Constructed Identities

A Chronotopic Reading of *The Great Gatsby*, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit*, and *Mad Men*

By Ingrid Rivedal Yndestad

Master’s Thesis
Department of Foreign Languages
University of Bergen
May 2016

Samandrag

Litterære verk speglar fortida på ulike vis. Der nokre ser på fortida som noko ein kan leggje bak seg og viske ut, meiner andre at den er ei varig formande kraft ein aldri kan fri seg fullstendig frå. Andre igjen posisjonerer seg ein stad mellom desse ytterpunkta. Denne oppgåva tek utgangspunkt i det andre av desse synspunkta, og har som mål å undersøke korleis fortida utspelar seg i romanane *The Great Gatsby* (1925) av F. Scott Fitzgerald og *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (1955) av Sloan Wilson, i tillegg til i TV-serien *Mad Men* (2007-2015), skriven av Matthew Weiner. Ved å sjå på serien som eit litterært narrativ på lik linje med romanane, vil eg undersøke korleis strukturar som skildrar tilhøvet mellom tid og stad vert konstruerte i desse narrativa. Dette gjer eg for vidare å synleggjere korleis fortida, notida og framtida til hovudpersonane blir konstruerte gjennom desse strukturane, og såleis fører til at karakterane mistar evna til sjølve å avgjere sine vegar i livet.

Gjennom ei lesing av den russiske filosofen Mikhail M. Bakhtin sin teori som tek føre seg litterære kronotop (frå gresk, der «kronos» tyder «tid» og «topos» tyder «stad»), vil eg forsøke å kaste lys over aspekt ved dei tre ulike narrativa som tidlegare har blitt oversett av andre kritikarar i større eller mindre grad. Den geografiske og tidsmessige bakgrunnen handlingane utspelar seg mot dannar delar av grunnlaget for samanlikninga mellom dei tre hovudpersonane, i tillegg til fleire ulike fellesnemnarar som skildrar personlegheitane og bakgrunnane til karakterane.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Lene Johannessen. Thank you for your guidance, for sharing your extensive knowledge, and for your sincere interest and belief in my work. Our meetings have given me both motivation and inspiration throughout this year, for which I am ever grateful.

My parents, my sister and Bjørn, and Mona deserve special thanks, for giving me the time I needed to work on my thesis, and for distracting me from it when needed. Thank you for your questions, concerns, and support.

I wish to thank Ida Neple and Hanne Frafjord for helpful comments and feedback, and for your support outside of the time-space continuum writing a thesis really is.

Last, but not least, I wish to thank my fellow students, both this year and the preceding. This process would not have been the same without you.

To all of you: I got by with a little help from my friends.

In memory of Benedicte.

Table of Contents

Samandrag……………………………………………………………………………… iii

Acknowledgements…………………………………………………………………….. iv

Table of Contents……………………………………………………………………… v

Introduction…………………………………………………………………………... 1

1. **Traces of the Past**………………………………………………………………… 12

   1.1. Introduction…………………………………………………………………… 12

   1.2. Jay Gatsby and the Past……………………………………………………….. 14

   1.3. Tom Rath and the Past………………………………………………………… 29

   1.4. Donald Draper and the Past…………………………………………………… 39

2. **Traces of the Pastoral**…………………………………………………………….. 52

   2.1. Introduction……………………………………………………………………. 52

   2.2. Jay Gatsby and the Pastoral…………………………………………………… 55

   2.3. Tom Rath and the Pastoral…………………………………………………….. 68

   2.4. Donald Draper and the Pastoral………………………………………………...81

Conclusion……………………………………………………………………………… 95

Works Cited……………………………………………………………………………..101

Introduction

“The past is never dead. It’s not even past.” (Faulkner 85)

Literary works refract the past differently. Whereas some believe the past to be something one can leave behind and obliterate, others regard it a shaping force with enduring and inescapable impact on the present. Others again position themselves somewhere in-between these perimeters. With the second of these stands as a vantage point, this thesis aims to explore how the past figures in F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby* (1925), Sloan Wilson’s *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (1955) [1], and in the AMC series *Mad Men* (2007-2015), written by Matthew Weiner. Focusing on the main protagonists in these works, namely Jay Gatsby, Thomas Rath, and Donald Draper, the following will be an examination of how the past makes itself valid in these characters’ present lives. In doing so, I will make use of the Russian philosopher Mikhail M. Bakhtin’s (1895-1975) theory of literary chronotopes, as these allow for an approach towards the interconnection of time and space in the respective works.

Despite the vastly different ways these works and characters have previously been read, they still make for comparison in the exploration of the time-space continuum, its ties to the narrative construction of the novels and of the series, and the impact this continuum has on the main protagonists. The characters share a background of influential and formative incidents and experiences which to varying degrees have determined their lives in the present, and which will continue to determine their future paths. Additionally, the suburban setting of the three works, as well as their proximity in temporal setting, provide for a common backdrop against which the time-space continuum will be investigated.

---

[1] *The Great Gatsby* and *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* will henceforth occasionally be referred to as the shorter *Gatsby* and *Flannel Suit.*

At the time of its publication in 1925, *The Great Gatsby* faced diverse reception: It was praised for its marvelous language and for its ability to capture the enticing and magnetic essence of The Roaring Twenties, and simultaneously disregarded for what was deemed its lack of depth and inability to sustain the ravages of time (Beuka 3-4). There seems to be general agreement that contemporary critics largely were resistant to separate Fitzgerald's troublesome personal life from his works and characters (Curnutt 10-11), which presumably added to the perception of *The Great Gatsby* as a novel lacking societal value. To Fitzgerald's disappointment, *Gatsby* sold less than his previously published novels *This Side of Paradise* (1920) and *The Beautiful and the Damned* (1922) (Prigozy xii; Curnutt 9), and, as Robert Beuka puts it: "By the time of Fitzgerald's death in 1940, *The Great Gatsby* was long gone and forgotten." (Beuka 2).

Ruth Prigozy, Kirk Curnutt, and Robert Beuka have all written extensively on Fitzgerald's life and work in general, and on *The Great Gatsby* in particular. Moreover, their written works also include material on how Fitzgerald's work was received by his contemporaries, and how it has been perceived after his death. Many contemporary critics were crude in their reviews, and the following example from *New York World* is just one of several that condemned *Gatsby*: "'there is no important development' of the protagonist, a flaw indicative of the overall shallowness of the narrative" (Beuka 4), a statement that has been widely refuted in subsequent years. Not all were as critical as the foregoing illustrates, and as mentioned above the prevailing opinion up until Fitzgerald's death seemed to be that *Gatsby* "was not a book for the ages, but it caught superbly the spirit of a decade", as printed in the *New York Times* in 1940 (Prigozy xiii). H.L. Mencken seemed to share this opinion, as he applauded Fitzgerald's language in *Gatsby*, but claimed that the story was "obviously unimportant" (Beuka 15). Others again acclaimed the novel's quality, and foresaw its success. Among these we find Gertrude Stein, who anticipated that Fitzgerald "would be read when many of his well-known contemporaries were forgotten" (Turnbull 253), and T.S. Eliot, who in a letter to Fitzgerald told him he regarded *Gatsby* "the first step that American fiction [had] taken since Henry James" (Prigozy xii). Further, Lillian C. Ford ascertained that "Mr Fitzgerald has certainly arrived" (Prigozy xi), and Gilbert Seldes, along the same lines acclaimed that "Fitzgerald has more than matured" (Prigozy xi-xii). Finally, William Curtis argued that "Mr. Fitzgerald…has produced something which approaches perilously near a masterpiece" (Beuka 17).

A decade following his death in 1940 saw the beginnings of what became known as the first wave of the "Fitzgerald Revival" (Prigozy 79). Further, Prigozy regards the comprehensive academic interest of the '60s a solid foundation for the immense research and writings on Fitzgerald and *Gatsby* that were to continue over the decades and stretch far into our own time: "One scarcely could have predicted the increased level of energy and the variety of its sources that would propel the Fitzgerald Revival into a second phase that began in the early 1970s and has shown no signs of diminished intensity now well into the twenty-first century." (Prigozy 80) This has resulted in a vast body of work illuminating Fitzgerald's life and published novels, where *Gatsby* has been given decidedly most attention.

It is beyond doubt that *Gatsby* still remains a novel of interest both in academia and in society on the whole. "Google 'Gatsby', and you will bring upwards of ten million hits", Beuka claimed in 2011 (Beuka 1). If you google "Gatsby" today, five years later, the number of hits has increased to approximately 42 million. Baz Luhrmann's 2013 film adaptation of the novel with Leonardo DiCaprio in the role as Gatsby, presumably contributed to a great deal of this development, as its immense popularity sparked a reinterest both in the novel itself, and in the alluring and fascinating era of "the Jazz Age". Aside from this, the rising number speaks of a novel that still makes itself valid to our own contemporary society, and one might ask in what ways this novel has *not* been read, and what aspects have *not* been examined. However, I believe the chronotopic reading in this thesis, in combination with the reading of the other works I examine, may shed new light on how the past and the pastoral figure in Fitzgerald’s classic novel *The Great Gatsby.* Leo Marx discusses how the pastoral figures in *Gatsby* in his book *The Machine in the Garden- Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (1967), and this thesis will draw on the pastoral ideal as it is defined in this book. Marx sees the pastoral ideal as something that “has been used to define the meaning of America ever since the age of discovery...[where] [t]he ruling motive of the good shepherd…was to withdraw from the great world and begin a new life in a fresh, green landscape…an oasis of harmony and joy” (Marx 3). We will see how the pastoral ideal represents new beginnings and opportunities to the characters examined in this thesis.

Like *The Great Gatsby* seizes the spirit of the time in which it was written, so too does Wilson’s 1955 novel *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.* The novel portrays the life of the average American suburban family of the mid-fifties, represented by the Rath family. At its time of publication, the novel was a bestseller with nearly 100 000 copies sold during its first year in print (“20th-Century American Bestsellers” Brandeis.com), and was made into a movie starring Gregory Peck the subsequent year. In contrast to *Gatsby,* the success of this novel was not long-lived, and in later years it seems to be “remembered mainly for its title, which (…) became a watchword of fifties conformity”, as Johnathan Franzen puts it in his introduction to the novel (Franzen 1). What limited academic research and writing that has been done on *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* is in line with Franzen’s statement, as it seems to be largely centered on the topic of corporate business and its role in the American society of the fifties. A more recent article (2008) by Bert Spector investigated the film version of the book from a corporate point of view, in which he sees the film as presenting “a startling and emotionally draining range of motivations, aspirations, and choices at play in the executive suites of American corporations” (Spector 88). However, he does not mention what these motivations and aspirations are, thus eliminating significant aspects of the novel such as the pressure of the past, the war, the suburban setting, discontentedness, and so forth, aspects that all will be of importance to this reading.

Emily S. Rosenberg has read the novel in light of international politics and warfare. More specifically she examines the "romantic triangle" Betsy-Tom-Maria, and argues that "[t]he foreign woman (…) signifies not just a personal entanglement for the male protagonist but, on another level, a troubling international involvement for the United States" (Rosenberg 60). Although her main focus is on gender roles and international post-war affairs, which differs from the perspective of this thesis, Rosenberg makes a valid point in that "[m]ost analyses of this film (…) almost totally [neglect] (…) the long-term impact that Rath's wartime "foreign affair" is having on his marriage" (Rosenberg 63). As will be evident in the present thesis, this aspect of the novel will be of major importance to our discussion of the past and its impact on the present.

Several critics fall prey to Rosenberg's above characteristics, among which we find David Castronovo and Malcolm Gladwell. Castronovo, in his book *Beyond the Gray Flannel Suit. Books from the 1950s that Made American Culture* (2004), sets out to examine the novels of what he regards "the remarkable literary explosion that took place between the late 1940s and the Kennedy years" (Castronovo 9). As the title of his book suggests, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* does not make it to Castronovo's list of novels that "made American culture" (front cover). In his introduction, Castronovo leaves no doubt concerning this, as he describes Wilson's novel as one that "had limited staying power –[a] bread-and-butter naturalistic work (…) that appeared on the bestseller lists but that no longer seem[s] to speak to our condition." (Castronovo 9-10). This last remark speaks more of Castronovo's own inability to recognize the novel as more than a title and "a watchword of fifties conformity" (Franzen 1) than it speaks of the novel itself, and he obviously neglects the aspects of the past, of returning from war, of discontent and of aspirations, as well suburban setting of the novel, in stating that it no longer has societal value. The following extract from Castronovo's book arguably contributes to what seems to be the prevailing opinion of Wilson's novel, as a plain story about a suburban family, with a happy-go-lucky ending:

> Sloan Wilson extricates Tom Rath from snobbish family traits, small prospects, bad decisions, and wartime traumas by…giving him a better job and a better house in Westport, Connecticut. He gets these things because of his basic integrity (…). A mature contentment floods his life once he squares himself with his wife (…). The man in the Gray Flannel Suit eventually detaches itself from Tom's isolation and collapse into a bundle of clichés about a brighter future and being at peace. (Castronovo 25-27)

The clichés might be present in the novel, but Castronovo misreads the narrative when he considers their truths a given, and ignores the clear implications of a repetitive pattern that this thesis will make visible.

Gladwell (2004) is similarly simplistic in his reading, portraying the Raths as alcoholics and Tom as an absentee father ("Getting over it; Annals of Psychology", ProQuest.com), and arguing that the novel "ends with Tom Rath stronger, and his marriage renewed" (Ibid.). He further says of this ending that "[i]t's an ending that no one would write today (…) because we have become blind to the fact that the past—in all but the worst of cases—sooner or later fades away." (Ibid.). The following chronotopic reading of this novel will make clear how both Castronovo and Gladwell, in his claim that Tom "put the war behind him" (Ibid.), are "taking the easy way out" of a novel that upon closer examination proves far more complex than it previously has been given credit for. Moreover, this thesis will refute Gladwell's assertion that "the past…sooner or later fades away." (Ibid.).

In contrast to Castronovo and Gladwell, Catherine Jurca approaches *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* in a manner that is closer to the approach of this thesis. In "The Sanctimonious Suburbanite" (1999) she concludes that for the characters and their lives "a great deal has changed, but it may be that some things never change; in the endless cycle of middle-class discontent and mobility, even the suburb one builds oneself is destined to be the place from which one must try to escape." (Jurca 102) What the analysis of this thesis continues and in part aims to answer is *how* and *why* this cycle prevails.

The AMC series *Mad Men* written by Matthew Weiner first aired in 2007, and has since been regarded as a high-quality series both by its audience and by critics. The series' numerous nominations and awards in prestigious accolades and award ceremonies are only some of many indicators of this. Its final season alone got eleven nominations in the 2015 Emmy-Awards, which resulted in the total number of Emmy-awards for this show rising to 116, making it the single most Emmy-nominated TV series in history[2]. In addition to this, the show has been nominated to a total of thirteen Golden Globe nominations, out of which five were won[3], and twelve nominations to the Writers Guild Awards, out of which six were won[4].

The series has been discussed and analyzed in all possible ways across the Internet, from fan-sites, web-forums and blogs, to more serious sites such as various online newspapers and educational forums. Also academia has embraced the series, and analyzed it from historical and sociological perspectives, where issues of gender, race and class have been examined, to mention a few. The Whitman College, Washington, offered a course on the series in 2013 ("Don Draper 101", Slate.com), and the 2015 Harvard University Lit Fest invited Matthew Weiner to talk about the series, literature's position in it, and about creative writing in general ("At the heart of 'Mad Men'", Harvard.edu). Duke University Press in 2013 published a collection of essays referred to as a

---

[2] http://www.amc.com/shows/mad-men/talk/2015/07/mad-men-receives-11-emmy-nominations-remains-the-most-nominated-basic-cable-drama-of-all-time

[3] http://www.goldenglobes.com/tv-show/mad-men

[4] http://www.amc.com/shows/mad-men/talk/2015/12/mad-men-receives-two-writers-guild-of-america-nominations-for-its-final-season
https://www.wgaeast.org/2016/02/2016-writers-guild-awards-winners-announced/

> comprehensive analysis of the groundbreaking TV series, [where] scholars consider the AMC drama from a fascinating array of perspectives, including fashion, history, architecture, civil rights, feminism, consumerism, art, cinema, and the serial format, as well as through theoretical frames such as critical race theory, gender, queer theory, global studies, and psychoanalysis (back cover)

Further, in 2010 the Blackwell Philosophy and Pop Culture Series published the essay collection *Mad Men and Philosophy*, parts of which will be taken into consideration in relation to memory and forgetting in the first chapter of this thesis. The collection explores the series and its characters through the thinking of philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Ayn Rand, to mention a few, in order to "gain insight into a host of compelling *Mad Men* questions and issues, including happiness, freedom, authenticity, feminism, Don Draper's identity, and more" (back cover). These two publications alone make visible the wide range of theoretical perspectives that have been considered in relation to this series and its characters.

Mad Men differs from *Gatsby* and *Flannel Suit* both in that it is a series, as opposed to the novels, and in that it is set in a time preceding its production by decades. I will in this thesis treat *Mad Men* as a historical text that reconstructs a narrative in the same manner as the novels. A historical text or a historical novel

> takes its setting and some characters and events from history…[and] makes the historical events and issues crucial for the central characters…and for the course of the narrative…[A] variant of the historical novel is known as **documentary fiction**, which…also reports of everyday happenings in contemporary newspapers…[Related to

> this is a] form called **documentary drama** in theater, film, and television, which combines fiction with history, journalistic reports, and biography.” (Abrams & Harpham 256-257, emphasis in the original).

Mad Men thus can be seen as a documentary drama or a historical fiction, with a narrative that constructs the literary chronotopes in the same way as the narratives of the novels do.

Numerous episodes could have been taken into consideration in order to broaden our understanding of Don’s background and development. Among these we find “The Wheel” (S1.E13), “The Hobo Code” (S3.E11), and “In Care of” (S6.E13). “The Wheel” shows the well-renowned Kodak-pitch, where Don contemplates memory, family, and nostalgia. “The Hobo Code” portrays what can be seen as a defining moment in Don’s way of thinking about life, when his childhood farm is visited by a vagabond who has uprooted himself in order to move ahead and create a better and more harmonious life. Finally, “In Care Of” is the episode where Don during a sales pitch for Hershey’s Chocolate Bars unexpectedly breaks his constructed façade as Don Draper, and shares a personal memory from the brothel where he lived as an adolescent. At the end of the episode Don takes his three children to see this house, and tells them that he grew up there, with Judy Collin’s mellow and melancholic recording of “Both Sides Now” playing in the background. These episodes could all have been looked at in detail, but due to the scope of a MA thesis, I have chosen not to elaborate on these. Rather, I find that the episodes “Nixon vs Kennedy” (S1.E12), “The Mountain King” (S2.E12) and “Person to Person” (S7.E13) best make visible how Don’s character can be read through a chronotopic lens. The scenes found in these episodes portray the strife between the double identity of Dick Whitman/Donald Draper, and how the two identities differ in their interaction with other characters, in large made visible through the character Anna Draper.

I will suggest that Bakhtin’s essay “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel” (1937-1938) may bring out new perspectives on the tree works in question in this thesis. I will argue that the characters' lives are destined and determined, both in their past, present, and future, by the construction of the chronotopes in the narratives. The word "chronotope" stems from Greek, and literally means "time space" (Bakhtin 85). It is a concept where "spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole" (Bakhtin 84). Bakhtin distinguishes between several types of chronotopes, but points out that the separate chronotopes might be combined in a narrative, and that "[c]hronotopes are mutually inclusive, they co-exist, they may be interwoven with, replace or oppose one another, contradict one another or find themselves in ever more complex interrelationships." (Bakhtin 252), as we will see is the case for the narratives examined here.

In my thesis I will make use of three specific chronotopes, both separately and as they combine in various ways. The chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the chronotope of the *threshold* are considered in chapter one, "Traces of the Past", as these enlighten how the three characters' history and development are determined and shaped by chance incidents and specific crucial moments, which in turn have led to the process of metamorphosis that all characters go through in some way. Moreover, I will demonstrate how these metamorphoses differ from one another, and that they are not necessarily completed. The second chapter, "Traces of the Pastoral", looks at how the characters' present lives are characterized by the longing for the pastoral, made evident in the imitation of the pastoral ideal that takes place within the suburban setting of the novels, and in a slightly different manner in the series. Here, the chronotope of the *pastoral* makes visible *how* and *why* this imitation fails, as it eventually does in all three narratives. In other words, the chronotopes of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and of the *threshold* relate to the characters' pasts, discussed in the first chapter, whereas the chronotope of the *pastoral* relates to their present lives and their futures, discussed in the second[5].

In *The Great Gatsby* my chronotopic reading will contribute to the appreciation of *how* and *why* Gatsby's ambition of repeating his past with Daisy Buchanan fails, and how the text constructs the underlying forces that make this impossible. In *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* I will look at character development, and in particular argue that through the chronotopes a new understanding of the ending condenses, which questions what for the most part has hitherto been dismissed as just another "happy ending" to just another suburban story. As for *Mad Men,* the chronotopes make visible how the internal struggle of the identities Dick Whitman and Donald Draper play themselves out. This reading sheds new light on the ambiguous and much-debated final scene of the series, and of the possible future of its main protagonist.

In other words, the main focus of the present thesis is to illuminate *how* the narratives' controlling power, internalized in the knot of the time-space continuum of the literary chronotopes, interlaces and ties the characters to their pasts. We will see that the metamorphoses of all three characters that are initiated within the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* are not completed. As will be evident, the metamorphoses are disrupted by the chronotope of the *threshold,* in combination with the quasi-cyclical nature of the chronotope of the *pastoral*. This interruption and the interrelationship of the chronotopes results in the characters' constant return to their past identities and the inability to truly leave their pasts behind.

---

[5] With reference to the chronotopes, I will italicize the words "adventure novel of everyday life", "threshold", and "pastoral". This is to make clear I here refer to the chronotopes, as opposed to the "moment of threshold" and "pastoral ideal", etc., where these same words will not be italicized.

1. Traces of the Past

1.1. Introduction

> "How curios it was to find that apparently nothing was ever really forgotten, that the past was never really gone, that it was always lurking, ready to destroy the present (…)." (Wilson 77)

Common to the three works in this thesis is the preoccupation with the past and the interrelationship between time and space. Consisting of three sections, one for each of the characters in the three novels, the present chapter aims to explore this interrelationship and consider the latency of the past. Through close reading of scenes and passages in which the past is portrayed, it looks at how Gatsby, Rath, and Draper are marked by their pasts in differing manners and to varying degrees. Representations of childhood and adolescence in these works are of varying importance, as are the representations of the experiences of war from their participation in WWI, WWII, and the Korean War, respectively. Common to the three characters is also the desire to move upward in society, to be prosperous men of stature in the American society of the 1920's, the 1950's, and the 1960's. Further, they seem to share a belief that their aspirations cannot be realized without the rejection of the past. However, as we shall see, this progression or path of life is interrupted, as their pasts somehow lock them into a moment of crisis they are unable to free themselves from completely.

In order to explore these questions more purposefully, the essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" by Mikhail M. Bakhtin will function as a basis for discussion. Introducing the concept of the chronotope, Bakhtin says: "We will give the name *chronotope* (literally, "time space") to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature." (Bakhtin 85). He further distinguishes between several types of chronotopes, and among these the one found in the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the chronotope of the *threshold* are of particular interest to *The Great Gatsby, The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit,* and *Mad Men.* These chronotopes are helpful in order to explore how past experiences and events have shaped the characters, and consequently how these events and experiences make themselves valid in their present lives. In *Gatsby,* we will see that the *threshold* chronotope disrupts the metamorphosis central to the *adventure novel of everyday life*, ultimately resulting in a reversal of the transformation he seeks. In *Flannel Suit* it will be argued that the chronotope of *the adventure novel of everyday life* is actually contained within the chronotope of the *threshold.* Finally, with regard to *Mad Men,* I will contend that the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* leads up to and makes possible the chronotope of the *threshold*, and that the metamorphosis here differs from the one in *Gatsby.*

In addition to Bakhtin's essay, I will make use of Jean Paul Sartre's essay "Time in Faulkner: The Sound and the Fury" (1960), where we will find that his perspective on fictional characters and their relation to time and chronology is apposite to our discussion of Gatsby, Rath, and Draper. Moreover, the essay "Pete, Peggy, Don, and The Dialectic of Remembering and Forgetting" (2010) by John Fritz will offer useful perspectives on how the characters relate to memory. In order for the reader to be familiar with the aspects of these character's stories that are of importance to our discussion, all three sections will provide a brief outline of main events.

1.2. Jay Gatsby and the Past

> "So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past." (Fitzgerald 144)

The character of Jay Gatsby is presented through first-person narrator Nick Carraway.[6] In retrospect, Carraway tells the story of how he moves to West Egg and incidentally neighbors the fashionable Jay Gatsby. Across the Manhasset Bay, in East Egg, lives Nick's cousin Daisy with her husband Tom Buchanan. Through their friend Jordan Baker, with whom Nick starts a relationship, he is introduced to Gatsby. It turns out that Gatsby and Daisy were lovers before Gatsby had to leave for the war,[7] Gatsby having made the false impression that he was a man from the same social strata as Daisy and in a position to take care of her, an impression under which Daisy remains when he leaves. However, while he is away, Daisy meets and marries Tom Buchanan, who is in fact in such a position. In spite of this, Gatsby never gives up the hope of getting Daisy back, and years later consequently settles down in West Egg with a view to her house in East Egg.

Through Nick, Gatsby gets in touch with Daisy. Well aware of her husband's notorious love affairs with other women, the latest being the married Myrtle Wilson, Daisy recommences her relationship to Gatsby. As Tom and Daisy, Nick and Jordan, and Gatsby spend a day together in a hotel room in New York, Tom confronts Daisy and Gatsby with this relationship and Gatsby with the reality of his past, whereupon Daisy (and also Gatsby) realizes that she is not going to leave Tom. Driving back from town, Daisy takes Gatsby in his car, with Tom, Nick, and Jordan following shortly after. On their way back they pass the place where Myrtle Wilson lives. Myrtle, having seen Tom drive the same car earlier that day, assumes Tom is driving, and runs out in the road where Daisy accidentally hits her and kills her. In shock, Daisy keeps on driving. Gatsby takes over the wheel and before they both return to the Buchanan's residence he leaves the car in his garage to protect her. However, Tom and Daisy decide to leave for a while the following day, and Gatsby loses hope of having her back. Meanwhile, Myrtle's husband George Wilson, after some research, locates the car in Gatsby's garage, shoots and kills Gatsby, and subsequently commits suicide.

---

[6] The credibility of Nick Carraway as objective narrator might be questioned. However, for the purposes of this thesis this will not be taken into consideration.

[7] WWI

From what information is conveyed about his past, it is evident that Jay Gatsby, or James Gatz, was ambitious and seeking prosperity from a very young age. He grew up on a farm in rather poor surroundings (Fitzgerald 78), and his attempt at attending college gives the impression of a man with a wish to make something of himself, and with a wish to get away from the circumstances under which he is living (Fitzgerald 79). The schedule he makes for himself as a young man illustrates his determination and his belief that hard work will lead to success:

Rise from bed…………………………………………………	6.00	A.M.
Dumbbell exercise and wall-scaling……………………	6.15-6.30	”
Study electricity, etc. …………………………………………	7.15-8.15	”
Work…………………………………………………………………	8.30-4.30	P.M.
Baseball and sports……………………………………………	4.30-5.00	”
Practice elocution, poise, and how to attain it……………….	5.00-6.00	”
Study needed inventions……………………………………	7.00-9.00	”

GENERAL RESOLVES

No wasting time at Shafters or [a name, indecipherable]

No more smokeing or chewing.

Bath every other day

Read one improving book or magazine per week

Save $5.00 [crossed out] $3.00 per week

Be better to parents (Fitzgerald 137-138)

This ideal of self-improvement goes back to Franklin and the archetype of the self-made man, where a similar schedule is provided for the purposes of self-examination and -improvement[8]. However, there is a difference between Franklin and Gatsby: whereas Franklin looks to the future and is able to embrace the new, Gatsby is not. As we will see, the process of creating himself anew comes to a halt as Gatsby is unable to leave his past with Daisy behind him. This inability will be seen in relation to the chronotope of the *threshold*, and before I discuss how Gatsby can be read according to this time-space continuum, a brief explanation of the concept, as well as of the chronotope of *the adventure novel of everyday life*, may be useful:

Bakhtin distinguishes between three types of ancient novels, each with a different type of chronotope, that is, with a different connectedness between spatial and temporal indicators. (Bakhtin 84). In what he terms the *adventure novel of everyday life*¸ adventure-time merges with everyday time, resulting in "a new type of adventure-time (…) one that is a special sort of everyday time" (Bakhtin 111). Bakhtin exemplifies this chronotope by way of Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*[9], where protagonist Lucius by accident is turned into an ass. The aspect of *metamorphosis* is one of the defining characteristics of this chronotope, one that is of particular interest when investigating the character of Jay Gatsby, and, as we will see, when investigating the characters of Tom Rath and Donald Draper. The relation of time to chance is another defining characteristic of this chronotope, and Bakhtin describes it as follows:

> (…) it leaves a deep and irradicable mark on the man himself as well as on his entire life. It is, nevertheless, decidedly adventure-time: a time of exceptional and unusual

---

[8] See Part Two of his Autobiography, in «Continuation of the Account of My Life. Begun at Passy, 1784.» (Baym et. al., pp. 284-289) for a broader understanding of this.

[9] The story of Lucius is one of the few ancient novels that have "survived in its entirety", as Bakhtin puts it (Bakhtin, 111). Its original date has been widely debated, but there is general agreement that it dates from the late second century (http://www.jstor.org/stable/293616?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents). The lines Bakhtin quotes in this essay are from: Apuleius, *The Golden Ass*, tr. William Adlington and ed. Harry C. Schnurr (New York: Collier, 1962). Adlington's first translation of the story was published in 1566 (http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1666/1666-h/1666-h.htm)

> events, events determined by chance, which, moreover, manifest themselves in fortuitous encounters (temporal junctures) and fortuitous nonencounters (temporal disjunctions). (116)

Reading *Gatsby* in relation to Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope in *the adventure novel of everyday life,* one might argue that James Gatz, when he changes his name and leaves his family, undergoes a form of metamorphosis and becomes "other than what he was". (Bakhtin 115) The characters in question all undergo some form of transformation, although in varying degree. With regard to James Gatz and the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* his metamorphosis is the construction of the identity of Jay Gatsby. What little is revealed about Gatz' family is that "[h]is parents were shiftless and unsuccessful farm people – his imagination had never really accepted them as his parents at all." (Fitzgerald 78) When James Gatz decides to change his name to Jay Gatsby, he clearly distances himself from his family and from the background he is not able to accept as his own. However, as the two names are still similar to some degree, the change is not complete. There are traces of "James Gatz" present in the name "Jay Gatsby", indicating that James Gatz is never as far away as Gatsby wishes for him to be, as will be evident when we later will return to his social downfall.

One specific moment allows for the transformation of James Gatz into Jay Gatsby: "James Gatz – that was really, or at least legally, his name. He had changed it at the age of seventeen and at the specific moment that witnessed the beginning of his career – when he saw Dan Cody's yacht drop anchor over the most insidious flat on Lake Superior." (Fitzgerald 78). We recall that time in the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* is "a time of exceptional and unusual events, events determined by chance, which, moreover, manifest themselves in fortuitous encounters (…)" (Bakhtin 116). Dan Cody *suddenly* appearing on Lake Superior is one such fortuitous encounter, and an encounter that changes James Gatz' life. In the story of Lucius' transformation into an ass, Lucius himself is an active agent in his attempts at reversing this transformation, and Gatz is also an active agent in the encounter with Cody (Bakhtin 116). The interplay between *chance* and personal initiative consequently determines the fate of the character in Apuleius' story, as well as in the story of Jay Gatsby. Bakhtin states that "*guilt, moral weakness* [and] *error"* function as "initiating forces" in the story of Lucius, and I argue that they do so in the story of Jay Gatsby as well (Bakhtin 117). This is found in the aforementioned schedule, which shows not only that James Gatz is ambitious, but also that he seemingly feels *guilt* towards what he regards as his own *moral weaknesses* – his "wasting time", "smokeing [and] chewing", among others - and that he by way of the schedule, tries to correct both this and his *errors* – evident from his resolution to improve his diction and posture, and to improve his mind through studying and reading[10].

His brief college attendance is an attempt at correcting these errors, but as this fails, Gatz "was still searching for something to do on the day that Dan Cody's yacht dropped anchor in the shallows alongshore." (Fitzgerald 79). Gatz, eager to start his life over, does not hesitate to take the chance when it presents itself in the shape of Dan Cody's yacht:

> It was James Gatz who had been loafing along the beach that afternoon in a torn green jersey and a pair of canvas pants, but it was already Jay Gatsby who borrowed a rowboat, pulled out to the *Tuolomee*[11], and informed Cody that a wind might catch him and break him up in half an hour. (Fitzgerald 78)

At this point Gatz is still trying to correct his "errors" and to find a way out of his present life. In much the same way as Lucius, Gatz "attracts the power of chance to himself" (Bakhtin 117). by way of his determination to move forward. Thus, "[t]he initial link of the adventure sequence is (…) determined not by chance, but by the hero himself and by the nature of his personality." (Ibid.). Dan Cody functions here as a mere catalyst, allowing Gatz to reinvent himself as Gatsby, whereas “the primary initiative (…) belongs to the hero himself and to his own personality”, that is, to Gatz himself, evident in his eager approach towards Cody (Bakhtin 116).

---

[10] The italicisation of words follows Bakhtin's italicization of these same words in Apuleius' story.

[11] The name of Cody's yacht.

This moment is the critical turning point in Gatsby’s metamorphosis. However, the change is not completed here, and as we will see it never really is. For the five following years Gatsby works for Cody on his yacht as they travel around the world, and under Cody’s guidance the metamorphosis is somewhat still in process. Deceived of the monetary inheritance Cody leaves him when he dies, Gatsby is “left with his singularly appropriate education; the vague contour of Jay Gatsby had filled out to the substantiality of a man.” (Fitzgerald 81). Under his education with Cody he has arguably further practiced “elocution, poise, and how to attain it” (Fitzgerald 137), and in combination with the knowledge attained while sailing around the world he now appears a man of wealth and stature, despite the fact that he is left with nothing.

Following this, Gatsby is enrolled in the army. Here, the anonymity of his uniform is what allows for him to get in touch with Daisy, as she is what he describes as a “nice girl” (Fitzgerald 118). He is however aware that the differences between them are too vast at present for him to hope for a future with her: “However glorious might be his future as Jay Gatsby, he was a present a penniless young man without a past, and at any moment the invisible cloak of his uniform might slip from his shoulders.” (Fitzgerald 118). Only on the surface, then, has he become the man he is aspiring to be. When the war sends Gatsby overseas it creates a distance between him and Daisy that allows for the image of the reinvented Gatsby to last.

Meeting Daisy is the single most significant encounter in Gatsby’s life, and this is where the chronotope of the *threshold* is significant to our discussion. This chronotope is “highly charged with emotion and value”, and is further a chronotope that “can be combined with the motif of encounter, but its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in a life” (Bakhtin 248). The moment he meets Daisy is to Gatsby a moment of threshold, the encounter being of such importance that it does signify a *break* in his life. The war is of major importance here, as it is what enables the moment of the *threshold.* As argued above, it is Gatsby's uniform that makes it possible for him to approach Daisy, as its anonymity allows for him to reinvent himself as someone in a position to provide for her. However, Gatsby cannot return from the war as the same "penniless young man without a past" (Fitzgerald, 118) who left, and he consequently spends the subsequent years of his life trying to pursue social status and wealth, in order to return to Daisy as the man she believes him to be. During the war, then, Gatsby makes his way up the ranks of the military system, in turn leading to his brief attendance at Oxford, before he returns to America as a Major and an Oxford man.

Bakhtin notes that "[t]he word "threshold" (…) is connected with the breaking point of a life, the moment of crisis, the decision that changes a life (or the indecisiveness that fails to change a life, the fear to step over the threshold" (Bakhtin 248). It follows, he continues, that "time is essentially instantaneous; it is as if it has no duration and falls out of the normal course of biographical time." (Ibid.). His time with Daisy remains a rupture in Gatsby's life, and as we will see, his belief that his position in society will be secured through Daisy results in his own "indecisiveness that fails to change [his] life, the fear to step over the threshold" (Ibid.) To Gatsby, time is locked in his time spent with Daisy, which makes possible the idea that this time still exists and is possible to return to.

The notion that a character might be locked in a specific moment of the past is addressed also in Sartre's essay "Time in Faulkner: *The Sound and the Fury",* where Sartre exemplifies the way Faulkner's characters regard time by way of an anecdote: "I have been told of an old school principal whose memory had stopped like a broken watch; it remained forever fixed at his fortieth year. (…) Thus he interpreted his present by means of this fixed past (…)." (Sartre, 228) Like the principal, Gatsby is also living in the present "by means of this fixed past". This is evident from the way he attempts to re-create his past with Daisy. His life becomes dedicated to the pursuit of this mission, and his belief that this is possible is beyond any doubt: “He wanted nothing less from Daisy than that she should go to Tom and say: ‘I never loved you.’ After she had obliterated four years with that sentence (…) they were to go back to Louisville and be married from her house – just as if it were five years ago.” (Fitzgerald 88). That this is the way Gatsby regards time is apparent from his frenzied response to Nick’s remark that the past cannot be repeated: “‘Can’t repeat the past?’ he cried incredulously. “Why of course you can!’ (Fitzgerald 88). This statement also makes clear Gatsby’s aforementioned indecisiveness to cross the threshold and change his own life.

The reader will recall that chronotopes can be mutually inclusive and co-exist (Bakhtin 252), and in *Gatsby,* the chronotope of *threshold* and the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* must be seen in relation to one another. As will be made clear from the following analysis, the chronotope of the *threshold* impacts and disrupts the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* in this novel. This is evident from the way Gatsby’s metamorphosis – his attempt at creating himself anew – is interrupted the moment he meets Daisy. Not until he lets go of his past with Daisy completely, is the realization of the self-made man Jay Gatsby achievable.

The character of Jay Gatsby shares several similarities with what Bakhtin terms the *parvenu* or *adventurer* found in the *adventure novel of everyday life.* In Apuleius’ story the main function of this character, represented by Lucius the ass, is to spy and eavesdrop on private life[12] (Bakhtin 124). Here, it is precisely his metamorphosis into an ass, which results in his ability to move through life unnoticed and as a “third person”, that allows for Lucius’ spying and eavesdropping (Ibid.). Clearly, Gatsby is not a “third person” in this novel, but there are other aspects of the adventurer and the parvenu that are germane:

---

[12] Bakhtin here refers to «when the private and individual life entered literature (in the Hellenistic era)», which was in contrast to the «classical ancient literature, which was a literature of public life and public men» (Bakhtin, 123) He further comments that «[t]he quintessentially private life that entered the novel at this time was, by its very nature and as opposed to public life, *closed.*» (Ibid.) Therefore arose the «third person» character whose function was to spy and eavesdrop on this private life.

> The role of the adventurer and parvenu is the role of one who has not yet found a definite or fixed place in life, but who seeks personal success – building a career, accumulating wealth, winning glory (always out of personal interest, ‘for himself’) (Bakhtin 125-126)

Evident from the foregoing discussion, Gatsby is seeking personal success. Having met Daisy, but not being in a position to marry and provide for her, she becomes another encouragement for him to “accumulate wealth”. However, turning this around one might also argue that Gatsby’s intentions with Daisy are somewhat fraudulent: Bakhtin also describes the *adventurer* or *parvenu* as a character that “can climb upward (usually via the courtesan route) and thus reach the high peaks of private life (…)” (Bakhtin 126). I will suggest that Gatsby adheres to this characterization, and that Daisy can be seen as a courtesan, who will function as a stepping stone for him to enter the higher ranks of society. This view is further enhanced by the fact that Gatsby eventually “took Daisy one still October night, took her because he had no real right to touch her hand.” (Fitzgerald 118). The use of the word “took” may support the view that Gatsby does this “out of personal interest, “for himself”” (Bakhtin 126), in that it does not signify Daisy’s wish to be “taken”. In turn, this leads us to the question of how Gatsby regards Daisy, which I will return to presently.

Gatsby’s dubious business with Meyer Wolfshiem is of importance to Gatsby’s upward mobility after he returns from the war, but because it is illegal[13] it does not assure him his position in society. However, the income from this business is what enables Gatsby to recommence his relationship with Daisy, with the hope of marrying her. This marriage would in turn secure him the position he strives for, and thus Daisy becomes an encouragement for Gatsby to “accumulate wealth”, like the parvenu. That Gatsby wants Daisy not out of love but for status is further illustrated in Gatsby’s observation that “[h]er voice is full of money,” (Fitzgerald 96). Nick makes a remark about Daisy earlier in the novel, that “there was an excitement in her voice that men who had cared for her found difficult to forget (…) (Fitzgerald 11) With Gatsby’s remark it becomes clear to Nick as well that it is precisely money her voice rings of: “that was the inexhaustible charm that rose and fell in it, the jingle of it, the cymbals’ song of it (…) High in a white palace the king’s daughter, the golden girl (…)” (Fitzgerald 96). We consequently see that Gatsby is not attracted not to Daisy per se, but to what she represents: a social position securely anchored in her hereditary wealth and family traditions.

---

[13] Although it is never confirmed in the novel, it is heavily implied that Gatsby is a bootlegger.

Bakhtin further notes that an *adventurer* or *parvenu* who fails to make his way upward can “suffer a reversal on the road or can remain to the very end a lowly adventurer (an adventurer of the slum world)” (Bakhtin 126). Interestingly, when Tom Buchanan confronts Gatsby with his insidious business with Meyer Wolfshiem, it is made clear that Gatsby is not as honest and decent a man as he gives the impression of. Gatsby strengthens this notion as he frantically disputes Tom: “he began talking excitedly to Daisy, denying everything, defending himself against accusations that had not been made. But with every word she was drawing further and further into herself (…)” (Fitzgerald 107). Daisy distances herself from Gatsby right at this moment: “‘*Please*, Tom! I can’t stand this anymore.’ Her frightened eyes told that whatever intentions, whatever courage she had had, were definitely gone.” (Ibid.). Her begging evidently tells of her return to Tom, while the image of her frightened eyes makes clear how she draws away from Gatsby. As a consequence of being exposed, Gatsby’s reversal is set in motion. Tom’s next insistence is not only a suggestion to return from the city to their respective residences in East and West Egg. Rather, “home” here refers to where they originate from and thus where they really belong. Tom, having established that Gatsby is not from the same social strata as himself and Daisy, renders impossible the continuation of their affair:

> ‘You two start on home, Daisy,’ said Tom. ‘in Mr. Gatsby’s car.’ (…) ‘I think he realizes that this presumptuous little flirtation is over.’
>
> They were gone, without a word, snapped out, made accidental, isolated, like ghosts, even from our pity. (Indentation in original, Fitzgerald 107)

This last observation indicates that Gatsby and Daisy are not only gone from the room, but their relationship is also ended. The word “ghosts” indicates that their relationship was perhaps never real, it was only a faint shadow of what once was. Gatsby’s conviction that “of course you can repeat the past!” (Fitzgerald 88) is proven a failed mission, and what remains is only Gatsby’s “dead dream” of a prosperous future, anchored in the dream of a relationship with Daisy (Fitzgerald 107). As the contours of the reality of Gatsby’s past are slowly surfacing, the “ghost” that makes its presence is the ghost of James Gatz. However, this “ghost” was never truly absent, as the name of James Gatz was always lurking in the shadows of the other name, like an ever-present echo from his past. Arguably, Gatsby’s metamorphosis is reversed before it is even completed, and he “remain[s] to the very end a lowly adventurer (an adventurer of the slum world).” (Bakhtin 126).

So far we have seen how the character of Jay Gatsby can be read as an adventurer or parvenu, except that he cannot be seen as a “third person” whose main function is to spy and eavesdrop on private life (Bakhtin 124). The character of George Wilson, on the other hand, *can* be read as such a “third person”. Bakhtin brings forth “the complex, synthesizing novel of the great French realists Stendhal and Balzac” (Bakhtin 126) where he states that in addition to the adventurer and the parvenu “[a]ll kinds of other “third person” representatives of private life (…) live and move in the background of their novels” (Bakhtin 127). Further, he points to "classic English realism (…) [where] such characters play secondary roles" (Ibid.). Wilson's character does play a secondary role, as the simple-minded mechanic who does not realize his wife is cheating on him with his regular customer. Not until Gatsby's past has been disclosed and the reversal of his metamorphosis is impelled, does Wilson's character become more prominent, a shift that signifies the increasing resemblance between the two characters. The reversal of Gatsby's metamorphosis is a "reversal on the road" to "the high peaks of private life" (Bakhtin 126), and his reversal to the "slum world" (Ibid.) is completed as Wilson takes both Gatsby's and his own life.

The two of them die together, physically removed from the other characters, epitomizing their belonging together in "[a] new world, material without being real, where poor ghosts, breathing dreams like air, drifted fortuitously about (…)" (Fitzgerald 128). That the word "ghosts" is repeated here underlines the image of the ghost of James Gatz' return, as seen above. The last affirmation of Gatsby's social downfall is demonstrated by the almost complete lack of friends and acquaintances attending his funeral (with the exception of his father, Nick, and six or seven others). Gatsby has become what Tom Buchanan refers to as "Mr. Nobody from Nowhere" to the society he so desired to be a part of (Fitzgerald 103).

Gatsby's participation in this same society might, however strong his desire to belong in it, be questioned in other ways too. Prior to his downfall, his name is on everyone's lips, partly due to his outstanding accomplishments during the war, as we have seen, and his acceptance and kinship to the higher ranks of society is demonstrated through the popularity of his extravagant and grandiose parties. However, few of his guests know Gatsby personally, and he does not make any greater efforts to change this. Again, Bakhtin's theory opens up to an intriguing reading of the character. On the *adventure novel of everyday life,* he asserts the following:

> The main protagonist and the major turning points of his life are to be found *outside everyday life*. He merely observes this life, meddles in it now and then as an alien force; he occasionally even dons a common and everyday mask – but in essence he does not participate in this life and is not determined by it (Bakhtin 120-121)

That Gatsby does not participate in life and in his own present is apparent from the way he is physically removed from the people around him: "[N]o one swooned backward on Gatsby, and no French bob touched Gatsby's shoulder, and no singing quartets were formed with Gatsby's head for one link." (Fitzgerald 42). To some degree, this can be seen in relation to Bakhtin's "third person," in that it is his constructed identity, i.e. the result of his metamorphosis that creates the physical distance between Gatsby and his guests. In Apuleius' story it is this metamorphosis into an ass that creates the distance between Lucius and the people around him, because, like with Gatsby, they no longer see him as who he really is. Bakhtin says the following of the *philosophy of the third person in private life*:

> This is the philosophy of a person who knows only private life and craves it alone, but who does not participate in it, who has no place in it – and therefore sees it in sharp focus, as a whole, in all its nakedness, playing out all its roles but not fusing his identity with any one of them. (Bakhtin 126)

That Gatsby is not participating or fusing his identity with any of his guests is evident from Nick's observations of him on one of the many parties: "[M]y eyes fell on Gatsby, standing alone on the marble steps and looking from one group to another with approving eyes." (Fitzgerald 41). The image of Gatsby standing on marble in this scene creates an image of him as a statue, a cold and passive observer who sees his surroundings in "sharp focus", where his guests are "playing out all [their] roles", but he himself does not "fuse his identity with any of them", to put it in Bakhtin's words. Further, Gatsby's physical distance from the others underlines his non-belonging in this crowd. His efforts to belong, demonstrated in the materialistic extravaganza, so absorbs him that it in reality further distances him from the others. This suggests that Gatsby is unable to separate material and personal happiness, which can further be related to his inability to see Daisy as anything other than what she represents.

The only exceptions to this seems to be Jordan Baker and Nick Carraway. However, they are both close friends of Daisy, and Gatsby befriending them is in no way accidental. As he remains in the moment of *threshold,* his parties are held only with the hope of Daisy showing up, which in turn is a step closer to recovering his past with her: "He talked a lot about the past, and I gathered that he wanted to recover something, some idea of himself perhaps, that had gone into loving Daisy." (Fitzgerald 88). This is the idea of himself as someone who belongs in Daisy's world, a "nice" man with a position, as opposed to the destitute James Gatz of North Dakota (Fitzgerald 78). If succeeded, this in turn would lead to the completion of Gatsby's metamorphosis, securing his position as the parvenu that has "reach[ed] the high peaks of private life". (Bakhtin 126).

However, as seen above, Daisy does not take him back. When Gatsby loses Daisy he loses his place, that is, his position in society. Relating this again to the story of Lucius the Ass, we see that there are similarities also here. In this story "Lucius performs not as Lucius but as an ass. At the end of the novel he casts off the appearance of an ass and in a triumphant ceremony re-enters the highest, most privileged spheres of life (…)" (Bakhtin 121). In Gatsby's case, appearances are also cast off at the end, but *he* re-enters the "slum world". Here, the chronotope of the *threshold* disrupts the metamorphosis of the *adventure novel of everyday life*, and thus makes impossible its completion.

Returning to Franklin and the archetype of the self-made man, this, the moment of threshold, is the point in the novel where the project of self-realization fails, as Gatsby relies not on himself, but on Daisy to secure him his position. Only if Gatsby liberates himself from the moment of the *threshold* can the process of *self*-improvement continue, and the realization of the self-made man be attained. Ultimately, then, in this novel, the chronotope of the *threshold* presides over *metamorphosis*, resulting in the demise of the name and the person of Jay Gatsby.

Defining the distinctive features of the *adventure novel of everyday life*, Bakhtin states that "[t]he most characteristic thing about this novel is the way it fuses the course of an individual's life (at its major turning points) with his actual spatial course or road - that is, with his wanderings. Thus is realized the metaphor 'the path of life'" (Bakhtin 120). Through the foregoing discussion we have seen how James Gatz started out as a young and ambitious man seeking a way out of the life that he was born into and that he came to resent. Seen through the lens of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* I argue that his determination to move forward and, most notably, *upward* in society, works in combination with a series of chance incidents and ultimately leads to his encounter with Daisy. This encounter represents the chronotope, or the moment, of *threshold* in this novel, which, as we have seen, Gatsby is unable to cross, thus disrupting the process of metamorphosis found in the *adventure novel of everyday life*. Ultimately, Gatsby's indecisiveness to step over the threshold results not only in the stagnation of the process of metamorphosis, but also in a complete reversal of it.

As a final comment, it is worth observing that the path of life Bakhtin refers to in the *adventure novel of everyday life* "extends through a familiar, native territory, in which there is nothing exotic, alien or strange." (Bakhtin 120). I will return to the image of territory in the next chapter on the chronotope of the *pastoral,* where the suburban setting represents this territory. Before doing so, however, I will look at how the chronotopes of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the *threshold* also orchestrate the narratives of the characters Tom Rath and Donald Draper. As the following discussion will make evident, these chronotopes make themselves valid in a slightly different manner in the story of Tom Rath, where the metamorphosis in particular will take on a different shape than what we have seen in the foregoing.

1.3. Tom Rath and the Past

> "Only masochists can get along without editing their own memories." (Wilson 13)

In *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* Sloan Wilson presents the character Thomas Rath and his wife, Betsy, who live in the suburb of Westport with their three children. They live a peaceful, albeit not very happy life, with Tom commuting daily to his office job in New York and Betsy staying home as a housewife. Through Tom's flashbacks, the reader learns that he was a paratrooper in Europe and the Pacific Ocean for more than four years during the Second World War. During his stay in France, he meets Maria, with whom he falls in love and lives with for seven weeks. Maria gets pregnant, and gives birth to their child after Tom's departure from France. However, they do not stay in touch, and when his time in the service is over Tom returns to the United States and Betsy.

On the initial page of *Flannel Suit*, Tom shares the memory of a domestic fight over money with Betsy, which immediately reveals to the reader that memories to a great degree impact the character of Tom.

It is through these memories or flashbacks that we get most of the information about Tom's past; his childhood in South Bay, how he and Betsy met, his time in the war, and what his and Betsy's life has been like after his return from the war and up until we meet them in 1953, at the outset of the novel. This opening, which in itself is a flashback, makes evident that the narration of this novel centers precisely on Tom's flashbacks and memories:

> After struggling for months to pay up the back bills, Tom came home one night to find that Betsy had bought a cut-glass vase for forty dollars (…) Tom was tired and worried because he himself had just spent seventy dollars on a new suit he felt he needed to dress

> properly for his business, and at the climax of the heated argument, he picked up the vase and heaved it against the wall. The heavy glass shattered, the plaster cracked, and two of the laths behind it broke. (Wilson 1)

This scene will be looked at in greater detail in the following chapter on the pastoral, but I mention it here to exemplify the omnipresence of memories throughout the novel, from the very beginning to the very end, and further to demonstrate the detailed recollections of these memories.

The importance of *time* itself in Wilson's novel is evident not only from the narrative and the representations of time and space, but also from how the characters explicitly contemplate on it and how precious it is. When looking back at the war, it is clear that time was a matter of great concern to him and to his fellow soldiers. An example of this is the night when Tom and his company are given the message that they have one week off in France before their next mission in the Pacific: "I have a week, he had thought, seven days and seven nights, the amount of time the world had been created in" (Wilson 79). This is the night he meets Maria, and in the course of the following week the two of them create a world that is their own. This is a world removed in both time and space from everything they know; from Betsy, from Tom's comrades, and from war:

> He had lived with Maria for a week, shunning everyone he knew, and in that week he and Maria had built a small, temporary world for themselves, full of delights and confidences, a completely self-sufficient world, packed with private jokes, and memories, a whole lifetime with silver and golden anniversaries, Christmases and birthdays, fifty years compressed into a week (Wilson 81)

The company's stay in France is prolonged, and Tom and Maria live together for forty-nine days before he has to leave. Tom thus lives a life completely detached from his life in America with Betsy in these seven weeks. Seen in connection with the chronotope found in the *adventure novel of everyday life*, arguably, this is Tom's metamorphosis. However, the metamorphosis in *Flannel Suit* is of a different kind than in *The Great Gatsby,* where the name change marks the start of the metamorphosis. In *Flannel Suit,* Tom's metamorphosis is not marked by such a name change, but solely by the decidedly different time-space continuum during his time in the war. Thus, when he returns, his life with Betsy can continue, at least on the surface, the way it did before he left. However, we will see that the chronotope of the *threshold* interrupts the continuation of this carefree life.

Tom is haunted by his past in the war, and in particular by his time with Maria, evident from the memories that keep resurfacing in his everyday life. John Fritz, in his essay "Pete, Peggy, Don, and the Dialectic of Remembering and Forgetting" points out (in relation to Don Draper) that "[a] circumstance, an object, or a line delivered by another character seems necessary to force Don to reactivate his past." (Fritz 64). In *Flannel Suit,* the character of Caesar Gardella forces Tom to reactivate *his* past. Gardella was a fellow soldier during the war, who by chance turns out to be working as an elevator operator in the building where Tom works. Gardella is the only person in Tom's present life in America who knows about Maria, and his presence turns out to be of both great concern and great relief to Tom: Initially, Tom worries that Gardella will blackmail him. However, Tom soon realizes that Gardella's only concern is for Maria and the baby. Gardella helps Tom get in touch with the two, which is a key factor in order for Tom to come to terms with his past.

One might argue that in relation to the character of Tom Rath "[m]etamorphosis has become a vehicle for conceptualizing and portraying personal, individual fate, a fate cut off from both the cosmic and the historical whole" (Bakhtin 114), rather than a metamorphosis where Tom Rath is no longer Tom Rath. This is evident in that his metamorphosis takes the shape of a markedly different time-space continuum rather than a physical metamorphosis that changes Tom's appearance, name, and character. As we have seen, this is in contrast to the metamorphosis of James Gatz/Jay Gatsby, where there arguably are two identities present. Tom and Maria's world is "cut off from both the cosmic and historical whole", a world in which "[t]ime breaks down into isolated, self-sufficient temporal segments" (Ibid.). In this sense, metamorphosis is not so much of a personal manner, as in a transformation of Tom himself, but of a temporal and spatial manner. Time changes, and seven weeks of living a somewhat ordinary life in peace in the midst of a six years long war seems like a lifetime in itself: "During those forty-nine last days, they had grown old together, patient of each other's weaknesses, and they had acquired old family friends, men in bars who nodded to them and recognized them as a couple who belonged together (…)." (Wilson 82). Not knowing how many days they have left together, Tom and Maria see *time* as the most precious thing they have:

> still fourteen more hours, eight hundred and forty more revolutions of the sweep hand before he had to check in. He had stretched out on the soft bed, full of an incredible sense of luxury, thinking of the minutes ahead as a king might think of his empire. (Wilson, 181)

What is clear from this excerpt, and other representations of time in *Flannel Suit,* is the way it is made visible through its presence in language. In Bakhtin's closing remarks on the significance of literary chronotopes, he comments that "[w]e cannot help but be strongly impressed by the *representational* importance of the chronotope. Time becomes, in effect, palpable and visible; the chronotope makes narrative events concrete, makes them take on flesh, causes blood to flow in their veins" (Bakhtin 250). The depiction of Tom's watch functions as an embodiment of time in this sense, and its ticking makes visible the unyielding passing of it. Aware of hers and Tom's limited time together, and aware of their incapability to take control over it, Maria resents the watch: "'Take it off,' she had said. 'I hate to hear it ticking (…) Tick tock!' she had said derisively. 'Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick! I would like to break it!'" (Wilson 239).

One might also read this in connection with Sartre's reading of Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury,* where Sartre sees *time* as separate from *chronology*: "Dates and clocks were invented by man (…) To reach real time, we must abandon these devices, which measure nothing: 'time is dead as long as it is being clicked off by little wheels; only when the clock stops does time come to life'" (Sartre 226). Arguably, then, as Maria and Tom remove *chronology* and arrest time - represented by the removal of the watch - *time* is brought to life and set in motion as a separate phenomenon. This in turn allows them to live a life where "fifty years [are] compressed into a week" and where the forty-nine days hold the time for a life in which they can grow old together (Wilson 82). Sartre argues that the reader of Faulkner is forced "to see time without the aid of clocks", symbolized by the character's literal breaking of the watch in Faulkner's novel (226). Similarly, the literal removal of visible time, represented in *Flannel Suit* by the watch, enables Tom and Maria to preserve and make the most of the time they have been given.

Sartre's understanding of time shares similarities with Bakhtin's chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life.* Where Sartre sees time as something separated from chronology, with the ability to become *real time,* or to come to life, Bakhtin similarly talks of time as being *substantial,* with the result that "[s]pace becomes more concrete and saturated" (Bakhtin 120). When Tom and Maria's conception of time changes, so then does their conception of *space.* Over the course of the weeks they spend together they create an isolated space which is their own, and which can be seen as filled with what Bakhtin calls "real, living meaning, [which] forms a crucial relationship with the hero and his fate" (120). The image of a space with "real, living meaning" (Ibid.) is in stark contrast to the myriad, meaningless deaths of war that take place around them. Additionally, the child that is conceived in this time and space might be regarded as an embodiment of what is real and living, and of that which “forms a crucial relationship with the hero and his fate” (Ibid.). This is powerfully reflected in the way the child re-enters Tom’s life later, which leads to Tom’s decision to cross the moment of threshold, as we will return to.

The way time figures in the relationship between Tom and Maria differs greatly from how it is thought of in Toms’ post-war life with Betsy. As Tom looks at his past in France in relation to his present in America, it is striking that whereas Tom and Maria were living for the moment, Tom and Betsy are living for the future. Their actions in the present are performed solely for the purposes of a better future, by getting a better job, more money, a bigger house, a better car, in sum: what they believe they need to be happy. This is also apparent to Tom himself, as he reflects “[t]hat had been the trouble with him and Betsy: what with his brooding about the past and worrying about the future, there never had been any present at all” (Wilson 175). However, the Rath’s increasingly hectic everyday-life, brought about by Tom’s new job, their move to South Bay, and their housing project, soon makes them regard present time in a different manner.

The watch stays with Tom, and in his post-war life with Betsy the way he thinks of its ticking indicates to the reader how he feels towards what is happening in his life. When he applies for the job at The United Broadcasting Corporation the watch is referred to as his good-luck charm, and a familiar and reassuring object in an unfamiliar place (Wilson 13). Faced with the seemingly never-ending hours of work that come with his new job, Tom finds himself “wishing time away”: “Suddenly he wished for the day to be over (…) The big sweep hand on his wrist watch seemed to crawl with maddening slowness.” (Wilson 238). He realizes that he is not happy with his current situation in life where work, in addition to his and Betsy’s housing project, seems to be taking up all time and energy, leaving no time for actually living the happy life they had expected to be living after the war: “There must be something drastically wrong when a man starts wishing time away. Time was given us like jewels to spend, and it's the ultimate sacrilege to wish it away." (Wilson 238-239). Toward the end of the novel, Tom and Betsy start realising that their ambitions for the future stand in the way of living happily in the present:

> He glanced at his watch. 'It's almost midnight,' he said. 'We better get to bed – I'll have to leave here at eight in the morning to make that plane.' 'Eight hours,' she said. 'We've got eight hours – that's still quite a lot of time.' He glanced at her, startled. She smiled hesitantly at him. It was true: time had become precious again. (Wilson 248)

This passage makes evident their awareness of how their ambitions for a better life, as aforementioned represented by Tom's new job, their move to South Bay, and the housing project, in reality leaves them bereft of a time and space that is "filled with real, living meaning" (Bakhtin, 120).

As mentioned, Tom's flashbacks are typically triggered by some external circumstance, which results in the resurfacing of the memories he tries to suppress. When this happens, however, Tom allows himself to reflect over them: "I can think about it now (…) I can finally see what happened, and it's absurd to be ashamed" (Wilson 77). He *is* ashamed, however, evident from his struggle to tell Betsy about his relationship with Maria, and because he consequently convinces himself of the importance of forgetting:

> Between peace and war a clear line must be drawn. The past is something best forgotten; only in theory is it the father of the present. In practice, it is only a wildly unrelated dream, a chamber of horrors. And most of the time the present is unrelated to the future. It is a disconnected world, or it is better to believe it that way if you can (…) (Wilson 97)

From this, it is evident that Tom sees forgetting one’s past as a sign of strength, and that he regards it a necessity in order to move forward.

Tom’s past life with Maria and his experiences from the war affect his present life to such a degree that it changes the conception of who he is, both to himself and to the reader. I will suggest that the war – in its totality as an experience to Tom, consisting both of his time with Maria and his time in combat with the brutal cruelties he both witnesses and partakes in – *is* Tom’s moment of *threshold.* Bakhtin says of this chronotope that “its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in a life” (Bakhtin 248). The war literally is such a *break* to Tom, a break that physically and mentally removes him from the peaceful and happy life he is living with Betsy, and places him in the midst of a raging battle. This argument can be supported when relating the foregoing analysis of Tom and Maria’s conception of time during the war to Bakhtin’s further definition of the chronotope of *the threshold.* Here he states that “[i]n this chronotope, time is essentially instantaneous; it is as if it has no duration and falls out of the normal course of biographical time” (Bakhtin 248). Recalling our discussion of Tom and Maria’s time together seen through Sartre, it is striking how the arrestation of chronology (the removal of the watch) that brings time to life, can be seen precisely as the instantaneous time that “falls out of the normal course of biographical time” (Ibid.) which Bakhtin refers to here. In turn, this allows us to read this time-space continuum as Tom’s moment of threshold.

However, despite the fact that Tom’s time during the war “falls out of the normal course of biographical time” (Ibid.), it does not mean that it is wholly separated and removed from Tom’s present life. This is apparent in the way that memories from his past keep resurfacing in his present. As with Gatsby, the moment of threshold remains a moment that *disrupts* the present, and obstructs the progression of it, the moving forward of the present into the future. It seems that Tom is of the conviction that not until he has let Betsy know the truth about his time in the war are they able to move forward.

As we saw in the foregoing, Tom's metamorphosis is rooted in a spatial and temporal manner, represented by the "small, temporary world [he and Maria built] for themselves" (Wilson 81), rather than of a personal manner where Tom's appearance, name, and character is transformed. Differently from *Gatsby*, it is this metamorphosis, the changing of time and space, which allows for the chronotope of the adventure novel of everyday life to be set in motion. Thus, the time-space continuum that is constructed during the war is Tom's moment of threshold. This is evident from the way this time-space continuum "leaves a deep and irradicable mark on the man himself as well as on his entire life." (Bakhtin 116). The chronotope of the *threshold,* represented by the war as a whole, arguably contains the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* represented by the transformation of time and space, in this novel. Moreover, Tom's frequent flashbacks to the time-space continuum of the war makes evident his inability to cross the threshold.

Bakhtin states with reference to the *adventure novel of everyday life,* that "[t]he series of adventures that the hero undergoes does not result in a simple affirmation of his identity, but rather in the construction of a new image of the hero, a man who is now purified and reborn." (Bakhtin 117). If, as argued above, Tom's metamorphosis takes place during the war, then it arguably also results in "the construction of a new image of the hero". However, this image is primarily not regarded a positive one, as this is the image of an adulterous man who has an illegitimate child with his French lover during the war, and who returns to his wife, on the surface without remorse, either towards his wife, his lover, or his fatherless child. In other words, this is not an image of "a man who is now purified and reborn", as Bakhtin puts it, but rather, quite the contrary. However, the image of this character is again reconstructed, and Tom is purified as he ultimately reveals his past to Betsy, evoking Catholic traditions of confession of sins and subsequent absolution. Betsy's comment that "I feel as though we almost died and have just been rescued" (Wilson 273), adds to the notion of rebirth, a theme that will be central to our discussion of *Mad Men* and the pastoral in the coming chapter.

By way of his confession, Tom confronts his past and comes to terms with it. In doing so, he affirms the crossing of the threshold. Consequently, he gains control over the metamorphosis that the chronotope of the *threshold* contains. One might argue that until Tom steps over the threshold, there is a part of him that still exists in this moment. Betsy's remark that "I realized for the first time what you went through in the war, and what *different worlds* we've been living in ever since" (Wilson 271, emphasis added), arguably supports this view and suggests that Tom's inability to forget the past engenders fractions of absence in his present. However, as Tom reveals his past he is finally able to be present in his post-war life with Betsy.

As we saw in relation to Gatsby, the reversal of and separation from his metamorphosis and his moment of threshold is what pulls him back into his past as James Gatz and disables him from looking forward and embrace the future. This leads to his social downfall and subsequent death. To Tom, on the other hand, accepting his past and bringing it into his present is what allows him to resume his life and to look forward towards a reinvigorated future with Betsy, seemingly filled with optimism and ambition. Recalling the introduction, there are critics who argue that by telling Betsy about his past consequently enables Tom to leave this past behind. However, the chronotopic reading offers a different perspective on this, which will be returned to in the next chapter. Before turning to this, we will explore how the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the chronotope of the *threshold* can be seen in relation to the character of Donald Draper.

1.4. Donald Draper and the Past

> "I have a life, and it only goes in one direction: Forward."
>
> ("5G", S1.E5, 39:52)

Mad Men's temporal setting stretches from the year 1960 to the early '70s, and follows the life of main protagonist Donald Draper through these years. We meet the successful creative director in the fictional advertising agency Sterling Cooper, situated on Madison Avenue, New York. Don lives in the suburb of Ossining with his wife, Betty, and their three children[14] for the first part of the series. However, Don and Betty are eventually divorced. Following this, Don has several relationships, some more serious than others, but none lasting, and Don is thus alone at the end of the series. Through flashbacks the viewer is made aware that Don's real name is Dick Whitman, and that during the Korean war, Dick stole the deceased Donald Draper's identity by exchanging their dog-tags. This enables him to get away from his destitute life as Dick Whitman and start anew as Donald Draper. He tries to keep this past a secret, but does not always succeed. The only person who knows the truth is Anna Draper, widow of the real Donald Draper, who finds Dick and confronts him with his identity theft shortly after the war. The two remain close friends until Anna dies from cancer, and she is arguably the only person our main protagonist is able to truly connect with, as will be made evident in the following analysis.

Dick Whitman is the son of Archibald Whitman and a 22 years old prostitute, who died giving birth to him. Dick is brought up by Archibald and his wife Abigail on a farm in the Midwest. His childhood is one of poverty and hard work, of meagre means and little love. Archibald dies when Dick is only ten, and Abigail, then pregnant with Dick's half-brother Adam, takes Dick with her to live with her sister and her husband, Mack, in Pennsylvania. Mack makes a living from running a brothel in the house they live in. As Abigail's sister (for reasons unknown to the viewer) is no longer present, Abigail and Mack start a relationship and continue to run the brothel together. These are the surroundings Dick grows up in, and which he is desperate to find a way out of. Seeing this in connection with the foregoing analysis of the character Jay Gatsby, we find that there are aspects of Don's background that share similarities with that of James Gatz: They are both from poor, rural families, and share the desire to both leave their origins behind, and the ambition to make something new and better of themselves. For Gatsby the chance encounter with Dan Cody in combination with his own initiative becomes his way out. Also for Dick does the interplay between chance incidents and personal initiative offer a way out of the life he is born into, which further leads up to the metamorphosis of this character.

---

[14] Don and Betty have two kids, Sally and Bobby, at the outset of the series. The third, Eugene, is born later.

The reader will recall that the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* is characterized by "a time of exceptional and unusual events, events determined by chance, which, moreover, manifest themselves in fortuitous encounters." (Bakhtin, 116). The life of Dick Whitman can be read in light of this, as chance arguably determines his life from the outset. "Out of Town" (S3.E1) portrays the circumstances under which Dick is born:[15] The offspring of a prostitute and her client, Dick's conception was unintended[16], and consequently he is brought to life by accident. When his mother dies in childbirth, the midwife brings him to his father, Archibald, and Abigail. From the flashbacks in this episode it is made clear that Abigail has delivered several children, none of whom survived birth. By chance, then, is Dick conceived, by accident his mother dies, and by chance Abigail and Archibald do not yet have any children of their own, which enables them to take care of him.

---

[15] Of minor importance to this discussion, but worth noting, is that the viewer does not know whether these scenes portray what Don has been told of this circumstance, if it is the way he imagines it to have been like, or if it portrays what really happened.

[16] This is evident in the way it is emphasized that Archibald did not bring "a sheath" and does not have the money to buy one. (S3.E1, 01:41)

At the age of ten, Dick watches his father being kicked by a horse, a brutal and sudden kick that kills him instantaneously. Several coincidences make this possible, much in the same way as the metamorphosis of Lucius into an ass is determined by chance incidents in Apuleius' story. In *Mad Men,* a drunk Archibald loses a saddle on the stable floor, and bends down behind his horse to pick it up. Coincidentally, *at that very night* there is a thunderstorm. *Suddenly*¸ lightning strikes and frightens the horse, who kicks Archibald, *at that moment* bending down behind the horse.[17] In relation to Apuleius' story, Bakhtin states that following Lucius' transformation into an ass, "chance continues to play a major role [in] all subsequent adventures of the ass itself, and of its various masters" (Bakhtin 116). However, Bakhtin is also careful to point out that Lucius, in his attempt to reverse his transformation, becomes a more active agent in his own story (Bakhtin 116-117). Up until this point in his life, chance alone has determined Dick Whitman's path: from his mother to Abigail and Archibald on the farm, and from the farm to the brothel with Abigail and Mack. However, in what can be seen as the "subsequent adventures" (Ibid.) of Dicks life, *chance* is not the sole determining factor. The reader will recall the previous reading of Gatsby as an active agent in his own metamorphosis: the transition from James Gatz to Jay Gatsby. This is true for Dick Whitman as well, as the combination of chance incidents and his own active agency leads up to his moment of threshold, which manifests itself in his transformation into Donald Draper - in other words: *his* metamorphosis.

At the outbreak of the Korean War and the following American intervention in 1950, Dick joins the army and volunteers to go to Korea. Here, he is by mistake the only man stationed to accompany the engineer Donald Draper in building a field hospital. By accident, there is an explosion in their camp, where Donald Draper is killed, his body being burnt to the unrecognizable. Before help arrives, Dick Whitman takes Donald Draper's dog tag and replaces it with his own. When he later wakes up in the hospital, he is rewarded with the Purple Heart medal and sent back to America as Donald Draper. He lets his half-brother and caretakers believe that Dick is no longer alive, and starts a new life for himself.

---

[17] As previously, the italicisation of words follows Bakhtin's italicisation of these same words in his narration of Apuleius's story. (Bakhtin, 116)

In "Nixon vs Kennedy" (S1.E12) Don is forced to remember what happened during the war, and his flashback reveals several aspects of interest to our discussion. One of these aspects is how Don relates to the memories of his past life, a question I will return to subsequently. Before investigating this, I will explore how chance and active agency makes possible Dick's metamorphosis, made visible in the flashback from the war. Through conversation with the real Donald Draper, the viewer learns that Dick Whitman volunteered to go to Korea; clearly a decision taken on his own initiative that will take him away from the life he resents. We further gather that Donald Draper is an engineer, stationed in the camp to build a field hospital. Don expects the arrival of twenty soldiers to accompany him in his work, but due to a misunderstanding, that is, *by accident*, Dick is the only one who arrives. While the two of them are digging fighting positions, they are *suddenly* fired at. The shooting ends, and as Dick lights up a cigarette, his lighter *accidentally* slips out of his trembling hands and falls to the ground. By *chance*, there is gasoline on the ground, which ignites and causes the explosion that costs Donald Draper his life. In other words, Dick kills Don *by accident*. The sequence of chance incidents is what enables Dick to exchange their dog tags - an action that represents the active agency in this moment.

Much in the same manner as Lucius in Apuleius' story, Dick's life is no longer determined by chance alone, but also by his own decisions, as he takes on a more active role in order to change his life. The following description of Lucius' active agency is thus apposite to Dick as well:

> It is not chance but voluptuousness, youthful frivolity and "prurient curiosity" that urged [him] on to that dangerous entanglement with witchcraft. *He himself is guilty.* He undoes

> the game of chance by his own prurience. The *primary initiative,* therefore, belongs to *the hero himself* and to his own *personality.* (Bakhtin 116)

That this applies to Dick is evident from the fact that he decides to go to Korea on his own initiative, and further in that he chooses to take Donald Draper's dog tag and replace it with his own. However, the swapping of identity tags would not have been possible without the instances of chance happenings we have seen. The peculiar instance of *chance* that takes place when Dick accidentally takes Don's life, in combination with Dick's subsequent active agency, is what determines the life of that agent, resulting in his transformation from Dick Whitman to Donald Draper.

This transformation relates to Bakhtin's further account of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* as he argues that a metamorphosis here takes place at the time of a *crisis,* resulting in the *rebirth* of a character. This differs from that of the chronotope of the *threshold* in that it portrays "moments that decide the fate of a man's life and determine its entire disposition" (Bakhtin 115). The crisis of the chronotope of the *threshold* is however "always metaphorical and symbolic, sometimes openly but more often implicitly" (Bakhtin 248), as this is characteristic of the chronotope as a whole. Moreover, whereas the chronotope of the *threshold* is instantaneous, the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* has a different chronology:

> Metamorphosis serves as the basis for a method of portraying the whole of an individual's life in its more important moments of *crisis:* for showing *how an individual becomes other than what he was.* We are offered various sharply differing images of one and the same individual, images that are united in him as **various epochs and stages in the course of his life**. There is no evolution in the strict sense of the word; what we get, rather, is crisis and rebirth. (Bakhtin 115, emphasis in bold added, emphasis in italics in the original)

In *Mad Men*, there is an absolute metamorphosis, and a clear distinction between the pre-war life of Dick Whitman and the post-war life of Donald Draper, witnessed in the name change. This metamorphosis is literally made possible by the explosion, or what can be seen as *the crisis* in Bakhtin's theory. Bakhtin further says of this that "[i]n the crisis-type of portrayal we see only one or two moments that decide the fate of a man's life and determine its entire disposition." (Ibid.). Dick's metamorphosis is one such moment, and this leads us to the chronotope of *threshold* in our discussion of this character. Again, the distinction between the two types of crisis must be kept in mind. Bakhtin introduces the chronotope of the *threshold* in the following manner:

> We will mention one more chronotope, highly charged with emotion and value, the chronotope of *threshold;* (…) its most fundamental instance is as the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in a life. The word "threshold" (…) is connected with the breaking point of a life, the moment of crisis, the decision that changes a life. (Bakhtin 248)

That Dick volunteers to go to Korea can be seen as a breaking point in his life and an action that relates to one of the "epochs and stages in the course of his life" found in the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* (Bakhtin 115). Further, this decision leads up to, i.e. "is connected with" (Ibid.), what must be seen as the definite breaking point or crisis in his life, the moment of threshold; when he decides to take Draper's identity. This decision stays with him throughout his life, and being a moment of major importance, distance in time does not have any impact on its distance in memory. Rather, it is a moment that is ever-present in Don's sub consciousness: "In this chronotope, time is essentially **instantaneous**; it is as if it has no duration and falls out of the normal course of biographical time." (Bakhtin 248, emphasis added). The instantaneous characteristic of this chronotope, that it falls out of normal time, is underlined in the way this moment keeps resurfacing in Don's post-war life, as will be evident from the discussion of the struggle between the identities Dick Whitman/Donald Draper in the next chapter.

Don returns from war as a deserter and guilty of identity theft, and is consequently anxious to keep his past as Dick Whitman secluded from his present and the people in it. Drawing on a Nietzschean line of thought, John Fritz offers a valuable perspective on the way Don relates to his past, by looking at the way he struggles between the wish to forget and the inability to do so completely. In the essay "Pete, Peggy, Don, and the Dialectic of Remembering and Forgetting" Fritz argues that "Don does not simply have a bad memory, but […] he is aware of the value of forgetting. (…) he uses forgetting as a tool to relieve the pressure of the past, which threatens to destroy his present and his future." (Fritz 62). This is reflected in "The New Girl" (S2.E5), when Don visits Peggy at the hospital after giving birth, where she is in denial of the fact that she has been pregnant and has delivered a child. Arguably, Don's advice to Peggy makes visible how he himself separates his past from his present:

> DON. Peggy, listen to me: Get out of here, and move forward. This never happened. It will *shock you* how much it never happened.[18] (40:59)

One might argue that this illustrates how Don considers forgetting and denying the past as the only way to leave it behind. This is also palpable from the way Don reacts and acts when his half-brother, Adam, comes to find him in "5G" (S1.E5)[19]

In this episode, chance again plays an important part. The Sterling Cooper company wins an award, and a picture of Don and Sterling is therefore printed in the paper. Adam sees this, and consequently finds out that his brother is still alive. He tracks him down, and tells him how he found the paper by chance:

---

[18] Fritz also considers this statement, in his discussion of the character Peggy in his essay (60)

[19] To be clear: Adam's visit precedes Peggy's hospital stay, both chronologically and in the series.

> ADAM. I'm a janitor at American Calculator in the Empire State Building, and I found this in someone's trash, I thought I saw a ghost! (15:28)

In other words, *chance* here makes possible and manifests itself in what Adam presumably regards a "fortuitous encounter" (Bakhtin, 116). This scene also makes visible Don's denial of his past life, evident from the way he initially reacts by trying to convince Adam (and arguably also himself) that he does not know who either Adam or Dick are:

> DON. I don't know what you're talking about. (…) I don't even know who you are. (…) I think you've mistaken me for someone else. (14:55-15:38)

However, face to face with his half-brother, Don proves unable to keep up appearances and is thus, as Fritz argues "incapable of truly actualizing the Nietzschean ideal of forgetfulness because the past eventually does find him, again and again" (Fritz 63-64), this time in the shape of Adam.

Don sees no possibility of letting Adam be a part of his life without it simultaneously destroying everything in it: his family life, his work, his stauts, and his freedom. In other words, Don sees no possibility of his past being a part of his present:

> DON. Adam, listen to me: I have a life, and it only goes in one direction: forward. (S1.E.5, 39:52)

Consequently, he offers his half-brother a considerable amount of money, and asks him to forget about him, so that they both can go on with their lives (S1.E5, 41:03) In connection with this scene Fritz argues that how Don relates to memories and forgetting can be read in the light of Friedrich Nietzsche's theory on the topic:

> Nietzsche writes: 'It will be immediately obvious how there could be no happiness, no cheerfulness, no hope, no pride, no present, without forgetfulness.' Don ultimately sides

> with Nietzsche in privileging forgetfulness over memory. He knows that forgetting is essential to the robust expression of vitality and his life. (Fritz 61)

To Don, forgetting has been crucial and necessary in order to move on with his life, and he seems to believe that this is something anyone is capable of if forced to. The chronotopic reading of *Mad Men* makes evident that Don is in fact *not* able to forget the past and move on with his life, an argument I will return to in the next chapter. However, his *faith* in forgetting and moving on is still strong, and thus he tells Adam that “[i]t’s going to be okay” (S1.E5, 42:42). These words might be reassuring to Don, but they do not have the same effect on his brother. Don urges Adam to make his own life, the way he has done for himself. To Adam, however, there is “no happiness, no cheerfulness, no hope, no pride, no present-,” without memory, i.e. without Don recognizing him as his brother and letting him into his life, evident from his subsequent suicide.

In many ways, the characters of Adam Whitman and Caesar Gardella carry the same functions in *Mad Men* and *Flannel Suit*, and their encounters with the main protagonists coincide in several manners. They both show up at their work place, not posing any immediate threat to the stability of family life. Don and Tom, after unsuccessfully denying their presences, take them to obscure restaurants, in order to talk about the past away from colleagues and other acquaintances. Adam and Caesar carry information that is new to both the main protagonists themselves, and to the reader, and further serve to trigger Don’s and Tom’s memories. The main difference between these encounters is the way Don and Tom respond to them. Whereas Don - siding with Nietzsche - does not want Adam to be a part of his life, demonstrating his inability to move forward by denying his past, Tom does the opposite. He decides to listen to Gardella, and provide financial support for Maria and the baby, demonstrating his necessity to come to terms with his past in order to move forward.

Preceding his suicide, Adam sends Don a package which contains pictures from their childhood on the farm, inscribed with their names on the back, along with Dick Whitman's dog tag. In other words, these are physical and concrete traces from Don's past, a remainder of a past time of adventure. *By accident,* this package is given Pete Campbell instead of Don, as Pete *by chance* is alone is Don's office *at that moment*[20] (S1.E11, S1.E12). He understands that Don's real name is Dick Whitman, and uses the information he gathers from the box and his friend to try to blackmail Don into giving him a better job. The conflict ends in the office of Bert Cooper, to whom Pete conveys the same information, convinced he is exposing Don as "[a] fraud and a liar [and] a criminal even" (S1.E12, 37:29), and that this will have fatal consequences to Don. However, contrary to Campbell's expectations, Cooper seems to share Don's, and Nietzsche's, perspective on life, as he responds in the following manner:

> BERT. The Japanese have a saying: "A man is whatever room he is in.", and right now Donald Draper is in this room. I assure you, there is more profit in forgetting this. (S1.E12, 37:49)

Pete's allegations trigger Don's flashbacks to the war in "Nixon vs. Kennedy" – the only episode in the series portraying his time in Korea. The anachronic order of the episode, the interweaving of scenes from Don's time in Korea and the intense hours between Pete's first approach and Bert's reassuring response, can be read in light of Sartre's reading of the relationship between time and space in Faulkner. Sartre argues that "[t]he past here gains a surrealistic quality; its outline is hard, clear and immutable. The indefinable and elusive present is helpless before it; it is full of holes through which past things, fixed, motionless and silent, invade it." (Sartre 228). This can be related not only to the flashback to Korea, but also to other scenes portraying Don's childhood. Apart from giving the viewer an overview of the main character's background, these scenes provide a psychological depth to the character of Don, and further contribute to his development throughout the series. Sartre's characterisation of the past as motionless and silent echoes the characterisation of time in the chronotope of the *threshold* as instantaneous and beyond biographical time. Time here is fixed, and the construction of the chronotope of the threshold in the narrative results in the fixed time's invasion of the helpless present.

---

[20] Again the italicisation of these words follow Bakhtin's italicisation of these same words in Apuleius' story.

The way Don's memories resurface when confronted with his past life, both in "Nixon vs. Kennedy" and in other episodes where this occurs, can also be read in light of Sartre's reflections. He argues that

> [t]he order of the past is the order of the heart. We must not believe that the present event, after it has gone, becomes the most immediate of our memories. The shift of time can submerge it at the bottom of memory or leave it at the surface. Only its own intrinsic value and its relevance to our lives can determine its level. (Sartre 229)

As we have seen, it is beyond question that Don sincerely strives to "submerge [his past] at the bottom of memory" (Ibid.). However, as these memories keep resurfacing despite his efforts to submerge them, it indicates their fixed and motionless character, and their "own intrinsic value and [their] relevance to [his life]"(Ibid.). One might argue that Don's inability to suppress his past life lies precisely in the delicacy of the relationship between past events and their "intrinsic value and (…) relevance to our lives" (Ibid.). Because his present life would not have been possible without his past life – his time in Korea in particular – it has such value and relevance to him every day that it disables him from truly subduing the memories from it.

In much the same way as Sartre argues that it is the "intrinsic value" of a memory that "determine[s] its level" (229), Bakhtin, with reference to the chronotope of the *adventure novel* *of everyday life,* argues that the chronology of events is of minor interest, whereas the significance of these events is crucial to how the character identifies him- or herself:

> From what has been said, it should be clear that a novel of this type does not, strictly speaking, unfold in *biographical time.* It depicts only the *exceptional,* utterly *unusual* moments of a man's life, moments that are short compared to the whole length of human life. But these moments *shape the definitive image of the man, his essence, as well as the nature of his entire subsequent life.* (Bakhtin 116)

Bakhtin's description of time in this chronotope relates to *Mad Men*, as the interweaving of present and past time in this series makes evident. Don's history is not told chronologically or in *biographical time*. Rather, we are introduced to the highly esteemed ad man and family man, and get to know his development through memories that are of "the exceptional, utterly unusual moments" of his life and which contribute to the understanding of the development of this character (Bakhtin 116). Moreover, the chronotopic reading makes visible that it is precisely the narrative structures that determine this development, both through the shaping forces of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* and through the fixed, motionless nature of the chronotope of the *threshold,* which, in Sartre's words, keeps invading the present (228).

The foregoing makes evident how Don's childhood as Dick Whitman in large is determined by chance and of exceptional and unusual moments, and how this can be seen in relation to the chronotope of *the adventure novel of everyday life.* We see how this is further supported as Dick gradually takes on a more active role in determining his life, and how this active agency, in combination with the chronotope of the *threshold* – made possible by the explosion and Donald Draper's subsequent death – enables his metamorphosis. Further, we see how the past keeps recurring in his present, and that his efforts to suppress the past life ultimately prove futile, and that this must be seen in relation to the anachronic portrayal of his life. This will be of importance in relation to Don and the pastoral, which will be returned to in the following chapter.

Overall, the chronotopic reading of this chapter makes evident how the characters' past lives are constructed and thus determined by the narrative. We see that for Gatsby, the structures of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* determines his role as the parvenu with the desire and ambition to move upwards in society. The metamorphosis that takes place within this time-space continuum is what enables the beginning of this upward mobility. However, this metamorphosis also enables him to get to know Daisy, which in turn becomes his moment of *threshold.* Gatsby's inability to step over the moment of the threshold further disrupts his metamorphosis, which we see, is finally reversed. The following chapter will make evident how this downfall and reversal can be seen in relation to the chronotope of the *pastoral.* For the character of Tom, this reading lays bare how his time in war can be seen as distinctively removed from his pre-war life, where both time and space are radically different from his life in America. This in turn represents Tom's metamorphosis, as one that differs from that of Gatsby in that it is solely a temporal and spatial metamorphosis, and not one that transforms him per se. We see that this time-space continuum has such impact on him in his post-war life that it can be seen as the moment of *threshold.* One could argue that when Tom steps over the threshold this simultaneously enables him and Betsy to overcome the obstacles in their relationship, represented by Tom's moment of *threshold.* Critics argue that Tom here leaves his past behind and looks towards a bright and prosperous future with Betsy. Whether or not this future is truly within reach will be a question of importance in the following chapter concerning the imitation of the pastoral ideal and its chronotope. In relation to this, the image of Tom as the hero who is now purified and reborn is of interest, as it opens up to a comparison of Tom Rath and Don Draper which spans across the chronotopes discussed in this chapter and the chronotope of the *pastoral* in the following chapter.

2. Traces of the Pastoral

2.1. Introduction

The preceding chapter showed how the relationship between the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the chronotope of the *threshold* opened up our reading of *The Great Gatsby, The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit,* and *Mad Men.* It laid bare some of the fundamental similarities between the characters Jay Gatsby, Tom Rath, and Don Draper, in the way they are all unable to free themselves from their past lives in order to move forward and realize their ambitions. The following chapter will make use of another of the chronotopes Mikhail Bakhtin discusses, namely the chronotope of the *bucolic-pastoral-idyllic,* henceforth referred to as the chronotope of the *pastoral.* I will argue that the suburb, as it is portrayed in these three works, can be seen as an imitation of the pastoral ideal, and that this imitation must be seen in relation to the characters' construction of their own personal identities as discussed in chapter one. Questions worth exploring are, for instance, is the imitation of the pastoral fully realized in these works? If not, to what extent does this mission prove possible, and what are the obstacles hindering it? Do they relate to the influence of the chronotopes explored in the previous chapter?

The concept of *façade* will also be a key concept in this chapter, as the construction of identities is closely linked to the construction of an outward appearance designed to display the characters' lives as happy, contented, and unproblematic. "Façade" is defined as an "architectural design concerned with elegance, etc." ("façade", OED), and can be seen in relation to the construction of new identities in *Gatsby* and *Mad Men,* and also to the construction of buildings and their surroundings in *Gatsby* and *Flannel Suit.* The construction of façade will further be read in relation to ideas of *happiness* and *loneliness*, and their portrayals in the three works. Finally, I will look at how the imitation of the pastoral ideal and the chronotope of the *pastoral* that we find in this chapter, relate to the foregoing chapter on the past, and the chronotopes discussed there, namely the chronotope of *the adventure novel of everyday life,* and of *threshold.* By incorporating Bakhtin's theory on the chronotope of the *pastoral,* the main objective of this chapter is to demonstrate the ways in which these works problematize this relationship.

That the American suburb can be seen as an imitation of the pastoral ideal, is a view that has been argued by several critics, among whom we find Leo Marx and Mary P. Corcoran, to mention a few. Drawing on some of the views presented by these critics, I aim to explore the relationship between the suburb and the city, and thus between the pastoral and the urban in the works in question.

With reference to literature, "pastoral" is typically seen as a "historical variety of forms and tones (…) of the desire to return to nature (…) ("pastoral", *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide*) Leo Marx' book *The Machine in the Garden – Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (1967), even though it is an older work, offers useful perspectives on the pastoral ideal in America, and is still relevant both to the society portrayed in these works, as well as to our own. Marx distinguishes between two types of pastoralism: "one that is popular and sentimental, the other imaginative and complex." (Marx 5). The first of these, the sentimental, Marx describes in terms of what he calls "the current "flight from the city" [where] [a]n inchoate longing for a more "natural" environment enters into the contemptuous attitude that many Americans adopt toward urban life (with the result that we neglect our cities and desert them for the suburbs). (Marx 5). The second kind, the imaginative, Marx explains by way of the mass media and advertising agencies, arguing that these impose on the sentimental kind of pastoralism inherent in the American population in order to increase television ratings and commodity sales (Marx 6). Although not of major importance to our reading, this last kind of pastoralism can be worth keeping in mind when we return to the pastoral ideal in *Mad Men*.

On what she terms the “pastoral suburb”, Mary P. Corcoran, referencing several critics on the matter, states the following:

> For first-generation suburbanites, the suburb ‘represented an escape from the filth, noise, and debauchery of the 19th century industrial city’ (…) For suburbanites, Palen argues, rural images and supposed rural values continue to hold popular appeal. The portrayal of the rural as idyllic is an attempt to construct space as pure and uncontaminated by unwanted others (Corcoran 2543)

Corcoran further looks at the suburb in relation to a sense of place, and how this correlates to a sense of self and a sense of other, an issue that will be explored in consideration to all three works in question. In short, the suburban imitation of the pastoral grows out of an aversion towards the city and the modern, industrial, and dirty way of life it represents, which results in a longing towards the rural, and a desire to return to it. In all three works I will discuss how this aversion and longing is made visible through the language used to portray the distinctive spheres, and through the manner in which the characters conduct themselves as subjected to their surroundings.

The following exemplifies how the word *return* stands out when looking at the pastoral in these works, and how closely this relates to the chronotope of the *pastoral*, where time is essentially cycled, and thus arguably ever-returning (Bakhtin 103).

2.2. Jay Gatsby and the Pastoral

The setting of *The Great Gatsby* is in no way unintentional, and it reveals a great deal more about the characters than what might strike the reader at the outset of the novel. The narrator, Nick, describes the difference between the two areas in the following manner: “I lived at West Egg, the – well, the less fashionable of the two, though this is a most superficial tag to express the bizarre and not a little sinister contrast between them.” (Fitzgerald 8). The use of the particular word *superficial* in this passage alludes to *façade,* a concept that will be of importance in the discussion of Gatsby and the imitation of the pastoral. One might also argue that the use of words such as *bizarre* and *sinister* to describe the differences between the areas lays bare the tension between them, and foreshadows the tension between Gatsby and the Buchanans.

As narrator, Nick is detailed in his descriptions of characters, objects, as well as landscapes, emphasizing the importance of *façade* throughout the novel and portraying the houses situated on each side of the bay, starting with Gatsby’s:

> The one on my right was a colossal affair by any standard - it was a factual imitation of some Hôtel de Ville in Normandy, with a tower on one side, spanking new under a thin beard of raw ivy, and a marble swimming pool, and more than forty acres of lawn and garden. (Fitzgerald 8)

The description of Gatsby’s West Egg mansion as excessive, on the brink of vulgar, is in stark contrast to the one of the houses of East Egg, underlining the disparity between the two areas: “Across the courtesy bay the white palaces of fashionable East Egg glittered along the water (…). (Fitzgerald 8). As any study guide to *The Great Gatsby* can tell you, the vast difference between the description of the two houses bears meaning, the most important one being that Gatsby’s mansion is an *imitation*, symbolizing James Gatz’ own imitation of his life as Gatsby. The Buchanan’s home, on the other hand, is a Georgian Colonel mansion, symbolizing Tom

Buchanan's heritage and position. The descriptions further underline the difference between West Egg and East Egg, and between new and old money. Gatsby's extravagance tells of new money, and of a need to make visible his wealth, whereas the Buchanan's mansion expresses class and style.

Despite preceding the period of the vast expansion of the typical American suburb, *The Great Gatsby* still problematizes the relationship between the urban city of New York and the more rural Long Island. Robert Beuka points out that

> [w]hile the beginning of the twentieth century saw increasing urbanization across the land, the second half of the century witnessed the massive development of the suburban landscape, a new type of terrain that dissolved the urban/rural place distinctions that had, until that point, largely characterized American topography (Beuka 1)

Over the course of the century, the American landscape was in constant flux, and it is therefore reasonable to see the landscape portrayed in *The Great Gatsby* as belonging somewhere in-between the period of increasing urbanization, and the massive development of the suburbs. Arguably, East Egg and West Egg can be seen as representations of the early stages of the development of the American suburb, and already at this stage it is striking that the novel, as a representation of contemporary literature, depicts the city and the suburb in such contrasting manners.

It is also evident that this novel thematises pastoralism, and that the it can be read in light of Bakhtin's chronotope of the *pastoral.* In this chronotope, Bakhtin states, "time possesses its own definite semicyclical rhythm (…) [which] has fused bodily with a specific insular idyllic landscape (…)" (Bakhtin 103). In *Gatsby,* the semicyclical aspect of time can be seen in relation to the discussion of the past in the previous chapter, and one might even say that to some degree this is where the chronotope of the *pastoral* and the chronotope of the *threshold* overlap; Gatsby's attempt to recreate his past with Daisy, or in other words to recreate his moment of *threshold,* is partly realized in their reunion four years later. However, this recreation is not completed, and the following reading will make visible why this attempt fails.

When Bakhtin presents time in the chronotope of the *pastoral* as having "fused bodily with a specific insular landscape", one might read this in two ways: Firstly, in a figurative way as a community that is sociologically, culturally, and psychologically isolated, secluded, and detached from its surroundings, in this case from the city. Secondly, the landscape of the novel is literally depicted in terms of isolation, seclusion, and detachment, as the action is set to "that slender riotous island which extends itself due east of New York (…) [t]wenty miles from the city (…)" (Fitzgerald 7). Already here it is apparent that the area in question is separated from the city, with the water making up a physical border between the two areas. Nick points out the "unusual formations of land" that is East Egg and West Egg, and portrays the area in the following manner:

> a pair of enormous eggs, identical in contour and separated only by a courtesy bay (…) They are not perfect ovals – like the egg in the Columbus story, they are both crushed flat at the contact end – but their physical resemblance must be a source of perpetual wonder to the gulls that fly overhead (Fitzgerald 7-8)

Several aspects are noteworthy in this depiction, as they lay bare some of the larger themes of the novel, and simultaneously foreshadow the unfolding of the events that follow. When Nick says that the eggs are "identical in contour", he is arguably also saying that they are not identical *beyond* their contours, a fact that is underlined when he subsequently contrasts East Egg and West Egg. This in combination with the phrasing "physical resemblance" introduces the themes of *façade* and *imitation*: The two eggs, being vastly different despite the fact that they look identical from the outside, tell the reader that upon closer examination things might not be exactly what they seem, foreshadowing both Gatsby's false identity and the imitation of the pastoral ideal. I will return to the images of the eggs and what they stand for later in the discussion.

Also of interest in this passage is the reference to “the egg in the Columbus story”. Tracing the explanatory notes in the novel one finds that this refers to the famous story of how Columbus, when attending a party after having discovered what he thought was the Indies was met with the argument that “others could accomplish the same task” (Fitzgerald 145), an argument he refuted in the following way: “He challenged them to stand an egg on its end, which they were unable to do. He then flattened an end of the egg until it stood, thus demonstrating that others would be able to make the trip after he had shown them how it could be done” (Fitzgerald 145). One way of interpreting this story is to gather that imitation is the key to success. Columbus found the way to America, to a new and green world filled with opportunity. By following his steps, or in other words by imitating his journey, the new world could be reached by others as well. This can be seen in relation to the discussion on Gatsby’s schedule in the previous chapter, where by following Franklin’s method, by imitating his steps of self-improvement, Gatsby aspires to reach a new world of opportunity, manifested in the attempted realization of reaching the “high peaks of private life”, as seen in chapter one (Bakhtin 126).

As noted above, East Egg is considered the more fashionable of the two areas, the main distinction between them summed up in “old versus new money”. There is never any mentioning of Tom working or doing business, and it is thus made clear that his inherited “old money” puts him in a position where he does not rely on income. The inhabitants of West Egg, represented by Nick and Gatsby, are however not in such a position. Although there is some disparity between the two of them as well, evident from Nick’s characterization of his own house as “an eyesore” compared to that of Gatsby’s, the two of them still represent West Egg, separated from East Egg not only by the bay, but by the divergence in class and position.

Both Nick and Gatsby are commuters, in itself a characteristic feature of a traditional suburbanite. Gatsby drives from pastoral West Egg to the urban New York to do his business with Mr. Wolfshiem, never the other way around. Whenever Gatsby receives business calls at home, it is always a city calling: “Philadelphia wants you on the ‘phone, sir” (Fitzgerald 44), “[i] called Gatsby’s house (…) four times; finally an exasperated central told me the wire was being kept open for long distance from Detroit” (Fitzgerald 123). The image of the city as a place of sin is a recurrent one when looking at the relationship between the city and suburbia, a notion that is underlined if we look closer at the nature of Gatsby’s business: Throughout the novel, Gatsby’s business and work is something that takes place in the city or in connection with the city, arguably, for the dishonest business of bootlegging cannot take place within the innocent sphere of the suburbs. This is further underlined when Gatsby dies, and his only business partner who has a face and a name in the novel, tells Nick that “I cannot come down now as I am tied up in some very important business and cannot get mixed up in this thing now.” (Fitzgerald 132). If the imitation of the pastoral landscape is to succeed, as a landscape that is innocent and pure, the bootlegging business cannot be present within the suburban sphere. Thus, as Gatsby’s shady business still finds a way into the suburban sphere, this becomes a disruptive element to the pastoral imitation, as will be evident as we return to this later.

Recapturing the events of the summer, Nick makes clear that work is what takes up most of his time, and that “[i]n the early morning the sun threw my shadow westward as I hurried down the white chasms of lower New York to the Probity Trust” (Fitzgerald 46). The wording is of interest here, as it lays bare some of the contrasts between West Egg and New York. The word *threw* indicates that the move westward is an involuntary one, while *hurried* adds a notion of distress. In addition, the use of the word *chasms* arguably paints a picture of Nick being devoured by the tall buildings of the city, which again reinforces the image of the city as an unknown and threatening territory. Of his decision to settle down in West Egg, Nick states that "[t]he practical thing was to find rooms in the city, but it was a warm season, and I had just left a country of wide lawns and friendly trees, so when a young man at the office suggested that we take a house together in a commuting town, it sounded like a great idea." (Fitzgerald 7). In combination with the words *threw, hurried,* and *chasms,* this last implication of the city as being too warm to live in creates an image of the city as suffocating, even as hell. Contrasting this to the "wide lawns and friendly trees" of the countryside, one might further argue that the latter gives allusions to the Garden of Eden. In this sense, the characters' return to the pastoral suburb can be read as redemptive. Further, the allusions to hell can arguably be read as an early foreshadowing of the collapse of the innocent suburban sphere that is to come.

This leads us to the importance of the garden, and how its portrayal must be read in connection with the imitation of the pastoral and with the chronotope of the *pastoral.* When we look at how Gatsby's mansion is described, it is striking that the garden is repeatedly referred to in relation to his house. In this manner, the house and the garden constitute a unit that together make up the façade of Gatsby's estate. In turn, this can be seen in relation to the suburban ideal, where the symbolism of the garden plays an important role. Suburbia in itself is often seen as one large garden. The separate units, each consisting of a house and a surrounding lawn, together make up one whole, protected from the wilderness that surrounds it, and from the unknown dangers of the city that lurk beyond the physical boundaries of the white picket fences.

This relates to the chronotope of the *pastoral,* with "a dense and fragrant time, like honey, a time of intimate lovers' scenes and lyric outpourings, a time saturated with its own strictly limited, sealed-off segment of nature's space, stylized through and through (…) (Bakhtin 103). In relation to *Gatsby* it is precisely Gatsby's garden that makes up this "sealed-off segment of nature's space", as it can be viewed as an enclosed area in nature. The garden is the scene of the numerous parties held over the course of the summer, and only with a few exceptions does the action take place inside Gatsby’s house. The descriptions of the garden, with its flowers and fragrances, echo Bakhtin’s portrayal of space in this chronotope. Further, the “lyric outpourings” are provided by the orchestra, and the “intimate lovers’ scenes” take place amongst the trees and flower of the garden, partly secluded form the rest of the party. The link between Gatsby’s garden and the *topos* of the *pastoral* is also underlined by the image of space in this chronotope as being “stylized through and through” (Bakhtin, 103). Gatsby’s garden is undoubtedly so, pointed out by the narrator through the detailed descriptions of the decorations and preparations that precede every arrival of the numerous guests.

Gatsby’s house is surrounded, as we have seen, by “more than forty acres of lawn and garden”, and in it is located a swimming pool (Fitzgerald 8). The aura of mystery that surrounds the garden is conveyed by way of descriptions such as “[i]n his blue gardens men and girls came and went like moths among the whisperings and the champagne and the stars” and “[a]t least once a fortnight a corps of caterers came down with several hundred feet of canvas and enough colored light to make a Christmas tree out of Gatsby’s enormous garden.” (Fitzgerald 33). Here, both the “dense and fragrant time” (Bakhtin, 103), and the stylized space of the garden are exemplified by way of Nick’s observations.

Gatsby’s mansion and his garden parties are also depicted in terms of grandeur and affluence. The ultimate symbol of the extravagance might be the live orchestra, and the way the music seems to move through the garden is of interest in relation to the reading of Gatsby’s garden as an imitation of the pastoral ideal. Leo Marx points out that “[t]he echo [is] a recurrent device in pastoral, [it] is another metaphor of reciprocity. It evokes that sense of relatedness between man and not-man which lends a metaphysical aspect to the mode (…)” (Marx 23). In Marx, this echo refers to the “harmonious relation between Tityrus and the natural environment", described as "a serene partnership" (Ibid.)[21]. Reading this in light of the descriptions of the orchestra, one might argue that the orchestra can be seen as a symbol or a representation of the pastoral ideal, as it echoes back the landscape that surrounds it, namely the idyllic garden: "There was the boom of a bass drum, and the voice of the orchestra leader rang out suddenly above the echolalia of the garden." (Fitzgerald 41). The line of words "the boom of a bass drum" evokes an image of the sound reverberating throughout the garden, permeating the very core of it, and making its presence felt in the bodies of the people in it. The word "echolalia" is of further interest to the discussion of imitation, as it simply means "[t]he meaningless repetition of words and phrases" ("echolalia," *OED*) One could see Gatsby's pastoral imitation a sort of "meaningless repetition", not of words and phrases, but of a way of life, reflected among other factors in his house as a "factual imitation of some Hôtel de Ville in Normandy", with which he has no history or connection. The "meaningless repetition" is also emblematic of Gatsby's dedication to re-create his past with Daisy, a mission that fails due to Gatsby's imitation of his own persona, as made evident from the discussion of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and metamorphosis in chapter one.

Jordan Baker captures some of the essence of Gatsby's garden when she paradoxically declares that "I like large parties. They're so intimate. At small parties there isn't any privacy." (Fitzgerald 41). That Gatsby's parties allow for intimacy is important, as it makes possible the conversation between Gatsby and Jordan that ultimately leads to Gatsby and Daisy's reunion. If we here look to Bakhtin's chronotope of the *pastoral,* we find that the reunion of the two characters can be read in line with its "specific and cycled (but not strictly cyclical) time (…) (Bakhtin, 103) Imitating the pastoral, then, is what makes possible the cycled time which again makes possible the reunion of Gatsby and Daisy. As we have seen, this reunion is not a permanent one, and I will return to the question of how the chronotope of the *pastoral* and its quasi-cyclical time can be read in connection with the incompletion of Daisy and Gatsby's reunion, of Gatsby's failed imitation of the pastoral ideal, and further how this can be seen in relation to the chronotope of the *threshold* in this reading.

---

[21] The story of Tityrus will not be elaborated on in this thesis. See pages 19-24 in Marx for this story.

As argued above, it is within the borders of the suburb that the imitation of the pastoral takes place, as a counter-reaction to the exasperating mode of life in the city. In her study of Dublin suburbs, Corcoran points out that "pastoral ideology plays an active role in constituting (…) suburbs and helps to inculcate a sense of place. This sense of place in turn helps to cement social embeddedness which acts as a bulwark against isolation and alienation" (Corcoran 2537). Her description reinforces the notion of the need to protect what is on the inside from what is on the outside by way of a physical boundary, a bulwark, and as argued above, this boundary is represented in the stereotype of the white picket fences of the traditional American suburban garden.

The reader will recall my discussion on the Eggs and of the Columbus story as a symbol of Gatsby's aspirations. East Egg and West Egg can themselves be read as innocent, protected, and secluded spheres in nature, a description that gives allusions to the Garden of Eden. The names "East Egg" and "West Egg" in themselves, in addition to the areas' physical resemblance to that of eggs, reinforce this image, as eggs have shells that protect and seclude the embryos they protect. In this case, then, the shell makes up the *bulwark* that protects the suburb in Corcoran's depiction. However, if we return to the early description of East Egg and West Egg we find that they are both "crushed flat at the contact end" (Fitzgerald 8), suggesting that the nature of the suburb is not as protected as it might appear. In the following, I will argue that the image of the crushed shells symbolizes cracks in the façade of the suburban life, through which seeps the sinful nature of the city, disrupting the imitation of the pastoral and compelling a modification of the time-space of chronotope of the *pastoral* in this novel.

If we look again to Jordan Baker's aforementioned opinion that "I like large parties. They're so intimate. At small parties there isn't any privacy" (Fitzgerald 41), we find that, while it relates to the chronotope of the *pastoral,* it simultaneously reveals something of the sinful nature of these parties. One example is the conversation in the garden between Gatsby and Daisy. After having danced together, Nick recounts that, "they sauntered over to my house and sat on the steps for half an hour, while at her request I remained watchfully in the garden. 'In case there's a fire or a flood,' she explained, 'or any act of God' (Fitzgerald 84). Undeniably, Daisy is aware of the perfidiousness of her sneaking away with Gatsby, evident from her wish that Nick will keep watch and make sure that they are not exposed. Her comment "or any act of God" underlines this awareness and strengthens the notion of sin, as it implies that their being together is immoral to the degree that it could be hindered by divine intervention. The biblical connotations of the wording "remain watchfully in the garden" lends support to the before mentioned image of Gatsby's garden as a symbol of the Garden of Eden. However, like the Garden of Eden, Gatsby's garden is finally overtaken by sin.

While Gatsby and Daisy are stealing away, Tom is busy initiating another one of his numerous affairs (Fitzgerald 85-85). That this is not the only affair that takes place at these parties is given emphasis when considering Nick's previous observation that "[o]n Sunday mornings while church bells rang in the villages alongshore, the world and its mistresses returned to Gatsby's house and twinkled hilariously on his lawn." (Fitzgerald 49). The use of the word *mistresses* underscores the notion of sin that seems to pervade the garden. However, the hints of immorality are all obscured by the haze that grows out of the "profusion of champagne" (Fitzgerald 83) that persists throughout these parties. The haze thus functions like a veil, or another kind of *façade,* concealing the true nature of the events. The "intimate lovers' scenes" of the chronotope of the *pastoral* still take place here, but the pastoral ideal is corrupted by dishonesty.

This is where the only Greek romance where the chronotope of the *pastoral* is of interest to this discussion, namely Longus' *Daphne and Chloë* (Bakhtin 103). Here, the chronotope of the *pastoral* is "riddled with decay, its compact isolation and self-imposed limits [are] destroyed, surrounded on all sides by an alien world and itself already half-alien; natural-idyllic time is no longer as dense, it is cut through by shafts of adventure-time" (Bakhtin, 103) I have previously pointed out how Gatsby's illegal bootlegging business cannot take place within the innocent sphere of the suburb. Examining the way Gatsby's dishonest business is handled, one finds that it has a way of entering and intruding the pastoral landscape. Apart from the overt consummation of alcohol which is present throughout the novel, there are also instances where the business itself forces its way to West Egg, namely through Gatsby's numerous phone calls. The tainted business that should take place in the city, represented by long distance calls from Philadelphia and Detroit, seeps into the suburb through the telephone line, and the self-imposed limits of the pastoral sphere are destroyed. The calls also simultaneously distance Gatsby from the same landscape, and reinforce the image of this character as isolated from his surroundings examined in chapter one. For instance, the moment after having introduced himself to Nick, Gatsby is pulled away from his guests by a phone call from Chicago (Fitzgerald 40). Later, after Gatsby and Daisy's conversation in the garden, Gatsby is forced to distance himself from his party once again, as he "had been called to the phone" (Fitzgerald 85).

Because the distancing is always repeated, Gatsby is never wholly present in the pastoral landscape, and thus his orchestration of it is bound to fail. This is made evident when Daisy visits Gatsby's house for the first time and he shows her around. He intends on showing her the outdoor area, but they are hindered by rain, and so they stand behind the windows looking out "at the corrugated surface of the Sound" (Fitzgerald 74). That the surface is creased relates to the failure of imitation of the pastoral and to Gatsby's construction of his own self in that the furrows obscure the surface and disguise what lays beneath it. Arguably, what obscures

Gatsby's persona is his material wealth; his estate, the luxurious interior of his house, the books he is never seen reading, the piano he does not know how to play, and his manifold shirts (Fitzgerald 72-75). This blurring is emphasized by the ringing of the phone in the following sequence, intruding and disrupting the crucial point that Daisy's visit represents. His bootlegging business is forcing its way through the surface right at the moment when keeping the façade is at its most crucial (Fitzgerald 75). Apart from obscuring his persona, this corrugation also creates a distance between Gatsby and the people around him. The reader will recall the image of Gatsby standing on the marble steps overlooking the party discussed in chapter one, where I argued that Gatsby's preoccupation with belonging is what distances him from the people he wants to belong with. One might also argue that it is his constructed identity that creates this distance, in that the people around him are unable to connect to what is in truth an imitation. This is an aspect I will explore further in the last part of this chapter, concerning the character Donald Draper and the pastoral.

The characters' constant movements between the city and the suburb, made possible by way of industrial inventions such as the automobile and the train, contribute to infiltration of the urban sphere into the rural. Even the depiction of the road that leads to the city lends support to this view:

> This is a valley of ashes – a fantastic farm where ashes grow like wheat into ridges and hills and grotesque gardens; where ashes take the forms of houses and chimneys and rising smoke and, finally, with a transcendent effort, of ash-gray men, who move dimly and already crumbling through the powdery air. (Fitzgerald 21)

The repeated use of the word "ashes" in combination with words such as "chimneys", "smoke", "transcendent", and "powdery air" creates an image of the polluted air as pervading the landscape, leaving the trains, cars, and the people who move through covered in the gray dust, and thus making them carriers of it. The "ash-gray men" alludes both to this image and to another male commuting suburbanite in this thesis, the man in the gray flannel suit. I will return to how *he* comes across as precisely one of the men who "move dimly (…) crumbling through the powdery air" weighed down by the workload and by the stressful, arduous city life. Recalling my argumentation of the city as the image of hell and the suburb as the Garden of Eden, this valley of ashes might be read as purgatory.

As we have seen, there are numerous implications of the "riddled decay" in the chronotope, of the sinful nature of the city seeping in through the cracks in the façade so carefully constructed by Gatsby. That the process of decay is insuppressible is made final with the image of Gatsby lying dead in his pool, floating amongst the first fallen autumn leaves: "A small gust of wind that scarcely corrugated the surface was enough to disturb [the air mattress'] accidental course with its accidental burden. The touch of a cluster of leaves revolved it slowly, tracing, like the leg of a transit, a thin red circle in the water." (Fitzgerald 129). The images of "gust of wind" and "cluster of leaves" allude to autumn, and consequently to death, decay, and endings. Arguably, the reading of Gatsby's garden as an imitation of the pastoral makes way for the reading of the pool as a representation of the sea. If we here return to the Columbus story, I will suggest that Gatsby's inability to imitate the pastoral thus can be seen as an inability to retrace Columbus' steps, understood as failure of imitation. Gatsby consequently drowns in the ocean on the "journey" towards the promised land, the "fresh, green breast of the world" (Fitzgerald 143) that is America. Here, the image of the corrugated surface is once again repeated, and the image of the cracks in the façade that runs like a thread throughout the novel is continued to the very end. The cracks in the façade take on a more concrete and visible form in *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit*, as we now proceed to explore the imitation of the pastoral ideal and the chronotope of the *pastoral* in that novel.

2.3. Tom Rath and the Pastoral

> “The lark’s on the wing; the snail’s on the thorn: God’s in his heaven – all’s right with the world.” (Wilson 76)

“By the time they had lived seven years in the little house on Greentree Avenue in Westport, Connecticut, they both detested it” (Wilson 1). The opening line of Wilson’s novel immediately sets the tone and introduces what must be seen as its central theme, namely suburban discontentment. In fact, the entire first chapter, although not the longest one in the novel, is dedicated to the task of portraying the miserable façade and interiority of the house and how the characters regard it as an embodiment of their own personal shortcoming and dissatisfaction with their current life situation. The omniscient third-person narrator captures the Raths’ aversion towards their house in the assertion that “the house had a kind of evil genius for displaying proof of their weaknesses and wiping out all traces of their strengths” (Wilson 1). The word “display” relates to the words “façade” and “surface”, both central to our discussion. Already here, then, is it clear that outward appearance and exteriority is of importance to the characters. Evidently, there is a disparity between how the Raths’ regard themselves and their self-perception, and as the following reading shows, the novel portrays their struggle to change this self-perception by way of constructing a façade.

The façade Gatsby constructs around himself is made up of his house and his garden, which together constitute a unit with the purpose of reflecting his persona. This is true for the Raths as well, reflected in the manifold references to and descriptions of both the exteriority and interiority of the two houses they inhabit in the course of the novel. The exteriority of their house on Greentree Avenue is portrayed exclusively in unfavorable terms, both with reference to the house itself, but also to their seeming inability to keep maintenance on it: “The ragged lawn and weed-filled garden proclaimed to passers-by and the neighbors that Thomas R. Rath and his family disliked ‘working around the place’ and couldn’t afford to pay someone else to do it” (Wilson 1). To the outside world, this suggests the Raths’ indolence and languidness in a society where productiveness and hard work are high-esteemed values. By extension, the Raths’ inability to “pay someone else to do it” contributes to the image of Tom as a sluggish worker, who does not have the financial means to keep his house in order. The weed-filled garden indicates that the decline of the façade is a process that has taken place over time, an assumption that is verified with reference to the front door of the house, which “had been scratched by a dog which had been run over the year before” (Wilson 3). The peculiar detail of the deceased dog adds a notion of decay and demise, and of things coming to an end.

Behind the front door the order of things does not appear to be in any better shape, the cracks in the façade of the house thus reflecting what is hidden behind it. Tom and Betsy themselves are of the opinion that the “interior of the house was even more vengeful” (Wilson 1) than the exterior. If the neglected façade of the house tells of indolence and insufficient income, so then does the interior, as none of the rooms are described without a flaw or defect: “The hot-water faucet in the bathroom dripped. Almost all the furniture needed to be refinished, reupholstered, or cleaned” (Wilson 3), and “[t]he linoleum on the kitchen floor was beginning to wrinkle (…) it was scuffed, and by the sink it was worn through to the wood underneath” (Wilson 6) In sum, there are “[a] thousand petty shabbinesses [that bear] witness to the negligence of the Raths” (Wilson 3).

Two specific incidents have made their physical marks on the walls, remaining constant reminders of the family’s quarrels and disagreements. One of them holds the memory of an incident involving Betsy, “and the middle one of the three Rath children” (Wilson 2), Janey: “An ink stain with hand marks on the wallpaper in Janey’s room commemorated one of the few times Janey ever willfully destroyed property, and the only time Betsy ever lost her temper with her and struck her" (Wilson, 2). Both to Janey, and in particular to Betsy this is a painful memory, where the realization that she struck her child left her "[f]eeling like a murderess" (Wilson, 2) Betsy and Janey eventually wash off the ink from their hands and face, but the ink stain on the wall persists like a chronic wound, a blue bruise that never fades.

The other incident tells of a disagreement between Betsy and Tom, and has left a visible mark in the Raths' living room, where there is "a big dent in the plaster near the floor, with a huge crack curving up from it in the shape of a question mark" (Wilson 1). Frustrated by his wife's and his own excessive use of money, Tom, in a fit of rage during an argument, throws Betsy's new vase against the wall, resulting in the crack in the wall. This scene is of interest due to the simple fact that it alone lays bare so much of Tom and Betsy's way of thinking: Betsy, trying to live up to the stereotype of the perfect housewife with a sense of style, has spent too much money on a vase. At the same time, Tom, the commuting businessman, has "spent seventy dollars on a new suit he felt he needed to dress properly for his business" (Wilson 1). That Tom *feels* he needs a new suit reveals that also he is trying to live up to a certain stereotype, and to what he believes is expected of him as a businessman. That they cannot afford both makes evident their imitation of the roles they have applied to themselves as the happy, traditional suburban family. Their efforts to cover up the crack in the wall prove futile, and the large question mark prevails, without Tom and Betsy considering its symbolism: "The fact that the crack was in the shape of a question mark did not seem symbolic to Tom and Betsy, nor even amusing – it was just annoying" (Wilson 2). Here, the crack in the wall represents a crack in the façade of the perfect family, and the fact that it is in the shape of a question mark symbolizes the Raths' uncertainty about their place and how to act out their roles on Greentree Avenue.

Their struggle stems from a feeling of placelessness and of not belonging, a notion that is underlined in their opinion that "the house was too small, ugly, and almost precisely like the houses on all sides of it." (Wilson 3). This last observation of the similarity between the houses reveals the Raths' aversion towards the neighborhood they reside in and towards the community they in turn are a part of, an aversion that is further underlined through the dialogue in the novel: "'I don't know what's the matter with us,' Betsy said one night (…) We shouldn't be so *discontented* all the time.' 'Of course we shouldn't!' Tom said. Their words sounded hollow." (Wilson 3). The "hollowness" might be said to be emblematic of the emptiness that seems to haunt these characters. It is actually striking how apposite Corcoran's study from 2009 on Dublin suburbs is to this 1955 narrative about a traditional American suburbanite couple. With regard to placelessness, she argues that the development of suburbs "has produced serial homogeneity and uniformity in the landscape and that this impacts negatively on everyday quality of life" (Corcoran 2550). That this is true for the characters in *Flannel Suit* is evident precisely from their complaint that their house is identical to all the other houses on Greentree Avenue, which, amongst other factors, results in their palpable disaffection and feeling of emptiness and hollowness.

Corcoran further states that "residents who express disaffection with place, and whose disaffection is not assuaged by the mediating properties of a pastoral ideology, are more likely to feel unattached and to develop feelings of placelessness" (Corcoran 2538). The character of Betsy, in particular, shows an awareness of hers and Tom's resentment towards their current life situation in the suburb of Westport, and on several occasions reflects over what the underlying reasons for their feelings of detachment and placelessness are. On being invited to a cocktail party to celebrate a neighbor's raise, Betsy responds with annoyance: "Filled with sudden distaste, Betsy put the telephone down. In this invitation (…) Betsy found concentrated everything she disliked about Greentree Avenue. The intensity of her displeasure surprised her"

(Wilson 108). Thereafter follows a thorough contemplation of the prevailing attitude amongst the inhabitants of the Westport suburb: “few people considered Greentree Avenue a permanent stop (…) [here], contentment was an object of contempt. (…) the cocktail parties simply gave everyone a chance to prove he considered Greentree Avenue no more than a stepping stone to the same kind of life on a bigger scale.” (Wilson 109). Greentree Avenue can be seen as what Corcoran refers to as a “middle landscape”, situated in proximity to both the city and the country (Corcoran 2550). Her study shows that while some suburbanites consider this a positive feature, others again regard it as a negative one: “It’s near to the city and the country, it’s a no man’s land, it’s impersonal and quiet” (Corcoran 2550). This last notion seems to be the prevailing opinion of the residents on Greentree Avenue

Taken together, these descriptions paint a picture of a house that does not accord with the romanticized image of the conventional suburban home, and finally a neighborhood that is in stark contrast to the romanticized image of the suburban community. Relating this to the imitation of the pastoral ideal, we find that apart from the name of the street, “Greentree Avenue”, there is not much that alludes to the pastoral in this suburb. Rather, what we find at the outset of this novel is a suburban landscape that is more in line with the particular variation of the chronotope of the *pastoral* found in *Daphnis and Chloë.* As argued with reference to *Gatsby,* this chronotope sheds light on the imitation of the pastoral ideal in East and West Egg, and makes clear how this imitation fails due to the underlying cracks in the façade and the subsequent destruction of the self-imposed limits of the suburban landscape. Differently form *Gatsby,* the cracks in the façade in *Flannel Suit* are made visible through the concrete cracks on the walls, and through the characters’ explicit discontentedness, expressed both by their actions and through dialogue. Greentree Avenue is, in Bakhtin’s words, “riddled with decay” already from the outset of the novel, and whatever pastoral imitation might have taken place in the earlier stages of this suburb have undoubtedly vanished.

The specific chronotope in *Daphnis and Chloë* describes an environment where the destruction of the self-imposed limits, and thus the destruction of the insular idyllic landscape, results in an environment which is "surrounded on all sides by an alien world and itself already half-alien" (Bakhtin 103), This resonates with Corcoran's study, where she finds that "[l]ife in suburbia is experienced by these residents as anomic and alienating" (Corcoran 2550). The Raths clearly fall under this category of suburbanites. In the chronotope found in *Daphnis and Chloë,* Bakhtin further states that in comparison with the chronotope of the *pastoral,* this chronotope consists of a space where "natural idyllic time is no longer as dense" (Bakhtin 103). The faded pastoral imitation on Greentree Avenue makes this clear, as does the characters' univocally negative perception of it.

In his 2002 introduction to *Flannel Suit*, Johnathan Franzen points out that "[t]he latter half of the book belongs to Betsy" and that this character "launches a program of family self-improvement" (Franzen 3). One could argue that it is Tom's change of work place and ensuing increase of income, in combination with old Mrs. Rath's passing and the inheritance that befalls the Raths, that become Tom and Betsy's way out of Greentree Avenue. Surely, these factors are determinant, but Betsy is the one who truly initiates their move to South Bay. She puts their house out for sale, and simultaneously starts what might be seen as a mental preparation for their move and towards a slightly higher rank in society: "This is the new regime" she states one morning (Wilson 65), "No more instant coffee (…) No more television (…) [w]e're going to stop lying around Sunday mornings, drinking Martinis. We're going to church in a family group." (Wilson 66). In addition to the new rules she sets for the household, her determination to move forward is also made physically visible, in her apparent change in attitude towards the interiority of the house: "When Tom got back to Westport, the first thing he noticed when he stepped in the front door of his house was that everything looked suspiciously neat, and a table with a large vase of hollyhocks had been moved against the wall to obscure the crack in the plaster" (Wilson 106). In relation to Bakhtin's theory, Betsy's attempt at a new façade in turn can be seen as her attempt at reconstructing the destroyed self-imposed limits of the suburban landscape.

Where in *Gatsby* there is a transition from the chronotope of the *pastoral* to the specific instance of this chronotope found in *Daphnis and Chloë,* we find in *Flannel Suit* the same transition, only reversed. The Raths move away from Greentree Avenue and the suburban sphere there that is "riddled with decay" and "half-alien", and instead settle down in South Bay and the Tom's childhood home. If we look once again to Corcoran's study, we find that her observation that childhood memories, in combination with the pastoral ideal, brings forth a feeling of belonging and sameness. This can be seen in relation to the Raths' move to South Bay, precisely in the fact that this is where Tom grew up. Corcoran finds that:

> Images of rurality, memories of rural childhoods, pastoral idealisations and so on are tapped in order to express and develop a local 'structure of feeling' (…). This complex of beliefs, values and attitudes can be described as an ideology of pastoralism which enables residents to explain and justify their movement to the suburb, even when aspects of the suburban experience disappoint (Corcoran 2538)

The remark that South Bay is "a small town not far from Stamford" (Wilson 16) gives the impression of this area as sparsely inhabited and also as further removed from the city of New York where Tom works, than Greentree Avenue is, underlining the rurality of the place. Further, Tom's visit to his Grandmother early in the novel reveals his sentiment towards the place he grew up and eventually moves back to: "When Tom approached it, he got a curious feeling of home-coming which was still strong, despite all the years that had passed since he had lived there (…) Tom was beset by the same old mixture of emotions from which he always suffered when he visited the place." (Wilson 16-17). Tom's emotional attachment to the place, along with its rural features thus enables him and Betsy "to explain and justify their movement" to

South Bay, even though there also here are "aspects of the suburban experience [that] disappoint" (Corcoran 2538). These aspects are manifested in the dilapidated state of the house and of the public school the Rath-children will attend. These matters are both attended to, and the ways in which it is done will be briefly returned to below.

In *Flannel Suit* it is South Bay and the old family estate that truly represent the suburban ideal and consequently also the sphere where the imitation of the pastoral takes place. "Bay" naturally alludes to the ocean, and in combination with "South", the name suggests this area as distanced and physically cut off from its surroundings. Like East- and West Egg in *Gatsby,* South Bay can be seen as "a specific insular idyllic landscape" (Bakhtin 103) characteristic of the chronotope of the *pastoral.* Within this insular landscape, the old family estate might be seen as a "sealed-off segment of nature's space, stylized through and through" (Bakhtin 103), which is made clear by the fact that this house alone is situated on the top of a hill, separated from the remaining habitation of South Bay: "the driveway (…) led to the top of the hill, on the highest point of which was the old mansion itself, a tall Victorian structure with a tower at one end that had been designed to appear even larger and more grandiose than it was" (Wilson 18). The wordings "old mansion" and "Victorian" suggest the history of the house, as well as the history of the Rath family and their social standing. This image is reinforced through Mrs. Rath insistence on referring to Tom's father and grandfather as "the Major" and "the Senator", respectively. However, Tom sees this as his grandmother's romanticizing the past: "there (…) was here elaborate myth about the Rath family's accomplishments" (Wilson 19).

Tom's comment here suggests a construction of the Rath family's identity, a notion that is supported by the observation that the tower of the house "had been designed to appear even larger and more grandiose than it was" (Wilson 18). Mrs. Rath's efforts to keep up appearances are conceived in the way she obscures the truth about Tom's father's death: "she enjoyed talking about his father with him, presenting a caricature of a hero, elaborated by all kinds of distorted facts, hidden among which Tom often caught glimpses of what he suspected was unpleasant truths" (Wilson 19). Relating this to the discussion of Sartre in the foregoing chapter, this suggests that also here the "fixed" and "motionless" past invades the present. From what is deducible to the reader Stephen Rath suffered from depression after his return from the First World War, and presumably committed suicide by driving his car into a rock while driving down the driveway leading up to the mansion (Wilson, 17-18).

The Raths' move back to South Bay and to Tom's childhood home can also be seen in relation to the quasi-cyclical time in the chronotope of the *pastoral,* made evident precisely in Tom's return. However, the quasi-cyclical nature of time in this chronotope renders impossible the completion of return, an argument I will pursue subsequently. For now let us notice that, in much the same way as in *Gatsby,* the Raths' mansion and surrounding garden make up a unit that comprise a constituent in the larger suburban garden, the insular landscape of South Bay. However, also in this novel, the self-imposed limits of idyllic landscape are broken down, and through the cracks in the façade sin, decay, and corruption seep in. In addition to the description of the house and garden as unkept and overgrown, Mrs. Rath herself is also described in terms of decline and decay, as Tom finds her "seated in an armchair, dressed in a long white gown [and] [i]n her hand was a gnarled black walnut cane which looked almost like an extension of her withered fingers. She was ninety-three years old" (Wilson 18). Her high age, withered fingers, and her white gown create a ghost-like image of her, an image that is reinforced by Tom's comment that this is the "crazy, ghost-ridden world of his grandmother and his dead parents" (Wilson 22). Also here we recall the discussion on Gatsby in chapter one, and the image of ghosts from the past that makes their presence in the present. The corruption of the Rath-estate is also embodied in Mrs. Rath's servant, Edward Schultz, who turns out to have been deceiving her of money for years, and forged her testament to make it look like she left the house to him after her passing.

Arguably, these incidents are all in the past when Tom and Betsy take over the house, but they somehow still make their mark on the present, represented by the state of the house and in the repeated mentioning of the spot where Tom's father took his own life. There is also another element of the past that influences the Raths' present, namely the secret of Tom's adultery during his time in France. When this past reenters Tom's life through Caesar Gardella, the guilt-ridden Tom tells Betsy about his past in the war and his wish to help the ones he left behind. This leads to a heated argument between Tom and Betsy, and the subsequent climax of the novel that is the fight between the two. In relation to the chronotopic reading in the previous chapter, I argue that this is when Tom crosses the moment of threshold. I further point out that this moment has typically been seen as the moment Tom leaves his past behind, resulting in the happy ending of the novel. Through the reading of the chronotope of the *pastoral* I will dispute this view, and make clear how the time-space continuum of this narrative constructs a different path for the Raths.

In relation to the reading of this novel in connection with the chronotope of the *pastoral* and the pastoral imitation, it is interesting that this fight, the defining moment of their future lives, takes place precisely in the garden. If their move to South Bay is a move towards pastoral imitation, then arguably their house, and in particular their garden would be the setting for "a dense and fragrant time, like honey, a time of intimate lovers' scenes and lyric outpourings" (Bakhtin 103). To some degree this is true, witnessed in the romanticized descriptions of the surroundings of the fight: "There was a brilliant moonlight on the tall grass and on the distant waters of the Sound (…) The grass smelled sweet" (Wilson 267-268). However, these descriptions are contrasted with descriptions of the argument, making visible how the pastoral imitation fails and how the self-imposed limits of the pastoral chronotope are broken down:

> She ran through the dark shadows of the rock garden (…). He caught her (…) but she whirled and hit him on the mouth with her clenched fist. He kissed her and she bit him

> hard. (…) She twisted away, tearing open the shoulder of her blouse (…). He threw himself across her, and, feeling her fingers digging into his back, kissed her hard. Suddenly she burst into tears and, burying her face in his neck, clung to him like a child. Her whole body was quaking. (Wilson 267-268)

Here, the alien world of war surrounds the pastoral landscape, and forces its way through the cracks in the façade. Moreover, the presence of war is underlined in the use of words such as "hit", "clenched", "bit", and the like. In other words, the "natural-idyllic time", represented by Tom and Betsy's new life in South Bay, "is no longer as dense, it is cut through by shafts of adventure-time" (Bakhtin 103), represented by Tom's past life with Maria during the war. Recalling our discussion on Sartre in chapter one, we see that also here, the present is "full of holes through which past things, fixed, motionless and silent, invade it." (Sartre 228), underlining the presence of the moment of *threshold* in the Raths' life and how it disrupts the imitation of the pastoral ideal.

After this follows the reconciliation between Tom and Betsy, the rekindling of the romance in their marriage, and what can be read as their attempt at reconstructing the broken down borders of the pastoral landscape. All the pieces of the puzzle fall into place: Tom has come clean about his past, the petition for the new school is a success, and there is every reason to believe that the Zoning Board will approve of Tom and Betsy's plan to turn the outskirts of the Rath estate into a housing project to provide homes for new suburbanite couples seeking the same pastoral ideal (Wilson 262). The housing project will simultaneously provide enough income for the Raths to provide financial support for Maria and the baby, enable them to pay taxes for the new school, and make the necessary alterations to their house and garden. The final scene shows Tom and Betsy preparing for their romantic weekend get-away, after Tom has visited judge Bernstein to arrange the monthly transfer of a hundred dollars to Maria and the baby. Bernstein observes the following through his office window:

> Betsy, with her arms full of bundles, was just coming down the sidewalk. Bernstein watched as Tom hurried towards her. He saw them bow gravely toward each other as she transferred the bundles to Tom's arms. The Tom straightened up and apparently said something to her, for suddenly she smiled radiantly. Bernstein smiled too. (Wilson 276)

However picture perfect this ending seems to be, one can't help but be left with the feeling that it is indeed too good to be true, and that the semicyclical aspect of the chronotope of the *pastoral* will result in a return to the same mode of life the Raths were leading on Greentree Avenue. This notion is further underlined by their housing project, which can be seen as a way for the Raths to be selling the same dream that they are trying to live up to throughout the novel - a way of everyday life in happiness that is never truly made visible to the reader of *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.* Arguably, through the planning of the housing project, what Tom and Betsy in reality are doing is to bring the conformity of the community on Greentree Avenue with them to South Bay, thus assuring the continuation of the life they so resent and feel detached from. Moreover, the construction of the chronotope of the *pastoral* in this narrative will, due to its quasi-cyclical time, eventually return the Raths to the feeling of discontentedness and placelessness that they feel I Greentree Avenue. If we again turn to Corcoran's study, we find that also with regard to the housing project, her study supports this view:

> While place attachment involves positively experienced bonds, these bonds are tested in the face of changes in the people, processes, or places (Brown and Douglas, 1992, p. 284). Estates created on the edge of established suburban settlements are not so easily integrated into the locality. Indeed, those who live there may feel actively disconnected. For these residents, there is a palpable sense of placelessness expressed in terms of feelings of entrapment and disconnection (Corcoran 2551)

With this in mind one might argue that the changes brought about by the housing project will test Tom's experienced bonds and attachment to his childhood home and the aura of pastoralism that draws him and Betsy back to this area. Simultaneously, these bonds will be tested for the remaining residents of South Bay, as is made clear in the resistance this project meets by specific members of the small town. Further, the housing project might be seen as an “estate created on the edge of [an] established suburban settlement”, namely the existing establishments of South Bay and the outskirts of the Rath estate, thus arguably removing it both from the Raths and from the remaining inhabitants of South Bay.

Recalling Corcoran’s statement that “serial homogeneity and uniformity in the landscape (…) impacts negatively on everyday quality life” (Corcoran 2550), it is likely that this will be the outcome of the housing project as well, supported in the descriptions of these houses as “seats in a theatre, the back row the highest, and the front row the lowest” (Wilson 146). The plan to “avoid straight lines” and to “put planting around each house and perhaps push up some earth between houses, so in time you couldn’t see one house from another” (Wilson 146) is arguably just a construction of another façade, which does not eliminate the fact that the houses will be identical. In my view, the imitation of the pastoral and the pastoral sphere the Raths create for themselves and for new suburbanites in South Bay, can be explained by the semicyclical aspect of the chronotope of the *pastoral,* likely to fall victim to the same breaking down of limits, and of cracks in the façade, as we have seen throughout the entire novel. Further, the quasi-cyclical time of the chronotope of the *pastoral* will also result in the return of the moment of the threshold, i.e. to the war in this narrative. If this takes the shape of Maria and the baby once more, or of the less emphasized aspect of the traumas caused by the violence he has witnessed and the men he has killed, is a question that remains unanswered in this thesis. What we do know, is that Don Draper’s accidental act of killing in war is something he can never leave behind, and the following discussion on this character and the chronotope of the *pastoral* broadens our perspective on this.

2.4. Donald Draper and the Pastoral

The discussions on *Gatsby* and *Flannel Suit* in this chapter have largely examined how the characters in these works imitate the pastoral ideal within the suburban spheres where they reside, and how this imitation works in combination with the chronotope of the *pastoral.* By looking at depictions of the city and the suburb in *Gatsby,* and by contrasting Greentree Avenue to South Bay in *Flannel Suit*, we have seen how the pastoral imitation fails in both these works: In *Gatsby,* it is disrupted as the sinful nature of the city and of Gatsby's business seeps in through the cracks in the façade he constructs. We see that the Raths' imitation fails due to their apparent discontentedness with their life on Greentree Avenue, and that they arguably perpetuate the same mode of life in South Bay. Further, we see how the construction of the chronotopes in the narrative determines this perpetuation. Drawing on these explorations, this section on *Mad Men* and Donald Draper offers a slightly different perspective on the pastoral ideal and the chronotope of the *pastoral.* Rather than paralleling New York to the suburb of Ossining, where the Drapers reside, in terms of pastoral imitation, I will instead look at how the depictions of California can be seen as a representation of the pastoral ideal in *Mad Men.* The concept of California as a symbol of the pastoral, and as a "land of opportunity" within the "land of opportunity", i.e. America, is a fairly established trope in literature, and I will therefore not elaborate on this for the purposes of this discussion. It is further worth noting that in the legend of «The Queen of California», California was believed to be an island (Montalvo 76-77). To us, this strengthens the image of California as a place where the pastoral imitation can take place, as an isolated sphere protected from the dangers of the outside, threatening to corrupt the innocence of this sphere, as we have seen in the foregoing discussions of this chapter.

By looking at two episodes in particular, namely "The Mountain King" (S2.E12) and "Person to Person" (S7.E14), I will explore Don's constant longing for and return to California, as an extended symbol of the promised land, and how this can be seen in relation to the pastoral ideal and the chronotope of the pastoral. Further, I will argue that these episodes problematize the previously discussed duality of this character's identity, and lay bare an internal tug of war between the return to the pastoral, and the drive to move forward that is so characteristic of Don Draper. *Resurrection* will be a key trope when discussing this duality, as well as ideas of *loneliness* and *detachment*. Ultimately, this section aims to open up to a new reading of the character of Don, with decidedly more emphasis on the dynamics of the dual identities Dick Whitman/Donald Draper than previous readings provide. Such readings often tend to separate the two identities, and do not acknowledge the co-existence of these in the present.

The opening scene of the first episode of season one of *Mad Men,* "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes", shows the character of Donald Draper sitting in a dimly lit New York bar, the air filled with music, laughter, and smoke. He is surrounded by people, but alone (S1.E1, 00:44). As will be evident from the following examination, that image is a recurrent one, and one that sums up the essence of Donald Draper's life. The dialogue between Don and Rachel Menken towards the end of "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes" picks up on the initial image of Don sitting solitary at his table, and raises the subject of loneliness and dissociation, which will recur throughout the series:

> Don: "You're born alone and you die alone and this world just drops a bunch of rules on top of you to make you forget those facts, but I never forget."
>
> Menken: "Mr. Draper. (…) I don't know what it is you really believe in. But I do know what it feels like to be out of place. To be disconnected. To see the whole world laid out in front of you the way other people live it. There's something about you, that tells me you know it too. (S1.E1, 39:38-40:27)

At this, Draper finds himself at a loss of words, arguably because Menken accurately describes the way he feels. As we will see in the following, Don himself refers to this feeling of distance in “The Mountain King” (S2.E12) and clearly relates to it in the final episode, “Person to Person” (S7.E14), making clear how the feeling of isolation haunts this character throughout the series.

The Corcoran study on the “pastoral suburb” is of interest also in relation to *Mad Men*. As has been pointed out in the foregoing, an important aspect here is the fact that the traditional suburban landscape is surrounded by self-imposed limits which protect the suburban landscape from the dangers of the outside world, by and large represented by the industrial, busy, and sinful way of life that in *Mad Men* takes place in New York City, as it does in *Gatsby* and *Flannel Suit* as well. Corcoran elaborates on this, stating that there exists within the suburban landscape a “social embeddedness which acts as a bulwark against isolation and alienation” (Corcoran 2537). *Alienation* is a recurrent way of describing the feeling of estrangement that comes with an individual’s awareness that, despite being a member of a crowd, a mass of people moving through the same streets of the same city, one is still irrevocably alone. This, amongst other factors, has its roots in the cultural diversity of the people of the city, which does not make its presence in suburbia felt to the extent that it does in the city. With the suburbs being limited to people of a certain class due to economic factors, a certain degree of conformity common to one group results, which again gives this same group a feeling of sameness and of belonging. However, placelessness and loneliness have long been recurrent themes in the suburban novel, and as we shall see, these themes are present in *Mad Men* as well.

In “The Mountain King” (S2.E2) Betty, with reason, suspects that Don is having an affair with Bobby Barrett, which causes Betty to kick Don out of the house *sine die*. During a business trip with Pete Campbell to LA shortly after, Don, without notice, leaves Pete and instead goes to San Pedro to visit Anna Draper, the real Donald Draper’s widow. After Anna exposed and confronted Dick Whitman with his stolen identity shortly after the war, the two remained close friends. During his stay, it is apparent how his whole persona changes: the busy, ambitious ad-man has exchanged his flannel suit for chequered shirts and khakis, and even introduces himself as Dick Whitman to those he meets. Removed from the exasperating life in New York and from the troubles he is facing in his marriage, Don appears calm, relaxed, and more at peace with himself.

One might argue that this is because Anna knows the truth about him, and due to their deep and genuine friendship, expressed in Anna's comment that, "I always felt that we met so that both of our lives could be better. That's just how it is between us." (S2.E12, 16:04). In this episode, we see Don opening up to another person in a way that has not been previously shown. Don tells Anna that, "I have been watching my life. It's right there. And I keep scratching at it trying to get into it. And I can't" (S2.E12, 17:20) Recalling the discussion on Gatsby and façade, we find that there are similarities between the two characters that are of interest here. I previously argued that "the corrugated surface" (Fitzgerald 74) in *Gatsby* symbolizes the façade Gatsby creates around himself, where the creased surface, represented by his constructed identity and perceptible wealth, obscures what lies beneath the surface; the James Gatz of North Dakota from the past. With the abovementioned comment, Don reveals that some of the same mechanisms are at work here. Arguably, the construction of a new identity that precludes for his family or colleagues to know who he really is, distances Draper from his surroundings, creating a surface that he is not able to break through, and depicted in the image of himself as "scratching at" and "trying to get into" his own life.

Apart from displaying the close relation to Anna, "The Mountain King" further makes visible Don's relationship with California. As is the case with the Rath family, a similar imitation of the pastoral landscape takes place in Ossining where the Drapers reside. To Don, it is however California which is the absolute symbol of the pastoral landscape, and the place he always returns to in times of trouble. In "The Mountain King" (S2.E12) Anna does a tarot card reading for Don, where the card representing “the soul of the world” has a central position, underlining Don’s connection to nature and its impact when he is in California:

> ANNA. She’s the soul of the world. She’s in a very important spot here. This is *you*, what *you* are bringing to the reading. She says you are part of the world. Air, water, every living thing is connected to you.
>
> DON. it’s a nice thought (…) what does it mean?
>
> ANNA. it means, the only thing keeping you from being happy is the belief that you are alone.
>
> DON. What if that’s true?
>
> ANNA. then you can change.
>
> DON. people don’t change.
>
> ANNA. I think she stands for wisdom. As you live you learn things. (S2.E12, 40:53)

It is evident from this exchange that Don’s unhappiness is closely related to his loneliness, reflected also in his statement that he “[has] been watching [his] life”. In his book *Ensomhetens filosofi*[22], Lars Svendsen argues that there is a difference between being *alone* and being *lonely*: Loneliness does not, neither logically nor empirically, depend on being alone. It does not depend on the presence of others, but rather on how an individual experiences its relation to other individuals (Svendsen 21). Thus, one might be perfectly happy being alone, and, as I argue is the case for Draper, one might be profoundly lonely despite being in a house or a city full of people, and despite giving the impression that one has an exciting life.

Don’s palpable loneliness must be seen in relation to what we might call his “double identity”, as Dick Whitman disguised as Donald Draper. In his essay “Egoless Egoists”, Robert

---

[22] Svendsen’s book has not been translated into English (as of 26.04.2016), but the title approximately translates to “A Philosophy of Loneliness”.

White explains Draper’s inability to connect with the people around him and his loneliness precisely as a result of his false identity:

> Whitman/Draper is invisible to his wife. Mutual psychological visibility is only possible between two (or more) people who genuinely see each other. Betty Draper cannot make a connection to her husband because the man she’s reacting to and responding to does not exist. (…) Whitman/Draper does not appear to have any genuine friends (…) Whitman/Draper’s clients and colleagues are reacting and responding to Draper, not Whitman. (White 86-87)

This reading arguably explains the character of Whitman/Draper’s feeling of distance from his life, like a passive by-stander unable to truly connect with the people around him. His identity is like an impenetrable surface that obscures his true self and that further makes him “move through his days invisible to all those around him” (White 86-87). White further argues that “the one person Whitman/Draper appears to have a genuine connection with is Anna Draper (…) because Anna is the only person who sees Dick Whitman. Anna is reacting and responding to *him*, not to the man he pretends to be.” (White 87). This is evident also in conversation between the two characters, where Don tells Anna that “I’ve told you things I’ve never told Betty. Why does it have to be that way?” (S2.E12, 16:40). Arguably, one might see White’s claim that “Whitman/Draper’s clients and colleagues are reacting and responding to Draper” (86-87) as somewhat inadequate, as they are in reality responding to a constructed identity and a façade. In this sense, neither of the two identities are ever really seen or responded to.

The names “Whitman” and “Draper” are also of interest here, as they can be seen in relation to the two identities they represent. “Whitman” might be seen as this character’s identification with the pastoral[23]; He grows up on a farm, depicted as poor and rural. Further, his name is in itself an allusion to the rural and pastoral, in that he shares it with a prominent figure in pastoral writing in the American literary history, namely Walt Whitman. The connection between the name "Whitman" and Don's identification with the pastoral is underlined in the fact that he introduces himself as "Dick Whitman" during his stay in pastoral California in "The Mountain King", as seen above. (S2.E12). "Draper", on the other hand, alludes to his false identity, the identity he has draped himself in[24], and the identity he wears whenever he is not in California.

The duality Dick/Don leads us to the theme of *resurrection* in *Mad Men.* As we saw in chapter one, the *metamorphosis* that is the transition of Dick Whitman into Donald Draper is seen as the *rebirth* of this character (Bakhtin 115) As will be evident from the following, the chronotope of the *pastoral* arguably reverses this transformation to some degree. The question that thus arises is how the chronotopes that we explored in chapter 1 combine with the chronotope of the *pastoral* and the imitation of the pastoral ideal in this chapter. Is a reversal of the *metamorphosis* and thus the return to the *pastoral* possible? Or does the time in the chronotope of *threshold,* the exact moment which allows for Dick's transformation into Don, prevail over this return? In "The Mountain King" this issue is also raised in Anna's tarot reading. Alongside the "soul of the world", the resurrection is also a central card:

> DON. That can't be good
> ANNA. It is
> DON. it's the end of the world
> ANNA. It's the resurrection. Do you wanna know what this means or not?

---

[23] http://arcade.stanford.edu/blogs/whitmans-grandchildren-becoming-and-unbecoming-walt-whitman, 01.03.2016

[24] http://www.popmatters.com/column/138997-richard-whitman-shrugged-the-merging-of-identities/, 26.04.2015

DON. No, I don’t. (S2.E12, 40:26)

The tarot reading takes place in Anna’s living room. The white curtains move in the breeze flowing through the sunlit window, and we hear the distant sound of a wind chime tinkling on the porch. Looking towards the window, Don says “I can smell the ocean” (S2E12, 40:48). “The Mountain King” ends with Draper alone on a beach, walking barefooted into the ocean. He washes his face in the water, evoking baptism and the redemption of sins. He is stripped to the waist, wearing only a pair of beige khakis as he wades in the water and lets the waves wash over him. This is Don’s resurrection. The water symbolizes new life, and Don, being barefooted, partially naked and partially dressed in white, suggests a return to an innocent infantile stadium. This is underlined by the song that is playing over this scene, where the lyrics are as follows:

> I say Christian pilgrim so redeemed from sin,
> Called out of darkness a new life to begin.
> Were you ever in the valley where the way is dark and dim?
> Did you ever drink the cup of loneliness with him?
>
> (“Cup of Loneliness”, George Jones)

The use of this song with this specific scene lends support to our reading of California as the pastoral landscape in Donald Draper’s life. It creates the image of Don as the “Christian pilgrim”, returning to the “promised land”. Relating this to Bakhtin’s theory, the reader will recall that he refers to the *bucolic-pastoral-idyllic* chronotope (Bakhtin 103), where the word *bucolic* underlines the Christian connotations in relation to resurrection. Further, “the valley where the way is dark and dim” evokes New York, and we recall Nick Carraway’s depictions of the city and how it creates allusions to purgatory in *Gatsby*. Don’s constant longing for and repeated return to California can be seen as his being “called out of darkness”, i.e. New York, where the “new life to begin” is made possible by his resurrection, as described above.

However, Don's resurrection does not result in a return to his identity as Dick Whitman, and "a new life to begin" with this name. Rather, Draper returns to New York, to Ossining, and to Sterling Cooper, where he recommences his life as Donald Draper, and thus to his life as the traditional American suburbanite, a commuting family man and successful business man. In the following seasons it is this identity we get to follow, and as for the subject of his double identity there seems to be few or no incidents of major importance that take place, until the last season draws to an end.[25] As we now move on to look at *Mad Men*'s last episode, "Person to Person"[26], it will be evident how the trope of resurrection, and the duality of Dick/Don again makes its presence in the ultimate episode of *Mad Men.*

This episode takes place in Big Sur in California, where Don has joined Anna's niece, Stephanie, to a retreat center[27] (S7.E14). The events that take place here makes visible the struggle between the identities Dick/Don. During a seminar where Stephanie opens up to the group, she is met with judgement by one of the other members in the group for having left her son with its father and chosen not to take part in his life. She leaves the seminar in tears, whereupon Don follows and tells her that "you can put this behind you. It will get easier as you move forward" (S7.E14, 32:16). This is clearly his identity as Don speaking, and it is striking how this statement resembles the advice he gives Peggy after she gives birth that we see in chapter one: “Get out of here and move forward. This never happened. It will shock you how much it never happened” (S2.E5). Whereas Peggy is able to follow this advice, Stephanie responds in a different manner, which underlines Don’s own inability to free himself completely from his past, made clear in her use of his given name: “Oh, Dick. I don’t think you’re right about that” (Ibid.). Following this incident, Stephanie takes Don’s car and leaves him at the retreat center, and Don is once again where we found him in the initial scene of “Smoke Gets in Your Eyes” – surrounded by people, but alone (S1.E1, 00:54).

---

[25] Certainly, there are episodes and scenes that could have been included to elaborate further on Don's relationship to California, and to lay bare the progress of being more open about his background to the people around him that arguably takes place over the course of the series. However, these have not been taken into consideration for the purposes of this thesis. Rather I have chosen to focus wholly on the episodes discussed in this section, as I feel they best illustrate the duality of Dick/Don and this character's connection with the pastoral and the chronotope of the *pastoral.*

[26] The title of this episode refers to the three long-distance phone calls Don makes in this episode, called «person-to-person calls», to Sally Draper, Betty Francis, and Peggy Olsen, respectively. It has been argued that these characters are those who matter the most to Don, and that his calls to them can be seen as a desperate attempt to «make a connection», and further that it is Peggy who in the end urges him to return to New York and to McCann Erickson. For the purposes of this thesis, the phone calls to Sally and Betty will not be taken into consideration, due to spatial and temporal limitations. (http://www.hollywoodtake.com/mad-men-finale-disappointing-dons-desire-come-home-lost-translation-phone-calls-except-82346 24.04.2016)

[27] The *Mad Men* team wanted to shoot «Person to Person» on the grounds of the renowned retreat center Esalen, but were rejected due to the retreat center's wish to protect the privacy of its guests. The retreat center remains unnamed in the series, but there is little doubt that this is a depiction of Esalen. Esalen was established in the sixties in Big Sur, and, according to president of Esalen Gordon Wheeler it was «all there was (…) if you were going up the coast from LA (…) [a]t that time». (http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3086707/Pictured-Big-Sur-retreat-7-000-spiritual-workshops-Mad-Men-based-final-scenes.html 22.04.2016)

From the retreat center Don calls Peggy, who urges him to come back to McCann Erickson to work on the sales pitch for Coca Cola. Don breaks down over the phone and says he cannot come back, whereupon Peggy finally asks him: “Don (…) what did you ever do that was *so* bad?” (S7.E14, 39:43). His response might be seen as a confession of his sins and lays bare the internal struggle between the identities Dick/Don. The dialogue that follows evokes suicide, and recalls both Svendsen and the contrariety between being alone and being lonely, and consequently also Corcoran and the issue of isolation and alienation, as discussed above:

> DON. I messed everything up. I’m not the man you think I am.
>
> PEGGY. Don, listen to me. What did you ever do that was *so* bad?
>
> DON. I broke all my vows. I scandalized my child. I took another man’s name and made…*nothing* of it.
>
> PEGGY. That’s *not* true.
>
> DON. I only called because I realized I never said goodbye to you.
>
> PEGGY. I don’t think you should be alone right now.
>
> DON. I’m in a crowd. I just wanted to hear your voice. See you soon. (S7.E14, 39:26)

After hanging up the phone, Don is seemingly on the verge of a mental breakdown. When a staff member of the retreat center finds him in this condition, she takes him along to a group seminar. Here, the words of Leonard, another resident at the center, results in what can be seen as the culmination of his conflicting identities, and finally the release of Don's year-long suppression of his identity as Dick Whitman. What triggers this release is the fact that, like Menken in "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes", Leonard expresses in words Don's feelings of estrangement and detachment:

> It's like no one cares that I'm gone. They should love me. I mean, maybe they do, but I don't know what it is. You spend your whole life thinking you're not getting it, people aren't giving it to you. Then you realize, they're trying, and you don't even know what it is. I had a dream I was on a shelf in the refrigerator. Someone closes the door and the light goes off, and I know everybody's out there eating. And then, they open the door and you see them smiling, and they're happy to see you., but maybe they don't look right at you. And maybe they don't pick you. And then the door closes again, the light goes off. (S7.E14. 40:56)

Leonard breaks out in tears. Don rises from his chair, walks slowly towards him and hugs him. For a few moments they sit embraced, without exchanging any words, both crying. Besides his relationship to Anna, this is arguably Dons' most sincere connection to another human being throughout the series. In this moment he allows himself to be Dick Whitman again, underlined in his rugged look: he is unshaven, and wears jeans and a chequered shirt, evoking his rural roots. By letting go of his constructed identity as Draper he is able to connect with Leonard. Recalling the aforementioned essay by Robert White, it is possible to see this scene as evidence of White's statement that "[m]utual psychological visibility is only possible between two (or more) people who genuinely see each other" (White, 86). As will be returned to in the conclusion of this thesis, this scene represents a crucial moment in the question of whether or not Don returns to his identity as Dick Whitman.

In the last few scenes of the final episode Don stands looking at the sun that sets on the horizon, and we hear the distant sound of the waves from beneath. We hear the voice of the leader of the meditation group Don has joined in the following scene: “Mother Sun, we greet you, and are thankful for the sweetness of the earth. The new day brings new hope. Lives we’ve led, the lives we get to lead. A new day, new ideas, a new you” (S7.E14, 52:01). Draper is all dressed in white, and the camera closes up on him as he sits crossed-legged on the green grass, chanting, with the ocean as a backdrop. In the same way as in the opening scene of the pilot episode, Don is also here surrounded by people, but alone. The scene is replete with symbolism, and can be seen as Don’s rebirth. Much of the symbolism that we saw in “The Mountain King” is echoed: He has returned to nature and in particular to the ocean, in itself a symbol of regeneration. The fact that he is dressed in white symbolizes innocence, new beginnings and thus arguably a new life; a new him. The combination of the water and the white garments alludes again to baptism, as a ritual that is meant to free the human being of sin. Further, the chanting can be seen as a return to a stage, both in evolution and in life, that precedes human language.

Whereas his identity as Dick Whitman was present in the previous scene, it is however Don Draper who is born again in this one. Apart from symbolizing innocence, Don’s white shirt can also be seen as a symbol of corporate America, as opposed to the plaid shirt from the previous scene. The “new him” represented by the “baptism” and underlined in his change of clothes, or his re-*draping* symbolizes is a Don Draper reincarnated. This view is supported by the meditation leader’s mentioning of “new ideas”, which alludes to Don’s future in the advertising industry. The words of the meditation leader are followed by the sound of a bell. The whole group then chants three times in unison: “Hummm. Hummm. Hummm.”, giving further allusions to rebirth and to the Christian traditional baptism, where the baptized is blessed in holy water three times, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The chanting is followed by another ring of the bell, identical to the first one, arguably symbolizing the completion of the baptism and of the reincarnation of the ad man Donald Draper. At this exact moment is he born anew, and his stern and concentrated face breaks up into a discreet, almost sinister, smile. This is the last image of Don in the entire series. Following this, and also concluding all of *Mad Men*, is the world famous advertisement video for Coca Cola, the "Hilltop" ad of 1971.[28] This ending indicates that Don returns to McCann Erikson and creates the "Hilltop" ad, an argument that is supported when we recall Peggy's question "[d]on't you wanna work on Coke?" (S7.E14, 39:30), and the focus on "new ideas" in the meditation session.

The question that thus remains concerns what this rebirth as Donald Draper indicates. Is the return to his identity as Donald Draper a final one? Or are the traces of his past still visible, with his identity as Dick Whitman still present beneath the façade of his constructed identity? These are questions that will be addressed in the forthcoming conclusion.

---

[28] The «Hilltop» ad was indeed made by McCann Erickson (http://www.coca-colacompany.com/stories/coke-lore-hilltop-story/ 26.04.16)

Conclusion

To read *The Great Gatsby*, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit*, and *Mad Men* through chronotopes brings out aspects that may have been previously neglected. This analysis shows how the construction of a literary time-space continuum in the narratives lays bare essential features of the constructions of the respective main protagonists, and the underlying reasons for their ambitions and actions in the present. We see how the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and the chronotope of the *threshold* are being held by the chronotope of the *pastoral,* in that the quasi-cyclical time in the latter will always result in a return to the two former in the case of these works. In turn, the interrelationship between the chronotopes and the narratives' construction of them them arguably reveal aspects of the characters' paths of life. Additionally, this thesis shows how the time-space continuums are somewhat ever-present in these characters' lives, which results in conflicted personalities. In turn, this disables them from truly connecting to the people around them and to the present.

The chronotopic reading of *Gatsby* contributes to the already immense body of readings of this novel, in that it has given way to a possible understanding of *how* and *why* Gatsby's life unfolds in the way it does. It shows not only that the young James Gatz' ambitions lead him to seek a new life and reinvent himself as Gatsby, but that this is the result of the narrative's construction of the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life,* where chance, the role of the parvenu, and metamorphosis make this reinvention possible. We see how Gatsby's desire for Daisy is rooted not in Daisy herself, but in what she represents, a reading that is fairly established. Through the lens of Bakhtin's theory, however, the discussion in this thesis broadens the perspective of this reading, by interpreting Gatsby in relation to the parvenu. Moreover, Gatsby's iconic exclamation "[c]an't repeat the past? (…) Why of course you can!" (Fitzgerald 88) in this reading not only expresses his naïve hope of having Daisy back, but makes clear that this is his moment of threshold, which makes it a moment that is intrinsically impossible to leave behind. Through the chronotope of the *pastoral,* we see that the imitation of the pastoral ideal fails because it is disrupted by the chronotopes of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and of the *threshold,* brought by due to the quasi-cyclical time of the chronotope of the *pastoral.* This imitation reflects in Gatsby himself as well, through his own imitation of the identity he has constructed. Further, it is precisely the quasi-cyclical nature of this pastoral time that determines the faith of Gatsby, in that it takes him back to a stage preceding his incomplete metamorphosis.

In *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit,* the chronotopic reading opens up to a markedly more complex interpretation of the novel's narrative. What has previously been regarded a fairly plain and shallow story about the petty struggles of the average commuting business man and his suburban family life, holds more substance and depth than it has been given credit for. In particular, it is interesting how this reading radically alters the comprehension of the novel's ending, which for the most part has been repudiated and debased to a cliché ending lacking momentum. We see however how the narrative constructs a separate time-space continuum during Tom's time in the war, where the chronotopes of the *adventure novel of everyday life* and of the *threshold* are combined. Further, it is made clear that this time-space continuum keeps resurfacing in Tom's present, in which the narrative is constructed by the chronotope of the *pastoral.* In part it is the ever-presence of the war that hinders him and his wife in a successful imitation of the pastoral ideal and that thus hinders their true happiness. Consequently, when Tom steps over the moment of threshold and seemingly comes to terms with his actions during the war, this *could* guarantee them their happiness, which is what most critics argue. However, their present lives are still governed by the chronotope of the *pastoral,* and through the restrictions this chronotope brings, with its quasi-cyclical time, they are forced to perpetuate the pattern of failed imitation of the pastoral ideal and of picture-perfect suburban idyll. The quasi-cyclical time of the chronotope of the *pastoral* thus indicates that the Raths' happy ending can only be temporary, and that it can only result in a return to the mode of life they believe they have left behind, and a return to the moment of threshold.

As for *Mad Men,* a chronotopic reading illustrates how the time-space continuum of the narrative determines Don's life. We see that chance and personal initiative in this chronotope makes possible the metamorphosis of Dick Whitman into Donald Draper, and that the quasi-cyclical time of the chronotope of the *pastoral* results in a constant return to the moment of *threshold,* evident from the inherent battle of these two identities. Moreover, such reading makes visible how the dual identity impedes Don from establishing a profound connection with the people around him.

In the discussion on Draper and the pastoral I argue that the sound of the bell in the series' final scene marks the completion of the second rebirth, and the affirmation of the identity of the ad-man Don Draper. Interestingly, this resonates with what can be seen as Don's entrance to advertising, also made possible by chance, seen in "Waldorf Stories" (S4.E6): The young Don Draper works as a salesman in a fur company, where Roger Sterling one day comes by to buy a fur. Don is made aware that Sterling works in an advertising agency, and eagerly shows him the ads he has made for the store. Sterling shows some interest, but is clearly not convinced of his talent. Don is persistent, however, and convinces Sterling to join him for a drink, which turns into a quite liquid lunch. The following day Don shows up in the entrance hall of the building of Sterling Cooper, approaches Sterling and tells him:

> DON. You hired me.
>
> STERLING: What? When?
>
> DON: Yesterday. You said "welcome aboard". (S4.E6, 44:07-44:26)

At this exact moment, we hear the clear and distinct sound of the elevator bell. Don and Sterling step into the elevator that will take them up to the office of the advertising agency, and the

Skeeter Davis song “Ladder of Success” sets in. Also here, the sound of the bell marks the beginning of Don’s career in advertising, underlined by the song.

In relation to the chronotope of the *pastoral,* one might argue that the bell in the final scene *echoes* the elevator bell of this scene, and makes visible the quasi-cyclical time of this chronotope. Arguably then, the Don that sits smiling assuredly on the cliff in Big Sur is a newborn Don, who has returned to his old self precisely as the newly invented Don who returned from the war, transformed from Dick Whitman, and ready for a new beginning. However, this is a beginning that eventually will take him back to a stage in life where his past will mark its presence once more. Interestingly, one could argue that Don’s claim that “people don’t change” that we see in his conversation with Anna (S2.E12, 40:53), reveals a subliminal awareness of the fact that he can’t leave the past behind.

Moreover, the significance of the bell and what it represents can be seen in relation to the other works as well, in that it makes visible the idea of being pulled back into the past. In *Gatsby* this is the moment when Tom, in the hotel room in New York, exposes Gatsby’s past and sets his reversal in motion (Fitzgerald 106-107). However, as Tom is unaware of Gatsby’s true identity as James Gatz, this confrontation does not bring him further back than to the stage of the newly invented Gatsby. Only when Wilson kills Gatsby is the reversal completed. In *Flannel Suit,* it is the moment where Tom and Betsy make up after their fight that represents the moment of being pulled back. Here, Tom is brought back to a stage of purity and innocence, preceding his time in the war. Like with Don, however, this new beginning will eventually result in a return of the past once more.

In sum, the chronotopic reading of these works may open up to a slightly different understanding of these works, where the texts construct themselves around the chronotopes, resulting in a quasi-cyclical pattern which restricts the characters and determines their paths of life. This reading makes visible how the time-space continuum of the *adventure novel of* *everyday life* and of the *threshold* determine the characters' past, and how the time-space continuum of the *pastoral,* with its quasi-cyclical time, results in a repetitive and constant return to these pasts, which in turn determines the characters' present lives and their futures. In *Gatsby,* this means a return to a life as James Gatz, a complete reversal of metamorphosis, and ultimately death. In *Flannel Suit* and *Mad Men,* the quasi-cyclical time of the chronotope of the *pastoral* results in a return to the stage of new beginnings and a temporary state of happiness, contentment, and ambitions and prospects for a brighter future. However, the quasi-cyclicality that the narrative constructs determines their paths of life, and eventually returns them again to a stage of life where their past lives once more will catch up with them and disrupt the reconstructed façades. Ultimately, this results in a never-ending loop, where the characters are never allowed to be completely freed from their past lives, and where the struggle of their dual identities will always be inherent and returning.

In the introduction I mentioned how the song "Both Sides Now" plays when Don unveils parts of his upbringing to his children. I will conclude this thesis with an excerpt from the lyrics of this song, as I feel it is indicative of the inescapable duality of the lives and personas of the characters Gatsby, Tom, and Don:

> I've looked at life from both sides now
> From up and down, and still somehow
> It's life's illusions I recall
> I really don't know life at all. (Mitchell, 1967)

This underlines the characters' incomprehensible understanding of life, reflected in the conflicted personalities and inability to connect with life, as it is viewed through the illusions of the self, imposed via the narrative and the chronotopes. The chronotopic reading of these works illuminates our understanding of the characters. However, there will always be aspects that eludes the gleams of light and remain obscured, and so we read on, borne back ceaselessly into the narrative.

Works Cited

"5G." Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 16. Aug. 2007. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

Abrams, M.H. and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* The United States of America: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2012. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011. Print.

85-258.

Beuka, Robert. *American Icon. Fitzgerald's* The Great Gatsby *in Critical and Historical Context.* Rochester, New York: Camden House, 2011. Print.

---. *Suburbianation. Reading Suburban Landscape in Twentieth-Century American Fiction and Film.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.

Carveth, Rod, and James B. South, eds. *Mad Men and Philosophy. Nothing Is as It Seems.* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2010. Print.

Castronovo, David. *Beyond the Gray Flannel Suit. Books from the 1950s that Made American Culture.* New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc., 2004. Print.

Collins, Judy. "Both Sides Now". *The Very Best of Judy Collins.* Warner Music, 2001. CD.

Corcoran, Mary P. "'God's Golden Acre for Children': Pastoralism and Sense of Place in New Suburban Communities." *Urban Studies* 47 (12) Nov. 2010: 2537-2554. Sagepub. Web. 8. March 2016.

Curnutt, Kirk. Introduction. *A Historical Guide to F. Scott Fitzgerald.* By Curnutt, ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. 3-19. Print.

"echolalia, n." *OED Online.* Oxford University Press, March 2016. Web. 27.04.2016 “façade, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2016. Web. 5 May 2016.

Faulkner, William. *Requiem for a Nun.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1953. Print.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Franklin, Benjamin. “The Autobiography [Part Two]”. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature. Shorter Seventh Edition. Vol 1.* Ed. Nina Baym et. al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2008. 276-92. Print.

Franzen, Johnathan. Introduction. *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.* By Sloan Wilson. 1955. 3rd ed. London: Penguin Classics, 2005. i-iv (unnumbered). Print.

Fritz, John. “Pete, Peggy, Don, and the Dialectic of Remembering and Forgetting.” *Mad Men and Philosophy. Nothing Is as It Seems.* Eds. Rod Carveth & James B. South. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2010. 53-65. Print.

Gladwell, Malcolm. “Getting Over It; Annals of Psychology.” *The New Yorker* 8. Nov. 2008: 75-79. *ProQuest.* Web. 5. May 2016.

Goodlad, Lauren M. E., Lilya Kaganovsky, and Robert A. Rushing, eds. *Mad Men, Mad World. Sex, Politics, Style, and the 1960s.* The United States of America: Duke UP, 2013. Print.

“The Hobo Code.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 6. Sept. 2007. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

“In Care Of.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 23. Jun. 2013. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

Jones, George. “Cup of Loneliness”. *The Definitive Collection 1955-1962.* Import, 2004. CD.

Jurca, Catherine. “The Sanctimonious Suburbanite: Sloan Wilson’s The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit”. *American Literary History,* Vol. 11, No. 1. 1999: 82-106. JSTOR. Web. 6. May 2016.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden. Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America.* New York: Oxford UP, 1967. Print.

McArdle, John. “20th-Century American Bestsellers”. Brandeis University, n.d. Web. 6. May 2016.

Montalvo, Garcí Rodriguez Ordóñez de. “The Queen of California”. *The Literature of California. Volume 1. Native American Beginnings to 1945.* Ed. Jack Hicks et. al. California: University of California Press, 2000. 76-77. Print.

“The Mountain King.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 19. Oct. 2008. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

“Nixon vs. Kennedy”. Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 11. Oct. 2007. Hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

“pastoral”. *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide.* 2006. Print.

“Person to Person.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 17. May 2015. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

Petersen, Anne Helen. “Don Draper 101”. Slate. The Slate Group, 8. Apr. 2014. Web. 6. May 2016.

Prigozy, Ruth. Introduction. *The Great Gatsby.* By F. Scott Fitzgerald. 1925. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. Vii-xxxv. Print.

---. “The Fitzgerald Revival.” *F. Scott Fitzgerald in Context.* Ed. Mangum, Bryant. New York: Cambridge UP, 2013. 78-86. Print.

Rosenberg, Emily S. “‘Foreign Affairs’ After World War II: Connecting Sexual and International Politics”. *Diplomatic History* Vol 18, Issue 1, 1994: 59-70. Oxford Journals. Web. 6. May 2016.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. “Time in Faulkner: The Sound and the Fury.” *William Faulkner. Three Decades of Criticism.* Eds. Frederick J. Hoffman & Olga Wickery. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1960. 225-32. Print.

Spector, Bert. “The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit in the executive suit: American corporate movies in the 1950s.” *Journal of Management History* Vol 14, 2008. 87-104. Emerald Insight. Web. 11. May 2016.

Svendsen, Lars Fr. H. *Ensomhetens filosofi.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2015. Print.

Sweeney, Sarah. “At the heart of ‘Mad Men’”. Harvard, 28. Apr. 2014. Web. 6. May 2016

Turnbull, Andrew. *Scott Fitzgerald,* New York: Grove Press, 1962. Print.

“The Wheel.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 18. Oct. 2007. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.

Wilson, Sloan. *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit.* New York: Penguin Group, 2005. Print.

“Waldorf Stories.” Writ: Matthew Weiner et.al. *Mad Men.* Weiner Bros & Lionsgate Television for American Movie Classics, 29. Aug. 2010. hbonordic. Web. 1. Feb. 2016.