The Act of Silencing in Robert Musil's "Tonka"

Harfiyah Widiawati¹, Lambok Hermanto Sihombing², Aris Masruri Harahap³

¹*Pusat Kajian Daerah dan Anggaran, Sekjen DPD Republik Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia*

¹*E-mail: hwidiawati@gmail.com*

^{2,3}*President University, Bekasi, Indonesia*

E-mail: ² lambok@president.ac.id, ³ aris.masruri@president.ac.id

Abstract— Modernism's overemphasize on universal objectivity as well as its optimistic humanism have generated critical questions. The critics on modernism, labeled under the name of postmodernists, question the neutrality assumed by humanist universalism and scientific objectivism. Seeing the ugly sides of enlightenments, the modernist critics begins to see modernism "as deeply implicated by forms of oppression: sexism, racism, class-ism, colonialism". The purpose of this paper is to analyze a modernist work from the view point of postmodernism. The work that is under discussion here is "Tonka" by Robert Musil. Within the story, we can see that a form of oppression appears. We are to find how the form of oppression within the story works. It is interesting to find that the oppression works through the act of silencing. To see how silence is interwoven in the story, we have to firstly set some limitation to make possible the discussion on silence itself. The easiest way to do it is by putting the entity in a binary opposition since the text strongly shows binary organization.

Keywords— silence; modernism; postmodernism; oppression

I. INTRODUCTION

At the end of nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century there was a movement that departed from realism and emphasized on aesthetics innovation which tried to break what already existed (and famous) and to create something new and contains process creation and decreation. This movement is called Modernism [3]. In the world of art, especially in fiction, what was regarded as art was more about ethical content than aesthetic. This kind of view, then was challenged by modernist writers who prefer to put their vision in their works rather than to put ethical content in it [7].

Radiating from the enlightenment, modernism is very much influenced by rationalism and empiricism [2]. The scientific revolution that began slightly further back instigates new researches on almost every aspects of human life although originally was intended to help us understand physical reality, the scientific method later was modified for use in attempting to understand human reality [5]. As a consequence, modernism incorporates new perspective of the world, as well as the self, which is different from its predominant predecessor (though still so much influenced), that is the optimistic belief that rationality, human perfectibility and scientific progress will lead people to a better and positive end.

As the projects move on, Modernism's overemphasize on universal objectivity as well as its optimistic humanism begin to generate critical questions. Seeing the ugly sides of

enlightenments—the colonial expansion, the industrial revolution, the growth of metropolis and urban centers, the emergence of poor underclass workers—the modernist critics begins to see modernism "as deeply implicated by forms of oppression: sexism, racism, class-ism, colonialism"[5]. The critics on modernism who are sometimes labeled under the name of postmodernists question the neutrality assumed by humanist universalism and scientific objectivism. They begin to query on any possibility other than universality and objectivity offered by the modernists' proposal.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze a modernist work from the view point of postmodernism. Thus, any notion of modernity found in the literary work will be subject to critical suspicion. The idea is to reveal the naturalness, neutrality presented in the story, and give extra analysis on its social, political tradition. As a consequence, the so-called neutrality will be considered as being context specific, situated, partial, and limited.

II. METHOD

Within the story, we can see that a form of oppression appears through silencing. To see how silence is interwoven in the story, we have to firstly set some limitation to make possible the discussion on silence itself. The easiest way to do it is by putting the entity in a binary opposition since the text strongly shows binary organization. First, there are two major characters: He and Tonka, the first character is male, while the

second is female. The male comes from the middle class, the female from the lower class. The middle class is a young scientist, articulate in his manner; the lower class is an exploited worker, hardly says a line throughout the story.

The set of binaries in modernist classification fundamentally shows that one group of human has privilege over the other: man has privilege over women, logos have privilege over silence, and middle class has privilege over lower class.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The realm of silence belongs to Tonka. Muted as she is, Tonka is rendered into “petty little things”. For He, the main character in the story, Tonka is none else than “burrs in a fairy-tales as well as an ugly, yet sublime reality outside his own” [9]. Tonka’s incapability of uttering flowing words, despite his enduring encouragement, has only made him define her more and more. Above and beyond, that is exactly what the story is about: the narrative account of defining Tonka, of defining “the silenced other”.

Tonka is a unique story because the form of oppression within it works mostly through the act of silencing. The supposedly neutral re-presentation of silent Tonka, through a closer perusal will appear as a matrix that invokes rhizomatic interrelation in the discourse of silence as a form of oppression. Despite the beautifully presented aesthetic form of the story, the seemingly “simple” binary found within it shows nothing but the all too obvious problematic of hierarchical logic. The binary is problematic, however, because it strengthens the building of hierarchical modernist classification of human being. To come to this view, let us trace back its genealogy in the narrative representation of Tonka in the story.

Western Metaphysical View of Being

Before going to the representation of Tonka, it is important to note that the story has a third person point of view, in which an anonymous, subjective narrator tells the story about Tonka and He. By subjective we mean that the narrator can go into the mind of He, but cannot, if not rarely, go into the mind of Tonka. In that sense, the narrator seems to be subjective, always “following” He. Any depiction in the story, then, is seen through the perspective of He, the young, male, middle class scientist. This subjective partiality of such perception will prove later as creating hierarchical representation of being. In the narration, Tonka is described as having an unattractive, almost strange, complexion:

She was not beautiful, but her face had a clear-cut, definite quality. There was nothing in it of that petty, cunningly feminine look which seems to result from the face as a whole; in this face, mouth, nose, and eyes were each something clearly in their own right and could stand up to being contemplated separately, delighting the beholder simply by their candour and the freshness irradiating the whole face. It was odd that so gay a glance should stick fast like a barbed arrow, and she herself seemed to have hurt herself with it [9].

Such depiction which is given in the very beginning of the story set, in the mind of the reader, a posture of Tonka as

being physically ugly. The representation of such blemish quality of Tonka is repeatedly constructed through the using of the words such as “her sensibilities were blunted”, “pert and shy and laugh a lot”, also from the way He addresses her as “poor dear Tonka”. The characterization of Tonka observantly indicates that there is this good-and-bad hierarchical binary in which she occupies the lower one, as clearly appears in the following lines:

There are, so to speak, psychological ambiguities, time when even nature does not give an equivocal answer. And in the very moment when he remembered that, he knew that heaven itself was against Tonka [9].

Here, there is a kind of determination which renders Tonka as being on the opposite side of heaven. It is as if Tonka has been doomed to the place she is now: ugly and unintelligent; therefore, she must be given pity.

From however many sides he approached it, in the end he always found himself confronted with the same opacity in her mind. Tonka was not stupid but something seemed to prevent her from being intelligent; and for the first time he felt this wide expanse of pity for her, this pity that was so difficult to account for [9].

By giving Tonka pity, He posits himself as being in the higher place than Tonka. Such hierarchy is not only felt by He, even Tonka herself assumes and internalizes such positioning; she cannot put herself in an equal plane with He, for instance she necessarily feels not confident in giving him physical affection: “she linked her arm more closely with his, although she felt dreadfully shy of doing so” [9]. The narrative building then seems to indicate that Tonka is fundamentally not fit for He, her nature is always already incompatible. There is a kind of determination that characterizes Nature, compartmentalizes the world. The determination is, again, rooted from the metaphysics itself (meta = beyond, over; physics = thing as it is, being), which affirms that beings and their mental reflections are essentially discrete, unchanging [11]. In addition, Spanos [13] states that western metaphysical interpretation of being involves

[T]he perceptions of beings or things-as-they-are from the end, not only in the sense of termination but also in the sense of the purpose, or goal of a directional and totalizing temporal process, a process in which this end is present from the beginning.

Within this metaphysics, then, one’s plot in the world has been determined since the very beginning. As illustration, Tonka from the very beginning is determined to be obtuse, as pointed by the narrator: “Tonka was not stupid but something seemed to prevent her from being intelligent” [9]. From the metaphysical perspective, Tonka’s being unintelligent, then, marks the presence of her end; her being imperceptive determines the plot of her life where heaven itself was against her. Also, when He is in difficult position because of Tonka’s pregnancy, then it is Tonka who is to be blame:

... it seemed in some way or another to be all Tonka's fault. Tonka seemed to be not merely the cause of all that was going wrong now, but positively something like an ill omen, a herald of misfortune, in that it was she who had first disturbed the normal tenor of his life [9].

In such positioning we can clearly see the work of western metaphysics in which the end is already presence in the beginning, thus it is not at all surprising that at the end of the story Tonka fades, not in a beautiful way though. The end of the story metaphysically renders the female, poor Tonka into the doomed, the inferior, the other.

Tonka began to fade. Poor Tonka, of course she did not fade beautifully, as some women do, radiating an intoxicating splendour in decay; she wilted like some dim little herb in a kitchen garden that turns an ugly yellow and shrivels away as soon as it loses the freshness of its green [9].

Logocentrism

The compartmentalization of human beings by western metaphysics is further substantiated by another fruit of modern enlightenment: logocentrism. Tonka is incompatible for He not only because she is not attractive and intelligent, but also because she is inarticulate:

"Yes, no. Yes, no." He grew impatient. "What's the sense of talking like that? Can't you even grumble about us?" But he saw that she was struggling to find an answer, that she kept on discarding possible answers just when they were on the tip of her tongue. And suddenly he felt sorry for her [9].

Responding to He's curious inquiry, Tonka can only answer yes or no and it makes him feel sorry for Tonka: because she is incapable of articulating her mind. The logic of the above lines is that being inarticulate is pitiful. In that matter, logos occupies a higher hierarchy, as typically characterizes western civilization. In this western metaphysics, logos or reasons become the center for everything: Tonka is thus inferior because she cannot articulate her reasoning. While words come out from He like fountain, yes or no, without verbal explanation is the only thing that Tonka is capable of. Reason is important for the young scientist, because it is compliant with the urge of defining things, of naming things, of self-confirmation as suggested by the following line:

"How inarticulate Tonka was! She could neither talk nor weep. But how is one to define something neither can speak nor is spoken of, something that dumbly merges with the anonymous mass of mankind, something that is like a little line starched on the tablets of history? [9].

In western logocentrism, articulation is used to define things, to categorize things, to name things. Like Adam, after the creation, the first thing God taught him is the naming of things. It is the naming, the defining that differentiates Adam

and the rest of God's creations. It is logos that enable Adam of becoming, it is also logos that confirm the existence of Adam. In other words, the naming, or the logos, determines the principle of being. The importance of naming also characterizes western enlightenment, or should we say, rationalism and empiricism. The Cartesian emphasize on reason ("I think therefore I am") gives ground to scientific enquiry of the world, by which everything is examined, defined and given name. Rationalism's overemphasize on science, however, reduce the world into mechanistic, if not positivist, view. The rationalists, for example, believe that the law of nature will progress toward a better outcome, toward perfection. In terms of logocentrism, the scientific revolution on language also produces a kind of positivist idea that language is the media by which one can define everything. It is through language that the world is perceived, defined and understood. Thus, it is important for one to speak, because speech defines one's being, one's existence. Speech in terms of logocentrism is self-affirming, and thus functions as the condition of presence. Therefore, it is just logical that Tonka's inarticulateness cannot really sustain her presence. Since the condition of presence is not fully fulfilled by her being silent, then she appears in the story not fully as human, she is more like "hallucination", "fairy tales", "alien creature", "spirit", "visitation". The adjectives used by the narrator to describe Tonka are often the ones that build a sense of not real, for example the narrator uses the words "vague," "dream-like," "transparent," "imaginary."

He was a stranger in the world. And what was Tonka? Spirit of his spirit? No—perhaps a symbol, some cryptic correspondence to himself, an alien creature who had attached herself to him, with her secret locked within her [9].

The power of logos as the condition of presence renders anyone who cannot speak, who cannot talk, and who cannot weep into a lower binary in the metaphysical hierarchy.

Because Tonka did not talk the ordinary language that other people used, but some language of the totality of things, she had had to suffer being thought stupid and insensitive. [...] it seemed to him that she was very lonely. If it were not for him, who would understand her? [9]

Again here, metaphysical binary logic renders Tonka as being stupid and insensitive. Even her presence must be sustained by He (If it were not for him, who would understand her?). Remember also that He repeatedly states that he feels pity for Tonka. Such statement actually posits He in a higher position, as the benefactor, patron of Tonka who is pitiful and helpless. Such positioning seems to be a logical, natural and neutral consequence of the metaphysical thinking and logocentrism that we have discussed. Also, it is precisely in this metaphysical thinking and logocentrism that He justifies his act of voicing Tonka, of dubbing Tonka. Everywhere in the story, we can easily find how He tries to define Tonka, how the narrator (taking the perspective of He) does not give opportunity for Tonka to speak for herself. One obvious example that shows Tonka as being muted is the following:

Another time he said to her: "Tell me, how long is it now you've been with Grandmamma, Fraulein Tonka?" And when she had told him, he said: "Oh really? It's a long time to have spent with an old woman like that" [9].

The lines contain two voices: the present, direct voice of He, and the absent, muted voice of Tonka (when she had told him). The episode clearly indicates how He is given all the space possible to speak (his voice is narrated in direct sentence, which gives no room for any narrative bias since the narrator does not edit his sentence at all), while Tonka, poor Tonka is muted, not given any space (the narrator does not even give Tonka opportunity to state how many years she had worked with Grandmamma). If we imagine the episode as a scene from TV, then we can see and hear He when he speaks, however when it is Tonka's turn to speak, the volume is suddenly muted, we can only see her mouth is moving, but we cannot hear any voice. How do we know that she says something? It is because the narrator has dubbed her voice (when she had told him). Here the act of silencing, even if it mutes Tonka, cannot totally hide her presence: the figure is there but the voice is gone. With this inability of logocentrism to completely discard Tonka's presence, let us move to the next section of this writing: the post-modernist reading of the silenced Tonka.

The Silenced Other

As de Behar [4] suggested, silence is often used as an efficient instrument of obliteration. The existence of something or someone is acknowledged but discretely and implicitly. Despite the archiving tendency of modernist literary works to keep the enlightenment track of metaphysical view, there is also a tendency (most probably unconscious, unwitting, and cataleptic) to also question the limit of such determinative and positive view of the world. As we have described in the introduction, the modernists also saw the mechanistic impact of the development of science and technology. The "ugly" side of modernism—the colonial expansion, the industrial revolution, the growth of metropolis and urban centers, the emergence of poor underclass workers—forces them to also perceive the limit of metaphysical thinking, logocentrism, humanism as the product of the "great" enlightenment. Behind the privileged grandeur of enlightened world, there lies anxiety, and meaninglessness of the fragmented modernist's self. Edward Said [12] states that

The formal patterns that mark the hallmarks of modernist culture are shown in the extremes of self-consciousness, discontinuity, self-referentiality, and corrosive irony. As against this optimism, affirmation, and serene confidence radiate an extreme, unsettling anxiety that indicates the easily recognizable ironic awareness of the post-realist modernist sensibility.

At the back of positivist view (optimism, affirmation, and serene confidence) of scientific progress, there is a kind of disillusionment rooted from the recognition of the limit, the border of the modernist domain. The anxiety also reveals itself

in the post realist novel, such as Musil's oeuvre, which offers middle class reader intimate views of life in 'lower depths' [1]. The lower depth view in "Tonka" becomes the source of He's disenchantment of his "other": the silent Tonka. His encounter with Tonka, has brought him a new kind of awareness of himself and his world. He sees Tonka as a different "other" who has another kind of beauty, different from what his male, middle-class, scientific logic can possibly acknowledge.

There was something nobly natural in her helplessness, her inability to reject whatever was vulgar and worthless, even while with an obscure sense of rightness she did not adopt it as her own. [...] she remained pure and unspoilt, like nature herself. But loving this simple creature was by no means so simple [9].

Such narrative depicts Tonka from the view of different kind of aesthetics. Unlike the picture-like beauty, Tonka has the beauty of nature, of the ordinarieness, of the every-day reality. Here Tonka has her own elegance: "She was Nature adjusting itself to Mind, not wanting to become Mind, but loving it and inscrutably attaching itself to it" [9].

Unlike other persons He knows, Tonka is not hypocrite, she is pure. Her lack of "desire, dream, and ambition" ironically prevents her from being caught in greediness, from material ravenousness. When Grandmamma died, it is only Tonka who does not expect anything from the will. Tonka's Sisyphus-like acceptance of petty provision made for her in the bequest really strikes him, because at the same time his relatives

...were all talking eagerly, all talking at once, [...] skillfully turned the situation to his or her own advantage. They express themselves, if not clearly, at least to some purpose and with the courage of their convictions. In the end each of them got what he or she wanted [9].

In such sharp contradiction, her acceptance, her silence ironically becomes her language that speaks of total appreciation for Grandmamma. She does not need to weep or to speak out any verbal grief; she has her own way of showing her consideration for Grandmamma, and this, He realizes for sure. Upon arguing with his relatives and family, upon finding their ravenousness and insensitive consideration for poor Tonka, He suddenly "felt vastly pleased at the thought that Tonka had shed no tears" [9]. Confronted with typical middle-class hypocrisy He begins to realize that instead of using the language of western logos (reason, speech, weeping) Tonka has her own language: "Tonka did not talk the ordinary language that other people used, but some language of the totality of things" [9], the language of the sublime.

In this context, the logocentrism begins to reach its limit: "[...] the ability to talk was not a medium of thought, but a sort of capital, something [people] wore like jewelry to impress others" [9]. The awareness of the limit of language, though still in vague and obscure manifestation, also appears in several other parts of the story:

The shadowy being, the unreal element on him, sometimes struggled for words, and the realization that

everything ought to be measured by quite different standards almost broke surface—but, like all understanding, even this was ambiguous and without certainty [9].

The logocentrism begins to crumble. All forms of thought, including the notion of truth, no longer reside in language. The language has betrayed him; words cannot give him meaning anymore. He's ceaseless effort to define Tonka, only brings him uncertainty. When he tries to find the truth about Tonka's pregnancy, he knows that he can never find the answer; he knows that the enquiry never ends. Another possibility then appears: if indeed truth exists it might not have origin (archae) and end (telos), or probably it is nothing but a tangled thread:

Volition, cognition, and perception were like a tangled skein. One noticed this only when one tried to find the end of a thread. But perhaps there was some other way of going through the world, other than following the thread of truth? [9].

The more you attempt to find cognition, meaning, the more you get tangled in confusion, uncertainty. Since words have lost its meaning: it does not matter anymore whether Tonka admit or deny He's unprovable indictment on her pregnancy. Knowing and not knowing does not really change something, in fact, "[t]hat seeing and not seeing something was torment, and the torment itself was a darkness through which it was hard to see" [9]. Knowing and seeing have become ghastly because instead of revealing, it is perplexing. What is revealed are not only something but also nothing. What appear are not only presence but also absence. In terms of logocentrism, the presence of truth, of eidos is no longer in the logos, in reason but in somewhere, within, beneath an endless or temporal searching [10].

The western metaphysical presence collapses: the building of its very logic is subverted by the binary that it tries to suppress. It is the absence that constitutes the ideality and possibility of presence, not the other way around. Thus, absence has privilege over presence, and silence over speech.

The Politicality of Silence: Revealing the Irony and Partiality of Modernist Narrative

There was a typical similarity in the writers of the 20th century who recognized silence as a means to show one's attitude towards a situation [4]. When Tonka refuses to "speak" and chooses to be silent instead, she is actually performing a brilliant resistance. The political implication of her refusal lies in its power to disable any attempt of defining her. By staying silent, Tonka refuses to go into the logos, and thus it closes the way for He to define her.

But how is one to define something neither can speak nor is spoken of, something that dumbly merges with the anonymous mass of mankind, something that is like a little line starched on the tablets of history? What is one to make of such a life, such a being, which is like a snowflake falling all alone in the midst of a summer's day? Is it real or imaginary? Is it good, or evil, or indifferent? One senses the fact that here the categories

have reached a frontier beyond which they cease to be valid [9].

The reasons (categories) reach its frontier, its limit because the silence reinforces the absence of logos. The possibility of definition ceases to be valid because the silence denies the possibility of existence; it discards the possibility of presence in logos. The silence, thus, corrodes the building of reason from within. So rather than being submissive, the silence let the logos comes to its own limit. For He, to be silent means to be subdued, "She acted in silence, as though she were subdued by the authority of 'the master'" [9].

However, He never sees that it is precisely the silence that enables the possibility and the ideality of presence for speech. Without silence, there won't be any speech.

For if everyone talked at once, the background noise would make it difficult or even impossible for the doubling process known as echo to occur. The reflection of sound will be spoiled if different speakers uttered different things at the same time [8].

In the story, it is Tonka's silence that provides the reflection of sound for He, and hence enables He to have reflective thought of himself. Since her silence denies definitions, the words bounce back as echo. In Greek Mythology, Echo is described as a woman who dies a virgin for love of Narcissus. The voice of He is replicated, doubled through echo, enabling him to hear his own voice and have a reflective sight of his own self. That is why He said "[t]hat seeing and not seeing something was torment" [9]: because it is ghastly to see one's own reflection in a mirror—to hear one's own voice in the echo. The possibility of seeing one's self breaks the solid metaphysical monument down, leaving as its remnant the uncertainty, vagueness, doubt, hallucination. By seeing himself in the mirror, by recognizing the presence of the other, the modernist self is led to the feeling of dislocation and displacement, as shown by the narration through series of pervasive ironies.

The manifestation of silence in the narrative utterance constitutes the politicality of its narration. Since silence or blank is the condition of the presence of speech, we have to consider the utterance no longer as a totality.

What goes on and gets across in conversations, could no longer be reduced to that neutral blank, that neutral silence which allows words and their repetition to be discriminated and separated out and framed [8].

As a consequence, when we encounter a narration, we have to consider it as being context specific, situated, partial, and limited [5]. We have to see the narrative building as a selection that marginalizes its counter opposition. In the case of "Tonka" what is being eluded is Tonka's voice. By muting Tonka, the narrator takes away her chance to express her own version of truth. The partiality of the narration is of course not neutral. Even though the story is narrated through the third person point of view, as we have discussed earlier, the narrator takes a subjective stand point, that is following He. In this case, the narration is politically sided on He's interest.

However carefully the narrator tries to render Tonka into silence to suit He's interpretation of herself, still the narration speaks for itself. There are some parts in the story which show how partial and situated the narration is. While repeatedly said and built that Tonka is incapable of being eloquent in front of He, Tonka is actually eloquent in her own manner:

Tonka was full of stories about how smart (the draper's son) was, how many pairs of shoes he had, and how his trousers were every night laid between two boards and weighed down with heavy stones to keep them well pressed [9].

The lines show that Tonka has her own concern, has her own language, which, in most possible way, is not considered important for the young, male, scientist. The "mundane, trivial" things such as the number of shoes own by the draper's son, in the logocentric standard of He is not counted as eloquence. In his masculine standard, eloquence must concern with "sophistication and elegance" [9]. As suspected by Ardis [1], modernist literary field has been subject to masculine domain which concerns with aesthetics, science and serious art. Musil's "Tonka" in this respect shows the masculine tendency, though at the same time it also shows that the masculine building itself begins to crumble.

Another example of the partiality of the story is small portion given to Tonka's motherly as well as emotional maturity. Through the limited description of Tonka's inarticulateness and inexpressiveness, we got a sense that she is indifferent, stiff and rigid. The relation that Tonka has with He is not an affectionate one. The way they do the intercourse clearly shows this lack-of-emotional quality. However, if we look closer, there is moment when Tonka appear the other way round: "Tonka was 'fond' of children. She bent down to the child, cheerfully and consolingly, perhaps even slightly amused by it" [9]. Such noble quality of Tonka is of course not discussed further by He. In this respect, the narration only depicts the silent Tonka as one-dimensional character, not having complicated specificity. "The historical specificity is replaced by novelistic typicality" [1]. Here the narrator does not give any historical background for Tonka. The reader cannot figure her origin: we don't know her parents, we don't know where she comes from, we only know few about her grandma and aunty. In such limited information, it is then plausible to read the narration in its political, context-specific characteristics. In this sort of situation, we can see the text as a manifest discourse and also as "... the repressive presence of what it does not say; and this 'not-said' is a hollow that undermines from within all that is said" [6].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Silence is the condition of the presence of speech. Thus, it is careless to say that speech has privilege over silence, it is the other way round: silence constitutes the ideality and possibility of speech. If, for the sake of aesthetics concept of decay, Tonka dies not beautifully at the end of the narration, then the cry and echo of her silence eternally reside in the partial, situated, limited description of the narration. With this,

let us allow her silence to "speak" for hundreds of the reader of the story.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. L. Ardis, *Modernism and Cultural Conflict 1880-1922*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [2] P. Childs, *Modernism*, London: Routledge, 2000.
- [3] P. Childs and R. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*, Second ed., London: Routledge, 2005.
- [4] L. B. de Behar, *A Rhetoric of Silence and Other Selected Writings*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.
- [5] E. A. Flynn, *Feminism Beyond Modernism*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002.
- [6] M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Revised edition), New York: Routledge, 2002.
- [7] A. M. Harahap, "Modernism in Mabel and The Rocking-Horse Winner," *Language Research in Society Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1-7, 2020.
- [8] L. Irigaray, *Speculum of the Other Woman*, Itacha: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- [9] R. Musil, "Tonka," in *Five Women*, New York, Delacorte Press, 1966.
- [10] R. V. Nuncio, "The Text and the Logos: Language Debate in Jaques Derrida's Deconstruction," *Lumina*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2011.
- [11] Rius, *Introducing Marx*, Cambridge: Icon Books, 1999.
- [12] E. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- [13] W. V. Spanos, *America's Shadow: An Anatomy of Empire*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.