THE ROLE OF THE READER

AND THE

IMPLICIT DIMENSION

JILL F CRAIG

M.Litt Thesis

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

JUNE 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Mr J A M Rillie of the Department of English Literature, University of Glasgow for many helpful suggestions for wider reading and many exciting discussions. I also wish to thank him for allowing me to go my own way in this thesis, a freedom which I have found vital to my work.

My very special thanks must also go to Mr Arnold Chamove who supported me untiringly, read every faltering page through many drafts and despite being a scientist, made a large number of valuable suggestions which were incorporated.

My thanks must lastly go to Mr Dave Wardle whose sensitive support through the final stages of the work were essential to its completion.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

This thesis explores some of the effects in literature which are not obviously the content of a work, effects which influence the aesthetic response of the reader, unstated effects. It is also concerned with the particular relationship which develops between a writer and a reader.

The unstated effects will be referred to as the implicit dimension in literature. The reason for my interest in this dimension derives from a belief that the text as language alone, cannot account for the aesthetic experience. A writer can never totally efface himself since his values, biases and interests are necessarily revealed in what he writes and the techniques he uses. Neither this vision nor the "script" for the role of the reader form an explicit part of a literary work yet both determine the aesthetic experience of the reader. This thesis offers a method for exploring the implicit dimension in literature through the concepts of continuity and discontinuity.

By continuity I refer to connections apparent between different literary forms, between the actual and the fictional world, between the actual and the fictional world, between various parts of a literary work, and between the often dissimilar elements of a metaphor. I also discuss the ways in which the reader can join his thoughts to the writer's both through sympathy and through identifying an appropriate way of reading.

By discontinuity I will often be referring simply to the obverse of continuity. I examine what effect a gap between forms, parts, or worlds has on the reader; also how the disjunction between narrator and implied author or between two levels of meaning, acts as a controlling factor on the meanings constructed by the reader. In short I explore the effects of spaces, ambivalences, discords, upon the reader.

The imagination of the reader responds naturally in terms of continuities and discontinuities, seeking patterns and shapes, perceiving relationships, alerted and stimulated through what appears to be unfamiliar, unexpected and discordant.

For art to communicate to us we must locate the appropriate response which means applying a suitable paradigm. The form itself holds clues to this paradigm and thus to its own deep structure. I examine the effects of various patterns on the imagination of the reader: repetitions, pauses, symmetries. The reader is also controlled by other factors such as an unusual point of view or the peculiarities of distance in an ironic work. These techniques as well as a whole range of narrative forms can be used by the writer to delineate in different ways the relationship between writer and reader.

The implicit operates just as strongly in drama as it does in the novel, the imagination of the spectator penetrates through actor to character, through surface to deep structure. But in Pinter's Old Times we encounter a logically impenetrable surface structure and therefore a shared world cannot develop between writer and spectator. In Endgame, on the other hand, Beckett's world can be penetrated at the points of discontinuity (the perilous zones), between the two meanings of his dialogue, and his implicit vision is revealed.

Techniques causing discontinuities in art can lead to more profound levels of continuity between the art form and the actual world and can help to widen and deepen our understanding of our own lives. Irony, for instance leads from discontinuous perspectives to a new and different viewpoint, embracing both originals. The techniques used by the writer and the imaginative relationship which the reader forms with the writer, are the means by which art is able to strip the veil of familiarity from the world and to recover the sensation of life.

*****

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is concerned with the particular relationship which develops through a text between a writer and a reader. The process by which the relationship forms is sometimes directed explicitly by the writer who appears in this case to be in control. In other cases the relationship takes place between reader and narrator with the writer a shadowy third presence. What part does the reader play in a triadic relationship like this? The role of the reader is always to make sense of the work by imaginatively constructing meaning from it.

In recent years the role of the reader has been perceived as an essential part of the creative process of literature. And what of the writer? How can a relationship develop with a voice which has done everything in its literary power to efface itself? It is possible because a writer nevertheless reveals himself through the values, interests and biases in his work and through other unstated effects produced through the literary techniques he uses. This we can describe as the vision of the writer. But neither the vision of the writer nor the "script" for the role of the reader form an explicit part of a literary work and yet both determine the aesthetic experience of the reader. These two factors, the role of the reader and the vision of the writer are what constitute, for the purpose of this thesis, the implicit dimension to literature. This thesis offers a method for exploring the implicit dimension in literature through the concepts of continuity and discontinuity.

By continuity I will be referring to connections apparent between different literary forms, between the actual and the fictional world, between the various parts of a literary work, and between the often dissimilar elements of a metaphor. I will also discuss the ways in which the reader can join his thoughts to the writer's both through sympathy and through identifying an appropriate way of reading. Finally I will examine some of those effects of literary language which depend upon a connection between a psychological dimension and various sensory modes.

By discontinuity I will often be referring simply to the obverse of continuity. I will examine what effect a gap between forms, parts, or worlds has on the reader; also how the disjunction between narrator and implied author acts as a controlling factor on the meanings constructed by the reader. In short I will explore the effects of spaces and discords upon the reader.

Irony, parody, satire are three related techniques of discontinuity which make unfamiliar the world presented by the writer and break through the habitual modes of response to an often surprising new vision. This effectively interrupts a process of matching or finding continuities between the fiction and the actual world. Perceptually we try to continue a process towards completion and if this process is interrupted then the tension evoked mobilizes the awareness and imagination of the reader. We can find examples of this when a plot twists unexpectedly or shifts from one set of characters to another or when a writer disrupts the temporal dimension in some way. The reader has to reorientate to a new situation and the effect is to increase the awareness in the reader of the process he is involved in. In these ways the writer suggests a continuity and stimulates through discontinuity and the reader must identify discontinuities and respond appropriately by perceiving where the logic of the work lies and how to penetrate and participate in the world presented.

LITERATURE AND OBJECTIVITY

The interest in the reader which is expressed in modern literary theories reflects a wider preoccupation with the active nature of the process of perception. Historically it was believed that just as we passively receive the sense data impinging upon us, the reader too was merely a "consumer" of literature. Sense data were thought to be received from the world which comprised discrete objects to be observed and labelled and in the same way language written or spoken was thought to comprise words with discrete

meanings to be passively received. This kind of focus is described as concerning itself with content as if the significance (meaning-content) of an object or a word existed independently of its context, or its cultural/conventional interpretation, or an idiosyncratic response to it. This focus gave rise to a wide range of theorizing in literature about the author's intention and the real meaning contained in a literary work. It naturally permitted much speculation.

A reaction to such speculation began, first in the sciences in an attempt to remove scientific study from the realms of philosophy and subject them to the rigours of scientific method. Fundamental to the scientific method was the impartiality of the observer and a precise dealing with the available facts. Behaviourism was a reaction to the subjectivity which preceded it. The Behaviourists confined their attention to observable behaviour and rejected subjects' reports or any unobservable, unmeasurable behaviour.

This theory was rooted in what one might term the Myth of Objectivity and was paralleled in literary theory by the New Critics. By the Myth of Objectivity I am referring to the mistaken idea that a completely neutral and impartial dealing with "facts" is either possible or desirable. The New Critics stress that the author's intention is not available to the reader or critic and even if it were, the intention might be so widely divergent from the result as to make it of questionable value in illuminating the work. They claim therefore that the only available "fact" is the text itself. Along with the author's intention, the New Critics reject reference to the historical context of the work and the biography of the writer, choosing instead to focus upon a close reading of the work as an isolated and objective literary fact. History and biography are facts available to attach to the author in some way but are not a clearly correlated part of any particular work produced by that writer. This theory has since been seriously questioned by the work of the Formalists who sought new meaning in individual works precisely by locating them within a literary and cultural context.

A rather different view is proposed in a highly acclaimed study by Gabriel Josipovici who makes this curious statement: "modern art has in no way been influenced by Einstein, Heisenberg or Wittgenstein"[1]. I think Josipovici is simply mistaken. Wittgenstein writes extensively on the notion of representation in art and also the intention of the artist as being a necessary condition of representation in his Philosophical Investigations. The status of absolute scientific facts, the notion of objectivity, and the nature of perception have all been revolutionized in this century, the over-riding scientific principle now being Uncertainty rather than Certainty. This scientific Uncertainty can be traced through almost all modern novels and attains its most sophisticated expression in the ironic detachment of the writer. It is now believed to be impossible in scientific study objectively to observe and measure facts in the world without in some way interfering with them. In scientific experiments the observer "interferes" even before any data has been collected. The scientist has selected his area of research from a considerable number of possible areas, has constructed a research paradigm, and often formed an hypothesis, even before starting to collect data. These factors will inevitably bias his collecting. It is the strength of specialised scientific research that a problem can be isolated and examined under controlled conditions. It was Karl Popper who pointed out the prior role of intuition in scientific study[2]; but in terms of objectivity as it was originally understood, intuition in science is an unwanted intrusion. But since all scientific endeavour involves selection and organisation by the scientist then the concept of objectivity has to be altered.

In literature, critics would point to key-paragraphs, concepts or imagery acting as a microcosm of the meaning of the whole work and claim that these were derived from a close and objective analysis of the text. But in the same way as Karl Popper unearthed the prior role of intuition in the scientist's analyses, we can now perceive that in order to select these meaning-keys in literature, the critic has already made a detailed reading of the whole work

and an educated choice of passage for study. The point once again is that analysis cannot be neutral or impartial but necessarily incorporates bias. Meaning does not lie in the text waiting to be dug out by the critic or reader, it must be constructed; and meaning-construction is a creative and intuitive act.

The myth of objectivity is reflected in the sort of educational experience most children undergo. Knowledge is divided into subjects within which the salient facts are decided upon by teachers and others and fed to pupils who consume and maybe later "regurgitate" in exams, as we are fond of vulgarly saying, (we even talk of digesting something we have read). The assumption which lies behind this kind of system is that History is what the history teacher teaches and provided that a child is paying attention and is not stupid then what he learns is the same thing that the teacher has taught him. The belief in objectivity has had far-reaching effects in many fields, always elevating facts and disparaging personal response.

Just as the control which the scientist applies to his study not only means precision but also limitation, so the delimitation of subjects, areas, theories, problems, while proving aids to study, also confine the free play of the thinking mind. Why has such a curtailment of intellectual endeavour come about? The answer is not hard to find, the human mind naturally seeks organisation and order and a moment's thought reveals how impossible an alternative would be. If our attention was focussed on nothing in particular, we would neither notice nor learn anything in particular. If we did not select or categorize then our world would be a chaos of novelty in every moment.

If history has rejected first subjectivity and then objectivity, where does that leave us now? In scientific study there is still the endeavour to deal scrupulously with data, to apply the scientific method but scientists are more cautious about their theories. Like so many problems in this century, the subjectivity/objectivity co-ordinates have resolved into a grey composite. Knowing that

subjectivity cannot be avoided, it can be used or offset by controls. It is now a scientific factor to be taken into account, something to test the creative scientist's ingenuity further in isolating the variables he really wants to test.

In literature, an interest in the reader has derived as much from general discussion about the theory of relativity and the myth of objectivity and the recognition that perception is an active process, as from any more purely literary basis. Literature, the other arts and the sciences have become highly self-conscious and self-critical. This has produced a distrust of old assumptions and a tendency towards new kinds of experimentation. In Literature this has caused a shift in focus from content to form, from mimesis to techniques. Naturally it is an over-simplification to suggest that interest in form and technique is entirely new. Tristam Shandy has reeled under the impact of being recognised as both a very early novel and yet highly modern in its self-consciousness and its alienating devices. As before, the answer is a kind of compromise. Literature can never be pure form, it must always refer in some way to a world that the reader can make some sort of sense out of.

MEANING

In language and literature the shift in focus has been revolutionary. Meaning is no longer considered to be something planted in the text by the writer to be extracted by the critical reader any more than this is true of teaching and learning. Meaning cannot be contained in two dimensions and placed somewhere along the subjectivity/objectivity continuum, either in the reader or the text. It becomes part of a network. The concepts we use nowadays in literary analysis are interplay, interaction, relationship, tendency, dialectic, tension. The same concepts and cautions can be found throughout the scientific and artistic world and point to the underlying continuum of knowledge and to mutual influence.

For people learning to read, words are shapes which become associated with sounds and only then acquire the significance of meaning. Early stages of reading are so bound up with shape and sound that the meaning factor is too much to cope with at the same time. Sartre suggests[3] that proficient readers have acquired a certain attitude of consciousness which can be directed towards meaning through words. A word presents itself, awakens a meaning which goes out to the thing and the word drops away. This process is experienced quite clearly if we encounter an unfamiliar word or if we see a word on a sign at a distance. Shape is the first information and as we draw closer to it we rapidly and automatically match it against our existing memories of similar shaped words. When we recognize it, a meaning is awakened. Sartre points out that material is never the perfect analogue to language, a certain knowledge comes along to interpret and fill in the gaps. This is the role of the imagination. Gaps are also created through non-description, frustrated expectations, irony, caricature, interior views of unpleasant characters and also inescapably, through the fact that the view which the writer and reader have of the world will never correspond because they are two different people. These gaps draw the reader in to participate in the process of a work. In all we do, whether in arts or sciences, we cannot be passive receptacles. Gaps in a text, discontinuities, increase our involvement.

READER AS PARTICIPANT

If meaning is no longer to be viewed as something to be dug out of a text and if content can no longer be viewed as something separate from the form in which it is expressed, what does the process of reading involve? It is now believed that a text permits many meanings and that the process of reading makes the reader a participant in the construction of meaning. It can be seen here that the shift in focus is also away from a static towards a dynamic conception of meaning and reading. But this shift does not imply a return to complete subjectivity where the idiosyncratic response is all there is. Through the form, the pattern, the devices he uses, the writer

exerts a control over the reader. There is thus always a tension in the relationship set up between the directing influence of the writer and the personal response of the reader, between permitted and derived meanings. A text is like a chrysalis, which requires a reader to achieve its metamorphosis. It will remain cocooned for as long as it is unread. The process of reading will transform it into something living and dynamic. As a novel unfolds, its shape becomes more and more specific as the expectations of the reader become more controlled and defined. The mind always continues a process towards completion; this is a psychological law of mental life[4]. It is true of geometrical lines as in the gestalt figure of a partially drawn star which we nevertheless describe simply as a star because that is how we see it. It is also true of musical phrases, utterances and of the various patterns that make up a novel or play. This is the organisation which the mind naturally seeks in the process of comprehending the world.

THE IMPLICIT DIMENSION

Language is a process we continue towards completion by recourse to realms which are not linguistic. The text as language alone cannot adequately account for the aesthetic experience. The feelings and emotions we have in response to literature must be at least pointed to in any criticism. Criticism is not a science, it is an attempt to illuminate, to lead other readers on to the experience which the critic has and to evaluate this experience. The experience is not purely of words and words are not simply objects with meanings attached. Language, and especially language in the service of literature, is rooted in the subverbal and also echoes out beyond its own confines. These reverberations bear directly upon our experience of literature. When we converse or when we read, much is tacit and this implicit dimension to language is the deep structure on which the aesthetic experience depends. Much of the specifically literary quality of literature, its effects, its controlling and releasing power, is unstated, not explicit. It

arises from tensions, spaces, the unexpected, relationships, antitheses. The imagination of the reader is brought into play, seeking patterns shaping and reshaping always towards some kind of resolution. The imaginative part played by the reader is not written into the text and yet the text depends upon it. The vision of the writer is also not explicit and yet is everywhere revealed in the text. In the following pages I hope to show how the concepts of continuity and discontinuity can illuminate the role of the reader and the relationship between reader and writer.

*****

NOTES To Introduction

1 JOSIPOVICI G. The World & the Book. Macmillan. 1971. p xiv.

2 POPPER Karl. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London. 1972. Michael Polanyi, also a friend of Popper, develops a similar idea which he calls tacit knowledge in many of his books: Personal Knowledge, The Tacit Dimension, Knowing & Being.

3 SARTRE J-P The Psychology of Imagination. (1940). Methuen. 1972. p61.

4 MEYER L B. Emotion and Meaning in Music. University of Chicago Press. 1956. p 91. I develop this point more fully in the following chapter.

*****

CHAPTER ONE

CONTINUITY & DISCONTINUITY

(Apocalypse composed by Adrian Leverkuhn)

> The whole work is dominated by the paradox (if it is a paradox) that in it dissonance stands for the expression of everything lofty, solemn, pious, everything of the spirit; while consonance and firm tonality are reserved for the world of hell, in this context a world of banality and commonplace.
>
> (Dr Faustus p361)

CONTINUITY

In this chapter I will explain what I mean by continuities and discontinuities in literature and show how these concepts illuminate the process of reading.

The notion of Continuity has already been implied in several ways in the Introduction to this paper. The New Critics wished to isolate the text from history and biography, from affect and intention, in order to better see the thing for what it is. But not only is there continuity between a text and the conventions it is set within, but readers are affected in their responses by historical and biographical data which is not contained within the text. Even the author's intention can be a very illuminating factor in the discussion of a text. In Jacob's Room for example, one's whole response is altered and I think enriched after a reading both of Virginia Woolf's stylistic experiments and the letters she wrote shortly before her attempt on this novel. Woolf was writing in reaction against novelistic conventions and trying to develop what she saw as a more genuinely realistic mode of fiction. Art is created in response. This response can either reflect conventions and current ideas, branch away from them, take them further, be a reaction against them, or a parody of them. In every case there is continuity with what has gone before. Art cannot be created in isolation so we must be cautious if we think we can study it in isolation.

T S Kuhn has pointed out that normal science proceeds in the same way[1]. Certain agreed paradigms underly and define one scientific area from another. These paradigms not only form the structure and support for future research but they also constitute a kind of legislation, making certain problems legitimate and others either unthinkable or rejected as metaphysical. So science too, is generated in response, there is continuity between present research and the paradigms which permit it.

It was mentioned that Gabriel Josipovici rejected the idea of influence in art from revolutionary physics or linguistic philosophy and yet throughout modern thought there is evidence that the observer, percipient, reader, is engaged not in a passive but an active process. The underlying continuity of these ideas across different areas of thought makes them the more intriguing. We live in a relative world where fundamental particles more and more defy any kind of experimentation and indeed where the notion of "fundamental" disintegrates into the unlikeliness of "charm" and "strangeness".

The notion of the reader as participant in the construction of meaning is a somewhat different orientation from the idea of a scientist interfering with what he is trying to observe directly. The reader is a necessary part of a relationship, not a factor to be isolated or held constant. The writer is constantly engaged in using devices to encourage this participation and to control it.

The kind of assumptions that underlie the literary form of a novel are that it presents a world and that this world is in some way a world which the reader can make sense of. An obvious way in which a reader can make sense of the world of a novel is by finding similarities or continuities between the fictional world and the actual world. Structuralists call this process the <u>naturalization</u> of the text by the reader. The reader can also make sense of a fictional world by finding continuities between one fictional world and another, i.e., through the experience of literary conventions. This is the way in which a reader responds to irony or parody, by

locating the tone of the writing and reacting appropriately, thereby naturalizing the text or finding the level at which there are continuities between the fictional world and our understanding. We make sense of the world by categorizing it in terms of what is familiar. When we encounter a new situation we attempt to find some continuity between the new and the familiar. This brings the world under some measure of control. It is fundamental to human perception to shape meaningful configurations from our perceptions. Meaninglessness is not readily tolerated; a pattern and resolution is constantly sought. We try to make sense of art in just the same way as we do anything else by seeking pattern or completing a process.

DESIGN

Perceptually we are built to respond to design, to organize and simplify and this is one of the means by which we bring our world under control. Language too helps to stabilize concepts and to make us see reality in terms of our conception of it[2]. Language is a highly patterned part of culture and as subject to change as any other part but its stability enables people to understand one another. Upon the frame of language people develop expectations of the patterns which they either inherently know or which they have experienced. It is one of the greatest bonds between people of the same culture that they share the same language. The scope for misunderstanding is still considerable but a shared language is a step towards understanding.

The reality of our world is influenced by language and constructed by the limitations of our personal consciousness. We cannot directly perceive X-rays or ultra-violent radiation like a bee can; our eyes do not have the resolving power of the hawk's; nor do we have the acuity of smell which a fox has. In this obvious and biological way, reality is a relative concept, but it is not immutable, only conservative. Language increases this conservatism about new categories. If we encounter something new in the actual world which we are not

able to apprehend because we can find no continuity between it and our existing set of categories, then we either translate and therefore distort it, or we ignore it or we are unaware of it. The history of science charts the development by man of instruments by which he can extend his faculties so that he can grasp something of the chaos and the order in nature without confining nature within the limits of man. Revolutionary new ideas are often simply a new orientation, a reshaping, a different way of talking about the familiar. This is finding new continuities and connections between parts. Modern scientific discovery at the atomic level is remote from direct experience and as instruments and machinery become increasingly sophisticated, the orderly world is revealed as more obviously subject to chance. However, at the level of our own subjective experience it undoubtedly has survival value for us to encounter a limited and organized world. Noam Chomsky points out that our cognitive and perceptual limits are precisely what allows man his creative richness[3]. If we found no continuity between anything we encountered, our effective intelligence would be little more than a vegetable's.

If we look at the idea of design at a cultural level we find that people impose order and organization in every part of their life with the justification that it improves social functioning. These designs are what become the culture; they are the social rules and norms, the traditions and the national characteristics. Language is a part of culture and through its stability it allows us to be in touch with a period of history long past. Just as we construct a stable consciousness from our perceptual selections in order to survive in the world, shared meaning in communication has obvious advantages. Understanding between people with the same language is dependent upon the patterns within the language. It is through these patterns that people develop expectations, and when they are fulfilled people quickly reach a general understanding. In the notion of "expectations" we find another tool which is fundamental to the writer's art. Expectations are not only crucial in communication but they profoundly affect all aspects of behaviour.

EXPECTATIONS

Expectations arise from past experience; we expect some continuity between what we have found to be true in the past and what we experience in the present. In a literary work, the reader's expectations do not have to depend upon his past experience of other literary works, a single work can awaken and then fulfil or frustrate expectations. When we start to read anything new, we are entering an alien world and therefore are not sure at first what kind of response is appropriate. Since the ideal reader is receptive at this initial stage of reading, the writer is able through his rhetoric[4] to form the "mental set" of the reader, appropriate to the work[5].

In order to evaluate any experience we must construct hypotheses about it. We try to make sense of it by discovering the logic of the experience or by suggesting to ourselves a logical explanation which will account for our observations. We can then test these hypotheses against our knowledge of the real world. Although the terminology is scientific, we apply the same procedures to literature. We start to read, form hypotheses about what is being presented and develop expectations about what we will find on further reading. We then test our hypotheses against our further experience of the text and some of our expectations will be confirmed and others disappointed. This is the procedure of anticipation-and-test which Karl Popper outlines and which characterizes all cognitive processes[6].

The same reader can also have different experiences from different readings of the same text. The first reading will probably be the most subjectively selective because it is completely new and much will probably be missed or quickly forgotten in order for the reader to absorb the experience. This reading is the one most subject to the reader's personal biography[7] because this will form a large part of his context for judgement. Later readings can make use of what was learned from earlier ones and can be more receptive to a

wider range of clues incorporated by the writer. A reading can grow more flexible because there is more evidence to manipulate, because, we could say, there is an increase in meaning.

The powerful drive to find shape or form directs the mind to always tend to improve psychological organisation in the direction of known forms, symmetry, patterns, textures, to find and to make continuities[8]. In a fascinating study, Emotion and Meaning in Music, L B Meyer suggests that the lack of shape in music arouses powerful desires and expectations for clarification. This would apply also to literature and as Meyer points out, it is an important device which can be used by composer and writer in order to create tensions, to cause emotional reactions and to allow meaning to become objectified. This idea will be developed further in the next section since it is clearly a case of discontinuity. "For shape or pattern to be perceived, there must exist both similarities and differences among the several stimuli"[9]. If there were no similarities, as we have remarked before, all the parts would be isolated and signify nothing. Without differences, there would be uniformity but not unity, there would be no relationships or comparisons possible.

Expectation then is a product of two things: the habitual responses developed through experience of literary conventions and wired-in modes of perception and cognition. To a certain degree a writer must fulfil the expectations he has set up in the reader or a relationship cannot grow between them. The world of the novel must to some extent be a shared world or there will be no communications. But if all expectations are fulfilled then the reader will find little stimulation in reading, will readily find the pattern and new expectations will tend not to be aroused. Stimulation, according to Meyer depends upon discontinuity.

PSYCHO-PHYSICAL EFFECTS

We make sense of the world by categorizing it in terms of what is

familiar. We also make sense of the world through the continuity between different sense modalities. There is much controversy and research about the idea that we transfer information automatically from one modality to another. However, many of our explanations use visual and spatial terms which we are not really aware of but which we readily comprehend: focussing attention, outlining problems, forming hypotheses. We recognize intermodal and intersensory attributes like mellow, tingling, weak[10]. Walter Ong suggests that the visual terminology we use is a concealed error[11] but I think rather that it is an indication of the continuity and many correspondences across different modalities.

Even when we believe an image to be primarily visual we discover on closer inspection that other dimensions of our awareness are affected. When we call to mind a person we know, what we call up can be a visual image although the visualness of the details is not as important as the meanings and significances we attach to them. This seems to be a primary image and however we alter the context in which we call up the image of the person, we still capture the essential feelings which we attach to them. In the same way as we know the subject of our own thoughts without having to spell it out to ourselves, the significances attached to the images we recall, are embedded in them. Indeed it is these which determine the quality of the image. As L A Reid says, our whole meaningful existence, not only aesthetic experience, depends upon the continuity between the psycho-physical[12]. Sensory qualities and language, fuse into thoughts and feelings.

The physiologist John Eccles presents a theory which may shed light on the process by which continuities can arise between the psychological and the physical dimension[13]. In a discussion about the physiology of imagination, Eccles suggests that memory "must be dependent on some enduring change that has been produced in the cortex by its previous activation" and that this gives a "congealed neuronal pattern" or "engram" ready to be replayed by an appropriate input. He goes on to say that memory is triggered if a new, "evolving

spatio-temporal pattern tends to correspond to the old congealed pattern". Thus continuities and correspondences between experienced events, physiologically facilitate memory. Through culture, education, language, we have "engrams ready to be evoked by the reading - or better still the hearing - of some pregnant lines of poetry". Most recent physiological evidence points to these pathways being fixed through chemical traces within cells. Through the use of a certain vocabulary, or the presentation of some action, a whole atmosphere can be evoked. The meanings, connotations and associations "assembled" with a word or phrase, are echoes from the personal experience of the reader or spectator as well as the history, literature and the general culture of those who use the language.

sing/ ~~In an essay on~~ the "Auditory Imagination", T S Eliot describes what he means by this phrase:

> The feeling for syllable and rhythm, penetrating far below the conscious levels of thought and feeling, invigorating every word; sinking to the most primitive and forgotten, returning to the origin and bringing something back, seeking the beginning and the end[14].

Eliot is describing how words in the service of poetry echo out into the subverbal, evoking half-thoughts and images and feelings which in turn affect the aesthetic experience. An image reverberates like a word, into the significances which have built up and attached to it. The reverberations of a word are its associations and connotations with other words, ideas, experiences. The word acts as a kind of recall code, evoking the associations and giving personal meaning to the aesthetic experience. The word can thus elicit a whole more complex than itself, it can become a symbol. A symbol is the means by which there is continuity of meaning and significance across different modalities of experience, a psycho-physical effect.

With regard to visual art E H Gombrich suggests a parallel:

> The history of art ... may be described as the forging of master keys for opening the mysterious lock of our senses to which only nature herself originally held the key[15]

A master key in painting for Gombrich would be the discovery of perspective drawing. This technique produces the illusion of depth and distance to the eye and mind despite the fact of a flat canvas. But the artist uses a multiplicity of smaller keys to unlock doors to the smaller rooms in our imaginations.

Poetry in general and metaphor in particular depends upon this free commerce between sense modalities, feeling and language. L A Reid suggests that "to feel happy or angry, at ease or in anxiety, is neither mental nor physical only but psycho-physical ... psycho-physical embodiment is not only a good analogue of aesthetic experience, but one of the conditions of its existence"[16]. "Psychophysical" is a useful term in this connection, for as complex as we are, there are linked structures in our mental and physical life and this allows us to perform a kind of perceptual fusion process. Metaphor often depends upon an ability to fuse two elements from different contexts into a third new meaning.

Michael Polanyi in Meaning[17] discusses the working of metaphor in terms of focal and subsidiary awareness. A subsidiary awareness of words bears upon the focal awareness of meaning. This is the way in which some linguists have thought that language works[18]. With metaphor the subsidiary awareness is of the constituent parts (where this is an appropriate description of the metaphor), often discordant or dissimilar, which are made to bear on "a joint novel meaning of them". Something is seen in terms of something else, contexts are transferred, new insights can be achieved. The contribution which Polanyi makes to the idea of metaphor is to point to the participation of the perceiver. He suggests that we bring our experience of the world and integrate it into the meaning of the metaphor. In Ezra Pound's Haiku, "In a Station of the Metro", recalling a similar insight from Eliot, we read:

> The apparition of these faces in the crowd,
> Petals on a wet, black bough.

Polanyi's suggestion would be that the force of this metaphor depends upon both our knowledge of faces in crowds, petals, wet

branches, and also on our willingness to imaginatively fuse these together to construct the meaning. But a metaphor not only evokes a new context or form of thought, it essentially incorporates feelings and emotions into the new context. In the example, the faces are flat, characterless, faded, disembodied, transient, delicate, and these ideas about faces, through the veil of the petal context, embody feelings. A metaphor is a fusion of thought and emotion and is an example of psychophysical effect and cross-modal association. The agent which forms this continuity is the imagination. There is a connection with Coleridge's description of the imagination: Coleridge invests the imagination with metaphysical significance, a repetition in the finite mind, of the eternal act of creation[19]. It struggles to idealize and unify, it is essentially vital. The imaginative whole which Polanyi's perceiver struggles to achieve is a freedom from the bondage of forms.

DEEP STRUCTURES

Deep Structure is a Chomskian phrase referring to the particular meaning underlying the surface grammatical structure of a sentence. There is continuity between the surface and deep structure but there is also often discontinuity.

When we speak or read, much of our understanding is tacit. This is most obvious between two people who know each other well. Their tacit understanding is rooted in the world they share and they can communicate effectively by abbreviated reference to this shared world. They have also learned each other's style of thought, pre-occupations, habits, sense of humour. This shared world becomes a kind of deep structure implied in their communication. Minimal reference to it is required for it to be evoked. This can also lead to misunderstanding since the deep structure is a complex implicit dimension to a relationship. But it is nevertheless the vital growing link between two people, the continuity between one mind

and another. We share a wider public world of experience with people whom we do not know but with whom we can communicate because there is a general continuity between human feelings and experience.

Kuhn suggests an idea similar to the notion of deep structure in the context of scientific endeavour[20]. A scientific discipline comes into being through the agreement among practitioners about basic theories and concepts. These form the paradigms which underly and define the discipline. Normal science proceeds on the basis of these paradigms which render certain problems as the legitimate concern of the discipline and reject others as coming under another discipline or as metaphysical or unviable in some way. The practitioners of the science do not discuss or attempt to prove or disprove the underlying paradigm; research can move forward precisely because they are unquestioned. It is within the framework which these provide, that normal science proceeds. The paradigms thus form a kind of deep structure to the discipline, a world shared by the practitioners, providing the rules and implied in the work of the discipline.

When we find that we understand another person, we are not specifically conscious of all the details of this shared world, any more than we have to know all the written and unwritable rules governing English grammar in order to generate or understand English sentences. I am not suggesting as Noam Chomsky does with language, that shared worlds are in the final analysis, biological[21], but there is probably a strong genetic component in effective communication. George Herbert Mead suggests that in order for any kind of communication to be effective, it depends upon the ability of one to take up the position of another[22]. We must be able to empathize or enter into the world of the other. This is what we are doing when we learn another's style of thought and preoccupations. When we are being sympathetic, we are suspending for a while our own world and taking on that of another.

When a very young child converses, his tacit assumption is that

everyone shares his world. His own experience and preoccupations are the underlying meaning to what he says and he often makes only minimal reference to them. A child might greet a stranger with the information, "my cat died". This attitude, unsurprising in a child would startle us in an adult at a first meeting. If we did encounter it, we would assume that the adult was very over-wrought, perhaps unbalanced and definitely self-preoccupied. But there is one circumstance where we would not react with such alarm and that is if we knew the person well. In this case we find that we are ready to make an immediate sympathetic response because there exists a shared world of understanding between us. What is tacitly suggested behind the utterance "my cat died" might go something like this: "I am very unhappy and therefore would prefer not to pretend to civilities of greeting while I am only thinking of my cat. We know each other well enough to be honest. You know me and my life well enough to sympathize with my feelings. I cannot pretend to an interest in other things until we have acknowledged this occurrence which preoccupies me. I need your sympathy to soothe me". Of course not all our friends would react like this to the death of their pet. We are socialized to a great extent in this culture to screen our private feelings. But this screening process not only produces self-protection but also involves the recognition that the death of one's pet cannot mean the same to another person. What a child does not and cannot do therefore is to step outside his own private world and empathize with another. We do not expect children to be sympathetic people while they are young.

George Mead's theory about the social behaviour of the Self applies in an interesting way to reading literature[23]. The reader might for much of the time he is reading be detached and conscious of the artistry of the writer but in order to find meaning in the novel there must also be a movement into the world presented. He must make contracts of understanding about the fictional world, exactly the kind of contracts which are made between people who converse together. The fictional world must become a shared world or the writer would be using the techniques of scientific reports.

The creative writer can imply, and the reader can delight in participating in the implicit.

A special kind of relationship is built up between the writer and the reader in literature. R Rommetveit describes this in a verbose but interesting way. He suggests that the poetic context has its foundation in contracts of communication tacitly endorsed by the poet and his audience[24]. The "architecture of inter-subjectivity" is therefore different in reading literature, reading newspapers, reading science articles, and every other activity. Message structure must involve the evaluation of the contracts reciprocally endorsed. Also an implicit dimension and deep structure to a message can only be assessed in terms of the "architecture of inter-subjectivity". Literary contracts (which recall the more stylish suggestion of Henry James) give rise to specifically literary expectations. This is the first step in the process of reading and it is clear now how much is dependent upon our past experience of literary forms. It should also be clear that treating literature as an object to be studied ignores the fact of the writer's voice. Walter Ong suggests that "all verbalisation, including all literature, is radically a cry, a sound emitted from the interior of a person"[25]. If we ignore this quality in literature we are overlooking an important part of the pleasure derived from a literary experience.

As readers, we are required to take other worlds and imaginatively enter into them and make them for a while our own. In many ways the relationship which builds up between reader and the world offered by the writer is similar to the relationships already described. With a novel which unfolds in time, reference to something known before, something about a character can be more abbreviated in the second and subsequent references because it is shared information, tacitly understood by reader and writer. In this way the implicitly shared world, the deep structure to a novel can be said to build up, rendering the context of the whole vital to a full understanding of any moment in it. If we open a novel we have not read before and start to read part way through, we would of course

understand much of what is written but we would also fail to grasp some of the implications and significances and almost certainly any irony. In Chomsky's discussion of surface structure and deep structure he suggests that the phonetic form of a sentence is determined by its surface structure and that the grammatical relations represented in the deep structure are those which determine meaning[26]. This has obvious application to verbal communication when one person misunderstands another and the other says: Oh, I didn't mean that, and the first says, But you said ... Yes, but I meant ... . In such an interaction it is the underlying significance which is being referred to and the misunderstanding reveals the ambiguity of surface form. Perhaps the original statement was too abbreviated for clarity of communication. It permitted more than one meaning to be construed by the other.

In literature we can say that a genuinely reciprocal relationship builds up between the reader and writer because meaning is not a constant, objective factor. A text permits a variety of meanings because it can only point to and suggest its deep structure; through the process of reading, meaning is reconstructed by the reader through imaginative participation. The meaning is thus formed through a relationship: (1) the text, (2) the implied deep structure, (3) the conscious reader[27].

The relationship between reader and writer is also different from other kinds of relationships because the writer offers a world to the reader to share in. The writer sets limits to this world, selects and orders it. The willing reader enters into a contract with the writer to accept the fictional world[28], to share in it and to accept its limits but at the same time, the reader will have certain expectations about it. The fictional world will in some sense be a recognisably human world. If it is a fantastic or absurd world then it must nevertheless be recognised as concerning human human preoccupations and emotions. If it does not refer in some way to the actual world, then it will be incomprehensible and the reader will not be able to share in it. However, the writer might

employ an unusual surface structure which will render the significance of his fictional world inaccessible to many readers. Such discontinuities between conventional forms and experimental forms often cause problems of interpretation but they can equally be a fruitful device for communication.

***

DISCONTINUITY

The greater part of the discussion of the concept of discontinuity will centre upon its usefulness in generating all kinds of literary devices that mobilize the imagination of the reader and break through the deadening effect of habitual response. However, I will start by discussing first some of the problems that arise through discontinuities.

The history of art is replete with examples of outraged "consumers". The general public can feel insulted by a particular form which claims to be art but which they feel is unrecognisable as art. In many, if not most cases, a paradigm is being applied which is inappropriate to the new work and therefore the innovation is perceived as failure to achieve the standard of the paradigm applied. Cubism is still judged by the unwilling as failing to be representational and explained by the suggestion that the artist is not really competent to draw or paint. We hear exactly similar judgements of atonal music: a child could make a cacophony of sound like that, it is only discord and noise, where is the tune? Here the paradigm of tonality with all its conventions is being applied to a music which has deliberately set out to break with those conventions. Modern plays are often enigmatic and unresolved and this is often explained by the modern writer's distaste for narrative substitutes in drama. Modern novels have become perhaps more esoteric than any other form of literature, often rejecting most of the recognisable components of earlier novels.

In these examples the spectators, listeners, readers, have expectations about art which are frustrated in a negative way. The new form used is opaque to many people, it does not point to a world which can be shared, people are in fact shut out. For art to communicate people must perceive something of the deep structure implied by the surface form. Without this, we are left with the form only, which is unfamiliar. L B Meyer points out that the lack of

recognisable shape arouses powerful desires for clarification[29]. If this clarification does not occur to the satisfaction of the listener then the result will be a very powerful feeling of frustration and confusion and will probably lead to the rejection of the work.

This phenomenon seems complex when we consider that art which has at one time been rejected can later become so absorbed into a culture that it is considered conventional. Clearly the work itself has not altered. Certain social effects will occur in time, critics will comment on it, perhaps illuminatingly; people will discuss it and speculate on it. But apart from these effects, something alters the general mode of response without any direct training of the public. We could take Picasso's painting, Stravinsky's music or Beckett's plays as examples. Since their first presentation, some kind of learning has taken place; experience has filtered through the culture so that now the experience is no longer new and unfamiliar. In some way conventional aesthetic categories of painting, music, drama, have been reformed to accommodate the new. The limits of possibility have been extended[30]. Is this cultural learning or have perceptions actually altered? Or is this the same thing? The threshold of surprise or expectation appears to be at a different point from before. We are conservative about our existing store of categories, we always try to match new patterns against old ones, to find continuity, to make meaningful configurations. Our resistance to new forms helps us to preserve a stable constant world. But when we have overcome our conservatism sufficiently to allow a new category, or change to an existing one, we also attend to new features because we now have some notion of what to look for and we notice details which before would have eluded our attention. The surface structure is now no longer opaque and we can penetrate to the deeper level of significance and attempt to determine the inner logic of the work. In this way we move from the discontinuities between forms, through an extension or reconstruction, to a new continuity between the actual world and the world which the artist has presented.

T S Kuhn points to similar occurrences in science[31]. The paradigms which preserve the stability of a discipline are only the best theories of the time, they can never account for everything which requires explanation. Kuhn suggests that the history of science does not have the smooth linear flow that it is generally represented as having. It advances instead by discontinuities. These he calls revolutions. Over time, normal science encounters more and more evidence which existing theories are inadequate to deal with. Pressure builds up against the paradigm and at the same time there is great resistance to this pressure, often leading to an unscientific rejection of evidence. There is thus a tension between the resistance to change an underlying structure, and a powerful drive towards clarification of unexplained data. This eventually results in a new theory or paradigm being suggested and if it better fits the available data, then in time it will form the new deep structure to the discipline. Once again the limits of possibility have been extended, continuity has emerged from discontinuity.

DESIGN

Returning to art, how is it that we can generate a new or extended paradigm in response to a new stimulus? How can we begin to find continuity from discontinuity? If we think of a poem or a piece of atonal music then the most obvious aspect to come to mind is the pattern. We find patterns in the structure, the rhythms and in a poem, the images. It is through these inner patterns that we can begin to discover the logic of a new form. Repeated exposure to a piece of atonal music will reveal certain similarities between the musical sections, repeated phrases. When these phrases have been learned then variations can be perceived. A shape and texture begins to emerge and sections are perceived as similar or different, as foreground or background. We find we are listening to new kinds of features, that we are beginning to set on one side some of our conventional, tonality based expectations. We find that the inner pattern does not constantly thrust us forward to some future

resolution in the way we have learned to expect from classical structures, there is a moment by moment sound pattern, a web rather than a chain of sounds. We weave through a network rather than follow a line. So it is that the actual form itself holds the clues to its own deep structure. Naturally there will be exceptions and the difficulty in evaluating new art forms is that all art is not successful, especially if it is experimental. A delicate balance seems to be required even in experimentation, we can feel that Nabokov's games are too self-conscious, Pale Fire becoming tedious in its cleverness. Beckett risks saying again what he has said before; is The Lost Ones so different from Imagination Dead Imagine? The difficulty in evaluation is that we have not only to learn the "grammar" of each new work in order to penetrate it, but we have to decide whether the grammar is adequate, whether a deep structure actually exists, what the quality of the deep structure is, what the quality of the relationship between deep and surface structure is.

Patterns in poetry are often easier to isolate than in music. In Gerard Manley Hopkins' poem, "Carrion Comfort" for instance, the poet manages to combine an extraordinary dramatic intensity with the conventional form and rhyme scheme of the sonnet. One of the reasons is to be found in the new pattern he weaves into the old, the pattern of sprung-rhythm as he calls it. The weight of stress falls on all key words and allows the poem not only to be more emphatic but to chart the restless shifting of the poet's mood:

> Not, I'll not, carrion comfort, Despair, not
> feast on thee;
> Not untwist - slack they may be -these last
> strands of man
> In me or, most weary, cry I can no more. I can;
> Can something, hope, wish day come, not
> choose not to be.[32]

When a poet controls pause and emphasis as skilfully as Hopkins does in these first four lines of the poem, the reader begins to reproduce in himself something of the feeling which informs the poem because the process of reading the poem necessitates it. This process is assisted by the images of feeding on comfort as if on

carrion and of writhing strands of rope suggesting the wrestling with hope and despair. To achieve the involvement of the reader, the poet must make his language more than referential. Hopkins, through his choice of words, through repetition, emphasis, ambiguity, unusual order of words, alliteration, images and their connotations, can make the reader actually feel the highly-wrought state of the poet. The tight control which the poet attains through these devices, affects the pace with which the poem is read and how this varies, conveying with sensuous immediacy the ceaseless shifting of mood from determination, doubt and despair through moments of illumination and faith to a rather unconvincing resolution.

REPETITION

When we talk of the design or patterns within poetry, music or any other art, we are often really discussing repetitions; something which connects with something else, relations between features. These patterns are not static, they dissolve, shift and resolve. The features in themselves do not provide the aesthetic experience but the relations between them, and these refer forwards and back, as in the Hopkins' poem. It is the dynamic interrelation between the parts of the poem which causes the experience to be what it is. The interrelation is not in the poem, only repeated words are there, it is supplied by the reader through his imaginative perception of the pattern and continuities. An insight into the relations whether through repetition or connotation, and a cumulative reverberative effect of poetic language, provides the experience. The patterns act as triggers or releasers which arouse expectations and mobilize the resources of the imagination.

We have said that pattern invariably involves repetition. L B Meyer makes an important point about repetition in art, that it is only a physical event and never psychological[33]. It thus involves both continuity and discontinuity. We saw how in the Hopkins' poem, words, sounds and ideas are repeated and yet to the reader they are

not the same. This is because they refer forward and back, they modify each other in both directions. When a word is repeated it takes on more meaning, a new linguistic context gives it new meaning. It also changes our apprehension of the first use of the word. In the four lines of "Carrion Comfort", the word "not" becomes much emphasized through repetition and through repetition and emphasis suggests the fear and determination of the poet. The use of the word "not" in the second line, in the context of "untwist" makes us read it as both "not" and "knot". This new meaning subtly alters what we have already read and infuses "not" with even more emphasis because of its new connotation set off by "knot". These new connotations are then reinforced through the imagery of "slack they may be these last strands of man" and the reader once again senses the determination of the poet to gather himself firmly together through the emphatic repeated "not" of the first line.

Words can of course be repeated with entirely different effect. In Harold Pinter's Old Times, which I discuss in Chapter Three, repetition is used to baffle the audience and generate ambiguity. In Faulkner's work, which is discussed in Chapter Two, the device of repetition allows the writer to control the reader's participation, releasing the shared world in controlled portions. We can now agree with Meyer's suggestion that repetition can only be a physical but never a psychological event. When a word, phrase or event is repeated we perceive it as different the second time because of our memory of the first. By definition the two occasions are connected, like the internal stitching described by Forster which can provide a rhythmical unity to a work. The two events can therefore alter one another by echoing a different context. The kinds of repetition discussed produce very different effects in the reader and yet share certain features in common. We seem to be presented with continuity, connections between parts, symmetries, but we find discontinuities through the effect of modification. It is through the discontinuity that a real pattern emerges out of the triadic relationship mentioned before between the text, the implied deep structure, the imagination of the reader. It is through this process

that the meaning of a text is reconstructed by the reader.

It was suggested before that one of the assumptions that underlie the literary form of a novel or play is that it presents a recognisable world. What kind of recognition is involved then when we encounter the world presented by Absurdist Drama? Its surface form is often not easily recognisable as like the actual world - people in dust-bins, a body growing in a back room. But the plays are not attempting realism in any conventional sense. The spectator can only make his thought continuous with the playwright's by identifying the underlying meaning to the various strands in the play and responding appropriately. Absurdity, parody, and irony all depend upon recognition by the reader/spectator of an appropriate response which we could call the application of the right paradigm. The device is used by the writer to shock the reader into a new vision through defamiliarizing techniques.

DEFAMILIARIZATION

The term defamiliarization was brought into currency by the Russian Formalists and particularly Viktor Shklovsky who suggested that "habitualisation devours life, and art exists that one may recover the sensation of life"[34]. The poetic image seeks to "make strange" the familiar, to bring new perception and heightened awareness. Art restructures the ordinary perception of reality. This restructuring is brought about through the variety of devices available to the writer for surprising the reader out of his habitual response to the world and to literature. This idea is not new. It calls to mind Shelley's suggestion that "poetry strips the evil of familiarity from the world, and lays bare the naked and sleeping beauty, which is the spirit of its forms"[35]. Bertolt Brecht also uses a concept which has much in common with the Formalists' defamiliarization although the technique has a further purpose. Brecht's "Verfremdungseffekt" refers to the deliberate devices he employed in the theatre to break down conventional and habitual responses by the

audience to drama. He wanted an intellectually alert audience to take in the political message of his plays. Both techniques of defamiliarization and alienation work by shock, surprise and frustrated expectations.

Perceptually we always try to continue a process towards completion, to find continuity between parts. If this process is uninterrupted and expectations fulfilled, our awareness of the experience is dulled and automatic. If there is some kind of disturbance in the process of continuation then the tension this involves will mobilize the awareness and imagination of the reader. L B Meyer suggests that "affect or emotion-felt is aroused when an expectation - a tendency to respond - activated by the musical stimulus situation, is temporarily inhibited or permanently blocked". The same situation often causes a reader/listener to become self-conscious, reflecting, and this is when "meaning will become objectified". Meyer is here identifying the process of participation and reconstruction by the reader/listener of the meaning or deep structure of the work[36].

In Dickens' novels as in many others we see obvious examples of disturbance in the process of continuation each time the writer shifts from one set of characters and story line to another. This technique was partly developed in response to the serial form in which Dickens presented his work. He used devices to create tension and expectation in his readers in order to keep them reading week by week. In the opening of Our Mutual Friend the reader is taken immediately into the world of riverside characters with strange undertones of uneasiness expressed through Lizzie Hexam's distress. Leaving the story at a suitably dramatic moment, Dickens turns to a wholly different world where the Veneerings and others of the idle nouveaux riches stimulate their jaded imaginations with current gossip. The shift could hardly be more extreme and each throws the other into relief. The reader, even at this stage expects some clarification through a connection between these two worlds. This point is even more apparent in William Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury where it

is not only the setting which shifts but also the style of writing and the voice behind it.

Pinter defamiliarizes his world by presenting logical discontinuities between it and the actual world and by shifting and reversing the structure of relationships so that the predator of Act I becomes the prey of Act II. Dramatic conventions lead the audience to expect relationships to remain more or less constant on stage and Pinter's capacity for completely reorientating these relationships is often very disturbing. The effect is to make the audience question their assumptions not only about characters in the play but also about relationships and power in the actual world. Writers in the Absurdist tradition want to shock their reader/spectator into a new vision, to make them restructure ordinary reality. Assumptions that underlie human behaviour are questioned through parody and exaggeration. Relationships, social situations, communication between people are some of the features of daily life which are taken for granted and which the literature of the Absurd tries to examine. By a logical extension to this, the literature questions the assumptions on which it is based and anti-novels and anti-plays are written in a way as to undermine devices of character and plot and dialogue. Camus describes the feeling of Absurdity thus:

> A world that can be explained even with bad reasons is a familiar world. But, on the other hand, in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, a man feels an alien, a stranger.
>
> The Myth of Sisyphus[37]

The Absurdists try to make the reader/spectator feel this alienation in order to break through the deadening effect of habit to produce a heightened awareness.

V Shklovsky explores the defamiliarizing effects of unusual points of view in Tolstoy, giving as his favourite example, the story told from the point of view of a horse. More recently we have seen the great popularity of Watership Down by Richard Adams. This may not be of the same order as Tolstoy's work but the technique and effect are similar. People claim not only that they will never see rabbits

in the same way again but their perceptions of guns, traps, cars, myxomatosis, have also been altered. Such a technique is obviously much more effective "propaganda" than any straight polemic as any satirist knows. Swift, in his A Modest Proposal is also defamiliarizing in the same way. Parody, irony, satire, depend upon discontinuities of various kinds and the reader must know how they are to be read in order for his thoughts and imagination to be continuous with the writer's.

Another defamiliarizing technique is for a writer to disrupt the conventions governing time in a novel or play. Our expectations are that literary works gradually unfold in time, that time can elapse between chapters and episodes and that we will keep moving forward. Writers can extend and shorten time for particular effect and also move forward and backward. William Faulkner's As I Lay Dying is defamiliarizing through the disrupting of the linear forward flow of time. There are further strange effects through the shifting point of view.

SYMPATHETIC INVOLVEMENT

Communication between a writer and reader becomes effective only when the reader takes up the position of the other. When point of view shifts, the reader shifts too. When as readers we are offered an unusual or shifting point of view it makes us aware of one of the most fundamental features of the relationship between ourselves and the writer. Taking up the position of the other involves the reader in a complex movement between and fusion of discontinuity and continuity. Wolfgang Iser[38] suggest that through his rhetoric the writer attempts to cause the reader to "leave behind his individual disposition for the duration of his reading" and although I do not think this does happen for the duration of the reading, I do think at times it does. As D W Harding points out[39] the notion of identification or vicarious experience simply does not stand up to close investigation. We are at the same time our detached selves

and involved selves. We feel both for and with characters. When the reader can be persuaded to think in new rhythms of prose and to take on an alien orientation even with part of himself, then the notion of subject and object, reader and writer, fiction and actuality, is altered. The clear distinction between subject and object becomes blurred.

Schopenhauer discusses this blurring of distinctions in art[40]. He suggests that art reproduces or penetrates to Eternal Ideas: "It plucks the object of its contemplation out of the stream of the world's course" (p239). Human reason splits the unity of the Idea so that it can be comprehended in temporal and spatial terms. To put this in a Kantian form, the human mind translates into its pre-existing subjective categories, time and space, what is not necessarily temporal or spatial because this is the only way actuality can be perceived. Schopenhauer also discusses the notion of possession:

> ... if a man ... gives the whole power of his mind to perception, sinks himself entirely in this ... if the object has to such an extent passed out of all relation to something outside it, and the subject out of all relation to the will, then that which is so known is the Idea, the eternal form, ... and therefore he is so sunk in this perception that he is no longer individual, for in such perception the individual has lost himself; but he is pure, will-less, painless, timeless, subject of knowledge. (p231)

In the state of sympathetic involvement there can be a passing away of subject/object divisions for a while before a return to separateness. This is why we might rationalise the experience as complete identification whereas it is probably only momentary and then perhaps only partial. Setting aside one's own disposition and taking up the position of the other might appear to involve the reader in discontinuity but is probably more likely to be a process of continuity: This process of reading seems to involve both, a movement into and back from the world presented and also a kind of fusion of the two. The fusion arises from an imaginative projection of self into the position of the other.

A detailed study of examples in later chapters of the effects discussed above will reveal that the process of reading often involves a transformation of one perception into another and new perception. I have described this transformation as occurring between the response to discontinuities and the effort to find continuities. Metaphor for instance was presented as an example of the way continuity can be suggested through the fusion of or transfer between two often disparate elements. Metaphor works through the participation of the reader and the insight required of the reader arises beause of "the instant fusion of previously unrelated matrices"[41], continuity from discontinuity. This theory of "bisociation" of Authur Koestler offers an interesting example of continuity from discontinuity, applying not only to metaphor but to the nature of insight and also proving to be the basic structural feature of irony. Irony depends for its humorous effect not on one level of meaning but two. Once identified and read appropriately, irony does not become one dimensional. The deep structure remains implicit and the reader finds pleasure in penetrating to the implicit values and attitudes of the author while leaving a character or the narrator to be self-deceived or ignorant. Irony depends therefore upon a superimposition of one point of view upon another. One point of view the reader takes as his own because it is that of the implied author, "the other" of a novel. This orientation involves a recognition that one of the characters, for instance, is blind or self-deceiving.

In literature, meaning can no longer be regarded as something which exists in an absolute way in a text before it is read. It depends upon a relationship between the text, the implied deep structure and the reader. The reader is an active participant in the process of reading. Because the deep structure is always implicit, the reader constructs his own particular meaning and yet this is not simply an idiosyncratic response because he is controlled directly or indirectly by the writer through the text. This gives a new and dynamic conception to meaning and to the process of reading. We saw how scientists too cannot ensure that they are not participating

or "interfering" with their observations and measurements. In the creative arts an intuitive response seems more obviously appropriate and yet Polanyi has shown[42] that it is just as essential in scientific work.

Reading, like other processes of perception concerns a response to pattern. This response I have called one of finding continuity. Since art is created in response to other art this means that conventions are either reflected or rejected. The reader thus perceives continuity or discontinuity with other art forms and this process of matching or not matching is the first stage in any interpretation. In addition, the novel presents a fictional world which is continuous in some way with the actual world. The reader expects some correspondence between different novels and also between the fictional world and the actual world. The writer can make use of the reader's expectations and fulfil or frustrate them, create tensions and excite emotional reactions. Using the psychophysical effects of language through description and symbols, the writer can evoke a whole atmosphere or a complex response response to character. When we converse or read, much of our understanding is tacit, we are involved in a temporarily shared world which forms the deep structure to our conversation or our reading. Through our ability to take the position of the other, we can build up a shared world and in this sense make our thought continuous with the other, who in literature is the implied author.

The notion of discontinuity can be used to explain the opacity of modern art forms for many people. If a world cannot be shared, the suface form cannot be penetrated, it is therefore not possible to make one's thoughts and imagination continuous with the artist. So people say, I do not understand it, I do not see what the artist means. If the art form is to be interpreted, continuity must be sought within the work itself. Its connection with its own history will probably become apparent later. The continuity between the parts of a work will be revealed in its inner patterns of symmetry and similarity. As the work's own patterns are perceived, a shape

will emerge in a way that is different from earlier conventions of novel writing. Sensitivity to such new patterns will broaden the kind of expectations a reader has of the novel form and change can thus occur to our existing categories through which we make interpretations. An appropriate reading might involve identifying the discontinuity which lies at the root of an ironic mode. Instead of believing what a character thinks about himself or others we have more information with which to evaluate the character himself.

*****

NOTES to Chapter One

1 KUHN T S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago. 1962/30.

2 MARTIN G D. Language Truth and Poetry. University Press Edinburgh. 1975. p119.

3 CHOMSKY N. Men of Ideas. Spring 1979. BBC2 TV Programme.

4 BOOTH W C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. University of Chicago 1961. Booth uses the term to refer to those resources available to the writer by which he imposes his fictional world on the reader.

5 "Set" is a term meaning the mental orientation derived from expectations which in turn lead to other physiological adjustments arising from and modified by what actually occurs.

6 POPPER K. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London. 1972.

7 This phrase is used by the Gestalt Psychologist, Wolfgang Kohler as a definition of the word "meaning".

8 MEYER L B. Emotion and Meaning in Music. University of Chicago. 1956. p91.

9 A similar point can be found in the Biographia where Coleridge describes the power of the imagination as revealed in the balance or reconcilement of opposite or discordant qualities. (Ch. XIV p 166).

10 HAYEK F A: The Sensory Order. The University of Chicago Press. 1963. Hayek is anxious to point out the many interconnections between the senses and the academic nature of studies such as, the visual system.

11 ONG W. "A dialectic of aural & objective correlatives". (see D Lodge ed). p498-508.

12 REID L A. Meaning in the Arts. London. 1969. Also New York. p 77.

13 ECCLES J. "The Physiology of Imagination". Scientific American Readings: Altered States of Awareness. Freeman Press. 1954.

"Matthew Arnold", in The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism, Faber and Faber. 1933. pp. 118-19.

14 ELIOT T S. ~~"Auditory Imagination". Essay quoted in The Art of T S Eliot. H Gardner. Faber. 1949/68. p6.~~

15 GOMBRICH E H. "Illusion & Art". Gregory R L & Gombrich E H. (eds) Illusion in Nature and in Art. George Duckworth & Co Ltd. 1973. p201.

16 Op. cit. p77.

17 POLANYI M & PROSCH H. Meaning. University of Chicago Press. 1975.

18 In an essay "An Enquiry into Meaning and Truth", Bertrand Russell suggests that language has a transparent quality once meaning is grasped because words act as a vehicle to get to meaning and when this is achieved the word drops away.

19 COLERIDGE S T. Biographia Literaria. Dent. 1906. pp 159-60.

20 Op cit. p19.

21 Op. cit.

22 MEAD G H. Mind, Self and Society. University of Chicago Press/ 1967.

23 Ibid.

24 ROMMETVEIT R. On Message Structure. John Wiley & Sons. 1974. p57.

25 Op. cit.

26 CHOMSKY N. Language & Mind. Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch Inc. 1968. Rev ed 1972. p107.

27 M R COHEN, G H MEAD, L B MEYER, all support this notion of a triadic relationship: (1) stimulus, (2) that to which stimulus points, (3) conscious observer.

28 JAMES H. quoted Wayne C Booth Op. cit.

29 Op. cit. p 160.

30 ORNSTEIN R. The Psychology of Consciousness. Freeman. 1972. Penguin 1975. p 29. Ornstein discusses the conservatism of the categories we use and how this determines our perceptions and our behaviour. He shows how a novel event such as reaching the moon radically changes our conception of what is possible.

31 Op. cit.

32 HOPKINS G M. Poems & Prose. Penguin. 1953. p61.

33 Op. cit. p49.

34 SCHKLOVSKY V. quoted V Erlich. "Russian Formalism". Journal of the History of Ideas. Vol 34. No 4. Oct-Dec. 1973. pp 627-638.

35 SHELLEY P Defence of Poetry. (1821) Ed H F B Brett-Sinton. 2nd Edition Oxford. 1929. p174.

36 Op. cit. p39.

37 CAMUS. A. The Myth of Sisyphus. Hamish Hamilton Ltd. 1955. p13.

38 ISER W. The Implied Reader. Johns Hopkins Press. 1974 p56.

39 HARDING D W. "Psychological Processes in the Reading of Fiction". The British Journal of Aesthetics. Vol II. No 2. April 1962. pp 133-147.

40 SCHOPENHAUER A. The World as Will and Idea. (1883). Translated by R B Haldane & J Kemp. London. 1948.

41 KOESTLER A. The Act of Creation. Hutchinson. 1964. p220.

42 POLANYI M. Knowing and Being. ed M Grene. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1969.

*****

CHAPTER TWO

NARRATIVE

> And harmony, in a matter of eternal contraries,
> may lie in infinity, yet that playful reserve
> called irony carries it within itself, as the
> sustained note carries the resolution. (Thomas Mann[1])

In this and the remaining chapter I will be using the concepts of continuity and discontinuity to illuminate the role of the reader and the implied vision of the writer. The study of narrative brings us close to various aspects of the "voice" in fiction and the relationahip which develops between this voice and the reader. It was suggested in the Introduction that the implicit dimension of literature incorporates unstated effects produced through techniques such as irony. Any present-day discussion of narrative is inevitably also a discussion of irony and the complex relationship set up between writer and reader.

Although we share a language we do not share the medium in which thoughts form and move. We use the phrase "the way we think" to mean, the connections we make and sequences we follow in our ideas. These ways of thinking are formed through culture and other experiences. But what of the medium? Is it more or less the same from person to person, is it visual or auditory, does it use images or words, or both? No one has yet produced certain answers to these questions and yet consciousness is the most intimate and private part of each of us. It seems indeed that one does have a style of thought and also habits, biases, which determine this style. If one talks to another person, the possible connections and developments from one's own thought are widened by the different pattern of the other person's thought. In a novel this experience is enhanced by the greater submission of the reader to the vision of the writer. What is peculiar about the reader/writer relationship is that however the "voice" is varied through character, scene, commentary, it is most akin to monologue.

Many critics place the term "narrative" at the other end of a continuum from "drama" and use the continuum to refer to the form of presentation which a writer chooses. Narrative, in this case, refers

to commentary by the author, and the dramatic mode refers to direct speech and dialogue between characters. However, I am going to discuss narrative commentary and discourse of various kinds, of and between characters, point of view, distance and irony. Commentary and dialogue might appear to be very different forms but all utterances in a novel are selected and created by the author whether they take the form of commentary or dialogue. The discourse between writer and reader is in any event an unusual one. As the critic John Preston suggests, "the reader extends himself in play, in an action without consequences and in relationships without responsibility. The writer stretches out to unseen and unforeseeable readers; the reader responds to an absent writer who has already said his last word"[2].

The form of presentation which a writer chooses is not one thing or another; it is a continuum. Narrative commentary often shades into exposition coloured by a character's point of view. Retaining the third person form, commentary can shade into a rendering of a character's thoughts in his own idiom. Examples of these different shadings will be given later in the chapter. Direct speech represents a shift from third to first person. It is therefore logically difficult to exclude direct discourse from a discussion of narrative. However, in early narrative there is a clearer distinction between commentary and the dramative mode. What occurs in the development of narrative is that the discontinuities between teller, tale and audience become implicit, go underground. A study of early texts therefore will assist in an explanation of the reader's role because it is more explicit. This idea will be made clearer through the example of Troilus and Criseyde which will be discussed later. Since my purpose in this section is to capture the variety of narrative forms, discussion of individual texts will necessarily be curtailed.

IRONY

Robert Scholes describes any narrative situation as "ineluctably ironical"[3] because it involves three or four viewpoints. The term "irony" originated in a kind of deception characterised by

dissimulation and evasion[4]. We can still see much of this original sense of evasion in present-day forms of irony. It has shifted greatly in its meaning and now is notoriously difficult to define because it always seems to embrace more than any definition suggests. This is a sure sign that it is to be located in the implicit dimension. Indeed it is mostly found, or often missed, in the half light between different points of view. Point of view refers to the position which the writer takes up towards his material; this can be one or several perspectives. A discussion of irony is not only a discussion of narrative but also of point of view and distance. Irony is about the discontinuity between points of view in a narrative, for instance between the writer's implied vision and that of his narrator. Irony is articulated through apparent distinctions such as good and evil, comedy and tragedy, by confounding these and other distinctions.

A W Schlegel found ironies everywhere in Shakespeare through the Poet's mixing of comic scenes with scenes of high seriousness. Following Schlegel came a profound shift in emphasis and development of the term irony. The label that has come to be used now is Romantic Irony which is as intuitive and shifting as most terms linked to this adjective. Schlegel did not regard Shakespeare's comic scenes as a sop to the "vulgar general" but as an indication of the Poet's genius. Most poets, Schlegel said, try to "exact from their readers a blind approbation or condemnation of whatever side they choose to support or oppose"[5]. Shakespeare on the other hand rose above such narrowness by allowing us "an occasional glance at the less brilliant reverse of the medal". In this way Shakespeare makes a "sort of secret understanding with the select circle of the more intelligent of his readers or spectators". Perhaps this is one of the main appeals of irony to the reader. Its subtlety and indirectness mades the reader feel like a conspirator. The kind of relationship between reader and writer which this implies has universal appeal.

Although we can find irony in some early texts, it is in this century that it has become so all pervasive in literature.

Northrop Frye suggests "that the ironic tone is central to modern literature"[6]. We find the reasons for this tone expressed in themes of isolation, alienation, cynicism, absurdity, relativity, self-consciousness. Irony evolved from one of a number of rhetorical devices to its present metaphysical form, expressing the fundamentally absurdist vision that life is essentially meaningless and that man is the sole source of meaning, value and truth[7]. The ironic mode exposes and magnifies the incongruities of existence, the discontinuity between inward and outward, subjective and objective, treated so brilliantly by Tolstoy and by Chekhov. Although the ironic mode is essentially nihilistic, in the hands of the greatest modern ironists condemnation is avoided and positive values lie in a compassionate understanding and sympathy towards people. This extends an awareness in the reader of why people are as they are and of the predicament of man in a shifting relative world where the centre no longer holds. But just as the modern ironist makes no indictment, neither does he offer any resolution, because there is none. There is only the willingness to face the world as it truly is, to invent its meaning for ourselves and to laugh. The role of the reader is to join the writer in a sophisticated conspiracy or game with his fiction.

The device of an ironic narrator acts as a screen between the writer and his material. It allows detachment, reserve, humour. It is through this reserve, as Thomas Mann suggests in the quotation heading the present chapter, that harmony between contraries might be implied or encompassed. The satirists of the 18th Century created their own kind of screen through detachment and the avoidance of polemic. Although some critics prefer to separate satire and irony, the two are clearly related through their shared use of the discontinuity between a writer's true vision and the way in which it is expressed. The satiric theme chosen is often a familiar part of everyday life where the anaesthetizing effect of custom, dullness and resignation sets up barriers to perception. Satire works by defamiliarization through exaggeration and other tonal means, to present a true or exaggerated picture of life. Thus

paradoxically, it is through the erection of a screen between the writer's attitudes and values, that a reader's perceptual barriers might be broken down.

Modern irony particularly develops the effect of the distance between illusion and the truth, appearance and reality. In John Fowles' novel, The French Lieutenant's Woman the writer offers a dual perspective throughout the book. Set in the Victorian era, the fictional illusion is constantly broken into by the writer who remarks on the contrast and comparisons between the setting of his novel and the time in which he is writing. Our imaginations are too flexible to be seriously undermined by this shifting perspective. The effect is rather to give the reader the extra delight of, as it were, observing the fiction under construction. Haakon Chevalier suggests that there is an irony latent in every partial view and therefore the ironist is committed more and more to a perspective which is exterior to any one perspective, which attempts to embrace all contradictions, to be separate and godlike[8]. The limited or naive narrator is thus the perfect foil through which to articulate the superior vision of the writer. In the modern interest in irony we can see just another expression of the debate about objectivity. The ironic vision incorporates the admission that the subjective can never be entirely eliminated. It is no longer sufficient for the writer to show that he knows his characters are limited; he must be aware that his vision, too, is partial, and that the reader stands outside both, and is also limited. Romantic Irony points to the position of the writer who must be both objective and subjective, emotional and rational, creative and critical[9]. One is immediately struck by the thought that this is also a description of the role of the reader. The reader too is snared by this web of irony: The ideal reader must find a harmony between apparent contradictions in his role, through that playful reserve which Thomas Mann describes[10]. A successful reading of irony is rooted in the relationship which develops between reader and writer. It is therefore dependent upon context which provides the reader with the continuity with which to judge the appropriate reading.

DISTANCE

The first kinds of narrative were sung and they were characterized by an obvious distance between the author and the narrator. Distance is a technical term referring to the discontinuity between author, narrator, other characters and reader. This gap is not only different in quality in different works but can also shift and alter within the same work. In many cases of early narrative the author was unknown or there were thought to be a number of authors. The important feature of this form of narrative was the manner of telling the tale, since the story itself was already known to the audience.

The notion of distance is a combination of the literary and the psychological. A psychologist, Edward Bullough identifies several different kinds of distance in art[11]. Spatial distance is that represented in the work. This is small in Washington Square with its narrow world and its focus on a very few characters and a short time span; considerably greater in Our Mutual Friend with its span from Riverside to the Veneerings. Temporal distance refers to the remoteness in time of a work's setting such as King Lear or Troilus and Criseyde or any futurist work of fiction and this always tends to have a defamiliarizing effect. Finally Bullough identifies what he calls psychic distance which has a negative and a positive aspect. The negative aspect ensures that the "practical response" is cut out so that the spectators of a tragedy do not make the mistake of trying to kill the villain and save the maiden. This would arise from the effect of under-distancing and appears to be remarkably common in response to television serials such as Crossroads and Z Cars. The positive aspect concerns the new vision acquired through the defamiliarization caused by cutting the practical response. Over-distancing has the effect of making something appear artificial.

The notion of under-distancing is striking since it leads directly to the modern theories concerning alienation and defamiliarization. Under-distancing results in a deep emotional involvement and a tendency for the reader to identify the situation he is reading about with his own life. Bullough suggests that this is not an

aesthetic response. In order to steer the middle course therefore, the writer seeks to distance or defamiliarize his world sufficiently to avoid the reader's intense and personal response. He must also ensure that the psychic distance created is not so great that the reader finds no continuity between the fictional and the actual world. Bertold Brecht's "Verfremdungseffekte" in the theatre were devices designed to involve the audience along a different dimension. Brecht wanted to offset emotional involvement and encourage a lively intellectual involvement. As Wayne Booth points out, "distance along one axis is sought for the sake of increasing the reader's involvement along some other axis"[12].

The notion of over-distancing is also useful since it most obviously concerns an effect which alters with changing conventions. Flaubert, Chekhov, James and Joyce all adopted a similar stance about the over-distancing effect of earlier omniscient narration, preferring instead a more apparently realistic form where the author should be "everywhere present but nowhere apparent"[13]. However, in its time even the self-conscious narrator represented a striking innovation. As Robert Scholes points out[14], a new level of complexity and irony was added to narrative not so much through the introduction of self-conscious narrators but through authors since these had hitherto been unknown or lost to antiquity. Seen from this point of view, the distance between author and narrator is greatly decreased because the author creates his narrator as well as his story. He can thus control the degree of distance between himself and his narrator, promoting ironies and increasing the complexity of the work.

TROILUS AND CRISEYDE

If we turn from modern metaphysical irony, largely a struggle within the mind, to an early text, Troilus and Criseyde, we find Chaucer's narrator at great pains to point out the discontinuity between himself, his audience and his tale. From our brief discussion about irony we might immediately expect that Troilus and Criseyde is informed by an ironic vision. However, medieval scholars warn us against such an assumption and remind us that it is our tendency

today to find ironies everywhere where none are intended[15]. This supports Northrop Frye's suggestion of the pervasive hold which an ironic vision has on this Century[16]. As critical readers we must search for an appropriate reading and in Troilus and Criseyde we are partly guided by the way in which Chaucer's narrator controls the distance in the poem.

In Troilus and Criseyde the narrator is limited to the historical facts and embellishments and his authority lies in the tradition behind his story. He often invokes this tradition to show his helplessness to alter the fate of his characters. He is less helpless however, about the way he tells his story so that he can from time to time ask for help with his "woful" verses from his Muse. He is an observer, compliant to his sources (or so he claims) and little though he relishes certain parts of his story he can do nothing about it. We find a similar posture adopted by Thomas Mann's narrator, Zeitblom, in Dr Faustus, although Zeitblom is an eye-witness narrator to the events of his story. Again it is tempting to perceive in Chaucer's poem the same sophistication and ironic intention as we find in Dr Faustus but it is very difficult for us to judge the contemporary psychic distance generated by Chaucer between himself and his narrator. He wrote within a tradition of story tellers, old and well-known tales, oral epics and the elaborate conventions of medieval rhetoric. Modern readers suffer problems of over-distancing with such texts. The temporal distance between us and a medieval text can have too great a defamilarizing effect. We can however be guided through a comparison between Troilus and Criseyde and the primary source Chaucer used, Il Filostrato by Boccaccio[17].

A comparison reveals much of the conscious artistry of Chaucer's poem. Chaucer alters the time scale and the presentation of character and distinguishes clearly between the speech of his characters. There is a homogeneity of style in Boccaccio's poem which is curiously disrupted in Chaucer: the latter's mode of narrative is alternately realistic and stylized. Chaucer develops

the role of Boccaccio's narrator, creating a voice which is intrusively didactic, modest and naive. Why is there such variety of texture in Chaucer's poem? Why does the Poet create deliberate discontinuities between the parts of his poem through intrusion and shifts in focus? The events have a natural continuity which Chaucer deliberately breaks up through interruption and digression. The Narrator controls the focus of the reader's attention so that at times we feel more sympathy and at times less. We learn to understand the characters both in a personal and particular way, and in a much wider universal sense.

Not all critics agree that the narrative comment in Troilus and Criseyde means that Chaucer creates anything so clearly defined as a Narrator[18]. But it is undeniable that a voice constantly intrudes into the continuity of events and calls attention to the teller of the tale. The voice shifts between modesty, naiveté, didacticism, making reference to learned authorities, invocations and addresses to Muses, and fairly neutral story-telling. We know from Il Filostrato what "information" was available to Chaucer so that when he claims that his author does not say or that his source is a fictitious Lollius we know today that there is something more subtle at work in the poem than just the Poet's voice. It is therefore useful shorthand to use the term "narrator" for the shifts of indirection which Chaucer engages in.

As distinct from Zeitblom, Chaucer's Narrator can be classified as a non-participating historian narrator who is outside his story physically and temporally[19]. Because of this specific distance between narrator and story we might expect the narrator to be reliable. That is, we might expect his interpretation of the story to be consistent with that of the implied author. In fact he is dramatised in many ways in relation to the reader. We therefore find discontinuous levels of fiction. At the furthest remove there is the pagan story of Troilus and Criseyde, assumed to be known to the audience. The events are in the past and the Narrator reacts to them as if they are historically true. The Narrator has a broader

view than the characters not only because he knows the outcome of the story and stands outside it but also because of the religious disparity between the characters and himself.

He arranges the story with many conventional epic rhetorical devices. He intrudes to remark on the progress of the story at each book, clearly marking the parts and making the reader fully aware that the story falls into sections. We are reminded of the bones of the poem by comments such as "this ilke ferthe book" (V, 26) and "now wil I gon streght to my matere" and "now lat us stynte of Troilus a stounde" (I, 7)[20]. He so arranges the story that Fortune only allows the lovers half of Book III for real happiness and all the remainder is "wo" for Troilus. The Narrator therefore orders and selects his material, compressing some parts and greatly extending others. He draws out the description of Troilus's misery before he and Criseyde become lovers. The Narrator also focusses for a prolonged part of the poem on Troilus and Pandarus waiting for Criseyde to return from the Greeks.

The story is so obviously arranged that we cannot therefore simply point to the Narrator's helplessness. The story is clearly biased through the way it is organized. The Narrator might not be able to alter the outcome but he is at great pains to mitigate Criseyde's betrayal as far as possible. Chaucer draws him as emotionally involved with his story. E T Donaldson even suggests that he is in love with Criseyde[21].

The picture which takes shape about Chaucer's Narrator is that of a naive and modest man who cares very deeply about the story he tells and wishes to encourage his audience's involvement as far as possible. The effect is to insist on the reality of the Narrator telling the story which we also know is fiction. He is at an intellectual distance from the implied author. He claims to have no experience of love and is thus not only at an emotional distance from his characters but also from part at least of his implied audience. Unlike them he "ne dar to love, for myn unliklynesse". But the reader/audience too is complex. There are two discontinuous

readers, the first is recognised by the second as a fictional device. There is the reader addressed directly by the modest or didactic Narrator and there is the reader who evaluates this as a rhetorical posture, who wonders at the ambiguities and smiles at the ironies. Constantly drawn into and then held back from the poem, the reader is closely controlled, prompted to speculate and judge where the Poet leaves openings through ambiguity and contrast and where the Narrator requests collusion. There is a further kind of distance which is not made explicit until the end of the poem. Both the events and the framework to the tale have a pagan setting and the Christian moral is not clearly pointed until the end[22]. There is here a religious distance assumed between the Poet and story, and readers and story.

How then are we to penetrate the vision of the implied author? Is the Narrator's point of view distinct and different from Chaucer's? Is it even consistent? For many critics an answer to these questions turns upon the final part of the poem. There is still unresolved controversy about it. Some critics refer to it as the Epilogue and suggest that it is simply tacked on but in no way integrated into the poem. Other critics suggest that this is precisely what the apparently ironic discontinuities within the poem have been pointing towards. A good case can be made out for either view and we must therefore look to Chaucer's method for an explanation.

Predictably there is much ambiguity within the poem. The device of Narrator provides Chaucer with a technique for creating and controlling ironic shifts in point of view but we cannot be sure what the ironies mean. The Narrator's naive remarks while Troilus performs as a wailing Courtly Lover, alert the reader to something, but to what? Does Chaucer believe that people in love are ridiculous? That love at first sight is? That Courtly love conventions are? This list could be much longer because the answer is that we do not know. We know that Chaucer speeds up parts of the narrative and slows down other parts because he wishes to focus the reader's attention on certain aspects of the story rather than others. Why does he focus

on Troilus's misery and not on his happiness? Is it because Christian love should be the goal while Troilus has "leyde his herte al holly" on earthly love? Why does the Narrator turn from some of the most crucial parts of his poem as if deliberately breaking through the sympathy of the reader? Is it because he is not sufficiently articulate at such moments? Or does Chaucer wish to prevent the reader's sympathy with the characters beyond a certain point? Why then does he want the reader to be detached? The Narrator withdraws during the long section where Troilus argues with himself about free-will and predestination. One critic has suggested that the discontinuities of distance so clearly emphasized by Chaucer between the "historical facts" and the Narrator, the reader and the story, are a kind of dramatization of the debate about free-will and predestination[23]. The Narrator is unable to alter the outcome of the story and Troilus's "debate" with himself is not fully resolved. But we have already suggested that the Narrator is not as helpless as he claims even though he might be unable to alter the final outcome of the story.

I do not mean to imply by my discussion of the difficulties of interpretation in Troilus and Criseyde that Chaucer deliberately creates an unreliable Narrator. Indeed, as Scholes points out, such a Narrator is the "sophisticated product of an empirical and ironical age[24]". Chaucer's Narrator is in many ways a conventional figure.

In Il Filostrato there are continuities of events, of style and an even sense of time. Chaucer disrupts all of these, introducing further discontinuities through the device of a Narrator. The implicit dimension to the poem where the Poet's own vision lies, is complex and shrouded partly because of our remoteness from Chaucer's time. The Narrator enlists the sympathy of the reader with the events yet through intrusive comment on the action, on his own unworthiness on his bondage to history, on the process of telling the tale, locates the reader outside his story. We are placed at a critical distance from the Courtly love conventions, from earthly love and its

unreliability, from the issue of free-will and pre-destination. We thus stand apart with the implied author. The precise details of the Poet's own view of reality we cannot be sure of. The Christian vision in the final stanzas of the poem offers one possible reason for the discontinuities of distance which the Poet introduces and one which I personally favour; predestination of events offers another. The gap between the Narrator's interpretation and that of the implied author involves the reader in a critique both of the characters' values and those of the Narrator. Controversy arises because Chaucer's own vision is not made explicit at any point until the last stanzas and this is felt by many to be an inadequate account of the Poet's true position in relation to the whole of the poem.

Troilus and Criseyde offers an example of an early and yet highly complex narrative form and the distance from our own time adds another level of difficulty for us. The apparent discontinuity between the viewpoints of Poet, Narrator and story, unavoidably ironic in its effect today allows us in this Century to find Chaucer 's methods of particular contemporary interest. It is undesirable to deny that readers of Chaucer today are twentieth century readers and as each century before them, will in some measure reinterpret Chaucer in the light of their own biases.

DOCTOR FAUSTUS

If we turn from the Narrator in Troilus and Criseyde to Thomas Mann's Narrator in Doctor Faustus we find many similarities. One of these is the distance between the Narrator and the protagonist. This allows a much sharper picture to be drawn. When the Narrator is the main character such as in David Copperfield, the writer faces the problem of finding a balance between narrating the story and describing the protagonist. The narrator of Doctor Faustus, Dr Serenus Zeitblom, from the beginning of the novel adopts a classical posture concerning his own unworthiness:

> ... my mind misgives me that I shall only be awakening the reader's doubt whether he is in the right hands: whether I mean, my whole existence does not disqualify me for a task dictated by my heart rather than by any true competence for the work.[25]

The irony lies in the fact that Mann has deliberately created a narrator who is quite unsuitable for the task of reflecting a demonic mind. In the quotation Zeitblom introduces an idea constantly reasserted in the novel, that there is and has always been an intellectual discontinuity between the untalented but kindly humanist Zeitblom and his friend of genius and ironic nihilist, Adrian Leverkuhn. There is also an implicit contrast between the humanistic and the demonic. A tension is created through these contrasts and further emphasized in the difference between the two personalities. If both had been similar types the effect would not only have been less ironic but less stimulating. The distinction between the personalities adds the colouration in Zeitblom's reactions of shock, distaste, puzzlement, innocence. In Troilus and Criseyde we noted that Chaucer's Narrator also feels unworthy of his subject since he does not consider himself fit to love and also looks right to the end of his story in the first stanzas. His verses "wepen as I write"[26]. The continuity which Mann quite deliberately seeks between his own and classical forms of narrative adds a delightful and ironic dimension to his work as well as making use of the advantages inherent in the technique. In the Troilus Chaucer's Narrator takes an historical position, claiming his authority from the sources he uses. In Doctor Faustus Zeitblom also claims to be writing history but takes his authority from the fact that he was an eye-witness to the events and people he describes.

The narration in Doctor Faustus also takes on an omniscient quality because the story is seen in retrospect and therefore the narrator can use this temporal discontinuity to make comments about and evaluations of what he is about to write:

> I speak of this because, not without trémors, not without a contraction of my heart, I have now come to the fatal event ... . (p149)

Naturally this greatly heightens tension and builds up the reader's expectations. Zeitblom's agitations and feelings of inadequacy not only function to increase tension, to assert the reality of his story, but also to outline the position of the reader. Zeitblom's remark also reinforces the tacit agreement the reader makes with the writer that the Narrator and his story are true and real. We are constantly reminded of the narrator himself with his tremors and contractions of the heart and this again we find in Troilus and Criseyde.

The narrator's intrusions in Troilus and Criseyde insist on the fictional nature of the story and focus attention on the narrator. Paradoxically Zeitblom's intrusions assert the reality of his story because they are a constant reminder to the reader that the narrator was there. His inadequacy prompts a feeling of superiority in the reader because the reader can penetrate further than the narrator.

The different time dimensions of the novel introduce another and important discontinuity. The historian narrator always presents a story in retrospect. If he was an eye-witness, then as the story unfolds, it draws closer to the temporal dimension in which the narrator is writing. Zeitblom begins his writing 3 years after Leverkuhn's death. At the beginning he and Leverkuhn are young although as he writes he is 60 and his friend is dead. Their early childhood in Kaisersachern is happy and peaceful, contrasting strongly with the main time dimension of the narrative, the first World War and the time in which Zeitblom writes, the second World War. Zeitblom himself points to these "time-units" and adds a third:

> This is a quite extraordinary interweaving of time-units, destined, moreover, to include even a third: namely, the time which one day the courteous reader will take for the reading of what has been written; at which point he will be dealing with a three-fold ordering of time; his own, that of the chronicler, and historic time. (p244)

Zeitblom makes quite sure that the reader does not overlook the interesting three-fold ordering of time. It creates an intriguing

effect of temporal distance; the past commented on and interpreted in the light of the present. This is a technique we have already noted that John Fowles delights in. The reader is made curiously aware of the actual construction of the narrative. The reader is constantly reminded of himself reading because Zeitblom intrudes to remark upon the progress of his narrative. In very much the same way as Chaucer's Narrator points to "this ilke ferthe book", Zeitblom introduces asterisks as "a refreshment for the eye and mind of the reader" and then proceeds to enlarge upon the notion of sections and chapters. From the first, Zeitblom engages the reader in a very direct way and seems thereafter to be unflaggingly aware of the effect of defining the reader and the distance between reader, narrator and story. The credibility of the narrative is also enhanced by the way the narrator distracts the reader's attention. The reader is encouraged to focus on the narrator and his problems as well as on the biography he writes.

Although the temporal dimensions and what they symbolize are clearly marked and separated, Zeitblom constantly points to continuities between them. He is troubled by a connexion he cannot explain:

> Little as it was possible to connect his worsening health in any temperamental way with the national misfortune, yet my tendency to see the one in the light of the other and find symbolic parallels in them, this inclination, which after all might be due simply to the fact that they were happening at the same time, was not diminished by his remoteness from outward things ... . (p330)

The effect of this and similar passages is to suggest to the reader the symbolic part played by Leverkuhn in the novel. His Faustian destiny reflects and is reflected in the collapse of the German people both in the first World War and in the chaos of Nazism. The Devil embodies the dark demonic side of Leverkuhn, of the isolated artist, of the German people. It was the symbolic parallel between Faust and Germany's misfortune which formed the seed for Thomas Mann's novel. Naturally the undemonic Zeitblom does not fully understand yet cannot avoid perceiving the parallels.

Faust, from the earliest writings in the Faustbuch was a mythic figure, a symbol of humanity striving to realize itself in limitless freedom. This describes the role of the artist which for Thomas Mann always contained a fearful demonic aspect. He also used Leverkuhn's dilemma to express the national characteristics of the German people - cold, aloof, disciplined, finding enthusiasm invariably neutralised through analysis and cynicism. The supremely ironic temper! Mann returns again and again in his novels to the tension between the Apollonian figure of cool irony and the frenzied Dionysiac creative and destructive energy which lurks deeper within.

The only way in which Leverkuhn can break from his stale cultural heritage is through parody. He deliberately inflicts suffering on himself, taking his Esmerelda to bed even though she warns him against the disease she carries. In this he feels that he is like the little mermaid who suffered the pain of human legs in order to be close to her love. Leverkuhn seeks inspiration through suffering. There are similarities here with Dostoyevsky's writing: We remember Stavrogin's extraordinary marriage to the half-wit for a bet. The question of Stavrogin's sanity is left uneasily ambiguous by the end of The Devils. The ambiguity of Stavrogin like a number of Dostoyevsky's characters fits the paradigm of the ironist - mocking, nihilistic, unfathomable. As readers we cannot clearly locate the writer's own values and we can no longer be guided by orthodox discontinuities between good and evil characters. We find the ironist of the piece strangely compelling despite his possible criminality or insanity. In The Brothers Karamazov there are obvious correspondences between the section with Ivan and the Devil and the document describing a similar meeting between Leverkuhn and the Devil in Doctor Faustus.

Through using Zeitblom as a screen between himself and his material, Thomas Mann preserves a characteristically ironic detachment. He uses this mode not simply to be playful (a description few would use of him anyway), nor to conceal his own values, but rather because the material and issues he deals with are very complex.

Irony tends always to work through the principle of polarity, using discontinuities of point of view to allow the reader a richer perspective and more creative involvement in the process of reading than could otherwise occur. In Doctor Faustus there are many contrasts and discontinuities - good and evil, light and darkness, flesh and spirit, nihilism and humanism, yet none are resolved.

Through the narrative technique which Mann uses, he encourages a complex response in the reader. The demonic is seen obliquely through the undemonic, the Devil and disease are identified with the creative inspiration of the artist. This is an idea which haunted Thomas Mann through much of his life and one which he shares with Freud; the creative inspiration of the artist describes a pathological state. Thomas Mann recognises two antithetical forces inherent in art and within the individual. He also believes that this applies in a particular way to the German people. The forces can be described as form and chaos, restraint and licence, appearance and reality, Apollonian and Dionysian.

These last terms are from Nietzsche's Birth of Tragedy. This is an early work of Nietzsche centring on an examination of Greek drama to produce a theory about the origins of tragedy. Nietzsche wanted to found a counterdoctrine to ethics and years after writing The Birth of Tragedy he describes the doctrine thus:

> ... it still wanted a name. Being a philologist, that is to say a man of words, I christened it rather arbitrarily - for who can tell the real name of the Antichrist? - with the name of a Greek god, Dionysus. [27]

Later its prophet was to be Zarathustra. In his writing Nietzsche exalted in what was to be acknowledged uneasily and reluctantly by Mann: "that art owes its continuous evolution to the Apollonian-Dionysian duality". Apollo expresses the rejection of licence and the upholding of wisdom, beauty, perfection. Dionysus expresses the primitive forces of nature, intoxication, brutality, wild music, but above all, the union of the individual with the original oneness of nature. Apollo expresses order, and Dionysus, not only that which threatens order but also the impulse to creation without

which the Apollonian becomes sterile and lifeless. It is the tension between these two that Nietzsche suggests provides the energy which informs the arts, and tragedy especially.

The Nietzschian dualism is mirrored in Esmerelda, beautiful and secretive. For Leverkuhn she was the source both of his creativity and his destruction. The artistic problem at the heart of Doctor Faustus as with other works by Thomas Mann[28] is the necessity of the Dionysian element and the difficulty of restraining and directing it. Leverkuhn sells himself entirely to it, focussing too keenly on the demonic within himself and finally abandoning reason and will to it. The duality is also presented in Doctor Faustus through the narrator and the hero, the two warring sides of Thomas Mann himself. Mann recognizes the freedom inherent in an artist's calling but fears its potentially destructive effects. As he showed in Death in Venice, art may be in essence beyond good and evil but the artist, as a social being, cannot be.

Doctor Faustus represents a sophisticated form of the ironic mode and as we inevitably find through using the tools of continutiy and discontinuity to analyse the contrasts, parallels and varieties of distance, the writer uses techniques of discontinuity to draw the reader through to a higher level of continuity in his interpretation. Discontinuity, in other words, is found to disguise a more profound continuity.

OBJECTIVITY AGAIN

Having looked at an early and a recent text, the remainder of my examples will be largely drawn from the nineteenth century. If we return to the idea of the continuum from narrative to dialogue what we find is that the movement along this continuum which was thought to involve a shift from subjectivity to objectivity, in fact rather charts a progress from the explicit to the implicit and therefore from explicit guidance of the reader's response towards

a greater participation required of the reader. This does not mean that modern writers are necessarily more concerned about their readers. Indeed, numerous writers since Flaubert have stated that their first concern is their craft and a desire to be objective. Flaubert perhaps did more than most to make it an explicit aim to conceal the author and to scorn the intrusions of a Fielding or a Sterne. After a period in English literature of rather severe moralizing subjectivity where the writer tended to be rather didactic in tone, the aspiration to be objective and the demands for different and more sophisticated skills in the writer were liberating. By subjective it was meant that the writer constantly interfered with his fictional world, pointing morals, criticizing and judging his characters, not allowing them to express by their actions and interactions what kind of people they were or world they inhabited. But the initial ideals about neutrality and impartiality could not be fulfilled. Freedom from bias was impossible and perhaps undesirable. But what the experiments with objectivity taught was that the over-didactic authorial presence could be interestingly varied in a way more appropriate to a more relativistic and less authoritarian culture, by the transmutation of personal feeling into something more impersonal or universal. For example, the element of hysteria that occasionally creeps into Lawrence's writing causes recoil in the reader because it seems inappropriate. But Lawrence never really solved the technical problem of control of point of view even in his mature work.

The attempt to write objectively, controlling point of view with subtlety, so as to exclude all explicit guidance of the reader naturally means that the reader has more of a role to play in making interpretations than before. It is interesting once again to discover the rejection of subjectivity and the elevation of objectivity as a goal to be achieved. This time it is not critics in their analyses but writers with their craft who are pressing for objectivity. Flaubert insisted on the same impartiality shown by the physical scientists: "art must achieve by a pitiless method, the precision of the physical sciences"[29]. Chekhov made

similar claims. But now the claims made by the scientific method are more cautious, objectivity is not an absolute and therefore must come to mean something different from "complete impartiality". A writer might withdraw from the centre front but many components in his technique still exert a control over the reader. The writer, in effect, is more discrete in his biases, the reader less aware of being controlled.

The form of presentation chosen with the author as moral guide, generalizing about life, setting up his characters and criticizing them, will naturally reflect the writer's vision and purpose. Then as now, a writer's values are embodied in his narrative technique. This suggests that the notion of the superiority of one narrative technique over another can only be answered in terms of the purposes and needs of each individual work. The authorial voice in the early novels helped explicitly to develop a relationship between the reader and writer. In Chapter One the idea was discussed that understanding between two people is very much dependent on the tacit world they share. This does not only apply to people who know each other well. As soon as two people meet, a temporarily shared world begins to develop and to shape the communication. It is through the shared world that one person can to a certain extent make his thought continuous with another. George Herbert Mead describes this process as taking up the position of the other[30]. This involves a tacit contract between the two people.

We enter into contracts of various kinds with the writer, all implicit, many of which he defines through his narrative form. The narrative form delineates, in Ragnar Rommetveit's terms, "the architecture of inter-subjectivity" between reader and writer[31]. By this he means that the narrative form determines the relationships between the "voice" of the fiction -narrator of what ever kind - the other characters, the reader and the plot.

The authorial voice of the omniscient narrator locates the story and the characters at a distance from the reader and the narrator

in the same way as we found in Chaucer. The commentary points to continuities between the actual and the fictional world, allowing the reader an easy transition between them. The distance between voice and characters, reader and characters, caused by the Narrator being outside the story, enhances the relationship which develops between reader and writer.

Fielding in both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones creates a narrator not far removed from Chaucer's. Fielding's narrator calls himself an historian but he is not only this. His characters are both individual and types. The narrator is both limited by pre-existing facts and not limited. His role is to be everywhere and to guide the reader in his response to events and he also tells the reader about the process of constructing the story. This kind of omniscient narration was attacked by James and others because it was too subjective, untidy and crude. They felt that Fielding's role was too didactic and that he displayed his technique in a way which was inartistic. James preferred the sophistication, as he saw it, of a more limited point of view, submerging the narrator in a character who would be "a centre of consciousness". This leads naturally to such techniques as interior monologue and stream of consciousness such as we find in Joyce and Virginia Woolf. The reader in this case is no longer explicitly guided to make judgements and evaluations, the values of the work are implicit. The subjective consciousness of a character becomes like the reader's own point of view in interior monologue. It is the sole means available for revealing the other characters, the setting, the action, although it is not to be necessarily identified with the implied author. There is a tension between the continuity which inevitably forms between the reader and the limited centre of consciousness, and a discontinuity between this point of view and that of the implied author. The implied author can be separated in numerous ways from the centre of consciousness. In Great Expectations for instance, we see Joe Gargery through Pip's eyes but we do not have to assess him in the same way as Pip does. In Jason's section in The Sound and the Fury, we call on our knowledge of the world to realise that the

"voice" belongs to someone who is clearly selfish and inhumane. So it is through the ways in which people and things are seen that we can be alerted to an alternative perspective from that of the centre of consciousness. We can see clearly now that a literary posture such as the Jamesian concealed narrator is no more objective than Fielding's obtrusive narrator; it is just different.

POINT OF VIEW

James also attacked Tolstoy for his shifting point of view but one suspects that this was more through an attempt to reduce literature to rules than from an evaluation of the aesthetic experience of reading Anna Karenina. Tolstoy's restless and flexible point of view has the effect of giving depth to characters by showing them in a variety of ways from a number of different viewpoints. This technique also takes away the certainty of simple interpretations, never letting the reader see over the whole sweep of the novel at one time, to judge something as merely comic or quite serious, as it is with the partial view of human experience. Tolstoy's characterisation often follows a pattern. A character is introduced in one sentence without any elaborate history and it is another character who then widens the perspective on the first. The reader is given the effect produced on another character. For example, Tolstoy examines Karenin's interests through Anna, yet still in the third person narrative form:

> (Anna) knew, too, that really he was interested in books on politics, philosophy, and theology and that art was utterly foreign to his nature; ... and she knew that in politics, philosophy and theology he had his doubts and uncertainties; but on questions of art and poetry and especially music - of which he was totally devoid of understanding - he held the most rigid and fixed opinions. (p127) [32]

We cannot really describe this as narrative coloured by Anna's voice since there is little to indicate this apart from the emphases of "utterly" and "totally", perhaps. There appears to be unbroken continuity between the attitude of the implied author and Anna and the effect is both to give authority to the view, and of making the

reader feel as if he sees through Anna's eyes and grasps her shrewdly critical view of her husband. This perspective suggests to the reader that Karenin lacks an intuitive life, and his opinions on art are not personally felt but only adopted intellectually. Tolstoy uses Karenin's interests to make an implicit judgement of him; he is a man naturally drawn to theory and abstraction and inept emotionally and intuitively; he has a sarcastic smile and he is formal and these features produce a coherent profile of him. Tolstoy's analysis is indirect and therefore powerfully suggestive and we feel it appropriate that we should perceive him through Anna who is both his wife and someone very different from him.

Tolstoy is also a master of coloured narrative and (like Jane Austen) uses irony for indirect analysis of character. The portrait of Lydia Ivanovna:

> She was in love with several people at once, both men and women; she had been in love with almost every person of note. ... all these passions ever waxing or waning, did not prevent her from keeping up the most extended and complicated relations with the Court and society. But from the day that she took Karenin in ... she had come to feel that all the other attachments were not the real thing, and that now she was genuinely in love ... she loved Karenin for himself. (p540)

The striking feature of this form of coloured narrative is that it allows the narrator to glide almost imperceptibly into and out of the character he is talking about and yet to reveal the discontinuity between the points of view through irony. Lydia Ivanovna's idea of love is being ridiculed; the number of loved people suggesting sentimentality, shallow emotion and self-deceit; and the type (persons of note), suggestion calculation. The "passions", far from preventing relations with the Court, are the Countess's means of extending the relations. The reader cannot then believe in the sincerity of her attachment to Karenin but instead realizes that her loves are political, that she enjoys dabbling in the lives of others, controlling and organizing them and especially seeking opportunities through suffering and crisis. There is a delicious irony and ambiguity in the phrase "the day that

she took Karenin in" but this might just be a translation effect. It is not only Lydia Ivanovna's individual character which is revealed; her hypocrisy is an example of the cold war of "high society".

A shifting point of view in itself can only be judged within the context of a work and the question must turn upon the appropriateness of the technique and the control by which it is handled. The example above completely exonerates the technique and we will also noteits masterly handling by Jane Austen in a later example.

DEFAMILIARIZATION

Victor Shklovsky has made much of Tolstoy's short-story written from the point of view of a horse[33]. This technique, used to defamiliarize the world presented, serves a didactic function. Tolstoy wishes to point to the cruelty that it is so easy for us to take for granted. Swift's famous A Modest Proposal uses detachment and a bizarre point of view which takes for granted the cooking and preparation of children as a normal procedure. This effectively underlines the various kinds of ill-treatment children were suffering at the time. But this technique need not only serve a didactic function. In Anna Karenina, Tolstoy uses it to draw the reader more deeply into a scene. The scene I will illustrate this point with is not of vital importance to the plot or to character elaboration but few who have read it could forget it:

One morning Levin rises at dawn to shoot snipe with his dog Laska:

> Running into the marsh, Laska at one detected all over the place, mingled with the familiar smells of roots, marsh grass, slime, and the extraneous odour of horse dung, the scent of birds - of that strong-smelling bird that always excited her more than any other. ... scarcely aware of her legs under her, Laska bounded on with a still gallop ... sniffing in the air with dilated nostrils, she knew at once that not their scent only but they themselves were here before her ... (623)

Retaining the third person narrative form, Tolstoy renders Laska's

own experience. This is the kind of perspective and technique which D Cohn calls "narrated monologue"[34]. Through this form the inner and outer world of the "character" become continuous and the distance between writer and character is eliminated. It produces an effect of immediacy very similar to inner monologue but allows the text to glide between narrator and character. In the above example the narrator glides here and there into Laska's inner world, making the viewpoint of a dog more convincing by retaining the ambiguity inherent in this form. At the same time it is a strikingly unusual point of view because it is that of a dog. The reader gets an added quality to the scene through the intensity of the physical dimension for Laska. The effect then is to render the scene itself more vivid, more sensuous, because of the heightened quality of the hunt to a dog. One reason why Tolstoy might have used this technique here is so that the atmosphere of the countryside is rendered more vividly through the shift to Laska's point of view. The whole chapter concentrates more on the scene, than on thoughts of dogs or humans. The coming of dawn is described, the dew, bees, marshes, horses, birds. In the wider context of the novel, this scene asserts the particular qualities of the countryside and the deep love and harmony which Levin feels with it.

In the first chapter other defamiliarizing effects were discussed such as the disruption of conventions governing time in a novel or play. We expect continuity in the sense of logical sequences and also as an even, forward-flowing movement of time. In Washington Square, Henry James extends and shortens "time" for particular effect. The background of Dr Sloper's early life and marriage is condensed into the first chapter, all the main characters are introduced and the setting of the novel is nearly complete. This foreshortening produces a tight structure in which time is not very important but in which the action of the novel is very intensely focussed upon. James rounds off the structure with a similar "long stride" at the end of the novel, thus encapsulating the two years of Catherine's life that he is concerned with. But this design has a deeper purpose. The story is about a young woman who is deceived into loving a handsome and worthless young man. Their relationship

and his treatment of her deeply affects the whole of her life subsequently. The only time of any note in Catherine's life is when she is in love with Morris Townsend so the narrative is justifiably condensed before and after this time. This in itself very much increases the intensity of Catherine's experience for the reader. The unremitting concentration on one place and one set of characters also enhances this effect. In contrast there are Dickens' many strands.

In As I lay Dying Faulkner produced much more complex effects by disrupting the conventional temporal dimension of the novel. The title itself is the first indication of peculiarities of time and viewpoint. Addie is dead and her coffin must be taken to Jackson but the story moves forward often with spiral effect, returning to the same events from a different character's point of view. There are even occasions when the reader is presented with Addie's own thoughts. The effect is to fuse certain times together because their significance is here-and-now to the action of the novel. Because the story seems to emerge from the characters rather than to be told us by one narrator the action has a vivid immediacy and the characters are fascinatingly revealed through the indirect control of the writer. Each character is seen through the eyes of the others and the reader constructs his own version of the character out of the composite. This is very much like the way we perceive people in the actual world, we learn a certain amount about them from direct experience and we get other information about them from other people's attitudes towards the person.

Faulkner's technique has two components; one being time disruption and the other is repetition of the same scene or event from a different perspective. In The Sound and the Fury he presents a number of events through the viewpoint of four different characters. The details are repeated and yet the orientation and style of thought is so completely different that the composite picture built up is infused with the various personalities and preoccupations of the characters. The device of repetition allows Faulkner to control the

reader's participation. Because it is a novel, the reader tolerates the lack of shape and many discontinuities in the first section which is through the eyes of Benjy the idiot, having the expectation that the surface structure will resolve later. The change to another point of view is very stimulating to the reader and there is an immediate attempt to search for continuities between the first and second part, the deep structure implied through the fusion of both in the imagination of the reader. This shared world which slowly takes shape in the mind of the reader is released in controlled portions by the writer and this control involves the reader to a greater extent because in the imaginative effort to make sense of what he is reading, the reader is participating more than if there were a single viewpoint which was much easier to identify than Benjy's.

If we return once again to the more orthodox techniques of the Nineteenth Century writers, we find different devices used to encourage the reader's involvement.

MIDDLEMARCH

George Eliot, like Tolstoy, has a profoundly moral vision in respect to her art and to human nature and although one can point to certain similarities of technique, the narrative form is different. Tolstoy rarely generalizes about human nature or constructs an elaborate past for any of his characters. Characters in Tolstoy are often more vital because they move from place to place, they doubt, they constantly interact with others, they are in a state of becoming. Tolstoy increases their vitality through scene shift short chapters and changing and recombining groups of characters. On the other hand, the most striking feature of George Eliot's art is that she creates a striking "authorial presence", revealed in comments and narrative summary. There are often fairly lengthy passages of analysis and generalisation following and separate from dialogue. She also uses time shifts in a main plot and goes back into early histories of her characters. Dowden suggested in 1877[35]

that the form that most persists in the mind after reading her novels is not any of the characters, but "one whom if not the real George Eliot, is that second self who writes her books, and lives and speaks through them". Dowden shows a contemporary sophistication in response to the author and narration of a novel. His use of the term "form" implies something more pervasive and impersonal than a character, something not visual yet living; an implicit mind having form through its comprehensiveness and compassion. The "second self" is another way of describing the implied author, narrator or persona of the author. The second self is derived by the reader not only from the commentary but also from the kind of story told and the particular incidents developed within it. Through commentary George Eliot turns from the action briefly to make a generalisation or to supply a partial view inside one of her characters. She chooses a story of provincial life in the Midlands and creates Dorothea and Casaubon, Lydgate and Rosamond rather than the Cadwalladers or Mr Tyke. The implied author or the second self is the primary means by which the reader finds continuities between the fictional and the actual world.

If we examine this implied author a little further we find there are a number of components that make it up. No matter how wise a character is created to be, the reader is always aware that there is a kind of conspiracy between himself and the author which allows the reader to see and understand more than any of the characters. Tone can reinforce these impressions of seeing further, sometimes leading the reader to take a contrary position from the superficial point of view. It is possible for the author to attempt to be impartial following Chekhov's suggestion that an author "should be kindly to the fingertips" and never take a clear position about any of his characters. Here irony can be a useful protective device for the author, allowing him to avoid explicit judgements or commitment. If this is carelessly controlled by the writer, the reader might be confused as to what judgements to make.

Different writers show us that the involvement or detachment of the

implied author must vary with the needs of each work. Not only does the general "aesthetic distance" of the author vary from work to work but the reader's involvement is directed in different ways at different times within a work. The ironic way in which Rosamond is described at the beginning of her relationship with Lydgate leads the reader to a clear understanding of her faults and ensures a certain detachment from her:

> ... Rosamond never showed any unbecoming knowledge, and was always that combination of correct sentiments, music, dancing, drawing, elegant note-writing, private album for extracted verse, and perfect blond loveliness, which made the irresistible woman for the doomed man of that date. Think no unfair evil of her pray: she had no wicked plots, nothing sordid or mercenary; in fact she never thought of money except as something necessary which other people would always provide. (p301)[36]

By focussing on her attributes rather than her thoughts and by presenting her accomplishments as a catalogue of conventional social graces, the writer ensures an aesthetic distance between the reader and Rosamond. She is clearly the perfect ornament. "Unbecoming knowledge" she might have, but it would never "show", indeed the implication might be that she does not display much knowledge of any kind. In a cardboard way she is a model young lady. Her "elegant note writing" and "private album for extracted verse" alert the reader further to the tone of the passage and the vanity of Rosamond and the shallow way in which the tasteful trappings have been acquired. Her social accomplishments make an interesting contrast to the quality of Lydgate's education. That the man who finds her irresistible is "doomed" has a more serious ring when one knows the outcome of the Lydgate/Rosamond attachment but we suspect a mocking tone addressed to Mrs Lemon's establishment and its concern to produce "irresistible women". Ironically the direct address to the reader, "think no evil of her" more strongly directs sympathy away from Rosamond. Ironically too, it is through the list of reasons why she is irresistible that we are led to the poverty of Rosamond's education. Thus by ensuring a discontinuity of point of view between Rosamond and the reader, we are better able to judge her, and the selections which the author makes are an indication of the kind of

evaluation which is appropriate.

The implicit dimension to Middlemarch is not only revealed through the deliberate ironies of presentation and the narrative commentary but also through the subject matter which George Eliot has chosen - a wide view of an English provincial town in the Nineteenth Century. Unlike Jane Austen, she is concerned with different kinds of people, different social stratas and how they meet and intermingle. Through the introduction of social discontinuities George Eliot is able to define and implicitly to judge her characters within the context of their own lives. The time of the novel is one of self-conscious transition in society; reform is in the air and the 1832 Bill assumes an important place in the novel. Reform is one of the first concerns of Lydgate. But it is not only medical and social reform that concerns the author, with the inevitable battles against conservatism, it is the reform or change necessary in the individual to come to maturity, to move forward morally. Thus George Eliot's theme of change and development is enhanced through the continuities suggested between the social and the personal, social and moral. The interdependence of public and private lives is revealed through this theme and also the link suggested between historical and personal development, from blindness towards knowledge. Thus George Eliot uses continuity to highlight themes and reveal her vision; and discontinuity to imply judgements on various characters and to lend humour to characterization.

JANE AUSTEN

Jane Austen also uses the discontinuities of irony, indeed her technique is characteristically ironic and often very subtle, with the reader gaining much insight into character through the point of view shifting, for instance from narrator to different characters. Such a shift, often within one paragraph is one of the secrets of Austen's depth and economy because it is in this way she can expand and deepen a number of characters simultaneously. In Mansfield Park

we find Lady Bertram in many ways used as a kind of device. She is positioned at the heart of the decorous world of Mansfield Park and is significantly, almost lifeless. She remains ignorant of the reality of all worlds outside her own private one and initiates contact with others in only the most superficial way. By the time the reader has formed a strong dislike for her sister Mrs Norris, we find this narrative commentary by the author:

> To the education of her daughters, Lady Bertram paid not the smallest attention. She had not time for such cares. She was a woman who spent her days in sitting nicely dressed on a sofa, doing some long piece of needlework, of little use and no beauty, thinking more of her pug than of her children but very indulgent to the latter, when it did not put herself to inconvenience, guided in everything important by Sir Thomas, and in smaller concerns by her sister. Had she possessed greater leisure for the service of her girls, she would probably have supposed it unnecessary, for they were under the care of a governess, with proper masters, and could want nothing more. (p55-56) [37]

This is a fine example of coloured narrative with the implied author forming an apparently continuous line of thought with character. There is a strong suspicion of Mrs Norris's tones in the second sentence and the reader suspects that education is one of the "smaller concerns" which Mrs Norris has assured her sister that a baronet's lady has no time for. The tone then changes momentarily to a more informative one of a narrator but quickly becomes stabbing in the comments and qualifications: "of little use and no beauty". The phrase, "when it did not put herself to inconvenience", suggests the lack of time she thinks, or Mrs Norris suggests she has. The first long sentence has the effect of encapsulating a complete description of Lady Bertram and the final sentence is a masterpiece of subtlety, characteristic of the author. The tone is that of languorous musing, a sort of colouring suggestive of Lady Bertram herself and yet at a remove since the words: "she would probably have supposed" indicate that she has not thought about it. At the same time it suggests that if Lady Bertram had been asked about the matter this is how she would probably have answered. She would assume that the smaller and larger concerns were seen to

by other people. Here we have Lady Bertram and the ironic narrator almost entwined together directing the reader more delightfully and with greater subtlety than any direct account or condemnation of Lady Bertram could ~~be~~ do.

The way in which Jane Austen provides the colouring to her narrative is invariably very delicate. We do not tend to find whole passages clearly reflecting the idiom of a character. Rather it is a word or phrase here and there suggestive of the character's own evaluations. Thus while the reader receives information about a character, an aesthetic distance is ensured through the discontinuity of tone brought about through these words and phrases. In this way the point of view is closely controlled. Working in this very precise way allows Jane Austen to encourage qualified sympathy in the reader. In Emma for instance we find some of the author's most concealed manipulations:

> Emma was very compassionate; and the distresses of the poor were as sure of relief from her personal attention and kindness, her counsel and her patience, as from her purse. She understood their ways, could allow for their ignorance and their temptations, had no romantic expectations of extraordinary virtue from those, for whom education had done so little; entered into their trouble with ready sympathy, and always gave her assistance with as much intelligence as good-will. (p111)[38]

Tone is really little guide in this passage because it seems so neutral and informative. There is much to make the reader sympathetic towards Emma but the information is not entirely consistent. The passage begins by stressing Emma's compassion and willingness to help. We only pause at the word "counsel". Apart from this we have a list of what Emma is willing to give: Compassion, personal attention, kindness, patience, money. None of these imply judgement or condemnation on Emma's part, they are freely given. "Counsel" is of a different order, giving a slight suggestion of a morally superior attitude. The discontinuity between "counsel" and the rest of the description alerts the reader to the presence of another attitude besides that of the narrator. This is the dissonance which Booth describes[39]. The irony becomes clearer in the following sentence. Here we feel that the thread picked up from "counsel"

pays out into a patronising and morally supercilious attitude which we readily perceive to be Emma's own partial view. It is self-congratulatory and condescending. We then return to the earlier tone. Jane Austen has drawn the reader momentarily into those discontinuities in Emma's own attitudes which flaw her character. Through the very delicacy of her method, Austen provides the reader with an insight into human complexity. Emma's faults are not exposed so that we may reject her, but set within a strongly sympathetic attitude so that we may understand her while warming to her. Emma does not know herself well but the writer and reader join in knowing her better.

DOSTOYEVSKY

At the beginning of this chapter I talked about the rather questionable separation of narrative and dramatic form. If we look at the work of Dostoyevsky, we find examples everywhere of what appears to be a fusion of these two, and examples across the whole continuum from commentary to direct speech. Dostoyevsky's remarkable capacity for capturing the significance of details which generally require sound in order to be expressed, comes clearly through in translation. In The Devils, Lembke's growing distress of mind is revealed in his speech, and when he meets Stephan Verkhovensky, he demands to know his name:

> Mr Verkhovensky repeated his name with an even more dignified air.
> 'Oh-h! It's that - er - hotbed ... You, sir, have shown yourself to be er - you're a professor? A professor? (p446)[40]

Through capturing stammers, repetitions and pauses, Dostoyevsky is implicitly able to reveal moods and states of mind such as fear or anger or preoccupation. Even more striking is the way in which the writer individualizes his characters, making them clearly distinct from each other and above all from the implied author. He creates "idiolects" for his characters, a personal style of speech whose habits often function as an implicit commentary on the characters. The exclamatory style of Mrs Stavrogin provides an example:

> You're alone? I'm glad. I can't stand your friends. Oh, how you do smoke! Gracious, what an atmosphere! You haven't finished your tea, and it's almost twelve o'clock! Your idea of heaven is disorder. Your idea of enjoyment is dirt. What are these torn bits of paper doing on the floor? (p84-5)

Her tone and language are patronizing and emphatic, she is self-indulgent and demanding. The sentences are short and flighty. She seems emotional, perhaps short-tempered. So it is not so much in a particular use of words that Dostoyevsky distinguishes her but rather in style of speech. In the speech of Stephan Verkhovensky whomshe speaks to, Dostoyevsky has clearly created an idiolect:

> En un mot, I've just read that some stupid verger in one of our churches abroad - mais c'est très curieux - drove - I mean literally drove - a highly distinguished English family, les dames charmantes, out of the church before the beginning of the Lenten service - vous savez ces chants et le livre de Job ... (p70)

This is breathless, repetitious prattle, self-important like Mrs Stavrogin and seeking an effect through its random sprinklings of French phrases. It is more languid than Mrs Stavrogin's speech, suggesting perhaps an indolent man. Simply from their respective styles of speech we would expect Mrs Stavrogin to be very emotional, often flying into rages or dissolving into tears, letting no one get in her way. Stephan takes his time, dozes in chairs, is the epitome of the idle aristocrat.

These are clear examples of direct speech and distinctive speech types offsetting each other and discontinuous with the author's own style and the narrator's own voice. Dostoyevsky creates a subtle ironic effect through these discontinuities and most strikingly so in Notes from Underground. In this novel we find what appears to be a fusion of narrative and dramatic form. What is technically a first person narrative for the greater part of the novel, is more like a fevered dialogue between the Underground Man and his other self, or as he suggests, his reader. This is a superbly ironic novel, first because it was written as a parodic attack on Chernyshevsky's utopian novel What is to be done? Secondly the writer creates an obvious discontinuity between the narrator and

the implied author through the emotional involvement and confusion of the former and the reserve of the latter. It was suggested in respect of Doctor Faustus that Zeitblim has a self-conscious relationship with the reader, addressing him directly and confessing his narrative problems. Dostoyevsky takes this technique even further in Notes from Underground. The Underground Man, unnamed and self-isolated, pours out a feverish monologue. A thinking man in isolation with a developed moral sense and refined sensibility, he holds back, like Hamlet, in the search for primary causes and then finds himself so hopelessly torn by self-doubt and suspicion that he is paralyzed and unable to act.

The Underground Man's imagined interaction with the reader is an expression of the restless shifting of the mind of a man who is always under the glare of self-scrutiny. His parentheses are endless qualifications, digressions, sneers and defenses. He creates an audience for himself, slander and abuse, to give himself and his life some definition:

> 'Can a man really be left alone without occupation
> for forty years?'
> 'But that is no disgrace, it is not humiliating!'
> you may tell me scornfully shaking your heads.
> 'You thirst for life, and you try to solve life's
> problems with muddled logic ... And you are so
> importunate, so thrusting, so full of airs and graces!
> Lies, lies, all lies!'
> Of course, I have just this minute invented
> these words of yours. They also come from under the
> ground. ...I made them up myself, Ihave nothing
> else to think about. (p44)[41]

The reader he implicitly creates is just another facet of his self-conscious mind, it is the embodiment of his doubts. Through this technique Dostoyevsky creates a unique complex of interlocking points of view. Can we comfortably describe it as commentary or monologue? The novel defies categorisation in these terms. Most immediate to the reader is the feverish voice of the Underground Man; next to this voice is the reader which he creates to scorn and deprecate his every utterance. Behind or beyond this reader is the reader he hopes secretly will indeed understand and excuse him despite his defiance:

> I am, however, writing for myself alone, and let me declare once and for all, that if I write as if I were addressing an audience, it is only for show and because it makes it easier for me to write. It is a form, nothing else; I shall never have any readers. (p45)

The reader can give a knowing smile. But what is the reader's role here? As we found in the Chaucer example, the voice which directly addresses a reader does put ideas in that reader's head so that even if we are not the same reader as that voice assumes we are altered in our response because of the assumption. The general tone of defiance and phrases such as "let me declare" so strongly imply an audience and his protestations to the contrary merely reinforce the suggestion of someone to whom he must explain himself. Beyond this implied reader there is of course the actual reader who sometimes will and at other times will not, take on the role which the Underground Man defines for him.

For my final example I want to turn from the Nineteenth Century and Dostoyevsky's unusual and creative form of first-person monologue to a more recent and totally different inner monologue written in the third-person.

THE DEATH OF VIRGIL

This novel by Hermann Broch, written in 1945 is another work which defies simple categorisation. It is a kind of fusion between prose narrative and poetry. It spans the last twenty-four hours of Virgil's life ending with his death and "the word beyond speech"[42]. The novel is in four parts, each of which suggest in form and style a movement of a musical quartet. The pace of each part is carefully controlled through length of sentences, use of dialogue, advancement of plot. Virgil arrives by sea to Rome for the birthday of Augustus. He is carried through the streets to Caesar's palace. The idea central to the novel is Virgil's conviction that he must burn the Aeneid because he now believes that poetry, in seeking to represent endurable truths through language, in fact turns from

reality and human responsibility. His friends try to dissuade him from destroying his work and he is finally reconciled through his insight into a higher spiritual plane than poetry offers. In The Death of Virgil, Broch has produced a work which George Steiner describes as "the only genuine technical advance that fiction has made since Ulysses"[43]. It proceeds in the third person yet is clearly an inner monologue. The novel largely comprises Virgil's own observations, thoughts, feverish delusions and yet it is written primarily in the third person narrative form. This effect is like that/D Cohn describes as narrated monologue, clearly the character's own thoughts and yet narrated in the third person[44]. It was suggested, with reference to Tolstoy, that this form gives greater authority to the viewpoint expressed while retaining the immediacy of an inner voice.

One particular effect of this technique is that of self-reflection. Virgil reviews his life and work, he thinks and wonders about it, and he thus creates a distance between himself and his thoughts for the reader. He describes himself as "a lodger in his own life". The implied author, Virgil, and the reader are drawn together and the distance between them eliminated.

There is very little commentary which is clearly exterior to Virgil's own viewpoint. The opening paragraphs describe the approaching ships:

> On the ship that immediately followed was the poet of the Aeneid and death's signet was graved upon his brow. (p12)

But almost immediately after this the distance is narrowed through a narrative form coloured by the viewpoint of Virgil. This colouring becomes more distinct through the questions which Virgil asks himself:

> Why then had he yielded to the importunity of Augustus? Why then had he forsaken Athens? Fled now the hope that the hallowed and serene sky of Homer would favour the completion of the Aeneid. (p12)

This is an example of what one critic would call free indirect speech[45]. It presents the voice of the character, displays his

thoughts while allowing a greater flexibility to express the mental life of the poet. The mind of the poet is opened to the reader and yet a certain detachment is maintained. The text winds along this junction between inner and outer world, with the reader learning more of Virgil than would be strictly realistic to inner monologue:

> He had been a peasant from birth, a man who loved
> the peace of earthly life ...

This kind of information about a character, implicit in every person's attitudes towards themselves, must in some way be narrated for the reader. Here we scarcely notice the increased distance through commentary. By the third page of the novel, the writer has taken us from commentary through coloured narrative to narrated monologue, into further brief commentary and back into narrated monologue. This method allows Broch to weave a continuous thread between the inner and outer world of Virgil's life, drawing the reader's imagination in and eliminating the explicit distance between the writer and character. As the book progresses this method enables Broch to take the reader into the very core of Virgil's thoughts, into a rhythmically intoxicating identification with his reflections.

The musical analogy goes further than the structure and pace alone. Words, phrases, synonyms, ideas, recur in the manner of the leitmotif - a word over-used in literary criticism but here it is precise. One such idea constantly repeated by Virgil is that he must "listen to dying". This recalls Schopenhauer's suggestion (which also profoundly influenced Thomas Mann) that whoever is interested in life is particularly interested in death. Virgil feels that

> ... he who succeeded in giving shape to death by
> incessant listening and searching would find
> together with its genuine form his own real shape
> as well ... (p85)

These ideas are presented as thoughts which have occurred to the poet and they are worked and reworked with variation just as in a musical form.

Despite the lack of a plot in any ordinary sense, the novel is

very compelling and the reader must, as Hannah Arendt suggests, surrender to the tenseness of a movement beyond the suspense caused by plot, and to read the novel as though it were a poem[46]. The notion of continuity illuminates the narrative form of the novel in two ways: The technique of narrated monologue produces a continuity between the inner and outer world of Virgil and draws the reader into a close identification with the poet's reflections. Through the lyrical repetitions, Broch creates a continuity between the parts of the novel drawing the whole together finally into the Word beond speech. Through the repetitions also, not only Virgil, but the reader as well, gains insight into the philosophical issues which beset Virgil.

In this chapter I have tried to show how the concepts of continuity and discontinuity can illuminate the narrative techniques of various writers. A study of narrative is inevitably also a study of the relationships which develop between the writer and reader. The reader's imagination can be controlled by the writer through discontinuities between points of view. Using irony these discontinuities are implicit and writer and reader engage in a subtle contract of communication. Irony also works by rising above apparent contradictions to a profounder level of continuity between disparate attitudes, attributes, time dimensions. Another aspect of the implicit dimension is the suggestion of a character's thoughts and attitudes expressed through coloured narrative. Continuity between inner and outer worlds of a character can be fascinatingly suggested through the technique of narrated monologue.

The relationship between a writer and reader can be both explicit and implicit in a multilevel form of narrative where a reader is directly addressed by a narrator, and another reader and author are implied beyond them. This allows Dostoyevsky, for instance, to create a kind of fusion between narrative and dramatic forms. He also uses dramatic forms of speech variation in direct discourse to individualize and at the same time to provide implicit commentary on characters. We find therefore that boundaries between

narrative and dramatic form in novels blur in the techniques of certain writers. The key point which governs the development of the relationship between reader and writer is not how much commentary the writer introduces relative to the amount of direct discourse; it is rather a question of distance and the degree of control which the writer exerts over the reader's response.

*****

NOTES TO Chapter Two

1 MANN Thomas. Quoted in The Ironic Vision in Modern Literature. C I Glicksberg. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague. 1969. p 194.

2 PRESTON J. The Created Self. London. 1970. p6.

3 SCHOLES R. & KELLOGG R. The Nature of Narrative. OUP. 1966. p240.

4 CHEVALIER H. The Ironic Temper: Anatole France and his time. OUP. 1932. p40.

5 SCHLEGEL A W. A Course of Lecturers on Dramatic Art and Literature. Translated by John Black. London. 1846. p369-70.

6 Quoted in C I Glicksberg. Op. cit. p3n.

7 Ibid. p33.

8 Op. cit. p47.

9 MUECKE D C. Irony. The Critical Idiom. Methuen. 1970. These ironic contradictions have invariably been expressed as the finite work of literature being necessarily inadequate to the expression of the infinite world or the author's subject-ivity.

10 Op. cit.

11 BULLOUGH E. "Psychical Distance as a factor in art and an aesthetic principle". British Journal of Psychology. Vol 5. June 1912. pp 87-118.

12 BOOTH W C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. University of Chicago. 1961. p123.

13 FLAUBERT G. Letters. quoted in R Scholes. Op. cit. p268.

14 Ibid. p53.

15 LEWIS C S. Selected Literary Essays. Ed W Hooper. CUP. 1969. p34.

16 FRYE N. Quoted in C I Glicksberg. Op. cit. p3.

17 ROSSETTI W M. Translation of Chaucer's Troylus & Cryseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato. Chaucer Society. London. 1873.

18 BRONSON B H. In Search of Chaucer. University of Toronto Press. 1960. Bronson suggests that it is an inappropriately modern view to think that Chaucer has created a narrator for ironic effect.

19 DVORAK E F. Technique as moral purpose: Parody and Romance in the Development of Jane Austen's Narrative Method. Indiana University. 1976. PhD Thesis. Unpublished. These are classifications which Dvorak uses but can be applied outside the scope of her thesis.

20 ROBINSON F N (ed) The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Houghton Mifflin Co and Oxford University Press. 2nd Edition. 1957.

21 DONALDSON E T. Speaking of Chaucer. University of London. 1970.

22 BLOOMFIELD M. "Distance and Predestination in Troilus and Criseyde". PMLA. LXXII. March no 1. 1957. pp 14-26.

23 DREW Philip. In conversation about a chapter from a book he is currently writing at Glasgow University.

24 Op. cit. p139.

25 MANN Thomas. Doctor Faustus. (1947) Translated by H T Lowe-Porter. Penguin 1968. All quotations are from this edition. p9.

26 Op. cit.

27 NIETZSCHE F. Birth of Tragedy. (1870-1) and the Genealogy of Morals. Translated by Francis Golffing. Doubleday Anchor. 1956. p 11.

28 See also Thomas Mann's Death in Venice, Penguin, for another expression of many of the same ideas as are found in Faustus.

29 Quoted Scholes Op. cit. p260.

30 MEAD G H. Mind Self & Society. University of Chicago. 1967.

31 ROMMETVEIT R. On Message Structure. John Wiley & Sons. 1974.

32 Quotations from Leo Tolstoy's Anna Karenina (1876) from translation by Rosemary Edmonds. Penguin. 1954.

33 SHKLOVSKY V. "Art as Technique" in Russian Formalist Criticism (ed) Lemon L T & Reis M J. University of Nebraska Press. 1965.

34 COHN D — "Narrated Monologue: Definition of a fictional Style". Comparative Literature. 18. Spring 1966. pp 97-112. A useful general article.

35 DOWDEN E. — Quoted W C Booth Op. cit. p 71n.

36 ELIOT George. — Middlemarch. (1871-2). Penguin. 1965.

37 AUSTEN J. — Mansfield Park. (1814) Penguin. 1966.

38 ------- — Emma. (1816) Penguin. 1966.

39 BOOTH W C. — The Rhetoric of Irony. University of Chicago. 1974. p 35n.

40 DOSTOYEVSKY F. — The Devils. (1871) Translated by D Magarshack. Penguin. 1953/71.

41 ---------- — Notes from Underground. (1864). Translated by Jessie Coulson. Penguin. 1972.

42 BROCH H. — The Death of Virgil. (1945). Translated by Jean Starr Untermeyer. Universal Library New York. 1965. p 482.

43 STEINER G. — from the Universal Library edition of The Death of Virgil. See also Language and Silence. by Steiner. Penguin. 1969.

44 COHN D Op. cit.

45 DVORAK Op. cit.

46 ARENDT Hannah. — "The Achievement of Hermann Broch". Kenyon Review. Vol XI. No 3. Summer 1949. pp476-483.

*****

CHAPTER THREE

DRAMA

87

> Imitations produce pain or pleasure, not because they are mistaken for realities, but because they bring realities to mind. (Dr Johnson)[1]

Most of the discussion in this paper has concentrated on the novel although the spectator in drama is called upon to participate creatively both in reading the text and as a member of the audience. In this final chapter I will be using the concepts of continuity and discontinuity to illuminate the role of the spectator in drama. The implicit dimension in drama and the role of the spectator is, predictably, somewhat different from the imaginative participation required of a novel reader. The first involves a complex interaction between spectator, players, director and text; the second, reader and text. However, certain claims by Dr Johnson, for instance, lead us to explore this difference carefully.

In a play the focus is upon the dramatic realisation, and the dramatist does not have the same resources of narration as a novelist. But characters can incidently provide the spectator with an outline to the drama and can suggest an immediate past and a general history up to the moment when the play begins for the spectator. When characters come on stage and leave the stage the spectator in fact assumes, with little awareness of the assumption, that the existence of the characters is continuous. This is probably because our experience of people in the actual world informs us that their continued existence is independent of our perception of them. The essential feature of drama is that the audience listens and watches the play enacted by one or several actors who by their actions appear to give rise to the story. Having said this, a play and a poem or novel have in common that they can be read, and Dr Johnson claims that a play read affects the mind like a play seen in performance[2]. Does this mean that we are an audience to a play whether we read or see it? The experience is different from reading prose or

poetry. Can we agree with Dr Johnson? Perhaps he is not suggesting that the experience is identical but only that imaginatively we are able to make it something similar. We are more able to do this if we have already seen the play which we are reading. The characters are then more distinct, the actions more vivid, the setting more concrete.

In a rather unsuccessful televisation of Anna Karenina on BBC2, 1977, the setting nevertheless enriched the spectator's imagination. No average reader would be able fully to imagine the glittering ballroom, the gowns, the carriages driving through snow. If, having seen this we then return to our reading of Tolstoy's novel, there is an added dimension. Dr Johnson was probably not thinking of the setting of a play though, but rather of its emotional and moral content.

Dr Johnson also suggested that during a play the audience "are always in their senses, and know, from the first act to the last, that the stage in only a stage, and that the players are only players"[3]. Coleridge disputed this because he considered that the audience at all times has the power to see the thing as it really is but that the spectator will willingly suspend disbelief[4]. It is possible for the spectator to be caught up and drawn into the play because attention is turned away from the actual world, away from the stage as stage, players as players and becomes focussed on the significance of the presentations; what might be called the deep structure. It is perhaps difficult to be simultaneously aware of the players and of the play's meaning.

It was suggested in Chapter One that learning about new art forms involves a shift in focussed attention. This shift determines point of view and causes perception to be selective. We cannot attend to everything which impinges on us at any one time and if our chair feels hard, in that moment we become aware of it, we lose our absorption in what we had been seeing or watching. Dr Johnson describes such a break in focussed attention as "the mind is

refrigerated by interruption"[5].

What then do we make of Dr Johnson's suggestion that the audience are always in their senses? If they were, could Lear's palace ever become Gloucester's castle, then the Heath and finally Dover? But Dr Johnson was not suggesting that he found drama incredible but simply that he always knew he was in the theatre. Naturally, experiences in the theatre will vary according to the play, presentation and spectator. Dr Johnson and Coleridge might have had very different experiences.

I suggest that the spectator is in two minds about his dramatic experience. The process of watching a play involves a movement into and back from the world presented, just as occurs with reading. But can the spectator simply be in two minds - the actual world including the stage as only a stage, and the "temporary half-faith" in the action presented? E H Gombrich, in a discussion about visual perception which parallels this, suggests that with the familiar rabbit/duck ambiguous figure, the spectator could not experience these simultaneously[6]. However, thought does not seem to suffer from the limitations of simultaneous ambiguity. The imagination unfettered by visual ambiguity can be more flexible. A player, as player not character, can be as it were, superimposed upon the audience's experience of him as the character; there can be a direct continuity between player and character. This imaginative continuity allows the flexibility of perception. Laurence Olivier as Hamlet can be superimposed upon the audience's experience of him as himself. The apprehension of both "truths" can become or appear to become almost fused. The spectator in this case can experience simultaneously Olivier as Hamlet and the character as Shakespeare conceived him, as far as this is expressed in the text. We do not have to switch our awareness rapidly back and forth as with the Gombrich figure. Just as the imagination penetrates through words to their meaning, so the imagination penetrates through the actor to the character. We do not switch cognitively from word to meaning; instead, a word is infused with meaning. There is discontinuity

between word and meaning only when someone is learning to read or when a new metaphor comes into being. The word "melting-pot" for instance, a rather ugly term, is in the process of being assimilated and therefore still contains a discontinuity. It still retains a a defamiliarizing power, evoking connotations of cauldrons and alchemy, simultaneously with the new attribution of mixed races. In time, currently used metaphors actually become meanings. A gap between player and character is more marked in a bad production of a play, and the spectator feels detached. In the same way when we listen to music we can at the moment in which we are most affected, be aware say, that it is a cor anglais playing. Our mind is not refrigerated by this awareness, there is no discontinuity, because it is not a separate and contradictory awareness. In this way Dr Johnson's audience is not always in their senses if by his statement we are to understand him to mean detachment. However, there does appear to be a kind of simultaneous knowing and not-knowing.

In the course of a play, a player becomes as it were, "saturated" in the mind of the spectator with a complex of ideas and feelings about the character he represents. These are built up through the context in which he appears. The spectator observes the interplay between this character and others, hears his speeches, his words and style. These contexts provide the audience with information about the character. The character is revealed through the player. The audience have feelings and ideas about the character and these are associated with the player. In Anna Karenina, Tolstoy's character Oblonsky is often referred to as smiling a "soft foolish smile". It becomes attached like a signature tune; it reveals, indeed exposes the character. The essence of a character can be distilled into one image such as Oblonsky's smile and the image can evoke the reader's accumulated responses to him. Similarly, when a player is on stage he directly evokes a complex of reactions. The player himself is then irrelevant to some spectators, peripheral to others. The imagination of the spectator moves rapidly from the idea of the player on stage to the increasing reality of the character of say, Hamlet, until these become fused. We could then say Olivier

is the surface structure through which the deep structure of Shakespeare's Hamlet is revealed. The continuity between player and character, the process of fusion, is one obvious reason for the greater impact of a play seen in performance than a play read.

The reader of a play has a more difficult task than the spectator at a performance. The name of the character is the only thing available to start this recall process. The name of the character can operate for the reader in a similar way as the sight of the player for the spectator. The name accretes associations through the words and described actions of the character which can then be reinforced through speech peculiarities which the dramatist might give to the character. The name can then directly evoke the complex of reactions which the reader has to the character.

Whether reading or watching a play, the imaginative participation of the reader/spectator is called on. Coleridge's emphasis on the willingness to suspend disbelief, to encourage a temporary half-faith, locates a crucial factor in the working of the imagination of the reader or audience. We derive pleasure from involvement, and therefore we are willing to make agreements with fictions in order to facilitate involvement. However, there is more to the process of being absorbed, lost or occupied, than just a willingness to enter into the fiction. Much seems to occur in spite of the spectator's will. There are reservations about Coleridge's idea that the audience always retains the power to see the thing for what it is. Why could Dr Johnson not endure to see the end of <u>King Lear</u> as Shakespeare wrote it? Perhaps the quotation heading this Chapter helps to provide an explanation:

> Imitations produce pain or pleasure, not because they are mistaken for realities, but because they bring realities to mind.

But once a reality has been brought to mind it is no longer confined to the imagination by the original specific context. The original context no longer controls the idea; something occurs beyond the will of the spectator. In the scene where Gloucester's eyes are put out, the action surrounding this moment is violent, brutal and unexpected

and the spectator is drawn in to feel the horror and to have sympathy, quite involuntarily. It is the human response to the inhuman. Human eyes are put out and no spectator can remain quite detached. We do not feel quite so emotionally about any other organ or limb. Eyes are the most delicate and vital part of us; we cannot remain unmoved. At moments such as these and Lear's terrible "howl" at the end of the play, it is quite irrelevant that we are only watching or reading a play. The reality of our own or another's blinding, or our own or another's loss has been brought to mind, it becomes our own reality and we lose a certain control over what is evoked.

Antonin Artaud completely rejects any possible comparison between a play performed and the play read. Instead he claims that "we must admit that theatre's sphere is physical and plastic not psychological"[7]. He refused to interest himself in any text - a play had to emerge upon the stage or it was not theatre. Theatre to Artaud is about action and the use of stage space. He would agree with Peter Brook and Jonathan Miller that it is through the actor's presence in performance that the "invisible" can be made available to the audience[8]. When the spectator surrenders part of his freedom to interpret a text, to a director and actors, new possibilities are opened up.

When we turn from classical forms of drama to modern drama we find as in other literary forms, a shift in emphasis from content to technique. Supposedly this is a shift towards greater objectivity. In Shakespeare the spectator is often guided through asides, soliloquies, choric figures, but such techniques are eschewed in modern drama. Modern drama is often concerned with questioning its own nature and exposing the incongruities in human nature. In this it is essentially ironic in temper. The spectator cannot be so certain of continuities even between character and actor. In Six Characters in Search of an Author, Pirandello creates a striking discontinuity between character and actor. Also the continuities normally found between the real and the fictional world are not so readily

discovered in Absurd Drama. In modern drama the audience is obliged to become more self-conscious, more aware of the process of watching a play than we required from traditional dramatic forms. Modern playwrights wish to question some of the spectator's conditioned responses to drama. The invisible or implicit is more ambiguous or multi-dimensional.

OLD TIMES

In Harold Pinter's Old Times, the spectator forms and reforms various hypotheses to make sense of the play and at the end there is a final shift which seems to remove any remaining separation between past and present, truth and memory. The effect is reminiscent of something which E H Gombrich says of cubism: "the function of the representational clues in cubist paintings is ... to narrow down the range of possible interpretations until we are forced to accept the flat pattern with all its tensions"[9]. Gombrich seems to be suggesting that the representational clues suggest modes for us to use, limit the possibilities but at the same time do not allow one to find continuity. The audience is left with the necessity of seeing in a new way, of generating new models more flexible and tolerant than before, no longer rooted in earlier conventions of representation.

In Old Times, the playwright attempts to make his audience more aware of themselves watching a play. He performs a delicate operation. He exploits the human tendency to look for meaning, to organize perceptions to find continuity with the known world. But he must not short-circuit that process so radically that his audience rejects his work as incomprehensible. In order to achieve this, Pinter's presentations are realistic which allows his audience to find continuity between the world they know and the world of the play. Then he introduces a discord, an expected pattern is not followed, there is discontinuity. Always trying to share in the offered world, to find some meaning, the audience try a new template. Pinter shifts again. The audience becomes aware of what they are

doing, the process of watching a play becomes self-conscious. The play defies the spectator at every turn of his mind and finally he is left with a play of shifting meaning with all the tensions which that causes. Pinter points to, yet always subverts, the formation of a deep structure in this play. He explores the nature of communication between people, using suggestion as much as more explicitly verbal means. How then are reader and spectator different in their response to a Pinter play? The "charge" between characters on stage, something Pinter develops with conscious skill, is greatly intensified on stage.

Pinter's shift from a traditional focus is seen in the simplicity of his plots and the fact that the action of the plays is almost non-existent in the physical sense. The action is found instead in the interaction between characters and, at a more subtle level, in the "spaces" between the lines of dialogue. The information in these spaces is sometimes quite unambiguous. But Pinter trades in ambiguity which means that he depends upon the participation of his audience in their attempt to resolve the ambiguity. One of the major sources of ambiguity is the mystery always present in his plays, crucial facts are not explained. The audience is drawn in to attempt to find continuity, to fill in the blanks with guesses. Pinter works with a tension between realistic presentation and deliberate obscurity. Since he leaves much for his audience to wonder about, how much control does he exert over the interpretations made? The answer is perhaps unexpected. He exerts great control, playing with the audience like a chess player might move his chess pieces. He presents what appears to be a particularly open web, rich in ambiguity and suggestion. At the same time he controls and anticipates the spectator's move to interpret each time, and frustrates it. In the end he seems to shut the spectator out from the world he presents, holding him at the surface structure, tampering with the relationship between the deep and surface structure, between audience and writer, and undermining every attempt to generate a deep structure to the play, a tacitly shared world. What is Pinter trying to communicate to the audience? In Old Times

we find this obscure. The obscurity creates an increasing demand for some kind of resolution of meaning which can be a rich source for mobilizing the spectator's expectations. However, if no continuity can be found in the pattern then Pinter has overstepped himself in trying to "strip the veil of familiarity from the world" and instead he puts his audience through an exercise in incomprehension. If this is finally all that remains with the audience, the play fails to satisfy one important criterion of art because it does not communicate. His justification might be found in a programme note he wrote in 1960 for two of his own plays:

> A character on stage who can present no convincing argument or information as to his past experience, his present behaviour or his aspirations, nor give a comprehensive analysis of his motives, is as legitimate and as worthy of attention as one who, alarmingly, can do all these things. The more acute the experience the less articulate its expression. (p274)[10]

This is Pinter's justification for the omission in his own plays of explanations or a motivation for the action. Does this in fact make legitimate the confusion which the audience feels in response to watching Old Times? Is the confusion simply due to omission in Old Times? We cannot generalize about Pinter's plays. The early plays are often violent and crude whereas both The Caretaker and The Servant are masterly. Old Times is a recent play and must answer for more than just the omission of adequate motivation.

Like all Pinter's plays Old Times is about relationships, a husband and wife and an old friend of the wife's turning up after twenty years to talk over old times. The partners change as in a dance and change again as if seeking an equilibrium. Yet the play is even more static than most of his plays, highlighting the emotional charge between the characters. Pinter explores some interesting areas of human experience in relationships, superbly capturing elusive animal qualities of threat, submission, territoriality, dominance, which lie just under the surface of human behaviour. Although Old Times is unsatisfactory in a number of ways, it is nevertheless an intriguing play, an ever-shifting mosaic forming

patterns which seem for a time to match with patterns that we know. The opening conversation of the play takes place between Deeley and Kate and is about Anna. The audience immediately starts to try to make sense of what they are seeing and hearing; to have expectations, to make assumptions, and form hypotheses. This is an automatic reaction and only resisted with particular effort. Clearly Deeley and Kate are married; Deeley has never met Kate's oldest friend; Kate hardly remembers her. These hypotheses give rise to expectations concerning the logical outcome of the action. The expectations are logical possibilities based on the information received, on life, and on our knowledge of drama. They are the continuity we expect from our past experience. We attempt to find this continuity through matching what we perceive against the pre-existing models in our minds so that we can understand or make sense of the information. When we can find continuity, we are able to label what we perceive and therefore make predictions and assumptions. This is simply the process of making sense of the world.

In Pinter's Old Times there is repeated reference to an idle conversation in the opening part of the play, about a casserole:

> Deeley: Any idea what (Anna) drinks?
> Kate: None.
> D: She may be a vegetarian.
> K: Ask her.
> D: It's too late. You've cooked your casserole. (I, p12)[11]

Repetition in the later part of the play makes the reference to casserole absurdly significant and the audience almost inevitably searches for an underlying meaning simply because the significance it seems to acquire through repetition is not matched by its surface structure. Because its significance is unaccountable, it has the effect of making the audience feel uneasy. Pinter does not resolve this, instead he adds fuel to it with other troubling repetitions. He uses repetition to baffle the audience about what relationships really do exist between the characters. Repeated words and phrases instead of underlining and pointing to significance as the repeated words 'nothing' and 'Nature' do in King Lear, generate ambiguity by causing the audience to link occasions which contradict a logic

already suggested. Pinter is thus playing with the normal process of continuity through repetition and leading his audience into a morass of logical discontinuities. The result before it reaches a point of frustration is that the audience, driven by the powerful desire for clarification, attempts to shift interpretation to other levels and to make their thought continuous with the playwright's by perceiving the play in metaphorical or symbolic terms. These surface patterns of repetition form a surface structure to the play which almost defies penetration. Pinter seems to offer a world to be shared, a surface leading to meaning but the implied deep structure keeps shifting and dissolving and contradicting itself. All lines of interpretation thus lead back to the surface structure; no consistent reconstruction of meaning can be made. This problem in itself makes the audience aware of the very process of reconstruction which, as we have said, is a characteristic of much modern art.

Pinter uses the device of repetition both to suggest continuity between times and events which contradict a logic already suggested and also to charge something with an unaccountable significance. The reference to the casserole was initially a joke but it is a supposition which becomes a reality in the imagination of the reader/spectator. One interpretation of Old Times is that there is no significant difference between talking about something and a reality. We suppose and hypothesize all the time in the actual world. This is part of taking up the position of the other, finding continuities between our own and alternative positions. Pinter draws it to its logical extreme, an absurdist extreme, preventing continuity. We fill gaps and if the gaps are too large or we fill them incorrectly too often, then it leads to the situation where the audience is increasingly aware of the process of trying to make sense of the play. There is a difference between our experience of the actual world and Pinter's presentations. Old Times presents more logical impossibilities. Our normal experience of these is either due to lies or lack of information. In Pinter, however, the number of persistant logical impossibilities sends the spectator round in circles trying to connect different events and items in different

ways only to be led back to the flat pattern. Word patterns emphasize this lack of logic by suggesting continuity between details which are supposed to have no connection. Both cannot be true simultaneously. Deeley cannot both know and not-know Anna. He must be concealing something. An example of confusing continuity is when Deeley has a long speech where he remembers how he met Kate at a cinema showing the film Odd Man Out and that there were two usherettes behaving in an openly homosexual way. The sexual element in the play now becomes important and the remarks Deeley makes to Anna are highly charged with suggestions of sexual significance. Anna's responses are polite, uneasy and avoiding the implicit conversation:

> Deeley: ... What would (Robert Newman) think of this I wondered as I touched Kate profoundly all over. (To Anna) What do you think he'd think?
>
> Anna: I never met Robert Newman but I do know I know what you mean ... . (I, p31)

Just as in the songs and other squences, there is a music-hall quality to this exchange. Anna's reply is ambiguous so that the spectator cannot be sure of quite know what she means. We suspect that Deeley is not really interested in what Robert Newman would think but rather in asserting his superiority by having picked up Kate. His question to Anna has a non-verbal significance, by being very intimate. Anna's reply might be taken as safely literal, ignoring the implied intimacy or she might in fact be acknowledging it. She continues this speech saying what we all recognise as a trick which our memories can play. The comment is a significant one about the status of truth and memory in the play:

> Anna: ... There are some things one remembers even though they may never have happened. There are things I remember which may never have happened but as I recall them so they take place. (I, p31)

This, like the previous quotation refers to the way our imaginations work. It is the way fictions work in the imagination of the reader/spectator. As things occur in the play it seems to the spectator as though they are real.

In the same way, as the characters recall past events, these recollections seems to suggest something different from what was suggested before, something contradictory. Deeley recalls the film but Anna is in no way part of this recollection. Later when Anna is talking about the places which she and Kate went to, she gives an unexpected example:

> Anna: I remember one Sunday (Kate) said to me, looking up from the paper, come quick, quick, come with me quickly, and we seized our handbags and went, on a bus, to some totally obscure unfamiliar district, and, almost alone, saw a wonderful film called Odd Man Out.
>
> Silence (I, p38)

This is the kind of shock which Pinter frequently delivers. It is impossible not to make connections. In the silence the audience are compelled to question what they had earlier assumed. Did Deeley really not know Anna? Perhaps new patterns are formed in a desparate attempt by the audience to make sense of things, to find continuities. Nothing now is as certain to the spectator as before and yet everything feels as though it is being drawn tighter and tighter together because as more information is given, the gaps in the text are smaller. This is the point where in a play which was more conventional, the expectations of the spectator would be more and more specific. In Old Times at this point we feel puzzled, surprised, perhaps irritated and we feel a strong desire for clarification of these shifting relationships.

Pinter uses defamiliarizing techniques to shock the audience. When Anna used the example of the film Odd Man Out, it was a surprise because because it presented the new suggestion that Anna and Kate lived together at the time when Deeley first met Kate and therefore Deeley would have met Anna 20 years ago. What might have occurred in the past is a constant source of unease both for the audience and for Deeley. It is as though his marriage slips a little out of focus for him after Anna's arrival and he is no longer sure of Kate. Deeley gets angry with Anna, revealing his feeling of being usurped in some way by her. She knew Kate first and she knew a

Kate who Deeley has never been quite sure of; this makes him feel as if he is the outsider or intruder. This change of position is characteristic of Pinter's characters.

If the relationships between Deeley, Anna and Kate do not have continuity with the rules of the real world, we might suggest that the next level of interpretation might be symbol or metaphor. Perhaps the characters are a vehicle for the expression of general statements about truth, memory, relationships. Perhaps the symbolic content of the play is the frustration and discomfort which the audience inevitably feel in Old Times or the same quality of menace the audience feels reading or watching The Birthday Party. The reason why we feel more comfortable with a symbolic "explanation" of the play is the same sort of reason why we feel comfortable at the close of a symphonic movement with a return to the home key; it is a resolution. The unknown, unfinished, unexplained is unsettling, fearful, even intolerable, depending upon its degree. We expect art to present us with a world that is under control in some way. The Absurdists wish to shock their readers and audience into new ways of thinking through discontinuities of various kinds, but they are not nihilistic. We understand in patterns we try to discover patterns however much we find ourselves thwarted; that is why we must make sense, if we can, of what we see before us. But when we have found a comprehensible pattern, a continuity, we turn away relieved.

In Old Times, does Pinter deliberately try to upset conventional dramatic structures in order to question the form itself and from there to question the realities of human relationships? A play is such a powerful gestalt in itself that a playwright who wishes to question the form has his way prepared by the expectations of the audience. As suggested, when continuity between forms is perceived, less is attended to. As soon as an appropriate category is found, a form no longer evokes anxiety. A play is just a play. But if a writer wishes to explore some of the conventional attitudes to a play, to examine what a play really is, what can he do? It is partly this question which determines Pinter's method. "The poem comes

before the form in the sense that a form grows out of the attempt of somebody to say something"[12]. The characters in a play are only developed as the playwright chooses, as Pirandello's Six knew only too well. We return to Gombrich's flat pattern with all its tensions, a play is only a play, not an alternative world. Tension exists between imagination and reality. It is difficult therefore to know why Pinter has upset conventional dramatic structures because he offers no acceptable answers and does not even pose clear questions either about drama or about human relationships.

Pinter causes tensions by his liberal use of the pause. This example of discontinuity could be described as the foremost Pinter principle. The pause, as everyone who appreciates music will know, allows new relations and connections to be made. Just as irony works by rising above apparent discontinuities, the pause is another example which allows a higher level of continuity from what appears to be discontinuity. For example, Beethoven uses the pause to modulate from one chord to another at strategic points, say in a Late Quartet. This is made possible by the nature of accoustics. In the silence we "hear" overtones which occur naturally from the last notes played and make the new chord acceptable. Peter Brook describes how in a production of Measure for Measure he asked the actress who played Isabella to hold a silence until she felt that the audience could no longer bear it, so that they were really obliged to think about the meaning[13]. We can see the parallel between music and pauses in drama.

In Pinter, the pause has precisely this effect - the spectator has to think about the meaning beyond the obvious:

Anna: Listen. What silence. Is it always as silent?
Deeley: It's quite silent here, yes. Normally.
Pause (I, p19)

Without the pause we would hardly notice this comment. What exactly is its significance? Perhaps there is the kind of ambiguity which Beckett is so fond of; a reference to the theatre itself and something revealing about the action or situation being presented.

There is certainly a suggestion either that Deeley is rarely at home or that he and Kate do not speak much to each other; or perhaps that they have constant arguments. So the pause calls attention to to the remark which preceeds it or at least to a wider range of possible meanings. This one of the ways in which Pinter achieves the quality of unease or menace so characteristic of his work.

The greater part of the dialogue in Old Times is in single lines spoken by each character. The text is strewn with pauses and silences where the characters do not understand one another, affect not to understand one another, seem to run out of words and be unable to think how to express something, shock each other into silence, shock themselves into silence, and so one. In the dialogue between Anna and Deeley, they discuss how Kate bathes and dry/s herself: ie/

Anna: Why don't you dry her yourself?
Deeley: Would you recommend that?
A: You'd do it properly.
D: In her bath towel?
A: How out?
D: How out?
A: How could you dry her out? Out of her bath towel?
D: I don't know.
K: Well, dry her yourself, in her bath towel.

Pause

D: Why don't you dry her in her bath towel?
A: Me?
D: You'd do it properly.
A: No, no. (II, p55)

There is a rhythm in these sequences caused by repetitions and questions and answers, which is reminiscent of Beckett and his music-hall patter. But what is Pinter doing in this sequence of dialogue? The language used is very limited, conventional, abbreviated as conversational language is. But implied through these repetitions is another exploratory "conversation". This concealed conversation is about whether Anna and Deeley find each other sexually attractive. Part of the reason why we feel so disturbed by such exchanges is the disjunction of the two conversations, one verbal, the other implied through tone. And just as we do in real

life when frightened or disturbed by a sub-conversation, Anna pretends that the verbal exchange is the only reality. In Old Times Pinter ensures that the audience cannot adhere to the logical reality because it is too contradictory. The spectator must look elsewhere for the play's meaning.

The stoccato short lines of dialogue give a curious effect. They partly suggest intimacy because they are so abbreviated and yet there is frequent lack of understanding between the characters. In a number of cases the audience suspects that the speaker is deliberately being inexplicit or concealing his thoughts. The short lines are also curiously realistic and at the same time have the effect of rehearsed patter. A banal effect is an important part of Pinter's method and it throws into relief the more literary speech of Anna. Also the long speeches become striking in contrast to the rest of the dialogue and give the impression of the reliability of the speaker. The short lines of abrupt question followed by further question, followed by answer, the banality, the pauses, the repetitions; all these characterize Pinteresque dialogue.

The relationship between Deeley and Kate becomes more and more enigmatic as the play goes on and the spectator struggles to piece the threads together. The structure which appears so unequivocal at the outset, husband and wife awaiting old friend of wife, has become highly equivocal by the end of the play. Deeley says at the beginning: "I wish I had known you both then" but a number of remarks or conversations during the play with Anna suggest that he did know them both. Or did he? We are suddenly taken back through a conversation between Kate and Anna which is as though the past has reasserted itself. As memories are recalled, so they take place. Perhaps one of the points Pinter is making by turning memory into present truths and telescoping time backwards, is that in some sense people are made up from their past, that it lives in the present yet it also gets lost and left behind. Someone appearing as Anna does from Kate's past actually brings something of the past into the present, resurrects feelings and events, reestablishes old

relationships. Some of these will be in painful conflict with a present situation. But the spectator can only surmise because Pinter does not either particularly point to or support any one interpretation more than another. Modern playwrights often insist that the play must speak for itself, and questions from spectators such as, what does some part of the play mean, are not appropriate. But we know that no art object is simply a slice of life. To be considered art, it must be selected and ordered in some way. If the play does not speak for itself but only causes confusion and an array of equally possible interpretations then it cannot be considered successful art even in the Absurdist tradition. The uneasiness of the audience runs counter to the uneasiness of the characters. If Deeley gets angry or disconcerted the audience relaxes and can watch with a certain detachment because their own responses to the action are being represented. The situation which causes tension and puzzlement in the audience is where a character says something illogical or does not seem surprised when something extraordinary is revealed. This is an example of discontinuity awaking the attention of the audience.

It is often implied during the play that it is not necessary to ask whether something really happened. All three characters avoid any real discussion about what actually happened. Instead they tell stories. But the claims to truth made by the characters seem to point to one central story, probably the play itself. It might appear that in seeking to know what really happened we are commiting a fallacy because we are assuming a life beyond the written play. But this is the effect of realistic presentation and the drive to find continuity, we can do nothing else. If we just watch the play, it ceases to work because we are choosing to ignore the normal relation between the surface and deep structure and to allow it to mean nothing. In the same way that Kafka's fantasies haunt our lives and their meanings confront us at every turn as grotesque exaggerations of our own encounters with arbitrary authority, Pinter's world is absurd and yet absurd in a way which constantly strikes deeply into us: People can be enigmatic to each other; someone known can

be suddenly, frighteningly strange. We describe actual situations as Pinteresque and what do we mean? Often it is simply a feeling of the bizarre; not everything can be accounted for; the insignificant becomes imbued with illusive qualities. The absurd world is in many ways familiar; this is the primary way in which the play establishes its authority over the audience.

It is tempting to apply some of Charles Marowitz's ideas about drama to Pinter to illustrate his method. Marowitz's notion that a play can be thought of as a vase which one can-break and then put the pieces together again, seems more appropriate for Pinter than for Shakespeare[14], about whom Marowitz develops his theories and practice. We expect the pieces of a play to fit together into some kind of comprehensible whole. Marowitz expects the pieces to have an autonomy which makes the whole of secondary importance. Pinter constantly seems to be suggesting a coherent whole to Old Times but at the same time allowing several of the pieces to fit into more than one place in the jigsaw, or vase if we follow Marowitz. If we divide Old Times into segments along Marowitz's lines, each one seems to be a realistic partial view of a world but because the spectator expects the play to have a continuity and to be a functioning whole, he attempts to combine them into a meaningful configuration. A play is expected to chart the course of something, to mean something. But in Old Times Pinter's method leads ultimately only to the "flat pattern, with all its tensions": the play insisting on itself as a play, a fiction. This is its objective reality. Because it does not fulfil audience expectations, the focus of the play shifts round until it is no longer "out there" on the stage but it is within the spectator in the puzzlement, confusion and frustration. These feelings prompted in the spectator constitute the play's subjective reality.

The particular idea which Pinter explores in Old Times is truth and falsehood in memory, Anna's lines being particularly significant: "there are things I remember which may never have happened but as I recall them so they take place" (p32). Suppositions turn into facts

through the mere repetition of words; this is the reality which fictions have in the imagination. The reader tacitly understands that the writer is saying: Let us suppose that my story and the people I create, are real ... If the reader accepts the contract then this supposition, this fiction, becomes a reality in his imagination. By presenting the idea about memory and supposition, Pinter is showing us what we are always doing with our memories: recasting and reshaping the past so that we might wonder what is more true, what was actually said or occurred, or what our memories of the incident were. Generally there is no discontinuity between memory and actuality because we do not have access to what actually occurred except through our perception of it which becomes our memory of it. We do not usually feel anxious about our shifting, relative world because we experience it for the most part as stable. Pinter short-circuits the process of keeping it stable. As he causes discontinuities to follow one upon another, the audience tries to guess the truth, to discover what really happened, what the actual relationships were, whether anyone is deliberately lying or grossly exaggerating, as if a logical reality must and does lie behind the fiction. There is always the attempt to share in the fictional world, to penetrate to the deep structure, to discover the inner logic which will account for the relationships between the parts of a whole. Pinter suggests relationships through repetition and echo, even through the disposition of the furniture in the first and second act. But these relationships turn out to be spurious. There is only a flat pattern, a shifting mosaic, a surface structure, there is no resolution. Repetition confuses, it does not reveal or or illuminate; the appropriate way to interpret is not identifiable; the inner logic is undiscoverable.

Pinter writes in the tradition of the Absurd and yet we do not encounter Ionesco-like monsters or Beckett-like ash bins. Pinter's world is much more obviously realistic. In Pinter we find menace and equivocation. In Old Times there are contradictions which never trouble us in Beckett and Ionesco, strange though the presentations of these two playwrights can be. The Absurd is concerned with

recreating the irrationality of experience on stage[15]. It is essentially ironic in its exposure of the incongruities in human experience. But since even in this case the playwright wishes to communicate his vision of irrationality, some kind of meaningful configuration must be available to the audience. In Old Times Pinter goes too far because he denies the spectator the possibility of any kind of organisation or continuity. Whatever Pinter has said about the inarticulate nature of acute experience, the ultimate purpose of no artist can be frustration and confusion in his audience. Pinter deals in familiar patterns, the intruder, a third person being both welcome and unwelcome, a change in the original pattern of husband and wife, a person from the past, no one fully accounting for anything. But the details of the action make all the characters unreliable so the familiar becomes baffling because the audience has no means by which to judge whether the characters are leading each other on or playing games with the spectator, this finally becomes irritating and frustrating. Each of the characters at times feels menaced and at other times menaces, but no one picture is consistent. Pinter's method does prompt the audience to reject old ways of evaluating a dramatic experience, but in Old Times he offers no genuine alternative. The play almost succeeds but becomes so ensnared in contradiction that the audience can finally make nothing of it. Without guidance, it seems that no relationship can develop between the spectator and playwright. If the offered world turns out to have no coherent deep structure, the spectator has no way in. The vision of the writer is either incoherent or else quite obscured by a confusing surface structure.

**

ENDGAME

Samuel Beckett's Endgame like Waiting for Godot presents metaphysical irony in dramatic form. The theme is that waiting is useless and the characters kill time in every way they can. Life is stripped of meaning. They know life is meaningless but they persist, enduring all. Beckett's plays are an ironic version of the balked human quest for meaning[16]. Beckett's plays present a much more obviously alien world than Pinter's, with trappings of people buried in sand, in funeral urns, in ash bins, a disembodied mouth, etc. As each play opens, the setting Beckett has chosen causes certain psychological adjustments in the spectator. This is the mental set which determines the kind of expectations the spectator has about the play. What we do not expect from these bizarre settings is conventional realist drama. What we might expect is comedy. Beckett can and does work with both these expectations in the spectator. Despite greater apparent difficulties for the reader/spectator, Beckett's plays are more readily assimilated than many of Pinter's.

Superficially, Endgame is far less recognisable than Pinter's world. There is no sofa and easy chairs, instead there is a stark room, a blind man with a red face and two old people in dustbins. But the play does not lack shape like Old Times; it is if anything overdesigned. There is also genuine comedy in the play, a comedy of human life. There is a very deliberate self-consciousness about the play as a play, woven throughout the dialogue. But perhaps its most enduring significance lies in the fusion of those two strands with an exploration of relationships, and of human fear and suffering. We sense different levels of meaning in Old Times but we can never satisfactorily unravel them. In Endgame there are much more obvious disjunctions of meaning, but, disturbing though the juxtaposition is, the spectator is able to find a number of ways in to the world of the play.

Many of Beckett's plays concern two characters who are in some sense complementary to each other. These characters do not, cannot

leave one another; almost as though they were aspects of the same personality. They may fight, abuse and reject one another but finally they always return to each other. One may be dominant and ruthless and the other subservient but although this structure may shift and change it invariably returns to its former position. The shifts are quite different from the reversals we find in Pinter. By showing this flux in relationships, Beckett is able to present dramatically the nature of certain kinds of human interdependence. However, Beckett's perspective is deliberately partial, he selects a limited area of human experience, boredom and the suffering of being. His characters inhabit a mental world which the normally unreflective mind touches rarely. It has been stripped of most of its veils and thus the means of escape and protection from it are reduced and thus the escape made more pathetic. The motifs of void and nothingness which appear again and again in Beckett's work are not merely what the characters are forced to confront but also what they aspire to. This is why mutually dependent characters wish to leave each other. Nothingness is Clov's dream:

> A world where all would be silent and still and each thing in its last place, under the last dust.
>
> (p39)[17]

But hope causes a dichotomy in human suffering so the characters stay together because there is a possibility that the situation may improve and because there is no better, conceivable alternative. Hope also motivates the desire to leave. Since the present situation involves being together and that is nearly intolerable, perhaps parting would improve matters. The tension between staying and going in Endgame gives a feeling of paralysis to the play. Clov again and again says he is going to leave Hamm but he never does despite the other's unrelenting demands. They are necessary to each other. The reason we are given is that Clov does not know the combination of the larder and Hamm is a blind cripple and needs someone to look after him. Clov's reason is absurd. They are in fact afraid to be alone because this means death for either of them. In death there is loss; of everything. "So too at death the world does not alter but comes to an end" (Wittgenstein). Perhaps this

is why Hamm hesitates ... to end. And death is not guaranteed, and even if it was, it may not be the endgame.

Like Old Times, Endgame is very static, the focus being upon interaction and dialogue rather than action on stage. When we ask the same question about whether this results in a play which is more similar to read than more conventional forms where the accent is on action, we get a slightly different answer with Beckett. A performance of Endgame heightens the effect of the strange setting because the visual effect of Hamm and Clov with their red faces strongly suggests two clowns. In making this response the audience find a continuity between their experience of circus clowns and Beckett's characters. Reading about their red faces does not evoke this so distinctly, one forgets as the play is read. On the other hand Beckett is clearly very aware of the reader of his play as well as the spectator. His stage directions are very detailed:

> Clov goes and stands under window left. Stiff, staggering walk. He looks up at window left. He turns and looks at window right. He goes and stands under window right. He looks up at window right. He turns and looks at window left.
>
> P11

Reading this catalogue of trivial-seeming directions we get an impression of the character being reduced to an automaton or a puppet. It also has very much the quality we find in later "novels" by Beckett such as The Lost Ones. Clov continues to move about the stark set, pointing to every feature of it in a very laborious way, his actions minutely repeated. He gets a ladder, leans it against the wall, looks out of the window, then repeats this for the other window. This enhances the impression that he is a clown figure. Clowns are traditionally very stiff in the way they walk, very precise and purposeful in the way they move objects about. The audience of Endgame half expect Clov to trip to the accompaniment of a drum and cymbals. The suggestion Clov gives of being a clown produces two kinds of expectations in the audience. The world of the play is not after all such an alien world, it is the familiar world of a circus so the audience expect clownish humour

and repartee. We do not expect realistic and developed characters, spontaneous dialogue, or a strong sympathetic involvement with the presentation. Although familiar, the form Beckett uses is an alienating one because when we watch clowns we are detached.

In an essay on laughter, Charles Baudelaire suggests that we find something comic when it is that we can comfortably assure ourselves that we do not appear in this particular way to others[18]. It is therefore something which is more easily evoked in fiction where the people are different and at a distance from ourselves. Robert Langbaum, whose emphasis is different from Baudelaire's, suggests that "the comic effect depends specifically on the exclusion of sympathy"[19]. Do we never feel sympathetic towards clowns? It seems that we can, intermittently but perhaps not while we are actually laughing. But they are not real people we say, they are only puppets, so we do not have to feel sympathy. At the same time that we recognise them as clowns, Beckett almost immediately disconcerts us with the unclown-like dialogue and thereafter there is a tension between music-hall repartee, extraordinary questions and answers, and deliberately ambiguous remarks. This juxtaposition of discontinuous threads of dialogue is at the root of the disturbing quality of a Beckett play. In Old Times we noted the disjunction between conversation and sub-conversation but this was different. Pinter introduces menace in this way. In Beckett there is a quite different effect. It is possible to present a Beckett play with the accent on the comedy but the text itself presents an uneasy interweaving of different tones. The discontinuity between these tones or threads of dialogue Beckett suggests a dimension to the play which is far from comic.

In Endgame, the spectator is forced to experience time passing because it is endlessly commented upon. Once again the comments are ambiguous. They might refer to the play itself or to human life passing. Having been "uncovered", Hamm's first words are:

Hamm: Me - (he yawns) - to play.

This refers obviously to the title of the play, implying that they are involved in a game, probably a chess game in which they each make moves in accordance with some pre-determined rules, the rules of the playwright. The line also refers to the idea that Hamm has received his cue and must now begin to play his part in the drama. The fact that he is covered for the night suggests an odd mode of reality. The audience also receive their first impression of Hamm's languid superiority, the control that he constantly suggests he has over the proceedings, his Prospero-like position. Indeed, later in the play Hamm turns from his chronicle and a conversation with his father Nagg, to say:

> Our revels now are ended.
>
> (p39)

He means that there has been a little activity which has now ended but naturally "revels" is quite inappropriate for the rather gruesome dialogue which has occurred. His assumption of superiority is in ironic contrast to the idea that he is a chess piece or that he should be covered for the night.

Through such deliberate ambiguity throughout the play Beckett points to more than one level of meaning. The disturbance for the spectator lies in the feeling that these layers of meaning although incongruous are not separate but interwoven as in the example of the opening line. Just as with Old Times, the spectator attempts to make sense of what he sees in terms of what is familiar. The discovery is soon made that the clown model is too simple an explanation, there is too much of a serious undertone to the dialogue. Clov's first speech suggests real anguish although the stage direction: "(fixed gaze, tonelessly)" subverts this suggestion:

> Finished, it's finished, nearly finished, it must be nearly finished. (Pause) Grain upon grain, one by one, and one day, suddenly, there's a heap, a little heap, the impossible heap. (Pause) I can't be punished anymore.
>
> (p12)

Conventional dramatic responses make the audience assume that the characters and their dialogue and actions mean something, so the

spectator persists in an attempt to reconstruct some coherent meaning. Suddenly he is brought face to face with what he is doing:

> Hamm: We're not beginning to ... to ... mean something?
> Clov: Mean something! You and I, mean something! (Brief laugh) Ah that's a good one!
> Hamm: I wonder. (Pause) Imagine if a rational being came back to earth, wouldn't he be liable to get ideas into his head if he observed us long enough?
>
> (p27)

Here Beckett exposes to the audience the process they have been engaged in. By this time in the play, many hypotheses could be put forward as an explanation. Critics have suggested[20] the setting to be some kind of shelter following a holocaust with the characters as the only survivors; or the interior of a brain with Hamm and Clov as two aspects of the same personality, Hamm as Everyman at the centre of the world. But no exotic theory fits all the details. The play is multi-dimensional. We recall Gombrich's suggestion that clues point to modes of reality and interpretation. The humour in Hamm's suggestion lies in the fact that the spectator cannot help trying to make sense, to find continuities between the play and his own world. Apart from revealing to the audience the process they are engaged in, the other sense which underlies Hamm's remark is the alienation of living in an Absurd world, where to look for meaning is to be afraid to confront meaninglessness. The play is sprinkled with ambiguous remarks which refer both to the stage time of the play and to the anguish of the characters: "this is slow work", "this is not much fun", "this is deadly". These ambiguous remarks are often accompanied by a pause. This is a device of discontinuity which Beckett uses just as much as Pinter to evoke the eloquence of the implicit, to draw the spectator in to wonder at the suggestions. When Clov says to Hamm that he has things to do in his kitchen, Hamm answers:

> Hamm: Outside of here it's death. (Pause) All right, be off (Exit Clov. Pause) We're getting on.
>
> (p15)

Naturally, off-stage is where all characters cease to exist and Hamm tells Clov to be "off". His following remark of course refers to the dialogue and their life together. The function of the pause is to make time for the full implications of the preceeding remark to be felt by the audience, to ensure that the ambiguity is not overlooked. Hamm and Clov talk to get through life and also to get through the play. Because Beckett focusses on characters actually experiencing a situation and the ebb and flow in their capacities to cope with it, their experience becomes the experience of the audience because each moment is treated with equal concern by the characters and is thus enlarged and intensified.

But how can the audience enter into the bizarre situation they see in front of them, how can they become sympathetically involved with clowns whose dialogue ranges between music-hall and disconcerting enigma? Langbaum suggests that we cannot simultaneously feel sympathy and find something comic. I suggest that the spectator does not identify humanly with the characters but identifies the human fears and suffering suggested, in himself and in his own experience. This is a subtle version of Dr Johnson's idea that imitations bring realities to mind. Endgame is an imitation in no conventional sense and yet there is underlying meaning which does connect quite directly, if subterraneously, with our own deepest feelings. Beckett creates deliberate discontinuities between the normal world of reality and the particular mode which Hamm and Clov inhabit. The assumptions that underlie human behaviour are questioned through parody and exaggeration. Relationships, social situations, communications between people are some features of daily life which are taken for granted and which Beckett defamiliarizes in Endgame in order to prompt a new vision in the audience.

The characters are bored with life, with the play and yet they fear any alteration and they take comfort from habit:

> Hamm: I love the old questions. (With fervour).
> Ah the old questions, the old answers,
> there's nothing like them!
>
> (p29

Again and again in Beckett we find that characters cling to routine, to habitual responses and roles. We find father and son, master and slave, blind and seeing; Hamm cannot stand up and Clov cannot sit down. As Hamm says: "Each man his speciality". These distinctions give an illusion of identity, something coherent to cling to in the void. By the structure of his plays Beckett gives the audience the impression that the immediate past and general history up to the moment when the play begins was not in any way different from the play itself. The future, the tomorrow of the play will be a repetition of the play. Beckett greatly admired Dante and we can readily see something of the Inferno is this paralysis of repetition. But repetition and habit through routine are what Hamm and Clov cling to, their fear arises from change and especially the possibility of new life.

In his essay on Proust Beckett interestingly concentrates his attention on the notion of habit in the French writer's work. He suggests that:

> The periods of transition that separate consecutive adaptations ... represent the perilous zones in the life of the individual ... when for a moment the boredom of living is replaced by the suffering of being. (p19)[22]

For Hamm and Clov, parting would mean change even if that change were to be from living to death. Perhaps this is why they stay together, to avoid the suffering of being. But the quotation might also be the theory which underlies Beckett's dramatic method; the theory of discontinuity. Beckett is suggesting that it is only at the point of discontinuity between familiar modes of living that the veils are stripped away. Beckett's world can be found at this very point of discontinuity, and he achieves its presentation by interweaving different threads of meaning into a continual ambiguity. Clov says:

> Hamm: Do you not think this has gone on long enough?
> Clov: Yes! (Pause) What?
> Hamm: This ... this ... thing.
> Clov: I've always thought so.

As a reference to the play this is clearly amusing but as a reference to human suffering it is horrifying. To be aware of this ambiguity is very disturbing for the spectator because the two perspectives are so incongruous, one light-hearted, bantering and immediate, the other agonized, suffering and profound. In addition to the alienation caused by the setting and the red faces of Hamm and Clov, the white faces of Nagg and Nell, the ambiguity of the dialogue provides a constant source of defamiliarization. Beckett thus breaks through all the habitual responses of the audience. I believe the technique of ambiguity allows Endgame to maintain its shock effect. We cannot simply learn to widen our categories of drama to encompass the way in which Beckett uses the form in Endgame. The ambiguity cannot be resolved. This is quite different from the effect we get in Old Times. In Pinter's play we do not know what to think because there are inherent contradictions in the information we are given. In Endgame, on the other hand, there is a dense pattern of interconnections and repetitions and even although there is more than one level of meaning, no logic is disturbed, the two co-exist and make sense, each one in itself. One of the reasons that we feel that the play has no past and future is because there is no development within the play. It begins with Clov checking everything and then uncovering Hamm; it ends with Clov dressed for the road but not leaving and Hamm covers his face with his "old stauncher". Throughout, there have been remarks from all the characters such as "why this farce day after day?" which contains the usual ambiguity and also gives a strong impression that this dialogue is one of endlessly repeated exchanges. They seem to be performing a ritual, which of course they literally are doing:

Clov: You shouldn't speak to me like that.
Pause
Hamm: (coldly) Forgive me. (Pause. Louder)
I said, forgive me.
Clov: I heard you.

These repetitions and continuities within the play enhance the impression of music-hall repartee yet at the same time the subject is quite uncharacteristic of music-hall humour:

Hamm: Nature has forgotten us.
Clov: There's no more nature.
Hamm: No more nature! You exaggerate.
Clov: In the vicinity.
Hamm: But we breathe, we change! We lose our hair, our teeth! Our bloom! Our ideals!

(p16)

We also discover that there are no more bicycles, pap, sugar-plums, pain-killers, coffins. Do we laugh? Naturally it is amusing to hear the same old answer "there are no more ... " to such a range of objects and even to nature and yet once again we also respond to the deeper structure of meaning and imagine the horror of losing everything, of slowly running down. There are so many repetitions either exact or in form that it would be impossible to note them all. The effect is one of over-design which leads the spectator to the impression of both the rehearsed patter of music-hall and also the idea that the world of the play is endless, a paralysed repetition. At the centre is Hamm talking to himself, creating what he calls his chronicle, the one he has been telling himself all his days. There is a striking continuity here with other Beckett works. We often find a character trying to pass the time or to survive, talking to himself. In the novels it is finally reduced to a voice, in the plays it is reduced to a mouth. Critics have suggested that Beckett is referring to himself, his own life, his creative writing, the chronicle he has been telling himself all his days. It is he who suffers from not being able to finish, he really who hesitates ... to end.

The success of Endgame depends upon a shared world temporarily built up between writer and audience. Unfamiliar though the setting is, unlikely though the characters are from a realistic point of view, the play itself brings to mind realities of fear, desolation, and interdependence. Like Old Times and much modern drama, the focus is on interaction and this produces a static play with a high emotional charge between the characters. Endgame is highly patterned with verbal and physical repetitions but unlike Old Times this does not evoke misleading internal continuities but creates a density of texture and a rich ambivalence. Through Endgame Beckett presents

characters who cling to habit and fear change. The form he chooses breaks through the habitual responses of the spectator both to drama and to life. The particular merit of Endgame lies in the co-existing but discontinuous levels of meaning permitted by the text: one light-hearted, amusing, self-conscious; the other a searching exposure of human fear and alienation. It is the discontinuity between the two which shocks the audience into a new vision.

*****

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1 JOHNSON Dr Samuel. Preface. 1765. W K Wimsatt. Dr Johnson on Shakespeare. Penguin. 1969. p71.

2 Ibid. p72.

3 Ibid. p70.

4 COLERIDGE Samuel Taylor. Biographia Literaria. Dent. 1906

5 Op. cit. Dr Johnson. p97.

6 GOMBRICH E H. Art and Illusion. Phaidon. 1962. p5.

7 ARTAUD Antonin. Collected Works. Vo. 4. Calder & Boyars. 1974. p53.

8 in HINDE R A (ed). Non-verbal communication. C U P. 1972.
MILLER J. "Plays and Players" pp359 - 372.
BROOK P. The Empty Space. Penguin. 1968. p47.

9 Op. cit. GOMBRICH p 243.

10 Performance of The Room and The Dumb Waiter. Royal Court Theatre, London, March 1960. quoted:
ESSLIN Martin. The Theatre of the Absurd.
Penguin. 1961, 1968.

11 PINTER H. Old Times. Methuen. 1971. All references will be to this edition.

12 ELIOT T S. "The Music of Poetry". Selected Prose. Faber & Faber. 1975. p110.

13 Op. cit. BROOK. p100.

14 MAROWITZ Charles. Arena Theatre: Hands off the Classics, BBC2, December 1977.

15 HINCHCLIFFE A P. The Absurd. The Critical Idiom Series. Methuen. 1969. p1.

16 GLICKSBERG C I. The Ironic Vision in Modern Literature. Martinus Nijhoff. The Hague. 1969. p237.

17 BECKETT Samuel. Endgame. Faber. 1964. All references will be to this edition.

18 BAUDELAIRE Charles. Selected Writings on Art and Artists. Penguin. 1972. p146.

19 LANGBAUM Robert. The Poetry of Experience. Chatto & Windus. 1972. p100.

20 Op. cit. ESSLIN. p61.

21 BECKETT Samuel. Proust. London, Calder & Boyars. 1965, 1970.

*****

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing pages I have explored some of the aspects of the relationship which develops between writer and reader, the way in which this relationship is controlled by the writer and the kind of imaginative part which the reader is called on to play. I have suggested that the reader is able to get to know the writer because the latter, if not present in an explicitly omniscient role, is everywhere revealed in his writing through the values expressed, his biases, selections and shapings. The vision of the writer forms an essential part of the implicit dimension to literature and an equally essential element is the creative part played by the reader in constructing meaning from the text; the implicit dimension is the deep structure upon which the aesthetic experience of the reader depends.

By using the general concepts of continuity and discontinuity, I show some of the ways in which the writer exerts control over the reader by limiting the meanings permitted by the text. Meaning was seen to be part of a network, a triadic relationship between the text, the reader, and the implied deep structure. These can only be separated artificially but in the actual process of reading are interdependent. The imagination of the reader responds naturally in terms of continuities and discontinuities, seeking patterns and shapes, perceiving relationships, alerted and stimulated through what appears to be unfamiliar, unexpected and discordant. The human drive to try and make sense of the world involves the tendency to continue a process towards completion, to shape a gestalt. This process utilizes the fact that we perceive continuity in terms of our existing categories and our past experience; trying to match a stimulus with what is familiar. In literature, the reader looks for continuities between the real and the fictive world, between new and existing fictions. These continuities will always exist because art is created in response to something existing, sometimes the response is a reaction against it. Both directions are continuities. When we encounter something which is inexplicable in terms of existing categories we can even so find internal continuities in its structure. A new pattern of continuities provides a new orientation, alters our existing categories and widens our future expectations.

For the most part we do not encounter new situations and we make sense of the world and of art and we construct hypotheses about it through finding continuities within the world. Irony, for instancce, is not a subversion of a straight style, a familiar category, but a sophisticated reading of it depends upon the ability to locate the tone of the writing and to respond appropriately.

We know that the root of the aesthetic experience is not cognitive only but also involves the senses and emotions. The agent which fuses these three elements seems to be the imagination which orders and vitalizes all aspects of our conscious life. It is this often automatic capacity to find continuities across thoughts, senses and feelings which makes the aesthetic response what it is. Part of this process involves the association of words and ideas, the fusion of meanings.

The reader must be able to share in the fictional world in some way and the sharing depends upon finding continuities between one fictional world and others or between the fiction and the actual world. If the fictional world cannot be shared then meanings cannot be constructed. A world shared between two people either in actual life or literature is the implied deep structure to their relationship. In literature this sharing slowly builds up as the text proceeds, rendering context vital to full understanding. In entering the fictional world the reader becomes sympathetically involved. This involvement is not the same as complete identification but rather charts a movement between involvement and detachment. The reader understands the text through an act of imaginative projection into the fictional world. The process of reading seems to involve a gradual taking on of the habits and style of another's thoughts which is a further example of a kind of fusion of discontinuity and continuity. The continuity between reader and writer's thoughts permits meanings to be constructed by the reader and the difference, the discontinuity, is the stimulating factor. The relationship which develops between reader and writer depends upon the contracts of understanding between them, and the writer must to some extent

fulfil the expectations he sets up. However, stimulation in reading arises more obviously from a certain level of frustrated expectations, from discontinuities of some kind.

For art to communicate to us we must locate the appropriate response which means applying a suitable paradigm. The form itself holds clues to this paradigm and thus to its own deep structure. We find clues to an appropriate reading in the patterns lacing a text with internal continuities. In perceiving these continuities the reader's imagination is mobilized and expectations are aroused. We saw how pattern often arises through repetition and although this most obviously appears to be an example of continuity we also find an effect of discontinuity through the modification which occurs when something is repeated. We cannot help but connect those words and phrases which are repeated, but they are not identical. In Pinter's Old Times we found that repetition was used to link events which could not logically be linked. This effect can valuably alert the audience to the process they are engaged in but it can also lead to pointless frustration. The effect of repetition in Beckett is one of paralysis, a morbid Nietzschean eternal repetition.

A writer deliberately uses the effect of a technique of discontinuity when he defamiliarizes his fiction through, for instance, an unusual point of view. Also the discontinuities between more than one point of view in a narrative we call irony. A successful reading of irony depends upon the relationship between reader and writer. Through irony the writer can lead the reader into a conspiratorial relationship where the reader perceives more than he is ever told explicitly. The reader, once the appropriate reading is made, can observe the fiction under construction. This objective stance arises because the ironic mode is essentially one of detachment and awareness. The actual process of reading can also be seen as ironic. The reader is snared in a web of irony, required to make a contract of belief in the fiction and yet to be always aware that it is a fiction. This inherent contradiction in the reader's role yet again suggests discontinuity and is resolved through the flexibility of the imagination

into a new continuity, a harmony and fusion of different points of view.

The writer guides the reader to an appropriate reading of irony through the discontinuity of distance. I have explored a number of different forms of distance in a literary work and in each case find it to be a factor controlling the reader's response, determining the relationahip between reader and writer. The distance created between implied author and a narrator we saw to be a very fruitful technique for articulating irony. The reader can be made vividly aware of the actual construction of the narrative through discontinuities of time shifts and intrusions into the narrative. We have seen how different narrative forms delineate in different ways the architecture of the relationship between reader and writer. Guidance of the reader can be explicit as in Fielding or be more subtle and implicit. James often uses a character as a centre of consciousness and this, along with interior monologue which grew out of it, becomes like the reader's own point of view. Coloured narrative is an example of a controlling technique which functions to direct the reader's response, allowing continuity into and out of a character's point of view with the colouring, often expressed through discontinuities of tone, acting as an implicit revelation of character.

Narrated monologue is perhaps one of the most interesting and effective techniques for creating a continuity between the inner and outer world of character. I show too how direct speech highlights discontinuous speech types and provides a complex of interlocking points of view. In each of these narrative forms the implicit dimension strongly influences the reader's response. This dimension is always revealed through discontinuities in subject matter, tone, point of view, and speech types.

The implicit operates just as strongly in drama as it does in the novel. We found through the example of Pinter that a deep structure, a tacitly shared world must be found if the play is to communicate.

In the same way as does a reader, the spectator searches for continuities between the known world and the world of the play. Dr Johnson suggests that imitations bring realities to mind and this applies equally to novels and drama. In a successful production there can be a direct imaginative continuity between player and character for the spectator. The imagination penetrates through actor to character, through surface to deep structure. In Pinter's Old Times we saw how the implied deep structure keeps shifting so that all interpretations lead back to the surface. This is partly due to a logically impenetrable surface structure. Conventional dramatic responses must be rejected and yet no real alternative is offered, no coherent vision revealed.

The pause is a technique which Pinter uses successfully. It creates a discontinuity which allows new connections to be made, meanings beyond the obvious to be perceived - a more profound continuity to be synthesized. Beckett also makes masterly use of this technique to highlight ambiguities and evoke the eloquence of the implicit. Also like Pinter, Beckett plays with ambiguity to create a disjunction between possible meanings, disturbing and alerting his audience. But in Beckett's Endgame, I show how the ambiguity in the dialogue, although incongruous, is inherently logical and a means of questioning assumptions about human behaviour through parody and exaggeration. It is at the points of discontinuity (the perilous zones) that Beckett's world can be penetrated and his implicit vision revealed.

It has been pointed out on several occasions in this thesis that techniques causing discontinuities in art can lead to more profound levels of continuity between the art form and the actual world and can help to widen and deepen our understanding of our own lives. Metaphor works in this way, a new and often surprising synthesis between two often prosaic elements causing insight into some aspects of the subject. Irony also leads from discontinuous perspectives to a new and different viewpoint, embracing both originals. However, here, in contrast to metaphor, the ironic mode implicitly judges one perspective in terms of the other. In science too we found that

the step beyond Kuhn's notion of advance by discontinuity is to perceive that the breakthrough is often a new synthesis of existing data which is clearly a new continuity. Techniques of discontinuity help to raise art above our purely biological response, such as the maternal to the picture or description of a baby, our sense of peace at a pastoral scene, our awe of sea or mountain. We are here not so far from the Formalists in our recognition of the importance of techniques for removing the veil of familiarity from the world, recovering the sensation of life. Knowing these techniques the writer can break through the dulled habitual response to the world and once the veil has been removed the sensitive and imaginative reader may participate in a new vision.

*****

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABRAMS M H. The Mirror and the Lamp. OUP. 1971.

AGASSI Joseph. "Continuity and Discontinuity". Journal of the History of Ideas. No 4. Oct-Dec 1974

ARENDT Hannah. "The Achievement of Hermann Broch". Kenyon Review. Summer 1949. pp 476-83.

ARTAUD Antonin. Collected Works. Vol 1. 1968. Vol.4. 1974. Translated by V Conti. Calder & Boyars.

AUSTEN Jane. Emma. (1816). Penguin. 1966.

AUSTEN Jane. Mansfield Park. (1814). Penguin. 1966.

BANN S & BOWLT J E. (ed). Russian Formalism. Scottish Academic Press. 1973.

BARBER P J & LEGGE D. Perception & Information. Methuen. 1976.

BARFIELD Owen. Poetic Diction. Faber & Gwyer. 1928.

BARRON Frank. "The Psychology of Imagination". Scientific American. No. 3. Vol 199. Sept 1958. pp 151-66.

BART B F. "Aesthetic distance in Madame Bovary". PMLA. LXIX. Dec 1954. pp 1112-26.

BATE W J. From Classic to Romantic: Premises of taste in 18th Century England. New York. 1961.

BAUDELAIRE Charles. Selected Writings on Art and Artists. Penguin 1972.

BAXTIN M. "Discourse Typology in Prose" (see Matejka & Pomorska)

BAYLEY John. The Characters of Love. London. 1960.

BECKETT S. Endgame. Faber. 1964.

-------- Imagination Dead Imagine. London, Calder & Boyars Ltd. 1965.

-------- Proust. London, Calder & Boyars Ltd. 1965/70.

BERGER John. Ways of Seeing. Pelican. 1973.

BERGSON Henri. An Introduction to Metaphysics. Translated by T E Hulme. Macmillan. 1913.

BERLYNE D E. (ed) Studies in the New Experimental Aesthetics. Hemisphere. 1974.

BLACK M. Models & Metaphors. Cornell University Press. 1962.

BLOOMFIELD Morton W. "Distance & Predestination in Troilus & Criseyde" PMLA. LXXII. March No 1. 1957. pp 14-26.

BOCCACCIO Il Filostrato. (see Griffin & Rossetti)

BOOTH W C. The Rhetoric of Irony. University of Chicago Press. 1974.

--------- The Rhetoric of Fiction. University of Chicago Press. 1961.

BRADY F, PALMER J, & PRICE M. Literary Theory & Structure. Yale University Press. 1973.

BRETT R L. Fancy & Imagination. Methuen. 1969.

BROCH Hermann The Death of Virgil. (1945). Translated by Jean Starr Untermeyer. Universal Library New York. 1965.

BROOK Peter. The Empty Space. Penguin. 1968/76.

BROOKE-ROSE C. A Grammar of Metaphor. Secker & Warburg. 1970.

BROOKS C. "The Language of Paradox". TATE A (ed). The Language of Poetry. Princeton University Press 1942.

--------- A Shaping Joy. Methuen. 1971.

BRONSON B H. In Search of Chaucer. University of Toronto Press. 1960.

BROWN Roger. Words and Things. Free Press, Macmillan. 1958/68.

BULLOUGH E. "Psychical distance as a factor in art and an aesthetic principle". British Journal of Psychology. Vol 5. June 1912. pp 87-118.

BURKE K. The Philosophy of Literary Form. New York. 1967.

CAMUS Albert. The Myth of Sisyphus. Hamish Hamilton Ltd. 1955.

CHEVALIER Haakon M. The Ironic Temper: Anatole France & his time. OUP. 1932.

CHOMSKY Noam. Language and Mind. Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch Inc. 1968. Rev. ed. 1972.

COHN D. "Narrated Monologue: Definition of a Fictional Style". Comparative Literature. 18. 1966. pp 97-112.

COLERIDGE S T. Biographia Literaria. Dent. 1975.

CULLER J. Structuralist Poetics. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1975.

DEWEY John. Art as Experience. New York. 1958.

DONALDSON E T. Speaking of Chaucer. University of London. 1970.

DOSTOYEVSKY F. Notes from Underground. (1864). Translated by Jessie Coulson. Penguin 1972.

---------- The Devils. (1871). Translated by D Magarshack. Penguin. 1953/71.

DVORAK E F. Technique as moral purpose: Parody and Romance in the Development of Jane Austen's Narrative Method. Indiana University PhD. 1976.

ECCLES John. "The Physiology of Imagination". Scientific American Readings: Altered States of Awareness. Freeman Press. 1954.

EHRENZWEIG Anton. The Hidden Order of Art. Paladin. 1970

ELIOT George. Middlemarch. (1871/2). Penguin. 1965.

ELIOT T S. "The Music of Poetry". Selected Prose. Faber & Faber. 1975.

EMPSON W. The Structure of Complex Words. Chatto & Windus 1951.

ERLICH V. "Russian Formalism". Journal of the History of Ideas. Vol 34. No 4. Oct- Dec 1973.

ESSLIN Martin. The Theatre of the Absurd. Penguin. 1961/68.

FISH Stanley. Self-consuming Artifacts. University of Chicago Press. 1972.

FRIEDMAN N. "Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a critical concept". PMLA. Vol 70. ~~LXX.~~ Dec 1955. pp 1160-84.

GARDNER Helen. The Art of T S Eliot. Faber. 1949/69.

GLICKSBERG C I. The Ironic Vision in Modern Literature. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague. 1969.

GOMBRICH E H. Art and Illusion. Phaidon. 1962.

---------- "Illusion and Art" (see Gregory & Gombrich)

---------- "Action and Expression in Western Art" (see Hinde R A.)

GREGORY R L & GOMBRICH E H (ed) Illusion in Nature and in Art. Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd. 1973.

GRIFFIN N E & MYRICK Translation of Il Filostrato by Boccaccio. University of Pennsylvania Press. 1929.

HARDING D W. "Psychological Processes in the Reading of Fiction". The British Journal of Aesthetics. Vol II. No 2 April 1962. pp 133-147.

---------- Experience into Words. Penguin University Books. 1974.

HALLIDAY E M. "Narrative Perspective in Pride & Prejudice". Nineteenth Century Fiction. Vol 15. June 1960. pp 65-71.

HARVEY W J. "The Omniscient Author Convention". Nineteenth Century Fiction. Vol 13. Sept. 1958. pp 81-108

HAWKES T (ed) Coleridge on Shakespeare. Penguin. 1969.

--------- Structuralism & Semiotics. Methuen. 1977.

HAYEK F A. The Sensory Order. The University of Chicago Press. 1963.

HINCHCLIFFE A P. The Absurd. The Critical Idiom. Methuen. 1969/72.

HINDE R A (ed) Non-verbal Communication. CUP. 1972.

HOLLIS James R. Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence. Southern Illinois University Press. 1970.

HOLLOWAY J. The Victorian Sage. Anchor Books. Macmillan. 1962.

HOPKINS G H. Poems & Prose. Penguin. 1953.

HOUGH G. "Narrative & Dialogue in Jane Austen". Critical Quarterly. 12. 1970. pp 201-229.

ISER Wolfgang. The Implied Reader. Johns Hopkins Press. 1974.

JAMESON F. The Prison House of Language. Princeton University Press. 1972.

JOHNSON Dr S. In Dr Johnson on Shakespeare. W K Wimsatt (ed) Penguin. 1969.

JORDAN R. Chaucer and the Shape of Creation. Harvard. 1967.

JOSIPOVICI G. (ed). The Modern English Novel. London. 1976.

---------- The World and the Book. Macmillan. 1971.

KERMODE. F. The Sense of an Ending. OUP. 1967.

KNOX I. Aesthetic Theories of Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer. Humanities Press. 1958.

KNIGHTS L C & COTTLE B. Metaphor & Symbol. Colston Papers. Butterworths, London. 1960.

KOESTLER A. The Act of Creation. Hutchinson. 1964.

KOHLER W. Gestalt Psychology. London. 1930.

KOHLER W. The Task of Gestalt Psychology. Princeton. 1969.

KUHN T S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago. 1962/70.

LANGBAUM Robert. The Poetry of Experience. Chatto & Windus. 1972.

LEMON L T & REIS M J (ED). Russian Formalist Criticism. University of Nebraska Press. 1965.

LEWIS C S. Selected Literary Essays. (ed) W Hooper. CUP. 1969.

LODGE D. (ed). 20th Century Literary Criticism. Longmans. 1972.

MACH Dr E. The Analysis of Sensations. Translated by C M Williams 1st Ed. Revised and suppl. 5th Ed. S Waterlow. Open Court Publishing Co. 1914.

MANN Thomas. Death in Venice. Penguin. 1928.

---------- Doctor Faustus (1947). Translated by H T Lowe-Porter. Penguin.1968.

MAROWITZ C. Arena Theatre: Hands off the Classics. BBC2 TV Programme. Dec 1977.

MARTIN G D. Language, Truth & Poetry. University Press Edinburgh. 1975.

MATEJKA L & POMORSKA K. (EDS). Readings in Russian Poetics. MIT Press. 1971.

McLUHAN Marshall. The Medium is the Massage. Random. 1967.

MEAD George H. Mind, Self & Society. University of Chicago. 1967.

MEECH S B. The Shape of Chaucer's Troilus. Syracuse University Press. 1959.

MEHL D. "The audience of Chaucer's Troilus & Criseyde" Chaucer & Middle English Studies. (ed) B Rowland. George Allen & Unwin. 1974.

MEYER L B. Emotion & Meaning in Music. University of Chicago. 1956.

MILLER J. "Plays & Players" (see R A Hinde ed).

MILLER J Hillis (ed) Aspects of Narrative. English Institute Essays. New York. 1971

MUECKE D C. Irony. The Critical Idiom. Methuen. 1970.

NIETZSCHE F. Birth of Tragedy. (1870/1) Translated by F Golffing. Doubleday Anchor. 1956.

---------- Gesammelte Werke. Vol 1. Musarion-Ausgabe. 1954

NUTTALL A D. A Common Sky. Chatto & Windus. 1974.

OGDEN C K & RICHARDS I A. The Meaning of Meaning. London. 1946.

ONG Walter. "A dialectic of aural and objective correlatives". (see D Lodge ed).

ORNSTEIN R E. The Psychology of Consciousness. Penguin. 1975.

PINTER Harold. Old Times. Methuen. 1971.

POLANYI Michael. Knowing & Being. ed M Greene. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1969.

---------- & PROSCH H. Meaning. University of Chicago Press. 1975.

POPPER K. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London.

PRESTON John. The Created Self. Heinemann. 1970.

PRICE M "The Fictional Contract". (see F Brady et al eds).

RABKIN Eric S. Narrative Suspense. University of Michigan Press. 1973.

RATHBURN R C & STEINMANN M. (Eds) From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad. University of Minnesota Press. 1958.

REID L A. Meaning in the Arts. George Allen & Unwin. 1969.

RICHARDS I A "The Interactions of Words". (see A Tate ed)

---------- Philosophy of Rhetoric. OUP. 1965.

ROBINSON R N. (ed). The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Houghton Mifflin Co. & OUP. 2nd Edition. 1957.

ROMBERG Bertil. Narrative Technique of the First Person Novel. Almqvist & Wiksell. 1962.

ROMMETVEIT R. On Message Structure. John Wiley & Sons. 1974.

ROSSETTI W M. Chaucer's Troylus & Cryseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato. London. Chaucer Society. 1873.

SARTRE J-P. The Psychology of Imagination. Methuen. 1972.

SCHLEGEL A W. A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature. Translated by John Black. London. 1846.

SCHOLES R & KELLOG R The Nature of Narrative. New York. OUP. 1966.

SCHOLES R. Structuralism in Literature. Yale. 1974.

SCHOPENHAUER A. The World as Will & Idea. (1883). Translated by R B Haldane & J Kemp. London. 1948.

SEWELL E. The Structure of Poetry. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1951.

SHELLEY P B. A Defence of Poetry. Boston. 1891.

SCHKLOVSKY V. "Art as Technique" (see L T Lemon ed).

---------- "The Mystery Novel" (see L Matejka ed).

---------- "The Resurrection of the Word". (see S Bann ed)

STANISLAVSKY C. An actor prepares. London. 1937.

STEINMANN M. "The Old Novel & the New" (see R C Rathburn ed)

STRUVE Gleb. "Monologue Interieur: the origins of the formula and the first statement of its possibilities". PMLA. LXIX Dec 1954. pp 1101-11.

STURROCK J. The French New Novel. OUP. 1969.

SZE Mai Mai. The Tao of Painting with the Mustard Seed Garden Manual of Painting. Bollingen Series XLIX. 2nd Ed 1963. Princeton University Press.

TOLSTOY L. Anna Karenina. (1876). Translated by Rose Edmonds. Penguin 1954.

TATE A. (ed). The Language of Poetry. Princeton University Press. 1942.

TOMASHEVSKY B. "Thematics". (see L T Lemon ed).

VICKERY O W. "The Sound & the Fury: A study in perspective." PMLA. LXIX. Dec 1964. 1017-37.

VOLOSINOV V N. "Reported Speech" (see L Matejka ed)

WATT I. The Rise of the Novel. Chatto & Windus. 1957.

WILT Judith. The Readable People of George Meredith. Princeton University Press. 1975.

WIMSATT W K. (ed) Dr Johnson on Shakespeare. Penguin 1969.

WITTGENSTEIN L. Philosophical Investigations. Translated by G E M Anscombe. Blackwell, Oxford. 1976.

WOLLHEIM Richard. Art and its Objects. Penguin. 1970.

---------- On Art and the Mind. Allen Lane. 1973.

ZUSNE L Visual Perception of Form. Academic Press. 1970.

*****