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ABSTRACT

THE "UNSPEAKABLE" QUALITY OF E. M. FORSTER'S NARRATIVE VOICE

MADELINE JOAN FLEMING

This dissertation is an examination of the complex problem of narrative voice in three novels of E. M. Forster. Much of the recent critical commentary on Forster's narrative voice either discusses narrative voice as an extension of character, or discusses narrative voice as a biographical and psychological extension of Forster. Despite these approaches to Forster's narrative voice, Forster's narrative voice continues to "irritate" us, as it did Lionel Trilling in 1944, in its "refusal to be great."

I examine Forster's narrative voice as an autonomous element disconnected from the trappings of characterological, biographical and psychological criticism. I discuss how the narrative voice develops a moral and philosophical view that begins with a pessimism about the possibility of human relationships in Where Angels Fear To Tread, continues with a fantasy of perfectly unified relationships in A Room With A View, and culminates in A Passage To India in which the narrative voice promises unity and continuance through an implied acceptance of metaphysical and metaphorical assumptions.

The protagonists in the three novels that I discuss
all have an experience which they cannot define in words. The characters' inability to define experience parallels the narrative voice's detachment from the reader, and it also foreshadows the narrative voice's ultimate refusal to provide a definition, or an interpretation of itself. The characters' inability to define experience makes them appear to be characters who are limited, or "flat" stereotypes; and in all three cases, the protagonist requires another figure to act as an intermediary between it and the totalizing experience of "the other." This intermediary figure provides character with a circumlocutory interpretation of experience; and it therefore evokes the characters' simultaneous desire and inability to describe the subject of its experience.

This circumlocutory figure becomes a figure that exposes and exists within the implied space between character and narrative voice, and the narrative voice and the reader. When the narrative voice describes a character's use of a circumlocutory figure, it points to both the character's, and its own elision.
"absence implies presence"
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout the numerous critical works about Forster's novels, the issue of narrative voice \(^1\) emerges as a, if not the most problematic factor. Most critics either do not discuss narrative voice as an entity that is separate and distinct from the characters' voices, or they mistakenly discuss voice as a biographical extension of Forster. The first of these approaches is essentially characterological and considers character as the determining factor of narrative and plot. The second approach is basically psychological and biographical. It proceeds from the premise that since all art is basically autobiographical, character is not only the center of narrative, but character is also an event that describes the history and life of the author. While these two literary approaches are quite different in method, both views privilege character over voice. Biographical criticism favors character by assuming that Forster is the narrative voice. This view in turn argues that Forster as voice either directly, or latently expresses his social and sexual self through certain characters.

Despite these two approaches to Forster's text, Forster's narrative voice continues to "irritate" us, as it did Lionel Trilling in 1944, in its "refusal to be great."\(^2\) As a result of its elusiveness, Forster's narrative voice has been awarded the ultimate modernist, post-structuralist
and deconstructionist compliment of being "unsayable." ³ The popular equation that "absence implies presence" comes into play here; and for critics who privilege character over voice, the absence of character, like its presence, dominates and controls narrative. ⁴ For example, Mrs. Moore's absence at the end of A Passage to India leads the natives to conceive of her as "present" in the form of a Hindu goddess, which in turn leads many critics to describe her as the "absent center" of the novel.⁵ My dissertation examines this complex problem of narrative voice in three of Forster's novels: Where Angels Fear To Tread,⁶ A Room With A View,⁷ and A Passage To India.⁸ I discuss how the narrative voice of Forster's two "Italian" novels foreshadows the narrative voice of A Passage To India.

Although Where Angels Fear To Tread proceeds A Room With A View in order of publication, A Room With A View was in fact Forster's first attempt at the novelistic form. He abandoned his initial manuscript of A Room With A View to write Where Angels Fear To Tread, and finished his second "Italian" novel after his second published novel, The Longest Journey.⁹ A knowledge of this chronology allows us to view A Room With A View and Where Angels Fear To Tread as novels which are linked in that the narrative voice of both novels utilizes Italy as a background to the action, describes a story and plot which are unrealistic
"fantasies," and develops characters which are stereotypes lacking internal psychology. In *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, the narrative voice presents characters as "flat" stereotypes so that they function to enhance its satirical intent and cynical tone. This is quite clear at the end of the novel when the narrative voice finishes its story by cynically describing Philip and Caroline as they rush to protect Harriet from getting "smuts" in her eyes. Although the narrative voice's aim in the first book is certainly humor and irony, its encompassing tone is cynicism. In order for the narrative voice to develop fully its cynical attitude about human relations, it aligns itself with the realm of human nature and character; and as a result, its cynical tone has the effect of making it appear as a stereotype as much as the characters it describes.

Despite the narrative voice's ironic stereotyping of itself through its tone, its ultimate detachment from the action of the novel and its resistance to thematic unity prevents it from being viewed completely as a character that participates in the story. In *A Room With A View*, however, the presence of the narrative voice returns, and it once again makes character a subordinate narrative element and stereotype; yet it distances itself further from character than it did in the first novel by aligning itself with the non-human realms of physical nature and classical mythology. By further detaching itself from the
human realm, the narrative voice transforms the cynicism of human relations and character that it displays in the first novel into humor and irony. In addition, whereas the limitations of society and art prevent Caroline and Philip from having a successful relationship in Where Angels Fear To Tread, in A Room With A View Lucy and George are able to have a successful relationship precisely because they abandon society and art by responding to the dictates of instinct and nature. The narrative voice describes Lucy and George's love simply as an "unexpected melody" (53), and it leaves the "unexpected" unexplained. In the third published novel, the narrative voice is able to maintain its detachment from and superiority over character by favoring the realm of the superhuman, or "unexpected." The narrative voice of A Passage To India removes itself further from the realm of the human by aligning itself completely with the "unspeakable" (208) realm of the physical universe. While the narrative voice allows the character of Mrs. Moore to enter the realm of the "unspeakable" and become a function of both the world of spirit and the world of the human, the "earth," "sky," and the "thousand voices" of India tell Fielding and Aziz that they can not have a relationship by stating simply: "No, not yet," and "No, not there" (322).

These three novels do not share the realism,
psychology and common ground of England of Forster's second and fourth published novels, The Longest Journey and Howards End. Whereas the narrative voices of The Longest Journey and Howards End examine primarily human relationships and the consolation these relationships offer in the realm of the human, the narrative voices of Where Angels Fear To Tread, A Room With A View, and A Passage To India are all concerned with defining a metaphysical and metaphorical relationship that resists answers articulated in human speech or located in a physical space. The narrative voices of The Longest Journey and Howards End are equally concerned with human relations and character as the other three novels; but because the narrative voice of these two novels subordinates itself to the realm of human nature and character to acknowledge the importance of human relations and the physical structures of man, it loses its autonomy and ironic narrative detachment. For example, the narrative voice ends The Longest Journey by describing Stephen Wonham "salut(ing)" his child who is named after his own and Rickie's mother. By acknowledging his daughter with a physical gesture, Stephen Wonham validates his mother's love of which he and Rickie are a product. The narrative voice subordinates itself to character and privileges the human realm over the abstract realm of philosophy. Character, rather than narrative voice, governs the story and plot. Perhaps the elevation of
character in *The Longest Journey* is due to the fact that the narrative ground that it describes is realistic and rooted in autobiography.\textsuperscript{13} In *Howards End*, Forster's fourth published novel, the narrative voice again suggests that a child, the baby of Helen Schlegel and Leonard Bast, connects the relationships of the characters by maintaining his relation to earth through its connection to the place of Howards End.\textsuperscript{14}

The three novels that I discuss share a controlling narrative voice that focuses its attention upon defining the dualism implied in the notion that a relationship exists between the realm of the human and a non-human autonomous spiritual presence. Forster addresses this philosophical proposition when he says in *Aspects of the Novel*:

> We have already decided that Aristotle is wrong and now we must face the consequences of disagreeing with him. 'All human happiness and misery,' says Aristotle, 'take the form of action.' We know better. We believe that happiness and misery exist in the secret life, which each of us leads privately and to which (in his characters) the novelist has access.
And by the secret life we mean the life for which there is no external evidence (82). Forster refutes Aristotle and suggests that "happiness and misery" exist, and are not merely mirrored, within the abstraction of Plato's cave. When Forster refers to the "secret life... for which there is no external evidence," he is referring to the relationship between the human realm and the non-human autonomous realm of spirit. And when Forster states that this "secret life" lacks "external evidence" he is describing at once a metaphoric, or metaphysical space of non-action, and a linguistic structure that suggests that the synecdochal relationship between the human and the non-human represents ineffable gabs rather than Kenneth Burke's idea of "connectedness." The human realm unsuccessfully attempts to connect the gap that separates it from the other, or the the non-human, through a rhetoric that reduces the "secret life" to a physicality that denies multiplicity. The possibility of defining the space between the human and the non-human, the individual and the group, or the signifier and the signified is elided by human words. Words represent a rhetoric of power that reduces truth and knowledge to a totalizing object of nothingness. Philip's inability to articulate his feelings of affection for Caroline in Where Angels Fear To Tread, Lucy's inability to articulate her
feelings of love for George in *A Room With A View*, and Mrs. Moore's refusal to articulate her experiences of the Marabar caves to anyone in *A Passage To India*, all illustrate the narrative voice's depiction of the human realm as it attempts to metaphorize its relationship to the "unspeakable" other.

My discussion of the "unspeakable" gulf between the human and the non-human, words and image, character and narrative voice is different from many critics who tend to privilege character in Forster's novels, and then assert that Forster the man must be a character in the novel, or the narrative voice itself. Following this logic, however, critics inevitably discover connections between characters in Forster's novels and Forster the man that do not exist. *Aspects Of The Novel* frames many of the issues that are evoked in my discussions of *Where Angels Fear To Tread, A Room With A View* and *A Passage To India*; and, since Forster himself refutes many of the claims of biographical, psychological and characterological criticism in *Aspects*, it will be helpful to examine here some of Forster's notions of the novel that he discusses in his first critical definition of the novel.

I suggest in my examination of *Where Angels Fear To Tread, A Room With A View*, and *A Passage To India* that the narrative voice does not speak directly to the reader about
its experience of situations and characters, nor does it speak privately in a moralistic, or autobiographical way. Forster notes in *Aspects* that the writer "better not" take the "reader into his confidence about his characters" for such confidences "beckon the reader away from the people to an examination of the novelist's mind" (81-82). Forster acknowledges the problem that character presents to an author who wants to be judged artistically in terms of the autonomy of his narrative voice, rather than in terms of the potential that his characters present for psychoanalyses. Forster expands upon this point when he describes the differences between the "pseudo-scholar," the "real scholar" and the writer:

The reader must sit down alone and struggle with the writer, and this the pseudo-scholar will not do. He would rather relate a book to the history of its time, to events in the life of its author, to the events it describes, above all to some tendency. As soon as he can use the word "tendency" his spirits rise, and though those of his audience may sink, they often pull out their pens at this point and make a note, under the belief that a tendency is portable.
That is why... we must not contemplate the stream of time. Another image better suits our powers: that of all the novelists writing their novels at once. They come from different ages and ranks, they have different temperaments and aims, but they all hold pens in their hands, and are in the process of creation... chronology... is sometimes their enemy too. "Oh, what quenchless feud is this, that Time hath with the sons of men," cries Herman Melville... Let us avoid it by imagining that all the novelists are at work together in a circular room. I shall not mention their names until we have heard their words, because a name brings associations with it, dates, gossip, all the furniture of the method we are discarding (13-14).

Forster proclaims the autonomy of the novel by removing it from the limitations of date and place. The novel and the novelist are beyond time for they both exist in a "circular room" which provides a simultaneous "process of creation."
The notion that novels have an existence of their own apart from the author evokes Forster's theme of the "unspeakable" space between the human and the non-human, and between character and narrative voice.

Forster alludes again to this "unspeakable," metaphysical or metaphoric quality of his narrative voice when he says that the "final test of a novel will be our affection for it, as it is the test of our friends, and of anything else which we cannot define" (23 - my emphasis). Forster's statement that the "final test of a novel" is its ability to surpass definition, "gossip," and "dates" also refers to the synecdochal relationship between narrative voice and the reader which also implies an ineffable space or gap that resists connectedness. In addition, Forster implies that there is a similar ineffable space between his notion of "story" as opposed to voice. Forster states that the primary goal of a novelist is to "tell a story." Story is "the fundamental aspect of the novel," but "it is on the precise tone of voice" that all "subsequent conclusions...depend" (25). Forster places "story" in realm of human time; but he allows "voice" to encompass both the human and the non-human to emphasize the dual aspect of novels which must convey these dualities through the "unspeakable" images of written words. Story

transform[s] us from readers into

listeners, to whom "a" voice speaks,
the voice of the tribal narrator, squatting in the middle of the cave. . . The story is primitive, it reaches back to the origins of literature, before reading was discovered, and it appeals to the primitive in us (40). Forster's resistance to definition and time is reinforced by his narrative voice which, like ancient cave paintings, provides a simultaneous connection between the primitive and the modern. The narrative voice is both present ("a voice speaks"), and absent because it evolved before "reading," and therefore writing, "was discovered." In addition, although story is related to human time for it is "primitive" and "reaches back to the origins of literature," the narrative voice ("the tribal narrator") removes its "audience" from time and "origins" through voice. Thus, narrative voice "transforms us from readers into listeners," and Forster drives home the point that narrative voice opposes interpretation, and "gossip" about the author that is based upon time and history. Forster adds that narrative voice evolves from the author's "state" of "inspiration" which allows for "History" to develop while "Art stands till" (21). The narrative voice is distinct from the world of time and history of the author for it is the product of "primitive" artistic creation
which belongs to the a-temporal, "circular room" or "cave."

Forster's idea of character also belongs to the realm of the non-human in that character is distinct from history and time. While narrative voice is the vehicle for the "tribal narrator's" story "before reading," character is the vehicle for plot. Forster says that plot "is the novel in its logical intellectual aspect" (96), and it is the "narrative of events, the emphasis falling on causality" (86). Because character aids the plot with its "emphasis...on causality," it is similarly bound by the "narrative of events." Thus, characters, like plot, are governed by narrative voice which "as soon as [it] raises them to the level of the explicable they lose their native quality" (84). Character loses its "native," or a-temporal, a-spacial quality and becomes a stereotype as soon as it is explained in words and is "read." It is with this notion in mind that we can understand more fully Forster's explanation of the relationship between author and character:

And now we can get a definition as to when a character in a book is real: it is real when the novelist knows everything about it. He may not choose to tell us all he knows - many of the facts, even of the kind we call obvious, may be hidden. But he will
give us the feeling that though the character has not been explained, it is explicable (63).

Although Forster is speaking of the "novelist" and what "He may not choose to tell," he is not conflating the terms "novelist" and narrative voice. For it is "the feeling" that Forster describes that indirectly refers to the narrative voice which creates in the "circular room" or "cave." Forster indicates here that character is under the control of the narrative voice, and is in every way "explicable." Therefore, the issue is not how character shapes the novel, but how the narrative voice shapes character and theme. Since narrative voice does not take the reader into its confidence about character, then character must necessarily be objectified. Forster's narrative voice uses the free indirect discourse to enter the inner life and psychology of character, which in turn further emphasizes the character's outward representation or type. By virtue of the fact that Forster's character must be explained by an external element, his characters resemble his description of "flat" characters:

    We may divide characters into flat and round. Flat characters are called "humorous" in the seventeenth century, and are sometimes called types, and
sometimes caricatures. In their purest form, they are constructed round a single idea or quality...The test of a round character is whether it is capable of surprising in a convincing way (67-78).

Most of Forster's characters in *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, *A Room With A View*, and *A Passage To India* fall under his description of a "flat" character and are "constructed round a single idea or quality." That the characters are "flat" aides the narrative voice's autonomous existence and impartial treatment of ideas. The "flatness" of the characters adds to the narrative voice's elusiveness, and it emphasizes the narrative voice's refusal to attach itself to any particular character or view.

The narrative voice, through its "repetition" and "variation" of character, image, and phrase, creates what Forster describes as a musical "rhythm" (168). This musical analogy, which is itself elusive and vague, is fitting to characterize the "unspeakable" quality of Forster's narrative voice. Forster states that the most important aspect of narrative voice is its "accent" and its "song" (134):

With prophecy...is an accent in the novelist's voice...His theme is the universe, or something universal, but
he is not necessarily going to "say"
anything about the universe. .
Prophecy - in our sense - is a tone of
voice. It may imply any of the faiths
that have haunted humanity -
Christianity, Buddhism, dualism,
Satanism. . . but what particular view
of the universe is recommended - with
that we are not directly concerned. It
is the implication that signifies (125-126).
Again Forster makes the distinction between the "novelist"
and the "tone of voice." He defines the "unspeakable"
aspect of narrative voice here as "Prophesy," but is quick
to take away any meaning that this definition implies by
stating that "we are not directly concerned" with any
"particular view." Because it "is the implication that
signifies," Forster must find yet another analogy to
describe the "accent" and "tone" of the narrative voice:

Is there any effect in novels
comparable to the Fifth Symphony as a
whole, where, when the orchestra stops,
we hear something that has never
actually been played?. . .I cannot find
any analogy. Yet there may be one; in
music fiction is likely to find its
nearest parallel. . . Music, though it does not employ human beings, though it is governed by intricate laws, nevertheless does offer in its final expression a type of beauty which fiction might achieve in its own way. Expansion. That is the idea the novelist must cling to. Not completion. Not rounding off but opening out. When the symphony is over we feel that the notes and tunes composing it have been liberated, they have found in the rhythm of the whole their individual freedom (168-169).

This is the closest that Forster comes to defining the "unspeakable" quality of his narrative voice. It does not "involve human beings"; "we hear something that has never. . . been played"; there is no "anology"; it is a "type of beauty"; it is an "idea the novelist must cling to."

Although Forster does not privilege any system of thought or religion, when he suggests that we "hear something that has never actually been played" he alludes to the non-human "something" which exists but is ineffable to human understanding. In addition, Forster's statement that "notes" and "tunes" find in the "rhythm of the whole their individual freedom," points to the metaphysical or
metaphorical space between the human and non-human, character and narrative voice, and the paradoxical endings of his novels which appear to claim "expansion" and "completion" simultaneously. Forster's emphasis on the narrative voice's "accent" and "tone" is important to remember when we read the narrative voice's cynical "tone" in *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, its humorous "tone" of *A Room With A View*, and finally its perplexing "accent" and "tone" expressed fully in the final sentence of *A Passage To India* when the narrative voice gives the voices of India a British "tone" and "accent."

My study of narrative voice in *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, *A Room With A View* and *A Passage To India* is intended to be an interpretation and a reading. It does not attempt to extensively refute or present anybody else's interpretation. I do not offer insights into specific narrative structures that have evoked much critical commentary, such as the tri-part relationship of "Mosque," "Cave" and "Temple" in *A Passage To India*, the two chapter interval that describes Gino and Lilia's relationship in *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, or the abrupt transition between Part One and Part Two of *A Room With A View*. I describe how the narrative voice develops a moral and philosophical view that begins with a pessimism about the possibility of human relations in *Where Angels Fear To*
Tread, continues with a fantasy of perfectly unified relationships in *A Room With A View*, and culminates in *A Passage To India* in which the narrative voice promises unity and continuance through an acceptance of implied metaphysical and metaphorical assumptions.
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3Critics have responded to Forster's complexity, ambiguity and dualism in a variety of ways. See James McConkey's letter to The New York Times Book Review,
February 22, 1987. McConkey, who considers *A Passage To India* to be Forster's most representative novel, states that the "unsayable" quality of the Forster's narrative voice emerges because Forster's sense of rational humanism "intuitively responded to the insights of Eastern metaphysics." In addition, McConkey notes that "those most fully drawn to theories of deconstruction must be separated by only the thinnest of lines from Buddhism or Hinduism." Also see I. A. Richards, "A Passage to Forster: Reflections on a Novelist." *The Forum*, LXXVIII, No. 6 (December 1927), 914-20. Richards was one of the first critics to note the duality in Forster's narrative: the tension between men of vision and men of action, and also between the mode of mysticism and the mode of manners. Richards called these dualities Forster's "elusive weakness[es]."


5See Barbara Rosecrance, *Forster's Narrative Vision* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982) 219. Rosecrance notes that "An appeal to Mrs. Moore presents a muted and ironic counterpoint to Aziz's trial. The British are responsible for her invocation. . . .Forster places his characters in the position of the God, a role they are unable to assume - illustrating once again the human
separation from meaning."


7—-, *A Room With A View* (New York: Random House Inc., 1986). All subsequent quotations are from this edition; hereafter page numbers will be indicated in the text.

8—-, *A Passage To India* (San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1952). All subsequent quotations are from this edition; hereafter page numbers will be indicated in the text.

9For a discussion of the chronology of Forster's *Where Angels Fear To Tread* and *A Room With A View* see Barbara Rosecrance 82.

10For an example of an early review of *Where Angels Fear To Tread* see "'V''', Review," *Manchester Guardian*, 4 October 1905, 5 in *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Philip Gardner (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973) 44. The author notes that Forster "writes in a persistent vein of cynicism which is apt to repel." Despite the humor and irony inherent in Forster's first published novel, Forster's "cynicism" is noted more frequently and is the general basis for interpretations
that emphasize the novel's "somber" tone. See for example Alan Wilde, *Art And Order: A Study Of E. M. Forster* (New York: New York University Press, 1964) 27. Wilde states that the "unreality of Philip's and Caroline's feelings makes the ending of the book more somber; the triumph that comes from their growth in self-knowledge is muted by their failure an interpersonal relations." Forster was aware that the humor of his first novel was overshadowed by its unsuccessful conclusion; and he was therefore pleased when Malcolm Darling saw in *A Room With A View* what he had attempted to accomplish in *Where Angels Fear To Tread*. See Forster's letter to Malcolm Darling contained in P. N. Furbank, *E. M. Forster: A Life*, Vol. 1 (London: Secker & Warburg, 1977) 171. Forster tells Darling: "I am so glad that you see I'm not a cynical beast. Not that you've suggested I was! but information to the contrary is extraordinarily difficult for me to convey. I can't write down 'I care about love, beauty, liberty, affection, and truth', though I should like to."


13 See Wilfred Stone, The Cave And The Mountain: A Study of E. M. Forster (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966) 183. Stone states that in The Longest Journey "Forster gives us a far more intimate portrait of the artist, and shows a far more desperate search for self. If Philip Herriton is the observer of life, Rickie Elliot tries to become a participant."

14 Many commentators have noticed that The Longest Journey and Howards End inhabit a reality that is significantly different from the other three published novels. See James McConkey, The Novels of E. M. Forster (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957) 132. McConkey notes that "Howards End does not achieve nearly the degree of final liberation and expansion A Passage To India does. . . the lesser expansion of Howards End relates to a never-resolved conflict between the detached position of the Forsterian voice and the position of Margaret Schlegel, actively engaged as she is within the world of human relations." See also Frederick C. Crews, E. M. Forster: The Perils of Humanism (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962) 143. Crews notices that "In The Longest Journey all three of the central male characters suspect that the universe is indifferent or hostile to humanity. And the satisfactory conclusion to
Howards End is reached, not by Margaret Schlegel's having acquiesced in the providential scheme, but through her striving against the panic and emptiness of a godless world." Crews also notices that A Passage To India "brings us back to the world of Where Angels Fear To Tread and A Room With A View. The English sexual prudery, the emphasis on duty and good form, the distrust of everything foreign are all brought into expected relief against the spontaneity of a manifestly un-English country."


CHAPTER ONE

Forster's first published novel, Where Angels Fear To Tread, provides a solid basis from which to address the "unspeakable" quality of his narrative voice. The novel appears to be a conventional Victorian comedy of manners in terms of story and plot, yet critics disagree about the identity and function of the novel's protagonist. That character is one of the most widely discussed critical issues surrounding this novel is not surprising since the novel's narrative voice aligns itself with the aspect of character. The narrative voice's close relationship with character reveals that it is ironically both distant from and inhibited by character. This simultaneous inhibition and distance points to the narrative voice's distrust of the notion that the novel is capable of documenting reality and human history through characters in novels. As Forster states in Aspects Of The Novel, the novel must present character as a stereotype because the novelist can not achieve the omnicient vantage point necessary to "survey all human and pre-human activity" (173) in order to make any final claims about the development of character and humanity. Thus, the effect of the narrative voice's close proximity with character is that its tone becomes overwhelmingly cynical. Despite its cynical tone, when we examine how the narrative voice interacts with the character of Philip Herrition, we discover that the
narrative voice does not endorse Philip, or any other character as protagonist. The narrative voice ends the novel by neither condemning nor endorsing character. Its interaction with character reveals its cynicism concerning human nature which resists change and "expansion." By examining the narrative voice's relationship with the character of Philip, I will show how its alliance with character and the realm of human nature conveys a bleak and cynical view which inhibits its own "expansion."

Most critics follow Lionel Trilling who asserts that Philip is the protagonist of the novel: Philip goes to Italy first to interfere with his sister-in-law's marriage, and second to attempt to bring his Italian nephew to England. Within this conventional plot, Trilling asserts that Philip is "as nearly impossible as it is possible for the hero of a novel to be" (53), and that Philip is "not quite a man, though he wishes to be. To Philip... nothing can ever happen; that is his tragedy" (65). While all of the above statements any reader of the novel would deem true, Trilling also states that "On the trip back to England he (Philip) proposes to Caroline...But she gently refuses him" (66); and it is for this reason, that Caroline refuses him and becomes another "spectacle" of his life that is amusing and beautiful, that Philip's "salvation cannot be complete" (66). Trilling concludes his analysis
of the novel by stating that it
ends with an almost intentional
weakness...The life of self-complacency
has been confronted with the life of
self, and Sawston and its illusions can
never again have their hold upon
Caroline and Philip...Nothing important
has been changed, but in the struggle
things have assumed their right names
and true meanings (66).

Trilling erroneously states that the two main characters,
Caroline Abbott and Philip Herriton, change throughout the
course of the book: they "confront[]" the life of "self-
complacency" with the "life of self," and therefore,
according to Trilling, "illusions can never again have
their hold" upon them. At the same time, however, Trilling
states that while nothing "significant" has changed, in the
"struggle things . . . assume[] their right names and true
meanings." Trilling identifies Philip through the
classical notions of the term protagonist which implies not
only that the character undergoes some type of
transformation, but also that the character is responsible
for the novel's outcome. Yet Trilling's reading of Philip
and the novel reveals his own periphrastic critical
tendency of adding situations and events to certain parts
of the novel. For example, contrary to Trilling's
assertion, Philip does not propose marriage to Caroline Abbott. Although Philip entertains the idea that he is in love with her, Philip does not even come close to asking her to marry him. Caroline could not, therefore, "gently refuse him." In fact, this scene, which reminds one of the scene in *A Passage To India* when Aziz suggests to Fielding that he marry Miss Quested, is precipitated by Gino's advice in a letter to Philip that he marry Caroline:

In that very letter Gino had again
implored him, as a refuge from domestic
difficulties, "to marry Miss Abbott,
even if her dowry is small" (175).

Philip takes Gino's advice seriously enough so that he entertains the idea that he is in love with Caroline, but Philip is more interested in the fact that Gino conceives of Caroline as a possible wife. Philip continues to equate Gino with his "ideal of Italy," and he also equates Caroline with a goddess and his aesthetic idea of love. Gino continues to see marriage as a contract: the woman must have a dowry and be capable of taking care of his house and children. While Caroline recognizes that she cannot change or "expand" by abandoning her Sawstonian values and loving Gino "crudely," Philip recognizes that he cannot abandon his aesthetic view of the world. Because Philip cannot accept Caroline as a woman rather than as a
goddess, he cannot propose marriage to her. Philip's, Gino's and Caroline's inability to change and expand as characters emphasizes the distance and autonomy of the narrative voice that expresses a sense of anxiety due to the inability of the human condition to accept change. Philip does not undergo "salvation" to any degree, and by the end of the novel "Sawston and its illusions" have their hold upon Philip who wants to maintain them because he is looking for a life that is lived-out only in theory. While this understanding of the relationship between Philip, Gino and Caroline may appear simplistic to those critics who prefer to view the novel characterologically and/or psychologically, it is critical to our complex understanding of the narrative voice's autonomy.

Trilling fictionalizes the narrative voice's story further when he states that Philip proposes marriage to Caroline at the end of the novel; and this fictionalization indicates both the degree to which the narrative voice in the novel misleads the reader, and also the degree to which Forster's first novel has been misread. Most of the early critics unquestionably agree with Trilling that Philip is the protagonist of the novel, and then differ in opinion about the degree and method of his "transformation." 6 Recent biographical and psychological approaches to the novel that propose that Caroline Abbott is the protagonist of the novel 7 usually offer a disclaimer suggesting that
the "real" crux of the novel involves Philip's love for Gino, which in turn is often voyeuristically viewed as an insight into Forster's life:

Philip's homosexual temperament and Forster's need for concealment make the repudiation of love a comprehensible if not satisfactory outcome. 8

The fundamental mistake here, as with Trilling, is adding what Forster would characterize as "pseudo-scholarly" "tag[s]," "tendancies" or "gossip" to the novel. For example, Philip is an aesthete who looks to art rather than to life for truth; however, no incident in the book describes him implicitly, explicitly or even latently as "homosexual." The scene, which is the basis for the above quotation, is also the scene which Trilling cites as Philip's proposal of marriage to Caroline. Philip believes that Caroline is about to confess that she is in love with himself, and when Caroline states that she loves Gino, Philip abruptly and nervously interrupts her stating: "Rather! I love him too!" (180). Philip, who "love[s]" Gino as his "ideal of Italy," and as an adopted member of the "Italian brotherhood," is corrected by Caroline who points to the difference between his aesthetic love and her sexual love: "don't pass it off—I mean it crudely" (181). Thus, another common factor in misreadings of the novel
that focus upon Philip's "homosexual" temperament is the critic's conflation of Philip as protagonist and character with Forster the man and author. Forster himself states in *Aspects* that it is "dangerous" to conflate character and author because: "Intimacy is gained but at the expense of illusion and nobility" (81-82). Moreover, Forster maintains that such biographizing and psychologizing of character is "devastating" and "harmful" to the novel for it amounts to nothing more than "bar-parlour chattiness" (82). If Philip, as Trilling would like us to believe, proposed marriage to Caroline at the end of the novel, or even if Philip confessed a homosexual love for Gino, which he does not, his character would have changed significantly; and this change would may be significant to the evolution of Forster's story and his main characters. But to credit Philip with a proposal of marriage at the end of the book, or any significant "transformation" contradicts the actual events of the novel, as well as the narrative voice's description of Philip as a person who is passive. Critics who do not recognize that Forster privileges narrative voice over character, often mistakenly base their analyses of character upon biographical information from Forster's personal life which results in applying a depth and quality to character that Forster did not intend. This is a statement upon Forster's theory of the novel; it is not a biographical statement. One might
note parenthetically, however, that those critics who focus upon Forster's homosexuality as a basis for describing Philip's "latent homosexuality" are themselves further stereotyping and fictionalizing character and human behavior. In this sense, these biographical and psychological studies ironically serve to emphasize the distance between narrative voice and character, and the distance between narrative voice and Forster.

Philip Herriton is a character whom the narrative voice describes early in the novel as limited in his abilities to confront reality. The narrative voice says that Philip knows that he is limited and responds to life and human intimacy with either a "sense of humor," or a "sense of beauty" (69). If Philip does not respond humorously to intimacy, he displaces intimacy from the world of experience to the realm of beauty or art. When Philip cannot organize experience so that people are either humorous or beautiful, he objectifies them so that they, like his mother who "neither has wit nor an eye for beauty," become for him a "useless machine" (87). Philip is locked into a system of aesthetics that allows him to transcend culture and society, but this system also leaves him void of human truth and experience.

The narrative voice introduces Philip at the beginning of the novel as an aesthete who will never abandon Sawston
and the authority that his mother imposes. This chapter allows the narrative voice to introduce in microcosm its story and plot; and it also introduces Philip's relationship to Gino, Lilia, and Harriet. Philip is included with "all" the people saying goodbye to Lilia and Caroline as they are about to leave for Italy:

Philip, taking his place, flooded her with a final stream of advice and injunctions - where to stop, how to learn Italian, when to use mosquito-nets, what pictures to look at. "Remember," he concluded, "that it is only by going off the track that you get to know the country. See the little towns - Gubbio, Pienza, Cortona, San Gemignano, Monteriano. And don't, let me beg you, go with that awful tourist idea that Italy's only a museum of antiquities and art. Love and understand the Italians, for the people are more marvellous than the land" (3-4).

Note that the narrative voice immediately categorizes Philip as a conventional Sawstonian who "tak[es] his place" to give "advice and injunctions." When the narrative voice gives Philip the opportunity to speak, Philip's language is idealistic and unrealistic. For example, when he describes
the Italians as "more marvellous than the land," Philip indicates that he studies people and culture as aesthetic objects. It is for this reason that when Philip describes Italians as "people" who are "marvellous" he places the Italians in the realm of art where they achieve for him a comfortable sense of distance. When the Italians remain "marvellous," Philip can "love and understand" them as artistic models and he need not "love and understand" them as individuals. As the narrative voice states, it is only "in theory" that Philip "loved outraging English conventions" (10).

The narrative voice emphasizes Philip's rigidity and passivity throughout the novel by explaining and finishing most of Philip's sentences and thoughts. As a result, the narrative voice undercuts and satirizes Philip. That the narrative voice must take on the responsibility of explaining Philip more than any other character in the novel also emphasizes Philip's aesthetic method of perceiving people and reality, and it enforces Philip's stereotypical nature. The narrative voice tells us that when Philip's mother assigned him the duty of saving Lilia from Gino it was the "first time he (Philip) had anything to do" (19). The narrative voice is quick to point out that while Philip had "sung the praises of Italians" for three years, "he had never contemplated having one as a
relative" (19). And at the beginning of Philip's second trip to Italy, the trip to save Lilia from marrying Gino, the narrator describes Philip, who previously could not read about Italy in his Baedeker tour guide "without catching at the heart" (17), as leaving for Italy "reluctantly, as for something commonplace and dull" (20). Clearly, the narrative voice is pointing out that if Philip must confront his aesthetic conception of people and things in a realistic way, then his ideals become "dull" -- there is no middle ground for Philip.

The narrative voice further stereotypes Philip by stereotyping his mother and his relationship to the matriarchal society she represents. The narrative voice points out that Philip's actions in the novel are instigated primarily by his mother, Mrs. Herriton. By the time Philip is twenty-three, his mother has discovered that by flattering her son she can make him do anything for her. Philip, who believes he will "never carve a place" for himself "in the world" because of his physical inferiority (a "weak face") (68), is flattered that his mother perceives him in the role of family defender. The narrative voice sets up this relationship in the first pages of the novel by telling us that when "Mrs. Herriton and her son [are] left alone" there is "immediately confidence between them" (6-7). The narrative voice also tells us that Mrs. Herriton "knew how to manage" her son
(73); and it is to this end that Mrs. Herriton tells Philip at the beginning of the novel, referring to Lilia's trip to Italy, that it was his "idea of Italian travel" that "saved" the Herritons from any more of Lilia's embarrassing behavior in Sawston (7). The narrative voice comments that "Philip brightened" at his mother's "little compliment" (8). When Philip's vanity is appealed to, he agrees to do anything. Lilia's marriage to an Italian threatens the Herritons' position in Sawston society; but, more importantly, it also threatens Philip's personal idea of Italy. And when Philip learns that his "vulgar" (8) sister-in-law's suitor is the son of an Italian dentist (a social position Philip considers to be extremely low), he, the narrator tells us, "thought of Lilia no longer" because he became "anxious for himself: he feared that Romance might die" (26).

In fact, when Philip is faced with the task of attempting to break up the romance of Gino and Lilia, what he does in effect is confront and temporarily demystify his purely aesthetic idea of Italy and England. For example, when Philip is confronted with the "marvellous" Italian Gino, Philip becomes spiteful and petty. This is the case when Philip meets Caroline Abbott upon his arrival in Monteriano. His vanity is wounded when she describes the physical aspects of his prospective brother-in-law, Gino
Carella. Caroline's description of Gino as "very good-looking" (although "English standards would find him too short") provokes the narrative voice to tell us that "Philip, whose one physical advantage was his height, felt annoyed at her implied indifference to it" (24). The narrative voice's articulation of Philip's reaction to Caroline emphasizes Philip's self-consciousness and personal vanity, exposes the self-deception inherent in Philip's injunction to "love and understand" the Italians, and it also points to the idea that words and speech can "imply" meanings that the speaker did not intend. Philip's metaphysics and epistemology are rooted in his provincial English home of "Sawston in which his thoughts took birth" (22). When Philip believes that Caroline is privileging an Italian over himself, he privileges his metaphoric understanding of himself and Sawston over his metaphoric understanding of Italy. He finds that there is no intermediate ground: without his Baedeker tour guide of Italy, (which is itself a kind of fiction for it is filled with British metaphors of Italy), Philip views it as "the enemy's country" where he must save his sister-in-law from the ideal he proposed that she pursue.

The narrative voice continues to satirize Philip's stereotypical behavior when it describes his response to Gino and Lilia during their first meeting at dinner in Monteriano:
For the youth was hungry, and his lady filled his plate with spaghetti, and when those delicious slippery worms were flying down his throat, his face relaxed and became for a moment unconscious and calm. And Philip had seen that face before in Italy a hundred times - seen it and loved it, for it was not merely beautiful, but had the charm which is the rightful heritage of all who are born on that soil. But he did not want to see it opposite him at dinner. It was not the face of a gentleman (31).

Just like the dinner scene in the first chapter of *A Room With A View* when the Emersons offer Lucy and Charlotte their rooms, and Lucy is "perplexed" by the seemingly offended behavior of the Pensione Bertolini's residents which make her feel that she "might be in London," this scene similarly puts Philip in the position of having to compare his notions of Italy and England. Unlike Lucy whose perception of the "larger unsuspected issues" cause her to withhold her initial judgement of Italy, the narrative voice describes how Philip immediately perceives Lilia and Gino in terms of a parody and a stereotype.
Lilia and Gino are compared to Renaissance courtly lovers. Lilia, Gino's "lady," serves her "youth" until he becomes "unconscious and calm." Philip does not find that Gino and Lilia meet his artistic standards. Gino is Italian rather than English, but most importantly, Gino is not a "gentleman." Gino is merely "a face" not unlike "a hundred" faces he has seen in Italy. Philip sees Gino as an artistic and cultural metaphor that he "love[s]" for its "charm" or quality of being "Italian." In the same way that Philip "thought of Italy" (10) to save Lilia from marrying Mr. Kingcroft in Sawston, Philip now thinks of the "idea" of England in order to save Lilia from the "glamour of Italy" (35).

To save Lilia from Italy he appeals to her sense of England and maternity. Philip's idea of England is the society of "ladies and gentle[m]en" (34) and the obligations of family operating within that society. After dinner, Philip presents Lilia with two reasons for breaking off her engagement to Gino; he is "probably a ruffian" and "certainly a cad" (33). When Lilia responds to Philip by saying "There are no cads in Italy," Philip, the narrative voice tells us, "was taken aback; it was one of his own remarks" (33). Lilia rebuts Philip's argument not only by reminding him that in marrying Gino she will be following his own "love and understand the Italians" advice, but also that in marrying Gino, she will "this time. . . . marry for
love" (36). Lilia insults the memory of his brother Charles, which reminds Philip of the patriarchal duty his mother entrusted him to carry out: to "save Irma and the Herriton name" by forbidding Lilia to marry. And Philip inflates his own importance when he tells Lilia that Gino will release her from her commitment once he understands that he has "a man to deal with" (35). Philip, however, is intellectually humiliated when he learns that Gino cannot accept his one thousand lire bribe not to marry Lilia because the marriage has already taken place; and after Gino "topple[s] him on to the bed," Philip is physically demeaned by the Italian whom he initially perceived to be his physical, as well as intellectual, inferior. Despite those critics who state that this scene establishes the homoerotic basis in the novel, this scene functions merely to establish Gino as a stereotypical Italian. Like Mrs. Moore who mistakenly believes that her experience in the Marabar cave is a singular representation for the "thousand voices" of India, Philip perceives Gino to be merely one of a "hundred" Italian faces who signify the "rightful heritage" of Italy. He considers Gino's physical rebuke to be a symbol of all of Italy. Rather than facing the fact that his attempt to "save" Lilia is a vain reaction to his mother's manipulative command, Philip moves from an extreme idealism of perceiving the Italians with "love" and
"marvel," to the extreme of hating all of Italy and all Italians because Gino exposes the limitations of his aesthetic view. Although Philip is disillusioned about Italy, his disillusion is extreme, emotional and not long lasting because it proceeds only from his wounded vanity. For, as we discover later in the novel, after Philip hears that Gino is apologetic for pushing him, his "vanity [is] appeased" and "romance" comes back to Italy (111).

Throughout the book, the narrative voice illustrates that Philip is incapable of change because he is incapable of seeing life realistically. He is the kind of character Forster describes Aspects of the Novel as "flat" because he does not have the ability to "surprise" or change "convincingly." 9 Philip's character follows a pattern of behavior whereby he attempts action, and then abandons action when either his vanity is wounded, or he is intellectually bored. At the moment when Lilia dies in childbirth Philip still "hate[s] Italy" (91) and the narrative voice tells us that he "hate[s] Gino" whom he considers to be "the betrayer of his life's ideal" (70). The narrative voice at this point in the novel also gives us more insight into Philip's character when it digresses to describe Philip after his first trip to Italy:

He came back with the air of a prophet who would either remodel Sawston or reject it. All the energies and
enthusiasms of a rather friendless life had passed into the championship of beauty.

In a short time it was over. Nothing had happened either in Sawston or within himself. He had shocked half-a-dozen people, squabbled with his sister, and bickered with his mother. He concluded that nothing could happen, not knowing that human love and love of truth sometimes conquer where love of beauty fails (69).

This quotation is important because it describes the pattern Philip typically follows after a return from Italy; and it describes Philip's attitude at the end of the novel: Philip's "championship of beauty" disintegrates into "squabbling" and "bickering." The narrative voice's statement above also describes one of Philip's fundamental limitations: his mistaken notion that "the championship of beauty" transcends "human love and love of truth." Philip cannot, and will not know human love, or truth because such intimacy would call into question his aesthetic perspective on the world. In addition, such an insight would indicate a psychological change in Philip's behavior and would elevate him above the level of a stereotype.
Philip's aesthetic perspective contrasts with his mother's callous sensibilities. And the narrative voice uses the relationship between Philip and his mother to further its story and plot while it represses character. It is through Philip's relationship to his mother that the narrative voice describes how Lilia's marriage to Gino threatens the Herriton's position within Sawstonian society; and it is through the idealistic Philip that Mrs. Herriton attempts to save her reputation. Thus, Philip's short-lived disillusion with Italy and preoccupation with "attaining intellectual superiority" (69) is "convenient" for Mrs. Herriton (70) who needs allies when she must not only account to Sawston society for Lilia's death, but fears that she will have to account to Sawston society for Lilia's Italian born baby. Mrs. Herriton, like Philip, is a flat stereotype, and her "diplomacy" similarly lacks human depth and sincerity.

Mrs. Herriton's motivation to "save" Lilia's baby is prompted by Caroline Abbott's threat to bring the baby back to England and raise him as her own child. Philip, the narrative voice says, was "getting to enjoy his mother's diplomacy" to the point that he "did not think of his own morals and behavior any more" (82). Philip is frightened by his mother's manipulative abilities, and the narrative voice tells us that "All his life he had been her puppet...when she wanted a thing she always got it" (86).
But Philip's "vanity" is "wounded" when he discovers that his mother will not reveal her insincere motives to him as she has done so many times in the past (87). Even though the narrative voice says that Philip equates his mother with a "well-ordered, active, useless machine," the voice adds that he "could not rebel. To the end of his days he would probably go on doing what she wanted" (87). Although Philip knows the aesthetic value of human relations, he lacks any psychological awareness of human relations.

Because Philip cannot act, he asserts his "intellectual superiority" and uses his disillusionment with Italy to assume the pretense of "a prophet," and the pretense of "one who is better informed" (73). His "championship of beauty" is defeated during his second trip to Italy; and he attributes his defeat not only to Gino and the "glamour of Italy," but also in part to the twenty-three year old Caroline Abbott. Like Cecil Vyse, Philip is cynical about women and views them as his intellectual inferiors. Caroline challenges Philip's cynical view of women; but he lacks the ability to change psychologically. Rather than viewing Caroline as a human being, he views her as an artistic and mythological object. When Philip unexpectedly meets Caroline Abbott on the train while traveling to London, Caroline knows that Lilia is dead, but she does not know that she died while giving birth. Philip
can therefore approach her with the appropriate amount of condescension and intellectual superiority as "one who is better informed."

The narrative voice does not introduce this exchange between Caroline and Philip at this point in the novel as a superficial addition to the plot. This exchange is pivotal because it illustrates in microcosm the narrative voice's view of character as a whole element which is inferior in the novel: it emphasizes Philip's aesthetic limitations, and Caroline's limited realism. Caroline Abbott, unlike Philip who cannot read Baedeker's description of Italy "without a catching at the heart," is described early in the novel as a realist when she decides that she must go to Italy because "it is marvellous, and that one gets no idea of it from books at all" (22). Whereas Philip revives himself from intimacy by looking at life "at an immense distance" (183) aesthetically, Caroline entertains aesthetic notions only to discover that these notions are self-deceiving. In fact, the central action of the novel occurs because Caroline mistakenly believes herself to be responsible for Lilia's bad marriage, her death, and, finally her baby. To Caroline's "imagination Monteriano had become a magic city of vice" (88) from which she felt compelled to save the child who had come "into the world through [her] negligence" (84). Caroline realizes that by advising Lilia to marry Gino, she merely encouraged Lilia
to "change one groove (Sawston) for another - a worse groove (Monteriano)" (77).

Caroline confesses to Philip all of her regret regarding her first trip to Monteriano; and she describes to Philip how she mistakenly thought that Sawston, unlike Monteriano, was full of people who lived life with "petty unselfishness...for objects they didn't care for, to please people they didn't love" (76). Note that the narrative voice points out that Philip is flattered and "delighted" (76) that Caroline chooses him to confess her thoughts; and, elevated by this boost to his vanity, he feels that it is necessary to respond to Caroline in a condescending fashion:

'Oh, I quite sympathize with what you say,' said Philip encouragingly; 'it isn't nonsense, and a year or two ago I should have been saying it too. But I feel differently now, and I hope that you also will change. Society is invincible - to a certain degree. But your own life is your own, and nothing can touch it. There is no power on earth that can prevent your criticizing mediocrity - nothing that can stop you retreating into splendour and beauty -
into the thoughts and beliefs that make the real life - the real you' (78).

Philip, who enjoys the feeling of being "better informed," must point out to Caroline that she is a "year or two" behind him in her thinking; but, nevertheless, he "hope[s] that [she] also will change." Philip "retreat[s]" from reality into his own self-made world of "splendour and beauty." Philip's aesthetic conception of reality encourages him to believe that personal "thoughts" and "beliefs" make life real. For Caroline, this metaphoric and artistic view of reality is acceptable in theory; but reality has taught her that an individual's "thoughts" and "beliefs" are inexorably linked to society, which in turn is linked to place. Caroline responds to Philip's advice of "retreating into splendour and beauty" by stating realistically: "I have never had that experience yet. Surely I and my life must be where I live." The narrative voice, anticipating Philip's wounded vanity as a result of Caroline's sober response to his idealistic view, articulates Philip's silent sarcastic retort: "Evidently she had the usual feminine incapacity for grasping philosophy. But she had developed quite a personality, and he must see more of her" (78). By articulating Philip's thoughts, the narrative voice undercuts and pokes fun at Philip, while at the same time it illustrates Philip's inability to articulate his opinions in words. As we see
later in the novel, Philip begins to view Caroline less in terms of her "personality," and more in terms of her what she represents "philosophically," artistically and mythically. And when Caroline eventually asks Philip if she can correspond with him so that she can discuss Gino, she also illustrates that she prefers abstraction to reality.

Because Caroline flatters Philip by confessing to him, Philip no longer blames Caroline, along with the "glamour of Italy," for Lilia's marriage to Gino. In the same way that Philip attempts at the end of the novel to place himself along with Gino as a "fellow-victim" of the ladies' mismanaged plans, he attempts to place himself in relation to Caroline as a "fellow-victim" of Italy's "glamour." Philip and Caroline part ways when their train reaches Charing Cross; and the narrative voice summarizes their perspectives by telling us the activities with which they will engage themselves: Philip ("retreating into beauty") goes to a matinee; and Caroline (ironically foreshadowing her rejection of her sexual attraction for Gino) goes "to buy petticoats for the corpulent poor" (78).

The narrative voice gives Philip fewer opportunities to articulate his thoughts during his third voyage to Monteriano. By utilizing such a narrative strategy, the narrative voice further distances Philip from the action in
the second half of the novel, which in turn emphasizes
Philip's essentially inactive and aesthetic temperament. 10
In contrast to the second chapter of the novel which marks
Philip's disillusionment with Italy as a result of his
futile endeavor to rescue Lilia from Gino, Chapter six
through the end of the novel charts the return of Philip's
aesthetic nature. The narrative voice now typically begins
descriptions of episodes with metaphors; and the narrative
voice does not hesitate to cite Philip as the authority
responsible for its metaphorical descriptions:

Italy, Philip had always maintained, is
only her true self in the height of the
summer, when the tourists have left
her, and her soul awakes under the
beams of a vertical sun. He now had
every opportunity of seeing her at her
best, for it was nearly the middle of
August before he went out to meet

Harriet in the Tirol (93).

Even though Philip's third trip to Monteriano is
essentially a business trip with only the one goal of
retrieving Gino's baby, the narrative voice describes the
journey by stating that Philip is about to test out one of
his own theories: that "Italy is only her true self in the
height of the summer." Also, the narrative voice indicates
that Philip's disillusion with Italy will dissipate shortly
when it immediately uses Philip's metaphorical description of Italy in summer ("her soul awakens under the beams of a vertical sun") as a preface to all of events that encompass the rest of the novel. In this sense, the narrative voice's language ("her soul awakens") could refer to Caroline's discovery that she loves Gino "crudely," while at the same time it could refer to Harriet's impassioned kidnaping of Gino's baby. Moreover, the narrative voice emphasizes Philip's self-acknowledged disinterest in the events and actions in which the other characters participate. For Philip is interested primarily in "humour and beauty," and therefore he "saw no prospect of good, nor of beauty either. But the expedition promised to be highly comic" (94). The narrative voice tells us also that Philip "did not care about the baby one straw" (99); and that with reference to the activity surrounding Gino's baby, Philip

was simply indifferent to all in it except the humours. These would be wonderful. Harriet, worked by her mother; Mrs. Herriton, worked by Miss Abbott; Gino, worked by a cheque – what better entertainment could he desire? There was nothing to distract him this time; his sentimentality had died, so
had his anxiety for the family honour.
He might be a puppet's puppet, but he
knew exactly the disposition of the
strings (94).

Philip's cynical attitude described above soon changes. Gino, he discovers, cannot be "worked by a cheque" to give his son to the Herritons; and Miss Abbott eventually decides that she will not interfere with Gino's relationship with his son. But Philip is not concerned with Lilia or Gino's baby. Philip is concerned with recapturing his lost ideal of Italy; and Philip's ideal and aesthetic view of reality is connected to his own narcissistic view of himself.

Significantly, Philip's attitude towards Italy changes when he learns from Caroline Abbott that Gino "wished he hadn't been so rude to [him] eighteen months ago" (111). Philip responds to Caroline by pretending that he did not consider Gino's assault upon him during his last trip to Italy to be sufficient enough to require an apology:

"What a memory the fellow has for little things!" He turned away as he spoke, for he did not want her to see his face. It was suffused with pleasure. For an apology, which would have been intolerable eighteen months ago, was gracious and agreeable
now...His vanity had been appeased, and he knew it. This tiny piece of civility had changed his mood. "Did he really - what exactly did he say?" . . . What did the baby matter when the world was suddenly right way up? Philip smiled, and was shocked at himself for smiling, and smiled again.

For romance had come back to Italy(111).

The narrative voice is quick to point out that since this "admirable change in Philip proceeds from nothing admirable" it "may therefore provoke the gibes of the cynical. But angels and other practical people will accept it reverently, and write it down as good" (112). The change can only be considered "good" if, like Philip, "other practical people" perceive the world primarily in narcissistic and aesthetic terms. Philip, who has a "weak face," must turn away from Caroline so that she will not see that it is "suffused with pleasure" as a result of Gino's indirect compliment. That Philip's vision of romance returns to Italy as soon as his "vanity" is "appeased" indicates how closely his view of himself is connected to his view of the world. And the narrative voice, in asking us to consider Philip's change as "admirable," is utilizing a narrative ploy: in asking us to
sympathize with a character because of his weakness - that Philip changes because of a "tiny piece of civility" - the narrative voice encourages us to view Philip as a type, or a "flat" character. In addition, that the narrative voice addresses its readers directly here as either "cynical," or "angels and other practical people" emphasizes that it is separate and distinct from character. The narrative voice not only encourages us to interpret Philip simply as either "good" or "bad," but it also encourages us to look to the narrative voice as the element of the novel that is governing the story and plot.

Further, we can hardly ignore the narrative voice when it describes Philip as a character who is simple minded and humorous. Immediately after he asks Caroline "what exactly did he say," the narrative voice makes Philip's conversion back to his previous idealism complete when it notes:

'The view from the Rocca [small gratuity] is finest at sunset,' he
[Philip] murmured, more to himself than to her. . . . he watched her in silence, and was more attracted to her than he had ever been before (112).

Philip once again retreats into the "splendour and beauty" described in his Baedeker tour guide; and, as soon as his romantic vision is returned to him by way of Caroline, he starts to speculate about her beauty also. Gino appeases
Philip's vanity; but it is upon the intermediary between the two men, Caroline, that Philip projects his recaptured romanticism. While Philip observes Caroline romantically, Caroline is observing the grandeur of one of Monteriano's gothic towers. In his typical fashion as "one who is better informed," Philip must comment to Caroline: "Is it to be a symbol of the town?" Because Caroline is absorbed in her own thoughts, she does not respond to Philip's philosophical query. Like their meeting on the train to London the previous Christmas when the narrative voice articulated Philip's cynical thought that Caroline had the "usual feminine incapacity for grasping philosophy," the narrative voice now articulates Philip's comment that Caroline "was appallingly narrow, but her consciousness of wider things gave to her narrowness a pathetic charm" (113). Once again, the narrative voice articulates thoughts that Philip is incapable of voicing to Caroline directly. The narrative voice shows clearly that Philip is primarily concerned with "philosophy" rather than human relations. Once Philip's aesthetic view of Italy is restored, his behavior in Monteriano resembles his behavior in Sawston. He takes on the "air of a prophet," and becomes the "champion of beauty." However, in the same way that Philip's "championship of beauty" of beauty in Sawston turns quickly to "bickering" and "squabbling," Philip's
aestheticism in Monteriano also results in conflict. When Philip has the "air of a prophet" he recognizes, because of his self-acknowledged intellectual superiority, that a person's limits can also be "charming" - albeit "pathetically." While this behavior of Philip's is humorous, the narrative voice is showing us that, as in the above example with Caroline, when Philip perceives people to be "narrow" it is usually because they have insulted his vanity by not acknowledging him, or not agreeing with him.

From the moment that Philip's aesthetic illusions are restored, the task of offering Gino money in exchange for his first born male child becomes secondary to his personal mission of being a student of character and art. Because he now believes Gino is a "perfectly charming person" (124), he is not surprised when he finds Caroline in Gino's house holding baby Gino like a portrait of the Madona:

There she sat, with twenty miles of view behind her, and he placed the dripping baby on her knee. It shone now with health and beauty: it seemed to reflect light, like a copper vessel. Just such a baby Bellini sets languid on his mother's lap, or Signorelli flings wriggling on pavements of marble, or Lorenzo di Credi, more reverent but less divine, lays
carefully among flowers, with his head upon a wisp of golden straw. For a time Gino contemplated them standing. Then, to get a better view, he knelt by the side of the chair, with his hands clasped before him. So they were when Philip entered, and saw, to all intents and purposes, the Virgin and Child, with Donor (140-141).

Although Philip should be furious with Caroline for subverting his authority and going to Gino's house before him to attempt to negotiate for baby Gino, he ignores the reality of the situation because he prefers to view Caroline, like Italy, metaphorically as a painting. Just as Cecil Vyse views Lucy as a "Leonardo," by elevating Caroline to the level of art, Philip similarly does not need to respond to her personally with his petty Sawstonian values (that she is "narrow," and "pathetic"). Philip knows that his sister Harriet functions as the active emissary of Sawston; and Philip knows that Harriet will eventually be very "helpful" (96) when they must respond to Caroline and Gino in typical Sawstonian fashion. Therefore, The narrative voice indicates the degree to which Philip is out of touch with reality when it describes his view of Caroline and Gino as the "Virgin and child, with Donor." Ironically, immediately before this scene,
Caroline observes Gino interact physically with his baby; and it is through this physical interaction between father and son that Caroline sees through her own deception that she came to Italy to "save" Lilia's baby. The narrative voice tells us that Caroline now sees that Gino is a "man" who is "majestic" and "part of Nature" (139). In addition to discovering that Gino loves his baby, Caroline discovers that she loves Gino "crudely" because of his physical and natural sexual attraction. When Caroline asks Gino if she can help him wash the baby, the narrative voice notes that she asks "humbly" (140) now that she understands that she has deceived herself about Gino and his baby. Thus, when Caroline sees Philip approach her while she is holding Gino's baby, she believes that Philip will recognize also that she loves Gino "crudely." Caroline stands up, "raises her hands to her mouth, like one who is in sudden agony" (141), and runs away embarrassed from Gino and Philip. Perhaps Caroline "raises her hands to her mouth" as a sign that she acknowledges Gino's social reality as the "son of an Italian dentist"; at the very least, Caroline realizes that her desire to "save" Lilia's child proceeded from her own desire to be with Gino physically. She also knows, from her observations of Gino with his son, that the Italian will not part with his son for any amount of money. In contrast to Philip whose hope in life depends upon his "championship of beauty," Gino's hope is his son who is the
manifestation of "the strongest desire that can come to a man" (137); for a son provides Gino with a "divine hope of immortality" (67). Although Gino represents male fertility, as a character he never rises above the stereotype that the narrative voice describes him to be.

Caroline flees Gino's house and enters the church of Santa Deodata where Philip eventually confronts her. As the narrative voice reminds us: "He was not angry with her, for he was quite indifferent to the outcome of their expedition. He was only extremely interested" (145). While Philip is not interested in the expedition involving Gino's baby, he is now thoroughly interested in Caroline. Caroline, who acts upon her own initiative and instincts in order to come to terms with reality, is a mystery to Philip. The more realistic Caroline appears to be, the more Philip idealizes her and is, the narrative voice tells us now, "content to observe her beauty and to profit by the tenderness and the wisdom that dwelt there" (148). Ironically, this interview between Caroline and Philip occurs in the church's fifth chapel which depicts in a painting the death and burial of Santa Deodata - the saint who was canonized because of her devotion to passivity and her rejection of the world. And after Philip listens to Caroline's reasons for "chang[ing] sides" (148) in favor of leaving Gino alone with his son in Italy, "his vanity is
appeased" once again by Caroline and he associates himself with the painting of the saint:

"You do understand wonderfully. You are the only one of us who has a general view of the muddle." He smiled with pleasure. It was the first time she had ever praised him. His eyes rested agreeably on Santa Deodata, who was dying in full sanctity, upon her back...

In her death, as in her life, Santa Deodata did not accomplish much (148-149). Although Caroline credits Philip with having a "general view of the muddle," she knows that in his "general view" Philip is at a comfortable distance which will allow him to remain uninvolved. The narrative voice adds to Caroline's observation of Philip by stating that even though Philip "saw round" the muddle, "he was standing at an immense distance" (183). And although Caroline urges Philip to "do" something rather than settling for "'honourable failure,' which means simply not thinking and not acting at all" (150), Philip, prefers to equate his passivity with Santa Deodata. In doing so, he raises his passive nature to the metaphorical level of sainthood. Although Philip likes the metaphorical ideas that a saint represents, he does not embody the metaphorical qualities that a saint
represents. He tells Caroline that she is "quite right; life to [him] is just a spectacle, which - thank God, and thank Italy," and thanks to Caroline herself "is now more beautiful and heartening than it has ever been before" (151).

Unfortunately, Philip's aestheticism and passivity only lends his sister, Harriet, more power to be active. Harriet observes Philip negotiating with Gino for his son at the Cafe Garibaldi. She hears Philip exclaim: "Well, you are right...This affair is being managed by the ladies" (154); and she also sees by their laughter that their negotiations have come to nothing. Harriet decides to steal the baby. And as Harriet and Philip leave Monteriano in a carriage, Gino's baby suffocates in Harriet's arms just before the carriage overturns on the muddy road.

To Philip, the death of Gino's baby is unfortunate mainly because the reality inherent in this episode threatens to once again "betray his life's ideal." Philip's passivity, rather than leaving him in a philosophically superior position, exposes that "no one save himself had been trivial" (165). But, as the narrative voice explains, Philip manages to develop a response to the tragedy by metaphorically describing the idea that even when one is confronted with death one must
continue to live: "Philip knew that he was still voyaging on the same magnificent, perilous sea, with the sun or clouds above him, the tides below" (166). However, even though Philip has plenty of metaphors to describe life, he does not have metaphors adequate to portray the death of Gino's child. And in the same way that his mother finds that she is liable to be subject to social criticism if Sawston discovers that she has an Italian grandson and does nothing to attempt to bring him back to England, Philip knows that he will be liable not only to social criticism, but more importantly, liable to intellectual criticism if he does not take responsibility for the death of Gino's baby. Philip feels that he can save his family "honour," and that he can also save his aesthetic perspective of the world if he alone informs Gino of the death of his child.

However, in deciding to tell Gino about the tragedy of his son's death, Philip decides to tell Gino a complete lie: "You are to do what you like with me Gino. Your son is dead, Gino. He died in my arms, remember. It does not excuse me; but he did die in my arms" (168). Philip believes that there is something ennobling in his lie that Gino's baby died in his arms; perhaps Philip believes that the idea that Gino's son died in a man's arms will comfort Gino who believes that men, rather than women, provide a "divine hope of immortality." Nevertheless, Gino does not see that any aesthetic quality can be attached to his son's
death, and he decides to attack Philip physically in response to the news. Because Philip does not expect a physical attack in response to what he conceived to be a magnanimous gesture of good will and fraternity, he soon has only "one thought" which is to "get away from" Gino "at whatever sacrifice of nobility or pride" (170). Gino, however, catches Philip and proceeds to twist his arm that was broken in the carriage accident, while he also begins to strangle Philip's throat. While Gino tortures Philip, the narrative voice tells us that Philip thinks of three incidents: Lilia dying in the house where he is being tortured; Miss Abbott holding Gino's baby like the Virgin Mother; and, finally, he thinks of his mother who should be at this time "reading evening prayers to the servants" (171). The narrative voice tells us that at first Philip equates his situation with Lilia and Caroline who both followed Philip's aesthetic advice to "love and understand the Italians"; but then Philip finally equates his situation with his mother. Philip remembers his mother's "diplomacy" as she "read[s]...prayers to the servants." Significantly, Philip's "yells and gurgles" now become "mechanical"; and the reader recalls that earlier in the novel the narrative voice notes that Philip conceives of his mother as "mechanical." In the end, the narrative voice is telling us that despite Philip's aesthetic nature,
he will always function as a part of Sawston's, and his mother's civilized "machine."

By the time Miss Abbott arrives at Gino's house to save both Philip and Gino, Philip's physical pain has replaced his diplomacy. Philip implores Caroline to kill Gino, and also says that he "shall never forgive" Gino whom he now considers to be a "foul devil" (172). Gino destroys Philip's idea of Italy. But as Philip observes Caroline comfort Gino by holding him and kissing him, the narrative voice tells us that Philip sees her taking on qualities "he had seen in great pictures but never in a mortal" (173). In order to understand these events, Philip must attach to them aesthetic meanings. The narrative voice comments further that while Philip watches Caroline and Gino, he finds it necessary to "look[] away"

as he sometimes looked away from the
great pictures where visible forms
suddenly become inadequate for the
things they have shown to us. He was happy; he was assured that there was
greatness in the world. There came to him an earnest desire to be good
through the example of this good woman.
He would try henceforward to be worthy
of the things she had revealed.
Quietly, without hysterical prayers or
banging of drums, he underwent conversion. He was saved (173).

Philip, who quite recently in the novel stated that Caroline is "appallingly narrow," now sees Caroline as an agent and symbol of salvation. But Philip's salvation is not spiritual; nor does his "conversion" signify a change in his character. Caroline arrives at Gino's house because she is in love with him and wants to comfort him in his grief about his son's death. Philip cannot comprehend that Caroline in reality could, like his sister-in-law, "crudely" dote upon an Italian whom he believes to be his physical and intellectual inferior. Because Philip does not even consider it possible that Caroline's purpose is to "save" Gino, he must believe that she is a metaphor for the motherhood and sisterhood which he represents when he tells Gino of his son's death. In addition to saving Philip physically, Caroline "saves" Philip from losing, once again, his "ideal of Italy": in the same way that it is through Caroline that Philip forgives Gino for attacking him the first time they meet, it is through Caroline that Philip forgives Gino for attacking him a second time.

Philip is intent on not ending his third journey in Italy as he ended his second - with his life's ideals betrayed. To maintain his vision of the world, Philip finds it necessary to abstract reality, make metaphors for
truth, even when the truth is physically demeaning. That is, Philip, whose one physical advantage is his height, is physically demeaned by Gino who is the stronger of the two. When Gino comes close to killing him, Philip's aesthetic vision of Caroline comforting his oppressor is the means to his "salvation." In the same way that Philip views great art, he "look[s] away." Rather than taking life at face value, Philip must reinterpret life and its events as art. For Philip, love of beauty, rather than human love and love of truth, conquers. This explains why, when Caroline confesses her love for Gino to Philip, he ignores her when she emphasizes to him that she loves Gino for his physical sexuality ("crudely").

The narrative voice reinforces Philip's aesthetic vision of reality when he describes Philip's vision of Caroline as a goddess. For, immediately after Caroline Abbott confesses to Philip that she is in love with Gino, that she loves him "crudely" and "worship[s] every inch" of him, Philip cannot respond to Caroline except to say: "Thank you...Thank you for everything." The narrative voice must once again describe thoughts that Philip cannot articulate to Caroline:

Philip's eyes were fixed on the Campanile of Airolo. But he saw instead the fair myth Endymion. This woman was a goddess to the end. For
her no love could be degrading: she stood outside all degradation. This episode, which she thought so sordid, and which was so tragic, for him remained supremely beautiful. To such a height was he lifted, that without regret he could now have told her that he was her worshipper too. But what was the use of telling her? For all the wonderful things had happened (184).

Philip, who has just entertained the idea of proposing marriage to Caroline, does nothing to persuade Caroline that she is not wrong to love Gino "crudely"; and he does nothing to persuade her to love himself. In typical fashion, the narrative voice describes Philip retreating from action and looking at life aesthetically. Philip reminds himself of the myth of Endymion in which the young poet warms the heart and gains the favor of the chaste goddess Diana. And like Endymion, Philip prefers the inactive life of a poet immersed in dreams rather than reality. In Philip's world of art, poetry and dreams, Caroline can be the chaste goddess Diana as well as a picture of the Madonna. By seeing Caroline as a goddess, he can see Gino also as a subject of art or mythology. While Philip may not see Gino as a god, he prefers to see
him as a subject of art: Philip prefers not to see Gino for who he is - the son of an Italian dentist with whom in reality he could never comfortably sit down to dinner, or imagine having as a relative. Like his attitude after his first trip to Italy, Philip goes home to England after his third trip to Italy with the "air of a prophet" who feels he has championed life because he has "championed beauty" rather than truth. Thus, the narrative voice emphasizes Philip's inappropriately aesthetic nature when it notes that the "episode" in Monteriano that resulted in the needless death of Gino's baby "remained supremely beautiful" to Philip.

Ironically, however, by "worshiping Caroline" Philip also worships the English matriarchal social structure of Sawston which he condescendingly claims to have risen above. Caroline must remain an aesthetic object because she decides to go back to Sawston - the "real" world to which Philip will eventually return and settle once again into his "self-satisfied" groove of intellectual superiority where he will bicker and squabble with his mother and sister. Philip knows that his return to Sawston will bring Gino down to the level of the "son of an Italian dentist" once again. Unless Philip continues to see Caroline as an aesthetic object, he will "hate" Caroline as he once "hated" Gino because she will always remind him of his own passivity.
Moreover, as the narrative voice tells us, Philip cannot tell Caroline that "he [is] her worshipper," for he knows that she most likely will soberly remind him once again to "get over supposing" that she is "refined" (183). In addition, if Philip admitted the truth, he would have to admit that "nothing had happened within himself" during his visits to Monteriano: he was merely a voyeur to the events in which Lilia, Caroline, Gino and even his overly zealous sister, Harriet, participated. Philip will return to England to face his mother for whom, despite the fact that he sees her as a "well-ordered, active, useless machine," he will "to the end of his days... probably go on doing what she wanted" (87).

Immediately after the narrative voice describes Philip's aesthetic response to Caroline's confession that she loves Gino, it ends its story by stating:

At that moment the train entered the
San Gothard tunnel. They hurried back
to the carriage to close the windows
lest the smuts should get into
Harriet's eyes (184).

The narrative voice finishes its story by leaving its characters in an abrupt and inconclusive fashion. The narrative voice's abruptness emphasizes its distance from the characters, and it also emphasizes the characters'
stereotypical, or "flat" natures. The train enters the tunnel rushing back to Sawston, while the narrative voice describes the two characters rushing to attend Harriet. The narrative voice does not leave us with a reconciling poetic image as Caroline and Philip run to save Harriet who has become a symbol of Sawstonian values. While this may appear to be a gesture in the service of another, and it certainly has symbolic implications of a biblical stature, it is actually a gesture indicating Philip's and Caroline's acceptance of conventional values.

Philip does not grasp that the societies of Italy and England are similarly restrictive. Italy remains a symbol of freedom to Philip because he understands it only in terms of the aesthetic meanings he has attached to it. Even though the narrative voice tells us "life is very pleasant in Italy if you are a man" (47), the physical episodes between Philip and Gino show that the metaphors that apply to masculinity in Italy could never be realistically embodied by Philip who is physically passive. Nothing significant awaits Philip; for as the narrative voice tells us, to Philip "all the wonderful things had happened."

Caroline understands that while England and Italy maintain codes of society that are different, they are similar in that they are both finally restrictive. Caroline, however, tells Philip that she will never return
to Italy because she "understand[s] the place" (176); and in understanding Italy, Caroline understands that she cannot accept that she loves "crudely." Caroline prefers to serve the "corpulent poor" rather than to act and to follow her sexual impulses.

By separating Forster the man from the narrative voice of his novel, and from the characters of his novel, we can identify the tale telling strategies that the narrative voice utilizes. In doing so, we can agree with Lionel Trilling who relates Forster's narrative voice to the narrator of an American novel that falls within the genre of nineteenth century "romance" in somewhat the same tradition as Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*. In the same way that the narrator in Hawthorne's novel maintains a balanced level of distance and intimacy with his characters and his story while he seldom views his characters primarily as allegorical manifestations of good and evil, the narrative voice in Forster's novel allows the members of the two communities of Sawston and Monteriano to view each other while it remains at a distance from them in proximity with the reader. As noted above, however, it is precisely this sense of the narrative voice's simultaneous distance and intimacy that misleads readers into identifying Forster the man with the voice and characters in his novel. In fact, the narrative voice does not
sanction any one particular view or character in the novel. For it is not Forster's intention to be realistic, nor is it his intention to be moralistic. Rather, he attempts to achieve within the confines of the novel "a type of beauty" that music achieves: "not a rounding off but an opening out." 12 The distance between voice and character is Forster's attempt to achieve with words what an orchestra achieves with notes: "when an orchestra stops we hear something that has never actually been played" (168). And the distinct value of Forster's first novel is that he provides the expectation that, although the novel has ended with the story and the characters returning to Sawston, the narrative voice will continue.
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CHAPTER TWO

A Room With A View \(^1\) is an illustration of Forster's conception of the ideal modern "connection."\(^2\) It is the one example that we have of Forster's vision of the novel and human relations functioning in a way that he hoped that they could function. Because the primary purpose of A Room With A View is to show how Forster's notion of human relations illustrates his theory of knowledge and the novel, there is a great distinction between the narrative voice and the action of the novel. On the one hand, we observe the narrative voice as it aligns itself with myth and nature; and on the other hand, we observe the narrative voice as it aligns itself with character. \(^3\) The result of the narrative voice's elusiveness as it alternates between myth, nature and character, is that it can provide the impression that the novel is rooted in a type of fantasy that does not serve as a pertinent model from which to analyze Forster's literary merit. James McConkey states that A Room With A View is "less intricate than any other novel,"\(^4\) and many critics follow this assumption and dismiss Forster's third novel because it appears to be a simple love story that resolves itself in marriage. In addition, many critics describe and dismiss the third novel because it is "dominated by conversation" similar to, but not successful as, the novels of Jane Austen. \(^5\) However, it is my argument that the realm of unreality that A Room With
A View encompasses is a vehicle to express Forster's epistemology and metaphysics which are primarily rooted in personal relations. In A Room With A View Lucy Honeychurch and George Emerson are able to have a successful relationship because they abandon reason and respond to and trust the dictates of instinct and nature. The narrative voice which sanctions this relationship evolves from the classical Greek myth teller⁶ as well as from the objects which comprise the physical universe.⁷ By examining how the narrative voice is aligned with classical myth and the non-human physical universe, I will show how the autonomous narrative voice articulates a philosophy that is at once fatalistic and modernistic.⁸

Forster's notion of personal relations is that they are good in and of themselves and that they are not merely a means to an end (as marriage is often an end in many novels of the nineteenth century).⁹ Forster's initial assumptions about art and the novel are that they approximate what one would like to be real, but not necessarily what is real. Therefore, that Lucy and George end the novel married is not the primary concern. The primary concern is how Lucy and George are able to realize that self-knowledge and love are the means to their personal salvation. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that George and Lucy are not married at the end of the
novel - they are "married" with the blessing of nature, but they may not be married according to the English Church or law. In addition, it is important to notice that although George and Lucy are allowed the luxury of having a successful relationship, sex is not a primary issue for Forster. As John Colmer cogently points out, Forster preferred to "mythologize the ideal harmony of love than to present it in concrete human terms." 10 This statement applies even to Forster's posthumously published homosexual novel Maurice; for in response to Gore Vidal's question "What do your two young men do in bed?" Forster responded: 'They ... talk!'" (Forster's ellipsis) 11

Some critics note that Forster's novels are flawed by their lack of explicit sexuality. For example, Wilde states that Lucy and George's love is a "fantasy" and a "fairy tale": "Presumably, the novel's happy ending implies. .. sexuality. The implication, however, is weak." (my ellipsis). Wilde also maintains that the only scene in the novel which is directly sexual is when George, Freddy and Mr. Beebe bathe in the nude in the sacred lake. Like many commentators, Wilde argues that this scene is a reflection of Forster's and the characters' homosexuality. Wilde says that while the bathing scene represents "an ideal of desire" because of the "intensity of feeling it generates," like "so many Forsterian moments," the scene finally illustrates how "passion is cheated." 12 While I agree that
the establishment of the physical through bathing in the nude is important to the novel, I believe it functions primarily to reinforce George's affirmation to live after he witnesses with Lucy a murder and death. In addition, I view the bathing scene as a prelude to the overtly sexual scene at the end of the novel when George "pin[s]" Lucy down "with his elbows," "advanc[es] his face to hers," and, after he tells her to kiss him, he "indicate[s] the spot where a kiss would be welcome" (242).

The lack of explicit and graphic sexuality in Forster's novels serves to enforce his theme that "talk" is one of the most important keys to all successful relationships; and "talk" is the only human aspect of love that can be successfully rendered in written words. The narrative voice makes this point through the character of Lydia Lavish who illustrates, through her unsuccessful portrayal of Lucy and George's kiss in her romance novel, that written words are incapable of describing the physical actions of human love. Lydia Lavish's novel emphasizes that written words often serve to merely distort and parody the physical actions of love. For Forster and the narrative voice, therefore, the reality of what two young men, or a young man and a young woman "do in bed" sexually is not important in terms of the artistic requirements of the novel. I am not suggesting that "talk" is more central
to love than sexual intercourse. I am suggesting that Forster elevates the physical and sexual aspects of love by not reducing them to the non-human totality of written words which in turn can deny the physicality of love. In this sense, a synecdochal relationship of connectedness exists in the novel between the presence of love and the absence of sexuality associated with love. Forster's elliptical response to Vidal's question about Maurice in the above quotation implies that the reality of the novel can successfully portray only that aspect of love that the reader can experience and share with character and the narrative voice - "talk." The implied space and emptiness between love and explicit sexuality, or the sign and the signifier points to meanings and possibilities, or the "unspeakable" aspects of love that A Passage To India explores.

What is important artistically in A Room With A View is how the narrative voice maintains its detachment from character and develops a story which is concerned with human and universal themes. As Forster states in a letter to Malcolm Darling, universal themes like "love, beauty, liberty, affection and truth" are "extraordinarily difficult for [him] to convey"; and his endeavor to write about such themes in Where Angels Fear To Tread made the narrative voice appear cynical. However, two themes that the narrative voice of A Room With A View continues from
Where Angels Fear To Tread is the human reaction to death, and the capacity for human beings to develop truthful relationships. The narrative voice's concern with truth and relationships is more illuminating in light of P. N. Furbank's statement that at the heart of Forster's philosophy is the notion that mankind's "acceptance of death spiritualizes life." For Forster, death is merely another fact that one must accept empirically. Accepting death in this way forces one to live within the present moment according to one's instinct and intuition; and accepting death not only forces individuals to be concerned with important issues such as love and truth, but also to accept the fact that life involves continual change, and flux; and the only promise of the future is that it is unknown. Thus a sense of and responsiveness to fact enables one to live according to the "Now." In addition, Furbank notes that Forster's conception of the universe is an

unfathomably strange
collection of the most varied objects,
which objects one is wise to take as
much notice of as one can, and which
seem in some cases to take notice of
oneself, and of which at all events one
is oneself a member, not just
spectator. And to get into right relation to this universe it is essential to respond and to discriminate . . . For, as an object in the universe, one can give vitality to other objects as well as receiving it from them. 15

For Forster, then, a true vision of reality entails embracing the idea that all human beings are objects (on the same ontological level as nature) to which one must respond. In the same way that the narrative voice of A Passage To India links Mrs. Moore, Godbole and a wasp in death, the narrative voice links Lucy and George through an experience of death. Death is a natural fact which Lucy must acknowledge in order to gain a perspective of the whole of herself. The acceptance of death provides Lucy and George with a personal perspective from which to view themselves as a whole; and to view themselves as a whole leads to the doctrine of Connection: to connect the passion and the prose, and to connect the spirit and the flesh. For Forster, the universe is comprised of unfathomable objects or details which one must notice and to which one must respond. People are objects in the same way that trees, mountains, caves, rivers and paintings are objects. Objects have the power to both give and receive vitality. Since the universe is comprised in such detail, one must
have the desire and ability to determine the false and true ways of viewing reality. The primary way to discriminate the false from the true is to document history through human relationships. For although Forster gives the physical universe as much vitality as he does individual human beings, "the thing which may contain more reality and permanence is found in relationships between people." \(^{16}\)

Furbank's theory that Forster's philosophy is centered around the acceptance of death and relationships provides many insights into Forster's narrative voice. In particular, the narrative voice's treatment of the metaphysical issues that relationships evoke similarly evokes the narrative voice's treatment of conversation in the novel. Conversation marks significant and swift changes in character, and it almost always introduces a universal issue. For example, the first chapter is the only chapter in the novel that begins with conversation. The conversation is initiated by Charlotte Bartlett, Lucy's spinsterish cousin who is acting as her chaperon in Italy. Charlotte comments to Lucy that the "Signora had no business to" place them in small rooms without views. This conversation initiates the entire action of the novel: Mr. Emerson hears Charlotte and Lucy speaking about their rooms which lack views and offers the two ladies his own and his son's rooms which have views. Immediately the issue of
"rooms with views" introduces the importance of individual perspectives upon reality and the importance of truth. That Mr. Emerson has a personal philosophical "view" is significant because most of the residents of the Pensione Bertolini do not have a "view" that is distinct from the artificial rules dictated by the society of the previous century. In addition, the tone of the novel is set by the reaction of the residents of the Pensione Bertolini to Mr. Emerson's statement: "I have a view, I have a view" (4). Mr. Emerson's offer is considered to be vulgar within the provincial English society that inhabits the pensione where "Generally . . . people looked them over for a day or two before speaking" (4). Charlotte follows the dictates of society rather than self, and therefore must initially refuse Mr. Emerson's kind proposition. The narrative voice comments that Lucy is "perplexed" in the face of this situation and

had the odd feeling that whenever these ill-bred tourists spoke the contest widened and deepened till it dealt, not with rooms and views, but with - well, with something quite different, whose existence she had not realized before. Now the old man attacked Miss Bartlett almost violently: Why should she not change?
What possible objection had she? They would clear out in half an hour.

Miss Bartlett, though skilled in the delicacies of conversation, was powerless in the presence of brutality. It was impossible to snub any one so gross. Her face reddened with displeasure. She looked around as much as to say, "Are you all like this?"

And two little old ladies, who were sitting further up the table, with shawls hanging over the backs of the chairs, looked back, clearly indicating "We are not; we are genteel" (6).

Introduced in this scene is the clash between the outspoken Emersons and the Victorian Miss Alan sisters; and it is interesting to note that the narrative voice is able to describe the personality of a character by describing physical motion and physical detail. For example, the Miss Alans (the "two little old ladies") are characterized by their shawls hanging from their chairs and the way they "looked back" indicating that they "are genteel." Miss Bartlett is characterized by her inability to respond to Mr. Emerson's candid and truthful reasons for why she should accept his offer. Like the Miss Alans, Miss
Bartlett is characterized by her physical responses. Her face "reddened with displeasure" and she "looked around" to convey in gesture what she cannot communicate in words: "are you all like this." Mr. Emerson is aptly characterized as brutal in his honesty. Lucy, whom the narrative voice comments "had not yet acquired decency," (6) sees that the situation involves the "existence" of something "she had not realized before." Lucy, like Philip Herriton, is introduced as a character who is completely defined by her experiences in Italy. Unlike Philip Herriton, Lucy comes to Italy from a rural area which, despite the fact that it is five miles from the closest train station (118), effects Lucy like a "Wordsworthian" paradise. Windy Corner lacks the tarnish of the artificial society of Philip's Sawstonian community and Cecil Vyse's London community. Lucy's childhood education took place in a natural paradise where nature served as a teacher for both herself and her brother, Freddy. Ironically, Lucy's first encounter with the hypocrisy inherent in much of her British heritage is at the Pensione Bertolini where, the narrative voice tells us, the only portraits on the dining room wall are of "the late Queen" Victoria, "the late Poet Laureate" Tennyson that "hung behind the English people, heavily framed," and "the notice of the English church (Rev. Cuthbert Eager, M.A.)" (4-5). The narrative voice further comments that to Lucy "even more curious was the
drawing-room, which attempted to rival the solid comfort of a Bloomsbury boarding-house. Was this really Italy?" (9). Calling to mind the first chapter of The Longest Journey when Rickie and Ansell debate whether or not objects have a real existence of their own, the narrative voice puts this philosophical question in the mind of Lucy: is Italy still Italy when the objects and people that confront one evoke only England? The narrative voice is also illustrating Lucy's natural inclination to (like Rickie) define reality by noticing the relationships of the objects and people that surround her. And she comes to the premature judgment that, according to what she sees, she feels that they "might" as well "be in London" (4).

Just as in Where Angels Fear To Tread, the narrative voice of Forster's third novel is elusive; and although it focuses upon Lucy's endeavor to tell the truth, it cannot be linked with any one character or proposition. I noted in Chapter One that as a result of the narrative voice's immediacy and intimacy with the reader, critics often describe Philip Herriton of Where Angels Fear To Tread as a protagonist who changes and as a character who can be linked with Forster the man. The narrative voice of A Room With A View develops a similar intimate relationship with the reader, but in this third novel the narrative voice limits character further by rarely giving it the
opportunity of defining itself through its own words. The characters in *A Room With A View* appear to be more fully defined than in the first novel, but they appear this way because the narrative voice takes more liberty with free indirect discourse to enter a character's mind so that it can describe his or her thoughts and ideas. When the narrative voice utilizes free indirect discourse, it usually describes how a character discerns truth. For example, at the end of Chapter One, the narrative voice enters the mind of Miss Charlotte Bartlett:

It was then that she saw, pinned up over the wash-stand, a sheet of paper on which was scrawled an enormous note of interrogation. Nothing more.

"What does it mean?" she thought, and she examined it carefully by the light of a candle. Meaningless at first, it gradually became menacing, obnoxious, portentous with evil. She was seized with an impulse to destroy it, but fortunately remembered that she had no right to do so, since it must be the property of young Mr. Emerson. So she unpinned it carefully, and put it between two pieces of blotting-paper to keep it clean for him. Then she
completed her inspection of the room,
sighed heavily according to her habit,
and went to bed (16).

From the beginning of the novel, Charlotte attempts to
repress Lucy by telling her how she should behave, and what
she should believe. Just prior to the above quotation,
Charlotte has told Lucy that it is more socially
appropriate for herself to take the larger of the two
Emerson rooms because it was occupied by George. During
Charlotte's inspection of her room for "secret entrances"
(15), she does not find anything extraordinary in the room
except for the "note of interrogation." This "note of
interrogation" is literally and simply a question mark
drawn on a piece of paper. Like Miss Quested's experience
in the Marabar caves in *A Passage To India*, the note of
interrogation means nothing in itself; however, the note
"gradually became menacing, obnoxious, portentous with
evil" the more that Charlotte examines it. The "note of
interrogation" is important because it illustrates
Charlotte's and society's tendency to attach symbols to
things and situations that in reality are "meaningless";
and it also points to Forster's own dislike of symbolism.

Forster disliked symbolism because he felt that it
encouraged a concern for unrealities rather than for a
sense for fact; realities are whole and indivisible and
therefore do not have different levels of existence - they merely appear to be different depending upon where you observe them (which is why Forster prefers the term "aspect" rather than the term "levels.")

In addition, the narrative voice's description of Charlotte's response to the "note of interrogation" as "impulsive" is noteworthy. Throughout most of the novel, Charlotte appears to be a person who is socially calculating and methodical; that Charlotte must control an "impulse" to destroy the note that she believes to belong to George indicates that she is not as passionless as she appears. In fact, the end of the novel raises the possibility that she aids the two lovers from the beginning of their relationship. Finally, the "note of interrogation" introduces an aspect to the novel that is not centered in character, plot or story. In this novel that is concerned on the surface with the love story of a young man and woman, it is significant that Charlotte, the spinster, finds the "note of interrogation" and preserves it between "blotting paper to keep it clean." The obvious symbolism inherent in such a statement is that the spinster Charlotte, by enclosing the question mark between two pieces of paper, indicates her own unquestioned acceptance of the position given to her by society. For Charlotte, questions must be saved and preserved so that they can be answered by someone who is willing to address them.
From another perspective, the narrative voice presents the "note of interrogation" to the reader as a challenge and as an invitation to bring different perspectives to the text. However, the "note of interrogation" is not merely a symbol for the philosophical questions that the novel raises, nor is it simply a reference to George's initial intellectual doubt and morbidity. It is a detail that belongs to the realm of narrative voice; and it is a fact of the text that relates to the many different details within the text. The note of interrogation points to Charlotte's relationships, George's relationships, Lucy's relationships, and to every other relationship in the novel. In this novel that is full of events and things that can be interpreted symbolically (even the titles of the chapters appear to be symbolic), the "note of interrogation" asks us not to trust things if they have hidden meanings. Finally, the "note of interrogation" evokes another characteristic of Forster's narrative voice: it personifies inanimate objects and elements in the physical universe and allows them to interact within the text in the same ways as character. For example, Miss Lavish's book which the narrative voice describes as "red" and "sunning itself upon the gravel path" (173), eventually makes George kiss Lucy a second time. The printed word is given the ability to incite human beings to action. 18
One way that the narrative voice illustrates that individual characters function within the text on the same ontological level as inanimate objects and elements in the physical universe is the different ways it presents the character of Lucy Honeychurch. As discussed briefly above, Lucy's trip to Italy marks her first vacation away from England. Even though the novel begins with conversation initiated by Charlotte, the narrative voice immediately places priority upon the mind of Lucy. In response to Charlotte's statement "The Signora had no business to do it . . . Oh, Lucy!", Lucy replies: "And Cockney, besides!." The narrative voice continues in the mind of Lucy and states that Lucy "had been further saddened by the Signora's unexpected accent." As readers, perhaps our immediate impression of Lucy is formed by her first words which make her appear to be an intellectual and cultural snob. However, when we look closely we find that one of Lucy's primary weaknesses is that she does not possess the ability of describing her thoughts and responses in appropriate words - she is not articulate. We soon learn that Lucy is not a snob: her statement that the Signora is "Cockney" is a statement of fact and observation, it is not intended as a pejorative statement. Lucy's initial crude response to Italy indicates, as the narrative voice states, that she has not "yet acquired decency" (6), or the manners of "civilized" English society that condemns individual
expression. In order to illustrate that ultimately it is not important for Lucy to communicate in words her artistic and instinctive understanding of reality, the narrative voice first shows how Lucy's naive sense of society and personal relations mislead her into believing that it is better to respond to situations with the so called "appropriate" words of English society rather than not speaking at all. For when Lucy speaks, she is often ignored, or her words are misinterpreted. Part One of the novel describes Lucy's acceptance that she must remain silent in order to gain social respect and approval; Part Two of the novel describes Lucy's revolt against silence and the false ways that society attempts to define her. The narrative voice finally emphasizes to the reader that Lucy's words are not as important as the many ways she acts.

Lucy functions in the text primarily as the embodiment of the creative artist. She is an artist; and, most importantly to Forster, Lucy is a musician:

It so happened that Lucy, who found daily life rather chaotic, entered a more solid world when she opened the piano. She was then no longer either defferential or patronizing; no longer either a rebel or a slave. The kingdom
of music is not the kingdom of this world; it will accept those whom breeding and intellect and culture have alike rejected. The commonplace person begins to play, and shoots into the empyrean without effort, whilst we look up, marvelling how he has escaped us, and thinking how we could worship him and love him, would he but translate his visions into human words, and his experiences into human actions. Perhaps he cannot; certainly he does not, or does so very seldom. Lucy had done so never (34).

This is a statement not only about Lucy, but also about art, the artist, and also the way that mankind (the "commonplace person") understands and responds to art. The narrative voice states that the artist enters, while in the act of creation, a "Kingdom not of this world," but the "empyrean," or any concept of an heavenly paradise. The narrative voice also refers to mankind's pomposity when it says that "we could worship" and "love" the artist "would he but translate" artistic "visions" "into human words" and "actions." For Forster, "visions" of the "empyrean" are not subject to the conditions of human society that places too much significance on the importance of words. In fact,
Forster would argue that the act of translating artistic "visions" into "human words" merely reduces ineffable "visions" of the non-human other, the signified or the "empyrean" to a materiality and totality that denies the individual subject.

A translation of a "vision" into "human words" produces merely an intellectual and aesthetic abstraction which does not fully inhabit the realm of the human or the realm of spirit: words comprise a spiritual and physical desert where the spirit and the flesh do not meet. The narrative voice of *A Passage To India* acknowledges this inability of words to describe "visions" when it attempts to describe Mrs. Moore's reaction to her "vision" in the Marabar cave, but finally states: "Visions are supposed to entail profundity, but---- Wait till you get one, dear reader!" (208). Although the narrative voice makes it clear that "visions" are not part of the human realm, and admits its own inability to describe the ineffable, the character of Mr. Beebe makes the statement that Lucy is "illogical" (53) because she does not "live as she plays" (36). Mr. Beebe, like Philip Herriton and Cecil Vyse, is an aesthete who mistakenly believes that a true artist must "translate[s]" her/his "visions" into human words. Not surprisingly, and ironically, Mr. Beebe is disappointed that Lucy, "disjoined from her music-stool," is "only a
young lady" who "loved his sermon" (36). To Mr. Beebe, it is a further disappointment that Lucy does not attempt to "translate" her "visions" into words; in fact, Lucy lacks the ability to "translate" her "visions" into words. Lucy is not conscious that her art is visionary, and she does not feel compelled to interpret art:

"Music___" said Lucy, as if attempting some generality. She could not complete it, and looked out absently upon Italy in the wet...

"What about music?" said Mr. Beebe.

"Poor Charlotte will be sopped," was Lucy's reply (37).

Mr. Beebe is a man who says that he "loves" and "worships" art; and, he wants to love and worship Lucy as an artist. But because Lucy does not meet Mr. Beebe's mistaken expectations of the artist who always "translates" her/his "visions" into "human words," Lucy becomes for him a "work of art." Mr. Beebe, as he tells Cecil Vyse, even goes to the extent of sketching pictures of Lucy in Italy: "Miss Honeychurch as a kite, Miss Bartlett holding the string. Picture number two: the string breaks." However, the narrative voice is quick to tell us that Mr. Beebe made these sketches "afterwards, when he viewed things artistically" (106-107). Mr. Beebe ignores Lucy's physical presence (Lucy "disjoined from her music-stool) so that he
can worship and love her as an artistic object. Lucy is a work of art to Mr. Beebe; and like a work of art, and all "visions" of truth, Lucy is defined by the words that society attaches to her. Significantly, when Cecil Vyse tells Mr. Beebe that he is engaged to Lucy, Mr. Beebe feels "bitter disappointment" (107). Once Mr. Beebe must acknowledge Lucy's sexual reality as a woman, Lucy is no longer for him an artist, or a work of art.

Mr. Beebe, like Philip Herriton, is an aesthete who can love and worship art as long as art and the artist remains removed from physical and natural realities. In addition, Mr. Beebe's feeling about art (and people) is that it is best when it remains as far removed from sexuality as possible:

His belief in celibacy, so reticent, so carefully concealed beneath his tolerance and culture, now came to the surface and expanded like a flower. "They that marry do well, but they that refrain do better." So ran his belief, and he never heard that an engagement was broken off but with a slight feeling of pleasure (219).

When Lucy is engaged to Cecil, she looses her artistic potential; when she breaks off her engagement with Cecil,
she once again is a candidate to be viewed as an object of Mr. Beebe's notion of art that is "neither sensual nor sensational" (221).

In Forster's universe, as in the universe of classical mythology, artistic "visions" of the "empyrean" are "seldom," if ever, translated into human words and actions. However, he does believe that it is important for human beings to at least attempt to translate art into life by being truthful in their relationships - to make artistic "experiences" have an effect upon "human actions." In order for artistic "experiences" to have an effect upon "human actions," the artist must endeavor to be truthful to herself/himself by trusting nature and her/his own instincts. The artist can choose to be influenced by either the false restrictions of society that prohibit individuality (such as verbal propriety), or the artist can choose to be influenced by her/his instinctive notions of truth.

Lucy initially chooses to be influenced by what Charlotte tells her. She accepts Charlotte's explanation that she cannot have the large room with a view because it belonged to George and therefore it is "more suitable [she] should be under an obligation to his father than to him" (15). Until she returns to England and is engaged to Cecil, Lucy continues to follow what Charlotte tells her to do because she is frightened by her "sense of larger and
unsuspected issues" (15). Because Lucy does not yet trust her instincts and intuition, she finds it easier to respond to unknown and new situations the way Charlotte tells her she should respond. Lucy eventually accepts that it is not important, or necessary for her to translate her "visions" or the "larger and unsuspected issues" into words as long as her actions describe her experiences for her. As the narrative voice tells us, "by touch, not by sound alone, did she come to her desire" (35).

Until Lucy is confident that she understands the "larger and unsuspected issues," she mistakenly feels that it is more appropriate to respond to situations that she does not fully understand with words dictated to her by Charlotte and society. For example, in chapter two Lucy is left stranded by Miss Lavish in Santa Croce. The narrative voice tells us that "Tears of indignation came to Lucy's eyes - partly because Miss Lavish had jilted her, partly because she had taken her Baedeker" (23). Miss Lavish, who writes Baedeker-type novels, takes Lucy's Baedeker and soon writes a novel about her. Lucy decides to enter the church, and she meets the Emersons. While with the Emersons, Lucy is "determined to be gracious to them... and, if possible, to erase Miss Bartlett's civility" (25). While not in the presence of Charlotte, Lucy is her true self and responds to situations and people with her own

myself a very fortunate girl, I assure you. I'm thoroughly happy, and having a splendid time..."

She joined her cousin (33).

When Mr. Emerson describes in words Lucy's feelings, not only is Lucy embarrassed and confused, but she also senses that her natural inclination to like the Emersons is of one of the "unsuspected" issues which she does not understand. In addition, Lucy resents Mr. Emerson's presumptuousness in telling her how she should feel and talk as much as she resents the fact that Charlotte tells her how she should feel and talk. It is also interesting to note that Mr. Emerson, like Mr. Beebe, assumes that he understands Lucy; and both men respond in a condescending fashion to her when she does not finish her sentences. Because Lucy wants to be responsible for defining herself, and she continually is confronted with people who define her and interpret her, she attempts to gain control of herself and society through silence.

Lucy is very aware of how people use words to distort the truth ("those gossipping little Miss Alans"); but she is equally aware that her impulsive verbal responses allow other people to assume to have an understanding of her. Lucy's initial response to such situations is to continue "repeating" what she hears "older people say" (26). Thus,
the narrative voice ironically states that Lucy "joined her cousin" to indicate that she will repeat the words that Charlotte tells her to repeat; and Lucy makes an effort to avoid the George Emerson with whom she is most natural and truthful.

Lucy attempts to avoid the Emersons because she wants to be able to discover truth by herself. However, for Forster, if one attempts to find truth only through the self rather than through human relationships, one seldom finds it. Lucy intuitively believes that her growth is in part connected to rejecting the English conventions she observes in the residents of the Pensione Bertolini. To this end, the narrative voice tells us that Lucy wanted to "do something of which her well-wishers disapproved" (47). One thing that Lucy does of which the Pensione Bertolini residents disapproves is walking to the Piazza Signoria at dusk. Later in the novel, the narrative voice describes the Piazza Signoria:

The Piazza Signoria is too stony to be brilliant. It has no grass, no flowers, no frescoes, no glittering walls of marble or comforting patches of ruddy brick. By an odd chance - unless we believe in a presiding genius of places - the statues that relieve its severity suggest, not the innocence
of childhood, nor the glorious
bewilderment of youth, but the
conscious achievements of maturity.
Perseus and Judith, Hercules and
Thusnelda, they have done or suffered
something, and though they are
immortal, immortality has come to them
after experience, not before. Here,
not only in the solitude of Nature,
might a hero meet a goddess, or a
heroine a god (67).

It is important to note how the narrative voice discusses
humanity, art, myth and nature from the same perspective.
It discusses figures from from the bible (Judith) in the
same context that it discusses figures from mythology
(Perseus). Lucy enters a place which celebrates the
"conscious achievements of maturity" and attempts to do
something that is immature: she buys photographs of
paintings of nudes in an endeavor to do something that
Charlotte and her other "well-wishers would deem
inappropriate" (48). Lucy hopes to find "liberty" (48) in
such an action; but instead of gaining a sense of
"liberty," Lucy finds that she is "conscious of her
discontent," and the narrative voice adds that "it was new
to her to be conscious of it" (48). Lucy is conscious that
her growth as an individual is dependent upon action rather than words. In another endeavor to find something to "happen" to her, Lucy focuses upon the tower of the palace and it becomes for her "some unattainable treasure throbbing in the tranquil sky" (48). Like Charlotte's experience with the note of interrogation, Lucy gives the tower an existence and meaning which appear supernatural. Lucy manages to transform the tower into something that "mesmerized her"; but, the narrative voice also tells us that the tower becomes "no longer supported by earth." The tower is perhaps a symbol of Lucy's desire to transform reality into something meaningful to her personally or sexually; but because the tower becomes an image separated from earth, it is finally meaningless to Lucy who is an artist whose "visions" are maintained through "touch."

It is after Lucy decides to abandon her enterprise to find something to "happen to her," and after she focuses her eyes "to the ground and start[ed] towards home," the narrative voice tells us "something did happen." Two men begin to fight, and after one man is hit, he frowned; he bent towards Lucy with a look of interest, as if he had an important message for her. He opened his lips to deliver it, and a stream of red came out between them and trickled down his unshaven chin . . . Mr. George
Emerson happened to be a few paces away, looking at her across the spot where the man had been. How very odd! Across something. Even as she caught sight of him he grew dim; the palace itself grew dim, swayed above her, fell on to her softly, slowly, noiselessly, and the sky fell with it (49).

This event is the most crucial event of the novel. Lucy witnesses a murder, and before she faints, she sees George "looking at her across the spot where the man had been." George and Lucy are linked, or connected through the dying man. George sees the man focus upon Lucy "as if he had an important message for her"; and George also sees the man "open his lips to deliver" his message. Lucy's previous view of the tower that "mesmerized" (48) her now grows "dim." Although the description that the narrative voice provides of the tower from Lucy's perspective the moment before she faints can be interpreted as a metaphor for the phallus as it "swayed" above her and "fell" on her softly, this scene more accurately describes Lucy's abandonment of English values and perspectives. That "the sky fell with it [the tower]" not only describes Lucy's experience of fainting, but also indicates that Lucy's symbolic interpretation of reality is destroyed. When Lucy regains
consciousness, the narrative voice tells us that to her the "whole world seemed pale and void of its original meaning" (49). Unlike her unrealistic vision of the tower which is a vain attempt to place meanings upon an object that is meaningless, Lucy's experience of the murder connects her to George in a way that she cannot explain. Lucy's initial assumptions about reality are changed by the experience of death that she shares with George. The narrative voice also indicates that Lucy, as an artist, is the appropriate person for a dying man to "deliver" a message which manifests itself as a "stream of red" blood. Lucy wonders "How should she talk" to George after he has witnessed that "she, as well as the dying man, had crossed some spiritual boundary" (50). Lucy is concerned with "How" she will translate her experiences into human words; George is not concerned with talk, but with "what to do with" Lucy's photographs that are covered with the murdered man's blood (51). George understands immediately that "something tremendous has happened"; and he throws Lucy's blood stained photographs into the the River Arno because they "frighten[]" him.

It is possible to describe this episode as a metaphorical description of sexual intercourse between George and Lucy: Lucy and George are connected by their shared experience of death; and their experience is at once sensual and "spiritual." Thus, when Lucy's photographs of
paintings of nudes are covered with the murdered man's blood they are no longer merely artistic abstractions, but are the physical remnants of life and death. In addition, the blood covered photographs are the physical remnants of Lucy and George's "spiritual" connection. The blood on the photographs indicates George's imminent sexual union with Lucy; and since Lucy is a virgin, her initial experience of sexual intercourse could be both a spiritual and violent experience. Perhaps George is "frightened" of the photographs because he acknowledges that they indicate that the mingling of the spiritual and the physical can be violent. The blood stained photographs become objects which represent the union of art and life, the spirit and the flesh. When George throws the photographs into the Arno, the river "roar[s]" an "unexpected melody" indicating that nature blesses the union of spirit and flesh that the blood stained photographs represent.

In addition to the sexual and spiritual undercurrents inherent in this scene, how Lucy and George react to it and each other after their shared experience of death is important to our understanding of the novel and the intention of the narrative voice. Lucy is a musical artist who distrusts words to explain experience; George, who is a philosopher, feels that he must respond to the experience by making the announcement that he "shall want to live"
(53). Because Lucy fears that she cannot express the experience in appropriate words, she asks George not to "mention it to any one" (52) so it will not be distorted by gossip. George, whom the narrative voice describes as lacking "chivalry" to indicate his realistic perspective, is not concerned with words; his only concern is how to act, or how to live.

Both Lucy and George's perspectives of reality change as a result of their shared experience of death. Significantly, the death takes place in the Piazza that celebrates not only maturity, but also the immortality of gods who are praised for their mortal experiences. George, as he tells Mrs. Honeychurch later in the novel, abandons his "Note of Interrogation" (177) that described his approach to reality as an "everlasting Why" (32). George is initially concerned with explaining all of the mysteries that reflect a "shadow" upon reality. George's experience of death that he shares with Lucy allows him to finally accept the idea that "the shadow always follows" (176). Because George accepts the fact that reality contains mysteries ("shadow") that can never be explained, he chooses to live life by connecting the realities he deems most important. George believes that reality is determined through "Fate" and that "We are flung together by Fate, drawn apart by Fate... we settle nothing" - "(148). Since George believes that he is destined by Fate to connect with
Lucy, he feels that all he needs to do is to act when Fate gives him the opportunity.

Lucy distrusts words and therefore asks George not to tell anyone about her "foolish behavior" when she fainted at the sight of the murder. However, Lucy, like George, is frightened by the experience:

In an open manner he (George) had shown that he wished to continue their intimacy. She had refused, not because she disliked him, but because she did not know what had happened, and suspected that he did know. And this frightened her... To behave wildly at the sight of death is pardonable. But to discuss it afterwards, to pass from discussion into silence, and through silence into sympathy, that is an error (70).

Lucy tries to discuss her experience of the murder with Charlotte, but to Lucy's surprise, Charlotte, who is having "adventures" of her own with the lady novelist Miss Lavish, "found the abridged account of it quite adequate," and she is "left to face her problem alone" (55). Lucy, who is used to having her "thoughts confirmed by others or, at all events, contradicted" (55) must learn how to trust her own instincts and perceptions of reality. Her first instinct
is not to speak about the event because she fears "gossipping - ladies" will distort the truth. But Lucy is equally "frightened" by George and the event because "she did not know what happened, and suspected that he did know." When Charlotte is not interested in discussing the event with Lucy, the silence surrounding the event is eventually linked in Lucy's mind with impropriety. It is an "error" to "pass from discussion to silence," and it is this sense of impropriety that is reinforced to Lucy when Miss Lavish and Mr. Eager ask her for details describing the murder. The narrative voice tells us that Lucy finds these "respectable" people "ghoulish" in their inquiries and refuses to give them details. Even though the narrative voice tells us that by not speaking "George Emerson had kept the subject strangely pure" (60), Lucy continues to be frightened because she is incapable of articulating her experience. Because society tells Lucy it is proper that she should not want to speak about the murder, Lucy continues to be silent and hopes that silence will lead to knowledge.

Like George, Lucy blames "Fate" (69) and "celestial irony" (70) when she encounters George a second time by falling into a bed of violets where he kisses her. The narrative voice frames this second encounter between Lucy and George with the myths of Phaethon and Persephone. Phaethon failed in his attempt to drive the chariot of the
Apollo; Persephone spends half of the year with the world of the dead, and the rest of the year with the living. By framing the incident in myth the narrative voice views the Italians from the perspective of myth which adds to the irony and humor of the scene (the Italian cab driver is linked with Phaethon and Persephone is linked with his girlfriend). In addition, the narrative voice wants Lucy and George to be considered as mythic characters who are capable of mingling their human and divine aspects. In fact, when Mr. Eager orders the Italian cab-driver's girlfriend to leave the cab, the two lovers appeal to Lucy as though she has mythic authority. The narrative voice continues to portray Lucy as a goddess as it describes Lucy as falling down out of a wood onto a hill of violets that is the "well-head, the primal source whence beauty gushed out to water the earth" (80). Without speaking, George turns and kisses her; and before Lucy speaks, "almost before she could feel, a voice called, 'Lucy! Lucy! Lucy!' The silence of life had been broken by Miss Bartlett, who stood brown against the view" (80). The narrative voice distinguishes Lucy's experience with George from her experience with Charlotte and the rest of the world by describing this experience as the "silence of life." Lucy's relationship with George allows her to translate her artistic "vision" of the "empyrean." Nature, myth, art and
life are united through Lucy and George; and the "vision" that this relationship communicates is silent.

Ironically, it is this second encounter with George that gives Lucy the courage to attempt to describe her feelings in words to Charlotte. Lucy, who previously avoided having to explain herself in words, now looks forward to talking with Charlotte:

The luxury of self-exposure kept her almost happy through the long evening. She thought not so much of what had happened as of how she should describe it. All her sensations, her spasms of courage, for moments of unreasonable joy, her mysterious discontent, should be carefully laid before her cousin. And together in divine confidence they would disentangle and interpret them all"(86). This is Lucy's first endeavor to define her experiences in her own words. Lucy is confident that by speaking to Charlotte, she will "disentangle" her experiences by describing them in words. However, Lucy's attempt at "self-exposure" is severely hindered by Charlotte. Charlotte opens her cousin's "divine confidence" by asking her "So what is to be done?" (86). Charlotte views Lucy's encounter with George as an "exploit[ ]"; and she is not
interested in listening to Lucy to help her "interpret" her experiences. Charlotte is only concerned that George may describe the experience himself; and Charlotte is primarily concerned with her own reputation as Lucy's chaperon who will be blamed by society for leaving Lucy alone. Thus, when Lucy proposes that she "speak" to George to confirm that he will keep silent about the event, Charlotte knows that it is Lucy she must silence to protect her own reputation. To silence Lucy, Charlotte destroys Lucy's confidence by asking her not about her "mysterious discontent," but challenging her personally with the hypothetical question: "if I had not arrived, what would have happened?. . .tell me now what you would have done" (88). Since Lucy has not been allowed the opportunity to explain her feelings about what actually happened, "She would not think what she would have done" (88). She responds to Charlotte by stating: "I should have---' She checked herself, and broke the sentence off" (88). Lucy cannot speculate about the future when she does not fully understand her past. Like her conversations with Mr. Beebe and Mr. Emerson, Lucy breaks her "sentence off" when she is unsure of what to say. Lucy is helpless in conversation with Charlotte who "is skilled in the delicacies of conversation." Lucy, as the narrative voice tells us, now knows that the most important truth about herself, and the
most important goal in her relationships, is to "give and receive some human love" (90). But Lucy's attempt to translate her feelings into words is suppressed by Charlotte who takes "diplomatic advantage" of her "sincerity" and of her "craving for sympathy and love" (93). Charlotte ends her "interview" with Lucy by manipulating her into promising not to "speak" of her encounters with George with her mother or with "any one" (92).

Stone states that *A Room With A View* is a novel "about a girl who lies." 19 It is more accurate to characterize Lucy as a woman who is afraid of speaking and challenging the lies promulgated by the institutions of society. **Part One** of the novel deals with Lucy's discovery that the most accurate way that human beings can define truth is by giving and receiving love. In addition, Lucy finds that this truth (or "vision of the empyrean") is brought to her by intuitively responding to the natural universe rather than responding to the false realities provided by the "talk" of society. When Charlotte tells Lucy that her relationship with George threatens the relationships of her family (between Charlotte and Mrs. Honeychurch), Lucy is frightened into agreeing not to speak of it to anyone. As a result of Charlotte's lie and rejection of Lucy's desire for intimacy, Lucy refuses "Never again" to "expose herself without due consideration and precaution against rebuff"
Charlotte's lie is the foundation for all of the lies of society that Lucy exposes and rejects in the second part of the novel. In fact, when we look closely, Lucy does not lie in the novel as often as that Chapter titles tell us that she lies ("Lying to George," "Lying to Cecil," "Lying to Mr. Beebe, Mrs. Honeychurch, Freddy and the Servants," and "Lying to Mr. Emerson"). The chapter titles are merely a further example of the subtle ways the narrative voice points to how society deceives; for we assume that it is Lucy who is "Lying" when in fact it is the society of Charlotte. By not being allowed to speak and validate her experiences with George, Lucy must learn once again to trust and respond to her own instincts.

There are several lies that Lucy must confront and expose in the second part of the novel. The first lie that Lucy must confront and expose is that unless she marries, she will either have to become a spinster like her cousin Charlotte and the Miss Alan sisters, or be scorned by her family and society if she remains single and enters the work force. Lucy knows that her mother's opinion of such so called "independent" women is that they

mess with typewriters and latch-keys. ... And
agitate and scream, and be carried off
kicking by the police. And call it a Mission
- when no one wants you! And call it Duty -
when it means that you can't stand your own home! And call it Work - when thousands of men are starving with the competition as it is! And then to prepare yourself, find two doddering old ladies, and go abroad with them... and then share a flat with another girl (226-227).

When Lucy returns from Italy she must face the expectations of her mother to whom she usually "tell[s] everything" (92). Lucy follows Charlotte's request of not speaking of her own desires; and in turn it is easier for Lucy to accept Charlotte's statement that the "Mission" of ladies is to "inspire others to achievement rather than to achieve themselves." Lucy continues to fear that if she "rush[e] into the fray" of life, she will "first be censured, then despised, and finally ignored. Poems had been written to illustrate this point" (46). Thus, Part Two of the novel opens with the chapter "Mediaeval" which ironically points to Lucy's unnaturally passive nature upon her return to England. The narrative voice tells us that Lucy is not "the medieval lady, who was rather an ideal to which she was hidden to lift her eyes" (47). Lucy's instincts tell her that it is wrong to consent to Cecil's proposal of marriage; and she previously refused him twice when she met him in Italy. But when Lucy returns to her childhood home she succumbs to the pressures that society imposes upon her.
Lucy knows that her mother likes Cecil because he is socially "well connected" (97), and she knows that the following year she will "come into [her] money" (226). Lucy must choose to either stay with her family, get married, or "share a flat with another girl." At this point in the novel, Lucy is still under the influence of Charlotte who makes her place George in her subconscious. However, since Lucy is aware that the truth of her existence is connected to the knowledge that was revealed to her through George (that she must give and receive love), Lucy senses that her personal truth and identity will be manifested in marriage with Cecil whom she can at least "inspire. . . to achievement." Because Lucy feels compelled to come to a decision about her future, she accepts Cecil's third proposal of marriage because she is afraid that she does not have any more socially acceptable prospects.

Like Philip Herriton, Cecil is an aesthete who "view[s] things artistically" (107). Cecil is like Philip in every way except that he is able to propose marriage to Lucy whom he views metaphorically as Leonardo da Vinci's "Mona Lisa." Unlike Philip, Cecil is not speechless in the presence of what he perceives to be great art. Ironically, when he proposes to Lucy the second time she "reminded him of a Leonardo more than ever; her sunburnt features were shadowed by fantastic rock. . . with immeasurable plains
behind her" (102). However, Cecil proposes marriage to Lucy during a period in her life when she consciously denies and distrusts her physical instincts and intuition. Also, at the time of Cecil's three proposals of marriage, Lucy is maintaining her promise to Charlotte that she will not speak of the two most significant events of her life: her experience of death that she shared with George; and her experience of love when George kisses her among the violets. Not surprisingly, then, Cecil loves Lucy "not so much for herself as for the things that she will not tell" (101-102). Also significant is the fact that when Lucy does speak and express her opinions to Cecil he is either annoyed, or shocked. For example, Lucy describes for her mother and Cecil how much she "hate[s]" (114) the English Chaplain, Mr. Eager, because he falsely accused a "Mr. Harris" (Mr. Emerson) of murdering his wife. Cecil, the narrative voice tells us, "longed to hint to her that not here lay her vocation; that a woman's power and charm reside in mystery, not in muscular rant" (114). Lucy is speaking for the first time about her experiences in Italy. Cecil and her mother are shocked by her repeated use of the word "hate" to describe Mr. Eager; and Cecil is shocked by Lucy's "muscular rant." What is also significant here is that this is Lucy's first "lie": she calls Mr. Emerson "Mr. Harris." Lucy lies here because she has "exposed" her feelings "without due caution. . .against rebuff." Lucy
feels passionately that Mr. Eager's treatment of Mr. Emerson is wrong and tries to express her opinion in words that both Cecil and her mother can understand. However, Cecil laughs at her "feminine inconsequence," and Mrs. Honeychurch "forbids" Lucy to hate clergymen (113).

In order to silence Lucy, Cecil changes the subject to "Nature - the simplest of topics," and asks Lucy to take a walk with him (114). However, to Cecil's dismay, Lucy becomes more articulate the more she interacts with the natural universe:

"I had got an idea - I dare say wrongly
- that you feel more at home with me in
a room."

"A Room?" she echoed, hopelessly bewildered.

"Yes. Or, at the most, in a garden,
or on a road. Never in the real country like this."

"Oh, Cecil, whatever do you mean? I have never felt anything of the sort. You talk as if I was a kind of poetess sort of person."

"I don't know that you aren't I connect you with a view - a certain type of view. Why shouldn't you
connect me with a room?"

She reflected a moment, and then said, laughing:

"Do you know that you're right? I do. I must be a poetess after all. When I think of you it's always in a room. How funny!"

To her surprise, he seemed annoyed (122). This conversation takes place in the woods close to Windy Corner; and as Lucy comes into contact with the natural surroundings of her childhood, she becomes more natural and confident about her opinions and responses. Cecil, who likes to believe that Lucy's silence is an indication of an aesthetic or poetic sensibility, does not expect Lucy to respond to his philosophical query with a realistic response. Lucy is not a "poetess," or a "Leonardo"; therefore when she speaks to Cecil he is "annoyed" because she does not describe him in aesthetic or poetic terms. In addition, during this scene Lucy and Cecil come upon a pond that Lucy and Freddy have termed the "Sacred Lake." Lucy comments to Cecil "dreamily" that both she and Freddy "bathed" in the "Sacred Lake" as children, and she continued to bathe in the pond until Charlotte discovered her. In the natural surroundings of her childhood, Lucy is reminded that the source of her knowledge is nature; and Lucy is also reminded that she is connected to the violet
hillside where George kissed her in Florence. The "Sacred Lake," like the hillside overlooking Florence, is a "primal source" of Lucy's childhood experience - an experience which was also brought to an end by Charlotte. Ironically, Cecil now sees Lucy as a flower and asks if he can kiss her; and Lucy complies with Cecil's request for a kiss by giving a "business-like lift to her veil" (124). Cecil's kiss is unsatisfactory to him and the narrative voice comments:

They left the pool in silence, after this one salutation. He waited for her to make some remark which should show him her inmost thoughts. At last she spoke, and with fitting gravity.

"Emerson was the name, not Harris" (125). When Lucy remembers kissing George among the violets, she immediately becomes more truthful and corrects her previous lie of referring to Mr. Emerson as "Harris."

Although Lucy intuitively knows that she can not marry Cecil, she does not have a rational reason for breaking off her engagement. She continues to fear that by confronting the truth that she loves George, she will lose all connection to her family and society. For this reason, Lucy continues to not to tell anyone about her experiences with George in Italy. In addition, that George has not
told anyone about the experience adds "joy" to the experience for Lucy. And it is nature that continually informs her that her experience with George belongs to a realm outside of her family and society: Lucy hears the "horses' hooves" sing "a tune to her: 'he has not told, he has not told.' Her brain expanded the melody" (178). However, when Charlotte tells Lucy that she must tell her mother and Cecil her secret, Lucy refuses not only because she knows that "Cecil desire[s] her untouched," but also because Lucy wants to keep her secret about George separate from the society she intuitively believes to be false. As the narrative voice states, Lucy was "too great" not only for the society of England but "all society," and she

had reached the stage where personal intercourse would alone satisfy her. A rebel she was, but not the kind he (Cecil) understood - a rebel who desired, not a wider dwelling-room, but equality beside the man she loved (128).

It is because Lucy desires equality that she is enraged when she discovers that her love for George is reduced to the words of Miss Lavish's cheap romantic novel. And Lucy is similarly enraged when George "insults her" by kissing her after he hears Cecil read Miss Lavish's account of their "secret" kiss among the violets. Lucy is "insulted" not so much because George kisses her a second time, but
because George is moved to the gesture by Miss Lavish's book. In addition, Lucy is furious because her "secret," exposed in print, portrays her to be a passive and pathetic romantic heroine.

Lucy realizes that she must stop the lies that society is perpetuating about her. For this reason, when George confronts her to tell her that he loves her, Lucy is determined to gain control of her experiences rather than having other people manage them for her. George asks Lucy:

"Have you ever talked to Vyse without feeling tired?"

"I can scarcely discuss----"

"No, but have you ever? He is the sort who are all right so long as they keep to things - books, pictures - but kill when they come to people... Every moment of his life he's forming you, telling you what's charming or amusing or ladylike, telling you what a man thinks womanly; and you, you of all women, listen to his voice instead of your own... Therefore - not 'therefore I kissed you,' because the book made me do that... But therefore - I settled to fight him."
Lucy thought of a very good remark.

"You say Mr. Vyse wants me to listen to him, Mr. Emerson. Pardon me for suggesting that you have caught the habit" (194-195).

Lucy sees that George, like Mr. Beebe, like Mr. Emerson senior, and like Charlotte, will not let her finish her sentences. Lucy also sees that because George "settles to fight" Cecil, he places her in the role of the passive "medieval lady" who is not allowed to choose for herself. George tells Lucy and Charlotte that "love and youth matter intellectually" (196); but this statement does not ring true for Lucy who intuitively knows that love transcends "youth" and intellect. Because George emphasizes his decision to "fight" Cecil, he emphasizes the superiority of intellect rather than the superiority of nature and truth; consequently, he fails to convince Lucy that she should leave Cecil. However, after George leaves Windy Corner, nature reminds Lucy that her personal growth and knowledge is connected to George; and her freedom is dependent upon her abandonment of the lies that society assumes she will accept:

But, once in the open air, she paused. Some emotion - pity, terror, love, but the emotion was
strong—seized her, and she was aware of autumn. Summer was ending, and the evening brought her odours of decay, the more pathetic because they were reminiscent of spring. That something or other mattered intellectually? A leaf, violently agitated, danced past her, while other leaves lay motionless. That the earth was hastening to re-enter darkness, and the shadows of the trees to creep over Windy Corner?... the same evening she broke off her engagement (196-197).

George's statement that "youth and love matter intellectually" moves Lucy to some emotion; but the emotion is equated with "odours of decay" because it is an emotion that evolves from an intellectual abstraction rather than from life. "A leaf, violently agitated, danced past" Lucy to indicate that although "other leaves lay motionless," nature will continue to provide truth despite the "darkness." Lucy realizes that she must inform society that she will no longer continue to conform to its standards, even if she is "censured"; and she must also inform George, her true lover, that she will no longer tolerate censorship, or censuring, from him or anyone else.
To this end, Lucy sends away George Emerson, and she breaks off her engagement with Cecil.

Lucy finds that not only must she defend her decision for not wanting to marry Cecil, but she must also defend and define her social position as a single woman. When Lucy breaks off communication with George, and breaks off her engagement with Cecil, she puts herself in a position of control relative to the patriarchal society that surrounds her. In other words, Lucy rebels against Mr. Beebe's notions of her as "only a young lady" who lacks any intellectual strengths, Cecil's notions of her as an artistic object, Freddy's notions of her as a sister, and George's notions of her as medieaval woman for whom he must "fight." In addition, Lucy challenges her mother's ironically masculine opinions regarding single women by planning to travel to Greece with the Miss Alan sisters. Lucy's claims for autonomy also reflect the narrative struggle between character and voice. As a result of this struggle, the narrative voice challenges Lucy's fears of being an unmarried woman by presenting to her the many negative stereotypes that society uses to describe single women.

This struggle between character and voice begins when Lucy tells Cecil that the event that initiated her decision not to marry him is that he refused to play tennis with Freddy. Perhaps Lucy could have come to this conclusion
earlier if she had followed her instincts and asked Cecil, (as she intended), to play tennis immediately after she accepted his marriage proposal (101). That Cecil will not play tennis with Freddy is a valid reason for Lucy to break off her engagement; for, as the narrative voice has already told us, Lucy's insights about truth and experience almost always emerge from her "physical" and natural experiences. The narrative voice further states that for Lucy there is "at times a magic in identity of position" (52); thus Lucy's intuitive and natural connection with George is recalled when they play tennis together (182). Cecil's refusal to play tennis drives home the point to Lucy that she does not share with him the "identity of position," or "magic." Lucy should not have to explain any further to Cecil her decision of why she does not want to marry him. However, Cecil tells Lucy to "never mind the tennis" (199), and he presses her intellectually by saying that he has "a right to hear a little more" (200). Lucy reiterates most of the reasons that George recited to her the same day, but she also adds that she is breaking off her engagement for "the sake of freedom" (203). Lucy is seeking "freedom" and equality for herself; and she understands that her desire to share her "freedom" with George is secondary to her desire to attain "freedom" and equality by herself first. At this point in the novel, the narrative voice echoes the
opinions of society that oppress Lucy. The first opinion that Lucy must defend herself against is the opinion that there are only two legitimate reasons for breaking an engagement: according to society, Lucy cannot break off her engagement unless she admits openly that she is either in love with another man, or that she has decided to maintain the "celibacy" and "resolution of virginity" (219) associated with darkness and Mr. Beebe.

In addition Lucy, who believes that her love for George is part of the "silence of life" that is not connected to the false propriety of society, does not want her love tainted by any of society's classifications. Although the fact that Lucy loves George is irrelevant to the fact that Lucy does not love Cecil, the narrative voice now suggests with Charlotte that Lucy must confess her love for George or accept reprisals from society. One reprisal that threatens Lucy if she does not get married is that she will join spinsters like Charlotte and the Miss Alans who, the narrative voice says, have neither passion or knowledge because they are members of "the vast armies of the benighted, who follow neither the heart nor the brain" (204). Because Lucy will not justify her love for George to Cecil, to Freddy, to her mother, to Mr. Beebe and the servants, the narrative voice ironically states that Lucy is "received" by the "night" in the same way "it had received Miss Bartlett thirty years before" (204). The
narrative voice suggests that Lucy's refusal to confess her love for George makes her a symbol for intellectual and physical barrenness. Unless Lucy, in Miss Bartlett's terms, "make[s] a clean breast" (138) to society about her feelings for George, she is characterized falsely as a "liar" who is "not worthy of . . . trust" (238). Furthermore, the narrative voice enunciates society's hypocritical view of unmarried women who, it states, have "sinned against passion and truth and march to their destiny by catch-words" (204). In short, the narrative voice requires that Lucy must make her love for George public, or face intellectual, moral, and social darkness. While the narrative voice is echoing these opinions about women ironically, the irony resides in the fact that its initial portrayal of Charlotte and the Miss Alan sisters as negative stereotypes is proven to be false. The last chapter of the novel begins by celebrating the Miss Alan sisters who illustrate that they have undergone a transformation.

The reader discovers that even after Lucy confesses her love for George, she is condemned by society to intellectual, moral, and social darkness. It is this latter paradox, that even after Lucy confesses her love she is condemned, that the narrative voice wants to emphasize. For what Lucy confesses when she confesses her love for
George is that she conceives of love as both physical and spiritual - a notion of love that is unacceptable to society. Lucy knows that her love for George is both physical and spiritual; her love is characterized as "the silence of life": the living flesh combined with the silence of the spirit. Lucy's love signifies an ineffable totality which rejects the multiplicity of words. Lucy is an artist who expresses her "vision" of the other, or the "empyrean" through artistic expression by playing the piano. Because Lucy does not know any words that are both appropriate for society and herself to express her love for George, Mr. Emerson does it for her.

Mr. Emerson is the appropriate instrument to communicate a message of love from an artist to her lover. He is a secular priest who is "profoundly religious," and is different from Mr. Beebe only in his "acknowledgment of passion" (234). Mr. Emerson states to Lucy: "You love the boy (George) body and soul, plainly, directly, as he loves you, and no other word expresses it. You won't marry the other man for his sake" (217). In response to Mr. Emerson's description of how she feels, the narrative voice says that Lucy is "shocked" and begins to "cry with anger" (220). Lucy is shocked and angry that Mr. Emerson can articulate her feelings in a way that she cannot. However, unlike her behavior towards Mr. Emerson in Italy when she grew indignant after Mr. Emerson put her thoughts into
words, Lucy allows Mr. Emerson to speak for her. The narrative voice gives Mr. Emerson's words the power of nature as they "burst against Lucy like waves from the sea"; and Lucy no longer feels the unnecessary burden of having to intellectualize her feelings and knowledge by describing them in words that society can understand. Lucy accepts Mr. Emerson's statement that "love is of the body" (237); and she understands that the unification of the soul with the body describes her love for George. Mr. Emerson also gives Lucy the response that she should have given to George when he told her that he "settled to fight" Cecil because "love and youth matter intellectually" (196). Mr. Emerson states that we "fight for more than Love or Pleasure; there is Truth. Truth counts" (240). What George failed to articulate successfully, and what Lucy "never exactly understood" (240), is that truth and love transcend the realms of society and the intellect. In addition, the narrative voice makes it clear that it is not important for Lucy or George to understand exactly why their love is an articulation of truth.

In the final chapter, "The End of the Middle Ages," the narrative voice corrects its previous statements which place unmarried women in "darkness." That unmarried women "have sinned against passion" is just one more lie that society would like us to believe. In fact, the "vast
armies of the benighted" more aptly characterizes Mr. Eager, Cecil Vyse, and Mr. Beebe who the narrative voice continually associates with darkness:

They hurried home through a world of black and grey...

"I love weather like this," said Freddy.

Mr. Beebe passed into it (219-222).

This quotation shows how the narrative voice links characters with the physical universe. In addition, although Freddy seems to have philosophical affinities with George, his statement that he "love[s]" dark weather not only links him closer with Mr. Beebe, but it also foreshadows his letter to Lucy at the end of the novel when he expresses his disappointment about her relationship with George by attempting to reduce its significance by calling it an "elopement."

The final chapter begins by describing the Miss Alan sisters and their journey to Greece:

They alone of this little company will double the Malea and plough the waters of the Saronic gulf. They alone will visit Athens and Delphi, and either shrine of intellectual song - that upon the Acropolis, encircled by blue seas; that under Parnassus, where the eagles
build and the bronze charioteer drives
undismayed towards infinity (141).

Although the narrative voice has earlier portrayed the Miss Alan sisters as figures who distort the truth through "gossip," the narrative voice now describes them as women of wisdom and knowledge rather than "darkness." The narrative voice's earlier treatment of the Miss Alan sisters corresponds to its earlier satirical treatment of Lucy when she is limited by the society that surrounds her. The Miss Alan sisters pursue nature and myth as sources of knowledge; and their quest is also metaphorically linked to sexual intercourse as they "plough the waters of the Saronic Gulf" to indicate their enlightenment. Rather than being satisfied with the knowledge offered to them by Italy, they travel to Greece and visit places that are inhabited by both nature ("encircled by blue seas," and "where eagles build") and myth. Like Phaethon ("the bronze charioteer"), the Miss Alans similarly attempt to find themselves by reconciling their mortal natures with their immortal and mythical origins. Lucy reaches the "stage where personal intercourse would alone satisfy"; the Miss Alan sisters reach the stage where the "bronze charioteer drives undismayed towards infinity." Unlike Phaethon whose mortal nature prevents him from driving successfully the chariot of Apollo, the Miss Alans arrive at a place where he "drives undismayed."
Finally, the Miss Alans' successful travels foreshadow Mrs. Moore in *A Passage To India* when she departs from Bombay and receives a final vision of unity when she discovers that she has not seen the "right places" (209).

By prefacing our last view of Lucy and George with a statement about the Miss Alans' quest for truth in the places of classical mythology and nature, the narrative voice emphasizes how the two young lovers find truth by connecting love with the realism of nature alone. While the Miss Alans equate nature with knowledge and mythology, Lucy and George equate nature with fertility and love. Lucy and George return to Italy, and to the Pension Bertolini; and once again "rooms with views" initiate conversation between the characters. This time the conversation is introduced by the narrative voice which articulates George's observation:

George said it was his old room

"No, it isn't," said Lucy; "because it is the room I had, and I had your father's room. I forget why; Charlotte made me, for some reason."

He knelt on the tiled floor, and laid his face in her lap... He was a boy after all. When it came to the point, it was she who remembered the past, she into whose
soul the iron had entered, she who knew
whose room this had been last year. It
endeared him to her strangely that he
should be sometimes wrong (241-242).

The narrative voice asks the reader to decide who to believe: is the lovers' room the room that George gave to Charlotte, or the room Mr. Emerson gave to Lucy? The question of rooms and views prompts George and Lucy to discuss meaning and motive. As readers we recall that at the beginning of the novel Charlotte finds the note of interrogation in the room that she believes to belong to George. However, one now wonders whether or not the note was left in the room by Mr. Emerson rather than his son. Although the narrative voice seems to answer these questions for us when it enters the mind of Lucy to tell us that "it endeared him to her (Lucy) greatly that he (George) should sometimes be wrong," the narrative voice also tells us that George "prefers the word" of his father" (245) when he must decide matters that concern Miss Charlotte Bartlett. Again, however, we are considering opinions ("views"); and each opinion is equally valuable for the two lovers, and for Forster. George does not tell Lucy that she is wrong; like Lucy, George is "endeared" to his lover and he responds to the misunderstanding by laughing and

pinning her (Lucy) with his elbows, and
advancing his face to hers. "What's there to cry at? Kiss me here." He indicated the spot where a kiss would be welcome (242).

George "indicates" that the only true answers to questions about origins are those answers that arrive after one "gives or receives human love." George and Lucy find truth in sexual embrace.

However, the narrative voice states that although George's "content was absolute," Lucy's contentment "held bitterness" because her family and her community "had not forgiven them" (243). Like the end of Where Angels Fear To Tread and A Passage To India, a letter provides a final event that the characters discuss. Freddy writes to Lucy and claims that he "knew" Lucy and George would "take the thing into" their "own hands" and elope. It is Freddy who articulates society's final disapproval of Lucy's behavior; and it is Freddy's lie that Lucy must finally expose: "They had fair warning, and now he calls it an elopement. Ridiculous boy" (243). Lucy's family and society will not recognize her union with George as being invested with the full meaning of the word "marriage." The only character who George suspects might sympathize with Lucy's situation is Charlotte. George manages to convince Lucy that "it is just possible" that Charlotte, "far down in her heart, far below all speech and behavior," is "glad." Because George
believes in Fate, he believes that all of Charlotte's behavior evolved from her suppressed desire to bring him and Lucy together. The note of interrogation that Charlotte finds in the first chapter now becomes "portentous" with love because it is able to supersede Freddy's letter. And one wonders again whether or not it was Mr. Emerson, rather than George who left the note of interrogation for Charlotte. If Charlotte's lies which prevented Lucy from obtaining her vision of truth through George are based upon the lies of society, then truth is possible when human beings respond to a voice that is "far below all speech and behavior." This voice is "more mysterious" than the mythical "song of Phaethon" that "announce[s] passion requited, love attained": the voice of myth is overcome by the voice of nature when Lucy and George become "conscious" of the river which is "bearing down the snows of winter into the Mediterranean" (246). The narrative voice leaves the lovers conscious of how their love is connected to the natural universe of the river which provides hope for future generations. While the Miss Alans, foreshadowing Mrs. Moore in A Passage To India, develop a relationship with "infinity," the two lovers develop a relationship with nature which brings the promise of "infinity" and fertility back to earth through the the sound of the river which melts the snow and guarantees a springtime of human, rather
than superhuman, experience.

The narrative voice ends the novel by describing how nature blesses and confirms Lucy and George's connection. Although the novel ends in marriage, the marriage is not a conventional marriage that follows the dictates of society. The marriage of George and Lucy takes place outside of orthodox society and religion. The novel ends by celebrating an almost pagan reconciliation of the spirit and flesh. Lucy and George are connected physically and spiritually by their shared experience of death. Lucy and George's connection stresses the importance for the individual rejecting the restrictions of society and the past, and to live according to the "everlasting Yes" and "Now." To do this, both characters must first possess the whole of themselves: they must connect the prose and the passion, the spirit and the flesh, the truth and the passion. This is the goal of the modernist quest which is so often abandoned. By giving us an example of how the modernist ideal can be attained, Forster's narrative voice delivers a message to the reader that such an ideal is available to any "commonplace" person who listens, and responds to the "connection."
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CHAPTER THREE

The narrative voice of *A Room With A View* describes two lovers who achieve love and knowledge by intuitively responding to the natural universe. Love is described simply as an "unexpected melody" (53); and the narrative voice does not attempt to define the "unexpected" quality of nature that allows Lucy and George's connection. The narrative voice leaves the "unexpected" unexplained; and in doing so, it further emphasizes its superiority over plot, story, and character. The narrative voice remains omniscient while at the same time it aligns itself with myth and nature. The narrative voice reveals its primary insights about character through free-indirect discourse, and through the interpretive power that it gives to nature and physical objects. The fact that the narrative voice seems to deliberately withhold full definitions of character, experience and love points to the value and power that Forster gives to the "unspeakable" (208) – to an existence and essence that cannot be translated into human terms and words. *A Room With A View* lacks the sociology and psychology of character and human relations which *The Longest Journey* and *Howards End* explore in detail; and it is this lack of human psychology and reasoning that aligns Forster's third novel with *A Passage To India.*

The narrative voice of *A Room With A View* ends by
making the statement that human relationships are mysterious calculations of the human world and the physical universe. The narrative voice of *A Passage To India* also stresses the complexity of human relationships, but its primary goal is to take the idea of relationships one step further by describing the relationship between mankind and the "unspeakable" mystery of nature, life after death, and God. In addition, from the beginning of the novel, the narrative voice emphasizes the authority and superiority of the natural universe over the world of man:

Except for the Marabar Caves — and they are twenty miles off — the city of Chandrapore presents nothing extraordinary. Edged rather than washed by the river Ganges, it trails for a couple of miles along the bank, scarcely distinguishable from the rubbish it deposits so freely. There are no bathing-steps on the river front, as the Ganges happens not to be holy here; indeed there is no river front, and bazaars shut out the wide and shifting panorama of the stream. The streets are mean, the temples ineffective, and though a few fine houses exist they are
hidden away in gardens or down alleys
whose filth deters all but the invited
guest (7).

The narrative voice begins the novel by establishing the
authority and autonomy of the natural universe. It
distinguishes between the mystery of the Marabar Caves
("Except for") from the realm of man represented by the
city of Chandrapore which is "scarcely distinguishable from
the rubbish it deposits." When the Ganges reaches
Chandrapore, it ceases to be "holy"; and the fact that
there are no "bathing-steps" for man to approach the river
further implies the separation of the human world from the
natural universe. Chandrapore's "streets are mean" and its
"temples," which should bring the human world into
connection with God, are "ineffective." Chandrapore's
"houses exist," but they are not represented as existing
for man: it appears that mankind's existence is far lower
than even the physical structures that are supposed to
accommodate him. The physical universe exempts only "the
invited guest" from being affected by the "filth" of
Chandrapore which is described as "some low but
indestructible form of life" where the inhabitants are "mud
moving" (8).

The physical universe governs both the mythical and
spiritual realms: trees are "endowed with more strength
than man or his works"; "when the sky chooses" it can cause
"glory" to "rain," or bestow a "benediction" (9) upon the earth. Whereas in *A Room With A View* the narrative voice aligned itself with both the world of classical mythology and nature, in *A Passage To India* the narrative voice deifies, mythologizes and personifies the natural world so that it becomes a mythology unto itself.  

The sky "settles everything" - its "strength comes from the sun," and its size comes from the "prostrate earth" (9). The Marabar caves are described as "a group of fists and fingers" that "thrust up through the soil" (9).  

Whereas in *A Room With A View* the narrative voice describes the human qualities of the Italian cab driver and his girl-friend by comparing them with the mythological figures of Phaethon and Persephone, in *A Passage To India* the narrative voice gives the sky strength, and it gives the earth fertility without alluding to classical mythology.  

Furthermore, the absence of classical mythological reference serves to enforce the distinction between the world of man and the physical universe. Human beings are absent from the first chapter of the novel so that the narrative voice can emphasize their dependence upon and relative insignificance to the natural universe.  

The narrative voice privileges the world of nature rather than the world of man; and this privileging of nature over humanity emphasizes the narrative voice's
dominance over character. In addition, the world of nature that the narrative voice aligns itself with is also the realm of spirit (the "spiritual silence" (140)); character is the human realm of personal relations and experience. The task of the reader is to accept these distinctions, and to accept the paradoxical notion that the unity, or the "passage" between these two antithetical realms is possible; but, as the narrative voice tells us, it is "not to be apprehended except when it is unattainable" (315). Thus, in Forster's fifth novel, the narrative voice further emphasizes the ultimate futility of human action and words when viewed from the vantage point of death and eternity. The "passage" between the sacred and the profane involves the acceptance of an illogical and non-sectarian idea that "God is love" (51). Mrs. Moore and Godbole both "apprehend" God; but Mrs. Moore "apprehends" God just prior to death, and Godbole "apprehends" God while in the midst of a mystical vision. However, both Mrs. Moore's and Godbole's vision, "passage," or unity cannot be "apprehended" or attained in any human terms. In this sense, Forster continues some of the themes of A Room With A View in which the connection between Lucy and George is not dependent upon logic, psychology or society. Lucy Honeychurch's inability to articulate love in words acceptable to both the society of the novel and many readers of the novel foreshadows Mrs. Moore's inability and
refusal to articulate her experience in the Marabar Caves in words acceptable to anyone. 11 A Room With A View examines the essentially ineffable quality of human love and sexuality which the narrative voice describes as the "silence of life" (80): A Passage To India examines the essentially ineffable quality of sacred or divine love which is described as "spiritual silence." In both cases, the narrative voice uses the term "silence" to indicate that the absence of human words appropriately characterizes the true reality of love. Lucy Honeychurch reaches the "stage where personal intercourse would alone satisfy her" (128). Mrs. Moore "come[s] to that state where the horror of the universe and its smallness are both visible at the same time" (207); and she feels that "though people are important, the relations between them are not" (135). Eventually Mrs. Moore reaches the "state" where only divine intercourse can satisfy her. Moreover, in the same way that Mr. Emerson functions to complete Lucy's connection with George in A Room With A View, the character of Professor Godbole also "imitat[es] God" and functions to "impell[]" Mrs. Moore "by his spiritual force to that place where completeness can be found" (286). The "place where completeness can be found" is a spiritual place (or place of "passage" or "connection") where Mrs. Moore can "say to the God, 'come, come, come come'" (291).
I will examine in this chapter how Mrs. Moore is the heroine and protagonist of the novel because she realizes the futility of words, and she acknowledges through Godbole that although all of her possibilities for personal relations are exhausted, she can develop a final relationship with her God and the physical universe. I also argue that by developing a final relationship with God and the physical universe, the character of Mrs. Moore is "complete" and is able to develop a relationship with the detached narrative voice. Thus, it is through the consciousness and vantage point of Mrs. Moore that we are able to understand the relationships between Fielding, Aziz, Miss Quested, Stella, and Ralph Moore.

Mrs. Moore functions to bridge the gap between character, the narrative voice which aligns itself with the "unspeakable" aspects of nature, God, and finally the reader. In order to achieve this "passage," the narrative voice portrays Mrs. Moore, like the physical universe at the beginning of the novel, as an entity that has an identity that is separate from the human world. She is a character with "double vision" who functions in both the human and the "unspeakable" worlds. Whereas the narrative voice of A Room With A view makes a point of describing Lucy as an artist who approaches and embodies the "unspeakable" through music, the narrative voice of A Passage To India deliberately depicts Mrs. Moore as a
mystic who is approached by the "unspeakable" which provides her with vision. For example, when Mrs. Moore first appears in the novel, she appears to be able to turn the pillars of a Mosque into living forms:

He repeated the phrase with tears in his eyes, and as he did so one of the pillars of the mosque seemed to quiver. It swayed in the gloom and detached itself. Belief in ghosts ran in his blood, but he sat firm. Another pillar moved, a third, and then an Englishwoman stepped out into the moonlight. Suddenly he was furiously angry and shouted: "Madam! Madam! Madam! (20).

This section of the novel is crucial to our understanding of the novel for a variety of reasons; but one primary reason that it is crucial is that it establishes Mrs. Moore as an aspect of the "unspeakable" physical universe, and it introduces the enigmatic relationship between Mrs. Moore and the Islamic Doctor Aziz. Although the narrative voice appears to be in the consciousness of Aziz who is meditating upon a poem written as an inscription upon the tomb of a Persian king, that the "pillars of the mosque" move is not merely an hallucination of Aziz's
consciousness. Later in the novel the narrative voice tells us that Aziz does not believe in ghosts, and it is because he "despise[s] ghosts" that he "come[s] to know Mrs. Moore" (99). The very fact that the narrative voice privileges nature and mystery over mankind, indicates that it has the authority to allow certain characters and things to behave in "extraordinary" and superhuman ways. Thus, our first glimpse of Mrs. Moore is that she is capable of making the works of man disappear in her presence. In addition, Mrs. Moore and Aziz's meeting is a mystical and visionary experience which causes both characters to feel a sense of unity: Mrs. Moore feels unified with "all the heavenly bodies," and Aziz feels unified with the "earth." This mystical experience that Aziz and Mrs. Moore share is a model for the action of the novel as a whole: it prepares the reader for the mystical visions of the Marabar caves, and the many visions that occur throughout the novel.

Mrs. Moore and Aziz's experience in the Mosque introduces Aziz's character which is emotional, religiously rigid, physical, and somewhat sexist. Yet Aziz believes and confirms Mrs. Moore's supernatural presence when he makes his preliminary judgments about her based upon the quality of her voice, and not upon her physical form which he cannot see closely. It is eventually Miss Quested's voice which "travelle[s]" through the Indian servants to Aziz and makes him realize "with horror" that the ladies took
seriously his invitation to the Marabar caves (126). He initially attacks Mrs. Moore verbally because he can see clearly enough to see that she is an Englishwoman; and he uses his preconceived notions of Englishwomen as a pretext to verbally attack her: he thinks that because she is English, she must not have "taken off" her shoes because "so few ladies take the trouble, especially if thinking no one is there to see." However, when Mrs. Moore corrects him by saying that it "makes no difference. God is here," Aziz immediately humbles himself before her as though she is a goddess; he asks her "can I do you some service now or at any time"; and he also asks if he can "know" her "name." Mrs. Moore's name becomes "very sacred" in Aziz's "mind"; and he eventually forgives Adela Quested by telling her in a letter that he will "connect" her with the "name" of "Mrs. Moore" (320). Mrs. Moore approaches Aziz as a vision approaches a mystic - a vision cannot be induced, it is an arbitrary act of the "unknown." 18

Although Mrs. Moore's "name" becomes "sacred" in Aziz's "mind," that Mrs. Moore the "Englishwoman" appears not to retain any mystical or sacred significance for Aziz supports the idea that his meeting with her in the mosque is a visionary experience. The narrative voice characterizes Aziz's "spiritual life" as "semi-mystic" and "semi-sensuous" (320). This dual aspect of Aziz's
spiritual life also characterizes his approach to medicine: Aziz's "hand, not his mind" is "scientific" (53). Aziz "required" his profession "to be exciting" (53); and he finds that it is the physical movements of surgery, rather than abstract "regime and hygiene" (53), that excite him the most. Aziz's conception of life, then, is biased towards the physical. In fact, when Aziz is involved in his surgical cases, he "cease[s] to be either outcaste or poet" (53).

It is not surprising that Aziz's approach to poetry resembles his approach to medicine in that he favors the physical and realistic rather than the theoretical. He is also a poet who believes in the value and ability of words to heal a wounded psyche; and he believes words belong to the realms of human history and time. Thus, Aziz uses words to control and reify emotions - to make the "unspeakable" aspects of his psyche real. In fact, when he is approached by Mrs. Moore in the mosque, he is meditating upon his own loneliness and alienation which he blames most of all upon the Anglo-Indian women of Chandrapore. As he tells Mrs. Moore, he has entered the mosque because Mrs. Callendar has "just taken [his] tonga without [his] permission. . . and cut[s] [him] dead" (23). When Aziz enters the mosque, he feels "the outcaste" and he wants to escape the Anglo-Indian community whom he serves; and he recites a Persian poem which emphasizes the human desire to
be understood by other human beings on earth rather than in heaven:

Alas, without me for thousands of years
The Rose will blossom and the Spring will bloom,
But those who have secretly understood my heart -
They will approach and visit the grave where I lie (19).

Aziz's response to the poem emphasizes his "semi-mystical" and "semi-sensual" conception of the universe and human relationships. The poem at once acknowledges the human realm of time ("thousands of years"), and the autonomous, a-temporal and continuous existence of nature ("The Rose will blossom"). The poem also indicates that the existence of the dead will be confirmed on earth by "those" who "secretly" understand the human heart. Doctor Aziz is moved to "tears" by the notion that it is possible for individuals to understand him through "secret understanding" (20), rather than through words.

However, the poem itself does nothing to make Aziz feel more unified with humanity. Aziz seeks relief from the Anglo-Indian women; yet, ironically, it is the English woman, Mrs. Moore, that provides him "secret understanding." In order to understand this paradox, Aziz makes Mrs. Moore's presence in the mosque part of his Islamic religion; and he also makes Mrs. Moore part of his definition of the mosque:
The front - in full moonlight - had the appearance of marble, and the ninety-nine names of God on the frieze stood out black, as the frieze stood out white against the sky. The contest between this dualism pleased Aziz, and he tried to symbolize the whole into some truth of religion or love. . . The temple of another creed, Hindu, Christian, or Greek, would have bored him. . . here was Islam. . .he decked it (the mosque) with meanings the builder had never intended (19).

Aziz defines himself professionally as a doctor, artistically and philosophically as a poet, and religiously as Islamic. To Aziz, science, art, philosophy and religion are masculine realms. Mrs. Moore initially appears to him to be a vision, and then appears to be one of the stereotypical Anglo-Indian women whom he dislikes, and he finally remembers her as a function of the mosque which has a "secret understanding of [his] heart." Mrs. Moore is able to move the pillars of the mosque, and therefore she becomes a spirit of the mosque: Mrs. Moore becomes the mosque. That Mrs. Moore, unlike Aziz, is able to enter the "temple of another creed" and at the same time is able to say "God is here," belies Aziz's masculine, poetic and Islamic sensibilities. Aziz finds Englishwomen "easy to
talk to" only when he "can treat[] them like men" (68). In order to separate Mrs. Moore's visionary voice from other offensive Anglo-Indian female voices like Mrs. Turton, Callendar and Lesley, Aziz asks Mrs. Moore's name so that he can romanticize it as he romanticizes the "ninety-nine names of God."

Aziz associates truth with his conception of religion; thus it is telling that Aziz comments to Fielding later in the novel that he remembers Mrs. Moore only as an "excessively aged lady," and comments further that he does "not consider Mrs. Moore [his] friend" (66). The narrative voice adds that for Aziz, the "romance" at the mosque had sunk out of his consciousness as soon as it was over" (66). In the same way that Mrs. Moore can only describe Aziz's human aspects, Aziz cannot define Mrs. Moore's spiritual aspects. Aziz does not tell Fielding of Mrs. Moore's ability to "know what others feel" - an insight that makes him feel less alienated and causes him to think that he "own[ed] the land as much as anyone" (23). In order to stress the mystical or visionary quality of Aziz and Mrs. Moore's meeting in the mosque, the narrative voice makes it clear that the characters recall in words only the human aspects of the experience while the spiritual aspects of their experience remain "unspeakable," or unspoken.

In addition, the narrative voice further emphasizes
Mrs. Moore's spiritual qualities when it describes Mrs. Moore speaking to Aziz while she is "in the shadow of the gateway, so that he could not see her face." When Aziz does see Mrs. Moore, he "did not know whether he was glad or sorry. She was older than Hamidullah Begum. . . Her voice had deceived him" (20). Because the narrative voice places Mrs. Moore in the realm of the mosque and the supernatural, Aziz responds to her as though she is a goddess; however, when Aziz discovers that Mrs. Moore is "old" and that her "voice had deceived him," he reveals that his conceptions of reality and women are rooted in Islamic and masculine assumptions. The supernatural quality of Mrs. Moore's voice is privileged over her physical presence; and Aziz goes on to further emphasize Mrs. Moore's spiritual qualities by saying that she has the power to "know what others feel" (23).

The narrative voice further separates Mrs. Moore from both the Indians and the Englishmen with her remark that "God is here." The reader, like Aziz, is given the impression that Mrs. Moore does have a supernatural and autonomous significance in that she refers to the God of Islam and the God of Judeo-Christianity as the same being. Moreover, that the conversation between Aziz and Mrs. Moore takes place in the "gateway" and "entrance" to the mosque gives their conversation a double significance. The terms "gateway" and "entrance" not only evoke other
Forsterian terms such as "connection" and "passage" which imply a unity between two distinct things, but the former terms imply also that the conversation occupies a metaphysical space which belongs neither to the world of India or England.

As mentioned above, the remarkable aspect of the meeting between Mrs. Moore and Aziz is that neither the Indian doctor, nor the Englishwoman can describe the experience afterwards. The experience remains visionary and mystical. And like Aziz's description to Fielding of Mrs. Moore as merely an "excessively aged lady," Mrs. Moore similarly finds it difficult to describe Aziz in words. In much the same way that Charlotte asks Lucy not to speak to her mother about her experience with George Emerson, Mrs. Moore's son, Ronny Heaslop, asks her not to "talk about Aziz to Adela" (34). The narrative voice comments that

He had not forbidden her to think about Aziz, however, and she did this when she retired to her room. In the light of her son's comment she reconsidered the scene at the mosque, to see whose impression was correct. Yes, it could be worked into quite an unpleasant scene. The doctor had begun by bullying her, had said Mrs. Callendar was nice, and then - finding the ground
safe - had changed; he had alternately whined over his grievances and patronized her, had run a dozen ways in a single sentence, had been unreliable, inquisitive, vain. Yes, it was all true, but how false as a summary of the man; the essential life of him had been slain (34).

Mrs. Moore acknowledges the inability of words to describe people; and the ability of words, even when they are "true," to distort "essential life" or meaning. In fact, she tells Ronny that her initial judgment of Aziz is based upon the quality of Aziz's voice: "His nerves were all on edge - I could tell from his voice" (31). Ironically, as Chandrapore's City Magistrate, Ronny is supposed to judge words impartially as they are presented as facts; as a judge, he is not supposed to take into account emotion and how the words are uttered. Yet in Chandrapore, the tone of one's voice indicates one's race, religion and social position. Thus, Ronny is irritated when his mother does not indicate "by the tone of her voice that she was talking about an Indian?" (31). In the same way that Aziz initially judges Mrs. Moore on the quality of her voice, Mrs. Moore also judges Aziz by the tone of his voice rather than the words that he says. However, Mrs. Moore judges her son Ronny not only on the quality of his voice, but also upon the way he physically pronounces words: "His words without his voice might have impressed her, but when
she heard the self-satisfied lilt of them, when she saw the mouth moving so complacently and competently beneath the little red nose, she felt, quite illogically, that this was not the last word on India" (51). Mrs. Moore judges her son upon his "words" and how he pronounces his words physically. Words are equated with the world of the human; voice with the realm of the spirit.

Because Mrs. Moore attaches a spiritual rather than racial significance to Aziz's voice, and she places little value on Aziz's words, her experience of Aziz in the mosque is private and "unspeakable." It is also possible to state that the experience provides Mrs. Moore with a mystical vision of the unity of all living beings. As the narrative voice tells us:

It matters so little to the majority of living beings what the minority, that calls itself human, desires or decides.
. . .the inarticulate world is closer at hand and readier to resume control as soon as men are tired (114).

The narrative voice again refers to humanity as a "minority" among all other life forms. Mrs. Moore is approached by "the inarticulate world" in the mosque and is given a sense of "unity"; unlike the Marabar caves which provide Mrs. Moore with a vision which she interprets as
human division and isolation, the vision in the mosque makes her feel unified with "all heavenly bodies." In this sense, it is possible to see how Mrs. Moore's meeting with Aziz in the mosque foreshadows the experience in the Marabar caves which is similarly elusive to human speech.

The narrative voice continues to emphasize Mrs. Moore's mystical existence rather than her existence as an old Englishwoman. Adela Quested and Ronny continually interrupt her vision of "unity" when they speak to remind her of her social duties as a mother. After her experience with Aziz in the mosque, Mrs. Moore returns to the Anglo-Indian club where the narrative voice describes how, immediately after she hears Adela Quested's voice say "I want to see the real India," Mrs. Moore's "appropriate life came back with a rush" (24). Mrs. Moore's disembodied voice in the mosque is at once beautiful and supernatural; and the fact that Adela's voice signals the return of Mrs. Moore's "appropriate life" indicates that her existence and experience in the mosque is alien to her existence as a British matriarch. Mrs. Moore is capable of acting in both the realm of "appropriate" physical reality, and in the realm of the supernatural. Later in the novel, the narrative voice also says that Mrs. Moore has "double vision...for which no high-sounding words can be found" (208). Mrs. Moore's "double vision" refers to both her "appropriate life" as an English woman who is "elderly"
(24), and also to her mystical life which allows her to see into the human heart. Thus, the narrative voice reinforces the fact that when Mrs. Moore engages in discussion with Aziz in the entrance to the mosque, she is acting not as an "elderly lady," but as a "voice" that is not subject to rules of sex, race, or religion.

In addition, Mrs. Moore is linked to another "pleasant voice" (24) in the novel who is similarly capable of walking through the physical structures of man. After Mrs. Moore leaves the Mosque and returns to the Anglo-Indian club, Adela Quested asks her if she was successful in "catching the moon in the Ganges" (24). Mrs. Moore begins to describe how the moon can be viewed from two perspectives and is corrected by an unknown voice:

"I went to the mosque, but I did not catch the moon."

"The angle would have altered - she rises later."

"Later and later," yawned Mrs. Moore, who was tired after her walk.
"Let me think - we don't see the other side of the moon out here, no."

"Come, India's not as bad as all that," said a pleasant voice. "Other side of the earth, if you like, but we
stick to the same old moon." Neither of them knew the speaker nor did they ever see him again. He passed with his friendly word through red-brick pillars into the darkness" (24-25).

To emphasize the fact that the reality of the novel is not realistic, and that Mrs. Moore is not alone in her ability to transcend the physical universe of man, the narrative voice introduces a character whose words and physical presence similarly "pass[] through red-brick pillars." In addition, it must be noted that although Mrs. Moore does not "catch the moon," she is successful in "stepp[ing] into the moonlight," and therefore she becomes a physical extension of the moon. And the narrative voice comments that

Mrs. Moore, whom the club had stupefied, woke up outside. She watched the moon, whose radiance stained with primrose the purple of the surrounding sky. In England the moon had seemed dead and alien; here she was caught in the shawl of night together with earth and all the other stars. A sudden sense of unity, of kinship with the heavenly bodies, passed into the old woman and out, like water through a
tank, leaving a strange freshness
behind (29-30).

The narrative voice describes Mrs. Moore as caught in the
"shawl of night together with earth and all the other
stars." The reader will recall the Miss Alan sisters in A
Room With A View are similarly characterized by their
shawls which reflect both their inner feelings and physical
mannerisms. In A Passage To India, however, the narrative
voice uses physical objects that belong to the human realm
to characterize the physical universe ("the shawl of
night"). The narrative voice of A Room With A View
describes how Lucy "love[s] George!" by stating that: "The
three words ('You love George') burst against Lucy like
waves from the open sea." The narrative voice of A Passage
To India describes how, as a result of her experience in
the mosque, Mrs. Moore feels "unity" with nature rather
than human beings. The metaphor that the narrative voice
uses to describe Mrs. Moore implies a relationship with the
universe; whereas the metaphor that the narrative voice
uses to describe Lucy implies her first sexual experience
and relationship with George Emerson. "Words" that "burst
against Lucy like waves from the open sea" imply a
connection between "words," "burst" and "waves"; whereas
"unity. . .with the heavenly bodies" and "water" passing
through a tank" implies a relationship between an an idea
"unity") and "water." The two distinctions are very important because the narrative voice is discussing two different types of "unspeakable" relationships and experiences. Lucy's experience describes her relationship with George and human "words"; Mrs. Moore's experience describes her relationship with the physical universe and an ineffable spiritual "otherness." In Lucy's case, the narrative voice equates words with nature; in Mrs. Moore's case, the narrative voice equates an ambiguous metaphysical idea with nature.

In *A Passage To India*, the narrative voice privileges "unity" over the distinctions that words can imply. Whereas for Lucy love, expressed in Mr. Emerson's words, is "the roaring of waters in her ears" (237); for Mrs. Moore love, expressed through a "sudden sense of unity," passes "into" her and "out" so that she is left with "a strange freshness." The narrative voice in *A Room With A View* remains on a purely metaphorical and epistemological level and uses water symbolically to describe a change in Lucy's sexuality and psychology; the narrative voice of *A Passage To India* goes beyond psychology, metaphor, symbol, and words by using water to describe Mrs. Moore's mystical connection with the "unspeakable." And when Mrs. Moore sees both "terror" and "wonder" (32) in the Ganges river in which she sees herself reflected along with the mosque and all the "heavenly bodies," she prophetically
foreshadows her own death when her body is "committed to
the deep" (256). The narrative voice of A Passage To India
abandons words to express mystic, metaphoric and spiritual
relationships. The fact that to Mrs. Moore the moon in
England is "dead and alien" while in India it provides her
with a "sudden sense of unity" and a "kinship with the
heavenly bodies" also suggests that Mrs. Moore's conception
and perception of reality has changed since her visit to
India, and that the physical universe that India
encompasses acknowledges and reflects her consciousness of
change.

While it may be argued that the narrative voice's
language, (such as when it describes Mrs. Moore moving the
pillars of the mosque), is purely metaphorical, from the
point in the novel that we first see Mrs. Moore moving the
pillars of the mosque she is continually aligned with the
physical universe and superhuman forces. At the same time
that Mrs. Moore is aligned with the supernatural universe,
like Lucy Honeychurch, she looses confidence in words as
accurate tools to render truth, reality and God. Like Lucy
Honeychurch, Mrs. Moore's crises involves her acceptance of
a relationship that she intuitively knows is immanent - her
relationship to life after death. However, unlike Lucy who
must abandon conventional notions of society and her family
in order to have a relationship with George, Mrs. Moore
must abandon her relationship with the human realm in order to engage in a relationship with the physical universe and God. Like Lucy when she tries to tell Charlotte about experiences with George, Mrs. Moore's response to her "sudden sense of unity" with the "heavenly bodies" is to attempt to articulate her feelings in words to her son. Like Lucy, she finally decides not to speak at all. For example, when she argues with Ronny that the English are in India to be "pleasant," she finds that when she attempts to describe her argument in words that include the terms "Love" and "God," her argument is dismissed:

"Because India is part of the earth. And God has put us on the earth in order to be pleasant to each other. God...is...love." She hesitated, seeing how much he disliked the argument...

He knew this religious strain in her, and that it was a symptom of bad health... the conversation had become unreal since Christianity had entered it. Ronny approved of religion as long as it endorsed the National Anthem, but he objected when it attempted to influence his life. Then he would say in respectful yet decided tones, "I don't think it does to talk about these things, every fellow has to work
out his own religion," and every fellow who heard him muttered, "Hear!" (51-52).

Mrs. Moore asserts that "God. . . is. . . love"; but when she uses New Testament "Christianity" to explain her argument, it becomes "unreal." religion is associated with unnecessary words which are "symptom[s] of bad health." Christianity, the "word made flesh," is supposed to represent the attempt to link the sacred and the profane; but to Ronny and his "fellow" Englishmen, religion is private and should not "influence. . . life." To the Anglo-English men, words that allude to God and love are associated with Christianity; and to the men, religion and love are political. English men do not "think it does to talk" about God and love because God refers to the Crown (the "National Anthem" - "God Save the King/Queen"), and love refers to women. The difference between Mrs. Moore and Ronny is that Mrs. Moore equates Religion with God and love; Ronny equates Religion with the Crown and politics. Mrs. Moore acknowledges that her increased awareness in stating the name "God" is an attempt to make God more "efficacious" or real for her personally (52). The politically minded Ronny believes that talking about religion will only cause division.

Despite Ronny's idea that his mother's "religious
strain" is merely a "symptom of bad health" indicating that she is old and near death, the narrative voice makes it clear that Mrs. Moore's interest in "pronounc[ing] his (God's) name" is an expression of her fear that she is losing her human understanding of God and the physical universe which she has always articulated in words. Her "sudden sense of unity" and "kinship with the heavenly bodies" opposes her "kinship" with her children and the human realm. Ironically, her "kinship with the heavenly bodies" also makes her want to share this knowledge with her son, but his religious attitude is the masculine and silent "Fifth Form" (257) attitude that does not talk. Her "kinship with the heavenly bodies" also opposes her Christian understanding of religion which emphasizes the importance of words as the "Divine Logos" to bridge the gap between the sacred and profane. Ronny's "Fifth Form" approach toward religion is helpful to him as Chandrapore's City Magistrate who "Wherever he entered, mosque cave, or temple, he retained the spiritual outlook of the Fifth Form, and condemned as 'weakening' any attempt to understand them" (257). Mrs. Moore desires to unite her Christian and mystical conceptions of God and the physical universe; but as words and the workings of Anglo-India fail to provide her with any appropriate means to express herself, she becomes increasingly withdrawn and silent. Mrs. Moore's silence is one way that the narrative voice
characterizes and places her among the physical universe; and the narrative voice makes Mrs. Moore an emissary of "unity" and a voice of hope for all living beings that must confront the limitations of the human. For instance, after her experience with Aziz in the mosque, and her experience of a "sudden sense of unity," the narrative voice describes Mrs. Moore preparing for bed:

   Going to hang up her cloak, she found that the tip of the peg was occupied by a small wasp. She had known this wasp or his relatives by day; they were not as English wasps, but had long yellow legs which hung down behind when they flew. Perhaps he mistook the peg for a branch - no Indian animal has any sense of an interior. Bats, rats, birds, insects will as soon nest inside a house as out; it is to them a normal growth of the eternal jungle, which alternately produces houses trees, houses trees. There he clung, asleep, while jackals in the plain bayed their desires and mingled with the percussion of drums.

   "Pretty dear," said Mrs. Moore to
the wasp. He did not wake, but her voice floated out to swell the night's uneasiness (35).

This scene, reminiscent of the scene at the end of the first chapter of A Room With A View when Charlotte finds the "note of interrogation," serves to emphasize how Mrs. Moore is moving further away from her Christian understanding of the universe. The wasp, which we see much later in the novel, functions in the same way that the "note of interrogation" functioned in the third novel: to unify characters and events. In addition, Mrs. Moore's sympathy for the wasp ("Pretty dear") indicates that her vision of the unity of living bodies surpasses even the visions of the Christian missionaries of whom the reader has only a fleeting glimpse. In addition to the fact that Mrs. Moore does not, like a the typical Anglo-Indian woman, try to remove the wasp from her room, the narrative voice personifies the wasp and places it in the same spiritual quandary as Mrs. Moore. In the same way that Mrs. Moore enters the mosque and gives it the same significance as a Christian church, the wasp enters Mrs. Moore's room as "a normal growth of the eternal jungle, which alternately produces houses trees, houses trees." Mrs. Moore's acceptance of the wasp, like Aziz's acceptance of her in the mosque, distinguishes her from all of the other Christians and Anglo-Indians in Chandrapore. One recalls
that a few pages later in the novel, the narrative voice describes Mr. Sorley, a Christian missionary, and his idea of the living beings reach heaven:

Mr. Sorley...saw no reason why
monkeys should not have their
collateral share of bliss...And the
jackals?...he admitted that the
mercy of God, being infinite, may well
embrace all mammals. And the wasps?
He became uneasy...We must exclude
someone from our gathering, or we shall
be left with nothing (38).

Unlike Mr. Sorley, Mrs. Moore includes all beings in her conception of the universe and the "heavenly bodies." Both of the above scenes are prefaced by Mrs. Moore's conversation with Mrs. Callendar who states that "the kindest thing one can do to a native is to "let him die." Mrs. Moore, perhaps not seeing fully the import of the woman's remark which implies that Indians do not, or should not, go to heaven, responds to her by saying: "How if he went to heaven?" (27). Mrs. Moore's "sudden sense of unity with all the heavenly bodies" begins to alienate her from the human world; and "talkative Christianity" (150), which Mrs. Moore attempts to utilize to articulate her vision of unity, fails to to unify anything, or anyone in India.
Thus it is not surprising that the narrative voice says that Mrs. Moore's "voice floated out" to "swell the night's uneasiness." Nature assimilates Mrs. Moore's voice, rather than her words: voice belongs in nature; words belong to the realm of human distinctions.

After Mrs. Moore's "voice" joins the physical universe, her words become increasingly ineffective in the human realm. For example, her "impulse" at the Bridge party to ask Mrs. Bhattacharya if she can "call on [her] some day" (my emphasis, 43) eventually turns out to be futile. The narrative voice makes a deliberate pun of the word "call" in connection to Mrs. Moore's voice which perhaps has no effect now that it has "floated out" into the night. As mentioned above, despite the fact that she mentions God more frequently, she finds that to "pronounce his name" is not "efficacious." Mrs. Moore's sense that her words, or any human words, are futile, is even more apparent when she attends Fielding's tea party and she asks Aziz and Fielding if she made a "blunder," or gave "offense" to Mrs. Bhattacharya. Fielding's tea party illustrates Mrs. Moore's disappointment with the relationships at the Bridge Party, her growing fear that love and God do not create unity, and her disappointment with Ronny and Adela's relationship. Fielding states that the fact that the Bhattacharyas did not take Mrs. Moore's words seriously is merely a "misunderstanding," and Aziz
states that the Bhattacharyas "grew ashamed of their house and that is why they did not send" (68-69). But the explanation that seems to impress Mrs. Moore the most is Fielding's statements that "A mystery is a muddle," and therefore "India's a muddle." In response to this, Mrs. Moore exclaims "India's____ Oh, what an alarming idea!" (69). Mrs. Moore increasingly acknowledges the insufficiency of words to convey truth. That she leaves "India's" unfinished indicates the "unspeakable" quality of mystery; and also, perhaps more significantly, the ellipsis after "India's____" foreshadows Mrs. Moore's vision of humanity's nothingness and emptiness in the Marabar caves.

To add to Mrs. Moore's anxiety over the inability of words to convey mystery and truth, Adela prematurely tells Aziz that she will not be staying in India (73). Mrs. Moore becomes "flustered and put out" (74) when she hears Adela confide this personal decision to Aziz. She came to India because of the relationship between Ronny and Adela, and the narrative voice tells us that she "regretted" that "she had not kept to the real serious subject that had caused her visit" (52). For she finds that her "sudden sense of unity" that she experienced as a result of her meeting with Aziz in the mosque is jeopardized by human words and actions.

In addition, Fielding's tea party foreshadows Mrs.
Moore's envy of Adela after the Marabar cave incident when the narrative voice tells us that Mrs. Moore thinks that "she [was] actually envious of Adela" (209). Adela describes Mrs. Moore as her "best friend" (248). Mrs. Moore describes Aziz as her "real friend" (97) who is "very charming" and "very good" (149). The narrative voice tells us that when Mrs. Moore remembers Aziz in the mosque she "suddenly" becomes "vital and young" (143). However, in the same way that the narrative voice describes how Mrs. Moore's "appropriate life" as an "elderly lady" returns to her "with a rush" when she returns to the club from the mosque and hears Adela speak, Adela's voice once again "unintentionally break[s]" the "spell" (143) when she begins to speak to Aziz about her relationship with Ronny. Mrs. Moore's vision of "unity" with the "heavenly bodies" is threatened when Adela implies to Aziz that she will not marry Ronny: the intimacy involved in Adela's disclosure to Aziz implies separation rather than unity. Adela's statement to Aziz also seems to suggest to Mrs. Moore that her experience with Aziz in the mosque was not visionary and exclusive; and the reader will recall that the narrative voice conflates the terms "mosque" and "temple" when it says that for Aziz "The temple of another creed, Hindu, Christian, or Greek, would have bored him" (19). The narrative voice describes Chandrapore's temples as "ineffective"; and, perhaps foreshadowing Fielding's tea
party, it states that Chandrapore's houses are situated so that they "deter all but the invited guest" (7). Furthermore, Mrs. Moore's reason for being in India is now unnecessary. Mrs. Moore begins to become jealous not only of Adela's attempted relationship with Aziz, but also of Adela's ability to use words to develop relationships. Perhaps the human emotion of jealousy is another factor that leads Mrs. Moore to her vision of human nothingness.

To describe and emphasize the division which results at Fieldings tea party, the narrative voice says that by the time Ronny arrives to retrieve Adela and Mrs. Moore, "Every one was cross or wretched. It was as if irritation exuded from the very soil" (78). The narrative voice alludes to this "irritation" and division at the beginning of the novel when it refers to Chandrapore's residents as "mud moving" and describes how the Ganges "might be expected to wash the excrescence back into the soil." It is at this point in the novel that Godbole attempts his own vision of unity through his invocation to Krishna. Like Mrs. Moore, Godbole is described by the narrative voice as an individual who is "elderly," and therefore close to "encountering Ancient Night" (76) or death. The reader will recall that the narrative voice earlier in the novel described Mrs. Moore's vision of her unity with the "heavenly bodies" with whom she is caught in the "shawl of
night." Mrs. Moore listens to Godbole's song of the "unknown bird" (78), and hears Godbole's explanation:

    I placed myself in the position of a milkmaiden. I say to Shri Krishna, 'Come! come to me only.' The god refuses to come. I grow humble and say: Do not come to me only. Multiply yourself into a hundred Krishnas, and let one go to each of my hundred companions, but one, O Lord of the Universe, come to me.' He refuses to come. This is repeated several times. . . .

    "But He comes in some other song, I hope?" said Mrs. Moore gently."

    "Oh no, he refuses to come," repeated Godbole, perhaps not understanding her question. "I say to Him, Come, come, come, come come come. He neglects to come."

    Ronny's steps had died away, and there was a moment of absolute silence. No ripple disturbed the water, no leaf stirred (80).

Mrs. Moore's question to Godbole, "But He comes in some other song, I hope?" reflects her anxiety and her sense
that she has lost her sense of "unity" with the "heavenly bodies"; and the intent of her question is literal. Godbole's response that "Oh no, he refuses to come" refers to the Hindu celebration of the birth of Krishna, and to the idea that God cannot be "apprehended except" when he is "unattainable." The god in Godbole's song is an "emblem," like the "images of Ganpati, baskets of ten-day corn, tiny tazis after Mohurram-scapegoats," and husks" that are "thrown year after year into the ocean as "emblems of passage" (314) between the humanity and God. However, Mrs. Moore does not comprehend the significance of Godbole's song. After the tea party, her sense of "unity" vanishes completely. Her despair as a result of this loss of "unity" causes her to withdraw further from the human world.

In response to Ronny's question of whether or not she is "pledged" to the "expedition" to the Marabar caves, Mrs. Moore states prophetically that she is "pledged to nothing" (82). And it is interesting that the narrative voice puts the word "pledged" in the mouth of the legal-minded Ronny to describe the Marabar expedition. Some of the word's implications are contractual and imply a "binding promise or agreement to do or forbear." As we shall see, the Marabar caves cause Adela "to do" and Mrs. Moore to "forbear." In addition, that Mrs. Moore is "pledged to
nothing" refers also to the reason why she came to India: Ronny, the narrative voice tells us, "commissioned her [Mrs. Moore] to bring" (24) Adela to Chandrapore so that the young woman could decide whether or not to accept his marriage proposal. Mrs. Moore knows, from Adela's comment to Aziz, that the marriage will not take place; and therefore, Mrs. Moore knows that her "commission" is over and that there is "nothing" more for her to do in India. In addition to feeling that she has lost her sense of unity with the "heavenly bodies," Mrs. Moore also feels that she has lost her sense of unity with the human world. As we shall see, Mrs. Moore escapes from her feelings of alienation by further isolating herself in sleep and dreams.

The next scene that is important to our understanding of the Marabar cave expedition is Ronny and Adela's automobile ride with the Nawab Bahadur. Immediately preceding their excursion, Adela tells Ronny that she does not want to marry him. The narrative voice describes how these two characters feel about their romance:

"I think we shall keep friends."

"I know we shall."

"Quite so."

As soon as they had exchanged this admission, a wave of relief passed through them both, and then transformed
itself into a wave of tenderness, and passed back. They were softened by their own honesty, and began to feel lonely and unwise. Experiences, not character, divided them: they were not dissimilar, as humans go; indeed, when compared with the people who stood nearest to them in point of space they became practically identical" (85)

Not only has Mrs. Moore distanced herself from the human, but the narrative voice seems to be at a vast distance from the couple when it makes the statement that "they were not dissimilar, as humans go." This is one of the many statements in the novel which illustrates how the narrative voice deliberately sets itself apart from human beings. It also implies that their agreement that they will "keep friends" is akin to a false mystical experience: "a wave of relief passed through them...and then transformed itself into a wave of tenderness, and passed back." Note how the reference to water ("wave") recalls Lucy's exchange with Mr. Emerson, and it also recalls Mrs. Moore's experience of "unity" with "the heavenly bodies" which is likened to "water" moving in and out of a "tank." The reader will also recall that the narrative voice of A Room With A View states in regard to Lucy and George that there "is at times
a magic in identity of position" (52). Adela and Ronny are "practically identical," yet they do not have the "magic" of George and Lucy. Their feeling of "relief" stems from the fact that this is their first intimate exchange since Adela arrived in Chandrapore. The narrative voice goes further to describe how Adela's "hand touched" Ronny's "owing to a jolt, and one of the thrills so frequent in the animal kingdom passed between them, and announced that all their difficulties were only a lover's quarrel" (88).

The narrative voice suggests that Ronny and Adela's "quarrel" is solved when they become sexually excited ("one of the thrills so frequent in the animal kingdom"). However, the narrative voice says that their union is not complete because it is "spurious" as the "night" which, although it seems absolute unto itself, is only one aspect of the entire physical universe when it is comprehended in conjunction with the "gleams of day" and "the stars" (88). In addition, it is ironic that Ronny and Adela experience their "animal thrill" of touch while they are in an automobile which is a man-made machine. As we have seen in Where Angels Fear To Tread and A Room With A View, the narrative voice uses the term "machine" to describe people (like Mrs. Herriton and Mr. Beebe) who scorn individuality and lack human passion and sympathy. Thus, when Adela and Ronny experience sexual excitement in an automobile, the narrative voice emphasizes the mechanical and purely
physical quality of their love. The narrative voice further emphasizes the mechanical and physical aspects of Adela and Ronny's love when it states that Ronny instructs the chauffeur to take the Marabar road which leads to the Marabar caves. Almost as a gesture to protest the existence of the automobile and Ronny and Adela's mechanical experience of love, a "large animal rush[es] up out of the dark" (89) and hits the car. The narrative voice tells us that Adela is not frightened by this experience. In fact, "in her excitement [she] knelt and swept her skirts about, until it was she if anyone who appeared to have attacked the car" (90). Later in the novel, when Adela is following Aziz to one of the caves while she is thinking about her marriage to Ronny, the narrative voice says that

she thought, 'What about love?' The rock was nicked by a double row of footholds, and somehow the question was suggested by them. Where had she seen footholds before? Oh yes, they were the pattern traced in the dust by the wheels of the Nawab Bahadur's car. She and Ronny – no, they did not love each other (152).

Adela's question "'What about love?" brings to mind Mrs.
Moore and Ronny's conversation earlier in the novel when Ronny explains that he is not in India "to be pleasant," and Mrs. Moore responds to him with her argument about love. Ronny's conception of love and marriage is similar to his conception of religion which is the "sterilized Public School brand. . .the spiritual outlook of the Fifth Form" (257). In order to properly conform to his Anglo-Indian role as Chandrapore's City Magistrate, Ronny must marry a woman who is willing to accept his "sterilized," or passionless idea of marriage. The narrative voice emphasizes this point when, after Adela agrees to marry Ronny, it comments: "His voice grew complacent again; he was here not to be pleasant. . .she was sure to understand" (96).

Adela's question about love also recalls the narrative voice's comment that, after the couple agree to marriage, "unlike the green bird or the hairy animal, she (Adela) was labelled now. She felt humiliated again, for she deprecated labels, and she felt too that there should have been another scene between her lover and herself at this point" (94). That the narrative voice connects Adela's experience with Ronny in the Nawab Bahadur's car to her experience with the Marabar caves indicates that the couple's "animal thrill" is sexual arousal, but, like the Marabar cave's echo, is not love. Adela senses this incompleteness when she is disappointed that there is "not
another scene," or another opportunity to make love, or at least another opportunity to talk about love with her "lover" before they tell Mrs. Moore of their engagement. The narrative voice says that Ronny, being faithful to his "Fifth Form" attitude, "had really nothing to say" (94). When the narrative voice says that Adela is "labelled," it prepares the reader for the Marabar episode where she realizes that "There was esteem and animal contact at dusk, but the emotion that links them was absent" (152). While Mrs. Moore responds to her lost sense of unity by retreating into her private world of dreams, Adela responds to her lost sense of identity by conforming to the standards set forth by the Anglo-Indian women, and she becomes that which the label implies.

While Ronny and Adela interpret their experience of "animal thrill" in the Nawab Bahadur's car as love, and they become engaged as a result of it, when they tell Mrs. Moore about the accident she responds by "shiver[ing]," and impulsively states that what hit the car was "A ghost" (97). In addition, although he does not tell the young couple, the Nawab Bahadur is terrified because he believes that what hit the car is the ghost of a man he accidentally had driven over on the same road when he first owned the car; and the narrative voice appears to confirm the Nawab Bahadur's and Mrs. Moore's beliefs that a "ghost" hit the
car when it says that "the man continued to wait in an unspeakable form, close to the scene of the death" (99). That the car, however, is dented and the paint is stripped-off of it as a result of the collision suggests that the "unspeakable" is at least a manifestation of a physical form. The "unspeakable" form in this sense suggests that Ronny and Adela's "wave of tenderness" is primarily physical and not spiritual; and for Forster, love requires both the flesh and the spirit. This incident foreshadows and parallels the Marabar cave incident in that the narrative voice does not identify what exactly hit the car. The "unspeakable form" that hits the car is another aspect of the "unspeakable" form that approaches both Adela and Mrs. Moore in the Marabar caves.

When the narrative voice returns to Mrs. Moore after describing Adela and Ronny's "animal thrill" in the Nawab Bahadur's car, it says that Ronny and Adela wake her up while she is dreaming (95). From the beginning of the novel, the narrative voice says that Adela has the effect of reminding Mrs. Moore of her human, or "appropriate" existence. The reader will recall that when Mrs. Moore returns to the club from the mosque where she meets Aziz, Adela's voice causes Mrs. Moore's "appropriate life" to come "back with a rush." Not surprisingly, when Adela and Ronny approach Mrs. Moore to tell her of their engagement, she "did not first grasp what was required of her" (95).
In the same way that Adela's voice at the beginning of the novel reminds Mrs. Moore ("with a rush") that she is an "elderly lady," and in the same way that Fielding's explanation of India is "alarming" (69) to Mrs. Moore, when Mrs. Moore is summoned out of her dream she "felt alarmed when it came to an end" (95). Moreover, Mrs. Moore's state of mind when she is dreaming is similar to her state of mind when she meets Aziz in the mosque at the beginning of the novel.

Except for during her discussion with Aziz in the mosque, Mrs. Moore's other children, Ralph and Stella, have not been mentioned in the novel thus far. The narrative voice presents Ralph and Stella as part of Mrs. Moore's subconscious, or mystical mind. Thus, it is significant that Mrs. Moore does not speak about Ralph and Stella with Adela whom, the narrative voice states, "unintentionally break[s] a spell" (143) when she interrupts Mrs. Moore and Aziz's only conversation that refers directly to their experience of happiness in the mosque. Adela and Ronny associate Mrs. Moore with her "appropriate life" which is connected to the duties that society imposes upon her as a mother. However, the sense of nothingness that Mrs. Moore pledges herself to after Fielding's tea pervades both her mystical and "appropriate" life. She says that she "really can't have" Adela and Ronny's "quarreling and
tiresomeness!" (82) which serves only to confirm her feeling that nothing, not even her role as a mother, has meaning. She can not "speak as enthusiastically of wedlock or of anything" (95). She abandons her attempt to achieve "unity" with the "heavenly bodies," and she tells herself that "she is passed marrying... even unhappily; her function was to help others, her reward to be informed that she was sympathetic. Elderly ladies must not expect more than this" (95). Her "appropriate life" as an "elderly lady" entails the known world and human relationships. Yet she is dissatisfied with her known and her familial relationships because they no longer provide her with a sense of "kinship with the heavenly bodies."

Mrs. Moore knows that she has exhausted all of her human possibilities for relationships: she has had two happy marriages; Ronny no longer needs a maternal relationship; Ralph and Stella are now relegated to her dreams. Although she wants a relationship with God, "She must needs pronounce his name frequently, as the greatest she knew, yet she had never found it less efficacious" (52). Even when she entertains the thought of having a relationship with the Hindu god Krishna, "he refuses to come." The narrative voice articulates Mrs. Moore's desire for unity and her corresponding fear that there is "nothing" that unifies when it states the question to the reader: "Beyond the sky must not there be something that
overarches all the skies, more impartial even than they? Beyond which again..." (40). Mrs. Moore wants to develop a relationship with that which is "Beyond the sky," but before she can develop such a relationship she must first regain her faith in humanity and reconsider the value of human relationships.

When she visits the Marabar caves, rather than being caught in "the shawl of the night" with the "heavenly bodies," she is caught within the "twilight" of her "double vision." Mrs. Moore's dissatisfaction with human relationships is all the more apparent because of Adela's satisfaction about her decision to join the Anglo-Indian women by marrying Ronny. As the two ladies are on the train traveling to the "fists and fingers" of Marabar caves, "Everything seemed cut off at its root, and therefore infected with illusion" (140). Both women have felt ill since Fielding's tea party after which "they had lived more or less inside cocoons, and the difference between them was that the elder lady accepted her own apathy, while the younger resented hers" (133).

In this atmosphere of "illusion," the two women lose consciousness of their true beings, or "root[s]"; they apathetically accept definitions of themselves which they hate, and which they fear the future will impose upon them. For example, Adela looks out of the window of the train and
notices that the train runs parallel with the Marabar road where the accident occurred in the Nawab Bahadur's automobile. She tells Mrs. Moore: "We can't be far from the place where my hyena was," and the narrative voice adds that "Her accident was a pleasant memory, she felt in her dry, honest way that it had given her a good shake up and taught her Ronny's true worth" (135). Adela's recollection of the accident in the Nawab Bahadur's automobile leads her to think about her engagement to Ronny; and she makes a comment that illustrates the degree to which she is beginning to resemble the Anglo-Indian women of Chandrapore and becoming the stereotype she dislikes. Adela criticizes Mrs. McBryde, the wife of the District Superintendent of the Police, because "she leaves her quite intelligent husband alone half the year, and then's surprised she's out of touch with him" (134).

Adela's comment about Mrs. McBryde is clearly the result of her participation in "club gossip" (120) with women like Mrs. Turton, Mrs. Lesley and Mrs. Callendar. Her comment about Mrs. McBryde's marriage also causes her to reflect further about her future marriage to Ronny, which leads her to consult Aziz about her "Anglo-Indian" problem: although she knows that she "can't avoid the label," she hopes to "avoid" the "mentality" which causes English women to "get rude after a year." Her comments, however "insult" Aziz because she "had spoken the truth,"
and thus "broke up their conversation" (145-146). Her reference to her sex, culture and marriage disturbs Aziz who finds it "easy to talk to these English ladies because he can "treat[] them like men." Beauty would have troubled him, for it entails rules of its own, but Mrs. Moore was so old and Miss Quested so plain that he was spared this anxiety" (68). When Adela refers to her marriage, "his mind shut up tight," for he "was not going to be mixed up in that side of things" (146). Adela persists in questioning herself and Dr. Aziz about marriage. As mentioned above, the "footholds" that appear on a rock leading to the second cave where she believes she is assaulted remind her of the accident in the Nawab Bahadur's automobile which leads to her engagement. The narrative voice comments that "she wasn't convinced that love is necessary to a successful union" (152) and she asks Aziz if he is married. As she enters the second cave, she thinks with "half her mind 'sight-seeing bores me,'" and wonders "with the other half about marriage" (153). Like the accident involving the Nawab Bahadur's car, the narrative voice never describes who, if anyone, attacks Adela. Adela cannot define exactly what happened to her in the cave. She eventually tells Fielding that she entered the cave wondering whether or not she loved Ronny; yet she cannot be certain if she followed anyone, or if anyone followed her.
She finally says: "Let us call it the guide. . . It will never be known." She tells Fielding further that Mrs. Moore "did know" through "Telepathy" (263).

Despite the fact that Adela's experience in the cave remains a mystery, her comment about Mrs. McBryde is interesting in light of what we learn of Mr. McBryde. Even though he was himself born at Karachi, Mr. McBryde has a theory that "All unfortunate natives are criminals at heart" (166-167). We also learn that Mrs. McBryde's "intelligent husband" disguises himself as a native "Holy Man" (182) in order to spy on the Indians before Aziz's trial; and soon after Aziz's trial is over, Mrs. McBryde divorces Mr. McBryde because she discovers that he is having an affair with Miss Derek (272). It is extremely ironic that Miss Derek, who finds Adela running down the precipice from the caves after her alleged attack, drives her back to Chandrapore and provides her lover, Mr. McBryde, with the details of the alleged sexual assault.

According to Mr. McBryde, he "couldn't worry her (Adela) overmuch with questions," but he "heard more from Miss Derek" (167-168). As McBryde tells Fielding, Miss Derek said that she found Adela "among some cactuses... she was beginning to fling herself about... Miss Quested couldn't stand the Indian driver, cried 'keep him away' - and it was that that put our friend on the track of what had happened" (168). If in fact Adela was afraid of the
Indian driver, it is more likely that her fear is connected to her accident in the Nawab Bahadur's car when she and Ronny felt "esteem and animal contact"; but, as she realizes just prior to entering the cave, they did not feel love: "the emotion that links them" was "absent." The reader will recall that after the mysterious accident in the Nawab Bahadur's car, it is also Miss Derek who drives everyone back to Chandrapore. One wonders if the sexual attack is not a figment of Miss Derek's imagination rather than Miss Quested's. Perhaps Mr. McBryde, who considers the the 1857 "Mutiny records" of Sepoys as his "Bible," reaches a similar level of fanaticism, or "unspeakable limit of cynicism" (187) and is motivated wholly by self-interest. He believes all Indians are "criminals at heart," and drafts his statement about Miss Quested's attack while he thinks: "Another of them found out" (167). Perhaps he is guilty of the assault: after all, he was born at Karachi, he is having an affair with an Anglo-English woman who is employed by Indians, and he sometimes disguises himself as an Indian. Although it is unclear whether or not Mr. McBryde could have returned to Chandrapore from the Marabar caves in a timely manner to be present for Adela's confession, his disguised identity as an Indian becomes emblematic of the British mentality to metaphorize India as an object and place of violation.
Adela's experience in the cave at least foreshadows and parodies future events in the novel when the narrative voice tells us that Mr. McBryde "had been caught in her (Miss Derek's) room" (272).

Adela states finally that what happened in the cave will "never be known," and the narrative voice does not solve the mystery; it is left deliberately ambiguous so that many facets of meaning can be considered. By implying multiple explanations and possibilities for Adela's experience in the cave, the narrative voice suggests, with Professor Godbole, that "nothing can be performed in isolation. All perform a good action, when one is performed, and when an evil action is performed, all perform it" (177). Godbole's explanation describes how all living beings are part of a whole; and therefore everyone is a victim of, and also the perpetrator of the evil that occurs in the Marabar caves. Although different opinions about the nature of the event suggest division, the event itself is absolute, "unspeakable," and provides an overwhelming unity. Godbole goes on to explain to Fielding his philosophy of good and evil:

"Good and evil are different, as their names imply. But...they are both of them aspects of my Lord. He is present in the one, absent in the other, and the difference between
presence and absence is great. .
.absence implies presence, absence is
not non-existence, and we are
therefore entitled to repeat "come,
come, come, come!" (178).

Godbole refers back to Fielding's tea party and his song of
the "unknown bird" which describes the call to Krishna
("'come, come, come, come'""). As Godbole tells Mrs. Moore
at the tea party, the god "refuses to come." However,
Godbole's notion of God and unity is a paradox: although
"absence implies presence, absence is not not-existence."
This statement supports the idea that many other things,
and characters (such as Mr. McBryde) could have attacked
Adela and Mrs. Moore in the cave; and this statement gives
a greater reality and significance to the visions that Mrs.
Moore and Adela experience in the Marabar caves. 22

Adela's remark about Mrs. McBryde points to her state
of mind and body which have been "under par" (240) since
she attended Fielding's tea party; it also has implications
that relate to her relationship with Anglo-Indian women,
the accident in the Nawab Bahadur's car on the Marabar
road, and finally her accusation against Aziz. Mrs.
Moore's response to Adela's comment similarly indicates her
"low health" and disturbed state of mind. She defends Mrs.
McBryde by saying:
She has children, you see. . .It is the children who are the first consideration. Until they are grown up, and married off. When that happens one has again the right to live for oneself - in the plains or the hills, as suits. . .if one has not become too stupid and old (134-135).

Mrs. Moore's statement that "one" does not have "the right to live for oneself" until one's children are "grown up, and married off" implies that Mrs. Moore believes that children hinder individuality and experience. However, the narrative voice has told us previously that Mrs. Moore has had two "happy marriages," and that she feels that it is "excellent" to "see the incident repeated by younger generations" (95). Mrs. Moore's feeling of nothingness that began to manifest itself at Fieldings tea party is exacerbated by the fact that Mrs. Moore is ill. The narrative voice tells us that she "ought not to have attempted the expedition, but pulled herself together in case the pleasure of others should suffer" (137). 23 The atmosphere of "illusion" that encompasses the Marabar hills makes Mrs. Moore feel "cut off," "stupid and old"; and her cynicism about human relationships and children is part of the "illusion" of the Marabar caves to which "nothing attaches."
To emphasize the Marabar caves' elusiveness, the narrative voice says that "extraordinary" is the only "word" that mankind uses to describes them, yet even that "word" does not accommodate the caves to mankind for it "has taken root in the air" rather than the earth (124). Mrs. Moore's feelings of isolation and despair are finally personified and she:

felt increasingly (vision or nightmare?) that, though people are important, the relations between them are not, and that in particular too much fuss has been made over marriage; centuries of carnal embracement, yet man is not nearer to understanding man. And to-day she felt this with such force that it seemed itself a relationship, itself a person who was trying to take hold of her hand (135).

Mrs. Moore's feeling that "people are important, the relations between them are not" is both a "vision" and a "nightmare." Mrs. Moore's emphasis on the importance of individuals ("people") rather than relationships refers to her own loneliness and isolation. Her feeling is "visionary" in that she is eventually responsible for bringing about a greater "understanding" between the people of India and England. However, because Mrs. Moore feels "old and stupid," and has lost her sense of "unity" with
all the "heavenly bodies," she disconnects herself from her
"happy marriages," her children and her friendships. The
narrative voice reinforces her sense of disconnection when
it describes how Mrs. Moore, while dreaming, tries to
"explain" to Ralph and Stella "that she could not be in two
families at once" (137). Mrs. Moore "attaches" the
nothingness of the Marabar caves to her own life; and,
forgetting her children, she reduces marriage to merely
"carnal embracement." She has reached the "twilight of
double vision," and her "spiritual muddledom" (208) causes
her to believe mistakenly that "nothingness" will be her
final relationship.

Mrs. Moore enters the cave with her feeling that human
relationships lead to nothing other than a relationship
with "nothing." Her experience in the Marabar cave
reflects both a physical and emotional collapse. She can
not maintain two perspectives at once: the cave is filled
with an equal abundance of life and absolute nothingness:

she had nearly fainted in it, and had some
difficulty in preventing herself from saying so
as soon as she got into the air again. It was
natural enough: she had always suffered from
faintness, and the cave had become too full. .
.the chamber began to smell. She lost Aziz and
Adela in the dark, didn't know who touched her,
couldn't breathe, and some vile naked thing
struck her face and settled on her mouth like a pad. She tried to regain the entrance tunnel, but an influx of villagers swept her back. She hit her head. For an instant she went mad, hitting and gasping like a fanatic. For not only did the crush and stench alarm her, there was also a terrifying echo... There are some exquisite echoes in India... The echo in a Marabar cave is not like these, it is entirely devoid of distinction... the monotonous noise replies, and quivers up and down... it is absorbed into the roof. "Boum" is the sound as far as the human alphabet can express it, or "bou-oum," or "ou-boum," - utterly dull. Hope, politeness, the blowing of a nose, the squeak of a boot, all produce "boum"... the cave is stuffed with a snake composed of small snakes, which writhe independently (147-148).

Like Adela's experience in the cave, Mrs. Moore's experience in the cave has physical implications. Unlike Adela's experience which serves to inform her that her relationship with Ronny is one of "esteem" and "animal contact" but not love, Mrs. Moore's experience in the cave serves to inform her that unity, "as far as the human alphabet can express it," sounds like "Boum," and is
"entirely devoid of distinction." Rather than uttering a message of mere nothingness and "distinction," the Marabar cave echoes with the sound of human beings and life. The cave "began to smell," she "couldn't breathe," "some vile naked thing struck her face," "She hit her head," and "she went mad." Shortly after Mrs. Moore has a vision of human disunity which "try[ies] to take hold of her hand" as if it is a "relationship"; and shortly after she feels that "relations" between people amount merely to "carnal embracement," "some vile naked thing" hits her in the face while she is in the Marabar cave. Mrs. Moore is accidentally assaulted by a baby which reminds her not only of the importance of human relations for future generations, but also reminds her that she can no longer participate in sexual relations to bear children.

Although Mrs. Moore is provided with a vision of human unity and fecundity in the Marabar cave, like Adela she interprets her vision as something violent and evil: "As each person emerged she looked for a villain, but none was there" (148). Almost as a last appeal to human relationships, Mrs. Moore attempts to write to her children, but she finds that she cannot write further than "Dear Stella, Dear Ralph." The "more she thought over it (the Marabar cave), the more disagreeable and frightening it became"; and she comes to the conclusion that "Everything exists, nothing has value" (149):
But suddenly, at the edge of her mind, Religion appeared, poor little talkative Christianity, and she knew that all its divine words from "Let there be Light" to "It is finished" only amounted to "boum." Then she was terrified over an area larger than usual; the universe, never comprehensible to her intellect, offered no repose to her soul, the mood of the last two months took definite form at last, and she realized that she didn't want to write to her children, didn't want to communicate with anyone, not even with God (150).

In the same way that Adela interprets her vision of love and sexuality in the Marabar cave as a personal attack upon her relationship with Ronny, Mrs. Moore interprets her vision of the absolute unity of humanity ("boum") as a personal attack upon her own existence. All she knows of human life amounts to a word that she cannot apprehend or articulate. Since she cannot participate in human relations in the ways that are familiar to her sexually and religiously, she decides not to participate at all. Whereas Adela's "faith that the whole stream of events is
important. . .compelled her lips to utter enthusiasms" and causes her to attach meaning to her vision in the Marabar cave, Mrs. Moore accepts her "apathy" (133) and she "surrendered to the vision" (150). She sees that her own potential for personal intercourse with the human realm is coming to an end. Her visit to the Marabar caves emphasizes her anxiety in abandoning her relationship with human beings, and in beginning her relationship with the "unspeakable" life after death. She becomes a "withered priestess" (208) who finds human connection repulsive, and divine connection as "tedious. . .trivial": "Unto us a Son is born, unto us a Child is given. . . and am I good and is he bad and are we saved?. . .and ending everything the echo" (205). Mrs. Moore realizes the ultimate futility of words to explain the complexity of human life and all existence.

However, she interprets the "echo" and the "boum" as a statement of meaningless and nothingness rather than unity. Christianity describes humanity with many words, and the Marabar cave describes humanity with a singular echo which sounds like "Boum." Mrs. Moore senses only division when she is confronted with two ways to describe reality. Even though Mrs. Moore may realize that "Poor talkative Christianity" and "Boum" are unified in that they describe humanity, she "surrenders" to the belief that the existence of one belief implies the non-existence of all belief:
"Every thing exists, nothing has value." Mrs. Moore's illness causes her to believe that presence implies absence, and that absence is non-existence. Words are the primary ways she has communicated and interpreted religion and reality. When words are rendered ineffective and meaningless to her because of the Marabar's reduction of reality to "boum," Mrs. Moore refuses to speak:

"Say, say, say," said the old lady bitterly. "As if anything can be said! I have spent my life in saying or in listening to sayings; I have listened too much...when I have seen you and Ronny married, and seen the other two and whether they want to be married - I'll retire then into a cave of my own. . . Some shelf" (200).

Many critics refer to this scene to support their view that A Passage To India reveals only a bleak, and despairing view of human relations and life. However, although Mrs. Moore initially interprets her vision of the Marabar caves as division, India's coconut trees provide Mrs. Moore with the final words to define her human relationships, and they give her a final vision of unity. As she leaves Bombay, heading back to the west, she looks out on the landscape and the narrative voice tells us:
The feet of the horses moved her on, and presently the boat sailed and thousands of coconut palms appeared all round the anchorage and climbed the hills to wave her farewell. "So you thought an echo was India; you took the Marabar caves as final?" they laughed. "What have we in common with them, or they with Asirgarh? Good-bye!" (210).

The narrative voice personifies the coconut trees, which are "endowed with more strength than man or his works," and the trees "wave farewell" to Mrs. Moore and tell her that her echo and vision in the Marabar was not "final." Mrs. Moore's vision of nothingness in the Marabar's articulation of unity as "boum" is modified by the trees who state that they are not part of the echo. Mrs. Moore realizes that she "has not seen the right places" (209), and that the vision of the Marabar caves is merely one vision, distinction, or opinion among "a hundred voices" (322) that describe the unity of "the hundred Indias" (210). Ironically, the trees describe their distinction from the Marabar caves in the human words which Mrs. Moore has come to distrust. The coconut trees communicate with Mrs. Moore in a language and voice that she can understand; the tone of the tree's words and the narrative voice appears
understated and decidedly British: "they laughed," and "Goodbye!".

The physical and unknown universe accommodates itself to humanity by communicating with Mrs. Moore in human words that are familiar to her. In death, Mrs. Moore is provided with a vision of the importance of human relations, and from the vantage point of death she is able to return to Chandrapore to help the human beings whom she abandoned during the "nightmare" of her relationship to nothingness. The narrative voice describes how Mrs. Moore's body is "committed to the deep while still on the southward track" (257). Mrs. Moore in the form of a "ghost" follows the ship until the Red Sea, and then, the narrative voice suggests, she returns to Chandrapore, and to Aziz's trial, to communicate her vision of "unity" and "kinship with the heavenly bodies" to the people whom she has left behind.

When Mrs. Moore dies, she no longer belongs to the realm of the human, or to the realm of character; and, as many critics suggest, she becomes an abstract idea that represents the unity that the end of the novel attempts to achieve. However, her presence in the narrative goes beyond abstract idea, and she becomes a character who becomes a function of story by aligning itself with the narrative voice. For example, when Aziz's trial begins, Adela meditates on the "man who pulled the punkah" (217),
and suddenly, the narrative voice states, she thinks "Mrs. Moore - she looked round...While thinking of Mrs. Moore she heard sounds, which gradually grew more distinct" (218). In addition, the narrative voice states that "Mrs. Moore, burst on the court like a whirlwind" (224), and the Indians evoke her as the Hindu goddess "Esmiss Esmour...suddenly it stopped. It was as if the prayer had been heard, and the relics exhibited" (224-225). The magistrate must "repeat that as a witness Mrs. Moore does not exist" (226); and finally, while Adela provides her testimony, she finds that a

new and unknown sensation protected her like magnificent armour. She didn't remember in the ordinary way of memory, but she returned to the Marabar Hills, and spoke from them across a sort of darkness to Mr. McBryde (227).

The narrative voice comments throughout the book how Adela's voice has the effect of "breaking a spell" and bringing back Mrs. Moore's "appropriate" or human life "with a rush." The narrative voice says that "Smoothly the voice in the distance proceeded, leading along the paths of truth" (228). Adela returns to the Marabar Hills, and perhaps she regards them now from the vantage point of Mrs. Moore. She does not remember "in the ordinary way of memory." In the same way that Mrs. Moore's voice "floated
out, to swell the night's uneasiness," Adela speaks across a "sort of darkness." In addition, the narrative voice says that "Something that she did not understand took hold of the girl and pulled her through," and she withdraws her charge with "hard prosaic tones" (230). After the trial, some of the natives "addressed her as Mrs. Moore!" (233). Mrs. Moore's perceived presence in the courtroom not only exonerates Aziz, but it also provides the "very very fair" and reasonable "minded" (34) Adela Quested with mystical vision and truth. 26

Mrs. Moore creates more unity by dying than she could have comprehended in her life. The narrative voice describes how Mrs. Moore's "death took subtler and more lasting shapes in Chandrapore. A legend sprang up that an Englishman had killed his mother for trying to save an Indian's life" (256); and Mrs. Moore's death starts the "beginning of a cult" (257). Later in the novel, Adela describes her experience in court to Fielding, and her statement, "My friend Mrs. Moore believes in ghosts," causes the two people to have a discussion of whether or not there is life after death. Even though they both agree that the "dead don't live again" (241), their discussion provides an intimacy and friendship which eventually surpasses the circumstances of India. In addition, Mrs. Moore's spiritual existence leaves an impression upon both
Adela and the "frank atheist" Fielding and they wonder: "How could she have known what we don't?" (263). When Adela asserts "Telepathy," she quickly "withdraws it"; however, the narrative voice adds "They had not the apparatus for judging" (263). Fielding loses his "usual sane view of human intercourse, and felt we exist not in ourselves, but in terms of each others' minds (250). Adela continues in Mrs. Moore's role as an agent of connection by introducing Ralph and Stella Moore to Fielding. Ronny eventually forgives Fielding by virtue of the fact that he marries Stella. In a letter to Fielding, Ronny commends him for being "able to come into line with the Oppressors of India to some extent"; and he asks Fielding to "give her (Adela) some sort of message" because he wants to "make [his] peace with her too" (307) In turn, Fielding introduces Ralph and Stella to Aziz who is finally able to forgive Adela for her false accusation by telling her in a letter that he will connect her to the name of Mrs. Moore.

When Godbole "impell[s]" Mrs. Moore, along with the "wasp" to "that place where completeness can be found," Mrs. Moore achieves a final relationship with God, all the "heavenly bodies," and the narrative voice itself. Like the first chapter of the novel, the last chapter ends by reasserting the inferiority of human beings; and in much the same way that the palm trees speak to Mrs. Moore before she dies, the physical universe and the physical structures
of man respond in human words to Fielding's question to Aziz "Why can't we be friends now?" (322):

But the horses didn't want it - they swerved apart; the earth didn't want it...the temples, the tank the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion, the Guest House...they didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, "No, not yet," and the sky said, "no, not there" (322).

Although Fielding and Aziz attempt friendship and unity in the novel, they both eventually surrender to the barriers of politics, culture, sex and race. The narrative voice states that "socially they had no meeting-place." In marrying Stella Moore, Fielding becomes aligned with Anglo-India and "aquir[ed] some of its limitations"; Aziz was a "memento, a trophy" (319) of his past "heroism." Aziz does not "want to meet Stella and Ralph again...and felt good old Cyril to be a bit clumsy" (320). Fielding and Aziz recognize and accept the human limitations that politics, sex, culture and race supply. Unlike Mrs. Moore whose vision of human diversity in the Marabar cave frightens her to the point that she temporarily loses any sense of human value, Fielding and Aziz remain aware of only the "speakable" aspects of existence. The narrative
voice states that for Fielding and Aziz the "divisions of daily life were returning, the shrine had almost shut" (321). While Ralph and Stella Moore continue their mother's visionary legacy and "like Hinduism, though they take no interest in its forms" (320), Fielding and Aziz continue to approach the "unspeakable" through political and poetic words.

However, they are not men of vision who, like Godbole, can transcend the realm of the human through mystical vision and "apprehend" God (315). Mrs. Moore "apprehend[s] . . . the unattainable" vision of God in death; and she "comes" to a point of "completeness." Mrs. Moore's "completeness" allows her to, like the palm trees, translate the message of the "hundred voices" of the "unspeakable" world. These voices tell Fielding and Aziz that they cannot even "apprehend" the possibility of a relationship until they understand that it is "not to be apprehended except when it is unattainable" - that is, until they abandon the "divisions of daily life." Although Fielding and Aziz have successful family and marital relationships, their friendship is unsuccessful because of the social and political differences between England and India. Ironically, Mrs. Moore and England seem to have the "final" word on the relationship when the "unspeakable" world translates the Hindu concept of incompleteness ("not now, not here" (314)) into phrases that are British in tone
and accent: the "hundred voices" say "No, not yet," and the sky, which "settles everything," says "No, not there" (322).
Notes For Chapter Three

1E. M. Forster, *A Room With A View* (New York: Random House Inc., 1961). All quotations will be from this edition and will be documented in the text by page number.


this view by focusing upon the Forster as artist and liberal humanist. In E. M. Forster (London: The Hogarth Press, 1944) 138, Trilling states that the "book simply involves the question in ultimates. This, obviously, is no answer; still, it defines the scope of a possible answer. . . Great as the problem of India is, Forster's book is not about India alone; it is about all of human life." James McConkey sees the novel as "the perfect union of rhythm and voice" (13). J. B. Beer, in The Achievement of E. M. Forster (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1962), views the novel as a "fusion of vision and realism" (164).


6My reading of the novel has been influenced by Thomson and Stone.

7See Rosecrance 193. Rosecrance describes the "phallic energy" of the Marabar caves.

8For a discussion of the way Forster uses mythology see Crews 138-140. See also Stephen K. Land, Challenge and Conventionality in the Fiction of E. M. Forster (New York: AMS Press, 1990) 216 - 217. Land states that "While the conventional and liberal attitudes, in A Passage To India as in Forster's earlier novels, provide the poles of the novel's moral dualism on an ethical level, temple and caves
provide the poles of a largely new mystical dualism on a metaphysical level. The mysticism which had operated only sporadically in the other novels here becomes an integral part of the structure of the story."


10"Profane" in this context should be understood in regard to the word's etymological meaning, "before [or outside of] the temple" that is, existing in the ordinary, non-sacred world. As such the term does not necessarily imply "contempt for sacred things."

11All critics agree that the Mrs. Moore's vision in the cave is central to the novel. Wilde and Crews maintain negation; while Thomson and Stone, with whom I agree, finally maintain integration and reconciliation. Crews makes an intriguing point, however, when he states: "Readers who have claimed that Mrs. Moore has suddenly been transformed from a modest Christian to a mystical Brahmin have had to overlook the prosaic quality of her feelings here. She has had, in effect, an antivision" (156).

12The identity of the protagonist in A Passage To India covers a broad range of issues. Most critics who focus on the relationship between Fielding and Aziz often initially base their arguments on the political and social
to that of F. P. W. McDowell, E. M. Forster (New York: Twayne Publisher, Inc., 1960), who sees Mrs. Moore as the "tutelary genius of for the book" (124). My view is also close to Thomson and Stone; but I do not focus so much on the psychological and symbolic as I do on Mrs. Moore's interplay with the narrative voice. See also Ellen Horowitz, "The Communal Ritual and the Dying God in E. M. Forster's A Passage To India," Criticism, VI (Winter, 1964, 70-88).

13See Thomson who states that "Mrs. Moore provides the human center for that narrative interdependence of good and evil which reaches out to include being and not-being, Temple and Marabar" (248).

14See Crews 158.

15Thomson 235.

16Many critics note with Martin how "the "inarticulate world" slowly insinuates itself as potentially more powerful than the efforts of man" (159). I see that the "inarticulate" world as part of the visionary experience of man. See also Thomson, 18, who states that the lack of realism and psychological realism in the novel is due to the fact that Forster's characters are "romance types who do not lend themselves to psychological analysis." This supports my view that the lack of psychology and realism allows for vision and mysticism.

17Wild also makes this observation: "It is significant
that Aziz is first attracted by Mrs. Moore's voice, for voices are important to Forster; they betray personality, and Mrs. Moore's youthful voice announces her spirit" (126).

extroverted consciousness in the following way: "All (phenomenal) things are perceived as one. Though the mystic sees trees, people, houses and so on, they appear to be mysteriously identical and/or rooted in some unity which lies behind them... The world is experienced as alive, or conscious, or as intimately rooted in life and consciousness; it is a 'living presence.'"

See Sir James George Frazer, ed., and Trans., Publili Ovidii Nasonis Pastorum Libri Sex: The Fasti of Ovid, Vol. 1 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1929) 3-19. In Ovid's Fasti, a poetical treatise on the Roman Calendar, Ovid stresses that beginnings and endings were intricately connected and signified a whole. This is interesting in light of the etymology of the greek god Janus' name which derives from the Latin meaning "going," and is further connected with the word "Janua" which, in addition to the month of January, signifies a "door," or "passageway." Janus is the two faced god of gateways and beginnings. Images of doubleness and double beginnings pervade A Passage To India, and serve to emphasize the dual vision of reality and love. Mrs. Moore and Aziz's meeting in the mosque takes place "just as the cold weather is ending" (21) and before May which is the estimated time of Adela and Ronny's marriage (134). In an interview with Angus Wilson, Forster referred to Mrs. Moore's experience in the cave as "the vision with its back turned." See Angus Wilson, "A
Conversation With E. M. Forster," *Encounter*, November (1957) 11. Wilde also sees the "double" significance of Aziz and Mrs. Moore's meeting: "It becomes clear that the symbolism of the word "mosque" is double" (128).

20See Martin 159.


23See Furbank 43.

24See for example Rosecrance, Wilde and Crews.

25See Rosecrance who says "Mrs. Moore as Hindu goddess is a not inappropriate "travestry," because she has been closest of any Western character to the Hindu identification of divine love with all matter. Mrs. Moore herself cannot come, not only because she is dead, a fact known only to
Forster, who withholds it here from characters and reader alike. Now summoned by the Indian populace, she "comes" to rescue her friend. . Forster places his characters in the position of the God, a role they are unable to assume—illustrating again the human separation from meaning" (219).

26See Thomson who refers to Adela's testimony in court as a "psychic" rather than psychological "breakdown" (210).

27See John Colmer, E. M. Forster: The Personal Voice, (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978). Colmer notes that the "superiority of Forster's last novel rests as much on the triumph of voice as the triumph of vision. Voice has special importance for Forster. Both in life and in art he identifies and recalls people through voice" (172). Colmer also notes that "The mediating voice of the author, transmitting the message of India, confirms the insight of the 'divine fool', Ralph Moore, who also uses the phrase 'Not yet', when Aziz says that "the two nations cannot be friends." "I know. Not yet'" (161). Colmer notices the British tone of these phrases by pointing out how Ralph Moore uses one of them. See also Rosecrance who states that "Forster's voice moves toward confrontation with the implications of his vision. As his perspective recedes to infinity, so, as events have verified, Forster the novelist reaches impasse" (236). See also Suleri who says of the last sentence of the novel: "With this
concluding sentence, even the difference of india is subsumed into a trope for a vacant and inexplicable rejection. It becomes instead an unimaginable space which cannot be inhabited by the present tense, resisting even the European attempt to coax it into metaphoricity" (175).
CONCLUSION

I will now endeavor to develop some tentative conclusions about Forster's narrative voice that my interpretations of *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, *A Room With A View* and *A Passage To India* provide. To do this, I will focus upon the presence of an element that occurs throughout all three novels, but which I have not addressed directly in my foregoing discussion. The narrative voice introduces letters at the conclusion of all three of the novels I discuss, and these letters provide another event which character addresses in its attempt define experience. As I mentioned earlier, Forster states in *Aspects* that the novel, like our relationships with human beings, is defined by "our affection for it," and "anything else we cannot define." ¹ The protagonists in the three novels that I discuss all have an experience which they "cannot define" in spoken human words. The characters' inability to define experience parallels the narrative voice's detachment from the reader, and it also foreshadows its ultimate refusal to provide a definition, or an interpretation of itself.

The characters' inability to define experience makes them appear to be characters who are limited, or "flat" stereotypes; and in all three cases, the protagonist requires another figure to act as an intermediary, or
conduit of information, between the protagonist and a the totalizing experience of "the other." This intermediary provides character with a circumlocutory interpretation of experience; and it therefore evokes the characters' simultaneous desire and inability to describe the subject of its experience. By circumlocutory I mean "the use of an unnecessarily large number of words to express an idea," and "evasion in speech." This circumlocutory figure becomes a figure that exposes and exists within the implied space between character and narrative voice, the narrative voice and the reader, and the sign and the signifier. When the narrative voice describes a character's use of a circumlocutory intermediary figure, it points to both the character's, and its own elision.

Philip's ineffable experience involves his relationship to art, society, and his potential for expressing human love. The limitations of Philip's conception of art and society are exposed through his experiences in Italy, and through his perception of the potentialities of human love and truth that Gino Carella and Caroline Abbott display. However, Philip erroneously concludes that "love of beauty" and art triumphs while "human love and love of truth" fails. The two-fold possibilities of friendship with Gino, and love with Caroline become for Philip totalizing objects which he defines only in aesthetic terms. His decision not to
define his feelings of affection for Caroline Abbott is related to his friendship with Gino for it is essentially a pretense that is maintained only through epistolary.

The narrative voice informs the reader of the valuelessness of written words in letters when it describes in the first chapter of the novel how the sparrows eat Mrs. Herriton's peas, but leave the "countless fragments" of Mrs. Theobold's letter to "disfigur[e] the tidy ground" (20). Like his mother, Philip cannot distinguish between the pretense of written words and the reality of human love and truth. Thus, the advice that Gino provides Philip in letters is elevated to the abstraction of art. As art, Philip does not consider Gino's written words of advice as realistic, or necessary. The narrative voice describes early in the novel that when the Herritons' solicitors translate Gino's letters from Italian into English, Philip acknowledges that Gino's sincerity and intimacy are due to "merely tricks of expression," and that "A bounder's a bounder, whether he lives in Sawston or Monteriano" (91). However, by the end of the novel, the narrative voice describes Philip as being "bound" by the "bounder" Gino through his letters which provide "ties of almost alarming intimacy." The narrative voice continues to describe the effect of Gino's letters upon Philip when it says that Gino had the southern knack of friendship.
...for he was a kind as well as a skilful operator. But Philip came away feeling that he had not a secret corner left. In that very letter Gino had again implored him, as a refuge from domestic difficulties, "to marry Miss Abbott, even if her dowry is small" (174-175).

Gino's letter's "almost alarm[]" Philip into action; but in much the same way that Aziz continues to concieve of Mrs. Moore as an aspect of the mosque, Philip continues to view Caroline as chaste goddess with whom he cannot communicate realistically in society. Like Mrs. Moore's effect upon Aziz, Gino provides Philip with a "feeling" of friendship. However, unlike Mrs. Moore who provides Aziz with "secret understanding" outside of words, Gino's letters make Philip feel that "he had not a secret corner left." The epistolary communication between Gino and Philip is the circumlocutory figure in the novel for it allows Philip to evade direct speech and the spoken word. Gino's letters elide Philip as a character, and they become the "'supplied' or supplemented ellipsis which calls attention to the pelitude of its own unsaid with such insistence that it turns to periphrasis." 4 In this sense, the narrative voice suggests that Philip deliberately ignores his initial observation that Gino's letters provide "tricks of expression" so that he can continue to equate Gino with his
artistic "idea of Italy." When character supplements experience with written words and metaphors, the narrative voice is further emphasizing the characters' need for a circumlocutory figure which provides further narrative ellipses, elision, and periphrasis, but not genuine human connection.

The narrative voice illustrates the power of letters as circumlocutory figures when it describes how Philip is satisfied with the abstractions that words in letters provide. For example, it describes Philip's response to Caroline's promise that they will continue their relationship in Sawston through letters:

"Of course we shall meet whenever you come down; and I hope that it will mean often."

"It's not enough; it'll only be in the old horrible way, each with a dozen relatives round us. No, Miss Abbott; it's not good enough."

"We can write at all events."

"You will write?" he cried, with a flush of pleasure. At times his hopes seemed so solid (178-179).

Gino and Caroline's relationship with Philip is limited by the abstraction, distance and periphrasis of letters.
Philip is satisfied with Gino's "tricks of expression" which provide him with an illusion of intimacy. Philip similarly overlooks Caroline's physical, or "crude[]" definition of love for Gino by focusing upon the "hope" of her future letters, and by looking to her as figure from classical mythology. Gino speaks about Caroline in a letter to Philip; and Caroline asks to "speak about" (181) Gino to Philip in their future correspondence. The written words of letters become for Philip a means of defining the space and lack of meaning that his relationships with Gino and Caroline expose. Ironically, written words in letters function in *Where Angels Fear To Tread* in the same way that Mr. Emerson functions in *A Room With A View*, and Godbole functions in *A Passage To India* - to provide the protagonist with an experience of the "unspeakable." Philip maintains both relationships through letters which remain separate from the realities of society and "relatives." Philip's silence at the end of the novel is not an indication that he understands or acknowledges human love and truth. His silence reflects the limitations of his aesthetic understanding of relationships; and his silence reflects the narrative voice's detachment and cynical attitude about the possibility that human beings are capable of change.

Like *Where Angels Fear To Tread*, *A Room With A View* also ends with a letter that provides an event that the characters use to define their
experience. However, unlike Philip who is a voyeur of rather than a participant in human action, and is a character limited by his vision of the power of art and written words, Lucy is an artist. For Lucy, art and words are not totalizing objects: music "appeared to her the employment of a child" (181), and words are meaningless unless they describe the "experiences of her own heart" (246). Lucy's relationship with George is the totalizing object which is, for Lucy, elided by human words. For example, in the last chapter of the novel the narrative voice describes how Lucy reacts to Freddy's letter by telling George: "They had fair warning, and now he calls it an elopement. Ridiculous boy - ... But it will all come right in the end. He as to build us both up from the beginning again" (243). Freddy uses words in the same way that Philip uses words - to supplement and take the place of experience. Lucy perceives Freddy's written words as an attempt to elide her experience with George. Because Lucy expresses herself through experience and action rather than words, she notes that Freddy will have to develop, experience, or "build" the couple metaphorically in terms of the relationship they represent together as a whole couple rather than as individuals.

Unlike Philip, Lucy distrusts written and spoken words. Lucy's distrust of words is in part related to
Charlotte who at first asks Lucy not to speak of her relationship with George, and then asks Lucy in a letter to "make a clean breast" of her relationship. Lucy reinforces the elliptic and circumlocutory possibilities of words. When she tells Charlotte not to "put 'Private' outside" the envelopes addressed to her because "No one" reads her letters (139), she refers to the simultaneous power of periphrasis and elision that the word "Private" conveys: "Private" calls simultaneous attention to experience and to the suppression of experience which, in turn, places a false value on the secrecy and silence of words.

Lucy eventually overcomes the metaphoric silence that results from the simultaneous expression and suppression of the meaning that words imply; and in her case, written words are not the circumlocutory figure that exposes and defines her relationship with George. Mr. Emerson functions in A Room With A View in the same way that letters function in Where Angels Fear To Tread — as a figure which attempts to define the synecdochal relationship between Lucy and George. This synecdochal relationship finally evokes space, or gaps rather than connectedness. Like Philip's, Caroline's and Gino's letters which promise communication and relationships through the abstraction of written words, Mr. Emerson similarly becomes a means for connection when he translates Lucy's feelings into words for George. He becomes a figure
of circumlocution and periphrasis which reduces Lucy's relationship with George to a materiality and a physicality that denies the multiplicity of her experience of love. The narrative voice does not describe directly or indirectly Mr. Emerson's periphrastic and elliptic translation of Lucy's feelings to George. Unlike the first novel in which the narrative voice uses the written words of letters to elide both itself and character, in A Room With A View the narrative voice dismisses the power of words and emphasises the power of human experience. This is the implication at the end of the novel when Lucy reads Freddy's letter. Lucy elides Freddy's words by saying that "it will all come right in the end." Unlike Philip who defines his relationship with Gino and Caroline through the abstractions that art, society, and ultimately letters provide, Lucy defines her relationship with George by circumventing the paraphrastic and elliptic quality of Freddy's written words.

The narrative voice circumvents and elides written and spoken words by circumventing the paraphrastic and elliptic quality of Mr. Emerson's words. It only implies that Mr. Emerson "Give[s] George" (238) Lucy's "love" while it does not allow the reader to witness Mr. Emerson's translation of Lucy's feelings to George. Although Lucy and George decide at the end of the novel that it is possible that
"far below speech and behavior" Charlotte "is glad" about their union, the reader does not witness the couple's initial reconciliation immediately after Mr. Emerson translates Lucy's feelings. The translation of Lucy's feelings into words, Lucy and George's love, and Charlotte's motivation, are all relegated by the narrative voice to a space or gap "below speech and behavior." In other words, the narrative voice begins to make a character a function of its narrative detachment and the non-human aspects of the "unspeakable" other.

In this sense, the narrative voice in _A Room With A View_ foreshadows the narrative voice of _A Passage To India_ in which the character of Mrs. Moore finally becomes an aspect and function of the narrative voice. Like Philip and Lucy, Mrs. Moore must come to terms with an experience which is ineffable to her human words and understanding. However, whereas Philip's circumlocutory figure takes the form of letters, and Lucy's circumlocutory figure is Mr. Emerson, Mrs. Moore has two circumlocutory figures that translate her ineffable relationship to the human world of experience and the non-human world of spirit. India's coconut trees translate Mrs. Moore's experience of the human world by telling her that her vision of nothingness in the Marabar cave is not final; and Godbole translates Mrs. Moore's experience of the non-human world of spirit by "impell[ing]" her to that "place where completeness can be
found." Godbole "place[s] himself in the position of God" and also in "her position" so that she can say to God "Come" (291). The reader does not witness Mrs. Moore's response to these two intermediaries between the world of the human experience and non-human world of spirit. Like Lucy Honeychurch's final acceptance of George's love that is achieved through Mr. Emerson, Mrs. Moore's experience of unity and love for the human and the spiritual realms remains mysterious. The narrative voice does not allow the reader to witness the actual process of Mrs. Moore's acceptance of and reconciliation with her human and spiritual origins.

However, the narrative voice allows Mrs. Moore to become a function of itself and therefore transforms Mrs. Moore into and element that inhabits the realms of the human and non-human, character and voice, story and plot. In this way, Mrs. Moore finally functions as Philip's letters function in Where Angels Fear To Tread, and as Mr. Emerson functions in A Room With A View. For example, we find out through Ralph Moore in the novel that despite Mrs. Moore's aborted attempt to write Ralph and Stella immediately after her crises in the Marabar cave, she eventually communicates her feelings about Aziz to her children. In response to Aziz's question "Did your mother speak to you about me?" Ralph answers "Yes... In her
letters, in her letters. She loved you" (3212-313). Aziz's knowledge of Mrs. Moore's letters leads him to forgive Adela Quested in a letter by "connect[ing]" her with the "name" of Mrs. Moore (320).

Like Philip and Caroline's letters which are possible mainly because they promise to discuss their individual artistic and societal notions of Gino, Aziz's letter to Adela is possible because Mrs. Moore, like Gino to Caroline and Philip, provides Aziz with an abstract source of experience and connection. In addition, Aziz's knowledge that Mrs. Moore discussed him in a letter solves the anxiety that he feels as a result of reading Heaslop's and Adela's letters to Fielding:

He went from one room to another, inquisitive, and malicious. Two letters lying on the piano rewarded him, and he pounced and read them promptly. He was not ashamed to do this. The sanctity of private correspondence has never been ratified by the East...all so friendly and sensible, and written in a spirit he could not command. He envied the easy intercourse that is only possible in a nation whose women are free...Hence the strength of England, and in a spurt
of temper he hit the piano, and since
the notes had swollen and struck
together in groups of threes, he
produced a remarkable noise. . . . he. . .
slipped the letters into his pocket
(307-308).

By connecting Adela with Mrs. Moore in a letter, Aziz is
able to connect Adela also with his notions of the mosque
and of Islam. Aziz "envie[s] the easy intercourse" of
England, but he is incapable of connecting England with the
name of Mrs. Moore. Although Aziz can translate and
connect abstract ideas of individuals into written words,
he cannot translate the barriers of culture and race. And
almost in an attempt to imply that the reality of the words
he reads in Fielding's letters is something that can be
possessed, Aziz steals Fielding's letters. The narrative
voice emphasizes Mrs. Moore's synecdochal relationship
between England and India, and between the realm of words
and the realm of experience. Yet, this synecdochal
relationship signifies the power of Mrs. Moore's absence
rather than her presence and connectedness.

The only way that Mrs. Moore achieves connectedness is
through her presence as an element of narrative voice,
which in turn allows her to give utterance to both the
realm of spirit and the non-human realm of physical nature.
Mrs. Moore appears in the form of words in Aziz's letter to Adela; and her presence in a letter allows her to continue in the novel in the role she plays at the level of character. Mrs. Moore's function as a character is finally superceded by her function as an aspect of voice. As an aspect of narrative voice, Mrs. Moore evokes the connections achieved by her children, Adela, Fielding and Aziz. Finally, the narrative voice allows Mrs. Moore to function like the coconut trees and like Professor Godbole; she puts herself in the position of nature and God to tell Aziz and Fielding that their relationship will be possible when they are willing to accept the human limitations of written words, time and place.

Mrs. Moore's triple function as aspects of character, story and narrative voice in A Passage To India parallels Forster's conception of the novel as a whole: "Any fictitious prose work over 50,000 words" which is "bounded by two chains of mountains . . . the opposing ranges of Poetry and of History - and bounded on the third side by a sea" (6). This amorphous definition of the novel includes the abstract significance of poetry, the human element of History, and also an elusive metaphor that alludes to the metaphysical elements of narrative voice, or "a sea." All three of the novels that I address in the foregoing discussion leave the reader with a feeling that this metaphorical and metaphysical third "range[]" of the novel
is yet to be defined — that the "unspeakable" remains to be spoken. This elusive sense of Forster's "unspeakable" narrative voice has, as I mentioned earlier, provoked a wide range of responses to Forster the man and the novelist. Rosecrance, for example, suggests that in *A Passage To India* "mankind seems at last to have reached not maturity but exhaustion," Forster as a novelist "reaches impasse," and finally, Forster's "voice echoes into silence." Other commentators have tried to define Forster's narrative voice, and Forster himself, in terms of a prescribed set of religious values, either eastern or western. However, despite these attempts to locate meaning, or a lack of meaning in Forster, Forster's narrative voice remains enigmatic. As Trilling tells us, Forster consciously refused "to be great"; and this "refusal" reflects also Forster's refusal to be defined and labelled in any terms.

Many commentators, such as Gore Vidal in regard to sexuality in *Maurice*, have attempted to force Forster into answering many of the "unspeakable" political, religious and sexual questions that his novels raise. Forster consistently avoids answering these questions; and even when Forster seems to provide answers, he skillfully qualifies his words so that they become semantic riddles. For example, in an interview with by G. K. Das, Forster
implies that there is a subtle distinction between the terms "unbeliever" and "non-believer":

The last question I picked on was a plain and straight one: 'Mr. Forster, you will be ninety in the New Year. . . do you still regard yourself as an unbeliever?'

'Yes,' replied Mr. Forster, 'I think I should call myself one.'

'Unbeliever?' I repeated.

'Yes, perhaps', answered Mr. Forster and halting for a moment corrected himself: 'Non-believer perhaps - a better description.'

'I thought you were inclined to believe in Krishna, Mr. Forster?'

'Not any more than any one else', Mr. Forster remarked and (somewhat hopefully for me) added: 'I like things about Krishna worship.'

Rather than characterizing himself with the term "unbeliever" which denotes a person who is a "doubter," and "skeptic" who "does not believe in a particular religious faith," Forster would rather be characterized as a person to which the term "non-believer" refers: "non" denotes "not: other than: referse of: absence of"; and "of little
or no consequence: unimportant: worthless"; and "lacking
the usual especially positive characteristics of the thing
signified." Thus, by characterizing himself as a "non-
believer," Forster simply negatives the conventional
meaning of the word "believer," but does not commit himself
to the specific denotation of the term "unbeliever." Forster's belief, or lack of belief is left ambiguously
intact.

One wonders whether or not the "unspeakable" quality
of Forster's narrative voice finally refers to the
synecdochal relationship between reader and text. As we
read Forster's novels, we acquire the "native" quality of
"Listeners to whom `a' voice speaks." like Gino's letters,
Mr. Emerson, India's coconut trees, Godbole and Mrs. Moore,
the narrative voice puts itself in the "position of God," and remains detached and elusive. Forster hints at the
reason for the narrative voice's elusiveness when he states
that "If God could tell the story of the Universe, the
Universe would become fictitious." If God could tell
the story of the Universe, he would cease to be a non-human
abstraction, and would become a human reality; God's human
reality "tell[ing] a story of the Universe" would, by
virtue of the fact that translation is involved, negate the
reality of the Universe. In the same way, if narrative
voice were to provide us with a "story," or metaphysics for
its own and the novel's existence, the reality of the novel would become a "fiction" governed by "story," time, place, and the "gossip" of human interpretation. Forster addresses this problem of "translating" or "interpreting" when he says in *Aspects*:

> When we try to translate truth out of one sphere into another, whether from life into books or from books into lectures, something happens to truth, it goes wrong, not suddenly when it might be detected, but slowly. . .There is more in the novel than time or people or logic. . .I do not mean something that excludes. . .nor something that includes (106).

In the same way that Ronny Heaslop does not feel that "it does to talk" about religion, Forster similarly does not feel that "it does" to talk about the specific human and metaphysical implications of his narrative voice. For the third "range[]" of the novel is perhaps is the narrative voice which is a metaphoric "sea" separate from "time," "people" and "logic." The narrative voice neither "excludes" nor "includes" meaning. That the narrative voice neither "excludes" nor "includes" meaning also points to an ineffable emptiness and space that simultaneously invites and rejects "connectedness." Forster's narrative
voice must remain "unspeakable" within the realm of the "non-believer" who is neither a skeptic, or a doubter; the "non-believer" can endorse all views of reality and God while refusing to "include" and "exclude," or to endorse or condemn any single view.

The narrative voice is itself a circumlocutory figure for the reader during its experience of reading Forster's text. The narrative voice elides the author's presence, but this elision points again to the synecdochal relationship between reader and text which implies ineffable gabs and space rather than connectedness. As I note above, it is ironic that although Forster's narrative voice can escape meaning through its totalization of meaning, it can not escape the British inflection of its "tone" and "accent" which are, perhaps, its only "speakable" qualities.
Notes For The Conclusion

1 See E. M. Forster, Aspects Of The Novel (San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1927) All further quotations will be documented by page number in the text. Hereafter refered to as Aspects.


5 I am following here Kenneth Burke's designation of synecdoche in "Four Master Tropes," A Grammar of Motives, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969) 507, 509. Burke defines synecdoche as "part for the whole, whole for the part, container for the contained" which "stresses a relationship or connectedness between two sides of an equation, a connectedness that...extends in either direction."

6 See Barbara Rosecrance, Forster's Narrative Vision
(Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982) 237, 244.


10Aspects 56.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

   House, 1986.
   House, Inc., 1921.
- - -. A Passage to India. A Harvest/HBJ Book. New York
- - -. Maurice: A Novel. New York and London:

Secondary Sources

Adams, Robert M. Strains of Discord: Studies in Literary

Albright, Daniel. Personality and Impersonality. Chicago

Alter, Robert. Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-Conscious
Genre. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: The University

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis. Translated by Willard Trask.


1971.


---. *The Art of Telling*. Cambridge, Massachusetts:

---


Rosenbaum, S. P. Editor. *The Bloomsbury Group*. Toronto and


Sontag, Susan. *Against Interpretation.* A Delta Book. New
Trilling, Lionel. E. M. Forster. London: The Hogarth Press,
1944.


