INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in “sectioning” the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.
SMITH, MACK L., JR.

FIGURES IN THE CARPET: THE EKPHRASTIC TRADITION IN THE REALISTIC NOVEL

Rice University

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Ph.D. 1981
RICE UNIVERSITY

FIGURES IN THE CARPET:
THE EXPHRASTIC TRADITION IN THE REALISTIC NOVEL

by

MACK L. SMITH, JR.

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

APPROVED, THESIS COMMITTEE:

Walter W. Isle, Professor of English
Chairman

Terrence A. Doody, Professor of English

Donald N. Levin, Professor of Classics

HOUSTON, TEXAS
DECEMBER, 1980
I would like to thank Walter Isle and Terrence Doody, who encouraged me when I began my initial formulation of my theory and who worked diligently with me while I labored with its elaboration. Thanks also to Robert Patten for helping to broaden the dimensions of my thesis and to Donald Levin for introducing me to classical precedents. But most of all thanks goes to Sue, my wife, whose emotional and intellectual contributions are so enormous that I share with her whatever success this study achieves.
ABSTRACT

A prevailing trend in contemporary novel theory criticism is the attempt to free the term "realism" from its static association with the fin de siècle movement which has led, in its extreme examples, to a kind of fictional literalism. Ian Watt's formula has provided a locus classicus for a generation of critics: the central notion of realism, he insists, is in "the correspondence between the literary work and the reality it imitates." In giving disproportionate, singular emphasis neither to the external world nor to the literary imagination, and in emphasizing, rather, the correspondence between the two, Watt implies that realism is an epistemological function of the novel, a changing set of conventions to examine both life and art.

The dissertation contends that novelists, for centuries, have been aware that the dual function of their art is to examine life as well as the tools (conventions) of their craft; it contends, further, that certain exemplary novelists have chosen a consistent method of examination, a revitalization of the classical convention of ekphrasis--the introduction of a work of art within a work of art. By placing the interpolated art form before his characters, the novelist can create the format of a debate on artistic representation. The paradigm is in Don Quixote, the debate between the Canon and the priest on the verisimilitude of chivalric romances as opposed to that of histories. In the ekphrastic episode of Master Peter's
puppet show, Cervantes illustrates the modes of narration intrinsic to both forms of art. The same format is created by Jane Austen in *Emma* through Emma's and Knightley's debate on Frank Churchill's conciliatory epistles; it is repeated again by Tolstoy in *Anna Karenina* through Vronsky's and Mihailov's discussion of pictorial representation, particularly Anna's portrait. Joyce, in *Ulysses*, pairs the Aristotelian Stephen against the Platonist Russell to reveal his mimetic standards through a debate on *Hamlet*. This dialectic, informing the structure of the novel, is portrayed ekphrastically also in terms of the unification of Tonic and Dominant keys in a classical sonata. And Thomas Pynchon in *Gravity's Rainbow* matches the behaviorist manifesto, *The Book*, against the preverbal communication of primitive ritual, and he resolves the implied argument with the metaphor of the cinema.

An examination of the convention in separate chapters on these five major texts will show that the debate of characters on the verisimilar correspondence of the interpolated art form with a defined, external reality is an analogue of the author's transformation of life through the medium of language: as the art form corresponds to life, so the word corresponds with fact. The argument is, consistently, a dialectic between two theories of language: one of which is epistemological and referential and the other transcendental and emotive. The art form within the art form is a metaphor used by the author to reveal his particular loyalty; it is also a center of focus through which
a critic can arrive at a broad understanding of a text's mimetic norms.
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I. PREMISES

A. Questions and Methods

In an endeavor to clarify distinguishing characteristics that differentiate various philosophical methods, Susanne K. Langer proposes a theory that is particularly relevant to the discipline of literary criticism: "a philosophy," she writes, "is characterized more by the formulation of its problems than by its solution of them. Its answers establish an edifice of facts; but its questions make the frame in which its picture of fact is plotted."¹ It is possible to argue that a number of critical schools begin with stable answers and solutions and work, through the analysis of texts, inevitably toward their preconceived, intrinsic positions. Marxist criticism, with its fairly predictable social conceptions, and Freudian criticism, with its reliance upon psychoanalytic schemata, might be cited as examples of critical theories that emphasize conclusions more than means, answers more than processes. But even though their allegiances to process are not as apparent as Formalist aesthetics, both Marxist and Freudian criticisms are distinguished more by their methods than by their conclusions, as attested by the variety of opinions—from Georg Lukács to Christopher Caudwell and from Ernest Jones to Norman Holland—that each include within their theoretical boundaries. Writes Harry Levin: "criticism . . . is less obliged to expound a thesis than to demonstrate a method."²

Guided by the exempla of Langer and Levin, I begin this
study with a question—a question whose answers provide no single, limited solution but rather the description of a process of literary investigation which is able to furnish independent solutions to the unique propositions raised by every text. Quite simply, the question begins with the observation that a considerable number of important novels contain episodes which are descriptions of works of art. Invariably, these art forms—plays, films, musical works, paintings—are created out of thematic elements which have been introduced earlier in the novel; thus they are illustrations of how an artist transforms empirical experience into a work of art by means of an aesthetic medium. My question is this: what relation does the interpolated art form have to the novel as a whole? This central question engenders ancillary considerations which appear also in the form of questions: since the work of art illustrates the transformation of the raw material of reality into art through an aesthetic medium, does it then represent the novelist's transformation of reality into fiction through the medium of language? Lastly, are the examples of this device numerous enough in the history of the genre and consistent in their applications to consider it an established convention, a trope of fiction used by novelists to establish their mimetic standards? In this study, I hope to prove that this device is a widely-used convention and that its applications are consistently a self-conscious means by which novelists explore the relationship between fiction and reality, art and
life. But more importantly, I hope to show that the explication of scenes in a novel which utilize this convention can be a valuable tool for a comprehensive understanding of the text as a whole.

B. **Ekphrasis** and the Narrative Tradition

My title *Figures in the Carpet* alludes not only to the James short story of a story-teller but also to the classical origins of the convention which is the subject of this study. As Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg remind us: "The novel...represents only a couple of centuries in the continuous narrative tradition of the Western world which can be traced back five thousand years."³ Similarly, the origins of the convention can be traced back to the earliest narratives, and a knowledge of its evolution is instructive for students of the novel.

The classical convention *ekphrasis* is a standard device in epic and narrative poetry. Simply, *ekphrasis* entails any elaborate description embedded within a narrative: it can be a story within a story, as Callimachus in the *Hecale* includes the narrative of Ericthonius within the central story of Theseus; or it can serve as an extended description of nature, as Dion of Prusa uses it to idealize pastoral life in the *Epheban Discourse*. But the most typical and instructive use of *ekphrasis* is the description of a work of art containing the graphic representation of figures from mythology, history, or everyday life which provide an implicit, didactic commentary
upon the narrative in which they are incorporated. The art
form classical poets most often use to embed these figures
is a carpet or tapestry. Catullus in his epyllion Carmen
LXIV comments upon the marriage of Peleus and Thetis by illustrating a tapestry which describes Theseus' desertion of Ariadne,
and Ovid shows conflicting views of divinity by describing the respective tapestries of Minerva and Arachne in Metamorphoses.
Jason's cloak in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius portrays several myths which compose a background to the central story. Similar to the description of tapestries are Longus' painting that opens his Daphnis and Chloe, Virgil's mural of the Trojan War that causes Æneas to weep in the Aeneid, Moschus' flower basket in Europa, and Homer's shield of Achilles in the Iliad.

For the tradition of the novel, perhaps the most relevant example of ekphrasis in classical epic is Ovid's tale of Arachne in Metamorphoses. In the weaving contest between Minerva and Arachne, Ovid establishes a comparison between two different modes of rendering. Minerva's tapestry is a representation of divine order, as she takes for her subject the Parnassian hierarchy and arranges it in a design of severest order and symmetry. Arachne, on the other hand, weaves a tapestry exhibiting no such symmetry, and she chooses for her subject the various metamorphoses of gods into animals for the purpose of seducing earthly maidens. It is described by G. Karl Galinsky as a "swirling depiction of the love of gods for
mortal women, and as such it is a thematic restatement of the stories which Ovid had told in the earlier books of Metamorphoses. Its structural design, he writes, is a loosely related series "not fitted into a rigid formal pattern, but the unity consists of the general theme, and the succession of the various stories is associative." As such, Arachne's tapestry is a self-definition of the work of art that contains it, for the Metamorphoses can be considered a series of epyllia (miniature epics) loosely linked together, telling the same stories that are woven by the ill-fated seamstress.

Like Ovid in the story of Arachne, many novelists use the ekphrastic convention to make an implicit or explicit comparison between two different forms of art which presuppose different modes of rendering. The novelistic paradigm for such a use of this convention is the debate between the Canon and the priest in Don Quixote on the respective virtues of histories and romances. Having characterized the modes of narration intrinsic to both forms of art, Cervantes illustrates them schematically in the passages relating to Master Peter's puppet show. Jane Austen in Emma embodies the empirical and idealistic impulses of history and romance in the figures of Emma and Mr. Knightley, and she allows them to give voice to the general premises of the Canon's and priest's debate in their debate over the degree of truth in Emma's portrait of Harriet Smith and Frank Churchill's conciliatory epistles. Similarly, Tolstoy, in Anna Karenina, contrasts Vronsky's
idealizing, ersatz Pre-Raphaelite portrait of Anna with Mihailov's empirically accurate portrait of her which gives a physical basis for the revelation of her spiritual essence. In Ulysses, James Joyce pairs the Aristotelian Stephen against the Platonist Russell in a debate on Hamlet which explicitly states the polar elements of thesis and antithesis in a dialectic which informs the structure of the novel. And Thomas Pynchon in Gravity's Rainbow matches the behaviorist manifesto The Book against the preliterature art of primitive ritual.

C. Ekphrastic Continuity and Discontinuity

Novelists who portray ekphrastic pairs, whether they be two different interpolated art forms or two characters interpreting the same art form from different aesthetic perspectives, use the interpolated forms as a means of defining their mimetic mode. For many novelists ekphrasis is utilized primarily to reinforce the mimetic standard developed by the verbal medium with that of another medium from an interpolated work. If the novel's standard of mimesis is continuous with the interpolated work, then the relationship between the novel and the ekphrastic artifact is one of imitation or adoption; if it is discontinuous, then it is parodic.

In the paradigmatic novel, Don Quixote, Cervantes interpolates forms of the romance which are discontinuous with his more realistic narrative for the purpose of parody. This parody reaches the height of complexity and humor in the Master Peter episode in which all the chivalric conventions are
performed by puppets in a mountebank's sideshow. Citing Cervantes as the primary example, Harry Levin writes that "realism...has often originated in parody," and that in its parodic treatment of the romance Don Quixote is the prototype of the realistic novel. Levin's remarks are of particular interest to this study in that he locates the origins of realism not so much in a method or perspective but rather in the author's ironic attitude toward an interpolated art form—in this case, the romance. By destroying the illusions upon which romances are founded, Cervantes implies that the fiction he has written creates no such falsifications and is based more on truth; hence it is more realistic.

The mimetic discontinuity of an interpolated art form within its frame narrative can be read as the novelist's concern for establishing distance between his work and an older narrative tradition whose mimetic norms seem no longer valid. Structuralist and Formalist theories have revealed that each work of fiction has embedded within it a trace of an earlier, archetypal narrative form. André Jolles did much to advance this view when he suggested that behind every written fictional text are nine verbal structures—the legend, saga, myth, riddle, proverb, case, memoir, tale, and joke. Basically, Jolles does nothing more than confirm that literary works do not generate spontaneously from a void in tradition but rather assimilate and refine whatever cultural artifacts are at their disposal. René Wellek and Austin Warren find this
process of artistic assimilation and refinement to be at the heart of the novel's birth in eighteenth-century England: "the novel develops from the lineage of non-fictionitious narrative forms--the letter, journal, the memoir or biography, the chronicle or history." Considering the novel's late appearance in literary history and the extent that it borrowed or assimilated the conventions of other genres, it would not be unwarranted to describe it as a kind of hybrid. A case just as convincing as Wellek's and Warren's for the novel's heritage in non-fictional documents could be made for its heritage in the epic, dramatic tragedy or comedy, the romance or pastoral. Individually, early novels clearly show their affinities for earlier literary genres. As Don Quixote is an outgrowth of the chivalric romance tradition and as the novels of Richardson are heirs to the guides for familiar letter writing, so Tom Jones derives from the mock epic, Robinson Crusoe from the daily journal, and the Castle of Otranto from dramatic tragedy. In addition to these more obvious examples, many novels show a tangential theoretical parentage from the aesthetics of art forms other than literary ones. For example, the aesthetics of nineteenth-century literary Realism borrowed freely from the representational theories of painting, and so many novelists, particularly the French Realists--Balzac, Stendahl, the Goncourt brothers, Burty, Rod, Zola, early Huysmans, and Duranty--reinforced the pictorial basis of their fictions with the interpolation of paintings and their
creators. And similarly, novels which can be considered heirs to the fin de siècle Symbolist movement—works by Joyce, Proust, and Huxley—display their allegiance to expressive theories with the interpolation of musical works.

In the evolution of any natural organism, certain outmoded features of the parent or primitive ancestor are retained in order to remind, like the navel, that "the cords of all link back." The novel, too, often retains features of its parent genre, sometimes by portraying it graphically as an interpolated art form as a means of showing how far the new form (novel derives from the Latin novellus, new) has evolved from the older one. The act of portrayal is often one of repudiation, as Cervantes (author of the Galatea, an Arcadian romance) portrays in Don Quixote several different versions of the romance avowedly in order to repudiate it. The novels of Jane Austen show a similar discontinuous relationship with an interpolated form from which they are derived. Many of her novels were, in their early drafts, imitations of Richardsonian epistolary narratives, but with the discovery of a fuller, more penetrating technique of narration the epistle becomes in Emma, her masterwork, an interpolated form used by charlatans for the purpose of falsification. And similarly, Flaubert's apocryphal "Madame Bovary c'est moi" is widely accepted because most of his interpreters are of the opinion that he exorcised his youthful Hugolian sensibility (which gave rise to his early romantic narratives) by making the sentimental
novels interpolated within *Madame Bovary* a primary cause of his heroine's misfortunes. Flaubert's rejection is similar to Stendahl's, who illustrated his recanting of Rousseauan romanticism in the romantic novels of *Le Rouge et le Noir* that lead Julien Sorel to his fateful liaisons. And Thomas Hardy in *Jude the Obscure* records the passing of romanticism in showing Jude's gothic-romantic paintings turn into the Christminster cakes he sells at a bazaar. In *Ulysses*, Joyce (author of *Dubliners* and *Stephen Hero*, both Realistic narratives) calls the technique of his most conventionally external chapter—"Bumaeus"—as "Narrative (old)." And his most objective episode is filled with falsehoods, reinforced by the false stories within the story of Murphy the Sailor. And Pynchon, in his Postmodernist work *Gravity's Rainbow* illustrates the limitations of Modernist specificity and logicality in his interpolated text *The Book*.

Most often ekphrastic discontinuity can be interpreted as a means of defining the novel's mimetic mode through contrast. The flat, wooden, puppet knights of Cervantes' marionette theatre emphasize the roundness of his flesh and blood knight Don Quixote. And the destructive liberties that Emma and Frank Churchill take in representing character through their respective portrait and epistles give validity to Austen's implicit argument for stability and referentiality in language. Quite similarly; Dickens in *Little Dorrit* portrays a false artist in Henry Gowan who describes his portrait of the
arch-villain Blandois as "whatever you think he most looks like."

Dickens carries his argument against the work of art that can be anything into the realm of language in his subtle criticism of the polymorphous word used by Blandois' acquaintance Cavalleto. "Altro," Dickens writes, is a "word being, according to its Genoese emphasis, a confirmation, a contradiction, an assertion, a denial, a taunt, a compliment, a joke, and fifty other things . . ." (47). And in another significant example of the many nineteenth-century novels of painters and paintings, Zola's L'Oeuvre tells the story of Claude Lantier who, in his climactic work, forsook the representation of reality for a conjuring of an ideal, an ethereal nude so unattainable that, crushed, he hangs himself in front of the painting, "gazing upon her with his fixed and lifeless eyes." (47)

In many novels, an ekphrastic description that is discontinuous with the norms of the novel is matched explicitly or implicitly with one that is continuous. So Dickens sets Gowan's laxness in interpretation and meaning against the exact scientist William Doyce, who, as an inventor, follows a creative doctrine much like a Realistic novelist. And Zola pairs Lantier's idealism and subjectivism against the views of the fictional novelist, Pierre Sandoz, who is, for all practical purposes, Zola's persona.

An interpolated art form that is continuous with the novel that contains it can be interpreted, of course, as a
partial mirror image of the whole. This is obviously the function of Vinteuil's little musical phrase in Proust's *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu*. Marcel's ambition in the last book of the series is to write a novel whose purpose is to evoke the same kind of response that the phrase had for himself and for Swann. And an even more challenging synecdochical relationship between an interpolated art form and its frame narrative can be found in Pynchon's *Gravity's Rainbow* where the ekphrastic use of film becomes an attempt to make the entire novel itself an imitation of a film.

Most commonly, however, when ekphrasis is used for purposes of self-definition, the novel will exhibit both continuous and discontinuous ekphrastic pairs.

**D. Ut Pictura Poesis, Ut Fabula Veritas**

For centuries most scholarly interest in ekphrasis was as a corollary to the convention of *ut pictura poesis*—the search for a common aesthetic bond between poetry and the spatial arts in the humanistic aesthetics of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Interest in the convention culminated in the eighteenth century when nearly every aesthetic treatise cited either the Horatian maxim "ut pictura poesis" (as is painting, so is poetry) or Simonides' "painting is mute poetry, and poetry is a speaking picture" as evidence of a common substance of the arts. This neoclassical extravagance led to the famous refutation of the convention by Gotthold Lessing in *Laocoön*, which was itself refuted by Irving Babbitt in
The New Laocoön and John Dewey in Art as Experience. Indeed, Lessing's position has been so controversial that André Gide was forced to concede that, "Lessing's Laocoön is one of those books it is good to reiterate or contradict every thirty years."  

I intend neither to reiterate nor contradict Lessing's refutation of ut picture poesis; I feel that it is more helpful for my purposes to note first that the convention inspired generations of poets to make the spatial arts an inexhaustible store of poetic imagery. It is not surprising, therefore, that all modern critical studies of ekphrasis in literature are examinations of individual poems. One of the most notable is Leo Spitzer's examination of the urn in Keat's famous ode; the purpose of the artifact, he contends, is to provide a spatial metaphor for the poem's temporal structure. Murray Krieger extends Spitzer's treatment to show that urn imagery is an extensive subspecies of ekphrasis and that it provides an iconic structural image in poems by Browne, Herbert, Donne, Pope, Eliot and Stevens.  

The critical treatment of ekphrasis in the novel, however, is so sparse as to be nonexistent. Joseph Frank in The Widdening Gyre follows the example of Spitzer and Krieger and notes that modern literature in all genres can be characterized by a propensity for metaphors of spatial form derived from the plastic arts. Frank, however, neglects to consider the ekphrastic use of the plastic arts as interpolated
forms.

The basic point of contention between the views of Lessing and Babbitt, and the nexus at which practically all studies of the ekphrastic principle converge (and, by redundancy, extinguish) is the question of the similarities and differences between aesthetic media. Lessing attempted to check what he considered the confusion of media legitimately belonging to one or other of the arts, a confusion that was most clearly evident in the neoclassical schools of pictorial verse and allegorical painting. Before his death, Lessing had intended to carry his argument for an observation of the limits of various media into the realms of music and dance. Babbitt counters Lessing's arguments with the romantic doctrine of suggestiveness--the synthesis of the arts through emotion which is most evident in word-painting and programme music. And Frank argues that modern literature has attempted to break the limitations of its medium--temporality--and aspire toward the spatial condition of the visual arts. According to Frank, this tendency is most evident in Ulysses in which, "a vast number of references and cross-references . . . relate to each other independently of the time sequence of the narrative."²⁰ An interesting reversal of this argument can be found in Etienne Souriau's "Time in the Plastic Arts," in which it is argued that spatiality and temporality cannot be considered independently since all art is "built upon a space-time network."²¹
I believe that if *ekphrasis* is once again to be an effective tool of critical examination, the question of medium must be approached from a different spectrum of values. Rather than emphasize differences and similarities, I think that it is helpful first to consider the etymological derivation of the word "medium" and the universal function it serves in every art form. Medium (from Latin *medius*, middle) was first defined as the artistic techniques determined by the materials or creative methods used as a subsidiary to the original application of the word, according to the *OED*: "An intermediate agency, means, instrument, or channel." With the added sense of intermediacy, standing between, "medium" in artistic usages takes on more resonant connotations than the simple meaning of the physical tools of artistic creation. A portrait, for example, is a subspecies of the visual medium, and it is created by means of the painter's particular physical medium—oils, water colors, pastels, etc.—but the artist's most significant medium, in the truest sense of the word, is the work itself. The portrait occupies an intermediate position between the painter and his subject, and the particular techniques that he uses are the means by which his subject (whether drawn strictly from empirical observation, imaginative invention, or a combination of the two) is revealed to the viewer. And similarly, a musician's medium is sound, and the musical instruments through which the sound is relayed is his mechanical medium, but it is the particular
form that a composer imposes upon the randomness of natural sound that most characterizes his true medium. In both of these cases, the medium is "an agency, a means, an instrument, or channel" through which the raw, natural substances of life or reality are transformed into works of art. M. H. Abrams provides a convenient pattern to illustrate the four co-ordinates of artist, reader, medium, and reality:  

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

The medium can be viewed as the artist's material, technique, and finished product—all in all.

The novelist's medium is, quite simply, language. But yet, like the other arts I have mentioned, the novelist's true medium consists of all the tools of his trade—imagery, symbolism, dialogue, exposition, etc.—with which he reveals his subject. The finished work occupies a medial position between the novelist and reader and the subject matter of the novel—the life it attempts to evoke. Ian Watt in *The Rise of the Novel* defines this medial position as "the correspondence between the literary work and the reality it imitates."  

This medial position or correspondence represents the realistic perspective of the novel. The search for a true correspondence between life and art is the dominant concern of
realistic novels. It must be a correspondence which implies that the view of life presented is authentic, based on facts, real things (realism derives from the Latin res, thing) not untruths. The ambition of realistic novelists, according to David Goldknopf, to "maintain the illusion that narratives were not fictional at all,"24 has forced them to be aware of changes in what is mimetically accurate. Watt's definition of a realistic novel as an "accurate account" providing "details" and "particulars"25 implies that there can be few unalterable conventions of realistic presentation since details and particulars change with alterations in the social milieu, along with what man believes accurate and true about his experience. John Loofbourow carries Watt's implications to their logical conclusion: "there will be, of course, different realisms at different times and in different contexts."26 As man's view of his world changes, novelists make technical adjustments to account for this perceptual change in order that their works might correspond faithfully to the new view of life.

A novelist constantly must be aware of the pressures of reality upon the realistic conventions of his medium. He can choose not to heed these pressures and strike off at another angle, but he cannot ignore them. But as sensitive as he might be to the demands of reality, he cannot duplicate it. As E. H. Gombrich in Art and Illusion writes of the painter: "He cannot transcribe what he sees; he can only translate
it into the terms of his medium. The conventions that compose a novelist's realism are the terms of translation, of which Gombrich writes, they are Watt's correspondents to reality, and they occupy the medial position between the reader and the raw, uninterpreted life that is reality. And since these conventions are not fixed and unalterable, a novelist is compelled to reinforce their claim to verisimilitude by subtle devices, of which ekphrasis is one.

With an ekphrastic artifact, a novelist can portray an art form upon which reality exerts the same pressure as upon the novel, and the way in which he shows the interpolated form responding to this pressure is often analogous to the way the novel responds. Realism in the novel implies a search for a true correspondence between life and art, and a novelist will often defend his mimesis or correspondence by portraying, for the purposes of comparison and contrast, both true and false correspondences in interpolated art forms.

In conventional usage, ekphrasis is limited to the interpolation of visual or spatial art forms within narratives. But in the novel the ekphrastic convention has been widened to include virtually all of the arts. Still, forms that are different from the novel compose the greatest part of novel's ekphrastic heritage. By portraying how another art form yields or withstands the demands of reality, the novelist can maintain a higher degree of self-effacement than if he were to create a character who is a novelist and interpolate a novel
within his own work. By the use of another medium, he can show more effectively where his novel stands in relation to life and still maintain the illusion of authorial effacement. So different art forms are ekphrastically portrayed not to highlight differences and similarities of media but to show how they too must respond to the demands of reality.

E. The Language of the Real and the Ideal

One of the most influential commentaries of the twentieth-century on realism and naturalism in art is Wilhelm Worringer's *Abstraction and Empathy* (1908). Worringer's work is an amply-documented, scholastic argument against artistic philosophies too firmly grounded on the representation of natural forms, mimesis; and as such it had an enormous vogue among the turn-of-the-century aestheticians and artists who rebelled against the Realism of the previous decades. Worringer describes mimesis as the impulse toward empathy—the ability to project one's self into the objective forms of natural life and to derive aesthetic pleasure from this sublimation. According to Worringer, the artistic technique for mimesis is, of course, objective representation, and the periods in which this technique and aesthetic have dominated include the classical age, the Renaissance, and most European history until the end of the nineteenth-century. The opposing impulse he defines as the impulse toward abstraction which is evident in most primitive art, Egyptian painting, Byzantine mosaic, Romanesque sculpture, and much of twentieth-century art.
Worringer finds the purest expression of the impulse toward abstraction in Oriental and Eastern art, of which he writes:

The happiness they sought from art did not consist in the possibility of projecting themselves into the things of the outer world, of enjoying themselves in them, but in the possibility of taking the individual thing of the external world out of its arbitrariness and fortuitousness, of externalizing it by approximation to abstract forms and, in this manner, of finding a point of tranquility and a refuge from appearances. Their most powerful urge was, so to speak, to wrest the object out of the external world out of its natural context... to purify it of all its dependence upon life. . . .

Without engaging in an extended debate on mimesis versus abstraction, I contend that both of the impulses that Worringer describes can be adapted to the theory of realism I have proposed. Instead of a narrow definition of representation, realism stands for all the conventions a novelist or artist uses to explore the relationship between his work and reality. Whether an artist attempts to give an illusion of reproducing a natural object, or whether he attempts to remove it from its natural context in the form of abstraction, he has, in both cases, established a relationship between the artifact and the external world; albeit in the latter case, the relationship is one of opposition.

Although Worringer is concerned primarily with the spatial arts, the tendencies he describes are applicable to the novel as well. Indeed, because of the artistic universality of
these tendencies, the novelist is able to portray them in ekphrastic scenes in order to show which of the two choices he has made in composing his novel. His choice represents his response to what I have defined as the pressure of reality. Nearly every critic who has attempted a theoretical history of the novel has taken these tendencies into account. Scholes and Kellogg describe two antithetical kinds of narrative: out of the impulses that Worringer calls empathy emerge "empirical" narratives which show "allegiance to reality," and out of what he describes as abstraction emerge "fictional" narratives which show "allegiance to the ideal." 30 W. J. Harvey in Character and the Novel suggests that as Aristotle's "Art Imitates Nature" is the basis of realism in the novel, it is necessary to define more accurately what is meant by "Imitation." Harvey is close to Watt in finding imitation as a correspondence to reality, although he defines this correspondence as "angle of mimesis." 31 Novels which are most purely representational are nearly parallel to life; those which are more idealistic or fantastical are at wider mimetic angles. The former he calls a mimetic mode of the novel, the latter an autonomous one. David Goldkropf in The Life of the Novel locates the two impulses in the polar opposition of inner and outer in Cartesian philosophy: the subjective (usually idealistic) impulse is a "psychological" form of narrative, the outer (usually realistic) one is "empirical." 32

The impulse a novelist obeys affects the entirety of his
medium, not the least of which is his practical medium, language. One of the most influential studies to examine the uses of language in the context of abstraction-empathy is I. A. Richards' *Principles of Literary Criticism*. His famous formulation of this dichotomy is worth quoting in its entirety:

A statement may be used for the sake of reference, true or false, which it causes. This is the *scientific* use of language. But it may also be used for the sake of the effects in emotion and attitude produced by the reference it occasions. This is the *emotive* use of language.

The scientific or denotative use of language is obviously the vehicle for the expression of the impulse which has been variously described as empathetic, mimetic, and empirical. The nature of symbolization in scientific use of language is referential—the correspondence between symbol and fact is as direct and unequivocal as possible. The abstractive, fictional, and idealistic impulses rely most heavily on emotive uses of language. Emotive or connotative uses of language are more affective, and as they aspire less toward representation, they call attention to themselves as autonomous structures.

A majority of the critics who write of the language of the novel describe it in terms closer to Richards' scientific than his emotional uses. Watt traces the origins of fictional
language to "a prose which restricts itself almost entirely to a descriptive and denotative use. . . ."34 And he finds realism in the novel characterized by "a more largely referential use of language than is common in other literary forms."35 Marvin Mudrick writes that a novelist's allegiance is so strong to the facts and actions he describes that he must make his language so unobtrusive as to be transparent. "In prose fiction," he writes, "the unit is not, as in poetry, the word, but the event."36 Mudrick's formulation is very close to that of F. W. Bateson who writes: "If words are the media of poetry, what are the media of prose? . . . The answer would seem to be Ideas."37 And similarly, Christopher Caudwell in Illusion and Reality posits: "in the novel [as opposed to poetry] the emotional associations attach not to words but to the moving current of mock reality symbolized by the words."38

The most persuasive and studied rebuttal to these charges that the language of prose and the language of poetry are inherently different is David Lodge's The Language of Fiction. Lodge argues that the symbolization of experience is the process of both novel and poetry and that each makes use of emotive and scientific language. The novel is no more than poetry a mirror image of fact or event. He writes: "Language--the particular selection and arrangement of words of which a work of literature is composed--is the only objective and fixed datum."39 Lodge's argument is, I think, self-evident, for
any use of language is a process of symbolization, and, hence, an idealization of experience. The only class of being restricted to a form of communication which is solely empirical and referential is the animal. This is the observation of Stuart Chase in The Tyranny of Words; observing his cat Hobie, Chase conjectures: "Hobie can never learn to talk... He can utter cries indicating pain, pleasure, excitement. He can announce that he wants to go out of doors... But he cannot master words and language... [Thus] he will remain a realist all his life."^40

Granting, then, that by its very nature language is idealizational, it can never offer an exact reproduction of a fact or an event. As A. A. Mendilow notes in Time and the Novel: "Language does not reflect reality but transmutes it into something vastly different."^41 Language can, however, by denotative or connotative uses be closer or further removed from the empirical experience it attempts to describe. The novel's allegiance to the concrete world of fact and the idealizational world of language is dual but not equal. Harry Levin is correct in his assumption that all novels contain realistic and romantic tendencies,^42 but in most works one tendency is subordinated to the other. And as these tendencies affect language, they warp the novelist's medium into directions of either representation or idealization.

Through an ekphrastic scene, which portrays an interpolated art form moving under the pressures of reality
toward empathy or abstraction, a novelist can provide an
implicit commentary on how his medium, language, responds in
a similar or dissimilar manner. Don Quixote, again, provides
the paradigm for this use of ekphrasis. Cervantes introduces
several different narrators at different points of his story
whom he describes as either poets or historians. The poets
use language according to the dictates of their ideals, and
for their purposes a barber's basin is as likely an object as
any to be called the Helmet of Mambrino. To the historians,
who obey the evidence of empirical experience, a barber's basin
is a barber's basin, nothing more. In the ekphrastic episode
of Master Peter's puppet show, Cervantes brings all of these
narrators together, allowing each to comment in his own manner.
The result is a riotously humorous collision of views and inter-
pretations, which, nonetheless, makes one of the fullest phil-
osophical statements in novel literature on the limitations of
language.

Emma is a novel whose primary subject is its heroine's
education in the proper and improper uses of language. The
world of Jane Austen is one of social stability, and the
typical plot of her novels is the union of socially equal
partners in marriage and the alignment of characters according
to their proper caste. In Emma, Austen deliberately confuses
the proper relationship of characters, their caste positions,
and their moral values. By limiting herself for the greater
part of the novel to the erroneous point of view of her heroine,
Austen draws her reader into the circle of deception and forces him to follow Emma's arduous education. The evidence of her education is her response to one of the novel's ekphrastic forms, Frank Churchill's epistles, which are circumlocutious distortions of the novel's primary values.

In Anna Karenina, Tolstoy's ekphrastic portrait of Anna is an analogue of his literary portrait of her. The ekphrasis offers two portraits: Vronsky's and Mihailov's. The former is drawn from convention and its maker's imagination which distorts Anna's physical characteristic to conform to an otherworldly ideal. The latter, on the other hand, so fully reveals Anna's physical being that the medium of oil and canvas seems to disappear and it becomes, "not a picture but a living, lovely woman. . . ."

The medium of language in Tolstoy's novel aspires toward a transparency which is similar to his painter Mihailov's medium. In such scenes as Levin mowing, or Vronsky confessing to Anna during the snowstorm, the barrier of language seems to disappear and as readers we respond to the scenes' physical contexts in much the same way as do the characters—through our senses.

The encyclopedia of literary styles in Ulysses makes it difficult to speak of Joyce's uses of language in the singular. To ignore the multiplicity of language and theme is to deprive Ulysses the recognition of one of its most significant innovations. As the Linati and Gilbert schemata indicate, Joyce strove to view each episode from different artistic, technical,
and symbolic perspectives. By shifting his emphasis, Joyce illustrates the relationship between Stephen and Bloom alternately as Telemachus and Odysseus, Hamlet and Shakespeare (or Hamlet and Hamlet Sr.), Don Giovanni and the Commendatore from Mozart's opera, Tonic and Dominant keys in a classical sonata, idealistic and realistic impulses, and father and son. By widening the spectrum in which his characters are examined, Joyce places them in what seems a universal context. The symbolic value of his characters is enlarged to include as many representative examples of the archetypal myth that underlies Ulysses, giving it shape and meaning.

Joyce's multiformity of theme is reflected in the multifariousness of his uses of language. The pastiches of literary styles in "Oxen of the Sun" represent what Joyce has been engaged in throughout the novel: the exploration of the many ways language can be used to examine his subject. As Joyce treats the coming together of Stephen and Bloom as many variations on the theme of consubstantiality (one of the most significant of which is the union of ideal and real), so does he treat language as many variations of artistic representation, ranging from the extremes of realistic and symbolic expression. Because of the linguistic mean Joyce achieves between idealistic and realistic rendering, the expressive values of Ulysses are close to those of Don Quixote, in which the Canon praises both romances and histories and in which Cervantes himself delegates his narrative authority equally
to his interpolated narrators, the poets and historians. In *Ulysses* there are many plays on the difference between referential and emotive uses of language which Cervantes treats by allowing his hero to transform an ordinary article of toilet by renaming from a "barber's basin" to the "helmet of Mambrino." Stephen's ashplant, for example, is transformed from its ordinary usage in "Telemachus" to the apocalyptic sword of Siegfried, Nothung, from Wagner's *Götterdämmerung* when in "Circe," Stephen renames it, uses it in its symbolic function, and:
"Time's livid flame leaps with the ruin of all space ..." (53).

Joyce's Odyssean frame is a kind of buried ekphrasis. It does not emerge by name, nor is it examined by the characters in any one specific scene; rather it emerges in the very actions of the characters themselves as they conform to the epic's archetypal pattern. There are, as I have mentioned, ekphrastic forms which, by analogy, duplicate what are for Joyce the essential features of Homer's epic. One of these is Shakespeare's *Hamlet* which is introduced in a scene that contains the typical elements of an ekphrastic debate similar to those between the Canon and the priest in *Don Quixote*, Emma and Mr. Knightley in *Emma*, and Vronsky and Mihailov in *Anna Karenina*. The idealistic and realistic impulses which motivate Stephen and George Russell's debate on *Hamlet* also find expression in another of *Ulysses*' ekphrases--the Don and Commendatore in Mozart's *Don Giovanni*. But one of the most extended and essential ekphrastic versions of the theme of consubstantiality
(and the one I have chosen to explicate) is the scene in which Stephen plays on a piano in Bella Cohen's brothel, discusses musical theory with his acquaintance Lynch (and by hallucinatory transference, Lynch's cap), and states the novel's major concerns in terms of the unification of Tonic and Dominant keys in a classical sonata.

Similar to the multiplicity of Ulysses, the encyclopedic form of Gravity's Rainbow presents enormous evidence for two different views of life which presuppose two diametrically different forms of art. At one extreme is purely empirical art, of which Pavlov's The Book is the clearest example. Devoted exclusively to the study of cause and effect, The Book fulfills Hugh Kenner's definition of empirical narration as "only the things an observer would have experienced . . . in the order in which he would have experienced them." The Book, as well as other empirical art forms, share a discontinuous relationship with the norms of Gravity's Rainbow. At the other extreme, Pynchon illustrates preverbal communication, Kabbalist mythology, oral myth, and the songs of the primitive Agyn, about which the Russian Tchitcherine realizes, "soon someone will come out and write some of these down in the new Turkic alphabet he helped frame . . . and this is how they will be lost." Pynchon's refusal to allow his narration to be governed by the dictates of cause and effect shows that his work's mimetic norms are more continuous with the ekphrastic songs and myths of Gravity's Rainbow's primitive tribes, the
Ayn and the Herowes. By means of such an identification, Pynchon aligns himself against uses of language that rely too strictly upon the grammatical and logical strictures of cause and effect. As opposed to the verbal freedom of the primitive forms, The Book and the Turkic alphabet make the medium of language a rigid, deterministic form of expression.

The most extended example, however, of an empirical art form of causal design in Gravity's Rainbow is the ekphrastic use of film. The unalterable continuity of frames in a reel suggests the causal rigidity of determinism. And as Pynchon makes Gravity's Rainbow a parodic imitation of popular American and German Expressionist films, he illustrates their destructive effects by showing his characters either trapped by or escaping from the deterministic sequence of film reality.

F. Ekphrastic Symbolism

It should be fairly obvious that the use I have proposed for ekphrasis is its value as symbol. Northrop Frye's general description of symbol is an adequate definition of the widest meaning of ekphrasis—"a unit of any literary structure that can be isolated for critical attention." But Frye makes his general description more specific by distinguishing between two kinds of symbols that point toward different directions in meaning. One is directed outwardly or centrifugally, outside the reading and toward the things that the words or verbal units denote in conventional association. The other
is directed inwardly or centripetally, pointing the verbal units toward other such units to form motifs that compose autonomous structures. The latter direction, according to Frye, is the direction of literary meaning and literary symbolism.  

What is interesting about Frye's formulation is that he does not interpret a symbol in a work of literature as an isolated unit. The verbal unit that composes a symbol interacts with other units to form a symbolic system which we see in the structure of a motif. Similarly, an individual scene in a novel which features an interpolated art form as a symbol of the novel's formal characteristics is not an isolated unit; it is, rather, a part of the novel's ekphrastic system. An ekphrasis will interact with other ekphrases in a novel to compose a motif which is the fullest statement of a novelist's formal and mimetic norms. Thus, the ekphrastic marionette show in Don Quixote can only be understood in the context of the Canon's and priest's debate on romances, the helmet of Mambrino, the song of Chrysostom, and the interpolated novellas such as "The Tale of the Foolish Curiosity." Frank Churchill's epistles provide the clearest focus of Jane Austen's concern over the referential accuracy of language, but the focus can be widened to include Emma's portrait of Harriet Smith and, most importantly, the various verbal games in Emma—Mr. Elton's charade, Mr. Weston's conundrum, and Frank's letter puzzle. And in Anna Karenina, Mihailov's and Vronsky's portraits of Anna are comparable and contrastable examples of Tolstoy's
theory of art which is also illustrated by Mihailov’s painting of Christ and Pilate, the French artist's illustrations to the Bible, the King Lear Fantasy for Orchestra that Levin criticizes, and the aborted works of Golenishchev.

In the context of ekphrastic systems, the multiplicity of interpolated art forms in Ulysses and Gravity's Rainbow is not in itself exceptional. What is exceptional is the degree of multiplicity. In Ulysses the coming together of Stephen and Bloom is portrayed ekphrastically as the resolution of Tonic and Dominant keys in a sonata, the discovery of Odysseus of Telemachus, the creation of Hamlet by Shakespeare, the subduing of Don Giovanni by the Commendatore, the return of Sinbad the Sailor, and many more. And in Gravity's Rainbow, the plots of literally a score of popular films are given special significance by ekphrastic parallels with Rilke's Duino Elegies, Pavlov's The Book, the myths of the Hereroes, the songs of the Aqyn, and the music of Rossini and Beethoven.

G. Ekphrasis and Realism

As symbol ekphrasis is used as a self-conscious tool for authors to examine the relations between their works and reality. It is thus a convention of realism; it is, perhaps, one of the most crucial conventions of realism which begins, as Watt suggests, as a search for a true correspondence between life and art. With an ekphrastic form, a novelist has the means to examine internally the mimetic correspondence upon
which his work is based. And a literary critic, concentrating on the ekphrastic tradition in the novel, is able to trace a history of realism by the interpretation of these self-conscious statements contained in texts of every literary period. The works I have chosen for close examination are not included in the study by virtue of their coincidental use of ekphrasis. They are works I consider crucial to any theory of realism in the novel; that they all contain ekphrastic scenes is a testament to the convention's timeless relevance. The ekphrases in these novels reflect historical changes in literary realism.

Cervantes, in *Don Quixote*, defines realism in the novel as a mixture of realism and idealism. To show the absurdities of romantic conventions, Cervantes embodied them in the absurd figure of Alonso Quixano, who, having gone mad from reading too many romantic fictions of knight-errantry, dubs himself Don Quixote de la Mancha, the heir to the glory of Amadis de Gaul. But Cervantes must have realized early that in condemning fictions he was creating one himself, and because of this paradox he chose to call his work a history and attribute its composition primarily to a fictitious historian--Cide Hamete Benengeli. A history is understood to be the statement of true facts, and Cervantes wanted to evoke in his work the same degree of verisimilitude. The conflict between appearance and reality in *Don Quixote*, then, is not between a solid, palpable reality and a disembodied, ephemeral ideal, but
between a fictitious reality and a fictitious ideal. This paradox provided Cervantes with a continuing argument, which, directly and indirectly, generates most of the action and interest of the novel. By confusing the verisimilar claims of both the idealistic poets and the empirical historians, by having the Canon find histories and romances equally true, by displaying a "true" puppet knight and a "false" flesh and blood one, and finally by questioning both Don Quixote's romantic daydreaming and Sancho Panza's realistic literalness, Cervantes touches the heart of the realistic dilemma.

By means of the ekphrases in Don Quixote, Cervantes illustrates that a writer, aspiring to achieve verisimilitude, can neither re-create the "real" external world with raw empirical experience alone nor with only idealistic imaginings. Fictional truth, he demonstrates, is achieved by means of an accurate correspondence between the world as perceived by the senses and the world as created in the imagination. As Cervantes defines it, realism is the search for the truthful correspondence between the creative imagination of the artist and the external world he attempts to evoke. In giving disproportionate emphasis neither to the interior imagination, nor to the external world, and rather in emphasizing the correspondence itself in manifold ways, Don Quixote is the exemplary realistic novel, the mean by which all others can be defined. All trends in fiction can be measured by the distance and direction they move from Cervantes' paradigmatic model.
The direction that the genre moves in the nineteenth-century from Cervantes' paradigm is further away from the romance and closer to empirical representation. In fact, realism in the novel aligns itself so closely with the impulse called empiricism that fiction writers of the other persuasion, such as Hawthorne, Scott, Bulwer-Lytton, and Poe were compelled to distinguish their works from novels by emphasizing their status as romances. Like Cervantes in *Don Quixote*, Austen in *Emma* creates a quixotic protagonist, *Emma*, who is an "imaginist." But unlike Cervantes, Austen is unequivocal in her dismissal of romantic idealizing in favor of accurate and truthful observation. The ekphrastic forms in *Emma* illustrate the dangers of representing character idealistically, higher than its proper station in a world of rigid social caste. *Emma*'s ekphrastic portrait of Harriet Smith portrays this limited "natural daughter of somebody,"48 as a refined lady, and the result of this falsification is very nearly disastrous for everyone concerned. And Frank Churchill's ekphrastic epistles which misrepresent himself and his intentions almost sabotage the two marriages that provide the novel with a happy ending. Austen's novels create a kind of social realism, one whose empirical impulse is based on an experience formed not so much from an individual's sensory perceptions as from the society's collective agreement of the proper state of truth.

Tolstoy's novels, on the other hand, create a kind of
spiritual realism. His empiricism moves away from social agreement to the individual's sensory perception as the proper standard with which to judge truth. But as the ekphrastic scenes in *Anna Karenina* show, Tolstoy's empiricism is not the clinical, scientific method of a Zola. Mihailov's portraits reveal the physical characteristics of his subjects so accurately that their spiritual natures are also revealed. His portrait of Christ is significantly, "a man made God, and not God made man" (501). The revelation of Christ's divinity is through his human, physical characteristics. And in his portrait of Anna, Mihailov captures just the features that Tolstoy has emphasized in Anna's expression which are the embodiment of her vital ardor. Tolstoy rejects Vronsky's portrait of Anna which is sketched according to the dictates of a preconceived ideal. His rejection of Vronsky's portrait is reflected in Levin's dismissal of the abstract speculations and theories of pseudo-scientists, priests, metaphysicians, and spiritualists who attempt to find meaning in life within the comfortable confines of a single philosophical preconception. Levin discovers life's meaning instead in an acceptance of the basic, seemingly paradoxical, qualities of natural life—intuition, fatherhood, labor, and the understanding between people in love that is beyond that attained by verbal expression.

The direction that realism takes with Joyce's *Ulysses* is away from the empirical bias of conventional nineteenth-century
Realism and closer to Cervantes' paradigm. Cervantes creates in *Don Quixote* a fiction which is balanced between reality and romance: it is a world in which both poet and historian, Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, ideal and real have a part in making. Cervantes' dual allegiance is reflected in Joyce's theory of consubstantiality. Stephen and Bloom, son and father, Christ and God the Father, earth and sun, Telemachus and Odysseus, Tonic and Dominant are all illustrations of the union of ideal and real. These thematic examples of idealistic and realistic consubstantiality are reflected also in the formal characteristics of *Ulysses*. As perhaps residue of Joyce's Realistic period, in which he wrote *Dubliners* and *Stephen Hero*, *Ulysses* is constructed upon a concrete Realistic framework characterized by specificity, accuracy of detail, precise description, and catalogue. Joyce's heritage from Realism compelled him to provide this base from which he could launch into imaginative flights of fancy.

The concept of realism as parody turns, from *Don Quixote* to *Ulysses*, a full circle. As I suggested earlier, realism began as parody, an ironic contrast of a false view of life with a truer one. Cervantes' ironic position, though, was to hold a clear, distinct mirror before the exaggerated distortions of Chivalric Romance in order to show the unreality of its vision; whereas Joyce held a quicksilvered, distorting reflector before the basic characters and conventions of Conventional Realism to show that its view was far too narrow.
and circumscribed to serve as medium for man's now wider view of himself in nature. Both authors attempted to restore a balance between the external world and the artist's creative vision that was missing in the prevailing tradition. Cervantes proved that romance had to be grounded upon the firm soil of everyday reality, and Joyce showed that the external world should serve only as raw material for the re-creative abilities of the artistic imagination.

The remedies Cervantes and Joyce prescribed set the tone for the direction of realism for novelists who followed them. Cervantes' realistic perspective on romance turned fiction more in the direction of empirical observation, culminating finally in the fin de siècle movement of Realism. Joyce's unrestrained imaginative view of everyday life turned many writers away from Realistic conventions to more experimental and innovative techniques of narrative. Pynchon's Gravity's Rainbow signals this new direction of realism. Pynchon's views of Realistic conventions, as evidenced by his symbolic use of film, behaviorism, Pavlov's The Book, and the Turkic alphabet, show that his abhorrence of cause and effect is a rejection of empiricism as the sole means of acquiring knowledge. His use of spiritualism, magic, hallucination, and mathematics represents some of the other means that he believes are now just as relevant.

A theory of realism in the novel is an epistemological approach to generic definition. Of all literary forms, the
novel has the greatest potential for a full examination of the self's relation to the world, and thus it has accrued the responsibility of faithfully rendering this relation, forgetting neither the perceiving mind nor the world in which it exists. As an epistemological tool, the novel parallels, if not anticipates, changes in man's perception of himself as he exists in the world, and those novels which relate the change by an adjustment of formal technique have had a tendency to examine themselves according to their faithful correspondence to the "real" world they represent. These are the novels I contend are realistic. They are the ones that provide the most explicit self-definitions, of which ekphrasis is one, for they must renew the continual dialectic concerning art and representation, justifying themselves and disclaiming the prevailing convention. Harry Levin writes that "yesterday's realism is today's convention," for realism is never static, nor can it be used as a qualitative comparison: it merely denotes change.
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II. THE PUPPET IN THE ROMANCE

A. Cervantes' Narrative Fugue

Don Quixote and Sancho complied and went to the show, which was now set up and uncovered; and they found it looking gay and resplendent, being lit all round by a multitude of wax tapers. On their arrival Master Peter got inside, as it was he who had to work the puppets in the play; and outside stood a boy, Master Peter's servant, to serve as interpreter and announacer of the mysteries of the show, holding in his hand a wand with which he pointed out the figures as they appeared.

When everyone in the inn was in his place, some standing in front of the show, and Don Quixote, Sancho, the page and the scholar in the best positions, the interpreter began to announce what the hearer or the reader of the following chapter will hear or see.

In this section which serves as an introduction to the chapter devoted to Master Peter's puppet show in Book Two of Don Quixote, Cervantes describes one of a series of the novel's narrators as he, directing the reader with his invisible wand, describes the puppet show's narrator who, with a wand, describes the puppet-characters for Cervantes' characters, Don Quixote and Sancho. Thus begins one of the most complex chapters of Don Quixote, an ekphrastic scene that presents a series of images of the novel's narrator as though he were reflected in a tunnel of mirrors. It should be noted that this dense narrative texture is one of the baroque elements of the novel. A characteristic of the art of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is the creation of multiple perspectives by means of shifting the focus of perception. Such shifts are created by
Shakespeare's placing a play within the play Hamlet, Vermeer's painting an artist painting a subject in "The Studio," Lope de Vega's writing about a sonnet in his sonnet "Soneto de repente" or about literature in general in La Dorotea. This perspectivism finds its essential expression in the dominant form of baroque music, the fugue.

Cervantes develops the perspectives of Don Quixote in a manner similar to the way Bach weaves the complex pattern of a fugue—by structuring mirror or nearly identical themes in relationships of increasing complexity. The essence of baroque counterpoint is the interplay of likenesses. Bach shows that a relatively simple theme played in inversion, augmentation, diminution, or in two or three part development (sometimes, as in the Art of the Fugue, in every conceivable form) will dizzy the listener with the illusion of an infinite number of thematic possibilities contained within itself. The same complexity of design underlying apparently simple material can be seen in Don Quixote episode after episode.

Nowhere, though, is the perspectival intricacy of Don Quixote more apparent than in ekphrastic scenes which portray the reading, creating, or performing of fiction. The ekphrastic system of Don Quixote reveals numerous examples of the fiction-maker motif: they range from the five interpolated novelles of Book One, which appear superficially to be independent of the primary story, to the more reflexive tales of Book Two (such as the puppet show, the elaborate Trifaldi play of
the Duke and Duchess, Don Quixote's vision in the cave of Montesinos), which are fictions commenting more directly upon the larger fiction in which they exist. Fiction-making, the act of re-creating the world by means of imaginative transformations, is the central theme of Cervantes' novel, and he treats it as Bach would a fugal theme—by mirroring it endlessly. As in a fugue, the original version of the theme appears more complex with each successive imitation until it finally merges into a seemingly endless series of redoubled patterns.

Cervantes' theme of fiction-making is redoubled numerous times by the creation of a series of characters as authors of the novel within the novel (in whom Cervantes implicitly characterizes himself). When all of these author-characters seem to converge upon the stage at once—upon the stage, as I shall show, of Master Peter's puppet play—the reader is afforded a perspective of the narrative as a series of author-characters identified implicitly or explicitly as the narrator of the novel Don Quixote. The narration of the episode is, quite simply, a straight-forward account of Don Quixote and Sancho as they attend the marionette theater of Master Peter, itinerant showman. While an assistant narrates the story and points out significant action with a pointing-stick, Master Peter works the puppet's strings from behind the stage. The story they perform is the liberation of Melisandra from Moorish imprisonment by her knight-errant husband Sir Gaiferos—a chivalric legend from French and Spanish ballads. Don Quixote, easily deluded by this artistic illusion into believing the
play real, leaps upon the stage and attacks the Moorish villains with his sword, smashing the puppets to bits. This simple description of the action belies the episode's narrative intricacy. George Haley and Ruth El Saffar have shown in their respective studies of the narrative of Don Quixote that if the voices of all the narrators who speak here (and the still resonant voices of those who have spoken earlier in the novel) are considered separately, a complex pattern emerges. For a full appreciation of the scene's complexity, I feel that it is necessary to know each of these narrators and the function he serves in the novel.

The original narrative voice speaks to the reader from the novel's opening page and is the one that, in most other novels, would be considered the narrator of the story. He displays himself as an historian, a scrupulous compiler of written facts concerning Don Quixote. But the documented sources of this First Author (as I shall call him) fail him during his narration of one of the knight's early adventures, and he leaves the story unfinished. Then, another voice rises from the page. The Second Author, who is introduced in the ninth chapter of Book One, speaks in first-person to the reader as a fellow reader whose frustration with the First Author's failure to complete his story drives him to search throughout Spain for the document containing the conclusion. By accident, he discovers an obscure Arabic manuscript which is the complete history of Don Quixote, and the rest of the
novel, from the unfinished adventure to the end, is to be considered the impartial rendering of this authentic document. The Second Author, however, intrudes into the narrative on numerous occasions, and he must hire a Spanish-speaking Moor to translate the manuscript. This translator uses the poetic license of a Third Author to alter the facts given in the original account. All of these intrusions and qualifications tend to diffuse the claim of authenticity for this original, true history composed by the Fourth Author, and the final one—Cide Hamete Benengeli, Arabic historian.

With the creation of four characters as authors of the novel, Cervantes presents an extremely complicated narrative structure, and yet he complicates it further by redoubling and extending his series of narrators with each presentation of an interpolated story. Thus, Master Peter's puppet show has an intrusive narrator, the assistant who is the "interpreter and announcer" (638) of the story. Master Peter, who controls the actions of the characters by means of puppet strings, gives the appearance of the Flaubertian author who is "present everywhere but visible nowhere."6 Finally, Don Quixote creates the story of the puppet show in the same manner in which he creates all of the situations that occur to him—by transforming it into his own fictional world, a world he carries, writes Marthe Robert, "inside himself like an incurable wound."5

In this example of a story within the story, and in numerous other examples as well, Cervantes narrates his novel as a
fugue in several voices. Thus, the reader is aware not only of the story before him, but also of what David Thorburn calls "the drama of the telling," the struggle of several different narrators to interpret and to relay this story to him. In such a manner, the processes of fiction are themselves dramatized and are examined so thoroughly that Cervantes can be said to have portrayed nearly all the narrative stances that novelists can assume toward their material.

Broadly speaking, fiction-making is, to Cervantes, the imaginative re-creation of the world through artistic representation. In Don Quixote, the fictionmakers (in addition to the four narrators of the novel) are romancers, historians, puppeteers, poets, and musicians. The relationships of these fictionmakers to each other form a continual debate on the subject of verisimilitude, the "true" representation of "reality." The subject is debated by two opposing groups of artist-characters which can be called Poets and Historians. Scholes and Kellogg in The Nature of Narrative write of Don Quixote: "As the entire narrative turns on the interplay between a realistic and an idealistic view of life, the opposition between poet and historian is a crucial one to the whole conception of the book." The Poet is the idealist whose imaginative re-creation of the world is not limited to mere facts which require proof from the senses. His imagination, overcoming the representational demands of reality, takes an active role in transforming physical detail and in rearranging historical sequence. The
clearest example of the Poet is, of course, Don Quixote. The Historian is the realist whose imaginative re-creation of the world yields to the demands of reality for accuracy in presenting details and for giving a faithful mirror's reflection of events. The Historian generally assumes a corrective position toward the Poet. As Don Quixote is allowed by Cervantes alternately to yield to physical necessity, then to overcome it, so the novel expresses sympathy for both idealist and realist views of artistic representation. The struggle between the Poet and Historian is most evident in the section concerning Master Peter and his puppet show, but to understand clearly the terms of the argument, one must see first how it evolves throughout the novel as a debate on language.

B. The Language of the Real and Ideal in Don Quixote

The ekphrastic form within the novel represents a transformation of the basic material (the "reality") of the story into an aesthetic medium. Language is the medium of the novel, and it is the standard for whose measure other artistic media are evoked. All the debates in Don Quixote on the authenticity and veracity of poems, legends, knighthly artifacts, songs, and plays turn into semantic debates on correct naming, or the proper and improper use of language. As it is true for Don Quixote, it is true also for many novels which contain a work of art—the explicit argument over the work's verisimilar features is paralleled by an implicit argument on verisimilitude
through the medium of language. Cervantes portrays the debate continually as a dialectic between an author and a reader. The seven author-characters the reader is aware of during Master Peter's puppet show have narrated their versions of Don Quixote after it has been narrated to them by their predecessors, and they have altered it according to their different views of language, which are, writes Leo Spitzer, "different reflections of reality." Thus they serve the dual function of author and reader—each provides a story and each provides a response. For this reason, they cannot be considered seven independent voices but six different pairs of speakers/listeners, authors/readers. Each narrator posits a theory of artistic realism in response to the narrator he has just heard, and he then passes on his version (along with his criticism of the previous account) to another listener/reader who becomes a narrator; the cycle is repeated over and over. Paradoxically, the effect of breaking up the narrative into seven distinct parts is both remedial in regard to the word's necessity to render faithfully the thing it describes, and ironically subversive of any theory of language or literature which implies a fixed "realistic" relationship between word and thing.

Don Quixote is the last reader and fictionmaker in the series for Master Peter's puppet show, and, even though his authority is undercut throughout the novel, he is still the most significant figure, the one to which all others must respond. It is with him that any study of the fictionmaker must
begin. When he leaps upon the stage, giving the puppets slashes and blows with his sword, Don Quixote's reaction as a reader to the fiction presented before him is precisely the same response he gave as reader of chivalric romances--he is unable to distinguish fictive from everyday realities. The fictions which he read in these tales of knight-errantry were so obsessive to him that "he passed sleepless nights trying to understand them and disentangle their meaning, though Aristotle himself would never have unravelled them or understood them, even if he had been resurrected for that sole purpose" (32). Aristotle is invoked here to define, by opposition, the reality rendered by these romances. As primary advocate of the theory of the precedence of sense perceptions in human knowledge, Aristotle is considered a forerunner of empirical analysis, even though, like Plato, he believed in universals as the ultimate truths. According to Ian Watt, realism in the novel is derived from the philosophical background of the empiricism and rationalism developed by Locke and Descartes; its premises or major conventions are, he writes in The Rise of the Novel, that "the novel is a full and authentic report of human experience, and is therefore under an obligation to satisfy its reader with such details of the story as the individuality of the actors concerned, the particulars of the times and places of their actions, details which are presented through a more largely referential use of language than is common in other literary forms."9 In a similar vein, Damian Grant in Realism, a work
that carries Wilhelm Worringer's arguments into the realm of literature, defines two general philosophical approaches to truth in art, the idealistic and realistic. Echoing Watt, he posits an empirical "correspondence theory," analogous to Worringer's empathy, which "defers automatically to the fact, and requires that truth be verified by reference to it," and which "takes its confidence from the substantial agreement of the majority in its description of reality, which it therefore calls objective."10

Cervantes' early reference to Aristotle is the first in a series of empirical references in the novel which are summoned to oppose the world of romance. The most explicit expression of an empirical fiction is the famous debate between the Canon and the priest on the merits of books of chivalry. The Canon describes two kinds of fiction; of one, he says:

> the more it resembles the truth the better the fiction, and the more probable and possible it is, the better it pleases. Fictions have to match the minds of their readers, and to be written in such a way that, by tempering the impossibilities, moderating excesses, and keeping judgement in the balance, they may so astonish, hold, excite, and entertain, that wonder and pleasure go hand in hand. None of this can be achieved by anyone departing from verisimilitude, or from that imitation of nature in which lies the perfection of all that is written. (425)

The Canon's sense of truth as a verisimilar imitation of nature is equivalent to truth in the correspondence theory which
"defers to fact." It must "match the mind of the reader" in the same way that Grant requires that it "take its confidence from the substantial agreement of the majority." This is the form of truth and the use of language that the Historian follows.

But yet the Canon, for all his criticisms of chivalric romances, admits that he has tried writing one himself (another author-character!) and presents a description of the other kind of fiction with almost the same conviction that he presented the first:

for all he had said against such books, he found one good thing in them: the fact that they offered a good intellect a chance to display itself. For they presented a broad and spacious field through which the pen could run without hindrance . . . Sometimes the writer might show his knowledge of astrology, or his excellence at cosmography or as a musician, or in his wisdom in affairs of state, and he might even have an opportunity of showing his skill at necromancy. (426)

In emphasizing the individual artist's use of his imagination to alter and to render the details of everyday life, the Canon now proposes an idealist view of art which suggests that the things of the "real" world are merely vehicles for the individual artist to use in discovering a higher form of reality in the imagination. This definition of artistic realism opposes the correspondence theory, and it is called by Grant the "coherence theory." In it the artist creates rather than discovers reality. Truth is obtained by the "intuitive
perception"¹¹ of an individual and not the "substantial agreement of the majority." This, of course, is the technique of the Poet, and the impulse that Worringer describes as abstraction. Scholes and Kellogg trace the opposition between Historian and Poet to their conflicting theories of realism—the "empirical" and the "fictional"—which are nearly identical to Grant's correspondence and coherence theories.¹²

C. The Don's Poetic Vision

The fictionmaker who most clearly creates through his imagination the reality in which he lives is Don Quixote. Part of the parodic intention of the novel is to portray him both as a reader of chivalric romances in his responses to the art forms within the novel, and as an author, a fictionalist in his transformation of the real world into the fictive world in which he is the chivalric hero. This is the dual function he serves during the puppet show. From the very beginning, Cervantes makes clear that Don Quixote's transformations are begun by a transformation in language—a process of renaming. Of all the Don's initial attempts to "translate his desires into actions" (33), the one to which he has to give most of his time is his translation of original, mundane names to their ideal, chivalric ones. Inspecting his hack, he decides that "it would be wrong for the horse of so famous a knight to be without a famous name," so he "spent four days pondering what name to give him" (34). The name he finally decides to use, Rocinante, indicates etymologically the process of
transformation that has just taken place. Rocin, a hack, and ante, before, shows that what was once a hack is now, by being renamed, the noble steed of a knight-errant. Four days are sufficient to rename a horse, but it takes Alonso Quixada eight days of deliberation before he can rename himself Don Quixote de la Mancha.

Beginning with these two transformations through renaming, Don Quixote attempts a recreation of virtually all the physical world by renaming it--the farm girl Aldonza Lorenzo becomes Dulcinea del Toboso, inns become castles, windmills become giants, two flocks of sheep become the armies of Laurcalco and Timonel of Carcajona, a barber's basin becomes the helmet of Mambrino. That these transformations are totally subjective, solipsistic, that Don Quixote is, as Wallace Stevens says of the woman singer at Key West, the "single artificer of the world" in which he lives, Cervantes makes clear time after time. He also portrays his hero not consistently as a madman deluded into believing that things are what they cannot be, but often as a self-willed, conscious creator who is aware simultaneously of the transformed and untransformed states of the objects he has altered. When reminded by the barber of his true identity, Alonso Quixada, Don Quixote replies, "I know who I am ... and I know, too, that I am capable of being not only the characters I have named, but all the Twelve Peers of France and all the Nine Worthies as well" (54). And when he tells Sancho that Dulcinea is really Aldonzo Lorenzo, he
answers his squire's protests by saying, "I imagine all I say to be true, neither more nor less, and in my imagination I draw her as I would have her be" (210).

Don Quixote's idealism manifests itself as a form of humanism—the belief in the perfectibility of man. Erich Auerbach suggests that his madness is a logical attempt to break out of the paralyzing conditions of his social position and his age, but it is more a mad exploration of the ultimate of his human potential. In the end, Don Quixote's belief in man's power to transcend himself, re-create himself and the world, has infected even hard-minded Sancho who professes, "every man's the son of his own deeds; and since I'm a man, I can become pope, let alone governor of an isle" (423). And Sancho proves his belief by actually becoming the governor of an isle and by succeeding in his new role quite well.

What Don Quixote lacks as a ficitionmaker is an audience, and his missions are attempts to create an audience of believers. What he seeks is a verification of his fiction by testing to see if it (using the Canon's words) "matches the minds" of those who participate in it. But when the Don's friends and captors conspire with playful trickery to agree that the basin is really the helmet of Mambrino, as he insists on calling it, they cruelly mimic a believing audience in their responses. By pretending to believe in Don Quixote's renaming and re-creating the basin, the group of characters sets a paradigm for almost all the other characters who participate in his
transformations of the world through language. Dorothea is renamed Princess Micomicona, Samson Carrasco becomes the Knight of the Mirrors, a maiden of the Duchess is transformed into the Countess Trifaldi, all for deceitful purpose of fooling Don Quixote.

The elaborate masquerades and plays the Duke and Duchess invent at Don Quixote's expense are extreme examples of the antithesis of the knight's purpose as a fiction-maker. As fiction-makers, the Duke and Duchess are concerned with no more than having fun with the Don's madness, playing along with his conception of the world in order to laugh silently at his absurdities. They represent what the author of Don Quixote might have been like had he not tempered his vision with sincere sympathy for his hero. Don Quixote's search for a believing audience leads him into such traps as are set up for him by those like the Duke and Duchess, but the traps also serve to contrast with his purely altruistic mission. The most direct expression of his goal of finding a world of believers is his speech to Don Lorenzo in which he enumerates the virtues of the conventions of knight-errantry and concludes that he would like to "make you see how beneficial and necessary knights-errant were to the world in past ages, and how useful they would be in the present, if they were in fashion. But now, for the peoples' sin, sloth, idleness, gluttony and luxury triumph" (583).

Don Quixote's eventual withdrawal from the solipsism of
his idealistic mission is symbolized by his experience in the Cave of Montesinos, called by Gethin Hughes "an intimate moment when we are permitted to penetrate the inner recesses of his mind." His unearthly vision or dream is unverifiable, and so he is unable to convince any of the other characters of its reality. In desperation, he becomes obsessed with proving it true, asking such unreliable sources as the magician in the Trifaldi masquerade and Master Peter's soothsaying ape if his experience really occurred. Don Quixote's failure to persuade anyone to believe his story of the Cave of Montesinos reflects his ultimate failure to find an audience of believers in his ideal world--this failure eventually leads to the abandonment of his mission and his death.

By having Don Quixote attempt unsuccessfully to transform the World by renaming, according to his chivalric ideal, Cervantes illustrates a testing of the conventions of a literary medium upon the factual reality of the empirical world. Don Quixote's failure represents the failure of chivalric literature to serve as a medium through which an author can convey the sense of the real world to the reader. Medium can be defined as the realistic perspective that an artist achieves by the various conventions of his art, or as Ian Watt defines it: the correspondence between the literary work and the reality it imitates. Don Quixote's failure is a failure of correspondence: Aldonzo Lorenzo is not Dulcinea, the inn is not a castle, the windmills are not giants, sheep are not
armies of knights, nor is a barber's basin the helmet of Mambrino. Don Quixote shows that the medium of chivalric language does not convey the reality of the world. Its conventions are discontinuous with the norms of Cervantes' narrative.

Cervantes shows, however, that Don Quixote's failure also can be interpreted as being rooted both in the nature of his vision and in the world. For Don Quixote, the final proof for the realistic relationship between word and thing or word and act is not through a process of testing with the senses, as it is for the empiricists, but through an act of faith. As the primary symbol of the Poet, Don Quixote requires of his audience that they maintain a poetic belief in his vision. When he asks the merchants from Toledo to declare that Dulcinea is the most beautiful woman in the world, and they complain that they cannot simply because they have not seen her, he replies: "If I were to show her to you... what merit would there be in your confessing so obvious a truth? The essence of the matter is that you must believe, confess, affirm, swear and maintain it without seeing her" (51). The absence of faith that Don Quixote continually discovers in the world about him is treated humorously here by Cervantes, but it takes on much more dramatically serious implications in the closing chapters when Sancho refuses to carry out the cruel, ridiculous penance of self-flagellation that the Duke and Duchess mischievously prescribe for the disenchantment of Dulcinea. Disregarding the foolishness of the penance, the disillusioned knight can only resign
himself to a refusal that earlier would have aroused instantaneously his indignation.

Don Quixote's faith manifests itself in his will to be constant to his ideal vision of the names in the world he has invented. His insistence on believing in the identities he has given objects by renaming, in spite of the contrary proof of his senses, is the source of humor for many sequences in the novel. But his insistence upon the precise use of language throughout the story reveals his innate sense of the importance of language as a fixed system in his created world. Don Quixote is veritably a grammarian in his correction of the goatherd Peter's and Sancho's malapropisms, and the other characters' improper use of chivalric names. The improper use of language that he most frequently rails against is Sancho's use of an inappropriate proverb to provide commentary for the situation at hand. He scolds his squire: "I do not find fault with a proverb aptly introduced, but to load and string on proverbs higgledy-piggledy makes your speech mean and vulgar" (742). This is an echo of his constant refrain: "What have all these proverbs to do with the matter we are discussing?" (201)

Don Quixote's basic criticism, that Sancho's proverbs do not correspond to any given situation, echoes the first requirement of a system of language—that it have a fixed, stable relationship with the world it describes. In spite of his recognition of this requirement in his criticism of Sancho,
Don Quixote is, at this point of the novel, ignorant of how it applies to his own vision. It says implicitly that no amount of faith in a system of language or symbols can overcome an irreconcilable discrepancy, a lack of correspondence, between the world of words and the world of objects. Cervantes does not condemn the knight's noble vision or the spirit behind it; he does, however, ridicule Don Quixote's almost arbitrary choice of objects to bear the overwhelming symbolic significance of his ideal names.

The progress of the novel follows the progressive correction of Don Quixote's vision. A proper gauge of his miscalculations and their rectification is the change in the name he applies to himself throughout the novel. The leap from Alonso Quixada to Don Quixote de la Mancha is an irrational one, born from madness and based on no criteria other than desire and dreams. When he assumes the name Sancho invents, "The Knight of the Sad Countenance," his reasons are partly irrational, for his primary justification is that it is "right for me to take some title, as all knights did in the olden days" (147). But his reasons are also partly justified, for the name indicates the suffering he has endured. His next title, "The Knight of the Lions," is, on the other hand, more suitable than any of the others because it bears a direct correspondence with an actual event he has experienced--his show of courage before an uncaged lion. This last title serves him up to the end, until his chivalric vision begins to disappear.
Then he creates an ideal vision of the world almost as irrational as the preceding one. The pastoral ideal he envisions is a recompense summoned by necessity in order to endure the painful loss of his chivalric ideal, and it is created by the same process, renaming:

He told them also how he intended to turn shepherd for the year, and pass his time in the solitude of the fields, where he could give free rein to his amorous thoughts, whilst occupying himself in that pastoral and virtuous calling. He begged them to be his companions, if they had not much to do and were not prevented by more important business, and said he would buy sufficient sheep and stock to give them the name of shepherds. But, he informed them, the principal part of the business was already done, for he had fixed on names for them which would fit them to a T. The priest asked him for them, and Don Quixote replied that he was to call himself the shepherd Quixotiz, the Bachelor the shepherd Carrascon, the priest the shepherd Curiambro and Sancho Panza the shepherd Panzino. (932)

In this summons to his friends, Don Quixote creates an ideal world flawed in the same manner as his previous one. The world could be conjured as before--by a transformation in language, renaming. But as before, the names would not correspond realistically in an empirical sense with their objects. Nor would his appeal for an audience, his request that his friends join him, be any more successful than it was earlier. When he recants his belief in knight-errantry on his deathbed, he recants his belief in the pastoral romance as well; it serves Cervantes as a lure for his hero to refuse in order to
prove his cure from his addictive visions. Then he chooses a name to be remembered by which truly befits his character, Alonso Quixana the Good, and it coincides with what all his friends and acquaintances, his audience of believers, finally believe about him: "he was always of an amiable disposition and kind in his behaviour, so that he was well beloved not only by his own household but by everyone who knew him" (937).

D. The Narrators of the Puppet Show

The flaw in Don Quixote's vision of the chivalric ideal is made ludicrously apparent during Master Peter's puppet show. At the end of the episode, Don Quixote, surrounded by broken bits of puppets, realizes that he has mistaken them for real people. He explains apologetically: "I assure you gentlemen that all that has passed here seemed to me a real occurrence. Melisandra was Melisandra; Sir Gaiferos, Sir Gaiferos; Marsilio, Marsilio; and Charlemagne, Charlemagne" (643). Unlike those moments of occasional lucidity in which he sees clearly both the altered and unaltered states of the objects he has renamed, when the Don is lost in his idée fixe, he allows the given name of an object to bear the full weight of significance, disregarding the proof of his senses. Thus, the name "Sir Gaiferos" is so resonant in meaning for the knight that the fact it belongs to a puppet is of no consequence. What is surprising is that Don Quixote snaps out of his deluded spell and finally admits their real identities as puppets, not stubbornly
insisting, as with the windmills/giants, barber's basin/helmet of Mambrino, in believing in the identities he has created for
them.

As a fictiormaker, however, Don Quixote is diametrically opposed to the fictiormakers, including Cervantes, who stress
the artificial nature of their fictions as a means of appealing to the reader's sense of their credibility. David Goldknapf's
definition of the realistic fallacy as the attempt to maintain the illusion that narratives are not fictional at all is the
technique of the Historian. But Cervantes portrays the clearest example of the Poet, Don Quixote, as an extreme solution to
this fallacy. Cervantes suggests that the Poet, as well as the Historian, is wrong to accept fiction (whether idealistic or empirical) as reality and not as an independent kind of truth. He clearly gives a subtle condemnation to aspects of both the Poet's and the Historian's view of life and art because they lack the double, self-conscious awareness of his own
vision. The mimetic norms of both types of narrators, or fictiormakers, are discontinuous with those developed by
Cervantes. The art form that he would create in Don Quixote is a hybrid of the Poet's and the Historian's techniques, con-
taining, as Harry Levin suggests, both realistic and romantic tendencies.

The Poet who is lost in the world of his interior imagina-
tion and the Historian who is confined in the world of con-
crete detail are deficient by themselves, according to
Cervantes, because their individual views are one-sided. Cervantes presents a truer vision because his perspective includes a variety of these partial views in various figures of the Poet and Historian. By viewing them individually, he can expose their fallacies, but he can also use them to supplement each other. Don Quixote's particular view is fallacious because in his believing so fully in the reality of the fiction he is unable to see the illusion behind it. Thus, writes George Haley, "unable to accept art as art, even in a puppet show where the illusion is minimal, Don Quixote attempts to invade the impenetrable world of fiction."15 Whether the illusion is created by puppets, or by words—or in this case by both—Don Quixote, when under the influence of his delusion, believes in it fully.

The author—characters—from Don Quixote, to the boy-narrator, Master Peter, Cide Hamete, the translator, the Second Author, and finally to the First Author—all provide a different solution to the realistic fallacy, each handling the nature of illusion through language in a different manner. The sense of a progression of narrators, beginning with the most deluded, implies a corrective pattern, but the correction does not necessarily unfold as a series of speakers with successively greater authority or wisdom. The pattern of correction is circular. Each one is corrected by another, undermining all of their singular views. The only ultimate authority is the mind able to perceive the entire perspective of the narration.
Don Quixote is invited to believe in the truth behind the story of the puppet show by Master Peter's assistant, the boy-narrator, who declares: "This true story, here presented to your worship, is taken word for word from the French chronicles and the Spanish ballads" (638). His claim of authenticity, of the story as history, echoes the First Author's claim for his story, "that we do not depart by so much as an inch from the truth in the telling of it" (31). Indeed, each of the narrators makes at least a superficial claim that his story is a true history, not, in the Canon's terms, "departing from verisimilitude or from the imitation of nature."

The story of the puppet show, both in the popular legend and in the boy-narrator's version of it, echoes the story in Don Quixote. Simply, the puppet show acts out the story of Sir Gaiferos' rescue of his wife Melisandra from her bondage in a Moorish castle. Similarly, Don Quixote, throughout the novel, views his mission as a rescue, a recovery of the true nature of things (according to his ideal) from their transformed states in the spells of evil enchanters. His most consistent adversaries are these enchanters, sages, magicians, who, from his point of view, create the illusions that giants are windmills, armies are sheep, and that the incomparable Dulcinea is a foul-smelling peasant girl. He instructs Sancho that "spells transform all things and change them from their natural shapes. I do not mean that they actually change them, but they appear to, as we learnt by experience in the
transformation of Dulcinea, sole refuge of my hope" (660).
The rescue of Dulcinea from her bondage in a spell becomes
the central focus of Don Quixote's life.

These transformations are the reverse of Don Quixote's
transformations through language. He has transformed natural
things, through renaming, to their ideal, romantic states;
the enchanters, on the other hand, have transformed them to
states of the mundane, the quotidian. After having first
identified the enchanter as Preston, the evil magician, Don
Quixote confesses to Sancho, "I am afraid that if the author
of that history of my exploits, which they say is now in
print, chanced to be some enchanter hostile to me, he has
probably changed one thing into another, mingling a thousand
lies with one truth, and digressed to narrate actions out of
the sequence proper to a faithful history" (516). Thus Don
Quixote conjectures that the narrator of his history is an
evil enchanter who has presented a false, parodic version of
his real, ideal state. His conjecture concerning the novel
written about him is as close to the truth as he, a character
in that novel, could ever know.

One of the delightful paradoxes of the novel is that
Don Quixote, who as a Poet has most actively engaged in the
transformation of things, should reverse the argument and
take the stance of an Historian by criticizing the author of
his own history for such transformations. Don Quixote's fears
concerning the narrator of his story parallel his criticism of
the boy-narrator's story of Sir Gaiferos. Indeed, the boy-narrator is the first "evil enchanter" who has transformed an ideal, chivalric story into a more common one. Don Quixote worries that his "history" will be marred by digressions which are unfaithful to the true sequence of events. His first criticism of the boy-narrator is over a digression; he says: "Boy, boy . . . go straight ahead with your story and do not go curving off at a tangent; for it requires much proof and corroboration to bring a truth to light" (640). And the knight's fears that the evil enchanter will mix lies with truth are expressed in his criticism of the boy's use of detail—his portrayal of Moorish bells instead of kettledrums and a clarion.

As it turns out, Don Quixote's criticisms are somewhat justified, for the boy's story, though called verisimilar, is a deliberate falsification of the original version found in ballad and legend. He portrays Sir Gaiferos as an idler, playing backgammon while his wife is kidnapped. And his description of the escape, with Melisanda hanging in mid-air with her skirt caught on the balcony, is a Punch and Judy routine, not the relation of an heroic adventure. The boy-narrator transforms the chivalric ideal into farce. The language of chivalry is given over to the speech of clowns. His manipulation of the story through the puppets for the purpose of ridicule mirrors the manipulation of Don Quixote by the Duke and Duchess, who use the knight's ideal world of words to debase and mock him. And it also mirrors, as I have mentioned, what
Don Quixote would have been like had Cervantes viewed his hero as a clown, without the noble stature he gains progressively in the course of the novel. The boy's attitude toward fiction is, contrary to Don Quixote's, to admit freely its illusion. His physical position on the stage highlights this. A narrator with one foot in the world and one foot on the stage, with a pointing stick to guide the audience's responses to the characters, is a parody of the intrusive author. He looks ahead to the omniscient role Thackeray assumes with such success toward the doll-characters of Vanity Fair. And he serves as a false mirror of Cervantes' self-consciousness. Cervantes uses the boy-narrator to show that this kind of narrative stance carried to its extreme creates too full a belief in the mere artificiality of fiction, which, when not tempered (like Cervantes') by understanding, poetic faith, and honesty, inevitably leads to a kind of callousness toward character. Characters are not real, hence they are dolls, puppets, objects of manipulation and farce.

But the boy is not the ultimate authority as fiichiornaker in the puppet show. Behind him is Master Peter, the actual author of the play and invisible manipulator of the puppets' strings. As a fiichiornaker, Master Peter has chosen one of the most artificial of all fictions as his medium—a puppet show. And he, even more than his assistant, openly admits the illusion of the artifice. Not content to remain invisible behind the stage, he continually steps forward to provide
commentary for the story, criticism of the boy's narration, and defense of himself as narrator. The effect of Master Peter's free admission of the illusion of his fiction is to give the appearance of complete honesty. Unlike the Duke and Duchess, his fiction is presented to fool no one into believing that it is real—Don Quixote is fooled only because of his mad fixation. And even he cannot sustain his own insane vision when the only evidence to prove that he has fought the Moors in defense of Gaiferus is a scattered heap of broken wood. Master Peter defends his theory of fiction in response to Don Quixote's criticism of his play's verisimilitude:

Don't worry about trifles, Don Quixote, or expect perfection, for you never find it. Don't they perform countless comedies in these parts almost every day, full of innumerable improbabilities and absurdities? But, for all that, they have a successful run and are greeted, not only with applause but with admiration and all. Go on, boy, and let them speak, for so long as I fill my bag they can act as many improbabilities as there are motes in the sun. (641)

Though his only ambition is to "fill my bag," Master Peter, ironically echoes the latter part of the Canon's two-sided argument which defends idealist fiction and gives the artist full privilege to abandon verisimilitude when it hinders the creative freedom of his imagination. But more importantly, Master Peter's attitude toward the illusion of his artifice represents a shift of perspective from that of his assistant. The boy has one foot constantly upon the stage, and, with his pointing
stick and incessant commentary, he continually guides and shapes the audience's responses. Master Peter, on the other hand, has resolved to tell the story by "deeds, not words" (638), but no sooner has the illusion of action started than he steps from behind the stage and reverts to words in his telling, effectively destroying any sense of reality. Master Peter's comments on fiction and his actions as narrator reveal a narrative stance that is realistic in one respect. By building and destroying illusions and by addressing his audience directly, he implicitly says that he knows art is nothing but illusion and that he wants to share this knowledge with his audience, so that the distinct boundary between art and life can be maintained. With no trickery on the part of the pretender, and no delusions on the part of the viewer that he is seeing life, Master Peter can present art as play, a game. His comic stance of undisguised intrusions anticipates the authorial roles of Sterne, Joyce, and Barth. And it is another parodic mirror of Cervantes' role. As the ultimate narrative authority in his fictional world, Master Peter appeals to his reader's sympathy by sharing with him all the secrets of his illusions. Thus, because of his apparent honesty, the rest of the audience of the puppet show and the readers of the novel sympathize with Master Peter when he laments the loss of his kingdom because of Don Quixote's inability to discriminate between art and life. Even the deluded knight comes to his senses and pays this honest author a large sum for his loss.
But wait. After Master Peter has pocketed Don Quixote's money and has left the scene, the reader learns that the guileless puppet master is none other than Gines de Pasamonte, the leader of the ungrateful galley slaves Don Quixote has freed in an earlier adventure, the same rogue who had stoned his liberator and had stolen Dapple, Sancho's ass. He is also an autobiographer, the author of *The Life of Gines de Pasamonte*, the book of his life which would not be finished until his life is. The revelation for the reader (which is withheld from the rest of the characters of the book) is that this artist who had won his audience's confidence by sharing the secret of his art's illusion had been himself hiding behind an illusion—an eyepatch and the name Master Peter. Thus, the reader has been taken in by an illusion this intrusive author had prepared after having gained credibility by divulging the mechanics of another illusion. And now, after having been duped as surely as the deluded knight he had just earlier found so comical, the reader can readjust his perspective and once again assume a position superior to the characters of the novel because of this privileged information.

But wait again. The information concerning Master Peter's true identity has come to the reader through an authorial intrusion by Cide Hamete Benengeli, by far the most ubiquitous of the narrators of *Don Quixote*, appearing in at least twenty-five separate intrusions. The paradox is that the reader must have faith in an authorial intrusion which warns against
the deceit practiced by another intruding author. Cide Hamete, however, is presented not as an artist working with illusion but as an Historian dealing with facts. He is meant to represent the first part of the Canon's two-sided argument which supports in fiction verisimilitude and the use of detail to provide a perfect imitation of nature. Cide Hamete's role is further defined in the discussion between Don Quixote and Samson Carrasco on the book concerning the knight's adventures which the Moor had just published. Don Quixote complains that Cide Hamete should have left out many of the unflattering things that had happened to Sancho and himself in order to have composed a more entertaining story. The bachelor corrects him by saying, "it is one thing to write as a poet and another as an historian. The poet can relate things, not as they were, but as they should have been" (488). The implication presented here is that Cide Hamete has portrayed things just as they were and has composed a realistic account of the knight's adventures.

The statements of the second author on the work by Cide Hamete support its claim to authenticity. The title on the parchment he had discovered by accident is "The History of Don Quixote de la Mancha, written by Cide Hamete Benengeli, Arabic Historian" (77). Later, he describes the practice of historians in general as being "exact, truthful, and absolutely unprejudicial" (78), and more specifically: "Cide Hamete Benengeli was a very exact historian and very precise in all
his details, as can be seen by his not passing over these various points, trivial and petty though they may be" (121). As an Historian, then, Cide Hamete is presented as the compiler and chronicler of all the truthful details and facts concerning the history of Don Quixote. His intrusions, Ruth El Saffar points out, are generally for the purpose of revealing to the reader the truth behind some artifice used to trick Don Quixote by other author-characters. Armed with the "true facts" of the case, Cide Hamete is able to shatter the illusions presented by other authors. The role prescribed for Cide Hamete as an Historian is similar to the role prescribed by Émile Zola for himself as a Realist. In his essay "Naturalism in the Theatre," he declares that art "ought to be based on truth," and that the artist's function is to be "an observer who sets down facts." But in spite of the instructive service Cide Hamete performs for the reader, he too engages in deception. In relating the stories of the interior fictions, the illusions that deceive Don Quixote, he withholding the secret of the illusion until the end. He could have revealed the identity of Master Peter at the beginning of that episode, but he preferred to allow the reader to be deceived along with the rest of the characters. The sequence in which he relates this story prejudices the reader against Don Quixote and confirms the knight's suspicions that the sage enchanter who would author his story might 'narrate actions out of sequence proper to a
faithful history" (516) in order to misrepresent what really happened.

The chapter in which Cide Hamete reveals the identity of Master Peter opens with an oath in which the Moorish author swears that what he is about to relate is indeed the truth. An appeal as fervent as this seems both an apology for the earlier deliberate falsification and a protestation declaring that this time he will not attempt to deceive. This passage is one of the rare instances in which three of the four narrators speak at once:

Cide Hamete, the chronicler of this great history, introduces the present chapter with these words: 'I swear as a Catholic Christian,' on which his translator observes that Cide Hamete's swearing as a Catholic Christian, he being a Moor, as doubtless he was, meant only that as a Catholic Christian, when he swears, swears, or should swear the truth, and observe it in all he says, so he should tell the truth, as if he had sworn like a Catholic Christian, in writing of Don Quixote; especially in his statement regarding who Master Peter was, and about his ape that amazed the whole country with its prophesyings. (646)

Cervantes stresses the difficulty of verifying the story's authenticity by purposefully confusing the syntax of this statement. Three voices and three views intermingle, collide, and undercut each other's authority.

The intrusion of the Translator into Cide Hamete's intrusion undermines the Historian's claim of possessing ultimate authority. The Translator shatters Cide Hamete's illusion of historicity by constantly pointing out discrepancies in the
narrative. Here, the translator, a Moor himself, clarifies the fallacy of the Moorish author giving a Christian oath. Elsewhere, he omits dubious passages and declares others apocryphal. The presence of the Translator serves to remind the reader that this history is not first-hand but transmitted, and the Second Author's initial doubts about the veracity of a Moorish author are doubled by having a Moorish translator. The text is seen, writes Harry Levin, at "three removes," containing "afterthoughts like a palimpsest."¹⁹

The ekphrastic Master Peter episode serves Cervantes as a stage upon which seven narrators are paraded before the reader, each presenting his version of fictional truth. The scene would appear to be the ideal forum for Cervantes to portray six false views progressing in a corrective order to the final voice of truth. But this, I have shown, Cervantes refuses to do. As the narrative passes from Don Quixote, the boy-narrator, Master Peter, Cide Hamete, the Translator, the First Author, and the Second Author, each of them undercuts the other's authority. Does Cervantes imply then that all narrators are equally untrustworthy for the reader? The Second Author provides a clue to this question.

Throughout the novel the changing relation of the Second Author to Cide Hamete is one of the most interesting of the character-author relations. It is his intrusion into the narrative begun by the First Author in chapter nine of Book One that first makes the reader aware of the perspective of
multiple narrators in the novel. In that chapter, after the original author had carried his description of Don Quixote's confrontation with the Basque through to mid-battle, a mysterious second voice picks up the narration: "At this critical point our delightful history stopped short and remained mutilated, our author failing to inform us where to find the missing part. This caused me great annoyance, for my pleasure from the little I had read turned to displeasure at the thought of the small chance there was of finding the rest of this delightful story" (75). The remainder of the chapter details the Second Author's search for the conclusion of the story, his discovery of the Arabic manuscript, and his hiring of the Moorish translator.

What is significant is that the Second Author is portrayed as having altered his position from serving as reader of the First Author's account to being a reader of Cide Hamete's history. His function in the novel is clearly to provide a model of the reader. And as a reader of this fiction, the Second Author is surprisingly similar to another reader of fiction in the novel—Don Quixote. Both the Second Author and the deluded knight believe completely in the truth of the fictions of knight-errantry that they are reading. And both turn their beliefs into missions. The Second Author's quixotic goal is to bring the history of Don Quixote to light, and, as he reminds the reader, if it were not for him, the novel would never have been read. His quest, he tells, grew out of his faith in the
reality of Don Quixote's existence and a belief in the ideals for which he stood. He describes himself as

anxious and eager for real and authentic knowledge of the whole life and marvels of our famous Spaniard, Don Quixote de la Mancha, the light and mirror of Manchegan chivalry, and the first man of our times, of these calamitous times of ours, to devote himself to the toils and exercise of knight errantry. (75-76)

In the Second Author, Don Quixote has found his believing audience and his mission, as he had described to Don Lorenzo, to "make you see how beneficial and necessary knights-errant were to the world in past ages, and how useful they would be in the present" (583), has been fulfilled.

The Second Author, then, begins his reading experience from a position of belief in the subject; what he suspects at first is the source. In the beginning of his account, he tells the reader, "In this history I know that you will find all the entertainment you can desire; and if any good quality is missing, I am certain that it is the fault of its dog of an author rather than any default in the subject" (78). But during the course of the narration the Second Author is increasingly drawn to praise the Moorish historian, culminating in the florid, extolling apostrophe which opens chapter 40 of Book Two:

In very truth, all who enjoy stories like this should show their gratitude to Cide Hamete, its first author, for his meticulousness in recording its minutest details,
leaving nothing, however trivial, which he
does not bring clearly to light. He de-
picts thoughts, reveals intentions, answers
unspoken questions, clears up doubts, re-
solves objections; in fact, elucidates the
slightest points the most captious critic
could raise. O most renowned author! O
fortunate Don Quixote! O famous Dulcinea!
O droll Sancho Panza! May you live, jointly
and separately, for infinite ages, to the
delight and general amusement of mankind! (721)

What has convinced the narrator that Cide Hamete, whom he had
first characterized as a "dog of an author," is now the per-
fected historian? Using the criteria provided by several
characters in the novel on the necessary qualities of an His-
torian, Cide Hamete is a failure, for he gives no indication
of his sources, of where he uncovered his detail, nor does he
present his story in the sequential order Don Quixote ex-
pects of histories. Clearly, then, the final belief of the
Second Author in the veracity of Cide Hamete is an act of
faith. It is what Don Quixote requires of the merchants from
Toledo—to believe in spite of the lack of proof. The ideal
reader of the book must commit himself to a "willing sus-
pension of disbelief."20 The dynamics of the relationships
between the Second Author, Cide Hamete, and Don Quixote con-
sist in the poetic faith of a reader in an author of a story
concerning a fabulous, almost unbelievable character, a dynam-
ics Joseph Conrad repeats in the relationships between the frame
narrator, Marlow, and Kurtz in Heart of Darkness. Like Mar-
low's frame narrator, Cervantes' Second Author must overlook
clues which indicate that his source, a story-teller, is
possibly unreliable. But both the frame narrator and Second Author forgive admitted lies, confessed subjectivity, the lack of verifiable detail, and deliberately confusing sequence in order to give their belief to a fictionmaker.

In order to give an alternative to the failed historian Cide Hamete, Cervantes creates for the reader one true historian among the author-characters—the First Author. He provides more descriptive and biographical detail than any other of the narrators, giving, indeed, a compendious catalogue of Don Quixote's readings in chivalric romance. He gives verifiable sources for his information and indicates when these sources are inadequate. Of Don Quixote's original name, for example, he writes: "They say that his surname was Quixada or Quesada—for there is some difference of opinion amongst authors on this point" (31). And he writes of Don Quixote's first expedition: "There are authors who say that the first adventure he met was that of the pass of Lapice. Others say it was the windmills. But what I have been able to discover of the matter and what I have found written in the annals of La Mancha, is that he rode all that day, and that at nightfall his horse and he were weary and dying of hunger" (37). Presumably, then, there were a number of histories of Don Quixote, and the First Author's sources were these other written accounts. As an Historian, he does not go beyond what he can find in research, refusing to create imaginatively adventures for which there are no sources. He qualifies,
therefore, to be the Historian described by the Second Author, the Canon, Samson Carrasco, and Don Quixote. He is the empirical chronicler of reality that Cide Hamete is in theory but not in practice.

However, Cervantes indicates that there are flaws in the first author's approach. In the very first sentence of the novel, the First Author betrays a subjectivity and bias which no amount of objective detail can overcome: "In a certain village in La Mancha, which I do not wish to name . . ." (31). Whatever are his reasons for concealing the identity of the village, the arbitrary manner in which he dismisses this detail reminds the reader that no matter how many facts he can provide, this author, like all authors, will present the details of the story selectively, omitting some and highlighting others. The sources the First Author has for these facts, too, are no more than other books, other subjective views. That they are subjective can be seen by the discrepancies these various accounts give of a supposedly factual reality. To arrive at these discrepancies each Historian had to adopt the technique of the Poet: he had to interpret, imaginatively creating or re-creating the world. The First Author's failure to do this, relying exclusively on other written accounts, leads him to a dead end: "the author of this history left the battle in suspense at this critical point, with the excuse that he could find no more records of Don Quixote's exploits than those related here" (74). It is at this point that the ideal reader, the Second
Author, turns to another narrator, Cide Hamete Benengeli, a creator to whom he can give the ideal reader's response—belief.

The belief of the Second Author in Cide Hamete and Conrad's frame narrator in Marlow differ from the foolish belief Don Quixote places in the mountebank storytellers of the puppet show. Don Quixote fails to take into account that the character of his sources might be untrustworthy—as they prove to be. But both the frame narrator and the Second Author cannot ignore the serious devotion Marlow and Cide Hamete show in the significance of their stories. Unlike the boy-narrator and Master Peter, who tell chivalric stories for the purpose of ridicule and fraud, Cide Hamete invents Don Quixote for a moral purpose, presenting him as a paragon of virtue, knightly or otherwise. Cide Hamete's devotion to his character and what he represents is clearly evident in the novel's conclusion, where he writes: "For me alone Don Quixote was born and I for him" (940). Poetic belief is just reward for such devotion.

E. The Realistic Heritage of Don Quixote

George Haley was the first to point out that the section dealing with Master Peter's puppet show is an analogue of the novel Don Quixote, "not merely because the burlesque legend that Maese Pedro recreates with puppets is a reductio ab absurdum of the same chivalric material... but also because it reproduces on a miniature scale the same basic relationships
among storyteller, story, and audience that are discernible in the novel's overall scheme."21 The episode serves not only as an analogue to the series of narrator-reader relationships, but also as a means to extend this series so that nearly every conceivable variation of the Canon's and priest's debate on realism in fiction can be portrayed. From Don Quixote to the First Author, from Poet to Historian, Cervantes presents the extremes of the argument from idealism to empirical realism. Each author-character posits a theory of realism according to his conception of the power of language to evoke an illusion of reality. And in the two extremes an interesting contrast in their attitudes toward language and naming can be observed.

Don Quixote's belief in the inherent significance in names themselves has been amply documented. It is through the name, the word, the symbol that he perceives an object, not through his sensory perception of it. The First Author, on the other hand, casually tells that he does not care to relate the name of the village where his hero lives, and he does not bother, even, to clear up an ambiguity in his hero's proper name because "this does not much concern our story" (31). The movement from Don Quixote's idealism to the First Author's empirical realism consists of a devaluation of language in favor of the thing. It is devaluation which Dickens would parody in Hard Times where Mr. Bounderby says, "You must discard the word Fancy altogether."22 It would find expression
in William Carlos Williams' "Say it! No ideas but in things." And it would motivate Hemingway to write: "There were many words that you could not stand to hear and finally only the names of places had dignity ... Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hollow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages. ..." The derivation of realism from the Latin res, thing, betrays this prejudice.

Empirical realism in novel history is characterized by this latently prejudicial attitude toward language, and the ekphrastic forms of empirical narratives generally comment upon the inadequacy of language to serve as medium for the complete revelation of truth. As I shall show more explicitly in subsequent chapters, Emma and Anna Karenina are examples of different approaches to the empirical impulse in fiction that culminated in the nineteenth century, but both have a common attitude toward language. The epistles of Emma serve to show the moral dangers of falsimilitude when language does not correspond directly, referentially to the object it symbolizes. And Mihailov's portrait, which is so empirically accurate that the medium of paint disappears, is an analogue of Tolstoy's attempt to make the medium of language transparent, giving the impression that the reader is experiencing directly the emotions of his characters. Generally speaking, empirical novelists, like Austen and Tolstoy, argue for the primacy of things and verifiable facts, with language serving as a direct and transparent medium to an ulterior truth residing in the
world and not in the word. For these novelists language serves a "scientific use," in I. A. Richards' terms, "for the sake of reference."

Robert Alter writes: "The novel begins out of an erosion of belief in the authority of the written word and it begins with Cervantes." This erosion of belief is dramatized in the figure of Don Quixote--the movement of the novel is the restoration of things to their natural places from the false, elevated status he had given them by renaming. The Don uses language (relying again on Richards' formulation) solely in its emotive function, expecting the emotional and attitudinal effect of such words as "the helmet of Mambrino," "Dulcinea," and (most important) "chivalry" to be so powerful that they can transform in a transcendental way the objects they symbolize. But Cervantes parodies fictions of knight-errantry by emphasizing their other-worldliness, their lack of a true connection with the real world, and he does this by showing Don Quixote, "imitating the language of his books" (37), call a puppet Sir Gaiferos. This creates a tension that cannot be relieved until the puppet is a puppet once more. The word has been adjusted to suit its object, and the adjustment is downward in scale. Here Cervantes' realism is deflationary; language is forced to serve the world by reflecting it literally.

Yet paradoxically, Cervantes shows that the series of empirical investigators into the ludicrous ideals of Don Quixote culminates in a reader and an author who finally
celebrate and confirm those ideals. The deflationary techniques of the various empirical historian-authors are shown to be lacking in many ways; and the only true failure as an author is the one who relies solely on details. Cervantes obviously created these authors to characterize his paradox of writing a fiction to destroy the absurdities of fictions. The baroque author Cervantes' fugal development of his theme is a movement upward and downward on a scale of illusions from Don Quixote's idealism to the First Author's empiricism. What results is a calling into doubt of each. Ultimately, though, Cervantes finds a voice to support (at least implicitly by his tone) Don Quixote's ideals and transformations, for the author's final commitment is to language, its ability to transform the world through imagination. The movement up and down the scale, however, allows Cervantes to develop a perspective which prevents his created world from degenerating either into the pure solipsism of Don Quixote's vision or the naked, representational literalism of the empiricists.

Cervantes' intentional failure to give complete authority to any one of his several narrative voices indicates that he, like the Canon, is of two minds regarding fiction. He would like to have his realism combined with some of the qualities of idealism. Terrence Doody, in his article "Don Quixote, Ulysses, and the Idea of Realism," notes that the Canon's two-sided argument is reflected in certain seemingly contradictory statements of James Joyce on the subject of realism, statements
in which he defends, on one hand, verisimilitude and objectivity, and, on the other, the supremacy of the subjective imagination. 26 Joyce's double-vision is clearly evident in *Ulysses* in which a minutely detailed, realistic setting is the stage of one of the most intense expressions of the subjective imagination. Cervantes' and Joyce's sense of realism encompass both abstraction and empathy, a dual allegiance that they reveal formally and ekphrastically. What this dual allegiance achieves is a balance between the conflicting claims of the real world and the imagination of the artist, a balance which highlights what I have offered as the central focus of realism—the correspondences between the novel and reality. This balance makes *Ulysses* and *Don Quixote* exemplary realistic novels, as they provide multiple interior definitions of the opposing impulses of realism. Because Cervantes' early interpreters emphasized his use of empirical experience to deflate romantic exaggerations, he was first credited as being a forerunner of the empirical movement of nineteenth-century Realism. But *Don Quixote*'s divided view of realism is more a harbinger of the multiplicity of *Ulysses*.

Cervantes is the paradigmatic realist because he has provided not only the basic argument of realism, but the terms of the argument as well. The consistent debate internalized within nearly every realistic novel is between opposing views of reality which result in different kinds of realisms, the conventions through language by which the fictional world is
evoked. The terms of the argument consist in an internal examination of these conventions and language itself as aesthetic media. And the argument is carried out, in novel after novel, by the portrayal of art and artists whose transformations of the world are analogues of the novelist's transformation of the world through his medium, language. Cervantes created the paradigm for this argument by portraying as many solutions in narrative as can be imagined, and a history of realism in the novel genre can be traced by following the subsequent choices of future novelists among these various solutions.
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III. THE LETTER IN THE NOVEL OF MANNERS

A. Ekphrastic Dialectics

Near the beginning and end of *Emma*, Jane Austen portrays a debate between Emma Woodhouse and Mr. Knightley on the character of Frank Churchill as it is revealed by two separate letters of apology that he sends to avoid being censured for his apparent breaches in social decorum. His first epistle is addressed to Mrs. Weston, whose marriage to his father he neglected to attend; although the unquoted letter announces his further delay in coming to Highbury, its tone, like an earlier one called by all a "handsome letter" (10), is so conciliatory that Emma shifts the blame for the delay from Frank to Mrs. Churchill, the young man's rich and querulous aunt. Knightley, however, is harsh in judging Frank for what he interprets as equivocation and declares:

He can sit down and write a fine flourishing letter, full of professions and falsehoods, and persuade himself that he has hit upon the very best method in the world of preserving peace at home and preventing his father's having any right to complain. His letters disgust me . . . No, Emma, your amiable young man can be amiable only in French, not in English. He may be very 'amiable,' have very good manners, and be very agreeable; but he can have no English delicacy towards the feelings of other people; nothing really amiable about him. (101)

Although Emma knows Frank only through his letters, she defends him against Knightley's charges and defines what Knightley calls equivocation as versatility and agreeableness:
My idea of him is, that he can adapt his conversation to the taste of every body, and has the power as well as the wish of being universally agreeable. To you, he will talk of farming; to me, of drawing or music; and so on to every body, having that general information on all subjects which will enable him to follow the lead, or take the lead, just as propriety may require, and to speak extremely well on each; that is my idea of him. (102)

The format of this debate is repeated in the last book of the novel by Emma's and Knightley's discussion of another epistolary exercise in ingratiating: Frank's apology to those affected by the concealment of his engagement to Jane Fairfax.

The implications of the first debate are expanded significantly in its repetition, but the initial argument between Emma and Knightley over Frank can be viewed as a nucleus around which the moral and perceptual oppositions of the novel revolve. Emma and Knightley are the primary spokesmen for two views of life which imply different codes of manner and conduct. Frank's letters, ekphrastic touchstones for each code, are the most elaborate attempt to define (or in this case, excuse) behavior through language. With the epistle as an interpolated art form, Jane Austen defines the moral values of her novel using a variation of Cervantes' methodology: an implicit, self-reflexive argument on the correct and incorrect use of language. As in Don Quixote, the argument is supported by redoubling the theme with numerous other ekphrastic variations, such as Jane's letters, Elton's letter and charade, Emma's portrait of Harriet, and the word puzzle which Frank
uses to reveal his "blunder." But in moving from *Don Quixote* to *Emma*, the empirical-idealist debate shifts from a metaphysical to a social level, and it is appropriate that the terms be expressed not by the interpolation of a form of the romance, which transcends the ordinary, but rather by the epistle—the "occasional art" of everyday social intercourse.

The structure of the scene containing Emma's and Knightley's first debate concerning an epistle from Frank is prototypical of the pattern of an ekphrastic episode: two views of reality, in conflict over the verisimilitude of an interpolated art form, express continuous and discontinuous relationships with the novel's standard of *mimesis*. In his two-sided, almost tautological argument on the respective virtues of histories and romances, the Canon is the voice of continuity and discontinuity, as it is only appropriate for a novel like *Don Quixote*, in which historical particularity and romantic idealism are effectively combined. In *Emma*, the views are clearly divided between two characters because Austen, with little of Cervantes' dual allegiance, strives to show the superiority of one view over the other. Knightley, the novel's voice of ekphrastic continuity, speaks most clearly for the novel's implicit definition of truth; while Emma, the voice of discontinuity, perceives truth only partially.

A comparison of the scenes in *Don Quixote* and *Emma* that I have mentioned shows the tendency of ekphrastic episodes to resolve themselves into the pattern of a dialectic—and as the
scenes reflect, in miniature scale, the formal characteristics of the novels in which they are contained, they show the tendency of novels to express their mimetic relationships also in the terms of a dialectic. The precise terms of this universal dialectic are derived from the most pressing question of Cervantes' day, which would finally manifest itself in the form of Cartesian epistemology: the question of the relationship between mind and matter, subjective and objective, imagination and reality, and in the formal terms of Don Quixote, romance and history. When Descartes suggested that mind might indeed be separate from, and independent of, body, he legitimized philosophically the position that many artists of his time had proposed: that the subjective mind creates its own reality—as Calderón de la Barca implies in Life Is a Dream. The extreme form of this position is, naturally, solipsism. But Cartesian philosophy is a genuine dualism, and if mind and matter do exist independently, then it is possible that matter is antecedent to, and formative of, the mind that perceives it.

Acutely aware of the intellectual climate of his day, Cervantes embodies the moieties of Cartesian dualism in his fictional characterizations. Don Quixote gives, of course, the clearest example of a solipsistic vision, and nowhere is it more fully dramatized than in the episode of the Cave of Montesinos. By altering the mode of presentation from that which he has used to narrate the Don's other fallacious visions,
Cervantes stresses the exceptional nature of this particular experience. In the episodes that treat as farce Don Quixote's transformations of the "real" world through renaming it, Cervantes allows the reader to see through the illusion by presenting both the actual and idealized versions of a specific object. Thus, the reader can see the wooden puppet Don Quixote calls Sir Gaiferos, the common barber's basin he calls the helmet of Mambrino, and the foul-smelling peasant girl he calls Dulcinea: The testimony of the author through the narration, as well as the witness of other characters, serve as objective standards for the reader to gauge the degree of Don Quixote's miscalculations. But the Don is lowered alone by a rope into the cave, and, when he returns, he relates a fabulous adventure in which he enters a palace of transparent crystal where Montesinos and Durandarte, whose amputated heart is carried by his mistress Belem, await for him to deliver them from an enchantment that has lasted centuries. This adventure is completely subjective, and thus cannot be objectively verified.

It is interesting to note that Don Quixote's narration of this story is an ekphrastic narrative which reflects, like the puppet play of Sir Gaiferos, the central theme of Don Quixote, Book Two--the Don's mission to save Dulcinea from disenchantment. But more significantly the story represents Don Quixote as the kind of fictionmaker the Canon defends in his ekphrastic debate because his subjective imagination creates "a broad and
spacious field through which the pen could run without hindrance" (426), presumably without the hindrance of reality's demand for verisimilar objective representation. As I have noted, this part of the Canon's rhetorical debate defines the origin of the artistic tendency Wilhelm Worthinger calls abstraction which locates truth within the subjective imagination of the individual artist. The Canon admires this tendency because the writer, unrestrained by the limitations of everyday reality, can tell of any real or imagined event that would delight the reader, "describing shipwrecks, tempests, encounters and battles... now depicting a tragic and lamentable incident, now a joyful and unexpected event..." (426), or, as with Don Quixote, an enchanted crystal palace.

Echoing the Canon, Emma admires and defends Frank, as he is seen through his letters, because "he can adapt his conversation to the taste of everybody... To you, he will talk of farming; to me, of drawing and music, having that general information on all subjects..." (102). The exercise of unrestrained subjective imagination is, in eighteenth-century terms, the use of Fancy, and both Emma and Frank exhibit this faculty. The rationalistic impulse of the age censured the extreme subjectivity of solipsism, especially as it related to human communication. Without objectivity as a standard, individual views can become nothing more than self-serving statements. Thus, as John Locke condemned Fancy (or wit) as a "court-dresser," a sycophant "that studies but to please," so
Knightley condemns the embodiment of Fancy, Frank: "He can sit down and write a fine flourishing letter, full of professions and falsehoods, and persuade himself that he has hit upon the very best method in the world of preserving peace at home and preventing his father's having any right to complain" (101).

The obverse of Fancy is, of course, Understanding, which finds its embodiment in Knightley. Locke defines the purpose of Understanding (or judgment) in communication as the observation of accepted standards of verisimilitude. As the fulfillment of a moral obligation, the faculty serves one to "speak of things as they are" to his listeners so that they will not be misled. As Frank neither observes the social standards of truthful communication, nor writes of things as they are, he is censured by Knightley as having no "delicacy towards the feelings of other people" (101). Knightley's role in the ekphrastic debate over Frank's letter mirrors the first part of the Canon's debate in which he defends history for its verisimilitude—"the more it resembles the truth the better the fiction" (425). And as Knightley requires that communication, epistolary or otherwise, be conformable to a moral standard guiding affective response, so the Canon requires that fictions "have to match the minds of their readers" . . . (425).

Knightley and the Canon describe different versions of the most important empirical requirement of truth--consensus. If, as the empiricists insist, sense experience is the primary means of acquiring knowledge, then the only means of objectively
validating this knowledge is by a comparison with the sense experiences of others. Truth is the product of such a comparison which reveals a conformity of experience—a consensus. But the clearest dramatic evidence in Don Quixote of the consensus that the Canon describes ekphrastically is a mocking parody of the concept. When his friends deceive Don Quixote and pretend to agree with him that the barber’s basin is the helmet of Mambrino, they create what Terrence Doody calls a “false consensus.”

In the same way that he undermines the authority of both the Poet and Historian fictiormakers, Cervantes presents dramatic parodies of the Canon’s two-part debate in the form of solipsism and objectivism. Rejecting them individually, he combines them to create a hybrid literary form. Borrowing the terms of Hegelian dialectic for use as a metaphor, I can describe this process as a romantic-thesis being combined with a realistic-antithesis to create the synthesis of the novel. Austen, though, rejects one of the terms of her dialectic—Fancy—in favor of the other—Understanding. Is Emma, then, not the synthesis of romantic and realistic elements, as Harry Levin suggests all novels are? I think the question can be resolved by tracing Fancy and Understanding throughout Emma as they reveal themselves as the conflict between subjective and objective views of epistles.
B. The Epistler as False Narrator

According to Ian Watt, the works of Jane Austen are the apotheoses of the eighteenth-century novel because they successfully resolve the conflict of inner and outer presentation which was highlighted by the contrasting styles of Richardson and Fielding. Writes Watt: "Austen "was able to combine into a harmonious unity the advantages both of realism of presentation and realism of assessment, of the internal and of the external approaches to character. . . ."4 Watt's descriptive definition of Austen's novels, though, show them more Richardsonian in nature: "In her novels, there is usually one character whose consciousness is tacitly accorded a privileged status, and whose mental life is rendered more completely than that of the other characters."5 This is the strategy of Pamela and Clarissa, as well as Emma. However, the technique by which Austen renders the subjectivity of her heroine is different from that employed by Richardson. Richardson conceived of his novels as a series of epistolary soliloquies—a collection of unmodified subjective views. Austen, on the other hand, mixes Emma's inside views with direct and indirect authorial commentary. From the first sentence of the novel, in which "seemed to unite" subtly qualifies the enumeration of Emma's blessings to the climax of her revelations in which she realizes "the blunders, the blindness of her own head and heart" (283), our views of Emma's interior vision are mediated by a narrative voice which
carries with it the moral authority of the novel. Through such a use of narrative authority, Austen is able to provide the reader with an objective standard to show how Emma's subjective view of herself in society moves from a position which "seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence" (1) to one which is indeed "the perfect happiness of the union" (325).

Wayne Booth indicates that Austen limits inside views to Emma and, to a lesser extent, Knightley, because the other two major characters, Jane and Frank, must be viewed always from an external vantage point—a penetration into either of their thoughts would shatter a central mystery of the novel, their secret engagement. However, both Jane and Frank present subjective visions in the form of letters, the form it takes in the novels of Richardson and his imitators. Austen uses the subjectivity of the personal letter as an example of falsification to show, by contrast, the truth of the inside views supported by the moral authority of the omniscient author's voice. Ian Jack notices that generally in her novels "Jane Austen is always less willing to give us a letter which is evidence of a good character than a letter which reveals a bad one." And in his discussion of letter-writing in Emma specifically, U. C. Knoepflmacher notes that "Frank's elliptical behavior and Jane's enforced reserve are connected by Jane Austen to the practice of writing letters which can mask the true sentiments of the writer."

As Cervantes progressed from writing a romance, the Galatea,
to what some critics refer to as an "anti-romance," *Don Quixote*, so Jane Austen progressed from epistolary novels to a more complete form which uses the épistle to define, by parodic contrast, the newer, fuller medium. Norman Page chronicles Austen's use of the epistolary mode as "a record of its early use and gradual abandon in favour of other narrative techniques, though important traces remain even in the later novels."9 Her first exercises in the form were the epistolary novels *Love and Friendship* and *Lesley Castle* (dated 1790-92). And her last attempt was *Lady Susan*, which is dated before 1805. Her movement away from the form began with her revision of her epistolary novels *Elinor and Marianne*, *First Impressions*, and *Lady Susan* into their present form as the conventional narratives *Sense and Sensibility*, *Pride and Prejudice*, and *Mansfield Park*.10 In *Emma* the épistle remains only as a kind of parodic form, a device of falsification for untrustworthy characters.

Watt writes that Richardson uses the letter as a "short cut . . . to the heart."11 This direct approach to subjectivity in point of view ultimately led to such sentimental excess that it created a conventional heroine (marked, according to Dorothy Van Ghent, by "debility")12, who constantly apologized to her reader for the tears staining her lacrymose correspondence. The major defect of such a technique is, of course, its tendency toward maudlin presentations. But many of *Pamela*'s readers felt that her letters masked her true
motives, and Fielding took advantage of such a view by having Shamela write: "I thought once of making a little Fortune by my Person. I now intend to make a great one by my Vartue." In *Emma*, Jane Austen uses the letter to show that it can disguise, as well as give direct views of the true feelings of the heart. For the reader, the novel is a mystery in which he is to discover gradually through a series of revelations the actual feelings and relations of characters, and letters are used to serve this end. Letters are summarized, anticipated, praised, criticized, and remarked upon throughout the novel, for Austen wants the reader to concentrate on the recipient's response as a clue to the letter-writer's character. It is not until the end of the last volume that a letter (Frank's final one) is quoted in full, and by then all the major mysteries have been revealed completely; the reader is finally in a position to compare the truth of fact with the truth in letter, a comparison that reveals Frank's character.

*Emma*'s obsessive concern with epistles and its subtle rejection of the epistolary mode in fiction represent Austen's self-conscious attempt to transcend an outworn narrative technique by revealing its potential for falsification. She posits that for subjective views, the stimulus of Fancy, to be considered trustworthy by her readers, they must be supported by different forms of the external standard of Understanding. The trustworthy, dependable Knightley is, as I pointed out, one of such forms. But the ultimate external standard the
reader can trust is, of course, the voice of the intrusive author which Watt defines as an "august and impersonal spirit of social and psychological understanding." By embodying the moral and intellectual values of the community, the author's voice has the value of consensus—not unlike the first-person narrators of Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily" and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, both of whom are so much voices of the community that they speak of themselves in first-person plural—the communal "we." But Austen's omniscient narrator, described by Wayne Booth as nothing less than "a perfect human being, within the concept of perfection defined by the book," more closely resembles George Eliot's narrative voice. The omniscient narrators of Eliot and Austen speak with an authority reserved for the acknowledged standard of social understanding. Obviously, to maintain any sense of mystery for the reader, or any joy of surprise or sudden elucidation, Austen must withhold use of complete omniscience in order to create a sense of doubt as to the honesty and reliability of certain characters, particularly Frank. An implicit debate on the proper and improper use of language evolves throughout the novel which focuses primarily on characters' subjective and objective judgments of the meaning disclosed by Frank's epistles. These judgments serve as partial movements of the debate which is resolved, first, by the extended discussion between Emma and Knightley on Frank's last letter, and, second, by the omniscient author's final summation.
C. The Language of the Real and Ideal in *Emma*

Returning to Frank's first letter and Emma's response that "he can adapt his conversation to the taste of everybody," a sensitive reader of Austen's works should be reminded of *Northanger Abbey* and Henry Tilney's criticism of Catherine's use of the word "nice":

'Very true,' said Henry, 'and this is a very nice day, and we are taking a very nice walk, and you are very nice young ladies. Oh! it is a very nice word indeed!--it does for every thing. Originally perhaps it was applied only to express neatness, propriety, delicacy, or refinement;--people were nice in their dress, in their sentiments, or in their choice. But now every commendation on every subject is comprised in that one word.'

A speaker or a writer like Frank who uses language "to the taste of everybody" is like a word that "does for everything"; neither can have any real value in the social world created by Jane Austen whose standards are maintained by words with relatively fixed and precise meanings which cannot be altered to suit equivocal and subjective views. Arnold Kettle writes: "The precision of her [Austen's] standards emerges in her style. Each word--'elegance,' 'humour,' 'temper,' 'ease'--has a precise, unambiguous meaning based on a social usage at once subtle and stable." C. S. Lewis also notes Austen's propensity for using abstract words of moral value which have lost their precise meanings due to the accretion of years of misuse, diffusing their once clear definitions. He writes:
the great abstract nouns of the classical English moralists are unblushingly and uncomromisingly used: 'good sense,' 'courage,' 'contentment,' 'fortitude,' 'some duty neglected, some failing indulged,' 'impropriety, 'indelicacy,' 'generous candour,' 'blamable trust,' 'just humiliation,' 'vanity,' 'folly,' 'ignorance,' 'reason.' These are the concepts by which Jane Austen grasps the world. In her we still breathe the world of the Rambler and the Idler. All is hard, clear, definable; by some modern standards, even naively so. 18

Mark Schorer, too, comments upon Austen's use of such words which he describes as "buried or dead metaphors," 19 and he emphasizes their metaphorical use as vehicles to stable tenors of commerce and property. But words which express moral rather than commercial value are even more dominant, I believe, and it is by concentrating on the repetition of these words that a more complete understanding of the novel can be attained.

"Delicacy" is a word used frequently as a moral touchstone in Emma; it and the word "elegance" are two of the "great abstract nouns of the classical English moralists," of which Lewis writes. "Delicacy," a moral metonym of "elegance," is a requisite for all the characters who are called elegant, truly or falsely, throughout the novel. As the OED notes, "elegance" signifies "refined grace or propriety"—outward manifestations of cultivation and taste; "delicacy," though, in eighteenth-century usage frequently means "delicate regard for the feelings of others," an inner quality of elegance, and a drastic shift from its original meaning in the sixteenth-century as "soft, tender beauty." In spite of the critical
emphasize on "elegance" as the primary social quality in *Emma*, "delicacy" is closer to the novel's moral center. It is the quality that Emma who is "handsome, clever, and rich" lacks in order to "unite . . . the best blessings of existence," and it is through Knightley that she acquires this quality necessary to her perfection.

The most severe charge that Knightley levels against Frank in response to his first letter is that "he can have no English delicacy towards the feelings of other people." Austen purposely contrasts Frank's letter with Robert Martin's which contains his proposal to Harriet Smith. In spite of the fact that Emma has dismissed Martin as "a completely gross, vulgar farmer," (21) Emma grudgingly credits him with having written a decent letter:

> The style of the letter was much above her expectation. There were not merely no grammatical errors, but as a composition it would not have disgraced a gentleman; the language, though plain, was strong and unaffected, and the sentiments it conveyed very much to the credit of the writer. It was short, but expressed good sense, warm attachment, liberality, propriety, even delicacy of feeling. (32-3)

Emma admires delicacy in others, even though she lacks it herself. Knightley, defining "English delicacy," observes class distinctions (in this very caste-oriented world) while genuinely regarding all levels. In a novel written about and for the landed gentry, Jane Austen demands that they show
delicacy toward those in the lower social strata. It is his
delicacy that makes Knightley the paragon of virtue and Emma's
lack of it that makes her a snob for the greater part of the
novel. Emma repeats her evaluation of Robert Martin when Har-
riet relates her meeting with him after she has sent her let-
ter of rejection. Emma observes:

The young man's conduct, and his sister's,
seemed the result of real feeling, and she
could not but pity them. As Harriet described
it, there had been an interesting mixture of
wounded affection and genuine delicacy in
their behavior. (120)

Ironically, though Emma can recognize the virtue of delicacy in
Robert Martin's letter and conversation, she can dismiss her
lack of it as a social privilege. After complimenting the
genuine feeling in Martin's letter of proposal, she instructs
Harriet: "You need not be prompted to write with the appear-
ance of sorrow for his disappointment" (37). Stuart Tave
comments upon Emma's hypocritical recognition of delicacy in
the action of others while ignoring her own indecent behavior,
and he concludes: "Robert Martin is delicate but Emma Wood-
house is not . . . because the needs of her imagination make
her own mind improper and indecent." 21

Knightley, the embodiment of delicacy, offers an extended
definition of the virtue in his description of Robert Martin:
"He always speaks to the purpose; open, straightforward, and
very well judging" (39). Later, Knightley criticizes Jane
Fairfax for her reserve by saying, "I love an open temper" (196). In the world of Emma, delicacy implies that genuine feeling for others calls for direct, unequivocal converse in speech and letters. It is a conversation which recognizes that falsification upsets the careful social balance of all parts which only delicacy can maintain. Delicacy in conversation or writing calls for the speaker to use words in a clearly referential relationship with objects or qualities, a relationship agreed upon by social consensus. The lack of this quality renders honest communication impossible. "Gallant," the epithet most often used to describe Frank Churchill, implies a moral conduct which exhibits only the exterior quality of delicacy—a going through the motions which makes him, according to Knightley, "amiable only in French."

Emma's movement from her contrived infatuation with Frank to her real love for Knightley represents the course of her education in "English delicacy." At the novel's beginning, she is, with Frank, at a moral extreme from Knightley. Austen's dilemma is to maintain sympathies for Emma (and to a lesser extent Frank) for a long enough time so that the reader might hope for her education, while simultaneously spelling out the moral values of the novel which show her heroine to be at fault. She accomplishes both objectives in exposing Emma's faults through a dramatic portrayal of a succession of her heroine's miscalculations, leading to a climactic one which precedes her repentance.
An early clue to her moral flaw is her underestimating Robert Martin's value while overestimating Mr. Elton's. As Martin's delicacy early in the novel mirrors Knightley's virtues, so Elton's flaws mirror Frank's (and at this point, Emma's). During the same conversation in which she calls Martin a "gross, vulgar farmer," ignoring the delicacy of his letter, she recommends Elton above all suitable bachelors:

"I think a young man might be very safely recommended to take Mr. Elton as a model. Mr. Elton is good humoured, cheerful, obliging, and gentle" (21). And later she calls him "a most valuable, amiable, pleasing young man" (75). In spite of realizing of Elton that "for with all his good and agreeable qualities, there was a sort of parade in his speeches which was very apt to make her laugh" (56), she is fooled by his endless compliments, flattering language, and ingratiating speeches into believing that he is courting Harriet and not herself. But when the reality of Elton's motives asserts itself physically and violently, she is forced to the conclusion:

"There had been no real affection either in his language or manner. Sighs and fine words had been given in abundance; but she could hardly devise any set of expressions, or fancy any tone of voice, less allied with real love" (92). And appropriately, when the rejected Elton departs from Highbury, he leaves a "long, civil, ceremonious note" (95) which falsifies his true motives as Martin's short, direct letter does not.
Elton's equivocation and his indirect use of language prepare the reader for Frank Churchill's similar behavior, but these clues are not sufficient for Emma. Why does not Emma learn a lasting lesson from Elton's flaws? Because she blindly shares some of them. For one, in rejecting Harriet, Elton exhibits the same motive as Emma in dismissing Robert Martin—pure snobbery. He complains: "Miss Smith is a very good sort of girl; and I should be happy to see her respectably settled. I wish her extremely well: and, no doubt, there are men who might not object to—Every body has their level; but as for myself, I am not, I think, quite so much at a loss. I need not so totally despair of an equal alliance as to be addressing myself to Miss Smith!" (90). Thus, they both exhibit a lack of delicacy in taking advantage of class status. But more important than this, Emma shares with Elton a misrepresentation of herself and life through ploys and disguises. Elton's "charade," a word game which offers its meaning only as a puzzle to be solved, is another contrast to the simple, direct, and truthful language of Robert Martin. Emma's misrepresentations, though not as blatant and obvious as Elton's, are just as insidious for the real and potential havoc they wreak on herself and the other characters in the novel.

Emma misrepresents the world because she cannot accept it as it is. As David Minter interprets her flaw: "Emma allows her fancy and imagination to shape and distort her perception of reality; and because she demands [a] harmony
and symmetry life cannot attain, she permits herself to meddle
and interfere with the lives of other people." Emma's
painting of Harriet is a parody of the Pygmalion theme—she
tries to make the real Harriet into the ideal Harriet she
portrays on canvas:

There was no want to likeness, she had been
fortunate in the attitude, and as she meant
to throw in a little improvement to the fig-
ure, to give a little more height, and consid-
erably more elegance, she had great confidence
of its being in every way a pretty drawing at
last, and of its filling its destined place
with credit to them both—a standing memorial
of the beauty of one, the skill of the other,
and the friendship of both. (30)

Knightley's reminder, "You have made her too tall, Emma" (31),
has the effect of Sancho's "What's giants?" when Don Quixote
attacks the windmills; it deflects Emma's aggrandizement of
Harriet's character. Even Mrs. Weston notices, "Miss Smith
has not those eye-brows and eye-lashes. It is the fault of
the face she has them not" (31). Only the falsifier Elton
approves of Emma's falsifications. Emma's notion that she
could "give . . . considerably more elegance" to Harriet as
easily as adding more spice to the stew is a sign of her in-
erent ignorance of that quality. Emma is just as blind to
her own lack of elegance because of her indelicacy, as she is
to the notion that she can bestow it upon whomever she pleases.
In attempting to make the word "elegance" transform the in-
elegant Harriet, Emma reflects the use of language Don Quixote
exhibits, for example, when he tries to transform the vulgar
Aldonzo Lorenzo into a beautiful damsel by applying the nomen Dulcinea del Toboso. The portrait of Harriet is a sign or signifier meaning elegance which does not correspond to the designated signified object. Like Don Quixote with his ideal names, Emma, following her subjective ideal, tries to recreate the world by renaming it. Her signs or symbols of transformation come from as romantic a conception of the world as the Don's. Her romanticism is derived, as is his, from a kind of solipsism—a vision of the world in which she is the creative center. And Emma's attempts to make the world conform to what she calls it (the portrait, for example, as a sign of elegance signifying the inelegant Harriet) are just as much failures as are his. Both Emma and Don Quixote are, in the terms of the previous chapter, Poets in their uses of language: as they define it, the language of the ideal allows the word to carry the full weight of signification and to have a transcendental relationship with the object it describes. Idealistic literatures are often utopian because of this ameliorative function of language, but because of the realistic perspectives in Emma and Don Quixote, both novels present an ironic parody of utopia.

D. Emma's False Poetic Vision

The portrait of Harriet is the most concrete example of Emma's attempt to force the world into a mold preconceived by her imagination. It is a product of her cleverness and her fancy, those virtues which isolate her both favorably and unfavorably from the other characters in the novel. She smugly
evaluates her talents while waiting for Harriet at Ford's:
"A mind lively and at ease, can do with seeing nothing, and
can see nothing that does not answer" (158). Emma's mind is
a creator's, and she sees a world rich in potential and variety.
Similarly, Emma makes another flattering evaluation of her
cleverness when she concocts a romantic intrigue between
Harriet and Frank, who has saved her little protegee from a
band of discourteous gipsies:

Could a linguist, could a grammarian, could
even a mathematician have seen what she did,
have witnessed their appearance together,
and heard their history of it, without feel-
ing the circumstances had been at work to make
them peculiarly interesting to each other?—
How much more must an imaginist, like herself,
be on fire with speculation and foresight!—
especially with such a ground-work of antici-
pation as her mind had already made. (227-28)

Unlike a linguist or a grammarian, whose methods limit them to
exact and precise interpretations, Emma can use appearances
as the groundwork for speculation and foresight. An imaginist,
Emma tries to create (rather than accept unquestioningly) the
world in which she lives. The world Emma tries to create is
derived from the same fictive materials used by Don Quixote—
the language of romantic fiction. But instead of using chiv-
alric romances as a model, Emma looks to the conventions of
the gothic romance. From the very beginning, the reader sees
Emma try to make the world a romantic one in which the orphaned
Harriet, discovered to be the daughter of a nobleman, is molded
into the elegant bride of Mr. Elton; in which she, Emma, receives and refuses the blind devotion of Frank Churchill, who then becomes the courageous hero-lover of Harriet after saving her from gypsies; in which Jane Fairfax is secretly admired by the married Mr. Dixon; and, most importantly, Emma tries to create a world in which she herself remains unmatched and unequalled in elegance.

The world which Emma attempts to create is shattered only when she can recognize an indelicacy in her behavior which makes her anything but elegant. By his actions and his evaluations of Martin, Knightley defines the meaning of delicacy and elegance according to a standard of verisimilitude agreed upon by a consensus of those in his, and Austen's, social class. Emma's gradual acceptance of the objective definitions of these concepts, which contradict her subjective view of them, is a measure of her education. At the novel's beginning, the world of Highbury offers Emma no feminine companion with whom she can compare her own perceived elegance. But when Jane Fairfax enters the scene, Emma is forced to make comparisons of the young girl with herself, and she discovers that her own qualities are matched, and in some cases exceeded:

Jane Fairfax was elegant, remarkably elegant; and she had herself the highest value for elegance. Her height was pretty, just such as almost everybody would think tall, and nobody would think very tall; her figure particularly graceful . . . It was a style of beauty, of which elegance was the reigning character, and as such, she must, in honour, by all principles admire it:--elegance, which, whether of person or of mind she saw so little in Highbury. There, not to be vulgar, was distinction and merit. (111-12)
Emma is uncomfortable around Jane and is annoyed by Miss Bates' constant adulations for her niece because she suspects that she may have found someone superior to herself—a new standard for elegance in Highbury. Emma's smugness is threatened once again by Mrs. Elton who defines elegance in reverse; in this woman who blatantly demands that others accept her as superior and who claims the right to meddle in Jane's life as a matchmaker much in the same way Emma does in Harriet's, Emma should be able to see herself. Like Emma, who is introduced initially as "handsome, clever, and rich" (1), Augusta Hawkins, soon to be Mrs. Elton, is announced as "handsome, elegant, highly accomplished, and perfectly amiable" (121), but Emma can recognize her false elegance:

She did not really like her. She would not be in a hurry to find fault, but she suspected there was no elegance;—ease but not elegance.—She was almost sure that for a young woman, a stranger, a bride, there was too much ease. Her person was rather good; her face not unpretty; but neither feature, nor air, nor voice, nor manner, were elegant. (183)

With all the other characters whose elegance is exposed as pretense—Frank, Mr. Elton, Mr. Weston, and Emma herself—Mrs. Elton shares a single, consistent quality: smooth, flattering verbosity. Through words they try to create a veneer of elegance by an excessive overlay of external refinement. These characters falsify themselves through words which disguise their true character in a manner similar to Emma's falsifying the true character of Harriet through the idealized portrait.
As Frank Bradbrook notes: "Great conversationalists are usually insincere as well as incorrect in their use of language, and reading a novel of Jane Austen is largely a matter of distinguishing between 'the usual rate of conversation.'"23

Emma is able to see through Mrs. Elton's vulgar opulence to the true inelegance within, but she cannot see through Frank because the young man has ready allies for his falsifications—Emma's vanity and imagination. Frank pretends to court Emma, of course, only to disguise his engagement to Jane, but the false courtship holds many charms for Emma—she is able to fabricate a romantic adventure for herself and (with Frank's aid) for Jane with Mr. Dixon. Frank has an intoxicating influence on Emma. Because of his callous machinations, she actually begins to lose control of herself, allowing her flaws (enhanced by Frank's flattery) to dominate her. All that is wrong with Frank and Emma and with the world they try to create becomes apparent at the disastrous party at Box Hill.

When Frank playfully announces to the gathering: "I am ordered by Miss Woodhouse . . . to say, that she desires to know what you are all thinking of" (253), he, in essence, gives voice to Emma's deepest desire—to know everyone's thoughts and be able to manipulate their lives because of such a privilege.

As a creator, an imaginist, she demands omniscience. Later, when Frank moderates his request, speaking for Emma, that "she only demands from you either one thing very clever . . . or three things very dull indeed" (253), he gives expression to a
slightly more admirable aspect of Emma's imagination--its
demand that the world be more entertaining, rich, and varied.
Lionel Trilling calls this "a poet's demand." 24

Frank's presumptions on the part of her omniscience and
privilege make Emma nearly giddy with her own power. Whereas
before she has harmed others innocently with her cleverness
and imagination, now Frank has given vent to the darker side
of her self. When Miss Bates tries to add to the levity by
making fun of her own ability to say dull things, Emma insults
her: "Ah! ma'am, but there may be a difficulty. Pardon me--
but you will be limited as to number--only three at once" (254).
This insult is particularly devastating because it is given
to Miss Bates who, as the most pitiable character in the
novel, is, according to Bradbrook, "a test of other people's
chivalry, forebearance, and charity," 25 and, one might add,
delicacy. Emma's indelicacy represents the farthest reach of
her world of imagination from the world of reality and respon-
sibility. And it evokes the strongest reaction from Knightley,
who once again must remind her of the limitations of imagina-
tion. "I will tell you truths while I can" (257), Mr. Knight-
ley says, blunting not a whit the full force of censure:

Were she a woman of fortune, I would leave
every harmless absurdity to take its chance.
I would not quarrel with you for any liber-
ties of manner. Were she your equal in
situation--but, Emma, consider how far this
is from being the case. She is poor; she
has sunk from the comforts she was born to;
and, if she live to old age, must probably
sink to more. Her situation should secure
your compassion. (257)
Mr. Weston's conundrum ("What two words... express perfection... M. and A.--Em-ma"), coming at the heels of Emma's disgraceful action, not only emphasizes how far the heroine is from a perfect state, but it also serves as a contrast to Knightley's honesty: "I will tell you truths." Mr. Weston's inappropriate use of perfection in reference to Emma, echoes Emma's own mismatching of elegance with Harriet. Both the conundrum and the portrait are ekphrastic metaphors of language that are discontinuous with the novel's system of language. Like father, like son: Mr. Weston is a falsifier, an eloquent, charming misrepresenter of events. Emma has already perceived some of this when she says of Weston: "to be the favourite and intimate of a man who had so many intimates and confidants, was not the first distinction in the scale of vanity" (217).

When Emma leaves Box Hill, she retains Knightley's true, and not Weston's false, representation of her, and her acceptance of this truth is the climax, the turning point of the novel, the point at which she is able to confront the fuller truths that are soon to be revealed:

Never had she felt so agitated, mortified, grieved at any circumstance in her life. She was most forcibly struck. The truth of his representation there was no denying. She felt it at her heart. How could she have been so brutal, so cruel to Miss Bates!--How could she have exposed herself to such ill opinion in anyone she valued! And how suffer him to leave her in without saying one word of gratitude, of concurrence, of common kindness. (258)
E. The Language of the Real

"I will tell you truths while I can": Emma is a novel about truth and the correct perception of it. Through the party at Box Hill, the reader has been introduced to the patrons of falsification--unrestrained imagination, flattery, insincere verbosity, vulgar opulence--and is prepared, with Emma, to see the workings of truth. After her difficult admission of wrong-doing, Emma is soon allowed to see truly. When Mr. Woodhouse informs Knightley of Emma's repentant visits to Miss and Mrs. Bates, she is praised (she thinks unjustly) for her attentiveness:

Emma's colour was heightened by this unjust praise; and with a smile, and shake of the head, which spoke much, she looked at Mr. Knightley.--It seemed as if there were an instantaneous impression in her favour, as if his eyes received the truth from her's, and all that had passed of good in her feelings were at once caught and honoured. (264)

What Emma receives is a hint of the pleasures of truth which she is soon to enjoy. But before this, she must be instructed again in the acceptance and understanding of truth. Her next lesson comes with Frank's letter to the Westons which announces his secret engagement to Jane and discloses all the falsities which he had created. With her new moral knowledge, Emma condemns Frank harshly:

Impropriety! Oh! Mrs. Weston--it is too calm a censure. Much, much beyond impropriety!--It has sunk him, I cannot say how it
has sunk him in my opinion. So unlike what a man should be! -- None of that upright integrity, that strict adherence to truth and principle, that disdain of trick and littleness, which a man should display in every transaction of his life. (273)

The standard for manhood that Emma evokes is, of course, Knightley's. It is the same standard that Knightley had insisted upon when he discussed with Emma what he saw of Frank through his first letter: "There is one thing, Emma, which a man can always do, and that is, his duty; not by maneuvering and finessing, but by vigour and resolution" (99). Knightley shows, by example, that a life guided by truth as the adherence to duty and principle is not an enforced external standard but an inner quality marked by naturalness and directness--delicacy.

The recognition of truth, for Austen, is more an emotional than an intellectual experience. She has shown that through words, the tools of the intellect, truth can be disguised. All the characters of Emma who are most proficient and skilled in language use it excessively to compensate for their lack of truth. When truth is there, it can be exchanged, as by Knightley and Emma, through a glance. Emma's revelation of "the blindness of her head and heart" (283) leads her to realize that "to understand, thoroughly understand her own heart was the first endeavor" (283). Her greater emotional awareness allows her to recognize the central truth of the novel--her love for Knightley. And Knightley, in contrast
to all the other mellifluously eloquent lovers, declares himself by saying: "I cannot make speeches, Emma... If I loved you less, I might be able to talk about it more. But you know what I am.--You hear nothing but truth from me" (296).

And after this short opening declaration by Knightley, Austen makes her famous withdrawal from the scene, summarizing what Knightley and Emma say to each other not, as popularly conceived, out of discretion, but rather as a final testament to the relative unimportance of words in the communication of truth. She leaves the true proposal by Knightley silent after having quoted verbatim Elton's false one. Here, only the narrative voice must speak:

Seldom, very seldom does complete truth belong to any human disclosure; seldom can it happen that something is not a little disguised, or a little mistaken; but where, as in this case, the feelings are not, it may not be very material. (297)

Austen, speaking through the narrative voice, gives the novel's final statement on the proper communication of truth. Granting that disguise and mistake are inherent in any disclosure, she affirms that when truth resides in what is being communicated, such interferences within the medium can be overcome. But when the medium bears most or all of the weight of signification, as do Emma's portrait and Frank's epistles, the possibility of falsification is much greater.

It is no coincidence that the next chapter does not reveal
more about Knightley and Emma, but gives a verbatim quote of Frank's final letter with several characters' reaction to it. Knoepflmacher calls the letter "an epistolary masterpiece worthy of Lord Chesterfield's Letters to His Son," but the reader, by this time, should be on guard against extended, florid speeches. As before, Frank tries to evade responsibility for his misconduct by a verbose, polished, circumlocutory apology. Verbosity is needed here because his conduct, if described simply and directly, would be judged by those he has offended as inexcusable; it must be viewed through the distortion of circumlocutions to be judged anything else. Frank himself is aware that the length of his apology makes it suspect when he writes, "this letter, which will be longer than I foresee . . ." (302), and, later, "I must still add to this long letter" (303). In seeking Emma's good graces once again, Frank resorts to his old weapon--flattery--with predictable results. Emma is lulled by his deceptive pleasantry into a state of admiration: "Every line relating to herself was interesting, and almost every line agreeable" (306). She has not learned completely the lesson taught by Knightley and must be re-educated.

In reading Frank's letter, Emma, unknowingly, accepts the use of rhetorical conventions as substitutes for what she thinks are true feelings. As the "Aeolus" chapter of Ulysses is an entire encyclopedia of rhetorical devices, so Frank's letter in Emma is a single volume in an encyclopedia of rhetoric
detailing the tropes of emotional appeal: anacoenosis, apostrophe, comprobatio, donysis, encomium, erotesis, eucharistia, paonismus, onedismus, philophronesis, eulogia, exucitatio, apoplanesis, anticategoria, and many more are used by Frank with the timing and precision of a master apologist.

Frank has the good sense to begin his epistle with comprobatio, compliments to his judges: "I know it [the letter] will be read with candour and indulgence.--You are all goodness ..." (301). Then, he asks his readers (the letter is addressed to Mrs. Weston, but Frank knows that she will show it to all affected parties) to consider the entire situation from his subjective viewpoint, disregarding the objective appearances and affects of his actions. In essence, Frank asks his readers to see with his subjective distortions rather than accept what is readily apparent. Believing that all can see the events through his eyes, Frank uses dicaeologia, excusing his actions because of necessity: "you must consider me as having a secret which was to be kept at all hazards" (301). Then he resorts to encomium, extolling those he has most offended; Jane he calls "the most upright female mind in the creation . . ." (301), and he praises Emma's "delicacy of . . . mind . . ." (302). In praising Emma for her delicacy, Frank duplicates the unwarranted flattery of his father's conundrum. This statement, alone, should be enough to alert the reader against falsification. Ever ready to assure his reader of his sincerity, Frank relies upon donysis, a dramatic reenactment of an emotion: when he begins to write of Mrs. Elton's
In the manipulation of Jane, he inserts a direct address—"Here, my dear madam, I was obliged to leave off abruptly, to recollect and compose myself" (303). *Dicaeologia* is used tediously, sometimes stretching credulity to its limit—he blames the grief and business obligations from his unloved aunt's death for his mindlessly locking in his desk the letter which, if mailed, would reconcile him with Jane. Typically, the letter ends with an impassioned *eucharistia*, not one but "a thousand and a thousand thanks . . ." (305).

Ignorant of its almost total reliance upon conventions instead of sincerity, Emma brings the letter to Knightley and expects him finally to approve of Frank in light of this most worthy epistle. Indeed, he does exclaim: "What a letter the man writes!" (308). But he is quick to see through Frank's reliance on epistolary conventions: "Humph!—a fine complimentary opening" (306). When Knightley charges that Frank in his letter, "trifles here . . . as to the temptation" (306), he refers to the young man's stated temptation to view the concealment of the engagement a virtue. The reason for the temptations Frank refuses to announce, and Knightley calls attention to this lapse, this *apoplanesis* (evading the issue by digressing) or *aposiopesis* (leaving a statement unfinished). Knightley brushes aside Frank's dicaeologic excuses for his behavior toward Emma. When he reads that Frank falsely carried on the flirtation with Emma in order to disguise further his engagement with Jane, Knightley declares: "He is too much
indebted to the event for his acquittal" (307). And he cannot truly believe Frank when he writes that he believed Emma knew of the secret all along. Knightley refuses to do what Frank has asked his readers—to accept his subjective view of the world as their own. Seen objectively, Frank's letter is a string of rather empty conventions. Acknowledging the grief Frank had brought to himself and others, Knightley conveys the moral lesson of the novel: "My Emma, does not every thing serve to prove more and more the beauty of truth and sincerity in all our dealings with each other?" (307).

Knightley softens his criticism of Frank, though, when Emma asks: "I wish you would read it [his letter] with a kinder spirit towards him" (308). To this he replies: "Well, there is feeling here" (308). Austen, in the latter part of the novel, is careful to show that Emma's and Knightley's union is not so much a matter of his raising her to his own superior level as it is a mutual complementing of the superior qualities of both. This ekphrasis shows that as Emma acquires keener discrimination through reason, Knightley's sternness is softened. Emma has been the symbolic figure of the subjective imagination, Fancy, and emotion, and Knightley has represented objective understanding and reason. Their union represents Austen's creative doctrine of intellectualizing emotion and emotionalizing intellect. Her narrative voice is the combination of Fancy and Understanding as it mediates between the subjective views of her characters and the objective views of
social consensus. Thus, when Emma and Knightley are joined in "the perfect happiness of . . . union" (335), they signify a coming together of the romantic and realistic elements in Emma.

But Knightley's final dismissal of Frank--"I cannot think any longer about Frank Churchill" (309)--is the end of the debate and the end of any serious consideration by Austen and her heroine of this pleasant but deceptive character. When Emma sees him again, their meeting is genial, and Frank's manner exhibits his usual charm and grace. Emma leaves, though, thinking that "pleased as she had been to see Frank Churchill, and regarding him as she did with friendship, she had never been more sensible of Mr. Knightley's high superiority of character" (332). She has been educated by Knightley to see by Frank's example the dangers of the abuse of language.

Her marriage is criticized as being shabby by the pompous, loquacious Mrs. Elton, but by now Emma has "no taste for finery or parade" (334). Her union with Knightley completes her acceptance of the simple truth.

F. The Conflict of Language

In their respective works, Cervantes and Austen portray an ambivalent attitude toward language, their common artistic medium. Both Emma and Don Quixote contain ekphrastic arguments against the excesses of language as a medium for the artistic representation of the real world. Both authors portray characters who present false representations of the world
by using language which does not correspond faithfully to fact or truth. Cervantes is probably more ambivalent since he portrays a greater variety of characters whose uses of language are false in some way. There is no equivalent in Don Quixote to the august, impersonal omniscient narrative voice of Emma. Because Cervantes supplies no single reliable voice and provides instead several conflicting ones, doubt is cast ultimately upon each—from the Historian who seeks to reproduce the external world through language to the Poet who creates a unique world of words.

But even though Austen uses in Emma a voice that can be trusted completely for its evaluations and conceptions (its consistently faithful use of language), she still does not find language alone completely reliable. All the most skilled and talented writers and speakers in Emma are shown to use language for purposes of falsification. Truth is communicated directly, simply—either without words through a true understanding of feeling, or with a few words of clear and precise meanings. Austen stands at the end of a tradition of eighteenth-century novelists who, according to Watt, were influenced by Locke's theories of literary language. At the end of Book Three of the Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Locke cites "eloquence and the fair sex" for indulging in falsification through pleasure.²⁷ Watt defines this tradition as a break with the previous one which "was not primarily concerned with the correspondence of words to things, but rather with the extrinsic beauties which could be bestowed upon description
and action by the use of rhetoric." The new tradition, he writes, employs a narrative style that does not "divert our attention from the content of the report to the skill of the reporter." Watt's argument, though valuable, is limited in some respects. His somewhat hasty conclusion to these accurate premises is that realism in the novel is characterized by a referential use of language and plainness of style. By this reasoning, he finds Fielding and Madame de la Fayette outside the mainstream of the realistic tradition because of their respectively exuberant and elegant uses of language. And by implication all major novelists who do not adapt the plainness of style characterized by Richardson and Defoe are outside the mainstream as significant but regrettable exceptions. But what is characteristic of many Realistic novels is a style, whether plain or elevated, that aspires toward the transparent. A novel which attempts to give the reader the illusion of experiencing life directly through the minds of the major characters must employ a style that does not call attention to itself in a manner that would diminish the reality of the material; rather it must draw the reader into that reality so that language and vision are one.

Watt is correct in defining the trend of fictional language from the late eighteenth through the nineteenth-century. Of the two narrative choices defined by Cervantes, the novelist as either Poet or Historian, the movement of Realism would
adopt the latter. But the closer the novelist, who obeys the empirical or empathetic impulse, comes to the ideal of creating the illusion of direct experience, he faces a dilemma. As noted by A. A. Mendilow, "while the intention of fiction is to communicate experience, experience unlike thought does not happen in language." 30 Aspiring toward the ideal of direct representation, the Realistic novelist must accept language as, according to Mendilow, "an opaque medium interposed between reality and our awareness of it, and between our awareness and our expression." 31 Faced with such a medium, the novelist can attempt to make its opaqueness as transparent as possible, or he can accept and even revel in its interposition by stressing its autonomous relationship with the real world.

Even though the novelist as Poet or Historian might aspire toward an ideal of either symbolization or representation, I contend that what he must finally accept is a compromise between the two. I have defined the conflict of mimetic impulses in the terms of a dialectic, in which the opposing factors are merged into a synthesis. In Don Quixote, the conflict between Poet and Historian is resolved by a merging of the techniques of both, and in Emma the conflicting interests of Fancy and Understanding are brought together in "a perfect union." These syntheses exhibit the novelist's acknowledgement of the fact that language can neither be abstracted completely from the world of experience, nor can it duplicate it--it exists in a state of tension between its own
autonomous symbolic system and the objects symbolized by it. The tension of language between symbol and object is translated, by its use as an artistic medium, into the tension in each novel between the fictive world it creates and the real world it evokes. The ekphrastic convention is a product of this tension: it is a way that the tension itself can be portrayed in dramatic scenes which are symbolic of the novel's response to the opposing pressures of language and reality. Thus, in every ekphrasis there are oppositions of characters, views of life, and theories of art which can be translated into expressions of how the novelist comes to terms with the limitations of his medium.

But even though all novels must, as I contend, create a synthesis of the idealistic and empirical impulses affecting language, the merger is not always equal. Don Quixote comes as close as any novel to obeying both impulses. But in Emma the scales of the balance are tipped in favor of objective representation. In both novels, the Poet-character loses his illusory view of life to accept a more realistic one, but whereas Austen portrays his loss as a gain, giving the novel a comic conclusion, Cervantes records the loss as tragic. Contrary to his claim, Cervantes wrote Don Quixote not so much to destroy romantic ideals as to show that they must be based in the world of everyday reality. His prescription for romance, though, set the tone for the nineteenth-century novel, and the movement of literary Realism.
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IV. TOLSTOY'S PORTRAIT OF A LADY

A. Character and Portrait

Chronicling the inevitable course of their tragic affair, Tolstoy affords Anna and Vronsky one brief interlude of relative quiet and peace: when they run away to Italy after Anna's near death at childbirth and Vronsky's aborted suicide. In all the pages of Anna Karenina, this digression\(^1\) contains nearly the sum of their shared serenity. Deprived of his military and government career, Vronsky decides to live the life of an artiste by gathering together the accoutrements necessary for such a calling: he rents a decaying palazzo, replete with wall frescoes, mosaic floors, damask hangings, and even an original Tintoretto; he wears a hat and a cloak flung over his shoulder in medieval fashion. One of his first artistic projects is to paint a portrait of Anna in Italian costume, fixing in oil an image of her that he has shaped according to an ideal. But before he can finish the portrait, he hires a professional painter, Mihailov, another Russian expatriate living in Italy, to paint a second portrait of Anna, of which Tolstoy writes:

After the fifth sitting the portrait impressed everybody, especially Vronsky, not only by its likeness but also by its peculiar beauty. It was strange how Mihailov had been able to discover that peculiar beauty. 'One needs to know and love her, as I have loved her, to discover the very sweetest expression of her soul,' thought Vronsky, though it was through this portrait that he himself learned this sweetest expression of her soul. But the expression was so true that it seemed to him, and to
others, too, that they had always known it.
'I have been struggling on for ages
without doing anything,' he said one day,
referring to his own portrait of her, 'but
he just looks at her once and the thing is
done! That's the advantage of technique. (503)

Vronsky, lacking a better word and sufficient knowledge,
attributes the superiority of Mihailov's painting to his own
to a mere difference in technical skill. What Vronsky calls
technique represents the degree of discontinuity between his
portrait and Mihailov's, or, between the interpolated artifact
and the novel itself. Tolstoy uses technique in this ekphrastic
context as Cervantes and Austen use literary conventions in
their respective ekphrases. Each attempt to reveal that realism
in the novel is a rigorous challenge to outworn literary con-
ventions. As realistic novels are concerned primarily with
discovering reality, they attempt to minimize their reliance
upon modes of conventional expression which call attention to
themselves as artificially contrived devices. Those novels which
are to be considered realistic are on a cutting edge of man's
evolving perceptual awareness, and their conventions are either
newly discovered or revitalized from a now dated use by the for-
mal recognition of a newer view of life.

This ekphrastic scene in Anna Karenina portrays the con-
flict over technique as an opposition between Vronsky's and
Mihailov's different approaches to the artistic conventions
governing the representation of character. If considered in
succession, the ekphrases of Don Quixote, Emma, and Anna Karenina
reveal a growing emphasis on character as the primary element of realism. That all of the novels take the protagonists' names for their titles indicates that character is central for each. But the ekphrastic representations of character, mirroring the novels' characterizations, change in form in each novel to suit the current philosophical and artistic conceptions of human personality. The puppet characters of Master Peter's marionette show reflect Cervantes' early and intended characterization of Don Quixote—a flat, one-dimensional character whose static, predictable responses to experience reveal him to be a kind of puppet, guided by the strings of his obsessive ideal. But the puppet episode is ultimately discontinuous with the realistic norms of Don Quixote, for Cervantes' intention is to ridicule the stock characters of medieval romance both by making the stereotypical knights puppets and by allowing his fictional knight to become a realistic character in conformity with the wider conception of human personality that evolved from renaissance humanism. According to W. J. Harvey, Don Quixote is a changeless, comical Card who becomes a fully-developed protagonist by progressively exhibiting the unpredictability of a multi-faceted human personality.²

After Cervantes, caricature slowly gives way to varying degrees of realistic portrayal in novelists' creations of protagonists. The caricatures of Fielding, Smollett, and Dickens are, of course, significant exceptions. By adding
the human dimensions of unpredictability, choice, and change to their characters, novelists opened their portrayals to philosophical and moral questions beyond those of religious and literary orthodoxy, for which caricatures or stock characters had been ideally suited. The moral dimension of Emma is portrayed ekphrastically by Frank Churchill's epistles, and Emma's moral growth is measured by the distance she places between herself and these discontinuous artifacts. The exchange of personal letters, as Richardson illustrates, was, in the eighteenth-century, a primary medium of an individual's moral edification, and, as exemplified by both Austen and Richardson, the ill-intended disguise of motives in letter-writing challenges the moral code through which personal relationships are defined. Like her eighteenth-century predecessors, Austen defines character in terms of social and moral contexts, and it is appropriate that the commonest form of social communication—the letter—is the interpolated artifact with which she reveals the moral truth of her characters.

Tolstoy's choice of portraits as his primary continuous and discontinuous ekphrastic forms is significant for several reasons, the most important of which is his theory of characterization. Anna Karenina is Tolstoy's "portrait of a lady," and the painting of Anna's portrait by Mihailov is symbolic of Tolstoy's creation of her. By identifying his artistic instincts with Mihailov's, Tolstoy provides an interior definition of the aesthetic foundation of his novel. Tolstoy's theory of
character is thinly disguised as Mihailov's: both the novelist and his created artist try to achieve a representation of the human form which becomes the embodiment of spirituality—the image of both physical and spiritual presences.

In attempting to achieve the artistic illusion of immediate physical presence, Tolstoy conforms with the dominant descriptive mode of nineteenth-century realism. The pictorial impulses in such novelists as Zola, Hardy, Conrad, and Crane were the culminations of an evolving trend in narrative toward realistic portrayal in description. This trend was a movement away from the scenic in natural representation. By scenic I mean the reliance upon the conventional scene as a standard of description. Fielding, for example, in the few natural descriptions of Tom Jones and Joseph Andrews, seems to describe not so much nature as the conventional background scene of a Hogarth or Gainsborough portrait. The literary realists rebelled against such stock scenes of nature, with their verdant pastures, grazing sheep, decaying castles, quaint cottages, and picturesque elms. The stark, undecorated pictures of nature on the canvases of Millet and Courbet were responses to the same impulse as that which the literary realists obeyed: to show life as it is so faithfully that one might forget he is seeing a painting or reading a novel. The realist painters carried to its extreme the visual element of mimesis—the perfect imitation of nature—and the significance of their perceptual and representational achievements was diminished only
when their photographic realism yielded to the technical accuracy of the modern photograph. In aspiring toward such an accuracy of portrayal that art could be confused with life, the realists gave new meaning to the myth of Pygmalion, and their aesthetic values were sympathetic with their literary counterparts who, according to David Goldknapf tried "to maintain the illusion that narratives were not fictional at all"3 (see Appendix: "Painting and the Nineteenth-Century Novel.")

Tolstoy is an excellent example of a realist who uses the medium of language like a realist painter—both aspire toward a transparency of medium which gives the reader or viewer the illusion that he is seeing life itself. Thus, as viewers of Mihailov's portrait of Anna think they are seeing a real woman, so do Tolstoy's characters seem to come to life physically for the reader. Tolstoy shares with his contemporaries a view of character which is a struggle to get beyond the conventional view that creates caricature. The movement from Cervantes through Austen to Tolstoy in the treatment of character is a movement toward lifelikeness, a verisimilar representation that takes into account the fuller, psycho-physiological view of human personality developed in the nineteenth-century. Anna's portrait encapsulates her complexity as it is progressively revealed in the course of the novel. The relationship of Tolstoy's ekphrasis to those of Cervantes and Austen in respect to character is analogous to the relationship between the realistic mode of painting and description and the scenic mode of portraiture and conventional description.
But even though Tolstoy epitomizes the Realist movement's attitudes toward natural and human description, he diverges from the mainstream in one significant way: providing a perfect physical imitation of his characters was not enough for the prophet-artist—he also had to reveal their souls, their ideal selves. Mihailov paints Anna so accurately that her very soul emerges from her physical features, and in his masterwork "Christ before Pilate," the Russian artist shows, in his figure of Christ, the incarnation of the divine.

Tolstoy exemplifies the dilemma of fin de siècle Realism, and he shows that, though generally, realism had moved in the preceding two centuries toward empirical representation, it had not completely resolved the mimetic conflict that Cervantes was aware of when he paired Poet against Historian. Even though he loathed their works, Tolstoy shares with the Impressionist painters of his time a similar response to this conflict. The Impressionists founded their aesthetic upon empirical realism: their works were artistic studies of man's physiological and intellectual responses to the physical realities of light, form, and color. But the artists discovered that the closer they came to an objective view of these physical realities, the further they moved away from their manifestations in identifiable objects. The artists, particularly Monet, began to view them as essential light, essential form, and essential color—in other words, they saw them as manifestations of an ideal. And in a somewhat similar
manner Tolstoy matured as an artist during the formative years of Conventional Realism, and by carrying the conventions of the movement to their ultimate extremes, he (like Bach in music) nearly exhausted their potentialities and highlighted the need for something more.

B. The Crisis Over Art

Anna Karenina stands at a crossroads in Tolstoy's career, for it represents the point at which he began to strive for "something more" than just art. The novel is the result of a convergence of his artistic and prophetic impulses, which would soon thereafter move toward irreconcilability. And the ekphrastic scene of Anna's portrait is significant not only in respect to Tolstoy's attitude toward character and description but also in respect to the necessary self-definition it provided him at a period when he began to doubt his dedication to art. In the middle of his composition of the novel, Tolstoy suffered a crisis during which he concluded, "I cannot tear myself away from living beings to bother with imaginary ones." The demands of life and of real, flesh and blood people turned him away from the creation of fictional characters and situations.

The composition of Anna Karenina began in March, 1873, a time in which Tolstoy saw himself at the height of his artistic career. Recognizing the aesthetic advance this novel would be from his sprawling, more ambitious War and Peace, Tolstoy called Anna Karenina "my first real novel." The reviews of
this section were nothing short of wildly adulatory. But as Thomas Mann notes: "The commentators of 1875, impressed by the first chapters of Anna Karenina ... did not dream that the author was in full flight towards an anti-art position, which was already hampering his work on his masterpiece and even endangering its completion." In the three years, 1873 to 1875, Tolstoy would suffer the deaths of three of his children and two beloved aunts, all dying in his presence in his estate Yasnaya Polyara. These tragedies precipitated the depression that usurped his energy and will; he wrote to his brother: "there is nothing else to do in life but die. I feel it every instant. I am writing, I'm working very hard, the children are healthy, but there is no happiness for me in any of it." In such a state, work on his novel almost came to a halt. "I'm sick and tired of my Anna K.," he wrote to his daughter Alexandra; and to his associate Strakhov: "Our profession is dreadful, writing corrupts the soul."

But in December, 1876, Tolstoy once again was overcome with the ecstasy of writing and finished the entire manuscript of Anna Karenina within a few months. Tolstoy found partial solutions to his major concerns—death and the validity of art—by resolving them through his characters. Through the figure of Levin, Tolstoy was able to balance the fictional element of his novel in Anna with an autobiographical one. Through Levin, writes John Bayley, "we escape from the novel back into life." Tolstoy endowed Levin not only with the
facts of his past autobiography (such as his courtship and marriage, his struggle to identify with the muzhiks), but also with the problems that concerned him daily while he composed the novel. Tolstoy's major concern during Anna Karenina's composition, and thereby Levin's major concern, is death. The only chapter to have a title is the one dealing with the death of Levin's brother Nikolai (based on the death of Tolstoy's brother of the same name), and the chapter is titled, appropriately enough, "Death." And Levin's crisis of faith at the end of the novel, which is triggered by his obsession with death and culminates in his redemptive vision, is also based on Tolstoy's own experiences.

Just as Tolstoy used his death-inspired paralysis as a source of subject matter for his fiction, he also utilized his doubts concerning art. These doubts culminate in his bitter, caustic What is Art? (1880), in which he dismisses all his own works (except "God Sees the Truth and Waits" which he calls his best work), as well as the creations of Sophocles, Aeschylus, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare, Raphael, Michelangelo, Bach, Beethoven, Liszt, Brahms, and Wagner.11 But in Anna Karenina, Tolstoy was able to direct these doubts into creative channels. Like the creation of Levin, Tolstoy turned to autobiography. The ekphrastic scene in which Anna's portrait is painted is based upon the painting of Tolstoy's own portrait by Ivan Kramskoye. Kramskoye actually painted two portraits of
Tolstoy, and during the lengthy sittings, the two artists discussed art and life. The figure of Mihailov is modeled partially on Kramskoye, and many of Tolstoy's theories of art expressed in the scene were based on their conversations.

T. G. S. Cain, in his recent book on Tolstoy, remarks that Tolstoy's rendering of Mihailov's aesthetic "is more accurate as a description of the way the writer works than of the way the painter does." Tolstoy used the portrait as a metaphor to define his creative process. Self-definition was important to Tolstoy in the early stage of the composition of Anna Karenina because of his doubts of the moral necessity of creating fictional characters. He was able to resolve these doubts aesthetically and intellectually through the autobiographical ekphrastic scene, and he resolved them practically through the figure of Levin. By the creation of the embodied soul as the basis of character, Tolstoy was able to reconcile his spiritual and artistic impulses. In this scene in particular and in the novel as a whole, the prophet and artist are one.

C. The Continuous and Discontinuous Pictures

That Levin and Mihailov are autobiographical portraits is not in itself exceptional. In creating Vronsky, Tolstoy looked into himself and drew upon his years as a young artist and carefree member of the aristocratic set. His rejection of his earlier fiction in What is Art? is similar to his portrait
of the artist as a young libertine. The older Tolstoy looked upon his earlier well-crafted fiction and Vronsky's stylized paintings as art that was abstracted from real life.

When Anna and Vronsky move into their Italian palazzo, they enter a hiatus in the sequence of emotional, tragic events which characterize their lives together. Here, they are able to turn their backs on the responsibilities and errors of their former lives. Anna feels no guilt for the pain she has caused her husband or for abandoning her son; she is, while with Vronsky, "unpardonably happy" (490). Vronsky, on the other hand, finds in the loss of emotion, even in the pain of unfillable desire and agonizing despair, a sense of indirection and emptiness, a "desire . . . in his heart for desires—ennui" (491). To fill this emptiness, he turns to various diversions: "As a hungry animal seizes upon everything it can get hold of in the hope that it may be good, so Vronsky quite unconsciously clutched first at politics, then at new books, then pictures" (491).

Bayley writes that at this point of the novel Anna and Vronsky are "no longer taken up with involuntary emotion and event. They have, in a sense, stopped living, and so have leisure for art." Tolstoy here gives further evidence of his hatred of that art which is created as an anodyne for ennui and is no more than a diversion for the leisure of the upper classes who have turned their backs on real life. Some of the most caustic sections of What is Art? concern the art
of the upper class which Tolstoy classifies without exception as counterfeit. He writes: "for people of the wealthy classes, spending their lives in idleness and luxury, desire to be continually diverted by art; and art, even the lowest, cannot be produced at will, but has to generate spontaneously in the artist's inner self." Tolstoy shows that the lack of spontaneity is Vronsky's greatest flaw as an artist. Because Vronsky cannot find the source of inspiration within himself, he seeks it in the imitation of recognizable artistic schools:

He had a talent for understanding art and probably with his gift for copying, he imagined he possessed the creative powers essential for an artist. After hesitating for some time which style of painting to take up—religious, historical, genre, or realistic—he set to work. He appreciated all the different styles and could find inspiration in any of them, but he could not conceive that it was possible to be ignorant of the different schools of painting and to be inspired directly by what is within the soul, regardless of whether what is painted will belong to any recognizable school. Since he did not know this, and drew his inspiration not directly from life but indirectly from other painter's interpretations of life, he found inspiration very readily and easily; and equally readily and easily produced paintings very similar to the particular style he was trying to imitate. (491)

Vronsky's reliance upon imitation is like Frank Churchill's total dependence upon rhetorical devices in Emma. Both characters use conventions to mask the truth. In his essay on art, Tolstoy writes of the imitation of recognized schools: "In availing himself of this method of imitation, the artist only
transmits the feeling received by him from a previous work of art; therefore every borrowing, whether it be of whole subjects, or of various scenes, situations, or descriptions, is but a reflection of art, a simulation of it, but not art itself.\textsuperscript{15} According to Tolstoy, the imitator merely mimics a convention and does not give a picture of life. In his need to find a model to imitate, Vronsky decides to paint his portrait of Anna in the "graceful and effective French school" (491), conceivably the Impressionists, a group which Tolstoy held in particularly low esteem.

Vronsky's friend Golenischev plays an important part in this scene, for, according to R. F. Christian, he "fulfills the role of the critic."\textsuperscript{16} whom Tolstoy rebuked even more than even the dilettante. Tolstoy, in \textit{What is Art?}, labels critics as "able writers, educated and clever, but with their capacity of being infected by art quite perverted or atrophied."\textsuperscript{17} Golenischev is cast out of the mold Tolstoy describes generally in his essay: condemning Mihailov as having "that everlasting Ivanov-Strauss-Renan attitude" (492), and declaring that Vronsky is the better painter because he paints "more like the Old Masters" (505). Golenischev classifies and simplifies artistic impulses, and reveals that convention and imitation are all he understands. Though drawn to create himself, he delays having to prove his abilities by "deceiving himself with the idea that his theories had not yet matured" (505). Thus, when Vronsky, Golenischev, and Mihailov meet on the common ground
of art, three different views collide—those of the dilettante, the critic, and the true creative artist.

The reader meets Mihailov when he is at work in his study. He has spent hours drawing a sketch of a man in a rage, and in frustration he tosses his second draft to his eldest daughter for her to play with. Still dissatisfied with the first sketch, he asks his daughter to return the paper which is now stained with candle grease. But the spot of grease gives him an insight into the pose of the figure:

He was drawing this new pose when he suddenly recalled the powerful face of a tobacconist with a prominent jaw, where he bought cigars, and he gave the man he was drawing just such a face and jaw. He laughed aloud with delight. The lifeless figure of his imagination had come to life and could not be improved upon. The figure was alive, with a sure and vigorous line. The sketch might be corrected to fit in with the requirements of the figure: the legs could, and even must, be spread apart, and the position of the left arm should be altered and the hair thrown back. But in making these alterations he was not putting in another figure but simply getting lucidity. He removed the wrappings, as it were, that partially obscured the form, each new stroke bringing out the action and power of the whole figure that had suddenly been revealed to him by the grease spot. (495-96)

Commentators have agreed that Tolstoy has given in this statement a summary of his own views on character. But there is widespread disagreement as to precisely what these views mean in the context of Tolstoy's work. There are several points to the statement worth considering. First, of course, is the source of Mihailov's inspiration: giving the jaw of a real
life tobcacoonist to an imaginary subject he is painting. Nadezhda Caradetzky indicates that as a tobcacoonist's jaw is used by Mihailov for subject matter, so "a wealth of auto-
biographical detail and features of contemporary Russian life were naturally absorbed by Tolstoy." As I have shown, Levin, Vronsky, and Mihailov are all partial biographical sketches. And, second, once Mihailov has found the true image of his figure, it cannot be changed significantly. This, too, is analogous to Tolstoy's view of character. Throughout his career, Tolstoy emphasized the inviolability and freedom from manipulation of his characters once they have been realized. His characters' lifelikeness demanded that he treat them as though they were real. For example, he wrote to Strakhov, "with Vronsky's suicide, I had never clearly felt the necessity of it. I had begun to revise my rough draft and suddenly, by some means that was totally unexpected but ineluctable, Vronsky determined to put a bullet through his head, and it later became clear that the scene was organically indispensable."19

But the most ambiguous, and I feel significant, part of this passage is Mihailov's view that the creation of character is nothing more than removing the wrappings that obscure the essential self. Cain interprets this as, "allowing the novel to develop as its own internal logic demanded . . . refusing to impose preconceived or simplified solutions."20 Christian, though, interprets the passage not as a structural metaphor but as a description of Tolstoy's attempt to discover his characters'
inner truth: "Like Tolstoy he wants to get at the character behind the conventional facade, to strip off the surface layers and reveal the essence of his subject." And, as I have already suggested, the essence of Tolstoy's and Mihailov's character-subjects is the embodied soul.

More than any other novelist, Tolstoy is able to make his readers perceive the embodiment of his fictional characters through a close identification with their physical selves--their minds, muscles, eyes, and nerves. As Dimitri Merezhkovsky so brilliantly and succinctly expresses it, "by the motions of muscles or nerves we enter shortly and directly into the internal world of his characters, begin to live with them and in them." Tolstoy is a master of knowing what gestures or features need to be described, what wrappings need to be removed, in order that the true essence of character be revealed. He is, in this way, like Mihailov who is able to see through the facade of Golenischev's polished but empty rhetoric to find his essential self in the features of his face: "A mass of hair and a very open forehead gave a semblance of distinction to the face, which had only one expression--a petty, childish, restless expression concentrated just above the narrow bridge of the nose" (497).

D. The Wrappings of Convention

To Tolstoy, wrappings are the acquired characteristics of personality which a character assumes to disguise his real self from others. Wrappings can also be defined as that elusive,
yet essential concept of novel criticism--manners. But, as R. P. Blackmur notes in his brilliant essay on *Anna Karenina*, the treatment of manners is different in Tolstoy, whose concern is to discover a character's natural self apart from society, than it is in Jane Austen, for whom manners govern the entire world of her characters. Discussing Dolly and Oblonsky, Blackmur writes: "We see in this couple how it is that manners dictate the roles by which we escape acknowledging reality." To Tolstoy, reality is the true, natural self, and the roles by which characters escape from it are the roles they assume in society. Manners, or social conventions, are, in Tolstoy's view, as false and unnatural as artistic conventions. As a counterfeit artist learns technique from recognized schools of art and ignores the inspiration to be derived from his soul, so does a character who is blind to life acquire manners from society in order to turn away from the reality of his natural self.

Manners are probably the civilized equivalent of tribal ritual. In moving from their primitive origins, manners were transformed from symbolic gesture to verbal communication. Manners are constructed upon a network of words, and it by what people say to each other--the accepted phrases, answers, questions, and statements--that society functions. But in Tolstoy, this element of human personality is the most fallible and hypocritical. Merezhkovsky notes: "The language of gesture, if less varied than words, is more direct, expressive, and
suggestive. It is easier to lie in words than by gesture or facial expression. One glance, one wrinkle, one quiver of a muscle in the face, may express the unutterable. "24 Tolstoy's ekphrastic argument against artistic and social conventions turns upon itself as he argues against the very basis of literary convention—language. Tolstoy attempts to reveal his characters not by words, but by glances, wrinkles, quivers of muscles. He attempts to make his readers forget that they are reading a description of his characters, just as a realist painter attempts to make the viewer forget that they are seeing paint on canvas which gives nothing more than an illusion of the human form. And Tolstoy is hesitant to allow his characters to reveal themselves through words, the medium of literary and social convention. It is remarkable how little readers of Tolstoy remember of what his characters say or think, but they come to life by their gestures, expressions, and mannerisms. As Malcolm Jones remarks: "We respond to their smiles, the pressure of their hands, just as characters in the book do." 25

All the major (and many minor) characters of Anna Karenina are distinguished by unique physical details which Tolstoy highlights as features that reveal their true selves. There is Oblonsky's habitual smile which, in its ability to infect everyone with its owner's empty and vacuous good-naturedness, is emblematic of his simple, harmless hedonism. Its untimely appearance during his argument with his wife Dolly over his innocuous little adultery sets off the crisis which opens the novel:
He had been unable to assume an expression suitable to the situation in which he was placed by his wife's knowledge of his guilt. Instead of taking offence or denying the whole thing, instead of justifying himself or begging forgiveness or even remaining indifferent—any of which would have been better than what he actually did—in spite of himself ('by a reflex action of the brain,' now thought Oblonsky, who had a leaning toward physiology), in spite of himself he suddenly smiled his habitual, kind, and somewhat foolish smile. (14-15)

There is Dolly's twitching muscle on the right side of her face which expresses the uneasiness and self-pity she feels throughout the novel for her plight of having to raise a large family while her husband, an incorrigible adulterer, gives her no solace. There is Karenin's habit, so distasteful to Anna, of cracking his knuckles which tells, better than any words, of his sexual tension with his wife, of his unalterable stiffness and formality. There is Nikolai's constant scowl which expresses the outrage that he feels for the life so slowly drawing from him. There is Varenka who, thin and without color, is described by Tolstoy as a flower past its bloom, an admirable but pitiable human being whose opportunities in life (like the proposal she almost receives from Koznyshev) have faded. There is Levin whose passions and vitality never fail to register upon his face, blushing easily, his jaw trembling when aroused. And, of course, there is Anna, whose first appearance is described through Vronsky's eyes:

As he looked round, she too turned her head. Her brilliant grey eyes, shadowed by thick lashes, gave him a friendly, attentive look, as though she were recognizing him, and then
turned to the approaching crowd as if in search of someone. In that brief glance Vronsky had time to notice the suppressed animation which played over her face and flitted between her sparkling eyes and the slight smile curving her red lips. It was as though her nature were so brimming over with something that against her will it expressed itself now in a radiant look, now in a smile. She deliberately shrouded the light in her eyes but in spite of herself it gleamed in the faintly perceptible smile. (75)

It is the animation shown in her eyes and smile that attracts Vronsky to her. Through these features he sees something in her "brimming over": it is her elemental passion for life, her need for emotional fulfillment that is "suppressed" but that expresses itself "against her will." Cain interprets Anna's expression as "an excess of vitality that should find release in marriage and motherhood." But her marriage with Karenin offers no such outlet for her emotion. Merezhkovsky finds in Tolstoy's references to Anna's "unruly curls, so easily becoming unkempt, the same tension, 'the excess of something ever ready for passion.'" But Tolstoy more constantly locates this animation, this excess of vitality, in Anna's eyes and smile.

This expression affects not only Vronsky—it attracts everyone to Anna, and each person gives it a different meaning, according to his relationship to her. To Dolly, when Anna comes to comfort her and reconcile her with Stiva, the expression means compassion: "Under their thick lashes her brilliant eyes suddenly filled with tears" (81). To Kitty, at first, the
expression captures the older woman's grace and sophistication, for which the young girl feels awe, devotion: "Anna was not like a society lady, nor the mother of an eight-year-old son. Her lithe movements, her freshness, and the persistent animation of her face, which broke out now in her smile, now in her glance, would have made her look like a girl of twenty" (86). But later, after Anna has won Vronsky from her, Kitty interprets the expression differently: "She saw that Anna was intoxicated with the admiration she had aroused. Knowing the feeling and the signs, she recognized them in Anna. She saw the quivering, flashing light in her eyes, the smile of happiness and excitement that involuntarily curved her lips, and the graceful sureness and ease of her movements" (95). To Vronsky, the expression is meant for him as a validation of Anna's love; for example, when he follows her to St. Petersburg and intrudes upon her reception by Karenin: "Her face looked tired and had none of that play of animation which peeped out now in her smile and now in her eyes; but for an instant as she glanced at him her eyes lighted up, and though the fire was at once extinguished, the instant made him happy" (121).

One of Tolstoy's intentions in concentrating so much on this expression of Anna's is to give an external picture of her internal, spiritual changes as her affair with Vronsky begins and progresses. Like her marriage to Karenin, her affair with Vronsky cannot provide an adequate release for her excessive vitality. The blame, perhaps, rests as much
with society as with her lover, but the result is that she
has no natural outlet for her energy which is diverted into
destructive channels—jealousy, insomnia, and drug addiction.
In the end she denies life as ardently as she had exuded it
earlier. Tolstoy makes her life-denial apparent through the
viewpoint of Dolly who, when visiting Vronsky’s country estate,
is shocked (as a mother should be, according to Tolstoy) by
Anna’s easy talk of her use of contraceptives and by her
apparent lack of affection or motherly concern for her daughter
by Vronsky. But the change in Anna is most apparent to Dolly
through the change in her expression. Dolly notices still the
faint half-smile, but a new expression has become more dominant.
When Vronsky asks Dolly to talk to Anna about renewing her
request for a divorce, she answers,

‘Very well, I will talk to her. But how is it
she does not think of it herself?’ asked Dolly,
for some reason suddenly recalling Anna’s strange
new habit of half-closing her eyes. And she
remembered that it was just when her inner
feelings were touched upon that Anna dropped
her eyelids. ‘As if she half-shut her eyes
to her own life, so as not to see everything,’
thought Dolly. (659)

The expression which once showed Anna to be open to life is
replaced by one which now shows her closed to it.

But Tolstoy allows another character to observe the change
in Anna’s expression, and it is his views that are most sig-
nificant. That character is Levin who, as the other major
character of the novel along with Anna, is given a story that
parallels and converges with hers. They have similar experiences, know the same people, but yet do not meet until the eve of Anna's death. Levin comes to know the earlier Anna only through Mihailov's portrait of her. As Joan Grossman notes: "It suited Tolstoy's design that the moment recorded in Mihailov's painting should be that of Anna's greatest happiness as a woman and thus of her greatest fascination." And it suited Tolstoy's design for Levin to observe his character, Anna, at this moment through the ekphrastic work of art that captured "the sweetest expression of her soul," which is now lost:

A lamp on the wall with a reflector threw its rays on a full-length portrait of a woman, which arrested Levin's attention. It was the portrait of Anna painted in Italy by Mihailov. While Oblonsky went behind the treillage, and the man's voice which had been speaking paused, Levin stood gazing at the portrait, which in the brilliant illumination seemed to step out of its frame, unable to tear himself away. He even forgot where he was and did not hear what was being said: he could not take his eyes off the marvelous portrait. It was not a picture but a living, lovely woman with black curling hair, bare shoulders and arms, and a dreamy half-smile on her soft, downy lips; triumphantly and tenderly she looked at him with eyes that disturbed him. The only thing that showed the figure was not alive was that she was more beautiful than a living woman could be. (728-29)

Anna's eyes and smile entrance Levin as they had entranced Vronsky so much earlier, but only because Mihailov had seen and understood that expression so thoroughly as to be able to depict it in art as it was in life. For the reader, this
moment resounds with the echoes of other moments in the novel that are now distantly past. Then, Levin turns to see the real Anna:

Levin saw in the dim light of the study the woman of the portrait herself, in a dark dress of different shades of blue, not in the same attitude, nor with the same expression, but with the same perfection of beauty which the artist had caught in the picture. She was less dazzling in reality, but, on the other hand, there was something fresh and seductive in the living woman which was not in the portrait. (729)

The "something fresh and seductive" is the change most evident to Levin, comparing the painting with the real woman. When the portrait was painted her beauty was natural, emanating from her free, joyful love for Vronsky; but now that her position is more insecure, now that she has come to realize how totally dependent she is on Vronsky, she feels the need to be constantly appealing, and so augments her beauty with ample cosmetics, perfume, lavish hair styles and dresses, and most importantly, she tries to be seductive, rather than rely on her former, natural charm. And she is seductive with Levin too: "she had unconsciously been doing her utmost the whole evening to arouse in Levin a feeling of love--as she had lately fallen into the habit of doing with all the young men she met" (736).

What Tolstoy has done is to show by means of external characterization the slow degradation of a woman, for whom ironically he still displays respect. But the earlier, natural Anna, as captured in Mihailov's portrait, and the later one,
debased by the outward show of convention, represent both the true and false arts he describes in his essay: "Real art, like the wife of an affectionate husband, needs no ornaments. But counterfeit art, like a prostitute, must always be decked out." 29

E. The Language of Convention and the Language of Gesture

Part of Tolstoy's intent in concentrating so much upon gestures, facial expression, and characterizing physical traits is to show them as a means of communication, in many cases far more accurate and trustworthy than language, the medium through which manners are sustained. Removing the social layers which conceal the essential character is analogous to Mihailov's "removing the wrappings." Speaking of Tolstoy's use of physical traits as a means of characterization, Malcolm Jones writes: "Such gestures may in a commonly understood context speak more eloquently than a thousand words." 30 The commonly understood context that Jones most emphasizes is the one of romantic intimacy that allows Levin's cough to be for Kitty a sign of Levin's dissatisfaction, or that makes Arna's eyes the means by which Vronsky discovers her need for him. And most remarkably, there is the example of Levin's second proposal to Kitty, in which he spells out on a table top only the initial letters of the words to his rather long question. His gestures and expressions allow her to understand first and fill in the words afterwards. She replies in the same fashion,
and Levin too understands before he knows the words. Jones' sensitive article discusses the failure of such communication as the source of Anna's and Vronsky's alienation from each other. But on the other hand, the story of Levin is Tolstoy's most significant vehicle for revealing the proper and improper methods for the communication of knowledge.

Levin is presented throughout the novel as a man who cannot live unless he can come to an understanding of life's basic mystery, the meaning of death. The "death theme" of the novel is presented first as mere background to more significant action. It is announced by the death of the guard at the train station where Anna and Vronsky meet; it picks up momentum with Levin's realization of Nikolai's terminal illness and with Anna's near death at childbirth; it reaches a climax with Nikolai's death and Anna's suicide; and it comes to a resolution with Levin's rejection of suicide and his transcendent vision. Levin is the most significant figure in the development of this theme, for he actively pursues, throughout the novel, all possible conventional avenues available for the understanding of death's meaning. And Tolstoy shows the insufficiency of each one.

Levin's obsession with death begins with his realization of the imminence of his brother's death. Nikolai's visit to his estate precipitates this realization and underlines Levin's incapacity to understand. The brothers' farewell is one of the most moving scenes of the novel; it shows how their shared
natural need to understand what is happening to both of them and to communicate with each other has been muted by the roles each of them serves in society, by the insufficiency of manners—

Levin . . . felt that if they both stopped keeping up appearances and spoke straight from the heart, as it is called—that is to say, said just what they were thinking and feeling—they would simply have looked into each other's eyes, and Constantine could only have said, 'You're dying, you're dying!' and Nikolai could only have answered, 'I know I am, but I'm afraid, afraid, afraid!' That is all they would have said, had they spoken only what was in their hearts. But that would make life impossible, and so Constantine tried to do what he had been trying to do all his life, and never could learn to do, though so far as he could observe, many people knew so well how to do it, and without it life was impossible: he tried to say something different from what he was thinking, and he felt all the time that it sounded false and that his brother saw through him and was exasperated. (375)

In these reflections, Levin struggles to say what is in his heart but finds himself constrained by the limited modes of communication he has available to him through his social role. Peter Jones, in his philosophical analysis of Anna Karenina, gives an interesting definition of Levin's struggle: "since any man is to be defined [according to Tolstoy] in terms of his internal essence, roles, regarded as existing only in external social contexts, inhibit the realization of that essence."31 The social roles befitting a man, an estate owner, a brother, and a human being governed by reason--wrappings, as it were--provide Levin with no means to give solace
to Nikolai or to seek understanding for himself.

Already Levin has attempted to find the solution to his problem through reason, the positivistic outlook of scientific rationalism which is embodied in the figure of Koznyshov, his eldest brother. Koznyshov first appears in the novel when Levin interrupts him and a famous professor of philosophy while they are discussing the division between psychological and physiological phenomena in human activity. Listening to them, Levin reflects, "he had never connected these scientific deductions . . . with questions of life and death" (37). He is caught up in the conversation but is frustrated:

Listening to his brother's conversation with the professor, he noticed that they linked these scientific questions with the spiritual and several times almost touched upon the latter; but every time they got close to what seemed to him the most important point, they promptly beat a hasty retreat and plunged back into the sea of subtle distinctions, reservations, quotations, allusions and references to authorities. . . . (37)

When Levin breaks into the conversation to ask if there is an existence of the soul after death, they are dumbfounded and reply that there is no sufficient "data" to answer such a question. According to Isaiah Berlin, Tolstoy's "is a view of reality which makes all clear, logical and scientific constructions—the well defined, symmetrical patterns of human reason—seem smooth, thin, empty, 'abstract' and totally ineffective as a means either of description or of analysis of anything
that lives, or has ever lived." 32 And Tolstoy shows in this scene that science and reason are totally ineffective as means of understanding death and the hereafter.

Other characters are used by Tolstoy to provide, by their reactions to death, a background to the main theme of Levin. Vronsky and Karenin, for example, at what they think is Anna's death bed, serve as examples of how social manners govern men even at such crucial events of their lives. Karenin is a purely social being, a bureaucrat whose actions are predeter-
mined solely by how he thinks his inner circle in society will react to what he says or does. Thus, when Anna reveals to him her liaison with Vronsky, he orders her to keep the appearances of a devoted wife, even though he knows that her affections and concern will never be his again. His sudden and drastic change in attitude when he finds her dying is an attempt by Tolstoy to show that even in such a regimented and emotionally stifled man, there is a natural part of him which struggles to break through his social facade. It does so momentarily here, for he forgives Anna and Vronsky and cares for their illegitimate daughter as would a father. But his artificial, social self is the stronger of the two; in spite of his con-
tentment with his newly found ability to forgive and love, his old, instinctual concern for appearances again masters him:

But as time went on he saw more and more clearly that, however natural his position might appear to him now, he would not be allowed to remain in it. He felt that besides the blessed spiritual force that
guided his soul, there was another force, brutal and as powerful, or more powerful, which controlled his life, and that this second force would not allow him the humble peace he longed for. He felt that everyone was looking at him with curiosity, that he was not understood, and that something was expected from him. Above all, he was aware of the instability and unnaturalness of his relations with his wife. (445)

In spite of his apparent passion for Anna and the sacrifices he makes for her sake, Vronsky is as governed by social convention as is Karenin, and his reactions to Anna's illness are just as much predicated on his sense of his role in society. The social code through which he originally perceived his affair with Anna was based upon what he could gain in status by such an alliance: "He was very well aware that in their fashionable people's eyes the role of the disappointed lover of a young girl or of any single woman might be ridiculous; but the role of a man pursuing a married woman, who has made it the purpose of his life at all costs to draw her into adultery—that role had something fine and grand about it and could never be ridiculous" (144). And his perception is true, for even his mother thinks, "nothing... gave such a finishing touch to a brilliant young man as an affair in the highest society" (191). With Anna dying, Vronsky attempts suicide not out of despair for the impending loss of his lover but rather out of his humiliation at the hands of Karenin whom he had viewed before as "a pitiful object, an incidental and somewhat ludicrous obstacle to his happiness" (441). But in
the face of the once-ludicrous husband's magnanimity, "Vronsky felt Karenin's elevation and his own abasement, Karenin's integrity and his own untruth" (441). Disgraced in his own eyes and in the eyes of others, Vronsky responds to Anna's illness by attempting suicide.

Karenin's last appearance in the novel shows him strongly under the influence of Lydia Ivanovna who offers him simplistic pseudo-spiritual answers to all his problems, including death. To help him make all crucial decisions (such as Oblonsky's renewal of Anna's request for a divorce), the countess enlists the aid of Jules Landau (who has taken the title Count Bezzubov), a medium and spiritualist whom she brags has so comforted a society matron for the death of her only child that "now she thanks God for the death of her child" (769). Tolstoy makes the scene in which Karenin and Countess Ivanova put to Landau the question of the divorce one of farce by having it recorded by Oblonsky's befuddled mind: "The most incongruous thoughts whirled through his brain. 'Marie Sanin is glad her child's dead ... It would be nice to have a smoke now ... To be saved, one need only have faith, and the monks don't know the way to salvation but the Countess Lydia Ivanovna does ... I wonder why my head feels so heavy? Is it the cognac or because this is so very odd?'" (770). Here Tolstoy spoofs esoteric, spiritualist approaches to life's mysteries, as he does in War and Peace by giving a humorous account of masonic ritual. Tolstoy is as critical of empty mystical solutions to
the question of death as he is of the solutions provided by rationalism. Berlin writes of Tolstoy: "He was against unintelligible mysteries, against mists of antiquity, against any kind of recourse to numbo-jumbo." 33

Tolstoy presents the death of Nikolai, attended by Kitty and Levin, as the true way death should be approached, an alternative to the false solutions offered by manners, reason, and spiritualism. His brother's death is the event Levin has most feared throughout the novel, and when news comes that he is dying, Levin is not ready. Kitty, out of a sincere desire to fulfill her marital vows and comfort her husband, offers to come along, but Levin, as much governed by manners at this point as Vronsky and Karenin, is appalled because to have his wife in the same room with Nikolai's mistress, a fallen woman, would be a breach of manners. But Kitty's tears persuade Levin of her sincerity, and at the deathbed, she is the only one who knows what to do to comfort and nurse the dying man. Levin is too frightened and confused in the face of death to understand. Thinking of his wife's similarity to his old nurse in the way they deal with death, Levin comes to an important conclusion:

he could not help knowing that he had more intellect than his wife and Agatha Mihalovna, and he could not help knowing that when he thought of death he thought with all the force of his intellect. He knew, too, that many great and virile minds, whose thoughts on death he had read, had brooded over it and yet did not know one hundredth part of what his wife and Agatha Mihalovna
knew . . . Both knew, beyond a shadow of a doubt what a thing life and death was, and though neither of them could have answered, or even have comprehended, the questions that presented themselves to Levin, they . . . were never under an instant's uncertainty as to how to deal with the dying, and felt no fear. But Levin and others like him, though they might be able to say a good many things about death, obviously did not know anything about it since they were afraid of death and had no notion what to do in the presence of death. (523)

The actions of those who respond to death in accordance with manners are analogous to Vronsky's method of painting which is imitative of pre-existing schools of art, and Kitty's natural, instinctive response corresponds to Mihailov's painting only what is in the soul. The distinction is between self-conscious unspontaneity and natural impulse giving rise to action. To Tolstoy, death is something impossible to understand by means of the intellect; it is rather something that can only be understood in the context of life's natural activities. "What is to be done?" (15) thinks Oblonsky in the novel's first chapter, and Tolstoy's work What Then Must We Do? (1886) proposes the same question; both highlight Tolstoy's preference of action over reflection.

F. The Embodiment of Spirituality

In his ekphrastic scene, Tolstoy clarifies the distinction between those who approach spiritual questions from the position of convention and manners from those who approach them from the basis of natural impulse. Viewing Mihailov's
masterpiece, "Christ before Pilate," which is an expression of "the incarnation . . . of the spiritual life" (500), both Golenischev and Vronsky interpret it with the criteria provided them by society. Golenischev, anxious to prove that he has something intelligent to say, selects one of the most obvious aspects of the painting upon which to base a self-serving, cliché-ridden lecture. And Vronsky, viewing the work in which Mihailov attempts to define the meaning of spirit, attributes his success to the methods he himself has followed—the study and imitation of recognized schools of painting. "There's technique for you" (500), he cries, innocently ignorant of the inappropriateness of his foolish compliment. He would not have understood Mihailov's indignation: 

He was always hearing that word technique, and could never make out what people understood by it. He knew it meant a mechanical ability to draw and paint, quite apart from the content of the drawing. He had noticed that even in actual praise technique was opposed to essential quality, as though it were possible to paint a bad picture with talent. He knew that a great deal of attention and care were required in bringing the idea to birth and producing it; but as to the art of painting, the technique, it did not exist. If the things he saw had been revealed to a child, or to his cook, they would have been able to peel off the outer husk of what they saw. (500)

When Golenischev suggests that Mihailov might have altered his technique in painting the figure of Christ, the artist replies: "I cannot paint a Christ that is not within my soul" (501). He stands, then, in direct contrast to Vronsky who
"could not conceive that it was possible to be ignorant of the different schools of painting and to be inspired directly by what is within the soul" (491). Vronsky and Golenischev, in their reliance upon learned technique in interpreting and creating spiritual art, stand with those characters who interpret the spiritual question of death from the social conventions of manners, reason, and esoteric spiritualism. And Mihailov's view of spirituality as that which resides within, accessible even to a child, is the view that Levin gradually accepts. It is a knowledge of spirit which is natural not acquired, acted upon not contemplated.

By disposition, Levin is already among Tolstoy's favored few who know that life is to be lived, acted out, not thought over. The rationalist Koznychev's visit to Levin's estate has already proven this. The brothers are an interesting contrast: "To Levin beyond all the country was good because it was the scene of labour... To Koznychev the country was particularly good because there one could and should do nothing" (257). Levin is frustrated by Koznychev's attempt to circumscribe nature within the confining boundaries of reason: "Levin did not like talking and hearing about the beauty of nature. Words detracted from the beauty of what he saw" (261). And Koznychev cannot understand why Levin would consider mowing with his peasants because "it's such jolly work, and at the same time so hard that there is no time for thinking" (269). Tolstoy's description of Levin mowing is one of the great
paeans in literature to natural labor:

Swath followed swath. They mowed long rows
and short rows, good grass and poor grass.
Levin lost all count of time and had no idea
whether it was late or early. A change
began to come over his work which gave him
intense satisfaction. There were moments
when he forgot what he was doing, he mowed
without effort and his line was almost
as smooth and good as Titus's. But as
soon as he began thinking what he was
doing and trying to do better, he was
at once conscious how hard the task
was, and would mow badly. (271-72)

Tolstoy shows that conscious thought impedes the growth of
natural knowledge whose most profitable expression is un-
reflective action. Levin again shows his implicit knowledge
of this when he goes snipe shooting with Oblonsky and Vasenka
Veslovsky. With the loquacious Veslovsky around, Levin is
self-conscious about his shooting and misses everything he
takes aim at. But when he goes out alone the next morning, he
gives himself to the instinctive act of shooting and bags nine-
teen head of game.

As insignificant as these examples might seem, they serve
to show that Levin has the potential to realize his natural
self, and in the course of the novel, he is educated. As I
have shown, death is the means by which he arrives at his know-
ledge. Apart from my earlier illustrations, the novel moves
toward even more intense realizations of death—the actual and
contemplated suicides of Anna and Levin. Tolstoy juxtaposes
the lives of his two protagonists with the common theme of
death, and he makes this juxtaposition clear through light and dark imagery. Anna, having lost her inner, spiritual sustenance, has a demonic vision of death:

Suddenly the shadow of the screen, wavered, pounced on the whole cornice, the whole ceiling. Shadows from the other side darted across to meet it. For an instant they rushed back, then moved up with fresh swiftness, flickered, blended and all was darkness. 'Death!' she thought . . . her trembling hands could not find a match with which to light another candle. . . . (784)

Tolstoy shows Anna arriving at the conclusion that death is her only recourse after she has had all the outward conventional sources of sustenance--her society friends, religion, self-respect--taken from her. And he describes her lonely death with an image of a flickering candle: "the candle by which she had been reading the book filled with trouble and deceit, sorrow and evil, flared up with a brighter light, illuminating for her everything that before had been enshrouded in darkness, grew dim and went out forever" (802).

E. B. Greenwood contends that "Tolstoy's treatment of death is very important . . . in connection with the bounds of sense."34 It is Levin, having cut himself away from the security of convention, who explores the bounds of sense in his metaphysical questioning of the last chapters. In the deepest period of his despair, as nearly alone as Anna, he thinks: "In infinite time, in infinite matter, in infinite space, an organic cell stands out, will hold together awhile
and then burst, and that cell is Me" (823). And he comes to the conclusion that there is only one escape from this intolerable conclusion—suicide. He is saved, however, from Anna's fate because he still has the sustaining forces she lacks. There is enough of the natural man in him that a simple statement by a peasant can trigger a religious revelation. While Levin is speaking with his tenant Fiodor about Platon Fokanich, a common acquaintance, the muzhik says: "One man lives for his own wants and nothing else . . . but Fokanich is an upright old man. He thinks of his soul. He does not forget God" (829). The statement, because of its simplicity, appeals directly to Levin's understanding, circumventing the obfuscating channels of reason. And even though the truth of Fiodor's remark affects him so profoundly that he thinks he has discovered the meaning of life, Levin cannot express the thought in words:

'I was in search of an answer to my question. But reason could not give an answer to my question—reason is incommensurable with the problem. The answer has been given me by life itself, through my knowledge of what is right and what is wrong. And this knowledge I did not acquire in any way: it was given to me as it is to everybody—given because I could not have got it from anywhere.' (832)

Levin realizes that his new-found inner knowledge is available to everyone, just as Mihailov knows that his artistic insight can be achieved by a child. As Tolstoy refrains from allowing
his characters to reveal their true selves by means of spoken words, the medium of reason, so does he refrain from expressing Levin's revelation directly. It is suggested by light and dark imagery. Unlike the imagery associated with Anna which, by the shrinking light of the candle, is narrow and claustrophobic, this is expansive—the sudden light and dark of an electrical storm. The storm threatens the lives of Kitty and their infant son, and the flash of lightning which he thinks may have killed them also shocks him into the awareness of what they mean to him: "The flash of lightning, the peal of thunder, and the instantaneous chill that ran through his body all merged for Levin into a single sensation of terror" (847). And as the sky has illuminated Levin's way back to the world and responsibility from his despair, so does it light Kitty's way to Levin: "she would not have been able to make out its expression had not a flash of lightning that blotted out the stars illuminated it for her. The lightning showed her his face distinctly, and seeing that he was calm and happy she smiled at him" (852).

The visual imagery associated with Levin's revelation convinces the reader where his long-winded verbalization of it does not. Essentially, Levin gives up his moral quest because he recognizes that he has an innate sense of right and wrong, and he puts his faith in this sense to make the correct moral decisions. One can assume that Levin speaks for Tolstoy, and, if it is possible to imagine Levin's life beyond the boundary
of the novel's last page, more than likely he would have been like Tolstoy who, a year after Anna Karenina's completion, looked, with terror, at places in Yasnaya Polyana where he might hang himself and stopped taking a gun on hunting trips because suicide would be too easy. 35

Barbara Hardy writes that Tolstoy's central concern in his fiction is "a metaphysical question, in finding a meaning in a life so quickly ended by death." 36 The question of finding a meaning in life haunted Tolstoy during the entire span of his own life. When Tolstoy was five, he was captivated by the fanciful stories of his brother Nikolai, who died in youth and upon whom Nikolai in Anna Karenina is based. In his favorite story, Nikolai told that he knew the secret of life that, once revealed, would end all sickness on earth and make love spring in the hearts of men, who would then become "Ant Brothers." Young Leo, profoundly affected by this, asked where might this secret be discovered, and Nikolai said that it was carved on a green stick which was buried near a ravine in Zakaz forest. Later, Tolstoy wrote: "I used to believe that there was a green stick on which words were carved that would destroy all the evil in the hearts of men and bring them everything good, and I still believe today that there is such a truth, that it will be revealed to men, and will fulfill its promise." 37

In all of his works, Tolstoy showed that he never abandoned his belief in the Green Stick of Truth. And though he represents, in each of his works, a character who discovers it, he
would never find it himself. But his continued search would lead him from history to literature, to philosophy, and religion, and it would be his justification, his raison d'être for creating some of the world's greatest literary masterpieces.

G. Beyond the Picture

Rousseau, who influenced Tolstoy more than any other thinker, wrote in *Emile* that he wanted his protagonist to learn to paint not from other men's works but directly from nature. Tolstoy's anti-intellectualism, as it appears in his fiction, is derived from this concept of Rousseau. It is made manifest by his avowed suspicions of the conventions of his medium and his yearning to describe exactly what is in nature. In *What is Art?*, Tolstoy condemns abstract conceptions of beauty and notes that in Russian, "by the word krasota [beauty] we mean that which pleases the sight." Tolstoy tries to make language something more than symbolic signification; in his hands it becomes a medium of pictorial representation, "that which pleases the sight." Ultimately, he desires that his reader respond to his novel not just as a creation of words, but rather as life itself. His model for his ideal reader's response is Levin who, when viewing the portrait of Anna, judges: "It was not a picture but a living, lovely woman" (728).

Tolstoy's choice of a portrait as the basis of an ekphrasis is significant for two reasons, both of which highlight his position as the consummate master of nineteenth-century realism.
As a portrait, the ekphrastic form represents realism's movement toward the representation of character as its primary interest—unique, individual character as opposed to stereotyped caricature. Marvin Mudrick notes: "In nineteenth-century fiction, the image of the individual personality emerges for the first time as an identifying feature of a literary genre." In Tolstoy, this interest in individual, rounded characterization reaches an apotheosis. And as a painting, the ekphrastic form represents the impulse of nineteenth-century realism toward physically accurate portrayal in description. The result of these two impulses is an attempt to make the novel a truly representational art form, a form in which readers are aware of reading words describing a character, but rather of actually "seeing" a "living, lovely woman."

But as E. H. Gombrich notes of the painter's art: "the artist cannot transcribe what he sees; he can only translate it into the terms of his medium." Tolstoy, like Austen, presents an argument against the conventional uses of his medium, language. But Tolstoy's retreat from conventional uses of language to what he considers a more faithful representation of nature is really nothing more than the creation of newer conventions which can present what is for Tolstoy a more convincing illusion of life. Like Cervantes' Poets and Historians, both Vronsky and Mihailov, through their respective paintings, create no more than illusory pictures of reality. Mihailov's is more "real," more "true to nature" because it
is a clearer reflection of the moral and aesthetic values of the novel.

When Tolstoy completed *Anna Karenina*, he answered to those who praised the novel: "What's so difficult about describing how an officer gets entangled with a woman? There's nothing difficult in that, and above all nothing worthwhile. It's bad, and it serves no purpose." In this statement the moralist speaks above the creative artist, but it also represents the frustration of the artist who would attempt a direct transcription of nature. The painter Lucien Freud writes: "A moment of complete happiness never occurs in the creation of a work of art. The promise of it is felt in the act of creation, but disappears towards the completion of the work. For it is then that the painter realises that it is only a picture he is painting. Until then he had almost dared to hope that the picture might spring to life." Like Freud who is disappointed at the end because his work is "only a picture," the later Tolstoy rejected his creative works because they were only novels and not life itself.

Tolstoy's rejection of his literary endeavors represents more than the conventional view that the artist in him died as he became consumed by his prophetic self. In attempting to reveal his characters' spiritual essences through their physical selves, and in giving an open-ended, partial solution to Levin's spiritual crisis, Tolstoy tries to get beyond the boundaries of the conventions of representation which he had
perfected. After perfecting the novel as a picture of life, he indicated the need for something more: out of his prediction would come the modern novel's questioning of the "ineluctable modality of the visible."
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V. THE STRUCTURAL RHYTHM IN ULYSSES

A. The Musical Vortex

In "The Genre of Ulysses" A. Walton Litz argues that Joyce's masterwork does not conform to conventional generic expectations, but by imposing the schema of a conventional novel upon its structure, a reader can perceive the lines of demarcation where the traditional novel ends and Ulysses begins. Litz writes: "The generic signals are all there, in greater profusion perhaps than in any other work of English literature, but the ultimate schema is something every reader must construct for himself.") Regardless of his literary background, each reader brings to Ulysses conventional assumptions and expectations which are derived from all the novels he has read. It is, of course, true that every novel is read with certain preconceptions of form, character, and style, and what a novelist does to fulfill, deny, or even frustrate these expectations defines, as much as anything else, his relation to the genre, as well as the aesthetic by which he has conceived his creation.

Viewer expectation is the basis of E. H. Gombrich's elaborate investigations into the psychological responses to visual art. An artist, Gombrich suggests, in experimenting with an artistic form, exploits a viewer's preconception of that form which he is taught by convention: for example, when we view a representation of a human face painted by Picasso, we see emerge from that shape, like palimpsests, the unconscious recollections of portraits by Cézanne, David, Reynolds,
Da Vinci, and behind all of these is the basic schema of a human face which is the essential form of any representation of it. Thus every painting silently evokes a history of art.

What is interesting about *Ulysses* and every other novel I have examined in this study is that they deliberately provide alternative schemata within the text in the form of interpolated works of art, ekphrasis that help define the novel's relation to the genre. Master Peter's puppet show, Marcello's story, the story of the enamoured shepherd Basilio and his mistress Quiteria, are all alternative fictions that suggest what *Don Quixote* might have been like if Cervantes had written a romance, but the schema of the romance superimposed upon Rabelaisian realistic detail creates an ironic view which is at the heart of the novel. Frank Churchill's letters suggest what *Emma* might have been like as an epistolary novel. Deprived of authorial omniscience, Jane Austen could not have presented as easily a reliable moral view that governs internally the world of surfaces, manners. And similarly, Vronsky's idealized, stylistically romantic portrait of Anna points toward an alternative, conjectural conclusion to *Anna Karenina* if Tolstoy had made the novel a sentimental love-story. If Vronsky's portrait of Anna and his picture of himself as expatriated artist had been an accurate representation of the mimetic standards of the novel, the lovers would have remained "happily ever after" in their palazzo.
Joyce provides the schema of the Odyssey as a kind of interpolated art form for the reader to build expectations concerning the narrative structure of Ulysses. It is a buried ekphrasis which is seldom alluded to directly but which underlies the form of the novel, giving it shape and meaning. But how is a reader to limit Stephen’s correspondences to Telemachus when he styles himself after Hamlet, Wagner’s Siegfried, Dante’s Satan? And Bloom consciously sees himself as the Commander in Mozart’s Don Giovanni (as well as the Don himself), Lionel in Flotow’s Martha, Sinbad the Sailor, Severin in Sacher-Masoch’s Venus in Furs, and the Wandering Jew. Frederick Sternfeld interprets Don Giovanni along with Hamlet and the Odyssey as schematic models for Ulysses. There is abundant evidence to support this view. Boylan and Molly meet to rehearse a duet from the opera "La ci darem la mano," and in nearly every chapter involving Bloom he thinks of the lyrics, confusing the conditional, "Vorrei e non vorrei," (I would like to and wouldn’t like to) with the unconditional, "Voglio e non vorrei" (I want to and wouldn’t like to). The aria represents the Don’s attempted seduction of Zerlina from Masetto, with whom Bloom identifies. Bloom also sees himself as the avenging Commander who comes to life in the form of a statue to send Don Giovanni to hell as he sings "Don Giovanni, a cenar teco," of which Bloom also repeatedly thinks. But with Martha Clifford, Bloom sees himself as Don Giovanni. And the analogies do not end here. Strictly for amusement, one could conjecture what might
have occurred if Joyce, playfully, had entitled his novel *Don Giovanni* instead of *Ulysses* and provided Carlo Linati, Valery Larbaud, Herbert Gorman, Frank Budgen, and St uart Gilbert Mozartean *schemata* instead of the Homeric.

Amusing conjectures aside, Odysseus is the principal model for Joyce's protagonist for very important reasons. Ter rence Doody, in his essay "*Don Quixote, Ulysses*, and the Idea of Realism," proposes: "I think it no coincidence ... that a writer so noted for his impersonality would appreciate in a character so favored for his multiplicity the statement, 'Outis is my name.'" Odysseus is an archetype that contains archetypes, and he is "Outis," a man who contains potentially all men. Hugh Kenner defines Pound's Vortex as a patterned energy that repeats itself through all time and all literature, and he sees the Odyssean myth as the original Vortex:

In Zurich James Joyce was drawing the 18 hours of Leopold Bloom through a patterned integrity defined by Homer: a tough self-interfering pattern through which, he discerned, Shakespeare had already drawn the skein called *Hamlet* (Telemachus, Stephen), and Mozart his *Don Giovanni* (Antinous, Boylan) and even the elder Dumas his Monte Cristo, returned avenger (Odysseus at Ithaca, the stone guest at the banquet, the ghost at Elsinore). Time, place and personnel alter; the pattern remains.

It is the pattern itself that Joyce wanted to portray—a pattern that contains nearly all his interpolated art forms, including the Odyssean. *Ulysses* is a form of novel which Edward
Mendelson classifies as an "encyclopedic narrative." And part of Ulysses encyclopedia is a compendium of art forms. Because it serves as a kind of encyclopedia of Western art, Ulysses is exceptional and stands apart from all the other novels I have examined because no single ekphrasis can be isolated for examination independent of the multitude of others. There are, however, ekphrastic scenes, which give the impression of integrating the novel's significant interpolated artifacts by presenting them in their purest forms. Music is form in its purest sense, and Joyce uses ekphrases of music to reveal the essential structure of his novel—the patterned integrity in which Odysseus, Hamlet, and Don Giovanni are contained.

B. The Song at the Ormond

A wide view of Joyce's use of correspondence tends to deny a total dependence on any one. From another angle of vision, the Odyssean correspondence is but the first of a series of correspondent examples of the novel's primary concern—the reconciliation of father and son. Zack Bowen counts eight such variations of this theme embodied in characterization, and more variations with characters' substituting roles, and he lists, for example, Shakespeare and Hamnet, Shakespeare and Hamlet, Reuben J. Dodd and son, God and Christ, Joseph and Christ, Bloom and Rudy, Bloom and his father, Bloom and his grandfather, Simon and Stephen, Patrick Dignam and Patrick, Jr., Odysseus and Telemachus, and the false father and the
croppy boy. This list is conservative, too, for there are many more examples, such as Stephen and Bloom, Siegfried and the parent gods (Bowen mentions six father-son themes in operas alluded to in *Ulysses*), the artist and his creation, and so on.

The theme of father-son reconciliation is extended by Joyce to encompass Stephen's obsessive concern with consubstantiality. In "Ithaca," Joyce suggests that Stephen and Bloom attain a consubstantial state when he refers to them as "Blephen" and "Stoom." The transposition of the letters of their names suggests a merging of selves, even if the merger is, in the dramatic context, slight and transitory. *Ulysses* moves ineluctably toward the union of these characters, and one of the ways that Joyce describes this union is by means of two ekphrastic scenes which describe the musical resolution of a Dominant tone into a Tonic one.

The first scene is in "Sirens," the chapter which Joyce describes as an encyclopedia of musical devices. The most dramatic musical effect of the chapter, though, is Simon Dedalus' rendition of the aria "M'appari" from Flotow's opera *Martha*. The song, of which fragments are quoted in the text, deserves a full quotation for a better understanding of its significance to Bloom:

```
When first I saw that form endearing;
Sorrow from me seem'd to depart;
Each graceful look, each word so cheering
Charm'd my eye and won my heart.
```
Full of hope, and all delighted,
None could feel more blest than I;
All on Earth I then could wish for
Was near her to live and die:
But alas! 'twas idle dreaming,
And the dream too soon hath flown;
Not one ray of hope is gleaming;
I am lost, yet I am lost for she is gone.
When first I saw that form endearing
Sorrow from me seem'd to depart!
Each graceful look, each word so cheering
Charm'd my eye and won my heart.
Martha, Martha, I am sighing
I am weeping still; for thee;
Come thou lost one,
Come thou dear one
Thou alone can'st comfort me:
Ah Martha return! Come to me!

Bloom is struck by the ironic significance of his writing a letter to Martha Clifford while listening to the aria from Martha, but his thoughts are with Molly. The opening line appeals to his "remembered lives" (274), and with the repetition of "When first I saw that form endearing," Bloom remembers when he met Molly at Matt Dillon's in Terenure. The line, "Each graceful look . . . charmed my eye," makes Bloom think of when he first saw Molly's "Spanishy eyes" (275). The song becomes a siren's song for Bloom because it causes him to despair. Stanley Sultan interprets the situation as Bloom's climactic revelation of what Molly's impending adultery really means to him: "Where Bloom was resigned in the sixth chapter (post office) and troubled in the eighth (Byrne's), he is now fully, consciously aware of his situation and of its significance."9 Singing silently along with Simon--"Bloom sang dumb" (276)--he identifies with the hero of Martha, Lionel, who
"cried in grief, in cry of passion" (275). The cry of passion, "Martha! Ah, Martha!" (275), is a faulty translation, as Bloom has noted—"Singing wrong words" (274)—but it is sung in notes which build to the climax of the song, the moment before "the dominant to love $\text{F}^7$ to return" (275). The Dominant note is sung with the word "Come" which is described vividly by Joyce:

It soared, a bird, it held its flight,
a swift pure cry, soar silver orb it
leaped serene, speeding, sustained, to
come, don't spin it out too long long
breath long life, soaring high, high
resplendent, aflame, crowned, high in
the effulgence symbolistic, high, of
the ethereal bosom, high, of the high
vast irradiation everywhere all soaring
all around about the all, the endless-
lessnessness. . . . (275-76)

Because it is the note most anticipatory of the return to the home key, the Dominant note expresses longing, a desire for rest of merger with the home or Tonic note. This Dominant note, a prolonged Dominant seventh, is B flat which is resolved in F major, the key of the song and the Tonic note of rest sung in the last word:

![Staff notation](image)

Come! to me!

When this last word is sung, the Dominant resolved in the Tonic, then a merger of identities takes place: Simon, the singer,
Lionel, the operatic character, and Leopold, the listener who is dumb singing, become "Siopold!" (276).

The first line of the song, sung in the home key of F major, presents an idyllic picture of a past love when Lionel-Leopold believed "None could feel more blest than I." But when the song describes the present plight of both the operatic character and Bloom, "yet I am lost for she is gone," it modulates from the home (Tonic) key to the active (Dominant) one. In the logic of tonal music, the melody of the song cannot be resolved until it returns to the Tonic tone. And in the emotional logic of personality, the situations of Lionel and Leopold cannot be resolved until they return to the lost bliss of love as was established in the home key. Thus, as the song expresses a desire for "dominant to love to return," it combines the Dominant note's longing for the home key with Lionel-Leopold's longing for the home of lost love. When the melody is resolved with the Tonic note, Lionel and Bloom merge in mutual longing with Simon, whose place Leopold will take as the father figure of Stephen.

The musical process with which Joyce describes the consubstantiality of Simon, Lionel, and Leopold as "Siopold," he uses also to show the consubstantiality of Stephen and Bloom as "Blephen" and "Stoom." Stephen's obsession with consubstantiality is often stated in a musical context. In "Circe," Stephen's schizophrenic projection Philip Drunk (Siamese twin of Philip Sober), states: "If only I could find out about
octaves. Reduplication of personality" (518). Philip Drunk’s question concerning the octave is a reference to Stephen's pronouncement on the return of the Dominant to the Tonic within the boundaries of the octave.

Earlier in "Circe" Stephen plays the series of "empty fifths" (503) on the piano in Bella Cohen's brothel. In playing empty fifths, Stephen would be striking "with two fingers" a chord consisting only of the Tonic and the Dominant key notes which would establish no home key since a third note is needed to form a triad, the principal chord material of any scale. Thus Stephen would traverse all keys (by means of the circle of perfect fifths, twelve in all) without establishing a home key, and, therefore, create a series of chords which have neither departure nor return--creating a metaphor to describe his condition at this point in the novel.

It is typical of Stephen that many of his musical thoughts concern medieval vocal music. The illusion of infinite linear development that music of this period gives is due to its being based on open fifths. His theoretical and aesthetic interest in this music (as opposed to the surcharged, emotional romantic music that haunted Bloom in "Sirens") could also be interpreted as evidence of his need to abstract himself from his environment, hence deny home and return in all its thematic manifestations.

As he discusses musical theory, he is mocked by Lynch's cap (a symbol of his skeptical companion):
(With saturnine spleen) Bah! It is because it is. Women's reason. Jew-greek is greekjew. Extremes meet. Death is the highest form of life. Bah! (504)

This charge is a defiant attack upon Stephen's theories of consubstantiality, which he elaborated at length in "Scylla and Charybdis." "The cap" denies that "jewgreek" and "greekjew" (Stephen and Bloom) can become consubstantial. Stephen attempts to answer the charge with the analogy of the octave:

... because the fundamental √Tonic and the dominant are separated by the greatest possible interval which ... interval which. It is the greatest possible ellipse. Consistent with. The ultimate return. The octave. Which.... (504)

When the cap interrupts him with further taunting, Stephen pauses. Then, a gramophone outside begins to play "The Holy City," which is an implicit reference to Bloom as the Messiah, the builder of the "new Bloomusalem" (484). This annunciation triggers in Stephen a sudden moment of realization:

... What went forth to the ends of the world to traverse not itself. God, the sun, Shakespeare, a commercial traveler, having itself traversed in reality itself, becomes that self. Wait a moment. Wait a second. Damn that fellow's noise in the street. Self which it was ineluctably preconditioned to become. (505)

Stephen's revelation is an answer to the crucial questions he proposed in "Scylla and Charybdis" concerning Shakespeare
and his works, an artist and his creation, God and the world. These questions are embedded in his theory of Hamlet which he disavows after having stated it fully, but yet I think he searches throughout the novel for its confirmation. In "Scylla and Charybdis," Stephen advances his theory of Hamlet from an aesthetic to an epistemological level:

He found in the world without as actual what was in his world within as possible. Maeterlinck says: 'If Socrates leave his house today he will find the sage seated on his doorstep. If Judas go forth to-night it is to Judas his steps will tend.' Every life is many days, day after day. We walk through ourselves, meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love. But always meeting ourselves. The playwright who wrote the folio of this world and wrote it badly (He gave us light first and the sun two days later), the lord of things as they are whom the most Roman of catholics call dio boia, hangman god, is doubtless all in all in all of us, ostler and butcher, and would be bawd and cuckold too but that in the economy of heaven, foretold by Hamlet, there are no more marriages, glorified man, an androgynous angel, being a wife unto himself. (213)

He gains an insight into his theory when he considers the logical necessity of a Tonic note within the octave. The octave represents the greatest interval between one tone and its duplicate in the scale; thus there is one octave separating C-C, D-D, E-E, and so on. It is the extreme limit that a tone can travel before returning to itself. And so it represents the extreme limit of Socrates' travels before he returns to himself,
of Shakespeare's journey to London and his works before returning to his personal life, of Joyce to Trieste-Paris-Zurich before returning (in his fiction) to Dublin, and of Bloom to the Hibernian metropolis before he returns to Molly. Harry Blamires describes the interval succinctly:

Thus it reflects the journey of God in making and entering a world intended to return to him, the daily journeying of the sun around the earth, the journeying of a Shakespeare from Stratford to London and back (with all that is produced), the journeying of a commercial traveler (a Bloom presumably) from home and Molly and back to them . . . the earth is the dominant to God's tonic; noon the dominant to midnight's tonic; London the dominant to Stratford's tonic; and the plays he wrote the dominant to Shakespeare's tonic; Bloom's wandering around Dublin the dominant to Molly's tonic.10

Frederick Sternfeld notes that Joyce's Jesuitical training in music undoubtedly included instruction in the Christian symbolical significance of musical intervals, as interpreted by Pythagoras, the Scholiasts, and Renaissance church scholars. In light of this symbology, Sternfeld offers the theory: "The ultimate return of the octave symbolizes the ultimate return of God in Everyman, the commercial traveler in Dublin, the 'usylessly' Ulysses."11 However, the most important relationship that Stephen's declaration implicitly alludes to is his and Bloom's. To carry the musical analogy to its logical conclusion so that jewgreek can become greekjew, one must be the Tonic to the other's Dominant, and the resolution demands
that one or both of them must change.

C. The Sonata Structure of Ulysses

The musical context most often used to describe the resolution of the Tonic and Dominant keys of Ulysses, particularly Stephen and Bloom into "Blephen and Stoom," is the sonata form. The sonata is a specific structural use of the contrast between Tonic and Dominant keys. The Tonic key is the scale of notes or progressions which cluster in an ascending or descending order around the note of rest from which a scale takes its name. The Dominant is the next related key whose note of rest is a fifth above or a fourth below the Tonic. The chordal relationships of one key are often not compatible with those of the other, and so a contrast between these two keys will cause tension, each striving for its own note of rest. The contrast between Tonic and Dominant keys is put to use in the classical sonata in a ternary form. In an Exposition, a theme is introduced in the Tonic key, and it is then contrasted with another theme in the Dominant. In a Developmental section, these themes (called Principal and Subordinate) are elaborated, and the resulting tension gives the music its dramatic quality. In this middle section, both themes are examined from every possible angle, according to the widest ranges of relationships, and both strive for dominance. In the last section, the Recapitulation, the Principal theme appears again in its original key and original context, and it is again contrasted with the
Subordinate theme which now, though, has modulated from the Dominant to the Tonic key, and the two themes are united. The three sections (to which a Coda may be included) have been metaphorically described in several different ways, such as statement—departure—return, and introduction—conflict—resolution, but the closest analogy they bear to *Ulysses* is their cyclic pattern of home—adventure—return.

Joyce left both external and internal evidence that *Ulysses* had a musical—especially sonata—structure. As early as 1922, Ezra Pound set forth the view that the novel definitely was a sonata. It was a theory that few responded to enough to test. Anthony Burgess in *ReJoyce* applies a sonata metaphor to the novel for the purpose of explaining the relationship of "Circe" to the entire book:

The exposition will not make sense until it has been followed by a development section in which the subjects combine, lend each other their subsidiary motifs, swirl about each other in an area of dream-like fantasy, bump into each other drunkenly, melt into each other in the discovery of previously unguessed affinities. After that—in the recapitulation section—they can appear soberly and singly, properly dressed and tidied up, but they cannot be as they were before, in the exposition. They have learned strange things about each other and about themselves.

Although undeveloped, Burgess' interpretation identifies Stephen and Bloom as themes of a sonata movement, but by not treating Stephen's "What went forth..." monologue, Burgess misses the
opportunity to explore the full significance of his revelation. A much more ambitious, sustained, and (even though aborted) helpful effort is Robert Boyle's "Ulysses as Frustrated Sonata Form." Boyle's contribution to the theory is a description of the Tonic and Dominant keys of Ulysses in terms of the moods created by the contrasting personalities of Stephen and Bloom. Boyle also charts the stages of the novel according to sonata form, noting whether the key for each chapter is Tonic/Stephen or Dominant/Bloom. Unfortunately, the author abandons his thesis on the basis of his denial of the two men's consubstantiality (did they or didn't they become one in some way remains a most controversial critical question). The first assumption one has to accept in order to perceive a sonata structure in Ulysses is that the themes represented by the lives of Stephen and Bloom are somehow united. This idea Boyle finds inconsistent with the evidence, and he dismisses it with a fervent denial of an optimistic interpretation of the book:

The extremes, the Jew Bloom and the Greek Dedalus, meet in the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter, and the results of that meeting, worked out in the Recapitulation, constitute the climax and the catharsis of Joyce's vision of the unsaved. If Bloom could enter Stephen's octave, as he desires to and pitifully strives to, the novel would indeed have something of the "happy ending" tonality which some readers claim to find there. But as above all else the style indicates, passing from the death of nauseating cliché in "Fumaeus"
to the rigor mortis of "Ithaca," the paralysis of *Dubliners* operates fully here too. . . . *Ulysses*, like Dante's *Inferno* or the fifth movement of Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique*, is a vision of hell.15

Since a sonata structure implies only a uniting of Stephen and Bloom (and the ways they unite are more complex and subtle than many readers are led to expect) and not a "happy or sad" ending caused by their union, the form cannot be dismissed by means of such an evaluative judgement.

Before Boyle carries his theme to the point of abandonment, though, he makes several interesting observations about structure. He points out that the first three chapters (treating Stephen) occur in the same time period as the second three (treating Bloom). The simultaneity of the introduction of these characters/themes constitutes a structural whole (even though the external form of the novel divides them) and corresponds to an Expositional section of a sonata—the classical double exposition of a pair of themes. Boyle defines Stephen's theme (or tone) according to the primary obsessions of "Proteus"—usurpers, history, and reality; to show the contrast in tone, he chooses the same elements to define Bloom's theme. To make a perfect sonata, Boyle feels that Bloom's treatment of these three concerns should be elevated to the key of Stephen, and since he does not perceive this as having happened, he defines looking at the book as sonata form "a didactic method to help perceive its actual structure."17
D. Exposition--Development--Recapitulation

The opening section of a sonata, the Exposition, sets forth both themes in their respective keys. I think that it is more than just a matter of convenience to consider the first six chapters of *Ulysses* an expository section. The simultaneity of the times of chapters one and four, two and five, and three and six represent the simultaneous introduction of the opposing themes--Stephen and Bloom. And there is more than just the matter of time to suggest that the first six chapters are opposing pairs and not just a triad for Stephen followed by a triad for Bloom. Richard Ellmann gives a most helpful explanation of the structure of the first six chapters:

Each of the first three chapters is half a circle, to be completed by its parallel chapter in the second triad. Mulligan's transubstantiation of God into flesh in "Telemachus" is completed by Bloom's transubstantiation of flesh into faeces ("Calypso"). The sadism of Christians and Romans persecuting Jews ("Nestor") is completed by the masochism of Christians and Buddhists in their devotions ("Lotus-Eaters"). In the "Proteus" episode Stephen follows the arc of generation through corruption to death, while in "Hades" Bloom begins with death and follows it back to birth.18

Although I differ with Ellmann and see the geometrical shape of the Exposition not as a circle but as two parallel lines, I agree fully with his matching of themes. As Joyce introduces Bloom and Stephen in the context of matching themes, he is able to establish consistent oppositions. In "Telemachus,"
Joyce introduces Stephen with a symbolic eating of flesh, the communion bread representing Christ's body; but in "Calypso," he tells that Bloom "ate with relish theinner organs of beasts and fowls" (55). In "Nestor," Stephen rejects secular and sacred history with acts of symbolic rebellion; but in "Lotus Eaters" Bloom submits in manifest acts of compromise to those very same historical forces. In "Proteus," Stephen contemplates the limits of sense and has a vision of the ultimate boundary, death; but in "Hades," Bloom is presented with an actual death and visits Death's own chamber, Glasnevin Cemetery. The contrast of personalities is similar to the contrast that Cervantes found so profitable in the figures of Don Quixote and Sancho: that between the mind and the body, the imagination and experience.

In the developmental section of a sonata, the theme or themes modulate from the home key to a series of foreign keys which builds up tension against the inevitable return home. Significantly, both Stephen and Bloom, in leaving home, lose their latchkeys and are both keyless. "Aeolus," the chapter beginning the developmental section of Ulysses is obsessively concerned with keys, and the advertisement that Bloom sells for Alexander Keyes--the two crossed latchkeys--suggests that both in theme and in the musical metaphor the keys of Stephen and Bloom must come together. The sonata's Development examines the themes in the widest possible angles, and in Ulysses' Development, beginning with "Aeolus," Joyce utilizes extreme
angles of vision and startling techniques.

One of the devices musicians use to build up tension for the theme's eventual return to the home key, is the presentation of hints, in the form of fragmentary phrases, of what the resolution will sound like when the theme is subsumed in the Tonic tone. Thus Joyce presages Stephen's and Bloom's consubstantiality in their similar dreams--Stephen's dream of Haroun al Raschid and the man who in friendship pressed the melon to his face, and Bloom's dream about the exotic east. Joyce also provides hints of their coming together in their mutual thoughts concerning Shakespeare, whom Stephen calls "greyedauburn" (202) and Bloom "greyed-auburn" (280). To emphasize that these references suggest consubstantiality, Joyce repeats the same phrase in each section--"One life is all. One body" (202, 280). Shakespeare is the focus of their merging together in "Circe" where Stephen and Bloom gaze into the mirror and see the reflection of the bard. Bloom's concerted efforts to achieve a quasi-paternal relationship with Stephen in "Fumaeus" end in failure as Stephen refuses to agree with Bloom's business schemes, theories on art, history and religion, nor does he agree to partake in the communal confectionery and coffee. These abortive but nearly-consumated efforts toward merger suggest the way a musician builds up tension for a theme's return to the Tonic by increasing the references to the eventual resolution. A good example of this is the first movement of Beethoven's Eroica symphony when the main theme, a horn call,
is attempted by a solo horn in the Tonic key of E-flat major but is cut off by the entire orchestra.

In the Recapitulation, the original (Principal) theme appears again in its home, Tonic key, and the Subordinate theme, too, modulates to the Tonic, so there is a merging of themes within a common key. "Ithaca" is *Ulysses* Recapitulation. When they share a cup of "Epps's massproduct . . . creature cocoa" (677), Joyce suggests a communion, a consubstantial merging, when he refers to them as "Blephen" and "Stoom" (682). And the moment the cocoa is consumed, Stephen sings the ballad "Little Harry Hughes." The anti-semitic song tells of the murdering of a gentile boy by a "jew's daughter" (691). The song resolves into the Tonic with the last word—"dead." Bloom has already experienced a merging of identities with the resolution of "M'appari." Then, he was called "Siopold" by Joyce, now "Blephen" or "Stoom." Stephen interprets the meaning of the song:

"One of all, the least of all, is the victim predestined. Once by inadvertence, twice by design he challenges his destiny. It comes when his is abandoned and challenges him reluctant and, as an apparition of hope and youth holds him unresisting. It leads him to a strange habitation, to a secret infidel apartment, and there, implacable, immolates him, consenting. (692)

Stephen (like Harry Hughes who, in the song, is stabbed) is the victim who is immolated (ritualistically sacrificed) in a secret infidel's (Bloom's) apartment. Thus, as God (Tonic)
entered the earth and was there, transformed into his own Son (Dominant), immolated in order to return to his true state as God, Stephen (Tonic) entered Bloom's (Dominant) life and was sacrificed in order to return to his true self.

In a sonata Exposition, the theme travels from the home (Tonic) key to the limit of that scale, which is the Dominant key, and in the Development is transformed to the Dominant, which nonetheless strives to and eventually returns to the Tonic. It goes forth to the ends of the scale/world to traverse not itself (it modulates to another key). But having traversed that reality/scale, it seeks the inevitable return to itself. Stephen, having rejected tradition, church, state, and paternity, has "gone to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience" and has traveled to the extreme limit of the interval where he modulates to Bloom's (Dominant) key. This leads to his inevitable return. But the same analogy (one might argue) could apply to Bloom; the Tonic key could apply to the correspondent figure to Odysseus, the wanderer who must return.

The answer to the question is, obviously, that Stephen and Bloom are Tonic to each other's Dominant. This Joyce has suggested in the interpretation of "Little Harry Hughes" when he refers to the host (Bloom) as both the "victim pre-destined" and "secret infidel" (692). In other words, Ulysses contains the story of more than one odyssey, and in his own scale, both Stephen and Bloom must become the other (if but
for a moment) in order to return. And it is in "Ithaca" that they literally become "Elephen and Stoom." Boyle's testing of the sonata theory proves false because he made a too strict identification of Principal and Subordinate themes with the specific characters of Stephen and Bloom. They are both Tonic keys (Gods in their own worlds), and they modulate to the other's key at the same moment in "Ithaca." Appropriate for the musical metaphor, their union is preceded by songs they sing and chant to each other "with modulations of voice" (688). Stephen, in Gaelic, sings "walk, walk, walk your way, walk in safety, walk with care." The message could be T. S. Eliot's advice in *Four Quartets*: "Old men should be explorers," a call for change or progress. Bloom chants a verse from the *Song of Solomon*, "thy temple amid thy hair is as a slice of pomegranate." And after writing phrases to compare Hebrew and Gaelic script, Bloom is inspired to chant the first two lines of a Hebrew song, the first Israeli national anthem, the "Hatikvah." The cocoa communion was just a symbol of their union, but the moment each of them recognizes it and admits it to himself, their fortunes merge:

What was Stephen's auditory sensation? He heard in a profound ancient male unfamiliar melody the accumulation of the past.

What was Bloom's visual sensation? He saw in a quick young male familiar form the predestination of a future. (689)
In this moment, keys change, modulate, son becomes father, father becomes son—consubstantiality is complete. Stephen's acceptance of the "accumulation of the past," a paternal obligation, is countered by Bloom's recognition that Stephen represents "the predestination of a future," whereby a father might have his youth restored through his son. They each begin a return—Stephen to a creative future through a recognition of the past and Bloom to a chance to retrieve his happier past with Molly through the prospect of future change.

In the Linati schema, Joyce describes the technique of "Ithaca" as "fusion." Each gets from the other what he lacks. Stephen learns by observing the older man's behavior the equanimity and self-assurance that comes from experience, what Bloom likes to call the university of life. And Bloom sees in Stephen the creative energy which is "the eternal affirmation of the spirit of man . . ." (666). Their "fusion" is evidence of Joyce's belief in the necessity of an artistic awareness of body and soul, real and ideal. An artist must have a vision which he implicitly identifies in "Cyclops" as "two-eyed"—a realization of both actual and possible. Joyce is close to Cervantes, who in Don Quixote balanced real and ideal in character—the Don and Sancho—and in technique—imitating both the Poet and Historian.

Joyce does not imply that they will remain united (Stephen's unconditional refusal of Bloom's offer of room, board, and wife/ daughter should settle any doubt), but they are united for a
time, and they return to themselves changed by the experience. The miracle is that this union takes place at all, and set against the backdrop of the cold, empty universe, it reveals the essential character of paternity, which Stephen had defined as

... a mystical state, an apostolic succession from only begetter to only begotten. On that mystery... the church is founded and founded irrevocably because founded, like the world, macro- and micro-cosm, upon the void. Upon incertitude, upon unlikelihood. (207)

Part of the power of "Ithaca" is derived from the starkness of the stage. In the complexity of relationships, the characters of Stephen and Bloom are elevated not diminished, though, and the universal dimension they are examined in, the God's view, draws the reader closer to them and their need for communion, the human shelter against the void, enacted against incertitude and unlikelihood. Left alone, after Stephen's departure, Bloom is symbolic of individual man naked before the universe:

Alone, what did Bloom feel? The cold of interstellar space, thousands of degrees below freezing point or the absolute zero of Fahrenheit, Centigrade or Reamur... . . (704)

Joyce described his technique for this chapter to Frank Budgen: "All events are resolved into their cosmic, physical, psychical, etc., equivalents ... Bloom and Stephen thereby become
heavenly bodies, wanderers like the stars at which they gaze."19
The technique is musical, too, but in the sense Bloom describes
music in "Sirens": "Musemathematics" (278). And earlier he
thought: "Numbers it is. All music when you come to think . . .
And you think you're listening to the ethereal." To Joyce
the revelation of universal correspondences is a Ptolemaic
music.

Even though Joyce said jokingly that "Ithaca" was the true
ending of the novel, it is, of course, not, nor is it, as the
Recapitulation, the end of the sonata form of Ulysses. 20
"Penelope" is a Coda, which, in strict musical terms, is a
vigorous restatement of the major themes in the home key--it
is often a celebration of the return to the Tonic by a restate-
ment of the themes in new, daring contexts which, according to
Joseph Machlis, proclaim "the victory of unity over diversity,
continuity over change."21 Bloom and Stephen continue
their consubstantiality as co-referents of "he" in Molly's
sexual musings. But Molly's thoughts revolve as surely around
Bloom, as his revolved about her during the course of the day.
Her return to the Edenesque moment for both of them--the day he
proposed to her on the Hill of Howth--is a celebration of his
return too. And her "yes" is the Tonic note, for which
Stephen's "non serviam" serves as Dominant, and its climactic
repetition is the triumph of "dominant to love to return . . ."
(275).
E. The Union of Ideal and Real

In the novels I have examined thus far, ekphrasis serves as a mirror of an artist's mimetic values by establishing a relationship between idealism and empiricism. The standard technique of the convention is the creation of artistic models which are either continuous or discontinuous with the novel's implied norms; thus, the unreality of the romance and the naive literalness of history are both discontinuous with their related hybrid form, the novel Don Quixote. And similarly, the self-serving idealism of Frank Chuchill's epistles are discontinuous with the unbiased lucidity of Emma's omniscient narrative voice. Tolstoy clearly chooses the penetrating empirical method of Mihailov's paintings over the conventional idealism of Vronsky's. But instead of setting continuous and discontinuous artifacts in opposition, Joyce emphasizes his dual allegiance with ekphrastic symbols of unity which blend both ideal and real.

The coming together of Stephen and Bloom is suggested by the union of themes in a Tonic key. Joyce's musical metaphor is ideally suited to his purpose of uniting seemingly antithetical impulses. [See appendix "Music and Symbolism."] Their union represents the consubstantiality of body and soul, objectivity and subjectivity, experience and imagination, empirical inquiry and poetic inspiration. Their union is, in other words, the focus of one of the novel's major guiding principles—that idealism and realism do not exist independently but in a
multitude of self-defining relationships. *Ulysses* is an exploration of this multitude.

Joyce's reverence for Aristotle stems from the philosopher's insistence on grounding universals in particulars. With the same impulse, Joyce embodies the universal, archetypal figure of Odysseus in the seemingly ordinary individual Leopold Bloom. This ideal-real relationship is explored minutely by Joyce, who sacrifices neither the mythical significance of Odysseus's travels nor the quotidian events of Everyman Bloom's day. Their relationship is not one of parody but of implied unity.

The stylistic interpolations of "Cyclops" show the limitations of an artistic perspective based on just one of the several forms of idealism or empiricism--spiritualistic mutterings, scientific jargon, jingoistic rhetoric, and mock heroic gigantism, are all "one-eyed" views which lack the wholeness of Joyce's "two-eyed" view of ideal and real, universal and particular. Joyce shows that referential and emotive uses of language are alone empty when they are deprived of their complement. Similarly, he shows that the view of life represented by the individuals Stephen and Bloom is not enough by itself. It must be completed by its other half.

Joyce's view of Stephen's and Bloom's coming together is not as simple as a merging of identities. Themes in a sonata, in the same way, do not simply merge--they come together in a common key. And Stephen's and Bloom's merger is given its fullest treatment in a key common to both of them yet separate
from each--Molly. During the course of the day, both have yielded to the allure of the spirit of love, independent of the flesh. Bello-Bella's spell over Bloom is broken when he can deny the temptations of the spirit in the form of his dream nymph who brags of her lack of a physical impurity--the human anus: "We immortals, as you saw today, have not such a place and no hair there either" (551). Bloom realizes: "If there were only ethereal where would you all be . . . ?" (553). Bloom's return to Tonic, his "dominant to love to return," is away from the "stonecold and pure" (551) sculpted flanks of ethereal goddesses to Molly's warm crevices:

He kissed the plump mellow yellow smell melons of her rump, on each plump melonous hemisphere, in their mellow yellow furrow, with obscure prolonged provocative melon-smellous osculation. (734-35)

Bloom presses his face to Molly's "mellow yellow smell melons" and fulfills Stephen's dream of the man of the street of harlots: "The melon he pressed against my face" (47). The question Stephen asks throughout the novel, "What is the word known to all men?" (49), is the question of a young man with still adolescent views of mature love. Women are either the ideal, universal, untouchable "She, she, she" (48), or the whores of nighttown. The answer to Stephen's question would come from Bloom and his knowledge of women through Molly. Stephen's naïveté concerning women significantly blemishes him in the eyes of his creator who rejected Christ as the complete
hero because "he was a bachelor, and never lived with a woman, surely living with a woman is one of the most difficult things a man can do, and he never did it."22

One could argue that the word for which Stephen searches is Molly's "yes." Stephen hints of this when he speaks of "the eternal affirmation of the spirit of man in literature" (666). But his idealistic, educated phrasing pales next to the gregarious physicality of Molly's expression. Molly does provide an implicit answer: the word is love—the ideal of love planted in the "full amoral fertilisable"23 human body.
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VI. THE PARACINEMATIC REALITY OF GRAVITY'S RAINBOW

A. Film and Novel, Fiction and Life

"A screaming comes across the sky," on the first page of Thomas Pynchon's Gravity's Rainbow. The sound is the fall of a German V-2 rocket on London during the final months of the Second World War, that apocalyptic period when as many as sixty guided missiles fell upon England in a single day. In the course of reading the novel, the reader assumes a conventional role outside the novel, observing the fiction which describes this theatre of war. From the beginning, though, the word "theatre" in relation to the war signifies two distinct meanings in the novel--it denotes specifically the locus of battle, but it also connotes the sense of the war as being something staged, directed, a conspiracy about which ordinary participants or actors are ignorant: On the first page the narrator hints--"The Evacuation occurs, but it's all theatre" (3). And later the main character, Tyrone Slothrop, concludes, "none of it was real before this moment: only elaborate theatre to fool you" (267). Another character, Enzian, suspects,"Perhaps it's all theatre but they seem no longer Allies" (326), and later realizes, "the war was never political at all, the politics was all theatre" (521).

Then, on the last page of the novel, the narrator addresses his readers directly with the implication that they have been drawn unsuspectingly within the fictional boundaries of the novel and are now characters in another "Theatre of War"--a movie theatre in contemporary Los Angeles, over which a
nuclear missile is poised, ready to strike the first blow of the Final Apocalypse. Why a movie theatre? We, the readers, Pynchon calls, "old fans who've always been at the movies (haven't we?)" (760). And we, now the doomed moviegoers, have been lured to this particular theatre, The Orpheus, by the machinations of its manager Richard M. Zhubb, a thinly disguised portraiture of Richard Nixon, who has staged a Bengt Ekerot/Maria Casarés Film Festival celebrating the actor and actress who played the roles of Death in Bergman's The Seventh Seal and Cocteau's Orphée. The movie we "old fans" have been seeing before the "film has broken, or a projector bulb has burned out" (760), might be entitled Gravity's Rainbow---"The screen is a dim page spread before us" (760). But it is more fitting to think, to borrow a phrase of another interpreter of Pynchon, that we have "read a movie," a movie or novel whose pages are a dim screen spread before us.

Pynchon's ekphrastic scene, which is a description of an audience watching a film, is similar in one respect to Cervantes' ekphrastic marrionette show: both Pynchon and Cervantes use ekphrasis to illustrate a confusion of the boundaries of reality and fiction. But whereas Cervantes allies himself with the reader in sharing with him the knowledge that the puppet show is a fiction and that only the deluded Don Quixote is fooled, Pynchon, on the other hand, attempts to subvert his reader's comfortable distinctions between what is fictional
and what is real. Don Quixote blunders upon a fictional
stage he thinks is real, but Pynchon's readers are drawn into
a "real" situation they had assumed fictional. The leap is,
as are many transitions in Gravity's Rainbow, abrupt. In the
course of a few pages, the narration has moved from a setting
in post-war Germany to contemporary Los Angeles, from describ-
ing the launch of a Nazi V-2 rocket to the descent of a nuclear
missile, from detailing the demise and disintegration of the
fictional characters Gottfried and Slothrop to the impending
holocaust in which the reader now is implicated--"There is
time, if you need the comfort, to touch the person next to
you, or to reach between your own cold legs . . . " (760).

Even though the narrative movement between the last two
scenes seems abrupt, Pynchon has prepared the reader for the
movement from reality to fiction, and vice-versa. This is
only one in a series of scenes in which film is used as a
medium to illustrate the relative states of what is real and
fictional. Elsewhere in the novel, a character is conceived
by a father making love vicariously, through his wife, to an
image he has seen on a screen; and later he comes to see his
daughter as a film. Gerhardt von Göll, Pynchon's mad director,
believes he has actually created the Schwarzkommando, a group
of German Southwest Africans, by making a film about them;
and later, buoyed by this success, he believes he can make a
different version of all reality by creating a film of it.
Pynchon's existential questioning leads ultimately to the answer that art or fiction creates reality as surely as what is "real" engenders fiction. Film is his primary means of describing this process. Pynchon uses the metaphor of film in two basic ways, thematically and formally. In his thematic use, Pynchon alludes to literally dozens of films, and by creating in the novel situations which are parallels to their plots, he shows how their fictions have now become real. To give greater emphasis to this idea, Pynchon creates films, such as his Expressionist Alpdrücken, and characters, such as the director von Göll and Pökler, father of the "film child," and he shows how they warp the novel into the direction of their cinematic realities. Pynchon's formal use of film is tied to his thematic use. As an even more powerful illustration of his thesis, he attempts to make Gravity's Rainbow an imitation of a film, so that his readers occasionally imagine that they are seeing or reading a film. The scenes in which the novel seems to become a film culminate in the closing one, in which the novel is the film the readers are watching before the final holocaust.

B. The Films in Gravity's Rainbow

Joyce's overriding concern with music influenced his perception of the myth of Odysseus as an interpolated art form in such a way that he composed Ulysses as a series of variations on the Odyssean motif, governed always by a musical
principle. Similarly, Pynchon composed *Gravity's Rainbow* as a novel which suggests the plots of a series of popular films with the whole governed by cinematic principles. The similarities between the use of *ekphrasis* in *Ulysses* and Gravity's *Rainbow* are not limited to this one. Both novels are encyclopedic narratives and their ekphrastic forms are encyclopedic as well. As Joyce provides an encyclopedia of Odyssean motives and musical devices, so Pynchon provides an encyclopedia of popular art, especially film. The musical *ekphrases* in *Ulysses* that I alluded to—the resolution of Tonic and Dominant keys in "Sirens" and "Circe"—present a paradigm of form which is reduplicated in many of the other *ekphrases* in the novel. And the concluding ekphrastic scene of *Gravity's Rainbow*—the film in the Orpheus Theatre—calls to mind the multiplicity of film *ekphrases*.

Literally dozens of films are mentioned specifically in *Gravity's Rainbow*: *Going My Way*, *White Zombie*, *The Bride of Frankenstein*, *Dumbo*, *The Return of Jack Slade*, *A Day at the Races*, *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, *Freaks*, *Flying Down to Rio*, *The Mask of Fu Manchu*, and many more. Several films, though, are given greater emphasis, both by the number of references to them and by the way they warp the plot of the novel in the directions that their plots take. One notable example is *King Kong*. Merian Cooper's 1933 classic movie of a giant ape brought by civilized man from the heart of primitive darkness to New York, the white metropolis he nearly
destroys, is given special significance in *Gravity's Rainbow*. Cooper's words to Fay Wray, his leading actress, form an epigraph to Part Two of the novel: "You will have the tallest, darkest leading man in Hollywood." Pynchon develops Jessica Swanlake as his Fay Wray character. In the concluding pages of Part Two, she goes again into her "Fay Wray number" (275), which Pynchon describes as "a kind of protective paralysis . . . for the Fist of the Ape, for the lights of electric New York white way into the room you thought was safe, could never be penetrated . . . for the coarse black hair, the tendons of need, of tragic love" (275). But later in the novel, Slothrop assumes the same role, when he wears "a blonde wig and the same long flowing white cross-banded number Fay Wray wears in the screentest with Robert Armstrong on the boat" (688). Immediately after Slothrop is transformed into Fay Wray, Pynchon modulates the prose of his novel into verse—a poem that, while never expressly stating it, is to be interpreted as Fay Wray's soliloquy which she delivers while tied to the sacrificial altar, waiting to be taken by the fist of the ape, King Kong:

At that first moment, long before our flight:
Ravine, tyrannosaurus (flying-mares
And jaws cracked out of joint), the buzzing serpent
That jumped you in your own stone living space,
The pterodactyl or the Fall, no—just . . .
While I first hung there, forest and night at one,
Hung waiting with the torches on the wall.
And waiting for the night's one Shape to come,
I prayed then, not for Jack, still mooning sappy
Along the weather-decks--no. I was thinking of Denham--only him, with gun and camera, wisecracking in his best bum actor's way through Darkest Earth, making the unreal reel. \\textit{my emphasis}\textsuperscript{7} (689)

In this section, Pynchon makes one further reference to Fay Wray, implicitly alluding to all the characters in the novel who are models of her archetype: "We've seen them under a thousand names... Greta \textsuperscript{7} Margherita Erdmann is only one, these dames whose job it is to cringe from the Terror" (689). In their own contexts, Fay Wray, Slothrop, Jessica Swanlake, and Margherita Erdmann are blonde, white symbols of civilization's vulnerability to the power and danger of darkness, alternately described as "the Fist of the Ape," "the night's one shape," and "the Terror."

David Cowart remarks that the Fay Wray soliloquy alludes to "the magical ability of directors to make the unreal real."\textsuperscript{3} The pun "making the unreal reel" (689), suggests that through film the unreal or fictional can be made real. Pynchon writes that civilized man's primordial fear of primitive darkness has created the film \textit{King Kong}, and now the process of creation has been reversed--the film has created, in the context of the novel, an empirical reality: "the legend of the black scapeape we cast down like Lucifer from the tallest erection in the world has come, in the fullness of time, to generate its own children, running around inside Germany even now--the Schwarzkommando" (275). As the "unreal" King Kong was
abducted from his primitive lair and mounted the Empire State Building, the highest tower of civilization's greatest metropolis, New York, threatening to destroy the entire city, so the Herero tribesmen, the "real" Schwarzkommando, were abducted from Südwest Afrika and brought to Germany where they erected and mounted civilization's most powerful tower—the 00001 Rocket—threatening to destroy the entire world. Edwin Treacle tries to convince his colleagues in the Allied psychological warfare section that their repressed fear of darkness, so aptly manifest in King Kong, had created the Schwarzkommando: "Why wouldn't they admit that their repressions had... incarnated real and living men, likely (according to the best intelligence) in possession of real and living weapons... they are real, they are living, as you pretend to scream inside the Fist of the Ape..." (276-77).

Part Three of Gravity's Rainbow begins, like Part Two, with an epigraph taken from movie lore, Dorothy's line from The Wizard of Oz: "Toto, I have a feeling we're not in Kansas any more." Part Three is entitled "In the Zone," the Zone being post-war Germany where all order (and, hence, all control) has been eradicated and characters can experience a chaotic yet free condition of living. The fantastic, surreal experiences of Slothrop in the Zone (and the reader's experiences following the alogical movement of the narrative) are like Dorothy's magical adventures in the land of Oz. When he first enters the Zone, he meets, like Dorothy, a good witch,
Geli Tripping, whom he compares with a witch in his Salem ancestry, "Amy Sprue . . . not like young skipping Dorothy's antagonist a mean witch" (329). He escapes from a harrowing experience in a hot-air balloon and meets a tin-man Tchitcherine "who is more metal than anything else" (337). Finally, Slothrop is led to another adventure in the Zone/Oz-land by Albert Krypton who, after taking cocaine, sings "Follow the yellow brick road . . . Follow the yellow brick road" (596-97).

The episodes in the novel that deal with German characters, particularly Franz and Leni Pökler, are colored by the somber, distorted landscapes of German Expressionists' obsession with the danger and mystery of streets, which gave rise to such silent films as Die Strasse (The Street), Die Freudlose Gasse (The Joyless Street), Dirnentragödie (Tragedy of a Street-walker), and Asphalt, is also an obsession of Pynchon's German characters—as it was for Benny Profane, Pynchon's major character in V. Lotte Eisner, in her definitive work on Expressionist cinema, discusses the sense of the evocative, treacherous street as part of the German character: "The metaphysical vision of German-speaking artists, whether they be Ludwig Tieck, Kubin, or Meyrink creates streets crammed with snares and pitfalls, which appear to have no relation to reality." In Expressionist films, the street is animated with a malicious life of its own; so Pynchon writes: "The street reaches in, makes itself felt everywhere. Leni knows it, hates it. The impossibility of any rest . . . when the
street has grown more desolate for them than they can bear. . ." (158). Leni's husband Franz is even more terrified of the street: "He couldn't go out in the street. Later he thought about its texture, the network of grooves between the paving stones. The only safety there was outscaled, down and running the streets of Ant City, bootsoles crashing overhead like black thunder, you and your crawling neighbors in traffic all silent, jostling, heading down the grey, darkening streets. . ." (399). Pynchon also adopts the Expressionists' concern with shadows and their ancillary manifestations—doubles and mirrors. Margherita Erdmann describes Gerhardt von Göll's lighting technique for Alpdrücke (Nightmare): "'The shadows came from above and below at the same time, so that everyone had two shadows: Cain's and Abel's'" (394). The play between illusion and reality which found metaphorical expression in such films as Schatten (Warning Shadow) is also a contributing factor in Pynchon's creation of Enzian, the black shadow of his white half-brother Tchitcherine, and of Ilse Pökler's "shadow child."

The Fritz Lang film that has the most obvious connection to Gravity's Rainbow is his 1929 Die Frau im Mond (The Woman in the Moon). Produced in the gestation period of Germany's rocket program, the film, which told the story of a rocket trip to the moon, was supervised by many scientists who later invented the V-2; indeed, Pynchon's rocket scientist Pökler "knew some of the people who'd worked on the special effects"
(159). In *Gravity's Rainbow* there are two rockets, the 00000 and the 00001, "a good rocket to take us to the stars [and] an evil rocket for the World's suicide" (727). *Die Frau im Mond* is *Gravity's Rainbow*'s hopeful fantasy of the good rocket, and, like *King Kong*, it is another example of film myth which becomes reality—reality in two senses: the fictional reality of the first V-2 launched on October 3rd, 1942 which, according to David Cowart, bore the emblem "Die Frau im Mond."

Pynchon gives Lang credit for his contributions toward the reality of the V-2 when he describes the takeoff of the 00000: "The countdown as we know it, 10-9-8-u.s.w. was invented by Fritz Lang for the Ufa film *Die Frau im Mond*. He put it in to heighten suspense. 'It is another of my damned touches,' Fritz Lang said" (753).

The films of Fritz Lang which play the most significant role in *Gravity's Rainbow* Siegfried Kracauer calls in *From Caligari to Hitler* the tyrant films which depict "the unavoidable alternative of tyranny or chaos," or, in Pynchon's terms, of paranoia or anti-paranoia. Kracauer's sometimes doctrinaire thesis is that Weimar Germany, buffeted by the winds of economic and political chaos, yearned for an omnipotent controlling power, like the "supermen-tyrants" depicted in films, and were conditioned by these cinematic figures to accept the real figure when it came in the form of Adolf Hitler. Lang's favorite actor for the criminal supermen
roles was Rudolf Klein-Rogge, "whom Pökler idolized and wanted to be like" (578). Klein-Rogge is most famous for his role as Dr. Mabuse, a hypnotist like Dr. Caligari who commits crimes by mind control. But his role which most impresses Pökler is that of Rotwang, the mad scientist inventor in Metropolis, Lang's 1929 masterpiece.

Metropolis is set in the twenty-first century and depicts a society characterized by a distinct division between capital and labor. John Fredersen is the master of Metropolis and the controller of the workers who labor night and day in tunnels underground to support the elite who live in sumptuous skyscrapers. His son, Freder, rebels and joins Maria who has led the workers, secretly, in prayers for a saviour to deliver them from their misery. When Fredersen becomes aware of Maria's influence upon the workers, he enlists his scientist Rotwang (Klein-Rogge) who creates a robot "which never tires and never makes a mistake" to take the physical appearance of Maria and incite the workers to revolt and destroy their machines which also causes the underground to be flooded. A complete holocaust is narrowly diverted when the real Maria is saved from the clutches of Rotwang and restores order.

Of Metropolis, and its effect on Pökler, Pynchon writes:

Klein-Rogge was carrying nubile actresses off to rooftops when King Kong was still on the tit with no motor skills to speak of. Well, one nubile actress anyway, Brigitte Helm in Metropolis. Great movie. Exactly the world Pökler and evidently quite a few
others were dreaming about those days, a Corporate City-state where technology was the source of power, the engineer worked closely with the administrator, the masses labored unseen far underground, and ultimate power lay with a single leader at the top, fatherly and benevolent and whose name Pökler couldn't remember, being too taken with Klein-Rogge playing the mad inventor that Pökler and his codisciples under Jamf longed to be—indispensable to those who ran the Metropolis, yet, at the end, the untameable lion who could let it all crash, girl, State, masses, himself, asserting his reality against them all in one roaring plunge from rooftop to street... (578)

In Nazi Germany, Pökler got a part of the world he had dreamed of, although the "single leader at the top," Adolf Hitler, was hardly "fatherly and benevolent." And Pynchon's view of modern society, as chronicled in Gravity's Rainbow, is based on a Metropolis model. According to Pynchon, the world has been transformed into an immense, class-conscious, corporate state, governed not by a single leader but by cartels, of which I G Farben and Shell are the most powerful. The scientists and engineers work with the administrators of these cartels—Laszlo Jamf's relationship with Lyle Bland seems to duplicate Rotwang's and Fredersen's—but the lot of the average engineer like Pökler is not much better than that of the workers. Pökler is far from the "untameable lion" that he envisions himself to be. And Pynchon's view of future society is also based on Lang's model:

It's a giant factory-state here, a City of the Future full of extrapolated 1930s swoop-faced and balconied skyscrapers, lean
chrome caryatids with bobbed hairdos,  
classy airships of all descriptions  
drifting in the boom and hush of the  
city abysses, golden lovelies sunning  
in roof-gardens and turning to wave as  
you pass. (674)

As the Schwarzkommando, the Herero tribesmen working on  
the apocalyptic 00001 for the "world's suicide," are analogues  
for King Kong, they are also the workers in Metropolis. From  
Africa, they were brought "to the Metropolis, that great  
dull zoo, as specimens of a possibly doomed race" (315), and  
after the war, they live "around Nordhausen [the German rocket  
factory] and Bleicheröde down in abandoned mine shafts" (315).  
In these "underground communities" (315), they use the tech-  
nology of the elite, the V-2 rocket, to bring destruction  
upon themselves and their masters, just as the underground  
workers in Metropolis turned their machines against their  
rulers and themselves.

C. Film Becomes Reality

Pynchon's implicit reason for modeling the various plots  
of Gravity's Rainbow on the plots of popular films is to  
illustrate the process by which a fictional (cinematic)  
reality becomes an historical reality. The film myth of  
King Kong generated the Herero tribesmen, as Die Frau im Mond  
gave birth to the V-2, and as Metropolis created a feudal  
economic and social system, bent on self-destruction. An  
even more explicit example of this process is Horst Achtfaden's
description of the secret 00000 project: "We were given
code-names. Characters from a movie, somebody said. The
other aerodynamics people were 'Spörri' and 'Hawasch.' I
was called 'Wenk'" (455). The characters are from Lang's
Dr. Mabuse der Spieler. And though Achtfaden's version does
not state it, it is assumed that the project supervisor
Weissmann/Blicero probably gave himself the name 'Mabuse,'
in an attempt to impose the reality of this story of a super-
man-tyrant upon the project, with himself cast in the omnipo-
tent role.

Aboard the Anubis with Margherita Erdmann, whose psycho-
sexual being is dominated by her experiences in Gerhardt von
Göll's sadomasochistic films, Slothrop hears of how Ensign
Morituri falsified newsreels and says: "Looks like German
movies have warped other outlooks around here too" (474).
But, of course, the outlook most warped by German movies is
that of Franz Pökler. Pökler is Pynchon's primary vehicle for
exploring how movies (and by implication all art) affect the
psyche and henceforth history. When Franz and Leni go to
see Lang's 1924 epic Die Niebelungen, he cannot stay awake,
for his days in inflation-ridden Weimar Germany are filled
by scavenging for coal:

He kept falling asleep, waking to images,
that for a half a minute he could make no
sense of at all--a close up of a face? Of-
ten enough it would resolve in Rudolf Klein-
Rogge, ancient Oriental thanatomaniac Atilla,
head shaved except for a topknot, bead-strung,
raving with grandiloquent gestures and those enormous bleak eyes . . . Pökler would nod back into sleep with bursts of destroying beauty there for his dreams to work on, speaking barbaric gutturals for the silent mouths . . . His wife bitched at Pökler for dozing off, ridiculed his engineer's devotion to cause and effect. How could he tell her that the dramatic connections were really all there in his dreams? (578-79)

Pynchon illustrates that as art is born of dreams, it also creates dreams that become reality. Pökler's dreams of "destroying beauty" are created by the fictional roles of Klein-Rogge--"Metropolitan inventor Rothwang [Pynchon's spelling], King Attila, Mabuse der Spieler" (579)--and these cinematic "untamable lions" create the reality of an untamable lion bringing a "destroying beauty" to Pökler and all of Germany--Hitler.

Pökler is a victim in two senses of film invading life. For him, the process is reversed; instead of film making reality, his reality is made into film. During the filming of one scene in Alpdrücken, Margherita Erdmann conceives a child, Bianca, with her co-star Max Schlepsig, and when the film is shown at the Ufa theatre, Pökler, in the audience, leaves with the scene still on his mind, thinking:

God, Erdmann was beautiful. How many other men, shuffling out again into depression Berlin, carried the same image from Alpdrücken to some drab fat excuse for a bride? How many shadow children would be fathered on Erdmann that night? (397)
The shadow child Pökler fathers, Ilse, eventually becomes a film vision to him, as the Nazis allow him to see her for only short intervals, spaced over long periods of time, so that he is not even sure she is the same child as before:

The only continuity has been her name, and Zwölfkinder, and Pökler's love—love something like the persistence of vision, for they have used it to create for him the moving image of a daughter, flashing him only these summertime frames of her, leaving it to him to build the illusion of a single child... What would the time scale matter, a 24th of a second or a year? (422)

"Persistence of vision" is the psychological phenomenon that makes motion pictures possible. Still photographs, when exhibited in rapid sequence, give the illusion of movement because the separate images persist long enough in the retina to reproduce continuity of motion. Pynchon implies that the same phenomenon is used by the Nazis to make the image of Ilse persist in the mind of Pökler long enough to give the illusion of a single child. And, more important, he implies that the same process, the presentation of an arranged series of images, which create the illusion of movement and life in a film, can be used empirically to create the illusion of a life in reality. And, in this case, the process is used insidiously for control and manipulation. Pökler's terrifying realization—"Isn't that what they made of my child, a film?" (398)—represents how often art can alter life into artificial and, hence, contrived and unnatural structures. As Richard Poirier
writes: "The loved child was . . . begotten of a film and has since become as if 'framed' by film, just as Gottfried is at last 'framed' by the Rocket that Pökler helped develop."? Poirier's use of 'framed' can be seen in two senses: 'framed' by the movie still and 'framed' in the colloquial sense of being unjustly implicated in a contrived plot. Both senses of the word apply to Pökler in his relationship with his daughter and in his involvement with the rocket project. Pynchon makes the connection:

During flights of the first rockets
the camera photographed the needles
swinging on the gauges. After the flight
the film was recovered and the data
played back. Engineers sat around look-
ing at movies of dials. Meantime Heinkels
were also dropping iron models of the
Rocket from 20,000 feet. The fall was
photographed by Askania cinetheodolite
rigs on the ground. In the daily rushes,
you could watch the frames at around
3000 feet, where the model broke through
the speed of sound. There has been this
strange connection between the German
mind and the rapid flashing of successive
still s to counterfeit movement, for at
least two centuries—since Leibniz, in
the process of inventing calculus, used
the same approach to break up the trajec-
tories of cannon balls through the air.
And now Pökler was about to be given proof
that these techniques had been extended
past images on film, to human lives. (407)

The flashing of stills that counterfeit movement in a film
also counterfeit a life, Pökler's daughter. Ilse, conceived
by her father's dreams which were inspired by "frames" of a
film, is herself placed in a "frame" of experience created by
Weissmann and the Nazis to "frame" her father.

For Pynchon, the contrived realities, plots, and insidious grand designs are created by an ubiquitous "Them" who manipulate the lives of others, and film is both their favorite instrument of control and a metaphor of their processes. The Allied versions of the Nazi agents who attempt to control Pökler are the behaviorists in "The White Visitation" branch of the service, specializing in psychological warfare. The object of their control is Slothrop, whose penis, conditioned while he was an infant by Lazlo Jamf, erects in the exact location a V-2 rocket is about to strike. One of their manipulative games is the conditioning of an octopus, Grigori, to attack their agent, Katje Borgesius, so that Slothrop will save her, and she can win his confidence. The behaviorists use films of Katje to condition Grigori to attack her: "The reel is threaded, the lights are switched off, Grigori's attention is directed to the screen, where an image already walks" (113). The film of Katje walking works on Grigori's primitive consciousness as the films of Klein-Rogge work on Pökler's dreams--they both are forms of conditioning: one specific, the other cultural.

The director Gerhardt von Göll (also known as Der Springer) is the character upon whom Pynchon places most of the symbolic significance of the "Them" that control and manipulate the lives of others. Like "Them" he is ubiquitous, apolitical, and amoral. He works both for the Germans and the Allies;
he has business connections with both the scientist Lazlo Jamf and the drug dealer Seaman Bodine. He is the "white knight of the black market" (492), but he also has established financial arrangements with the American tycoon Lyle Bland and the symbol of the world-wide cartel, I G Farben. And he explicitly defines himself as one of the elite, the chosen ones for whose benefit the preterite must suffer and die. With a .45, he guards a stolen turkey from the hungry masses and gleefully comments that, by tomorrow, many of them will starve, and there will be fewer to contend with. When Slothrop expresses disgust at his heartless remark, von Göll says:

Despise me, exalt them (the poor), but remember, we define each other. Elite and preterite, we move through a cosmic design of darkness and light, and in all humility, I am one of the very few who can comprehend it in toto. Consider, young man, which side you would rather be on. While they suffer in perpetual shadows, it's . . . always--break into song "Bright days for the black market" (fox trot). (495)

The insidiousness of von Göll's purpose in Gravity's Rainbow becomes more apparent when he attempts to transform his role from that of a director of films to a creator of reality itself. One of his missions for the Allies is to stage and film, with actors "in plausible blackface" (113), images of black rocketeers to represent "the fictional Schwarzkommando" (113), in whose real existence no one yet believes. But later, when it is proven that the Schwarzkommando
indeed exist, von Göll is overcome with the belief that he
and his film have created them:

Since discovering that Schwarzkommando
are really in the zone, leading real,
paracinematic lives that have nothing
to do with him or the phony Schwarzkommando
footage he shot last winter in England for
Operation Black Wing, Springer has been
zooming around in a controlled ecstasy of
megalomania. He is convinced that his
film has somehow brought them into
being. (388)

The real Schwarzkommandos are "paracinematic" versions of
the fictional, cinematic ones filmed by von Göll, just as
they are "paracinematic" King Kongs or "paracinematic" work-
ers from Metropolis. Movies, fiction, fantasy have, in the
example of the Schwarzkommando, engendered "reality." Although
he is unaware of it, von Göll's greatest paracinematic success
is the case of Pökler's daughter. In conceiving a child by
re-creating the torture-rape scene in Alpdrücker, in which a
child is also conceived, Pökler makes his daughter, Ilse,
a paracinematic version of Greta's Bianca. "How could they
not be the same child?" (577), Pökler asks Slothrop.

Obviously, Pynchon is engaging in a profound play on
the concepts of art and reality. To von Göll, the creations
of his imagination, which once had only a cinematic existence,
have now become tangible, physical, real—or in his terms
paracinematic. He uses the prefix "para-" in the sense of
beyond or above. He believes that his creations have risen
above a mere imaginative or subjective existence and have actually intruded into objective reality. Even though they now have an existence apart from him, he has been their creator. He has begun to populate the external world, the empirically perceived objective life, with the products of his subjective imagination. Von Göll is an extreme answer to Wallace Steven's proposition in "Ideas of Order at Key West" of the singer or artist who is "the single artificer of the world." When von Göll discovers that his cinematic Schwarzkommando have given birth to real, paracinematic ones, he is overcome with a megalomaniac urge to make all of life paracinematic by encompassing it in a film. Francisco Squalidozzi, the leader of the Argentine anarchists, expresses to von Göll his desire to recreate the myth of Martin Fierro, the gaucho of the once-open pampas; von Göll assures Squalidozzi that by making a film, Martin Fierro, he can make the mythical gaucho and his free plains real by creating paracinematic versions of them, just as he had done with the Schwarzkommando:

'It is my mission,' he announces to Squalidozzi, with the profound humility that only a German movie director can summon, 'to sow in the Zone seeds of reality. The historical moment demands this, and I can only be its servant. My images, somehow, have been chosen for incarnation. What I can do for the Schwarzkommando I can do for your dream of pampas and sky . . . I can take down your fences and your labyrinth walls, I can lead you back to the garden you hardly remember. . . .' (388)
From the Schwarzkommando to Martin Fierro, von Göll enlarges his ambition to make virtually everything paracinematic, or re-created by him. This dream of God-like omnipotence becomes clear when Slothrop complains of von Göll's theatrical interpretation of a situation that life is not a film; von Göll replies: "Not yet. Maybe not quite yet. You'd better enjoy it while you can. Someday, when the film is fast enough, the equipment pocket-size and selling at people's prices, the lights and booms no longer necessary, then... then..."

(527). The mad director envisions a time when technological advances will make possible the filming of every detail in life, so that all reality will be his paracinematic version of it. The irrepressible Springer is not one to wait for technology to catch up with his ambitions, however, and by the end of the novel, he has started his project of making reality paracinematic: "There is a movie going on, under the rug. On the floor, 24 hours a day, pull back the rug sure enough there's that damn movie! A really tasteless and offensive film by Gerhardt von Göll, daily rushes in fact from a project that will never be completed" (745).

Von Göll's endless film of reality is similar to another all-encompassing encyclopedic narrative described within the pages of Gravity's Rainbow: Brigadier Pudding's history:

He started in on a mammoth work entitled Things That Can Happen in European Politics. Begin, of course, with England. 'First,' he wrote, 'Bereshith, as it were: Ramsey
MacDonald can die.' By the time he went through resulting party alignments and possible permutations of cabinet posts, Ramsay MacDonald had died. 'Never make it,' he found himself muttering at the beginning of each day's work--it's changing out from under me. Oh dodgy--very dodgy.' (77)

Pudding's project fails because he tries to meet reality on its own terms. By trying to anticipate and chronicle the mercurial sequence of unforeseen events, Pudding is at the mercy of causality and always lags one step behind. Von Göll, on the other hand, believes that he himself is the causal agent of a reality that he can create; he can control the cause and effect sequence of his movies, and when they become paracinematic or "real," he has actually effected an alteration of empirical reality. He makes a film about life by making life into a film. As the novel progresses toward its conclusion von Göll's film has come to supplant life itself:

The sets for the movie-to-be help some. The buildings are real, not a false front in sight. The boliche is stocked with real liquor, the pulpería with real food. The sheep, cattle, horses, and corrals are real. The huts are weatherproof and are being slept in. When von Göll leaves--if he ever comes--nothing will be struck. Any of the extras who want to stay are welcome. (613)

William Plater, in his book on Pynchon, The Grim Phoenix, writes that Pynchon uses film to illustrate that "life and
illusion are both a matter of form." Pudding, as a version of the artist, tries to follow the form of reality as it unfolds in its random, haphazard causal design, whereas von Göll imposes his own form upon reality and forces it to conform to his own design.

By showing that life can be based upon cinematic and paracinematic models which are metaphors for fiction and reality, Pynchon deliberately confuses the boundaries between these realms so that the reader cannot be sure what is "real." At the end of the novel, when "we" the readers sit in the Orpheus Theatre, we realize that the main character, Slothrop, has disappeared because, according to him, he has been edited out of the film:

They've stopped the inflow/outflow and here you are trapped inside Their frame with your wastes piling up, ass hanging out all over Their Movieola viewer, waiting for Their editorial blade. Reminded, too late, of how dependent you are on Them, for their neglect if not good will: Their neglect is your freedom. (694)

After he has been edited from the film, Slothrop's real existence is denied by the fictional characters of the novel. His name is "apocryphal" (695), and he is "being broken down and scattered" (738). Even his arch-enemy is doubted to be real: "Jarmf was only a fiction..." (738). At the end, only Seaman Bodine "can still see Slothrop as any sort of integral creature any more" (740). Like the fictional characters, the
"real" characters of the novel deny Slothrop's reality. Earlier in the novel, Slothrop sees Mickey Rooney (a private in the Army then), and Pynchon writes: "He knows he is seeing Mickey Rooney, though Mickey Rooney, wherever he may go, will suppress the fact he ever saw Slothrop" (382). By mixing real characters (from Mickey Rooney to Walter Rathenau) with fictional characters (who themselves are divided into categories of real and fictional), Pynchon further confuses the distinctions between reality and fiction, so that his readers can accept his final premise on the last page—that "we" the readers in the Orpheus Theatre are now fictional characters in the novel. Pynchon presents reality as a series of fictional chinese boxes that the reader opens one by one until he reaches the last one in which he himself is contained.

D. In the Orpheus Theatre

The purpose of the ekphrastic scene at the end of Gravity's Rainbow is, I contend, to give a final, powerful illustration of the interface between fiction and reality. The reader discovers that he is addressed as a character in the novel. But, this is not the first scene in which the narrator has addressed the reader directly. Early in the work, after an external, third-person description of Roger's love for Jessica, the narration switches abruptly, too sharply, to first-person address for the reader not to feel that he is being spoken to:
You go from dream to dream inside me. You have passage to my last shabby corner, and there, among the debris, you've found life. I'm no longer sure which of all the words, images, dreams or ghosts are "yours" and which are "mine." It's past sorting out. We're both being someone new now, someone incredible. (177)

In the course of reading the novel, the reader has gone from dream to dream within the narration, and now, in the final scene, the reader does not know which reality is "mine" or "yours." Characters in the novel have become, through the interface of the screen, characters in a movie, and vice-versa. And now, finding ourselves characters in the novel, watching a movie until the "film has broken, or a projector bulb has burned out" (760), we learn that "in the darkening and awful expanse of screen something has kept on, a film we have not learned to see . . . it is now a closeup of the face, a face we all know--" (760). The implication is that the face is our own, the cinematic version of our paracinematic selves in the theatre.

Although it is not stated directly, it is implied that the ekphrastic artifact—the film—which has drawn the reader and character into it is Gravity's Rainbow, the work the reader has searched through from dream to dream. Because of this scene and Gravity's Rainbow's adoption of some of the formal characteristics of film, it is now almost a commonplace of Pynchon criticism to call his novel a film. George
Levine, Scott Simmon, David Cowart, and Bertram Lippman, all make the connection between the imitation of film devices in *Gravity's Rainbow* and the closing scene in which the reader has become a viewer of a film. There is plenty of evidence to support this view.

In his sudden shifts from scene to scene and character to character without the connective material readers have come to expect from realistic narration, Pynchon emulates the cinematic technique of montage. Pynchon's juxtaposition of seemingly unrelated episodes achieves a montage effect which Sergei Eisenstein has defined as "the conflict of two pieces in opposition to each other." Pynchon's apparent irrationality of narrative movement forces the reader to impose a structure by looking beneath the surface of the novel (sub rosa, one of Pynchon's favorite concepts) and find a wealth of connections that might have been overlooked had the more obvious connectives been provided.

Also, Pynchon is one of the few novelists to have orchestrated a musical score for their novels, in the manner of background music for a film. Scenes are accompanied by "mellow close-harmony reeds humming a movement in the air" (196), or "bridge music here, bright with xylophones" (222), or by "conga drums and a peppy tropical orchestra" (229). When Slothrop, in the guise of Ian Scuffling, is chased through Zurich, Pynchon makes sure that we know that the music is: "Zungg, diddilung, didila-ta-ta-ta, ya-ta-ta-ta William
Tell Overture here" (262). The most common form of music in *Gravity's Rainbow* is song. Characters will, if the occasion arises, croon a ballad, as in a romantic musical. Slothrop woos Katje Borgesius with "It's still too soon/It's not as if we'd kissed and kindled"... (195), and Roger Mexico laments his loss of Jessica Swanlake with "I dream that I have found us both again/With spring so many strangers' lives away"... (627). Most of the songs in *Gravity's Rainbow*, however, fit Pynchon's own description as "tune(s) of astounding tastelessness" (619), which might be parodies of musical comedy songs like ",,Who Dat Man?" from *A Day at the Races*" (619). Some of the most outstandingly tasteless examples are "Down this toilet they say you are flushin'" (68), "Twas the penis he thought was, his own" (216), "The Doper's Dream" (369), and "Fuke-a-hook-a-look-i I-i-i-island!" (635).

The abundance of song gives credence to Simmon's contention that "basically *Gravity's Rainbow* is a musical."14

Pynchon incorporates into *Gravity's Rainbow* many stock conventions of popular films. Roger's and Jessica's affair is "a typical WWII romantic intrigue" (247), "what Hollywood likes to call a cute meet" (38). Jessica has "a Fay Wray look" (57). They speak to each other in a "flip film-dialogue" (121). Pirate Prentice's favorite expression was "learned... at the films... the exact mischievous Irish grin your Dennis Morgan chap goes about cocking down" (32). Slothrop asks his friend Tantivy Mucker-Maffick, "what are you telling
him? . . . I'm some kind of a Van Johnson or something?" (182). But later he is "Errol Flynn frisk(ing) his mustache" (248). He speaks in a "Groucho Marx voice" (246). Seaman Bodine specializes in imitations of supporting actors like William Bendix, Arthur Kennedy, Sam Jaffe. One could go on almost endlessly with such references. This encyclopedia of stock characters in popular films and of their mannerisms is part of Pynchon's commentary on the effect of films on character in the twentieth century. Ours is a generation which has learned to kiss by the example of Clark Gable and Elizabeth Taylor, walk like Gary Cooper, talk with affected "coolness" and nonchalance like Marlon Brando. Film stars, Pynchon illustrates, have set standards for manners which all levels of our society have been quick to emulate.

Pynchon borrows the technical terminology of the cinema in many of his descriptive passages. This is how he describes the former actress Margherita Erdmann approaching Slothrop, who waits for her at the spa in Bad Karma: "When she materializes it is a shy fade in, as Gerhardt von Göll [her director] must have brought her on a time or two, not moving so much as Slothrop's own vantage swooping to her silent close-up stabilized presently across from him, finishing his beer, burning a cigarette" (459). A scene is described "from a German camera-angle" (229). Pirate Prentice's daydreams of his former lover, Scorpia Mossmoon are triggered by a drawing which is "a De Mille set really, slender and oiled girls
in attendance, a suggestion of midday light coming through from overhead" (71). The abandoned German rocket firing range is camouflaged by "German Expressionist ripples streaming gray and black all over it" (513). Pynchon's predilections for viewing the entirety of Gravity's Rainbow through cinematic techniques influence the perceptions of all his characters so that he can say of one of the Argentine anarchists: "Felipe like everybody else here lately has been using a bit of movie language..." (612).

The abundance of Pynchon's references to film and film technique causes George Levine to write that Gravity's Rainbow is virtually an encyclopedia of the myths of popular and non-literary culture, and that "these myths appear in the frames of motion pictures so that we are at once entertained, engaged, and conscious of the potential artificiality."15 Pynchon includes an episode which might suggest the reader's response to Gravity's Rainbow's potential reality and artificiality: the story of Takeshi and Ichizo. Like Gravity's Rainbow, the story of the two Komical Kamikazes begins as a reasonably straightforward and realistic rendering of a World War II theatre of battle but soon is diverted into irrational and absurdist directions. When Takeshi and Ichizo improvise a haiku to describe the epileptic thrashings of Old Kenosho, the loony radarman, Pynchon once again intrudes by means of authorial commentary to address his readers:
You didn't like the haiku. I wasn't ethereal enough? Not Japanese at all? In fact it sounded like something right outa Hollywood? Well, Captain--yes you Captain Esberg from Pasadena--you, have just had, the Mystery Insight! . . . Yes it is a movie! (891)

Captain Esberg's Mystery Insight is a possible model for the realization Pynchon expects to elicit from many of his perceptive readers—that they are reading a movie.

But before one goes so far as to say that all of Gravity's Rainbow is a film, or an imitation of a film, I feel that it is necessary to consider the effect the interpolated films have had on the characters and then to ask whether this is the effect Pynchon intends the novel to have on his readers. The manipulative films of von Göll, "The White Visitation," and German Expressionism have all been used to alter reality for the purpose of control. I believe that Pynchon incorporates such films as examples of art which are used for manipulation. They are ekphrases which are discontinuous with the norms of Gravity's Rainbow. Edward Mendelson writes of Pynchon's use of popular art in general and film specifically: "The popular modes that Pynchon assimilates into his encyclopedia of styles are never modes of liberation from the systems of oppression, but instead are a means of oppression and extinguishing."17 William Plater agrees with Mendelson's opinion of Pynchon's use of film in particular as a system of oppression; Plater writes: "Films, drugs, and sadomasochism are typical
systems...used to create illusions that victimize their adherents.18

Pynchon finds drugs and films to be alike in their analgesic functions. Wimpe, the omnipresent agent for I G Farben explains to Tchitcherine: "There is nearly complete parallelism between analgesia and addiction. The more pain it takes away, the more we desire it" (348). Drugs and films are analgesic and, hence, addictive because they create artificial realities less painful than the natural one, which is a relentless cycle of suffering and death. Pynchon illustrates how films can ease the pain of death by citing the example of John Dillinger:

John Dillinger, at the end, found a few seconds' strange mercy in the movie images that hadn't quite yet faded from his eyeballs—Clark Gable going off unregenerate to fry in the chair, voices gentle out of the deathrow steel so long, Blackie...turning down a reprieve from his longtime friend now Governor of New York William Powell, skinny chinless condescending jerk, Gable just wanting to get it over with, 'Die like ya live--all of a sudden, don't drag it out--' even as bitchy little Melvin Purvis, stalked outside the Biograph Theatre...there was still for the doomed man some shift in personality in effect—the way you've felt for a little while afterward in the real muscles of your face and voice, that you were Gable, the ironic eyebrows, the proud, shining, snakelike head—to help Dillinger through the bushwacking, and a little easier into death. (516)

Dillinger's fate was made easier because he had become a
paracinematic Clark Gable and was able to accept death with the same arrogance and nonchalance as Gable's cinematic character. Pynchon compares Dillinger with Närrisch, who also suspects that he might be the victim of a bushwacking, arranged by the self-serving Springer. But unlike Dillinger, whose fate was made easier by a movie, "Närrisch hasn't been to a movie since Der Müde Tod. That's so long ago he's forgotten its ending, the last Rilke-elegiac shot of weary Death leading the two lovers away hand in hand through the forget-me-nots" (516). Pynchon implies that it is unfortunate Närrisch cannot remember the end of Lang's 1921 film; for in it the actor Bernard Goetzke, according to Kracauer, "brings the humane character of Death to the fore," a character showing "tenderness" and "an inner opposition to the duty enjoined on him."19 If Närrisch could remember these characteristics of Death, he might be able to accept his fate more easily. But.

Films are shown to be analgesic because of their ability to transform reality and history into more palatable forms. But Pynchon warns his readers: "History is not woven by innocent hands" (277). The official versions of history, which Pynchon has shown are often paracinematic versions of films, are subversive to individual freedom. The influence of the German films of super-tyrants were subversive in obvious ways that have already been mentioned, but the overall influence of movies has been more subtle. Slothrop, for example, has,
like most other characters, believed "every wretched Hollywood lie down to and including this year's big hit, A Tree Grows in Brooklyn" (641). The effect has been that "They" have been able to "put him on the Dream" (697), a Hollywood Dream of "Happyville instead of . . . Pain City" (644-45). Pynchon provides a stark contrast between the Hollywood Dream and brutal, undorned reality by contrasting the dream world of Walt Disney and the nightmare of the war. Under the influence of the Sodium Amytal given him by the behaviorists of "The White Visitation," Slothrop has this hallucination: "For a moment, ten thousand stiffs humped under the snow in the Ardennes take on the sunny Disneyfied look of numbered babies under white wool blankets, waiting to be sent to blessed parents in places like Newton Upper Falls" (70). During the Advent Mass, Roger Mexico has a similar vision: "the lads in Hollywood telling us how grand it is over here, how much fun, Walt Disney causing Dumbo the elephant to clutch to that feather like how many carcasses under the snow tonight among the white painted tanks. . ." (135).

According to Pynchon, films have become a new opiate of the masses. The Hollywood Dream is an artificially contrived perception of the way things are, a mode of control used by "Them" to divert the attention of the masses from the self-destructive direction in which they are being led. And toward the conclusion of the novel, Pynchon correlates the Hollywood Dream with the American Dream when he makes a caricature of
President Nixon the manager of a movie theatre who takes "you" on a fatal ride on the Hollywood Freeway. Before "you" are taken to your predestined encounter with the rocket at the Orpheus Theatre, Richard M. Zhubb points out all the social outcasts and says: "Relax . . . There'll be a nice secure home for them all, down in Orange County. Right next to Disneyland" (756). Pynchon imitates film to illustrate its subversive and opiate effects. The ekphrastic film, be it Disney, Bengt Ekerot, Maria Casares, or any of the ones we have "seen" in Gravity's Rainbow has been staged by "Them" to lure us into the Orpheus, called by Tony Tanner, "the old theatre of our civilization," 20 for our encounter with destruction.

E. Causal Tyranny

Pynchon's intention is not so much to criticize film by making a discontinuous artifact of it as it is to illustrate metaphorically through film how reality is artificially contrived by those in power. Von Göll's megalomaniac intention to use film in order to transform all of life into his paracinematic version of it is just one of many examples in Gravity's Rainbow of the desire of the "elite" to change reality for their selfish purposes. Through most of his discontinuous artifacts, Pynchon illustrates the danger of such transformations and changes as from organic to inorganic, natural to artificial. Artifice implies control over form,
and to Pynchon any kind of control has the potential for tyranny. Imipolex G is Pynchon's primary scientific metaphor for the movement from organic to inorganic, and film the primary artistic metaphor for the movement from natural to artificial. At the end of the novel these two metaphors become one. Imipolex G is a synthetic fiber that is superior to and a replacement for human skin. One of the means by which this plastic substance literally "comes to life" is "the projection onto the Surface, of an electronic image, analogous to a motion picture. This would require a minimum of three projectors, and perhaps more" (700). Imipolex G is the technological advance that von Göll dreams of to make all life paracinematic or artificial.

Film and science are Pynchon's primary vehicles for the exploration of how "They" have attempted to gain control over the masses or preterite by making artificial what was formerly natural. Von Göll's attempt to make all of life into a film is no less insidious than Jamf's and Blicerio's desire to make a replacement for human skin. Art and science create what we interpret as reality, and when used by those in positions of political or economic power for selfish ends, they create "official" versions of reality which are subversive to individual freedom.

By taking the position that art does not describe reality but rather creates it, Pynchon stands opposed to theories of art which are empirically mimetic. None of the other authors
that I have examined in this study has taken such a critical stance toward empiricism. Tolstoy's version of the artist, Mihailov, tries to get beyond the limitations of empiricism by attacking externality and demanding that the artist look so closely at his subject that he sees within—to his soul. But what he describes is still a mode of seeing—empiricism. And for all of the extreme, unconventional angles of vision in *Ulysses*, Joyce's picture of the world is empirically accurate and identifiable. Save for the coincidence of characters having the same dreams or thoughts, nothing happens externally to them which would challenge our conventional views of what is "real." Pynchon, though, provides a mimetic conception of the world which includes characters speaking from the dead, an immortal light bulb, a life saved by witchcraft, and a character who actually transcends his body. Pynchon implicitly argues that to describe the world "as is" is only to give verification to the officially sanctioned, artificial version of it. He prefers to create his own.

To Pynchon, Conventional Realism is a contrived reality, which can be used for manipulation and control. Conventional Realism is parodied in *Gravity's Rainbow* with the characterization of Edward Pointsman, the behavioral psychologist, and his attitude toward his subject Slothrop is emblematic of a Zola toward his fictional characters. Pointsman proposes to consider "the war itself as a laboratory" (48) in order to observe Slothrop's reactions, and this intention parallels
Zola's attempt to view the world as a laboratory, as he describes in the preface to Thérèse Raquin, "my aim has been a scientific aim above all . . . I have carried out, on these two live bodies, the analytical work that surgeons do on corpses." The motto Zola used for this work was Hippolyte Taine's, "Vice and virtue are products, like vitriol and sugar." In the same manner, Pointsman, after his mentor, Pavlov, strives for "the true mechanical explanation . . . a pure physiological basis for the life of the psyche" (86).

Pointsman's mechanical explanation of life could verify his master's theory of cause and effect--"no effect without a cause, and a clear chain of linkages" (89) which would leave "little room for any hope at all" (86). Logical linkages in story create a narrative which is plot in Realistic fiction. Pynchon clearly associates the two--cause and effect both as determinism in nature and as plot in narrative--when he directly addresses the issue through the speech of an unnamed woman on board the ship of fools, the Anubis:

Each plot carries its signature. Some are God's, some masquerade as God's. This is a very advanced kind of forgery. But still there's a kind of meanness and mortality to it as a falsely made check. (464)

Just as the terms "theatre" and "framed" have for Pynchon both aesthetic and paranoid connotations, "plot" here is both realistic narration and conspiracy. Slothrop's growing
awareness that he is trapped in a "plot," a fixed sequence of
events, suggests John Barth's proposition in "Life-Story," of a novel whose protagonist moves progressively toward the
discovery that he is a character trapped in a fiction (or,
as I have suggested of Slothrop, in a film). The control an
author or a film director can exercise upon his characters in
a plot of cause and effect can often lead to tyranny, and
what Pynchon finally decides to do with his main character,
Slothrop, renders his verdict on the issue of control against
freedom. Pynchon frees him from the manipulative control of
Pointsman's experiment and his own manipulative power as
author. Pynchon attempts to diminish his own authority as
author by freeing his character from his control. He is thus
akin to Cervantes who relegated his narrative authority to
narrators with varying degrees of sympathy for his protagonist,
and he parodied the tyranny of a controlling author by means
of the Duke and Duchess who contrive fictions for the purpose
of maliciously ridiculing Don Quixote.

The manipulative artifact most discontinuous with the
mimetic norms of Gravity's Rainbow is "The Book." All written
literatures are symbolized by "The Book," a single copy, shared
and exchanged by an esoteric group of readers, including Points-
man of (although never explicitly identified in Gravity's Rain-
bow) Pavlov's second series of "Lectures on Conditioned Re-
flexes," Conditioned Reflexes and Psychiatry (1941) which
carries with it a "terrible curse" (171). Contrasted with
written language are the spontaneous songs of the Turkish Agyn, about which Tchitcherine realizes, "soon someone will come out and write some of these down . . . and this is how they will be lost" (357). The song he hears, in a singing contest between tribal members, tells of a superior communication which is diminished even by the expression of their song which must rely on words:

If the place were not so distant,  
If words were known and spoken,  
Then the God might be a gold ikon  
Or a page in a paper book.  
But it comes as the Kirghiz Light-- 
There is no other way to know it . . .

. . . And my words are reaching your ears  
As the meaningless sounds of a baby. (358)

This ekphrastic song suggests continuity with Pynchon's theory of freedom against control, and opposes the discontinuous "The Book." Paradoxically, in arguing against all written literatures, against all books symbolized by "The Book," Gravity's Rainbow argues against itself. But if realism is to be considered, as I have contended throughout this study, a continuing search for newer, more complete modes of rendering reality, a search that implies the rejection of older realistic conventions, then it is not surprising that a work would finally turn upon the primary conventions of the novel--sequential narrative, authorial control over character, and a stable social consensus concerning what is "real." The "terrible curse" that "The Book" carries with it is more than just the mysterious
deaths it brings to its owners: it is the death of life and creativity that Pynchon believes is implied in behavioral psychology, causality, and, most important, empirical fiction. Through *Gravity's Rainbow*, Pynchon attempts to get beyond "the book."

However, it is film as an art form that bears the fullest symbolic expression of the conflict of freedom and control. As I have demonstrated, Pynchon elaborates extensively the uses film has been put to for the purpose of control and manipulation. But it is through film too, a film possibly entitled *Gravity's Rainbow*, that Pynchon demonstrates that it is possible "to junk cause-and-effect entirely, and strike off at some other angle" (89). By his freeing Slothrop from both aspects of "plot," Pynchon shows that he is "no longer an actor, but free now, on the other side of the camera" (494). And on the novel's last page, Pynchon reminds that although "we" readers are fictional characters in the Orpheus Theatre observing cinematic versions of ourselves, we still have been saved, for our roles are finally those of readers who are directed, by the final mark of punctuation, a dash, to turn again to the novel's first page where a "screaming comes across the sky."

The rocket is supersonic and the sound follows the destruction. And since we hear or read it, we have not really been killed--only our fictional selves. But our real selves may not find our reality as comfortable or as safe as before.
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Appendix I: Painting and the Nineteenth-Century Novel

Tolstoy's choice of a portrait as his reflexive ekphrastic artifact is consistent with the interest his contemporaries showed in making comparisons between the novel and painting. Because of the growing use of descriptive detail in the nineteenth-century novel, novelists began to consider the analogies between their art and the spatial art of painting and to speak of the perception of their fictional worlds in terms of the visual organ of sense, the eye. The effects of this analogy can still be felt in the language of novel criticism, developed in large part by Henry James, whose Prefaces abound in analogical comparisons of novels and various forms of spatial art. Hugh Kenner, who writes of the "instinct that as the nineteenth century progressed drew writing and painting closer and closer together,"¹ lists several Jamesian critical phrases that are derived from painting, architecture, and sculpture: James speaks of point of view, foreground and background, perspective, outlook, insight, surfaces, depths, and structure, as if a novel could be viewed visually in the same way we see a portrait, building, or statue.

The impulse toward visualization in novels finds expression in John Ruskin's general comments on art:

The greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to see something, and tell what it saw in a plain way. Hundreds of people can talk for one who can see. To see clearly is poetry, prophecy and religion all in one.²
It is in the writing of the nineteenth-century realist novelists and critics, though, that this impulse very nearly becomes law. One of the earliest of the many treatises on realism, N. G. Chernishevsky's *Life and Aesthetics* (1853), defines art as *mimesis* in the strictest sense of imitation, reproduction; he writes: "The reproduction must convey as nearly as possible the essence of the thing reproduced. Hence, the creations of art should be least abstract and be expressed concretely in live pictures and individual images whenever possible."³ The essays of Zola written some thirty years later echo many of Chernishevsky's remarks; in "Naturalism in the Theatre" (1880), Zola gives prerequisites for the novelist that sound more like instructions to a painter: "the novelist . . . must confine himself to observed data and to the scrupulous study of nature if he is to avoid straying into lying conclusions."⁴

The language of the Conventional Realist movement has such a strong bias for visual metaphors because the movement itself is grounded in the art of painting. Courbet, in 1855, placed the words "Du Réalisme" over the doorway to the exhibition room which contained his paintings that had been rejected by the Academy of Fine Arts. A few years later Jules Claretie attempted a theoretical synthesis of Courbet's paintings with novelist M. Champfleury's views as espoused in his volume of essays *Le Réalisme*. This attempted synthesis of the two arts can be considered the theoretical part of a tradition of French
novelists broadly classified as Realists who use a painter as a character in their novels in order to define their relationship with the reality they would render: The tradition includes works by Balzac, Stendahl, the Goncourt brothers, Burty, Rod, Zola, Huysmans, and Duranty. The tradition extends into post-realism in the later work of Huysmans and Proust.5

The central work in this tradition, if not the greatest, is Zola's L'Oeuvre; Zola's novel more than any other French work defines the paradigmatic form of the nineteenth-century novel which uses painters and painting as a reflexive tool. Zola declared that the novel would be a self-conscious attempt to define himself as a novelist; he said that through the novel, "I shall recount my own intimate life as a creative artist, the everlasting pains of childbirth."6

L'Oeuvre's main character, Claude Lantier, begins his career as a painter with an impulse very much like Zola's—to show life as it really is. Lantier declares to his friend Sandoz: "Think of it, Pierre! Life as it's lived in the streets, the life of rich and poor, in market-places, on race-courses, along the boulevards and down the back streets ... the peasants, the farmyards and the countryside ... Modern life in all its aspects, that's the subject."7 This impulse has the panoramic sweep of social detail that characterizes Zola's Rougon-Macquart saga. It leads Lantier to attempt a single work that would encompass all of modern life, a vast
canvas entitled "Apotheosis of Paris." In his original vision, Lantier has this view of the work: "the crane and the barges with all the porters busy unloading them . . . That's Paris at work, understand: hefty labourers, with bare arms and chests and plenty of muscle! . . . Now on the other side of the Seine, there's the swimming bath, Paris at play this time" (218). But the execution of the painting does not match its original conception. Mysteriously, Lantier paints a nude upon a barge in the midst of the photographically rendered detail of Parisian life; driven by unknown urges, he ignores the rest of the painting and devotes all his energies to the nude which grows to colossal proportions, overwhelming the other figures. Unlike the nude he created in the realistic painting "Plein-Air" who "was smiling into space as she basked in the golden sunlight" (35), this symboliste nude usurps life and becomes a sun herself: "there he was . . . painting her legs and body like some infatuated visionary driven by the torments of the real to the exaltation of the unreal, making her legs the gilded column of a temple and her body a blaze of red and yellow, a star, magnificent, unearthly" (347). Lantier's pursuit of the real leads him into the realm of the unreal, an ideal vision so unattainable that, crushed, he hangs himself in front of his nude, "gazing upon her with his fixed and lifeless eyes" (356).

Many interpret L'OEuvre as Zola's criticism of the Impressionists, particularly Cézanne and Manet, for forgetting
their movement's realist backgrounds and venturing into nonrepresentational art. Others consider it a rejoinder to Zola's former disciple Huysmans whose *À Reeurs* espoused the later Lantier's art for art's sake philosophy. Each of these views is partially correct, but it must be remembered that Zola described *L'Oeuvre* as: "my own intimate life as an artist." Lantier represents for Zola the dangers of losing scientific objectivity in the pursuit of reality. Lantier's idealism and subjectivism is paired against the views of the fictional novelist who appears in *L'Oeuvre*, Pierre Sandoz, for all practical purposes, Zola's persona. Zola uses Sandoz as Tolstoy uses Levin—to give a portrait of a "true" artist to oppose a "false" one. Like Zola, Sandoz writes novels with a scientific-like objectivity: "This is the idea: to study man as he really is. Not this metaphysical marionette they've made us believe he is, but the physiological human being, determined by his surroundings, motivated by the functioning of his organs" (162).

The paradigmatic model of the novel of painting, which Zola so exhaustively details, is the illustration of a painting whose mimetic qualities are judged by a comparison with another work of art. One of these works is an analogue of the novelist's aesthetic theories; the other is a false representation of life which the novelist opposes. The continuous artifact is a painting, like Mihailov's of Anna, which is true to the physical appearance of the subject. The artifact which
expresses discontinuity with the author's mimetic norms distorts what is empirically verifiable, like Lantier's symboliste nude upon the barge in the industrial section of Paris. The continuous/discontinuous conflict over a painting, used by both Tolstoy and Zola, can be observed in numerous nineteenth-century novels. One of these is Dickens' Little Dorrit; although not explicitly a novel about art, like L'OEuvre, it contains numerous references to the subject. The false artist is the dilettante Henry Gowan, who describes his portrait of the arch-villain Blandois in such a manner: "There he stands, you see. A bravo waiting for his prey, a distinguished noble waiting to save his country, the common enemy waiting to do someone a bad turn, an angelic messenger waiting to do somebody a good turn--whatever you think he most looks like!" Gowan says that the portrait of Blandois can be, like the helmet of Mombino in Don Quixote, anything the audience desires, and he gives numerous alternatives to his subject's identity, among which the truth, "the common enemy," is hidden. Gowan, as an artist, evades responsibility for describing things as they are, and his neglect allows Blandois to maintain his disguise in order to achieve his insidious intent. Like so many authors who criticize a work in another medium, Dickens carries his argument against the painting that can be interpreted as anything into his own medium, language, in his subtle criticism of the polymorphous word used by Blandois' acquaintance Cavalleto. "Altro," Dickens
writes, is a "word being, according to its Genoese emphasis, a confirmation, a contradiction, an assertion, a denial, a taunt, a compliment, a joke, and fifty other things. ..." (47). Against such vagueness in meaning Dickens pairs the precision of the scientist William Doyce, who, as an inventor, follows a creative doctrine much like a Realist novelist:

He had the power ... of explaining what he himself perceived, and meant, with the direct force and distinctness with which it struck his own mind. His manner of demonstration was so orderly and neat and simple, that it was not easy to mistake him. There was something almost ludicrous in the complete irreconcilability of a vague conventional notion that he must be a visionary man, with the precise, sagacious travelling of his eye over the plans ... He never said, I discovered this adaptation or invented that combination; but showed the whole thing as if the Divine artificer had made it. ... (570)

Unlike Austen, Dickens, Zola, and Tolstoy, many novelists match a portrait or painting not against another interpolated art form, but implicitly against the work of art which is the novel itself. The social and moral realism that George Eliot develops in Middlemarch, for example, is shown to be a true representation of life in contrast with the effete aesthetic view of her fictional Nazarene painter Adolf Naumann, who so misrepresents character through art that he paints the deluded, selfish Casaubon as St. Thomas Aquinas. Often a novelist uses a painting to explore the relationship between art and reality,
as in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* which shows that the two are so closely intertwined that the art work changes in a self-conscious attempt not to mask the true reality of its subject. Poe uses a painting in his short story "The Oval Portrait" to show the parasitic quality of this relationship. In his story a painter literally kills his wife by forcing her to sit long hours in a damp, ill-lit tower to pose for a portrait that becomes more beautiful and life-like as she dies. The most conventional use of painting in the novel is to delineate character. Charlotte Brontë makes Jane Eyre a painter because her paintings reflect her view of herself and the world in which she lives. James' Milly Theale in *The Wings of the Dove* sees Bronzino's "Lucrezia Panciatichi" as a harbinger of her death.

These various uses of painters and paintings in the novel have in common the novelists' desires to adapt their works to the visual medium. In "The Lesson of Balzac," James writes: "It is the art of the brush, I know, as opposed to the art of the slatepencil; but to the art of the brush the novel must return, I hold, to recover whatever may still be recoverable of its sacrificed honor." Many nineteenth-century novels attempt to give such detailed and rich descriptions as to make the inner eye equal to the outer. Tolstoy in *Anna Karenina* achieves this; in the words of his first major interpreter, Dimitri Merezhkovsky, "in Tolstoy we hear because
we see." And more interestingly Tolstoy tells his reader how he makes them see by portraying a painting that reflects his creative vision.
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Appendix II: Symbolism and Music

The fin de siècle conflict between the Realist and Symbolist movements in literature can be observed in the contrasting fine arts that each use as analogues of their literary works. Tolstoy and Zola implicitly compare their techniques to those of Realist painters whose pictures of life are so clear in detail that they seem to be real. Analogically, as the painter uses his medium to create forms that correspond to easily recognized details, so a Realist novelist uses language that is clearly referential to the details of everyday life. The major tenet of Realism--objectivity--implies an external approach to character, a view of human personality that is roughly analogous to a life-like portrait which is an accurate rendering of the external details of the human form.

The Symbolists, on the other hand, in eschewing Realist externality, strove to portray internal states which concrete detail and referential language are ineffective in describing. The language of the Symbolists by necessity is evocatively ambiguous so as to suggest almost ineffable internal states. Music is the closest parallel to the Symbolists' aims, and so music became the emblem of their aspirations. As Charles Chadwick writes in his study of Symbolist movement, "music possesses just that quality of suggestiveness that the Symbolists were looking for, and lacks just that element of precision which words possess and which the Symbolists wished
to suppress."¹ The Symbolists' desire to make their literary work achieve the effects of music fulfills the prophecy of Richard Wagner who wrote: "In the course of the poet, so necessary to his very nature, we see him finally come to the limits of his branch of art, where it already seems to touch music; and thus the most successful work of the poet must be, for us, that which should be, in its perfection, entirely musical...² Wagner argues that the ideal art form is one that combines music, poetry, and drama, but he leaves no doubt that music is supreme. Walter Pater's famous dictum, "all art aspires to the condition of music,"³ does much to enhance this view.

As Wagner addressed his ideas on the musicalization of literature to poetry in particular, it is the poets, both in theory and practice, who respond first to his ideas. Mallarmé, in his essay "Crisis in Poetry," composed a Symbolist manifesto which is partly a rebuttal and partly a favorable response to Wagner's attitude. While he agrees that language has been debased in ordinary usage and that music is more appropriate for the revelation of spiritual essence, he argues for a musicalization of language which would be the basis of a supreme art in the hands of a skilled poet. Language is musicalized when it is freed from logical constructs and allowed to develop as a musical theme is developed--along lines of rhythmic rather than syntactically logical necessity. Then words are divorced from their ordinary usages, no longer
referential to external details but suggestive of internal states which are truer realities. "When I say: 'a flower,'" Mallarmé writes, "then from that forgetfulness to which my voice consigns all floral form, something different from the usual calyces arises, something all music, essence, and softness: the flower which is absent from all bouquets." In poetic usage the word flower does not refer to the tangible flowers of the outer world; rather it is a link between the imperfect, debased flower of external reality and the ideal flower of the mind, imagination, and emotion of the poet. The Symbolist's desire is to search for such linkages, or as Baudelaire calls them, "correspondences." And it is through a sensitivity to music, rhythm, that these correspondences are found. Paul Verlaine writes in "The Art of Poetry": "Music must be paramount . . . and everything else is mere literature." The Symbolist musicalization of literature, so prevalent in the poetry of the period, affected prose fiction much later, but its effects, when fully realized, were significant. The two greatest prose epics of the era, Joyce's Ulysses and Proust's A la Recherche du Temps Perdu, were profoundly influenced by music, both in structure and theme. Proust's use of music is similar to Joyce's in several ways. Proust in Recherche describes a search for linkages, Baudelairean correspondences, between real and ideal, present and past, the most famous example of which is the episode in Du Côté de Chez Swann of the madeleine cake and tea. The taste of madeleine
soaked in tea evokes for Marcel, the protagonist, the time in
his distant past when his now-dead Aunt Léonie used to give him
a piece of the cake dipped in tea and miraculously, "all the
flowers in our garden and M. Swann's park, and the water-lilies
on the Vionne and the good folk of the village and their lit-
tle dwellings and the parish church and the whole of Combray,
and of its surroundings, taking their proper shapes and grow-
ing solid, sprang into being, town and gardens alike, from
my cup of tea."

The madeleine cake is more than just a
symbol of the past; it is the physical means by which the
past, now lost and destroyed in the external world, is resur-
rected in its more perfect essence in the internal conscious-
ness of Marcel. And the novel Proust writes is the artistic
means by which this essence is preserved further from the devas-
tating effects of time.

Proust describes his search for the physical correpond-
dences of eternal essences in terms of music. As did Joyce,
Proust used music as a structural model. Like a Wagnerian
opera, the major themes and the strategy of *Recherche* are
introduced in the "Overture," and henceforth each theme is
reintroduced in the form of a leitmotiv, surfacing and re-
surfacing as the symphonic structure of the novel develops.
More importantly, the paradigm for the present object which
corresponds to the essence of past life is an ekphrastic
piece of music, a little phrase in the composer Vinteuil's
sonata for violin and piano which becomes the focal point of
the emotional life of first Swann and then Marcel. The story of Swann’s love for Odette de Crécy is a break in the autobiographical narrative of Du Côté de Chez Swann, and it represents the young Marcel’s first awareness of romantic love which, along with art, will lead him out of adolescence into maturity.

Swann meets Odette at the opera and is led by her into the high-class salon of Mme. Verdurin where he first hears the little phrase; as their love progresses the phrase, which at first had mildly pleased him, becomes to him an obsession, "the national anthem of their love" (167). Time passes, and when he feels he has lost Odette, he unexpectedly hears the sonata again, and when the phrase is repeated, "he now recovered everything that had fixed unalterably the peculiar, volatile essence of that lost happiness" (265). The ekphrastic musical phrase allows Marcel to return to a lost happiness, just as the ekphrastic song, "M'appari," suggests to Bloom the "dominant to love return." Wallace Fowlie writes: "Venteuil's music evokes in Swann memories of an entire part of the past . . . as drinking a cup of tea in tante Léonie's room had for Marcel." The phrase and the madeleine are among those group of things, according to Proust, that "remain poised for a long time, like souls, ready to remind us, waiting and hoping for their moment, amid the views of all the rest; and bear unaltering, in the tiny and almost impalpable drop of their essence, the vast structure of recollection" (36).
More significantly, the phrase has so distilled a past moment that Swann can feel what Vinteuil must have felt when he composed it. Through the phrase, Vinteuil and Swann symbiotically share the essence of an emotion, merging together for a time like Bloom, Simon Dedalus, and Lionel merge in "Sirens" as "Siopold" when "M'appari" is sung.

As Marcel grows older, he hears the phrase played by Odette (now Mme. Swann) in the Swann household where he courts Swann's and Odette's daughter Gilberte. Years pass and the sonata passes into oblivion until an older Marcel (in La Prisonnière, the fifth novel of the series) sits at a piano, and playing the music before him, is surprised that it is Vinteuil's sonata, and he hears again the little phrase. It stirs in him memories of Combray, and he remembers his desire to be an artist. Later, Marcel, like Swann, is brought to the salon of Mme. Verdurin to hear an unknown work, a posthumous septet by Vinteuil, in which he hears a transcription of the little phrase from the sonata. His artistic urgings become stronger when, again like Swann, he feels a communion with Vinteuil, a sharing of the emotion, the essence of which has been preserved in the phrase and in the composer's work as a whole. George Painter writes that the theme "revealed the existence, somewhere deep within him, of a region in which beauty was real and eternal, uncontaminated by disappointment, sin and death."9 This realization is a harbinger of Marcel's greater revelation in the closing pages of Le
Temps Retrouvé when he comes to understand his own artistic mission—the writing of the book the reader is now reading. Marcel thinks: "How much more so it appeared to me now that I felt it possible to shed light on this life which we live in darkness and to bring back to its former true character this life we distort unceasingly—in short extract the real essence of life in a book" (1112).

When Marcel hears the septet, he comes to realize that Vinteuil had extracted "the real essence of life" in a piece of music. Vinteuil is the book's ideal artist (as opposed to the derivative, stylized writer Legrandin) whose career has culminated in the composition of a work which incorporates all his previous works and preserves in an ideal state the entirety of his life. After listening to the septet, Marcel thinks, "Vinteuil's sonata, and... his other works as well had been no more than timid essays, exquisite but very slight, towards the triumphant and complete masterpiece which was revealed to me at the moment" (555). To this statement Fowlie adds: "In the same way, the early writings of Marcel Proust all flow into the final work where they are deepened and transformed. . . ."10 Vinteuil's final work is the ekphrastic form most continuous with the work in which it is contained.

Proust's use of music, then, is extensive and pervasive. It serves as a structural model for his work. The musician Vinteuil is the ideal artist upon whom Proust models himself. And an interpolated musical theme is an analogue of the central
experience of the novel—the preservation of the past through first recollection and then transformation into art. Proust's use of music, though, is not as extensive as that of Joyce in *Ulysses*, who carries Proust's strategies to an even further extreme. Nevertheless, both *Ulysses* and *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu* are novels that aspire to conditions of music.
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