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Abstract

Gelibolu Campaign (1915) is an inspiration for fiction writers as they delve into the ancient and present history of the campaign in their fictional constructions. Although in different ways the novels pay tribute to the memories and heroes of the campaign while connecting the carnage of 1915 to the classical times, of Homer’s Troy. References to Iliad and Odyssey appear in fictional stories representing Gelibolu battlefield as a mythical land. T.S. Eliot’s anti-war poem The Wasteland (1922) is echoed in novels lamenting the loss. Besides classical examples British war poets Rupert Brooke and Siegfried Sassoon are also remembered in fictional representations of the campaign. Yet, the representations offer an alternative discourse sought by New Historicism replacing the romantic and heroic representations of war with bitter and traumatic ones. This study aims to analyse the tributes to Brooke and Sassoon in Stanton Hope’s Richer Dust (1925), Bruce Scates’s On Dangerous Ground (2012), Rachel Billington’s Glory (2015), and Peter Yeldham’s Barbed Wire and Roses (2007) as they try to unearth the voices of First World War poets and discuss new perspectives offered by novelists in their understanding of the poets. Although wars consume poets besides the intellectual and educated mass, the power of poetry is still heard and remembered thanks to fictional representations creating a dialogue between voices of past and present.
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Çanakkale Romanlarında Rupert Brooke ve Siegfried Sassoon’u Anmak
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Gelibolu Campaign (1915), one of the most significant battles of the First World War (1914-1918), continues to trigger the imagination of fiction writers. Especially over the past twenty years, a remarkable increase has been observed in the production of historical fiction in Turkey, Britain, Australia and New Zealand on Gelibolu. Novelists and historians are consistently engaged with the Gelibolu Campaign and the First World War in their literary output. This interest may well be attributed to the centenary of the campaign when the fictional rewritings enrich the field and enable us to remember and commemorate our loss through literature. Since 2015, the centenary of the campaign, Gelibolu has been remembered in different ways ranging from movies, documentaries, symphonies, art exhibitions, conferences to fictional representations. As traditional commemorative acts are also changing each recreation enriches the memory of the Gelibolu Campaign in a particular way and presents an alternative act of commemoration. Jay Winter argues that “[acts] of shared remembrance require a time and place at which they can be expressed. Without a place, or a substitute for a lost home, collective memory vanishes. War memorials create such a focus of attention, a site where a past can be evoked, re-created, perhaps misinterpreted, but in any event kept alive (2006: 179).

Fiction provides an alternative space for such commemorative practices as it keeps the memory of the campaign alive with real historical characters as truth tellers or witnesses and fictional ones as imagined possibilities. Besides pilgrimages made to the memorials fictional rewritings offer new understandings to remember our loss. Winter sees fiction and fictionalized memoirs as “important vectors for the dissemination of traumatic memory” besides physical spaces (2006: 44). In this way it is essential to analyse novels taking on Gelibolu Campaign which communicate new meanings.

Major theme of the novels to be discussed in this study is human loss transcending nations and histories. The unprecedented scope of loss brings uneducated young soldiers together with intellectuals, university students and poets together in a battlefield. This loss is reiterated through the memory of poets and poetry as Gelibolu draws both Homer and war poets into the fictional constructions. The carnage of 1915 is read simultaneously with that of Troy as references to Iliad and Odyssey appear in novels fictionalizing Gelibolu land in a mythical way. T.S. Eliot’s anti-war poem The Waste Land is also echoed in novels lamenting the loss of human and non-human nature concurrently. However, the literary allusions in Gelibolu novels are not limited to figures of western culture and literature since novels voice the words of Sufi philosopher and poet Rumi as well. Hence, fictional rewritings of Gelibolu Campaign not only connect the ancient history and the myths of the land with the carnage of 1915 but also create a bridge between the cultures of east and west aspiring for a transnational ideal.

This tendency of novelists to connect the history of the First World War with the myths of war is read as an “obsession” (Bergonzi 1965: 34). Yet, it is injustice to poets Rupert Brooke and Siegfried Sassoon since “the literary history of the First World War is unique, in that the experience of war has been rendered through a small group of male poets” in which Brooke and Sassoon along with Wilfred Owen and Isaac Rosenberg
were influential figures (Gillis 2007: 100). Brooke’s yearning ‘‘If I should die, think only this of me’’ in his sonnet sequence ‘‘The Soldier’’ coincides with New Historicist Stephen Greenblatt’s claim that ‘‘the bodies of the deceased have refused to stay buried’’ (Greenblatt 2010: 1). Brooke wants to be remembered and his cry is heard by the novelists. After his wartime experience Sassoon is after better remembrances as well. Actually it is not only the poet soldiers but soldier poets who cling to poetry for emotional support. Poetry becomes ‘‘a means of consolation’’ for soldiers on the battlefield (Çelikel 2017: 17). As the personal diaries of Anzac soldiers reveal ‘‘Some Anzac officers quoted poems in their diaries and some wrote their own poetry to cope with the violence of war using the aestheticism of poetry’’ (Çelikel 2017: 11). Hence, this paper attempts to discuss the significance of literary allusions made to Brooke and Sassoon by Bruce Scates’s On Dangerous Ground (2012), Rachel Billington’s Glory: A Story of Gallipoli (2015), Stanton Hope’s Richer Dust (1925) and Peter Yeldham’s Barbed Wire and Roses (2007). In the fictional stories novelists try to unearth the voices of poet soldiers to show the extent of destruction caused by war and show how young and creative men were uselessly sacrificed for the good of others. In this way fictional stories recreate an alternative story of the campaign reminding us the lost voices and stories New Historicism seeks for.

Rupert Brooke was one of the first war poets who never set foot on Gelibolu and could not live to fight. Yet, he is a symbol of war questioning the scope of destruction and carnage for he represents the educated and intellectual sacrifices of the First World War. James Campbell argues that ‘‘the Great War was the first to send a large number of educated, non-professional soldiers into combat, several of whom considered themselves poets well before they became soldiers (2005: 263). Brooke was one of them who ‘‘won a Cambridge fellowship with a dissertation on John Webster and Elizabethan drama’’ (Lee 2007: 144) before serving with the Royal Naval Division as Sub-Lieutenant. He died of blood poisoning on a troop ship bound for Gelibolu and buried in Greek island Skyros in the Aegean Sea on April 23, 1915, two days before the Gelibolu landing. He became a myth after Winston Churchill wrote an obituary article in The Times calling him a “poet-soldier” based on a sermon performed at Easter Sunday by the Dean of St. Paul’s Cathedral 3 weeks earlier. In Joseph Bristow’s argument; ‘‘Given that Churchill’s commentary built on the Dean’s sermon to transform the young poet into a national legend, Brooke’s perished body came to stand for indomitable patriotic values, ones in which the sons of the soil would remain “forever England,” no matter how far-flung their graves were from the homeland (2014: 664).

With Churchill’s promotion based on the patriotic, nationalist and romantic imagery of poet-soldier, young poet was transformed into a legend. Yet, he was not a hero of war for he saw no fighting and he never experienced what Sassoon and Owen did. Still ‘‘of all the myths which dominated the English consciousness during the Great War the greatest, and the most enduring, is that which enshrines the name and memory of Rupert Brooke’’ (Bergonzi 1965: 37). Bergonzi argues that his death was seen as a sacrifice of the nation justifying the cause of England (1965: 36).
The unfortunate loss of an educated poet with a high profile and the surge of patriotic fervour he created must have triggered the imaginations of the novelists. Although contemporary novels written by Scates and Billington will be the main focus of this paper, the first tribute to Brooke goes back to much earlier-to interwar years. British Lieutenant Stanton Hope, who served in the Drake Battalion of the Royal Naval Division in Gelibolu pays a tribute to the poet in his novel *Richer Dust: A Story of Gallipoli* (1925) based on his personal experiences of the campaign. Hope was in Gelibolu for six months and spent the last ten days in the front lines and left on the last night of the Helles evacuation, January 9th, 1916. Hope not only takes his title from Brooke’s poem but also remembers the poet by an epigraph on the cover page. It is the first stanza of Rupert Brooke’s poem ‘”The Soldier”, a part of the sonnet sequence 1914:

*If I should die, think only this of me:*

*That there’s some corner of a foreign field*

*That is for ever England. There shall be*

*In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;*

*A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,*

*Gave, once, her flowers to love, her ways to roam,*

*A body of England’s, breathing English air,*

*Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.* (V. “The Soldier”)

Yet war veteran Hope’s tribute in his autobiographical novel is limited with the title and the epigraph. Allusions remain in the form without an argument carried on to the text. Yet, the meaning of Brooke’s poem needs to be elucidated to understand the place of the poet in the literary canon. Brooke’s sonnet sequence 1914 is one of the earliest examples of Great War writing. It is read as a dialogue between the living and the dead. Written at the very beginning of the war, the poem is prophetic and Brooke is intuitive, just like any other soldier volunteering. Yet their literary power is surpassed by the ideology they come to represent:

*The sonnets themselves are not very amenable to critical discussion. They are works of very great mythic power, since they formed a unique focus for what the English felt, or wanted to feel; in 1914-15: they crystallize the powerful archetype of Brooke, the young Apollo, in his sacrificial role of the hero-as-victim. Considered, too, as historical documents, they are of interest as an index to the popular state of mind in the early months of the war. But considered more narrowly and exactly as poems, their inadequacy is very patent.* (Bergonzi 1965: 41)

In their novels Australian historian Professor Bruce Scates and British novelist Rachel Billington try to unearth the voice of Rupert Brooke and commemorate the poet in different ways. In their fictional stories novelists revisit Gelibolu Peninsula in 1915, 1919 and 1920s to find the missing soldiers. Missing soldiers mean fallen soldiers without a proper burial place which disturb the families back home. As a history professor Scates
attempts to connect the past of the Gelibolu with present to have a better understanding of the Gelibolu Campaign. In doing this Scates shows historian’s responsibility with his expertise in historical details. Yet he does not overwhelm the reader with historical facts as a wide range of literary allusions are also embedded in the text. The novel is rich with classical literary allusions. Homer’s *Iliad* and *The Odyssey* are frequently remembered in George Lambert, Zeki Bey and the old professor Brawley’s narratives. Allusions to *Iliad* recall the mythical past with references to Trojan War and echoes war as carnage. Scates alludes to Sufi philosopher and poet Rumi as well revealing his intent to write a transnational story. Besides classical allusions Scates uses images of T. S Eliot’s poem “The Waste Land” to question the scope of destruction and universality of the carnage.

In Scates’s fictional construction poet-soldier Brooke appears along with the classical ones bridging the ancient history of Gelibolu with the Gelibolu Campaign. Brooke is a major influence in Scates’s novel, more in the form than in the content. The historian pays tribute to the poet by drawing his chapter titles from Brooke’s poem 1914. Ten chapter titles out of twelve are from Brooke’s poem sequence I. Peace, II. Safety, III. The Dead, IV. The Dead, and V. The Soldier in ‘‘1914’’. Scates’s choice of titles for each chapter is just a fragment of a line from a sonnet sequence; Dark Tides, Rich Skies, All things Undying, Dawn will be Theirs, Rarer Gifts, The Deep Night, The Colours of the Earth, Into Cleanness Leaping, A Gathered Radiance and Richer Dust. Scates’s chapter title “Dawn will be Theirs” is a formal variation of Brooke’s sonnet sequence IV. The Dead: “The years had given them kindness. Dawn was theirs” (Lines 3-4; emphasis mine). The formal variation is prophetic extending the past to the future hinting that the fallen soldiers will always be remembered.

Furthermore, the fragmented lines of Brooke’s poetry stand for the fractured, dismembered and missing bodies of the soldiers. Scates tries to give a sense of fragility through fragmented lines of poetry. Furthermore they are selective allusions since Scates extracts ‘dark tides’ from ‘Assured in the dark tides of the world that rest’ (Safety Line 3; emphasis mine) and uses the fragment of the line as a chapter title. In the chapters succeeding there is no thematic connection with the selected parts of Brooke’s poem yet the selections are repeated in the following pages for a few times. For instance, Chapter Two is entitled Dark Tides and in the first page of the chapter Scates uses tide in; “We will leave Lemnos on the tide, the same tide that carried us here” (2012: 31) and “I sigh and look out to sea; even now the dark tide is surging towards us” (2012: 31-32; emphasis mine). Although the use of repetitions seem random they enforce reader to connect with Brooke’s poem and remember the poetry and poet in intervals.

The only thematic reference to Brooke in *On Dangerous Ground* is when war artist George Lambert quotes from Brooke’s poetry as he remembers the carnage of 1915 in 1919 Nek:
Directly ahead of him, Lambert can see where the Turks fired from. ‘The Chessboard’ was aptly named: nine rows of trench and breastworks made the Nek a fortress. Men sent out to face that fire didn’t stand a chance. And they knew it. They shook hands and said goodbye before diving over the parapet. Like swimmers into cleanness leaping? No, Lambert knew better than that now. (Scates 2012: 190)

In Scates’ novel the reader not only remembers poet Brooke but also the young generation of intellectual men lost besides the uneducated privates. His tribute to Brooke focuses on the poetry rather than the personality of the poet. At this point, it is ironical to remember Bergonzi’s suggestion “[to] extricate Brooke’s poetry from the personal legend in which it played a merely contributory role is not at all easy, but the critic and literary historian must make the attempt” (1965: 37). It seems Scates as a historian takes on the responsibility and attempts to sever the myth of Brooke from his poetry as he never questions the death and the myth he comes to be the representative of.

However, British novelist Rachel Billington’s novel Glory is critical of Brooke’s position as a hero-poet. Similar to what Scates achieves in On Dangerous Ground, Glory connects Gelibolu Campaign with the ancient history of the land as well. Billington’s narrative construction reveals how Gelibolu was a failure. She favours Turkish army, German commander Liman von Sanders and the Turkish commander Mustafa Kemal while blaming the incompetent, over optimistic old generals of the British Imperial Forces and furthers her argument to the criticism of poet Brooke. In this way Billington emphasizes how an innocent generation was consumed for the good of others.

This idea is reiterated in Billington’s story as Captain Arthur is portrayed as an intellectual soldier, an Oxford graduate who reads The Iliad, The Odyssey, the Victorian novels, quotes from Rupert Brooke and Romantic English poets. As soon as Captain is introduced reader feels the extent of the loss deeply. In addition, Billington extends her tribute to poet Brooke by giving his name to a character, Captain Rupert Prideaux who is highly critical of war and the commanders of the campaign. Indeed Captain Prideaux is the reminder of Siegfried Sasson with his anti-war stance. Together with Captain Arthur they question poet Brooke’s death, his burial place, and the immature romanticism of his poetry. Captain Arthur and Rupert Prideaux converse on poet Brooke with a quotation from “The Soldier”:

_The official story is that he died from a mosquito bite on his lip. Actually it was one of those lethal injections against typhoid the medics like giving. Turned septic. He’s buried on the Greek island of Skyros without seeing a whisker of the enemy. Makes you think, doesn’t it? Hasn’t stopped him from becoming a hero of the war. Think only this of me./ That there’s some corner of a foreign land/ That is for ever England._ (Billington 2015: 47)

Since there are many missing soldiers in Gelibolu Peninsula without a burial place,
Captain Arthur questions why Rupert Brooke, buried on the Greek island of Skyros had been given a cross with a name (Billington 2015: 481). Actually Billington’s grandfather Brigadier-General Thomas, Earl of Longford was killed at Suvla Bay on August 21st 1915 and the body remained missing. Billington’s personal connection could be the reason for her criticism as she voices all the other missing soldiers awaiting acknowledgement.

After being a prisoner of war Captain Arthur criticizes the ‘patriotic fervour and ecstatic joy’ of Brooke who had not lived to fight and known the reality of war, yet remembered as a hero;

One of his housemates had been sent a copy of Rupert Brooke’s poems. It was a thoughtless present and, in a moment of self-flagellation, Arthur picked it up. The patriotic fervour and ecstatic joy of the young soldier who never lived to fight moved Arthur to a multitude of contradictory emotions: recognition and wistfulness for the feelings he had once known himself: derision that Brooke had never known the reality; anger at how false and lying was the romance of his poetry: pride that he himself had faced the reality and fought bravely. But in the end it only magnified his sense of loss and failure. He would have been better dead, falling on his sword like an honourable soldier. (Billington 2015: 416)

Arthur’s frustration is the result of his imprisonment which he sees as a failure compared to the heroic image Brooke received. Captain Rupert on the other hand is invalided after a bomb explosion and sent to Malta. He refuses to go back to England and severs all his ties with his family. In her novel, Billington not only criticizes the reputation Brooke received after his death but also the British commanders whom she finds unfit. She blames the commanders for the extent of loss in Gelibolu and attempts to voice the missing and the lost.

Although three novels commemorate Brooke only one novel Barbed Wire and Roses by Peter Yeldham makes allusions to war-poet Siegfried Sassoon. Yeldham’s fictional story is the story of another missing soldier, Stephen Conway who survives Gelibolu Campaign to disappear in France after four years of trench fighting. Stephen’s grandchild Patrick takes on the responsibility to uncover the mystery of his grandfather’s disappearance and in his journey he rediscovers his grandfather’s diary. On this journey he meets a British woman Claire at the Menin Gate Memorial who pays a tribute to her sixteen-year-old relative and cries for the poet Siegfried Sassoon. As Claire mentions that Sassoon hated the memorial and wrote a poem about it believing it mocked the dead (Yeldham 2007: 117) Patrick remembers seeing Sassoon’s verses in his grandfather’s diary. The poem Claire refers to is;

I died in hell, They called it Passendalde; my wound was slight
And I was shuffling back; and then a shell
Burst slick upon the duckboards; so I fell
Into the bottomless mud, and lost the light. (Yeldham 2007: 118)
Sassoon’s verses are nothing like Brooke’s pre-war poems. While romantic and patriotic fervour of Brooke’s poetry is criticized in Billington’s novel, Sassoon’s poetry reveals the opposite. Sassoon has a more realistic and bitter approach to war for he lived to fight and saw the horrors of war. His poetry reflects the effects of trench fighting as carnage, horror and hopelessness prevail throughout the lines. Brooke’s surge of patriotic and nationalist ideas is in contrast with the anti-war cries of Sassoon. Sasson’s poetry shows how Brooke may have written if he had lived longer and witnessed the brutality of war. It is ‘the most radical progress from early patriotic idealism through to ironic realism and then to the angry extremes of anti-heroic protest’ (Bergonzi 1965: 91).

Indeed as Paul Fusserl argues when war started Sassoon did not start as a dissent. He was a twenty-eight-year-old patriotic cavalry who fought in France with exceptional enthusiasm and courage. He has never been in Gelibolu but his younger brother Hamo was killed there. He was known to his friends at the front as ‘Mad Jack’. However in 2017 after a chance of armistice was lost he started arguing that the war was unjustifiably prolonged and the soldiers were betrayed. He made an anti-war statement ‘A Soldier’s Declaration’ which appeared in Cambridge Magazine (1975: 99). Bergonzi quotes the statement of Sassoon as follows:

I am making this statement as an act of wilful defiance of military authority, because I believe that the war is being deliberately prolonged by those who have the power to end it. I am a soldier, convinced that I am acting on behalf of soldiers. I believe that this war, upon which I entered as a war of defence and liberation, has now become a war of aggression and conquest. I believe that the purposes for which I and my fellow-soldiers entered upon this war should have been so clearly stated as to make it impossible to change them, and that, had this been done, the objects which actuated us would now be attainable by negotiation. I have seen and endured the sufferings of the troops, and I can no longer be a party to prolong these sufferings for ends which I believe to be evil and unjust. (1965: 97)

The statement is unexpected of a soldier but it is a powerful challenge to authority by a poet-soldier who has seen the carnage. As Fusserl details it caused him to be court-martialled but his friend Robert Graves helped him to be seen by medical board instead. The board decided to treat him as a shell-shock case and the poet was sent to Craiglockhart mental sanatorium near Edinburgh where he met another wounded poet Wilfred Owen. After his treatment he wanted to go back to the front believing he abandoned his friends. In June 1918 he published Counter-Attack and Other Poems and in July he was invalided home after he was wounded in the head. For a long time he was not fit for literary work (Fusserl 1975: 99-100). Read along with this context the next allusion in Yeldham’s novel to Sassoon’s poem ‘On Passing the New Menin Gate’ is better interpreted. It was written after the First World War when the effects of post-war trauma were still observed in Sassoon’s personality and poetry:
Who will remember, passing through this Gate,
the unheroic dead who fed the guns?
Who shall absolve the foulness of their fate,-
Those doomed, conscripted, unvictorious ones?
Crudely renewed, the Salient holds its own.
Paid are its dim defenders by this pomp;
Paid, with a pile of peace-complacent stone,
The armies who endured that sullen swamp.

Here was the world's worst wound. And here with pride
'Their name liveth for ever', the Gateway claims.
Was ever an immolation so belied
as these intolerably nameless names?
Well might the Dead who struggled in the slime
Rise and deride this sepulchre of crime. (Yeldham 2007: 133-134)

The poem is the reflection of each shell-shocked soldier’s feelings. The shocking images and messages comply with Sassoon’s earlier anti-war statement. Sassoon wants to be the voice of shell-shocked soldiers who will bear the scars of war forever for he is one of them. As he denounces war and the way fallen soldiers are remembered he is also upset at the hypocrisy of erecting huge memorials for the missing soldiers. He believes authorities are ignorant to the pains of the soldiers and the monument erected at Ypres, France is unable to express and voice the memory of dead.

Scornful and bitter words of Sassoon shock Claire and Patrick. They try to understand the anger of the poet. Patrick tries to connect the poem with his grandfather’s disappearance: ‘This was the writing of a man who had been there, had fought in muddy trenches, a poet with the poet's power to express what war was really like. Had his grandfather felt as angry as this?’(Yeldham 2007: 134). After reading the poem he believes he can find what motivated Stephen to run away from war. Discovering the diary and reading Sasson’s poem finally opens a path for Patrick. The reality is most disturbing as Patrick learns that his grandfather Stephen Conway is falsely accused of desertion and court-martialled since nobody realises he is shell-shocked. Execution turns to a ten year of imprisonment with Australian government’s intrusion yet he is not released even after the armistice. Disgraced, ill-treated and even rejected by his wife due to his ill-fame Stephen stands for the many forgotten and ignored soldiers who once volunteered. Patrick is determined to compensate for his grandfather’s fate and decides to make his story into a film to be dedicated to Stephen’s memory. In this way Patrick believes his grandfather’s name could live forever just like Sasson and all the other soldiers who realise the futility of war.

Yeldham’s allusion to Sassoon’s poetry is meaningful since it uncovers the feelings unknown to people who has no experience of war. As an eye-witness and a victim of war
his poetry help us enter the world of men who fought and suffered during First World War. Sassoon may be a survivor but his poetry conveys direct knowledge of suffering, the pain and deepest feelings most men never had a chance to express.

To conclude Scates, Billington, Hope and Yeldham return to war poets Brooke and Sassoon to offer new understandings and meanings regarding war and remembrance. In their commemorative practices novelists allude to literary figures writing or shaping the war in different ways and for different reasons. In their novels, Australian historian Scates and war-veteran Hope focus on the form and aesthetics of Brooke’s poetry. They choose not to go beyond the form as they seem content with the meaning of his poetry as well as his position as war-hero-poet. Although their tribute seems to have a romantic stance, they are still powerful in reminding reader the poet, the loss and the carnage of war a hundred years later. However, British novelist Billington opens a discussion on the position of hero-poet Brooke. In this way she is more political compared to the romantic remembrances of Scates and Hope. Yeldham’s choice of Sassoon is interesting because- contrary to Brooke who could not live to fight and witness- he survives the war to eyewitness and experience the suffering. Yeldham achieves to give the dark reality of war through his tributes to the mentally and physically wounded poet. In this way he achieves to highlight the consequences of survivors. He reminds us that war narratives are not only about heroes but also about the victims. By bringing the traumatic poet into discussion Yeldham uncovers an alternative voice sought by New Historicists. The only common motive of the novelists studied in this paper is the issue of missing soldiers in the Gelibolu battlefield and Western Front. Novelists remind reader that there are many missing soldiers left without a burial place. Hence, tributes to war poets not only help us remember them but also recover the reality of war time and post-war experience. By bringing back the memories of poets, novelists make us feel the loss more deeply as they are the reminders of many artists, university students, intellectuals and learned young men consumed as war victims. As novels question the extent of brutality of war they meditate on the human soul as well. Allusions create a bond between history and literature as it brings a distant time close when readers remember Rupert Brooke, Siegfried Sassoon, Gelibolu Campaign and the ancient history of this land at the same time. In this way novels rewrite history recreating a dialogue between texts and offer an alternative story reminding us the voices and stories of the past.
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