrongness of collective forgetting of earlier atrocities or even genocides to keep on a peaceful agreement between the earlier enemies. Arthur and the others who support forgetting spell have a reason to do that on behalf of doing the right thing. However, this is still problematic as totally forgetting is not presented as a solution in the novel for the wrong deeds in history. Besides, Arthur’s act is an example of *collective egoism* that Margalit defines as a form of behaviour which is about caring for your own

country's people and uncaring for other people (2002: 35). King Arthur uses oblivion magic in order to protect his own people and prevent the occurrence of revenge; hence, Saxons forget to take revenge and both communities turn to be oblivious of their hatred. The question is whether forcing people to forget is morally right thing even though it brings peace and tranquility.

Arthur thinks so, and by the help of Sir Gawain he distorts reality and creates a new narration, namely he forms a new memory. Sir Gawain tells people it was his King who established the peace between Britons and Saxons uttering that it is the result of Arthur's work who ensured peace between two communities as his King ordered them not to kill children, women and elders; that's why, both parties could trust each other. In reality, Arthur broke the peace, violated The Law of Innocents, and slaughtered people. The powerful one, not only manipulates the historical narration about the agents of the events but also creates an alternative reality. The peace Arthur brought with the help of oblivion magic is like the amnesty Henry IV legislated. In "Edict of Nantes" (1585), it was forbidden to remember any memories during the wartimes. Both Catholics and Protestants had to live peacefully without accusing each other. Living peacefully without dropping a hint to the past was an obligation, like in *The Buried Giant*. Arthur, like Henry IV, wanted to draw a veil over the memory of past atrocities; however, the difference is not by the help of law but by magic.

Although both Saxons and Britons do not remember their pasts, they do not seem to like each other. Saxons circle their village with high fences, and dig a ditch around it to defend themselves. Whether the trench is newly digged is not clearly stated. But probably, it was digged during the wartime. When Axl and Beatrice enter the village of Saxons, "[w]ho knows what goes on with Saxons," says Axl. They think it might be "better seeking shelter elsewhere" (*TBG* 54) as the village does not seem friendly. Not fighting any more does not mean they are friends now; however, it means that they can at least visit each other's villages. Halfheartedly, the couple stays for the night; neither friends nor enemies Britons and Saxons live side by side. Throughout the novel, Ishiguro makes it clear that both communities have different cultures and life styles ranging from the way they build their villages to their swordcrafts. It is possible to evaluate that the forgetting magic is unable to totally erase the cultural and ethnic bias they have against each other; but it temporarily covers it. The giant that is buried is also the authentic hatred that is ready to raise its head in any moment. Drawing upon Freud's discussion of the

return of the repressed, it is understood that the buried hatred will return at the end; that's why, forcing people to forget past atrocities is a vain and immoral attempt.

In addition to other prejudices, their religions are also different: Britons are Christian, Saxons are pagan. In the Saxon village where Beatrice and Axl stay for the night, there is a Briton elder named Ivor who lives among Saxons though he does not find Saxons as civil people. Beatrice asks him how he manages to live there. Ivor admits that he does not know how he lives among "such savages. Better dwell in a pit of rats" (*TBG* 84). He explains that the day before they had a problem and: "These pagans were sufficiently aroused last night to tear out each other's eyes" (*TBG* 84). Saxons are described as uncivil people; besides, there is an emphasis on their religion in a negative manner. Although the communities in the novel forget memories which are of vital importance, they remember some cultural codes they have had, which means the oblivion magic cannot erase some prejudices that people have, especially those stored in collective unconscious. As an explanation of the situation, it can be understood what is damaged in the novel is not *habit memory* but *recollection memory* as Blustein theorizes. To Blustein:

Habit memory, in its collective form, is sedimented in a society's institutions, conventions, and laws and in the civic habits of its people, and although it does preserve the past, it typically does so in an unself-conscious way that does not make explicit reference to the past. (2008: 33)

In this sense, people can fulfill their daily works as they do not lose their habit memory; however, they still hold some of their earlier prejudices against each other. Despite having habit memory to move on their lives, Britons and Saxons are deprived of their precious memories. In spite of being old, Axl and Beatrice like other people can work to maintain their lives like other people; for instance, no one in the novel forgets how to work in the fields. However, they easily forget even the recent past. In some circumstances, their minds are invaded by the fragments of the past but they cannot retrieve their memories.

The characters struggle to remember even a recent event such as Axl, who strains every nerve to make sense of the events around him. About Marta case, Axl's mind tries to reconstitute it: "But already these recollections were growing confused, in much the way a dream does in the seconds after waking, and it was only with a supreme act of concentration that Axl held on to the thought of little Marta" (*TBG* 12). The veil on their mind creates an effect that is similar to sleep as they live in an alternative reality. Till the end of the novel, they do not perceive completely what they have experienced before.

Without even realising it, Axl and Beatrice have delayed their journey to their son's village for a long time. Although they agree on the journey, on the following days they avoid the topic. "For they found they became oddly uncomfortable whenever the topic was broached"; no matter their effort to avoid the topic, each time one of them tries to talk about the topic as if the topic is a "compulsion" (*TBG* 21). It can be deduced though they try to suppress it, some memories in their unconscious bother them. After a while, they again forget the topic as it turns into a matter of debate between them. They forget even their quarrel just like they forget the memories of the war.

Despite loving each other, they are not loved and respected in the community they live. The children in the community mock Axl and Beatrice; the community forbids them to use a candle; hence, they have to stay in the dark at night. A girl brings them a candle; however, the community does not let them use it. They take it from Beatrice, at that time, feeling helpless Beatrice remembers their son. "When they were pushing me just now, it was our son I remembered. A fine, strong, upright man. Why must we stay in this place? Let's go to our son's village. He'll protect us and see no one treats us ill" (*TBG* 26); soon, Beatrice is confused. Beatrice's mind tries to remember their son; she says that she sometimes accomplishes to remember him. "Then the next day it's as if a veil's fallen over his memory" (*TBG* 28). The veil is nothing more than the forgetting mist which covers up their past. The veil is the outcome of the magic which invades both their minds and the world they live in. Their past is as dark as the night that they have to endure without the candle. The moment the veil over their past is uncovered, they will face the harsh realities.

Living in amnesia, the characters are similar to the inverted version of Jorge Luis Borges's story "Funes, The Memorious" (1962) that Ricoeur gives as an example to explain the situation of remembering everything. In the story, Funes cannot forget anything; as a result, he cannot live a normal life. He loses some of his mental capacities, since he loses the balance between remembering and forgetting. The very opposite situation can be observed in Ishiguro's novel in which people cannot remember their past as well as they also lose the balance between remembering and forgetting. The characters in the novel cannot maintain their lives normally as they do not know their real identities which are also buried together with their memories. Memory is the link between past and present which is valid in the realm of individual and collective spheres. When the novel is considered, the created amnesia not only erase the memories but also the identity of

people. The people do not know who really they are, in addition to that, they do not have any idea about their past. They lose the past with its ups and downs. The old couple forgets their son which is a good memory; at the same time, they forget their son's death which is a sad memory. They even forget Beatrice's disloyalty and the past of their relationship. They forget their friends and enemies. As Blustein points out amnesia results in losing identity as earlier self is forgotten: "Loss of memory as it occurs in cases of extensive amnesia would therefore not only completely sever a link to the past that many regard as necessary if one is to be the same person as some earlier person" (2008: 43). In a similar sense, neither Axl nor Beatrice is the same person before the mist. Despite being an Arthurian peace knight earlier, Axl is now unable even to defend his right to use a candle that the community prohibited the old couple from using. Thus, forgetting results in the involuntary transformations of their identities, which puts the question of the moral side of forgetting again.

By erasing the memories of the old couple, Ishiguro questions the nature of love in the eternal present by asking the question whether it is possible to love a person without memories. Beatrice utters that: "I'm wondering if without our memories, there's nothing for it but for our love to fade and die" (*TBG* 51). What if they were different people before the mist, and what if they do not love each other when they remember their past are the questions that preoccupy their minds. The fear of losing their love continues during the novel; besides, they cannot be sure the strength of their love till the end. When they have a suspicion, they promise to love each other even if their memories turn out to be disappointing. Their present love is bound up with not remembering their past emotions; hence, in order to continue to love each other whether they need to forget their past or not is a significant question that must be thought. The question is also whether it is moral to forget the past to protect the relation. At this point, Margalit is on the side of remembering to have a good relation: "So we ethically ought to remember on two counts: for the sake of the goodness *within* the relation and for the sake of the goodness *of* the relation" (2002: 106). In a similar way, it is morally necessary for the old couple to remember their past if their aim is to have a good relation that is based on a strong love. This idea about the moral side of remembering is given by Ishiguro especially via the boatman who tests their love witnessing the couple's remembrance of their memories at the end.

The people in the novel live in a bubble; that's to say, they are in a dream like fictional world which is set away from harsh realities. In his book *The End of Memory*:

Remembering Rightly in a Violent World (2006), Miroslav Volf gives an example about a person running happily after a ball on a highway by ignoring the cars. To Volf, even if the person manages to live, the life is not a meaningful one as “our lives would lose depth and richness for lack of memory and hope to bring the past and future into the present” (2006: 73). The example is very much like the situation in the novel. Although they manage to live by stopping the war, or the old couple lives in peace without their earlier memories, their lives become meaningless without their past. Volf resembles living in oblivion to living in a “bubble of untruth about ourselves and unconcern for those who wronged us”; the bubble could not stand the harsh reality and would burst at last (2006: 73). In the novel, within a similar “bubble of untruth”, the created amnesia erase both the individual and collective memory of the people. The oblivion mist provides a fake reality and fact for individuals and communities, which would also burst at last.

As the communities in the novel do not have their own ways to keep their memories, they tend to forget easier than the communities that can keep their memories. In the domain of collective memory, normally, there are various ways to keep memories like museums, commemorations, and monuments. Since the communities in the novel lack any of the entities similar to those, they are more vulnerable to forgetting. The communities mostly keep their memories in an oral tradition to form their collective memory. However, neither the Britons nor the Saxons has such a kind of oral tradition as observed in the novel.

Like there are various ways to protect memories, there are some other ways to abuse them. In order to abuse memories, the King applies the magic; in other words, the forgetting magic is an act aimed at erasing the memory of the people who witness the evil. Avishai Margalit gives an example of “Black Hole” operation aimed at eradicating the traces of the crimes of Nazis; the wrongdoers try to remove their traces by destroying evidence and witnesses (2002: 165). The forgetting magic in the novel is very much like Black Hole operation that Margalit criticises. Arthur tries to erase the traces of genocide that he carries out. In fact, what Arthur aims is not only erasing the memories but also the identities of the people. Since memory is part of identity, the manipulation of memory emerges as a threat to identity. For Ricoeur, identity is fragile, and one of the reasons of this fragility is the other: When the other is seen as a threat to individual and collective identity, the difficulty of accepting the other comes in view (Ricoeur 2004: 81). Arthur considers Saxons as a threat to his country and he wants to protect his people against the

danger of a revenge. He falls back upon a kind of amnesty, the outcome of which is very similar to amnesia. In the history, amnesty is granted by various countries at different times. After wars, it is seen as a solution to secure the uniformity that is hurt during the wars. However, Arthur's solution is doomed to fail; since people totally lose their touch with reality due to amnesia, not a conscious amnesty. It is not possible to reunite Britons and Saxons as they lose their memories and identities without their own choice. Besides, without knowing their past, it is unfair to expect them to form strong bonds with people at present.

Instead of erasing all the memories, the mist leaves some fragments behind. The fragments preoccupy the minds of people, and bother them. Individuals and communities forget their children, friends, relatives and enemies; in other words, they forget their love and hatred. Despite ending the wars between the communities, living in an eternal present cost them a lot. Arthur, who is the symbol of all authorities, creates an alternative narration, and distorts reality. Ricoeur, handles the notion of power from a Weberian perspective, and suggests that ideology produces belief for people to obey the authority; by this way, "the order is legitimized and power justified" (2004: 83). King Arthur's legitimized authority and suppression creates such a kind of belief that even the ones who remember the reason of that magic justify and rationalize it.

Arthur makes people believe that the war is put an end; the peace and security are maintained; in fact, he tries to bring peace by covering the traces of the genocide. By pressing Sir Gawain and the monks into service, Arthur hides and distorts historical facts. However, Arthur's act results in chaos on individual and collective level. They are required to give up their past in exchange for the peace. As Margalit quotes from Ralph Inge: "A man may build himself a throne of bayonets, but he cannot sit on it" (2002: 11). It resembles to the situation in *The Buried Giant*; the communities which are build on an imaginary peaceful world could not live in the world permanently. The novel reveals that on account of being among great crimes, the genocide Arthur carries out should be remembered by humanity. Even if the forgetting magic is carried out in the cause of peace, Blustein puts forward that "peace and stability, may not be achievable without proper acknowledgment of past wrongdoing, even if dwelling on the past can be dangerous and threaten their achievement" (2008: 22). Therefore, Arthur's decision of forcing people to forget their past is morally wrong, even though the aim is establishing peace and stability.

3.2. Duty of Remembering in *The Buried Giant*

Although individual and collective amnesia ensure peace and order on the surface, amnesia is not a conscious decision that humans take. Therefore, without memories, the formation of individual and collective identity is not possible. Remembering and creating memory are directly related to the formation of identity. In order to be aware of their identities, humans need to remember the past that they experienced. Blustein suggests that “obligations deriving from identity include obligations to remember aspects of one’s past that are internally related to constitutive ingredient’s of one’s identity” (2008: 49). In other words, as past sufferings people experienced are part of their identities they are obliged to remember it. The same is valid for the people in the novel because they need to remember their past trauma, otherwise “it would be an offense against that identity” (Blustein 2008: 49). In the hope of finding their son and their memories, namely constructing their identities, Axl and Beatrice set out on a journey. As the stranger woman whom Beatrice speaks and the ill treatment they endure trigger some fragments in Beatrice’s mind, they start out to visit their son’s village. The journey they set off turns into a journey to find not only their son but also their memories and identities which are hidden by the mist.

When Beatrice is afraid of losing their love bond which is a part of their identity at the end of this journey, Axl tries to calm Beatrice with the following words:

There, princess, there’s nothing to fear. Our memories aren’t gone for ever, just mislaid somewhere on account of this wretched mist. We’ll find them again, one by one if we have to. Isn’t that why we’re on this journey? Once our son’s standing before us, many things are sure to start coming back.
(*TBG* 52)

On the way, in order to seek shelter from the rain, they go to a villa where they meet a boatman and an old woman who cuts rabbits with her knife. On the ground, they see traces of old blood trails that smell like slaughter. The idea is that unlike the people in the community, the place has a memory and holds the events with the traces it hides. In this villa, they encounter a boatman for the first time for whom the villa is an important place which is full of “precious memories” (*TBG* 41). Ishiguro uses the adjective of *precious* to refer memories. Actually, the old woman who cuts rabbits dirties the villa and the memories of the boatman. The boatman explains that the house has been ruined in the war. It is also understood from the description of the house that the wars not only ruin

lives but also places. The place reminds Axl some fragments which lack details: “It’s just this ruin here. For a moment it was as if I were the one remembering things here” (TBG 48).

It is revealed that the island where the boatman takes people across, is not a typical one as the souls are alone there. It is obvious that the island is not for living but for the souls. The old woman tries to remind them the situation which is known by all people that only some couples who prove their love are allowed to go across together. Since the old woman and her husband did not have a strong bond, the boatman did not cross them together. When the old woman goes, the boatman feels relief. The story reveals that people who cannot go across with their spouse wander alone crying and yearning. Beatrice is afraid of losing her husband if their love is not strong enough to go across the island. They need to pass the test of the boatman, and in order to pass the test, they have to answer the questions that the boatman asks about the memories of couples. The woman asks a hard question to Beatrice: “How will you and your husband prove your love for each other when you can’t remember the past you’ve shared?” (TBG 51). Thus, Beatrice and Axl need to remember their precious memories to pass the test and they need to remember their real identities which are unclear now.

Axl and Beatrice strongly feel the necessity of retrieving their memories. However, the old couple has lost their memories about people they love, which means their *thick relations* –which are formed with people we know and love– are hurt as Margalit mentions in his book (2002). As Margalit associates ethics with *thick relations*, the old couple should morally remember their past in order to fulfill their moral obligation and prove their *thick relation*. In that sense, unmasking the past atrocities is not only a collective duty but also an individual duty in the novel. That’s to say, apart from remembering past events and atrocities, humans need to remember their friends, relatives and family members. Remembering loved dead ones means keeping their memories alive in spite of their death. To Margalit, if people have thick relations, then, they should keep them good, and in order to keep them good, they need memory as an important element of their *thick relations*; as a result of which, they expect to be remembered after death by trusting their thick relations (2002: 106). In “Memory and Death” part, Margalit handles the relation of memory and death. All of the people want to be remembered after their death and the opposite is a dreadful idea for them. By being remembered, human being believes to leave a trace in the world after death. People expect to be remembered by the people

with whom they have *thick relations*. Humans trust their *thick relations* which are worthy of continuing in spite of death. As people care for the other people while alive, they want to be cared by those after death. Axl and Beatrice's son and their relatives would expect to be remembered if they had a chance to express; that's why, the old couple needs to remember their son, friends and relatives, and their thick relations with them.

In addition to that, Axl and Beatrice also belong to a community; therefore, they need to remember their collective past as well as their individual past. As they forget the memories of other distant people, their *thin relations* are also hurt. Being social creatures, humans are burdened with a duty to remember their individual as well as collective past; otherwise, they lose their individual and collective identities. About relations with other people, Margalit draws a line between relations: We have thick relations "with whom we are involved" and other we have thin relations "with whom we have only a thin idea of their existence" (2002: 143). Margalit points out that being involved with people does not have to be in a positive sense; it is also possible to be involved with people who are not liked. While in ethics, which is related to *thick relations*, emotions are important; in morality, emotions towards other people are slight. Positive emotions are the element of an ethical community. The memory of past emotions tie community members to each other whether the emotions are positive or negative. "Disengagement, estrangement, and alienation—the solvents of the ethical community—loosen the memory of shared emotions" (Margalit 2002: 144). In the novel, when people forget their enemy, they forget their own solidarity. What must be understood is that people need to remember negative emotions as well as positive ones; otherwise, it is not possible to form bonds with the community members. In other words, emotions help to establish either a unity or a hostility towards other communities. However, both Britons and Saxons have forgotten their bonds with the community members; that's to say, amnesia attacks the bonds of people in every aspect. In that sense, collective forgetfulness disrupts collective memory of both communities. However, people have a duty of remembering which is represented in the novel with the journey of the old couple.

Related to remembering past emotions, Margalit explains two types of remembering: One is "a cold memory" expressed in words, and the other is "a hot memory of reliving" (2002: 139). The characters in the novel have neither cold memories to express nor hot memories to relieve. While reliving emotions, people use visual elements and when people are unable to remember via visual images, they think as if their

emotions begin to fade. If a person cannot remember exactly a hated or a loved person, it becomes difficult to trust the existence of the emotion. That case could be observed in the novel in a similar way as characters are unable to remember their love for their families and fellow countrymen while they cannot remember their feelings of hatred towards the other community. Britons' and Saxons' burying their hatred do not clear up their problems since they are not expressed and relieved.

On the collective level, Arthur's act is genocide that aims to vanish Saxons; that's to say, the slaughtered people are the victims of a great crime which humans have a duty to remember. Like Margalit, Blustein and many others claim that radical crimes should be remembered as humanity is attacked. The novel reveals that the victims of Arthur's genocide should not be forgotten and turned into ashes. In this sense, forgetting the victims of the genocide is not different from killing them once again. For Margalit, by collective remembering, the society keeps its *thick relations* with both living and the dead; and by remembering the dead, the dead continue to live via memory (2002: 67). When the victims are forgotten, their struggle would lose its meaning. Before being history, memories of the victims should be retrieved to the minds of humans and communities. At that point, Wistan is the person whose act is to reveal the atrocities of the past in *The Buried Giant*. Unlike the old couple who seeks their individual past, Wistan tries to uncover the collective past of the communities.

In the novel, Wistan shows up when the mist turns into an unbearable condition. While Axl and Beatrice are staying for the night in the Saxon village, they meet Ivor who is a respectable Briton in that Saxon village. Ivor is angry with the guards who forget everything including their cousins being attacked by ogres. No one dares to save them except Wistan. Ivor complains about people's being forgetful and not attempting to remember stating "I'd be doubting my own senses if such strange forgetfulness didn't occur so often in this place" (TBG 67). Axl agrees with Ivor and adds that he and Beatrice observe the same forgetfulness in their own community. Before meeting the old couple, Ivor thought that he could remember the events while others forgot as he has been an old Briton among Saxons. Therefore, Ivor is surprised to hear that the old couple experiences the same situation. Contrary to the general assumptions about the elders being more forgetful, like Ivor, Axl and Beatrice think that they are less affected by the mist stating "we seem to do so less than the younger ones" (TBG 68). Citing from Tammy Ho Lai-Ming, Charlwood comments that as Axl and Beatrice are old, they do not have time for

new memories, unlike younger ones who can create new memories instead of lost ones (2018: 27). They need to hold on their past memories and retrieve them before their deaths. The main thing they should remember is their son as losing their son's memory means losing him one more time. Since they cannot remember him, they cannot even grieve over their son. However, in terms of the ethics of memory, the beloved dead ones deserve to be remembered after their deaths. Forgetting them quickly erases the moral duty to remember.

When it comes to forgetting the victims of great crimes, it also results in injustice. To Ricoeur, "it is justice that turns memory into a project; and it is this same project of justice that gives the form of the future and of the imperative to the duty of memory" (2004: 88). Thus, duty of remembering stems from the idea of justice, especially in terms of the communal dimension. When victims are forgotten, their suffering would lose the meaning that is inherent in the event. Throughout the novel, Wistan is the person who seeks justice by fighting to uncover the truth. Despite being the members of the opposing parties, Wistan and the old couple are the ones who really want to retrieve their memories. While trying to uncover the past, Axl and Beatrice question the source of the mist. During their dialogue with Igor, he warns them about the dangerous Querig, the she dragon, on the way to the monastery. To Ivor, Querig is the source of "many dark force" (*TBG* 72). He mentions about an Arthurian Knight, Sir Gawain, who is entrusted with killing the dragon though he has not achieved it for years. Ivor talks about a stranger who says that "it might be God himself had forgotten much from our pasts, events far distant, events of the same day. And if a thing is not in God's mind, then what chance of it remaining in those of mortal men?" (*TBG* 73). Beatrice thinks about what Ivor said the night before and she questions whether God himself makes people forget the past. She even thinks that God might get angry with the acts of people and as a punishment makes them forget the past. Axl disagrees with Beatrice stating that instead of forgetting and turning people to fools, God could punish people. Beatrice says: "Perhaps God's so deeply ashamed of us, of something we did, that he's wishing himself to forget" (*TBG* 87). Axl replies this with another question: "What on this earth could we have done to make God so ashamed?" (*TBG* 87). What makes God ashamed is actually the genocide of Saxons by Britons which is against the commandment of God. Besides, the amnesia is not God's punishment but the King's order. In this respect, the duty of remembering could be seen as the wish of God.

Arthur's order is against religious ethics which Margalit mentions about in his book. What religion actually command is: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (qtd in Margalit 2002: 40) which is something above ethnical or religious limitations. Margalit questions whether this idea of neighbourhood includes all humanity or it is about the neighbour from a certain religion. At this point, Margalit argues Kantian understanding of neighbourhood that Kant accepts all people as neighbours due to sharing the same planet. The discussion continues with the well-known story of Good Samaritan that is about a wounded Jewish man who cries for help from two men. One of them is another Jewish person who does not help his fellow Jewish neighbour and by doing so violates an "ethical duty". The other man is Samaritan, who is a stranger person and by helping the Jewish man fulfills a "moral duty" (2002: 43). In Margalit's understanding, this behaviour is not about love, but about morality. Love can be defined as caring for people with whom we share a past. Margalit argues the term of neighbour belongs not only to the scope of ethics, which he defines related to thick relations; but also, to the scope of morality, which is defined related to thin relations. In the scope of morality, the term signifies any human; while in the scope of ethics, it signifies our personal relations with people we share a personal or communal history (2002: 40-43). In *The Buried Giant*, the community members do not like their neighbours from other communities, and the King in the novel only thinks about the welfare of his own people; thus neither of them fulfills religious ethics. The King pretends as if he fulfills the commandment of God; however, he violates the Law of Innocents and slaughters innocent people which is disobeying the commandments of God.

While Arthur violates morality with evil deeds toward people out of his own community, Axl and Beatrice behave kindly to Saxon Edwin and Wistan who are not from their own community. They accept to help Edwin who is in danger among Saxons, a superstitious community which believes ogres and fiends. The community thinks the boy Edwin who is bitten by a fiend will turn into a fiend. Ivor explains that Saxons cannot think any other way than superstition; that means, it is not possible to change their mind since they are subjected to the traditions. Wistan suggests the old couple to take Edwin to a Briton village as it is Saxons who believe in superstition about a fiend bite. Britons are Christian unlike Saxons who are pagan; thus, Wistan thinks Edwin will be safe there. The old couple accepts to take the Saxon boy Edwin, and they set off together with Wistan and Edwin. In this sense, the old couple fulfills a moral duty by helping a Saxon boy with

whom they have thin relations. According to Margalit's distinction of relations, which are *thick* and *thin* relations, the duty is not ethical but moral as they do not share a past with Edwin. They help their neighbour who believes in a different religion. Although they do not know Wistan and Edwin, they give Edwin a helping hand; and the group set off for finding what the mist hides.

Blustein argues that if to remember is obliged, it means that people "operating individually or collectively, must make an effort to guard the past, to hold on to it or retrieve it from the traces it leaves behind" (2008: 32). In the novel, at that point this group of people attempt to retrieve the past from the traces; thus, Ishiguro charges obligation on remembering the past. Wistan and the old couple, try to uncover the past by using the traces of the past events. Axl and Beatrice remember a day when Beatrice wears a green cloth. A man was amazed by her beauty, Beatrice remembers Axl had a quarrel with him. However, Axl remembers the event differently and he does not think he had a quarrel to which Beatrice responds: "If that's how you've remembered it, Axl, let it be the way it was. With this mist upon us, any memory's a precious thing and we'd best hold tight to it" (*TBG* 89). It is apparent that the pieces of their memories distort the reality and a new kind of skepticism appears for Axl who starts to question Wistan's real identity thinking "why so anxious to adopt [his] disguise travelling through a country long settled in peace" (*TBG* 124). The conflict is Wistan's effort to remind people their past would break the peace when retrieving the memories. Thus, which one is the moral way of remembering appears as the basic question.

Throughout the novel, some traces of memory appears in the minds of the characters from time to time. Axl thinks that Wistan could be an enemy of Lord Brennus who rules Briton lands now. Wistan reveals that his duty is to check the well being of Saxons who have been ill-treated by Britons and his king has sent him to learn their conditions. Sir Gawain explains that Arthur was loved by everybody as he was a generous man; even his enemies love him. Hearing Arthur's name, Axl feels uncomfortable as he remembers a fragment from his past. However, Axl cannot remember the other important details about the event. Beatrice disagrees with Wistan, and says that in their villages there are important Saxon families who are living in peace with Britons. Agreeing with Beatrice, Sir Gawain adds that it is the result of Arthur's work who ensured peace between Saxons and Britons. Wistan asks a very important question at that point: "By what strange skill did your great king heal the scars of war in

these lands that a traveller can see barely a mark or shadow left of them today?” (*TBG* 127). Sir Gawain replies the question by adding that his fair king was a religious person who prayed God and wanted help from Him. Not satisfied with the answer, Wistan asks another question: “Even so, sir, isn’t it a strange thing when a man calls another brother who only yesterday slaughtered his children? And yet this is the very thing Arthur appears to have accomplished” (*TBG* 127). It is apparent that Wistan has the full memory of what has happened in the past, while others remember only little pieces of it. Sir Gawain tries to correct Wistan, and says that his king ordered them not to kill children, women and elders; that’s why, both parties can trust each other even in the wars. Following Sir Gawain, Wistan poses a question to Axl: “Master Axl, do you not feel it a remarkable thing, how Arthur has united this country” (*TBG* 127). As observed, Wistan asks questions to uncover the reality and memory, and by asking questions he helps the old couple to remember the past or at least to question their past. His questions trigger some fragments in the minds of the old couple. With his questions, Wistan tries to reveal that the justice was not established in the past as it should have been.

Not only Wistan but also the old couple could be thought as moral witnesses. For Blustein, a moral witness is a person who is aware of her/his responsibility for uncovering the truth (2008: 304). Although the victims of a crime tend to explain the wrongdoing, perpetrators are inclined to manipulate, deny or cover the truth (2008: 312). What Sir Gawain does is covering the truth while the old couple and the warrior Wistan try to uncover it. As they also experience the wrongdoing individually, they are again moral witnesses. To Blustein, bearing witness to past injustice is important if there is a risk of erasing the event from the collective memory (2008: 322). Since the collective past is buried with the help of the oblivion mist, it is morally significant for the moral witnesses in the novel to uncover the reality. They are responsible for unearthing the atrocities which blocked out the social consciousness. Like Blustein, Margalit argues that the moral witness is an important actor to make the evil visible. By killing the dragon, the warrior and the old couple would make the evil visible and become moral witnesses. “Evil regimes try hard to cover up the enormity of their crimes, and the moral witness tries to expose it” (Margalit 2002: 165). In this respect, they need to uncover the reality of the genocide before it is used by the official narrative of the powerful ones. The King with the help of the monks and his knight tries to create history from the perspective of the state. In order to hide reality, Arthur uses priests and his knight to silence the warrior and

the old couple; by doing so, the King reaffirms his power, protects his people, covers the past evils, and controls narrative. Margalit relates the duty of remembering to “the effort of radical evil [which] forces to undermine morality itself by, among other means, rewriting the past and controlling collective memory” (2002: 83). As mentioned earlier, historical writing generalises the events, while doing that, it mostly tends to remind the victory of the powerful ones. Unlike history, memory making tends to reveal the sufferings of victims, as long as it is not abused. Thus, it is the duty of moral witness to uncover the memory of the past which is abused by the regime. Without knowing the past, it is not possible to secure the justice which is violated by the regimes that commit crimes. When justice is not ensured, the duty-bound to the past victims will not be unburdened. In this sense, Wistan’s questioning tries to uncover the violated justice and he struggles for the lost justice by restoring the memory of the individuals and the society.

In terms of restoring memory with the help of moral witness, Edwin’s walking through the monastery and discovering an interesting object take the reader to the realm of memory making. The object is a kind of cage in which there are chains and a mask. The person, who enters in that cage, is exposed to the attacks of some predator birds. There are dried blood stains on the cage; that means, it is a device of torture. When the group meets Father Jonus, Wistan asks him about the device of torture. To Wistan, the monks use that device to do penance for their crimes which are unpunished: “How can you describe as penance, sir, the drawing of a veil over the foulest deeds? Is your Christian god one to be bribed so easily with self-inflicted pain and a few prayers? Does he care so little for justice left undone?” (TBG 173). Wistan questions justice/injustice following a covered and unpunished crime. Although Jonus despises Wistan calling him *pagan*; to Wistan his being a *pagan* is much more precious as their *pagan* gods punish the crimes. To him, believing in a merciful God may mislead people to assume that God would easily forgive all the evils they commit. Wistan says: “Your Christian god of mercy gives men licence to pursue their greed, their lust for land and blood, knowing a few prayers and a little penance will bring forgiveness and blessing” (TBG 173). Jonus responds that he gave up believing in the idea of atonement though there are many monks who still believe in it. Jonus thinks that even their merciful God does not show mercy for them stating that “dark crows and ravens are a sign of God’s anger” (TBG 173). Jonus explains that the monks have different ideas about the cage; some think they should move on while some others think they should stop doing it, and the last group thinks they should face the past

by uncovering realities. At that point, forgetting, remembering and facing, and then, forgiving and reconciling the earlier atrocities are presented as three ways of recoding our memories. Wistan accuses the first choice that is forgetting and expecting to be easily forgiven. To him, it results in easily killing people for greed or lust for power. The same idea is evoked by Ishiguro in an interview on *Light Speed Magazine*, an online magazine, (2015) when he argues that believing in a merciful God whose mercy is not limited can make people commit sins easily and expect to be forgiven without punishment.

Instead of believing in atonement and forgetting, Wistan thinks remembrance and justice should be secured. In line with this objective, Wistan encounters the difficulties. Blustein puts forward that related to uncovering the past truths, two types of obstacles can be encountered: One is internal which “consists in denial or neglect of difficult truths about one’s predecessors”, the other is external which is related to “obstacles deriving from inquiry’s dependence on objective evidence” (2008: 216). Both of the obstacles can be observed in the novel. Beatrice and Axl have difficulty in believing in the truths; later on, they start to believe in harsh realities step by step. At first, Beatrice disagrees with Wistan about Britons’ abusing Saxons; however, her ideas change afterwards. Till the end of the novel, Sir Gawain avoids remembering what he and his king did. Like Sir Gawain, the monks also deny the harsh realities which means they prefer the duty of forgetting. The external obstacle in the novel is the distortion of traces by Sir Gawain and the monks as they obey the order of their king and hide the truths. The buried giant serves the purpose of hiding the traces of the past atrocities. Along with the buried giant, Arthur fulfills the necessary conditions to mask the evils committed, which means they consciously prefer to erase individual and collective memories within their belief in the duty of forgetting.

However, unlike Arthur and the monks, Wistan stands on the side of duty of remembering. The problem is that unmasking the past atrocities arises the idea of revenge which can be observed in Wistan’s manners and words. When Wistan kills two ogres to save Edwin, he cuts a part of the creature for the sins it commits; that means, Wistan is someone who only seeks for revenge. When the group go to the monastery, Father Jonus warns Wistan about the danger saying he should leave as soon as possible since not only the monks but also Brennus’s soldiers go after him. Even after learning the truth, Wistan stays at the monastery. Jonus asks Wistan why he is in that place despite knowing the danger he is in; instead of leaving at once, why is he cutting wood and wandering “like a

hungry wolf”? (*TBG* 176). It is apparent that Wistan is hungry for revenge. He cannot even sleep as he is full of rage. When Wistan kills the dragon to uncover the forgetting mist at the end, his words reveal his dreadfulness of revenge for the past events.

The giant, once well buried, now stirs. When soon he rises, as surely he will, the friendly bonds between us will prove as knots young girls make with the stems of small flowers. Men will burn their neighbours' houses by night. Hang children from trees at dawn. The rivers will stink with corpses bloated from their days of voyaging. And even as they move on, our armies will grow larger, swollen by anger and thirst for vengeance. For you Britons, it'll be as a ball of fire rolls towards you. You'll flee or perish. And country by country, this will become a new land, a Saxon land, with no more trace of your people's time here than a flock or two of sheep wandering the hills untended. (*TBG* 340)

Although Wistan declares his revenge, after he kills the dragon; instead of being victorious, he looks thoughtful. The thing he has just done sends shiver down his spine. He lets the old couple know that a new war is about to start, which means his duty was not limited to kill the dragon but start a new war. To him, just killing the dragon cannot administer the justice for his ancestors as Saxons will need more: “It's justice and vengeance await, mistress. And they'll soon hurry this way, for both are much delayed” (*TBG* 339). Axl is dreadful when he hears Wistan's words, and he understands that clearing of the mist would bring hatred as well as it brings memories back. Wistan's rage terrifies Axl and Beatrice; that's why, Axl asks whether Wistan would be pleased to see the coming of evils. Wistan says as he grew up among Britons and know them in person, probably he will not be pleased; however, he will train Edwin without the weakness he has. He will transmit the hatred to the next generation by training Edwin: “I'll train his heart well to admit no soft sentiments as have invaded mine. He'll show no mercy in our work ahead” (*TBG* 341). Since Wistan inherits hatred but cannot be as revengeful as a person who does not have any friendly memories about his enemies, he wants to bequeath vengeance to Edwin.

To Volf, when the victims of the past remember the wrongs done to them, instead of a reconciliation, it can yield a renewed hatred; it is possible to use memory negatively for justifying the present crimes as a return of past crimes (2006: 32). In the novel, when Wistan begins to face the buried past crimes, he becomes full of revenge. Thus, the moral

duty to remember appears as hazardous as the moral duty of forgetting because remembering does not bring a peaceful atmosphere but a possible disastrous future. Volf claims that the repressed memories can be used as a “sword” to revenge others (2006: 37). When Wistan learns the harsh reality, he takes his sword literally and metaphorically, which is made of painful memories, and he aims to use it to punish people who wronged himself and his community. Still, his bond with the old couple prevents him to hurt them in any way and he warns them to go away as soon as possible since his duty was not only killing the dragon but also starting a new war against Britons. In line with this purpose, he explains that he would transmit the old memories to train Edwin to hate all the Britons.

At that point, memory and the duty of remembering operate both negatively and positively. In terms of Wistan’s hatred against the Britons as a nation, his duty of remembering leads him to wage war on them; namely a new disaster both for the Britons and the Saxons. On the other hand, his ability to remember the old couple and his relation with them, or to keep the memories of the old couple in his mind, operate in a positive manner because he still wants to save them though they are also the members of the nation whom he hates and wants to avenge on. Thus, Ishiguro portrays that although the duty of remembering is a moral manner to do justice for the ones who are subjected to injustices, it may create new catastrophies or injustices for other people when it turns into an uncompensated hatred. That’s why, Ishiguro brings the other side of the medallion into consideration which refers to the duty of forgetting within the ethics of memory.

3.3. Duty of Forgetting in *The Buried Giant*

Forgetting is considered not only as a political solution but also a moral preference in the novel. As mentioned, Sir Gawain and the monks want to cover the past by covering the memories of people as they try to restore peace and prevent possible disasters. The oblivion magic serves their purpose to hide the wrongs of the past; that’s to say, their morally defected past is hidden beneath the magic on behalf of morality. However, as the problems between the two communities are not solved but paused, the struggle cannot be overcome. Because erasing the past and past memories by putting the rule is not enough to end the wars. Even though it was late, Sir Gawain realizes that despite being beneficial for a while, the law did not end the wars: “Where once we fought for land and God, we now fought to avenge fallen comrades, themselves slaughtered in vengeance. Where could it end? Babes growing to men knowing only days of war. And your great law

already suffering violation...” (*TBG* 312). It is understood that there has always been a reason to fight between the related parties and it is hard to prevent the war despite the mist. The hatred is renewed each time though the generations change; in the cause of breaking the vicious circle, the powerful ones see burying evils as the only way out.

To end the wars, which have traumatic effects on individuals and societies, the amnesia that Querig generates is accepted as a solution. Throughout the novel, Ishiguro depicts the traumatic effects of wars on people and countries. When the boatman and the old couple meet, he describes how magnificent his house had been before the war, which is a great contrast to the present situation that lies in ruins. He explains how the other houses were set on fire, how people and also their memories were demolished. The wars have always destructive effects on people, and Steffa, a wise old man who lost his legs in the battles, is a living example of that idea. Being a skillful warrior, Wistan examines the architecture of the Saxons’ castle, which is now used by Britons, with Edwin, and tries to understand how it served in the wars. They see a ditch inside the castle; there are stairs that rise towards the circle on the top of the castle, alongside of it, there is a chimney. Wistan guesses that Saxons used the stairs while fighting with Britons. Since the stairs were narrow, each time just two warriors could fight. When they reached to the top, they threw torch to the ditch that had been filled with woods before. The warriors probably used that chimney, and ran away by jumping on a cart filled with hay. Wistan tries to educate Edwin as a soldier. By observing the architecture of the monastery, Wistan understands that the monastery was actually a castle: “This is today a place of peace and prayer, yet you needn’t gaze so deep to find blood and terror” (*TBG* 161). To Wistan, Saxon families; children, women, and elders who were running away the war took a shelter in this castle. Those people knew they would die, and before that, they wanted to watch the dying of their enemies in that castle which is full of traps.

They know the infants they circle in their arms will before long be bloodied
toys kicked about these cobbles. They know because they’ve seen it already,
from whence they fled. They’ve seen the enemy burn and cut, take turns to
rape young girls even as they lie dying of their wounds. (*TBG* 162)

With those words, Wistan depicts the devastating effects of wars. Axl, who thinks those days are left behind does not want to accept what Wistan says. None other than Wistan can explain the meaning of the traces as they do not have a memory like Wistan. While the castle and the traces represent the earlier traumas that were suppressed, the battle is

actually between to remember or to forget about the hostilities. In the article “Aesthetic Historiography: Allegory, Monument, and Oblivion in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Buried Giant*” (2018), Bernadette Meyler touches upon the same idea, and puts forward that traces can have a meaning according to the background of the person who looks at them. As Wistan is a warrior, and he is not affected from the mist like other people, he can easily explain the meaning of the traces. Later on, Wistan says that he is not affected by the magic like other people; that’s why, his king chose him for that duty instead of some other better warriors than Wistan. At that point, whether having a full memory of the past make Wistan a moral person –make his deeds moral– or not exists as a moral dilemma.

On their way, the group encounters with some soldiers on the bridge one of whom tells them about his lost parents. He is not the only one who has lost his parents; Edwin and Wistan do not have parents either, just like the children on the hill. During the novel, lost parents and lost children are observed which should be evaluated as the most disruptive effect of the war and amnesia following it. In this sense, forgetting in the novel is not a moral choice for the ones who are forced to forget, but just an amnesia which is a form of *commanded forgetting* demanded by Arthur who sees no other way to stop bloodletting. In his article “Truth-Seeking, Truth-Telling; and Postconflict Peacebuilding: Curb the Enthusiasm?” David Mendeloff notes that “[s]ome societies that have chosen amnesia rather than truth-seeking in the aftermath of violent conflict have avoided the kind of bloodletting...” (2004: 371). In a similar way, the Britons, and Arthur as their representative prefer amnesia –a forceful forgetting– as a moral choice to stop violence.

To Sir Gawain, what Arthur did is a holy act that is not easy to be comprehended by ordinary people like him or other commoners. Gawain says:

Those small Saxon boys you lament would soon have become warriors
burning to avenge their fathers fallen today. The small girls soon bearing
more in their wombs, and this circle of slaughter would never be broken.
Look how deep runs the lust for vengeance! Look even now, at that fair
maid, one I escorted here myself, watch her there still at her work! Yet with
today’s great victory a rare chance comes. We may once and for all sever
this evil circle, and a great king must act boldly on it. May this be a famous
day, Master Axl, from which our land can be in peace for years to come.
(*TBG* 243)

Gawain uses a kind of utilitarian logic just like his king who considers the maximum good for maximum number of people. For Gawain, Arthur's act is moral since he prefers goodness of great number of people. Axl disagrees with Sir Gawain, and says: "This circle of hate is hardly broken, sir, but forged instead in iron by what's done today. I'll go now to your uncle and report what I've seen. I would see from his face if he believes God will smile on such deeds" (*TBG* 243). Axl does not see any morality in Arthur's act while Sir Gawain thinks Arthur had to decide in the name of his people as if he were God. For Gawain, Arthur saved not only the present generation but also future generations by erasing the traces of the war, namely by erasing their memories. Sir Gawain justifies this act by emphasising that thanks to the mist they created, children have grown up without knowing about the wars. To Sir Gawain, the mist will protect the future generations from the memories of the painful events that their ancestors had to endure; the hatred will not be transmitted and the peace will be sustained despite it is founded on distortion and clearance of realities.

To Blustein, the supporters of forgetting are responsible for past crimes and they want past to be covered up to hide their past wrongs (2008: 168). Like Sir Gawain, the monks want the past to be covered up probably to hide their earlier wrong deeds. In order to hide the reality covering their past crimes, the monks lead the old couple and Edwin to a tunnel. While the group is sleeping, Father Brian comes and wakes them up. Brian says that a group of soldiers attack Wistan, and he comes to save the rest of them. Wistan is on the tower fighting with the soldiers at that moment. Brian leads them to a tunnel that ends in forest. Despite knowing that the tunnel has not been used for a long time, Brian leads them to the tunnel in a hurry. He slams the door of the tunnel without saying anything and blocks the entrance; that means, if they meet an obstacle, they cannot come back. At that point, the tunnel represents a kind of journey to the darkness of the past and collective memory. At first, the old couple does not understand Brian's purpose; however, they would learn soon. While walking in the tunnel, they surprisingly come across with Sir Gawain who is sent by Jonus to help them. Sir Gawain reveals that actually the monks have sent them to the tunnel since they want them to be killed by a beast that lives in the tunnel. "As men of Christ, it's beyond them to use a sword or even poison. So they send down here those they wish dead, and in a day or two they'll have forgotten they ever did so" (*TBG* 188). Since killing is a sinful act, they prefer that sinister method to kill people in the name of protecting Querig. To Gawain, the abbot would even persuade himself that

action is what God wants, and sending them to the tunnel is saving them from soldiers. Although Sir Gawain is a sinful man who has slaughtered infants and women before, he praises himself and his king uttering “for if we’re mortal let us at least shine handsomely in God’s eyes while we walk this earth!” (TBG 189).

Both the monks and Sir Gawain try to rationalise their acts by distorting, repressing and falsifying realities. It is actually to reconstruct both their own memories and the collective memory by excluding some realities and including some others to rationalize their acts. It is clear that not only Sir Gawain and the monks but also Beatrice and Axl avoid to remember the past when it is painful. Avoidance is a form of forgetting which includes an active and passive form of forgetting as pointed by Ricoeur (2004). In his book *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1989), Nietzsche also considers forgetting as a repression mechanism. In this respect, the tunnel represents the eruption of the avoided and repressed memories for all of them. While they are walking in the tunnel, Beatrice’s foot touches something that she thinks a child’s body, lifeless for a long time. When they lighten the tunnel with a candle, they see it is just a bat. Sir Gawain who likes hiding and avoiding reality says: “Many things in this place are best left unseen” (TBG 191). However, Beatrice insists that it is a child, and worries over the child: “Such a lonely death. Where were its parents, Axl?” (TBG 193). It is probably Beatrice’s unconscious what makes her perceive the bat as a child. Though the traces are obvious, each time the characters interpret them according to their earlier knowledge. Thus, the repressed memories appear in a way in spite of the forced forgetting. When Axl claims that the bat is lying on a bed of bones, Gawain gets angry snorting that he does not see anything except a dead bat. They are nothing more than a few old bones that belong to unknown people for Sir Gawain. However, Axl sees skulls and bones scattered everywhere. As Gawain perceives their words as an insult to himself and his king, he says his king was merciful.

Gawain, soon admits that it was none other than Gawain himself who uncovers Wistan’s true intentions to the monks. Beatrice feels uncomfortable with the situation, and says: “Let’s leave this place, husband. I wish no more reminding of this lonely grave” (TBG 194). Remembering gives pain to the old couple who had taken a long journey to remember. The remembrance of death is actually related to the memory of their son’s death. This grave-like tunnel is not different from their son’s grave which is also lonely and full of sorrow. It may help to understand how they avoid remembering their son’s

grave. When the memories are hard to cope with, the people mostly prefer to forget by avoiding remembrance of those sorrows. What Sir Gawain and the old couple unconsciously try to cope with those sorrows takes the shape of forgetting. However, when the group reaches a burial place in the tunnel, Sir Gawain has to admit the reality as the traces of the event are still there. He only accepts the offense when he has no other choice; and even he has to admit, he tries to rationalise his crime. Sir Gawain says:

Here are the skulls of men, I won't deny it. There an arm, there a leg, but just bones now. An old burial ground. And so it may be. I dare say, sir, our whole country is this way. A fine green valley. A pleasant copse in the springtime. Dig its soil, and not far beneath the daisies and buttercups come the dead. And I don't talk, sir, only of those who received Christian burial.

Beneath our soil lie the remains of old slaughter. (TBG 195)

The idea of bones representing history is touched on by Edyta Lorek-Jezińska in her article “Testimonies of absence: Trauma and forgetting in *The Buried Giant* by Kazuo Ishiguro”. The bones in the tunnel have just turned into history for Sir Gawain, and they seem a “natural aspect of the cycle of life and death” for him (Jezińska 2016: 49). To Gawain, the bones belong to the unknown victims of history, which is a consequence of a natural aspect of life. Unlike Sir Gawain, the old couple feels sorry for the bones though those bones do not belong to someone they know. Sufferings of those victims in the tunnel are part of history which is official, general and abstract; that's to say, it is not possible to reach their stories.

The tunnel is very much like another buried giant which hides the evils of people. In this sense, it is also possible to consider the tunnel as a representation of Freud's concept of *uncanny*; *the thing* that is repressed and forgotten unconsciously but haunts the mind to rise to the consciousness. Sir Gawain underlines that the bones do not just belong to the slaughter they do, but there are also older ones that belong to earlier times. Seeing a lot of skulls and bones in the tunnel, Beatrice asks Axl whether it can be possible for monstrous Gawain having killed all of those people. Sir Gawain replies it cannot be possible for a knight to kill so many people. It is true that not just Gawain but other knights and soldiers have slaughtered people. The bones and skulls depict that civilisations have been created on buried evils and slaughters which are forgotten and imbedded in history. Under the green landscape, there are bones and skulls of numerous victims and the

creation of civilisations cost countless lives which remain anonymous among the pages of official history.

Besides history's being founded on collective traumas, there exist individual traumas embedded in the memories of people. In order to cope with the traumatic past, the characters in the novel use various defense mechanisms. Sometimes, they deny their acts like Sir Gawain does, and other times they avoid remembering their painful past memories like Axl and Beatrice do. There are some times when the characters block their memories by using repetition that Freud points out. As Ricoeur refers, the repetition is actually a way of forgetting (2004: 445). In the article "Forgetting or Making to Forget: Memory, Trauma and Identity in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*" (2018), Deimantas Valanciunas handles the repetitions observed in relation to the characters. To Valanciunas, the widows' cursing the boatman and cutting rabbits, Beatrice's checking whether Axl is there repeatedly during their journey, and their constant idea about their son's waiting for them are all signs of the characters' individual traumatic memories. It is also possible to observe different repetitions in the novel. Edwin turns around a cart repeatedly, and he hears his lost mother's voice a few times in the novel. Edwin's individual trauma is depicted with this repetition. Lost parents and lost children appear during the novel which represents their individual traumas and traumatic memories. Thus, repetition is like the roaring of the buried giant in the novel which represents the buried traumas, memories and histories which try to be heard. In this sense, the duty of forgetting to provide peace is not represented as a moral solution by Ishiguro. As forgetting alone does not solve the underlying traumas but just represses them temporarily, duty of remembering is still a moral attitude in the novel.

Similar to individual traumas, there is evidence of collective war trauma in the novel. It is possible to evaluate the buried giant as the collective unconscious of communities. Communities bury unwanted memories to forget, and historicize them. In the novel, the communities by using the dragon's breath bury their traumatic war memories. Besides the dragon's lair, they use ruined villa, castle, monastery and tunnel to bury their traumatic past. It is possible to evaluate this situation as a defense mechanism as well. Blustein claims: "One is not willing to acknowledge that one's agency was involved in what occurred in the past, and in this way one dissociates oneself from it" (2008: 70). In a similar way, they prefer to lose the memories of a period in their lives; however, they erase their good memories as well as the bad ones. In this sense, the

amnesia “is seriously damaging to the appropriative unity” of their lives (Blustein 2008: 71).

When the past wrongs are hidden to break the vicious cycle of vengeance, the conflict which arises is injustice. The crimes of the past go unpunished which hurts the past victims and their descendences. The scene in front of the dragon’s lair where Wistan and Sir Gawain encounter is important to understand the different views on remembering and forgetting of the individual and the societies. Sir Gawain admits that he wants Wistan to forget his aim by the help of the dragon. However, Wistan explains that he does not forget like other people; that’s why, he is chosen for the duty. In that scene, contrary to their expectations, the dragon is not magnificent or strong. It looks weak and tired, and it does not even react to the sounds around it, which makes Beatrice even feel sorry for it. However, Sir Gawain explains that as long as it breathes, the effect of magic continues. When Axl asks whether it is ill or not, Sir Gawain replies that she is getting older like people. At that moment, Axl remembers the time when Merlin casted a spell on the dragon’s breath. To Sir Gawain, it was the only choice to stop the war and it was God’s will, not only Arthur’s. He asks: “Without this she dragon’s breath, would peace ever have come? Look how we live now, sir! Old foes as cousins, village by village” (*TBG* 326). Sir Gawain tries to convince Wistan to give up and explains that her magic will save everybody:

Think, sir, once that breath should cease, what might be awoken across this land even after these years! Yes, we slaughtered plenty, I admit it, caring not who was strong and who weak. God may not have smiled at us, but we cleansed the land of war. Leave this place, sir, I beg you. We may pray to different gods, yet surely yours will bless this dragon as does mine”. (*TBG* 326)

It is apparent that Sir Gawain continues to insist on the moral side of the duty of forgetting. However, Wistan is against his idea, and he does not believe that forgiving without punishment is a moral attitude. Sir Gawain admits that what they did was not the kind of things that God consents; however, it has been a long time and the victims of the event are history now. He is not proud of his evil acts; even so, he wants everything to stay as forgotten at least until the wounds heal:

I beg you leave this place, and let Querig do her work a while longer.
Another season or two, that’s the most she’ll last. Yet even that may be long

enough for old wounds to heal for ever, and an eternal peace to hold among us. Look how she clings to life, sir! Be merciful and leave this place. Leave this country to rest in forgetfulness. (*TBG* 327)

Sir Gawain thinks after a few seasons people will forget completely, and peace will be restored. The passing of time seems enough to heal the wounds. However, Wistan does not believe in a peace that is established on evil sources: “How can old wounds heal while maggots linger so richly? Or a peace hold for ever built on slaughter and a magician’s trickery? I see how devoutly you wish it, for your old horrors to crumble as dust. Yet they await in the soil as white bones for men to uncover” (*TBG* 327). Those are the two opposing ideas in terms of the moral aspect of forgetting and remembering. To Wistan, as people do not have their memories, the peace they live in is not real but fragile; moreover, it is not based on free-will. As forgetting creates a forced amnesia without considering free-will of the people, it is not possible to talk about its moral side.

Though Wistan and Sir Gawain try to convince each other of the truth of their ideas, none of them change their minds being loyal to their duties –duty of remembering and duty of forgetting–. The old couple clearly expresses that they are on Wistan’s side about the slaughter of the dragon as they want to get their memories back. Wistan and Sir Gawain have a fair encounter; they promise not to take advantage of each other’s weaknesses, since one of them is old and the other one has an injured arm. At the end, Wistan defeats the knight; yet he says it was not easy for him and he even felt the death. Thirsty with revenge, without cleaning the blood, Wistan wants to kill the dragon because he wants their blood to be mingled. In this respect, two knights with opposing ideas represent two distinct standpoints on dealing with individual and collective memory. Their two opposing ideas set examples for Ishiguro’s questioning of the moral side of remembering and forgetting. In his interview in *Spiegel*, Ishiguro questions: “When is it healthy to remember, and when is it healthy to forget?” (2005). Actually, the novel does not give an easy answer to that question. However, it mostly makes the reader think about it within a skeptical attitude. In the context of Gawain’s and Wistan’s arguments, both of them have rights and wrongs in relation to their moral choices of forgetting and remembering. Sir Gawain’s adaptation to his duty of forgetting and making people to forget on behalf of peace and life without any wars and pains seems not only reasonable but also moral. However, Wistan’s insistence on the duty of remembering the earlier atrocities to do justice for the people who were exposed to injustice is also moral and

makes sense. The wrongness appears when remembering gives birth to new evils and revenges which will operate the circle of clashes and wars between individuals and societies.

Ishiguro portrays a world of oblivion in which people cannot reach an absolute happiness, even if they forget their painful memories. Contrary to the ideas of the defenders of forgetting, like Nietzsche and Augé (2004), who accept forgetting as a positive ability, it does not bring happiness to the characters and societies in the novel. Forgetting does not shape people's memories in a positive way as individuals cannot create a meaningful life having lost the connection between past and present. In parallel with those ideas, Ricoeur's (2004) term of *happy forgetting* cannot take place as the characters cannot reach the level of carefreeness of being in the world. Contrary to Kierkegaard's idea of forgetting (2009) which is valid for lilies and birds that are carefree; people cannot take lessons from their carefree lives despite living without memories like lilies and birds. The reason for not achieving the happiness of children or animals may be that the characters in the novel do not forget at the proper time in a proper way. As they do not complete the mourning process which is required after tragic and traumatic events, forgetting is unable to bring a child-like happiness. Besides, there is no such thing as an absolute happiness in life and in history. In one way or another, individuals and societies experience sorrows as well as happinesses. Thus, a complete forgetting or covering creates the holes in the memory which results in new traumas instead of healing. Blustein notes that when individuals and communities forget the events or important details of the events which they should remember, these situations require moral questions about remembering (2008: 15). In the novel, the reason behind the inability and immorality of forgetting is related to a wrongdoing towards an individual and a crime against humanity. While the old couple does not remember their wrongdoings to each other, the societies do not remember their crimes committed against other communities. In this respect, without remembering properly, the traumatic individual memories and collective memories of war and genocide haunt people; thus, forgetting which is forced upon people appears immoral.

3.4. Facing the Past and Mourning for the Losses

In *The Buried Giant*, being under the effect of the oblivion mist, the characters cannot face their traumatic memories. Though on the surface it seems like a positive effect

of the mist, it actually hurts their individuality as well as their relations with their families and other people. Especially, it is problematic as they can neither remember nor mourn for their lost loved ones. Without remembering their traumatic past memories and losses, it is not possible to overcome them. In order to be freed from the effects of those events; one should remember and face them honestly. Otherwise, the person who avoids the memory of her/his past traumas cannot get over the effect of those events in her/his present and future life. Freud in his book *Mourning and Melancholia* defines mourning as follows: “Mourning is regularly the reaction to the loss of a loved person, or to the loss some abstraction which has taken the place of one, such as country, liberty, an ideal and so on” (1914-1916: 243). Freud points out mourning is a process which is overcome after a while. In order to heal past wounds, one must face the reality which is buried in the unconscious. In this sense, the people in the novel cannot complete that healing process as their memories are hidden; due to this reason, the mourning process is stolen from them. The characters cannot lead a meaningful life since they have lost both good and bad memories of their lives. They are forced to live some fragments that occupy their minds which make them being trapped between remembering and forgetting. The fragments of the repressed memories, in a way, lead their present lives to conflicts. For Blustein; “if we repress our memories of the dear departed, we cannot properly work through our loss, and this will have a corrosive effect on our capacity to move on with our lives” (2008: 265). Thus, to get rid of the destructive effect of repressed past wounds, one must be ready to accept the past and reconstruct memory. However, the people in the novel cannot mourn for their departed sons, parents, relatives, and friends aftermath of war, which leaves a wound in their inner world.

What Beatrice wants is the ideal form of remembering the past: “We’ll have the bad ones come back too, even if they make us weep or shake with anger. For isn’t it the life we’ve shared?” (*TBG* 180). She knows that life is not the sum of good memories; in fact, everyone experiences bad memories as well. People take lessons from both good and bad memories which make them who they are. In this sense, for the characters of the novel, forgetting bad memories while remembering good ones does not even seem possible. Beatrice is aware of that fact and she is ready to face both bad and good memories as she knows it is meaningless to fear her past.

What’s to fear, father? What Axl and I feel today in our hearts for each other tells us the path taken here can hold no danger for us, no matter that the mist

hides it now. It's like a tale with a happy end, when even a child knows not to fear the twists and turns before. Axl and I would remember our life together, whatever its shape, for it's been a thing dear to us. (*TBG* 180)

Beatrice understands that after the mist clears, they would remember their painful memories too. However, those bad and good memories make a meaningful life story, and each person has the right to know her/ his real identity. Apart from that, they need to bring back their memories among which the precious memories of their son would also come. In addition to that, it would only be possible to prove their love to the boatman if they retrieve their memories. Unlike Beatrice, it can be understood that Axl wants to remember just good memories. When Sir Gawain tries to remind him his military background, Axl tells him not to remind those events; since he wants to remember just his memories with his wife. Axl asks: "For what good's a memory's returning from the mist if it's only to push away another? (*TBG* 294). In other words, Axl thinks that if a bad memory wipes out a good one, then it would be useless to remember the past. He is not eager to remember past as much as Beatrice and he repeatedly asks Beatrice whether she would love him when the mist brings bad memories. Unlike Beatrice, Axl fears about the painful memories; that's why, he wants Beatrice to promise to go on loving him, even if he lets her down after the mist clears. Wistan tries to remind Axl his past by asking whether he was the good Briton man who was leading people to believe in the possibility of a law that could protect innocent ones from the war. Axl again does not want to remember those painful memories as the law was violated, and humans were slaughtered. During the novel, in fact, it is mostly with Beatrice's efforts that they take a journey and they struggle to remember their memories.

When the children, who are forgotten by their parents, want the old couple to poison the dragon to get rid of the mist –so the children can reunite with their parents–, it is again Beatrice who tries hard to reach her goal. The children say that people are already feeding the dragon; however, it can be fed with the poisoned goat. They tell the old couple does not have to be near the dragon's inn; they can tether it and go on. Axl is uncertain to accept their request; however, Beatrice thinks that the situation they are in can be their fate and she convinces Axl to poison the dragon insisting: "Axl, don't we want returned to us our memories of this long life lived together? Or will we become like strangers met one night in a shelter? " (*TBG* 293). Her words reveal their dilemma. Beatrice thinks they are like strangers without their memories; thus, in order to learn about

their life wholly, they must learn who they are really. Beatrice is ready to take responsibility for her past; and to Blustein, taking responsibility for the past is being able to derive meaning from the past, and with this meaning an individual should create a unified meaningful life story (2008: 77). Beatrice does not give up her aim even if she understands that she has bad memories in her past. When they are about to reach the lair, Beatrice remembers that the person who should fear the unveiling of the mist is herself. She wonders whether Axl would leave her when the mist clears. Despite those memories, she says it is better to remember the life they have lived with good and bad sides: “Let’s see freely the path we’ve come together, whether it’s in dark or mellow sun” (*TBG* 322). Life is the sum of dark and bright days, and Beatrice wants to take the rough with the smooth. Axl still worries if the deserted one would be him, not Beatrice.

To Blustein, after a past wound or a loss, there are various ways to continue to live: One way is disregarding the past, the other way is accepting the past in spite of the emotional trouble of the past; the latter way is healthier way to heal (2008: 28). In the novel, the followed way is not the healthier one since except the people who struggle to kill the dragon, other people could not face the past but escape from it in a way, like Axl does. The past is mostly manipulated by means of Sir Gawain and the monks; it is repressed, distorted, and avoided. On the collective level, the past is buried in the aftermath of the genocide which means the communities do not take responsibility for their past. Citing from Rosenberg, Mendeloff notes that “societies, like individuals, can suffer posttraumatic stress disorder. Nations that repress traumatic episodes rather than confront them directly, just like traumatized individuals, are unlikely to recover that trauma” (2004: 364). Thus, collective conscious operates in a similar way with conscious of individual; and like people, communities should try to find some ways of healing to cope with past traumas rather than repressing them. Facing the past and admitting mistakes can be accepted as a first step to deal with past wounds. Without accepting one’s taking part in a past crime, healing cannot be expected either in victim’s or in wrongdoer’s conscience. Besides being a practical and curing process for the individual and the society, facing the past holds a moral aspect at the same time. To take responsibility for the past wrongs and include them in the collective memory would create morally better individuals and societies.

In the novel, the genocide and the vicious circle of hatred are the subject matters on collective level. Though, some serious healing strategies should be pursued, it is

observed that repression, avoidance, and ignorance are followed instead. Despite the efforts of Arthur, his knight Sir Gawain and the monks, the buried crimes return with all the evils they hide. As the supporters of forgetting, they apply various methods to make people forget past; however, by doing so, they do not take responsibility for the past. About taking responsibility for the past, Blustein puts forward that people “must *not* do with respect to it: one must not ignore it, or repress it, or falsify it, or self-deceptively deny it, or engage in dissociation” (2008: 62), which appears in the world of *The Buried Giant*, whose subject matters are repression, denying and falsifying. Taking responsibility of the past necessitates that a person should accept her/his past wrongs, and by reconstructing her/his memory, turns into a different person. However, neither Sir Gawain nor the monks give up their aim. Sir Gawain tries to justify his acts by rationalizing them with his attachment to his duty until he dies; that’s why, a change is not achieved. Far from accepting the wrongdoings and mourning for them, Sir Gawain does not even attempt to carry out the first step, which is remembering.

Restraining people from remembering their individual and collective past, Arthur, Sir Gawain and the monks become *false witnesses*, a term used by Volf. To Volf, not remembering truthfully means being a false witness, and in order to forgive sins “we must remember them in the first place” (2006: 64). Although being a false witness is against Christian understanding, the priests and Sir Gawain are false witnesses while Wistan and the old couple could be accepted as moral witnesses. Margalit accepts a moral witness as an agent of collective memory and as a person who witnesses “the combination of evil and the suffering it produces” (2002: 148). In this respect, a moral witness unveils the evil and at the same time expresses her/ his feelings while witnessing the evil. Without facing the past, it is not moral to forget, and make people forget the past atrocities. The monastery’s contribution to the forgetting magic can be associated with Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, which is referenced by Volf. Volf gives the example of Lethe which is the river of forgetting from Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. Before drinking water from this river, souls must be judged. Without judgment it is not allowed to drink water which causes to forget everything. Citing from Dante, Volf gives place to the following lines:

The deep design of God would have been broken
If Lethe had been crossed and he had drunk
such waters but he had not discharged the debt
of penitence that’s paid when tears are shed. (2006: 137)

In the novel, without judgment, they try to drink forgetting water which leads further problems instead of a peaceful mind. Although the monastery commits a sin by hiding the past evils and the buried sins of the past turn into a giant that haunts the conscious of evildoers, they do not repent. Citing from Hayner, Meral in his article “A Duty to Remember? Politics and Morality of Remembering Past Atrocities” notes that “bury your sins and they will reemerge later” (2012: 44). Like in the novel, the buried past does not result in a peaceful mind as the repressed material grows into a giant when repentance and mourning are not faced honestly. Unconscious is invaded by the repressed past memories which results in a pang of conscience. Feeling guilty, the monks use a device of torture which is designed to atone for their sins and they expose their bodies to the attack of some wild birds to unburden their sins which are the signs of their guilty conscience.

In relation to that, Ishiguro in his interview on *Light Speed Magazine* (2015) interprets that “we’ve superseded the beliefs in dragons and demons; that creatures like that are an expression of our fears and hopes and aspirations and longings”; however it is the inner fear that is reflected on them. When viewed from this aspect, Sir Gawain’s being bothered by a group of angry dreamlike widows can be thought as an expression of his uneasy unconscious and conscience. Sir Gawain cannot understand whether those widows are dead or alive. The place where they gather is not proper for people; thus, they are probably phantoms. At first, he sees them as birds, later on they become widows. They throw mud at Horace’s neck which becomes unbearable for Sir Gawain. The old widows are also among those who could not pass the boatman’s test as Querig stole their memories. The widows blame Sir Gawain due to his failure to complete his task of killing the dragon. They insult him by calling him a coward. If he had completed his mission years ago, they would not have been widowed. In order to prove that he was not a coward, Gawain remembers a time when he helped a young girl to revenge on a Saxon soldier who did evil to her mother and sisters. He remembers that in that place, he came across with Axl who was a Briton Knight. Axl was known as the knight of peace, who helped to establish The Law of Innocents. That law was protecting women, children and old people from the both sides; however, Britons violated the law and killed the innocent Saxons. Gawain remembers how Axl confessed that they also killed babies. At that point, Gawain’s discussion with the widows is like his inner questioning and conscience which disturb him.

A slaughterer of babes. Is that what we were that day? And what of that one I escorted, what became of her? Was she among you just now, ladies? Why gather about me this way as I ride to my duty? Let an old man go in peace. A slaughterer of babes. Yet I was not there, and even had I been, what good for me to argue with a great king, and he my uncle too? I was but a young knight then, and besides, is he not proved right each year that passes? Did you not all grow old in a time of peace? (*TBG* 244)

Trying to convince not only the widows but also himself that he is not guilty, Gawain distorts reality and rejects his own memory. He says he would explain everything to the boatman claiming that he was just completing his duty.

It can be deduced from the novel that the boatman is a metaphor for death. Sir Gawain says he does not have much time as he is an old man; he wants to fulfill his duty, then, die peacefully despite his evil acts. However, the widows are the voice of his conscience and what he repressed returns. He attributes his actions to the necessity of his duty; that's why, he tries to rationalise his evil acts. When he comes to the place of Querig, Gawain thinks about his own past again. He remembers that Merlin casted a spell over the dragon. Although he was a demonic evil person for Axl, Sir Gawain thinks he still did some good things which probably pleased God. Then, he remembers the way his friends died, and how they wanted to reach a river or a lake, like one of his friends of knights who did not question whether he did his duty or not when he was dying. He was just thinking about rivers and lakes. While Sir Gawain imagines his own death by Wistan's hand, he is curious whether he will behave like his friend while dying. He thinks about the old widows who had mocked him. They would say: "You above all need choose your resting place well, or find yourself a neighbour to the very ones you slaughtered!" (*TBG* 299). Then he remembers how Beatrice blamed him for the slaughter of babies. After facing his moral decisions in the past, just before his death, Gawain realizes his mistakes. However, his realization and remembrance at the last moment is not a moral solution either for himself or for other people. Despite his confession, Gawain is not on the side of solving problems between two communities, rather, he is on the side of silencing the evils.

Similar to Sir Gawain, Beatrice's being bothered by some pixies can be thought as an expression of her unpeaceful unconscious. Exhausted Axl and Beatrice walk to the direction of a boat shed, and want help from the boat keeper toward the end of their

journey. He explains that he cannot lend his boat to the old couple due to the weather conditions; however, he can lend two baskets to them to float down the river. Beatrice is cold; that's why, Axl wants something to cover her. The man gives a fur, and that item causes Beatrice to remember an event in her past. Beatrice remembers that not only Axl, but also their son left them saying to Axl: "He'd left a day or two before, saying he'd no wish to be at home when you returned. So it was just me alone, in our former chamber, the dead of night. But we had a candle in those days" (TBG 258). On the river, they encounter with an old woman on a boat. Due to the sedges, the boat cannot move and Axl goes to help the old woman. Then, Axl sees the woman is attacked by many pixies. Axl tries to save the woman with the help of a hoe; but soon, the pixies attack Beatrice. While the old woman is dying, the pixies want Axl to leave Beatrice. The pixies want to kill Beatrice like they killed the old woman a short time ago. They say it is not possible to have Beatrice treated; that's why, Axl should leave Beatrice to her fate. Despite not being a skillful warrior now, Axl manages to save her from the attacks of the pixies. As a supernatural element, the pixies represent the unpeaceful conscience of Beatrice who betrayed her husband and caused troubles for her family. Beatrice is bothered by her repressed painful memories which are depicted by means of numerous pixies that try to capture her. Throughout the novel, the pixies, the imaginary widows, and the raptors create the feeling of *uncanny* since they refer to *the things* that are repressed in the unconscious, by evoking uneasiness in the minds of the characters.

The role of supernatural elements in the novel suggests again the unpeaceful inner world of characters and communities. As repressed memories turn into a giant, they bother people who avoid remembering. However, in order to get over the traumatic memories, humans should take responsibility for their past by facing it. To Blustein, remembering properly the past injustices is thought as a part of "symbolic reparation" (2008:166). Otherwise, the victims and their memories are hurt due to the injustice they are exposed. In the novel, two communities are stuck into a vicious circle of hatred and war; instead of facing past evils, they are forced to forget past atrocities. However, both the victims and the wrongdoers need to remember past to heal their wounds. Volf handles the condition of remembering untruthfully: When wrongdoers do not remember truthfully, they would intensify the evil by not remembering properly (2006: 56). Remembering properly is vital not only for the wrongdoers and the victims but also for the peace itself: "For peace can be honest and lasting only if it rests on the foundation of

truth and justice” (Volf 2006: 56). In the novel, Arthur chooses dishonest ways to establish peace, and by serving a wrong purpose, Sir Gawain and the members of monastery act as accomplice. Even if they prevent the probable wars for a while, they cannot end wars eternally; since a perpetual peace is not established between the warring factions.

Citing from Lincoln’s view on war, Blustein states that “what was needed to bring the war to a successful conclusion was a process of national healing and reconciliation” (2008: 263). In the novel no attempt to heal the past wounds can be observed; instead of healing, burying them is preferred. As the novel suggests, Arthur’s way of repressing the past and turning it into a giant is not a morally right decision; since, at the end of the novel, Wistan’s words indicate a war that is about to start originating from revenge. To end wars, the right step that can be followed is accepting one’s fault, and facing it honestly. For instance, Todorov gives the example of “Truth and Reconciliation Commision” for the case of the struggle between blacks and whites. As a great number of white people were guilty, it was not practical to punish them. Thus, those who accepted their guilts were forgiven to ensure justice instead of a punitive justice “which uses means such as executions and imprisonment”; and instead, a restorative justice “which uses other means and pursues the moral wellbeing of the community” was applied (2009: 458). In the novel, a similar solution to end the wars is implied; it is possible to consider *restorative justice* as a solution to break the vicious circle of wars since it is not a correct way to administer *punitive justice* which could result in the cycle of revenge. Besides, in terms of the ethics of memory, after accepting the loss or the mistake and trying some healing ways, both “real and symbolic”, it would be probable to discharge oneself from the burden of traumatic memories which could, otherwise, hurt both the self and the other. In her article “A Quest for (Un)wanted Memories in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Buried Giant*”, Baysal evaluates the narration of traumatic memories as serving a “therapeutic aim” in the novel (2019: 272). Thus, facing the repressed and undesirable traumatic memories, narrating them and mourning for them –a psychological process as well as a social phenomenon– could free the self from the burdens of the traumatic memory. As mourning is a temporary process, “when the work of mourning is completed the ego becomes free and uninhibited again” (Freud 2004: 245). In this respect, the last scene of the novel is possible to be evaluated in terms of facing the old memories and mourning for them, which could bring the possibility of salvation of the soul. While Beatrice faces the pixies,

namely her traumatic memories, that attack her, Axl tries to make her get rid of them. However, it is Beatrice not Axl who is taken by the boatman. In this respect, the ambiguous end still makes the reader interpret on Beatrice's salvation, but Axl's getting lost in the world of mortality as he cannot face his past and mourn for it.

3.5. Forgiving and Releasing the Past

In order to free oneself from the traumatic burden of the past memories and make other people free, if the first step is remembering and facing the buried memory and mourning for the pains and losses, the second step is to forgive the past and release the buried sorrows, hatreds and also hostilities. However, what is experienced in the novel is mostly forgetting –without forgiving– of the characters who experience amnesia, or obsessively remember the past atrocities to take revenge like Wistan. While forgetting cannot bring peace, remembrance without forgiving does not propose a solution either. What needs to be done to prevent future catastrophes and wars is actually making peace in the name of forgiveness. Ricoeur summarizes Hannah Arendt's idea of forgiveness as a religious idea which indicates that “only if humans exchange forgiveness among themselves that they can hope to be forgiven by God as well” (2004: 487). Taking its source from religions, forgiveness, as a moral act, provides a hope for freeing the self and the other from the burden of the past.

Margalit points out though people actually do not forget the wrong acts, they might forgive them: If there is a duty to forgive, it is not a duty to other people but to oneself as it is not easy to carry on with the feelings of revenge or resentment (2002: 207). It is both psychologically and morally correct to forgive than to live with those disturbing feelings. For Margalit if “forgiveness is an ethical duty, it is a duty in that special case of ethics, namely, a duty to ourselves” (2002: 207). As mentioned earlier, Margalit describes two ways of forgiveness: One is *blotting out the sin* and the other is *covering it up*. In *covering it up* model, the sin is neglected, disregarded without forgetting; however, in *blotting out* model the sin is forgotten entirely. In the novel, with the effect of magic what is aimed is *blotting out* the sins. However, the *blotting out* model does not work due to the sin's being always there like a black mark. Margalit refers to the *Bible* which tells four ways of forgiveness: “as carrying a burden, as covering up, as blotting out, and as canceling a debt” (2002: 191). The dragon in the novel is doomed to carry the sins of people. It is like a scape goat which carries the burden of the sins of Britons. The true

forgiveness model which is proposed in the novel is similar to *covering up* or *canceling a debt* which means forgiving and releasing the earlier crimes that were committed to both the self and the other. From the two models of forgiving (*blotting out* and *covering up*) that Margalit describes, the mostly followed one is *blotting out* model in the novel; however, it results in failure since completely forgetting is not proper for humans. What is morally and psychologically proper is *covering up* model since the event is not forgotten, but forgiven and ignored.

In the novel, the problem that is related to memory making is forgetfulness without the act of forgiving. "Forgiveness is a conscious decision to change one's attitude and to overcome anger and vengefulness" (Margalit 2002: 193). Being conscious is an important factor to change an attitude; however, in the novel people are not really aware of their deeds; hence, it is not possible to evaluate the situation as an act of forgiving; it is mostly an act of forgetfulness. In the act of forgiving, people should stop obsessively remembering the past wrongs, and begin to cover the deed. That kind of forgetting is important both psychologically and morally. In the novel, the King playing God's role wants to erase the evil; however, he cannot interfere in the memories of whole humanity –Wistan is an example who remembers and searches for revenge. Arthur forces people to follow *blotting out* model; however, it does not work completely. On the contrary, *covering up* model is the appropriate one for human beings as the traces of past memories do not totally disappear but are ignored as a result of forgiving.

In *The Buried Giant*, even if there is a chance of people to forgive each other, Arthur violates the rights of people to do it. As a symbol of power and state, the King takes a decision on behalf of people, and obliterates the traces of past atrocities. However, as Derrida states we need a pure form of forgiveness which is not under the command of any institutions; it is "forgiveness without power: unconditional but without sovereignty" (2005: 59). However, in the novel, as they try to dominate the minds of people, unconditional forgiveness is not possible. By creating an imaginary peace, even the opportunity to forgive is left in the hands of power. If the war is wanted to be stopped, then, true way should be forgiving without any condition. Although the communities fail to forgive each other on the collective level, Axl and Beatrice accomplish to forgive one another on the individual level. After confessing their sins to the boatman at the last scene, they seem to forgive each other despite their earlier mistakes.

In the last chapter, the narrator changes and the events are narrated from the point of the boatman. Axl and Beatrice go up to the boatman in order to shelter from the heavy rain. Beatrice claims that their son is on an island waiting for them. The boatman confirms Beatrice, and suggests to row them over the island. Hearing this, Axl fears, due to the rumors about the boatmen; that's why, he is not volunteer to go to the island. He wants to have a rest and move on; however, Beatrice wants to see their son. When the boatman shows them the island, Axl tries to discourage Beatrice saying they do not have money to pay the boatman. The boatman says he would take the money in the saddle of the horse. Beatrice asks the boatman if a couple who has a really strong love bond can go to the island together. The boatman affirms the truth of the possibility, and he notices the strong bond between them when he first sees them. Beatrice is very hopeful that she even thinks they can see their son, and speak to him. Like in *Never Let Me Go*, the main characters should pass the test in order to persuade the boatman about the strength of their love. The boatman first speaks to Beatrice, then to Axl in private. What the boatman asks them is to tell a happy memory, and both of them tell it. His other question is whether they have a painful memory that is still too painful for them to remember. The boatman says they do not have to tell that memory as they have already passed the test. Axl realizes that the mist is recently cleared, and their memories begin to return. At that moment, they both remember the painful memory about their son who had left home because of Beatrice. While Beatrice accuses herself, Axl claims: "If she convicts herself for the first part of it, there's plenty to lay at my door for the next" (*TBG* 356). In terms of their confessions, it is understood that they face their wrongs and accept their faults.

The reader is revealed that the memory of their son is actually their most painful memory. To that story, Beatrice cheated on Axl for a short time, and their son witnessed all their quarrels; thus, he left home and did not come back even after Axl and Beatrice made peace. The traumatic point is after leaving home, he died of plague. Axl admits that in order to punish her, he did not even let Beatrice visit their son's grave. Though he changed his mind and accepted to take the journey to the grave of their son, due to the mist, they forgot what they were trying to find. The boatman asks what his purpose was while tormenting both himself and his wife by keeping them from visiting the grave. Axl admits that "[i]t was just foolishness and pride" (*TBG* 357); by doing so, he accepts that he did an evil thing both to his wife and the memory of his son. He confesses that he tried

to take revenge; but then, his feelings changed. When the boatman asks how it happens, Axl explains as follows:

A wound that healed slowly, but heal it did. For there was a morning not long ago, the dawn brought with it the first signs of this spring, and I watched my wife still asleep though the sun already lit our chamber. And I knew the last of the darkness had left me. (*TBG* 357)

After those words, Axl thinks their love is a “love flawed and broken. But God will know the slow tread of an old couple’s love for each other, and understand how black shadows make part of its whole” (*TBG* 358). In that sense, it is claimed that both good and dark memories make life a complete story, thus, the memories should not be disregarded. The clearance of the mist over their memories makes them face their family history and forgive each other, which is a moral act.

When the novel is closing, the boatman says he cannot cross them at the same time; thus, Axl should wait there for a while until he comes back for him. Though Axl insists on crossing together, Beatrice says she trusts the boatman; and if Axl waits, they can be together in the island just as the boatman says. The last conversation between them is like reconsidering and questioning their past which had been buried within forgotten memories. Axl asks Beatrice whether she is pleased about the clearance of the mist. She says that people can live dreadful things, but for them, it is the correct time to remember. Thus, duty of remembering morally outweighs duty of forgetting. However, this kind of remembrance is not like that of Wistan, who cannot achieve mourning for the losses and forgiving the other, who has caused it. Axl’s other question is complicated to answer. He asks: “I was wondering, princess. Could it be our love would never have grown so strong down the years had the mist not robbed us the way it did? Perhaps it allowed old wounds to heal” (*TBG* 361). At that point, while Ishiguro seems to be giving remembrance as a moral act, he turns the problem inside out and makes the reader think about the significance of forgetting again. For the old couple, forgetting has been healing for a while, but still not eternally. Otherwise, their story would end in an eternal amnesia which would bring a false happiness. When Beatrice’s answer to Axl’s question is that “it is not important” and they hug each other, it is clear that remembrance comes with forgiveness for each of them. At the end, they bid farewell, the boatman warns Axl to wait for him in a quiet manner; however, “he does not hear and he wades on” (*TBG* 362).

Axl is on his own at the end of the novel. His being alone on the shore could be thought as the atonement for his sins. Despite their faults, Axl and Beatrice accept and love each other. It is true that their love is not a perfect love story— and perhaps there is no such a thing as perfect love—, nevertheless, their love is strong enough to forgive each other. While facing their past, what Axl and Beatrice actually accomplish is carefrontation, which means confronting past with love instead of anger. After carefronting, they are free from the painful memories; thus, from now on, they can properly forget and forgive their past. As Volf suggests, after redemption, the memories of sufferings should be forgotten (2006: 203). The idea shows paralellism with Freud's idea of free mind, and Ricoeur's idea of happy memory. Yugin Teo, who deals with Ishiguro's novels before *The Buried Giant* in his book *Kazuo Ishiguro and Memory*, underlines that in Ishiguro's novels the characters yearn for a peaceful memory (2014: 150). In this sense, the peacefully separation of the old couple represents their releasing both their painful memories and themselves by achieving a peaceful memory at the end.

On the individual level, Axl and Beatrice accomplish to face, forgive and release themselves from the emotional burden of their past; that's to say, they reach a happy memory which Ricoeur supports in his book *Memory, History and Forgetting* (2004). Ricoeur's book is on the side of an appeased memory which is related to forgiveness as a moral duty: "The appeased memory does not seek to forget the evil suffered or committed. It seeks rather to speak of it without anger" (2003: 11). Happy memory does not mean remembering the past with a pure happiness; it means remembering the past without negative feelings such as hatred, revenge and rage. In the epilogue part, Ricoeur defines happy memory as remembering the past "without resentment. And above all without anger" (2003: 24). In this sense, Axl and Beatrice remember their past without accusing each other as both can forgive the other for the earlier mistakes. As they want to forgive each other, they find reasons to understand their mistakes; by doing so, they are able to end their anger.

Just forgetting is not proposed as a solution to end the problems between individuals and societies in the novel since forgetting steal their good memories as well as bad ones. In order to recover from traumatic past memories, instead of repressing them, one should remember those events properly, face them honestly, and after a mourning process release oneself from the burden of those memories. To forget the traumatic memories that separate people from each other is a moral duty in terms of the ethics of

memory. However, it requires first of all to remember the past and face it, then, to mourn for the losses and to forgive in order to go on living. After those processes; the buried giants that haunt human mind could be released; that's to say, a peaceful memory could be attained. To Teo: "This yearning for a peaceful memory is indicative of an ethical element in Ishiguro's representation of memory, as his characters desire to hold to the memories of those whom they have (2014: 153). In that sense, happy or peaceful memory is the moral way of remembering and also forgetting the memories of the past. By overcoming the forced oblivion of memories and retrieving them, Axl and Beatrice exhibit a moral duty for one another by forgiving each other unconditionally. However, on the collective level, the novel does not end with such a kind of solution. Though it enlightens the way of mourning for the past atrocities and still forgiving them in a way, the novel does not depict a picture of it. It leaves Wistan buried within his hatred and obsession with revenge. However, what Beatrice and Axl accomplish on the individual level serves as an example for communities to forgive each other to end the wars and other conflicts. The novel gives the idea that in order to break the vicious circle of hatred and revenge operating in memory, communities could seek some healing ways to settle conflicts with peaceful means, which is a moral duty.

CONCLUSION

Being a complementary part of individual and collective identity, memory is essential to form bonds among generations. Especially, after the great crimes of the twentieth century, a moral approach to memory studies has gained importance to grasp the sufferings of past victims. While the ethics of memory emphasises the necessity of remembering the victims of past atrocities, Ishiguro's novel depicts a world of oblivion where individual and collective memory is erased. Starting from the importance of memory on identity formation, this study has revealed that losing touch with reality, the characters of the novel cannot maintain their lives without their memories. Being forced to forget their past by the order of the regime, the characters lose their identities and their relation to the collective. Since they could not forget completely, they are forced to live with the fragments of past events which invade their minds that will lead them to the process of a painful remembering.

Set in the aftermath of a genocide, the novel depicts a world in which individual and social amnesia cover the past atrocities. The characters forget the deaths of their family members, relatives, and friends as a result of the amnesia in the aftermath of the war. Amnesia that they have to endure steals their familial bonds as well as social ones. However, the main characters Axl and Beatrice struggle to bring back their memories as they feel a duty to remember their son. Apart from the story of Axl and Beatrice, Ishiguro portrays various examples of individual and collective forgetting. Setting off on a quest, the old couple tries to establish a bond on individual level, which they cannot find on the collective level. While their journey is a symbol of their struggle to remember the past, the aim of killing the buried giant is the collective struggle to retrieve past memories. The novel's eponym, *the buried giant*, represents all of the repressed evils which are buried in the unconscious of people. However, demolishing the buried giant is required to reveal the repressed memories both for the individual and the society. In this respect, this process of abolishment requires some other sub-processes to make it a moral operation which are duty of remembering, duty of forgetting, and duty of forgiving.

Axl, Beatrice and Wistan are on the side of the desire to remember; that's to say, they are the supporters of duty of remembering the past. By killing the she dragon Querig, they aim to bring back their past with all the evils it hides. Though Axl and Beatrice would prefer to remember just good memories, they are aware of the fact that it is not probable.

Without remembering the lost ones, the lives of the characters turn into a shallow one. Utilising Blustein's and Margalit's ideas on the ethics of memory, it is revealed that when the victims of the great crimes are not remembered, their sufferings lose the meaning that accompanies the event. Forgetting those victims are like killing them again; that's why, those who are left need to remember the memories of people who are sunk into oblivion with the effect of the forgetting magic. Besides, forgetting the past victims hurt the notion of justice; in other words, the crimes which the evil doers have to face remain unpunished. Before being a buried history, the characters who support the duty of remembering need to remember and also remind the past. The fact remains that, when past is not remembered properly, it can be used as an excuse for vengeance as observed in the case of Wistan. Wistan wants to retrieve the collective memory of communities, however, not in a moral way. His aim is to examine the traces of the past which flames him with vengeance. In this respect, Wistan sets an example for remembering improperly and immorally. As it is understood, pure remembering does not resolve the problems and does not serve the ethics of memory. When the bad memories are constantly remembered without any repentance and forgiveness, the result is a renewed and a much more stronger hatred. The critical reading of the novel elicits that the hatred of past generations can be used to fuel the feelings of revenge. Wistan's aim of passing his hatred to Edwin shows how memories can be manipulated to pursue the hatred and revenge among individuals and societies.

Similar to duty of remembering, memories can also be manipulated by the supporters of duty of forgetting. When Sir Gawain and the monastery members support oblivion magic that Querig causes to cover past atrocities by the order of King Arthur, the purpose is breaking the vicious cycle of wars between Britons and Saxons. What they desire is to forget and make people forget the past wounds. At first, this tendency may seem to be based on a moral approach as they declare that the possible coming of wars and atrocities might be prevented in this way. However, when their real intent is examined, it is obvious that they try to erase the traces of their vicious act. It becomes clear that the supporters of forgetting employ various methods to manipulate the past for this purpose. While they sometimes deny past, in some other times they distort it in order to hide their crimes. The tunnel which is another buried giant shows how history is buried on the anonymous victims. The tunnel is essential to understand how regimes victimise numerous individuals in the name of securing peace; but actually, they aim to secure their power.

In spite of revealing how they slayed the innocent people, Sir Gawain invents a false narration to heroise the acts of himself and his king. The distorted narration displays how memories of communities might fade into oblivion, and an alternative history can be written when memories are manipulated. In this respect, this kind of forgetting is not moral in relation to memory formation. When memories are erased as in the novel, the crimes are unpunished; thus, the injustice that arises hurts the memories of past victims. This is the point where the ethics of memory penetrates into the novel. Although there are positive ideas on forgetting by some philosophers such as Nietzsche, Kierkegaard and Augé, the novel displays forgetting without remembering, facing the reality and forgiving as an incomplete and negative approach. The study reveals that being unable to forget profoundly, the characters cannot get a positive form of forgetting. From two models of forgetting that Ricoeur describes in his book (2004), the characters forget with *erasing of traces*; that's to say, it is still possible to remember, though not properly, as traces are stored in unconscious. Thus, the characters cannot attain a childlike happiness as it is not possible for any individual who has memory.

The reason behind not being able to forget profoundly is the idea that people do not complete the mourning process for their atrocities and losses; instead of confronting them, they bury those memories without facing them. Thus, the repressed memories turn into a giant, and bother them. Drawing upon Freud's idea on mourning, the study suggests that humans need to revisit traumatic past memories to get free from the invading effect of them. When traumatic memories are not faced, they turn into individual and collective buried giants. In this sense, some characters struggle to kill their individual and collective buried giants in an attempt to recreate their identities. However, without confronting their good and bad memories, they cannot have a peaceful mind which is free from remorse. Ishiguro uses supernatural elements which are pixies, imaginary widows, and raptors to depict how unpeaceful conscience of his characters disturb them when they cannot relate their consciousness to their memories morally. It is understood that only after completing mourning process or atonement, it is possible to forget traumatic memories and reform memory in terms of a moral frame.

Following mourning, forgiving process is presented as a necessity to release both the individual and collective self from the effect of past traumas. Stemming from religious ideas, forgiving is seen as a correct way of dealing with the past; otherwise, the self would continue to struggle with the feelings of revenge. The study has found out that Axl and

Beatrice succeed in forgiving each other unconditionally, while on the collective level forgiving cannot be achieved. Axl and Beatrice's approach to their past wounds sets as a model for forgiving of communities. Despite all mistakes they did, Axl and Beatrice accomplish to face their misdeeds and forgive each other. They accept their mistakes honestly, and confess their sins to the boatman, which makes their memory work a moral process. In that sense, the old couple reaches the *appeased memory* that Ricoeur points out by managing to remember their past without feeling anger and revenge.

This study reveals that when communities seek ways to forgive each other like the old couple does, they might break the vicious circle of hatred and wars. With some morally healing ways, they could bring about reconciliation. By embracing restorative justice, communities can stop violence and transmission of hatred to the next generations. It is possible to find peaceful solutions to end rivalries when memory making is accomplished in a moral way. Otherwise, hatred would be inherited from one generation to the other as observed in the example of Wistan and Edwin. Like Axl and Beatrice, communities should accept their past faults by taking responsibility for the past. In this sense, manipulating memory and narration would damage identities of individuals and communities like in *The Buried Giant*. Sooner or later, someone would kill buried giants and retrieve past atrocities; that's why, instead of repressing the past, remembering and confrontation/carefrontation should be preferred.

The critical reading of the novel suggests that pure remembering and pure forgetting are not moral solutions to deal with past wounds. Human beings need both of those capacities to move on, which is based on a balance between remembering and forgetting. In this respect, forgetting should be accompanied by forgiving. When the past is forgotten without being faced and questioned, it only results in repression which will certainly reappear sooner or later. When the repressed material is not faced, it changes into a giant which discomforts the minds of people. Thus, in order to disburden both themselves and other people, humans need to revisit their past traumas. Only after the process of mourning and forgiving the past, does the possibility of blocking out the traumatic memories rise.

Consequently, this study has pointed out the opposing ideas on remembering and forgetting of individual and collective memories. In the light of the ethics of memory, this study suggests that what is termed as "happy memory", "free mind" or "peaceful memory" is the moral way of dealing with past wounds and future atrocities. In that sense,

within the story of *The Buried Giant*, Ishiguro points out that past memories should be faced; if they are miserable, they should be mourned; then, the healing ways should be applied. Only after forgiving the past, then, would releasing be possible as a moral way of constructing individual and collective memory. Reading this novel from the perspective of the ethics of memory, it is anticipated that it will contribute to literary studies which is a strong way of memory making.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Psychological Association. 2018. <https://dictionary.apa.org/memory>
- Baysal, Yasemin. 2019. 'A Quest for (Un)wanted Memories in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*', *Literature, Narrative and Trauma*, eds. Aylin Atilla, David Waterman, Carlos A. Sans Mingo (Izmir: Ege University Press) 201: 265-272
- Beedham, Matthew. 2010. *The Novels Of Kazuo Ishiguro* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan)
- Blustein, Jeffrey. 2008. *The Moral Demands of Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- _____. 2017. 'A Duty to Remember', *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Memory*, eds. Sven Bernecker and Kourken Michaelian (New York: Routledge) 351-364
- Borges, Jorge Luis. 1962. 'Funes the Memorius', *Ficciones*, trans. by Anthony Kerrigan (New York: Grove Press)
- Charlwood, Catherine. 2018. 'National Identities, Personal Crises: Amnesia in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*', *Open Cultural Studies*, 2. 1: 25-38
<https://www.degruyter.com/view/journals/culture/2/1/article-p25.xml>
- Derrida, Jacques. 2005. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, trans. by Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes (London and New York: Routledge)
- Drag, Wojciech. 2014. *Revisiting Loss: Memory, Trauma and Nostalgia in the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro* (New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing)
- Erll, Astrid and Rigney, Ann. 2006. 'Literature and the Production of Cultural Memory: Introduction', *European Journal of English Studies*, 10. 2: 111 – 115
<http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/pdf/geschiedenis/EJES%20Intro%20final.pdf>
- Erll, Astrid. 2011. *Memory in Culture*, trans. by Sara B. Young (UK: Palgrave Macmillan)
- Freud, Sigmund. 1914-1916. *Mourning and Melancholia*, ed. and trans. by James Strachey (London: The Hogart Press), The Standard Edition Of The Complete Psychological Works Of Sigmund Freud Vol XIV
- Galloway, Anne. 2006. 'Collective remembering and the importance of forgetting: a critical design challenge' <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Collective-remembering-and-the-importance-of-%3A-a-Galloway/3fbe497112707596143d17c3c6914fb9a36e084b>

- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press)
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. 2005. Spiegel Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro 'I remain Fascinated by Memory', *Spiegel* (05 Oct)
<https://www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel-interview-with-kazuo-ishiguro-i-remain-fascinated-by-memory-a-378173.html>
- _____. 2015. *The Buried Giant* (London: Faber&Faber)
- _____. 2015. 'Interview: Kazuo Ishiguro', *Light Speed Magazine* (Aug 2015)
<http://www.lightspeedmagazine.com/nonfiction/interview-kazuo-ishiguro/>
- _____. 2017. *Nobel Lecture*, by The Nobel Foundation 2017
<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/2017/ishiguro/lecture>
- Jordison, Sam. 2015. 'The Unconsoled deals in destruction and disappointment', *The Guardian* (27 Jan 2015)
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/jan/27/kazuo-ishiguro-reading-group>
- Kierkegaard, Søren. 2009. *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, ed. and trans. by Howard V. Hong, and Edna H. Hong (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)
- Keunen, Bart. 2000. 'Cultural Thematics and Cultural Memory: Towards a Culture Sociological Approach of Literary Themes', *Literature as Cultural Memory Proceedings of the XVth ICLA-Congress*, ed. Raymond Vervliet, 19–30
- Lachmann, Renate. 2004. 'Cultural memory and the role of literature', *European Review*, 12. 2: 165–178
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4853294_Cultural_memory_and_the_role_of_literature
- Lorek-Jezińska, Edyta. 2016. 'Testimonies of absence: Trauma and forgetting in The Buried Giant by Kazuo Ishiguro', *Crossroads. A Journal of English Studies*, 15. 4: 42-51
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ec55/2fef8afae7d2f122dd585c947bf9f09a4e0f.pdf>
- Margalit, Avishai. 2002. *The Ethics of Memory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts London, England: Harvard University Press)
- Mendeloff, David. 2004. 'Truth-Seeking, Truth-Telling; and Postconflict Peacebuilding: Curb the Enthusiasm?', *International Studies Review* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing), 6: 355-380

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3699695?seq=1>

Meral, Ziya. 2012. 'A Duty to Remember? Politics and Morality of Remembering Past Atrocities', *International Political Anthropology*, 5. 1: 29-50

Meyler, Bernadette. 2018. 'Aesthetic Historiography: Allegory, Monument, and Oblivion in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*', *Special Issue: New Literary Analysis of Law*, 5. 2: 243-258

<https://cal.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/cal/article/view/32058/24470>

Michaelian, Kourken and Sutton John. 2017. 'Memory', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, Summer 2017 Edition
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/memory>

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1989. *On the Genealogy of Morals*, ed. and trans. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books)

_____. 1995. *Unfashionable Observations*, trans. by Richard T. Gray (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press)

Nimac, Jasna Ćurković. 2014. 'Toward an Ethics of Memory. Is memory the root cause of violence or a path to violence avoidance?', *The Ethics of War and Peace*, 51st Annual Conference of the Societas Ethica Maribor, Slovenia.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/74a9/bfe1a7261d5ad44491ff15980de2b4c4be3e.pdf?ga=2.57402348.718980996.1580238495-1708476221.1580238495>

Nora, Pierre. 1989. 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire' *Representations*, 26. Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory: 7-24
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2928520?origin=JSTOR-pdf&seq=1>

Plato. 1921. *Theaetetus*, trans. by H.N. Fowler (London: Loeb Classical Library)

Reisberg, Daniel and Friderike Heuer. 2004. 'Memory for Emotional Events', *Memory and Emotion*, eds. Daniel Reisberg and Paula Hertel (New York: Oxford University Press), 3-42

Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History and Forgetting*, trans. by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (London: The University of Chicago Press)

_____. 2003. 'Memory, History and Forgiveness: a Dialogue Between Paul Ricoeur and Sorin Antohi', *Janus Head*, 8: 14-25

<http://www.janushead.org/8-1/Ricoeur.pdf>

- _____. 2002. 'Memory and Forgetting', *Questioning Ethics: Debates in Contemporary Philosophy*, eds. Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (USA and Canada: Routledge), 5-12
- Rieff, David. 2016. *In Praise of Forgetting: Historical Memories and its Ironies* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)
- Russell, Jacoby. 1975. *Social Amnesia, A critique of conformist psychology from Adler to Laing* (Boston: Beacon Press)
- Shaffer, Brian W. 1998. *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press)
- Teo, Yugin. 2014. *Kazuo Ishiguro and Memory* (London: Palgrave Macmillan)
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 2009. 'Memory as Remedy for Evil', *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 7 (Oxford University Press), 447-462
- Volf, Miroslav. 2006. *The End Of Memory: Remembering Rightly in a Violent World* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing)
- Valanciunas, Deimantas. 2018. 'Forgetting Or Making To Forget: Memory, Trauma and Identity in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant*', *History, Memory and Nostalgia in Literature and Culture*, ed. Regina Rudaitytė (New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing), 213-227
- https://www.academia.edu/36837980/Forgetting_or_Making_to_Forget_Memory_Trauma_and_Identity_in_Kazuo_Ishiguros_The_Buried_Giant
- Winter, Jay. 2006. 'Notes on the Memory Boom War, Remembrance and the Uses of the Past', *Memory, Trauma and World Politics* ed. Duncan Bell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 54-74
- Whitehead, Anna. 2008. *Memory* (London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis)

APPENDIX

App. 1. Originality Report

		T.C. FIRAT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI BENZERLİK RAPORU		FORM 30
ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ				
Adı-Soyadı	Esra KARATEPE			
Öğrenci Numarası	161201102			
Anabilim Dalı	BATTI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI			
Programı	İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI TEZLİ YÜKSEK LİSANS			
Danışmanın Unvanı, Adı-Soyadı	Doç. Dr. Seda ARIKAN			
Tez Başlığı (Türkçe)	Kazuo Ishiguro'nun <i>The Buried Giant</i> Adlı Romanında Bellek Etiği			
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ'NE				
Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 102 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 24/06/2020 tarihinde Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezin benzerlik oranı %13'tür. Uygulanan filtrelemeler: 1- Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç, 2- Kaynakça hariç 3- Alıntılar hariç/dâhil 4- 5 kelimeden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç Yukarıda bilgileri verilen öğrencinin yüksek lisans tezi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu tarafından belirlenen aynı benzerlik oranlarını aşmadığını ve tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim. Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.				
Doç. Dr. Seda ARIKAN Danışmanın Adı-Soyadı (İmzası)		Prof. Dr. Abdülhakim Aydın Anabilim Dalı Başkanı (İmzası)		
Lisansüstü tezler, savunma öncesinde intihal programı ile birlikte enstitüye teslim edilir. Intihal raporu ile ilgili olarak etik kurallar dâhilindeki benzerlik oranları ilgili Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu tarafından belirlenir. (Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu tarafından tezin, intihal kapsamı dışında değerlendirilmesi için TURNITIN'den alınan raporda "benzerlik oranı", "alıntılar hariç" en fazla %10, "alıntılar dâhil" % 30'u geçmemesi şeklinde kabul edilmiştir).				
Firat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 23119 - Elazığ / TÜRKİYE		http://sosbe.firat.edu.tr/		Telefon : +90 424 241 5480 Fax : +90 424 233 2180 e-posta : sosbifenst@firat.edu.tr

CURRICULUM VITAE

Esra KARATEPE was born in 1989, Elazig. She completed her primary and high school education in Elazig. She received her bachelor's degree is from the Department of English Language and Literature at Gaziantep University in 2011. She worked as an English Teacher for three years. She has been working as an English Lecturer at Firat University since 2014.

