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INTRODUCTION

Dorrit Cohn claims that the discourse on narrative discourse is still in Babel, and while theorists have done impressive work on narrative during the past few decades, her conclusion does apply at least to the theories on free indirect discourse (FID). Although Charles Bally\(^1\) studied FID as early as 1912, and Mikhail Bakhtin\(^2\) included analyses of it as integral parts of his theory in the 1930's, these theorists and others who have followed them have failed to come to a consensus on a definition or a theory of the functions of FID.

Not surprisingly, the term FID seems now to have outlived its usefulness in the broad manner in which it has been employed. Once the more limited interests of linguistics gave way to the far-reaching implications of stylistic studies of the technique, theorists have had to provide their own definitions for the phenomenon. All such definitions respond to the intentions of the particular study, of course, but in some cases the term might even undergo redefinitions as it is applied to individual texts within the same study.
While the reasons for studying the technique vary, most theorists who are interested in style describe it as a covert narrative method for refracting different voices. Whether the use of the technique raises questions about voice because appropriate grammatical markers fail to signal the speaker, or whether it creates a dialectic between two or more voices, it has the potential for communicating ideas, emotions and values efficiently and, more important, mimetically. My term "refracted discourse" seems broad enough to cover all instances in which a covert voice or voices carry different messages from those their superficial meaning would suggest.

The work of Bakhtin informs my project significantly, while the phrase "refracted discourse" relates most closely to his notions about the various ways in which language creates and sustains dialogic relationships within the novel. In The Dialogic Imagination, Bakhtin introduces the idea that several "languages" may be evident in a novel, and that none of these may reflect, by itself, the values of the author. Instead the author's beliefs are refracted through the language of another: this may be the narrator's articulation of the "common point of view" at one time;
it may be the language of a character at another; and it is finally the combination of these two. Bakhtin coins many useful phrases, such as "character zones" and "pseudo-objective underpinnings," which by their very names offer sufficient stimulation for one to become interested in the role of particular narrative techniques in the development of double-voiced discourse. Yet, to commit myself to his term would suggest that I embrace all his theories relating to double voice and that I also limit myself to them, neither of which I intend.

Fascination with the notion of double-voices only begins to explain why a study of refracted discourse in five novels would be worthwhile. Although the question "who is speaking?" is central to an intelligent reading of any sort of literature, identifying the qualities of the narrator (such as his reliability, based on intelligence, tone, etc.) and establishing a relationship with him do not fully answer recurring questions about voice. As Gerard Genette's inquiries into the distinctions between voice and vision suggest, the various possibilities for fluid relationships between these two involve both linguistic and stylistic analyses. On the one hand, competent readers
generally demonstrate through their agreement on meaning that they make the necessary distinction intuitively or subconsciously. On the other hand, without a conscious analysis of double-voices, we cannot reconstruct the multitude of nuances which Bakhtin claims result from the dialogic nature of the novel. In fact, it has been my experience that a close analysis of refracted discourse yields extended meanings which readers find intuitively accurate, but which they had not considered in their full complexity. What most interests me, then, is this question: How have writers used refracted discourse as parts of larger narrative communications? Putting the question this way allows me to remain open to a wide variety of uses—and consequences—of refracted discourse, while also considering it as only one strategy among many. Among the uses I will examine are the representation of character, the manipulation of sympathy, for characters and events, the "embedded" disclosure of societal beliefs, and the creation of irony.

Before discussing my specific method for exploring these questions, I will summarize some important work which has been done in related areas in order to make clear what this technique is and why I am concerned with
defining a broader category. The following brief summary of Brian McHale's "Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts" helps to clarify what I mean by "refracted discourse," particularly because the breadth of McHale's study takes into account much more than a strict linguistic definition of the term would offer. In addition, I include material from some of the sources he uses which augment his analysis and seem especially relevant to my study.

McHale's introductory traditional grammarian's definition of three types of represented/reported discourse provides a logical starting-point for discussing FID and thus for defining refracted discourse:

1) She said to herself, 'No, no, I can't just now, but tomorrow I'll drink in spite of the pledge I've signed with the N.E.R. and shoot the moon.'

2) She said to herself that she couldn't just then, but that the next day she would drink in spite of the pledge she had signed with the N.E.R. and 'shoot the moon.'

3) She almost fainted when he started to make love to her. No, no, she couldn't just now,
but tomorrow she'd drink in spite of the pledge she'd signed with the N.E.R. and shoot the moon. 8

The second, or indirect discourse (ID), version may be "derived" by applying a set of informal "transformations" to the first, or direct discourse (DD) version, including: the suppression of quotation marks; the optional insertion of the conjunction that before reported declaratives; the conversion of personal and possessive pronouns from first or second person to third person, a "back-shift" of verb tenses; transformation of direct questions; transformation or direct imperatives; and the exclusion of vocatives, interjections, and lexical dialectic features.

Similarly FID may be described in terms of a set of "transformations" applied to the ID version. These transformations involve: deletion of the reporting verb of saying/thinking plus the conjunction that (while the verb of saying may appear as a "comment clause"); retention of the shift of person and back-shift of tenses characteristic of ID; reinstatement of deictic elements of DD; reinstatement of the auxiliary plus subject word-order of direct questions; reinstatement of DD features such as interjections which were barred from ID.
As helpful as this description may be in some cases, it often fails to distinguish FID grammatically from sentences of non-reportive narration: for example, "The day was unbearably hot" might well be FID, based on the evaluative word "unbearably"; on the other hand, it might cohere with a narrator's previously-stated "facts" about the weather of the area. The case would have to be decided on context (literary, not geographic!), not on grammatical markers. Thus the question of how we determine FID's perceptibility may have several answers. McHale argues against the transformational grammatical account on the basis that FID is "free" both in the sense of not being dominated by a "higher" clause, and in the sense that its range of formal possibilities is enormous. He refers for support to Voloshinov, who observes that it is unwise to make a strict distinction between canonical patterns and idiosyncratic, stylistic deviations in linguistic phenomena like FID.

As an alternative to the restrictive theory of traditional grammarians (and transformational grammarians, who fail to account for the differences between normal spoken and written English), Paul Hernadi defines three categories: histoire (recit); discourse; and a category between authorial presentation (diegesis).
and representation/impersonation (mimesis), "substitutionary narration." While these categories correspond to the three syntactical ones of the derivational account, they provide something the earlier categories could not—a continuum along which other types of representation may be located. In other words, with these categories, we can play with the possibilities between "purely" mimetic and "purely" diegetic: diegetic summary (a simple report that a speech event has occurred, without any specification of what was said or how it was said; on the same level as the report of any non-verbal event); summary (which to some degree represents a speech event, naming the topics of conversation); indirect content-paraphrase (ID); indirect discourse, mimetic to some degree; FID (grammatically and mimetically intermediate between ID and DD, just so that it is short of "pure" mimesis); and direct discourse (the most purely mimetic, with the reservation that it is a novelistic illusion, conventionalized and stylized). McHale suggests further that other categories could be invented to include transitional and mixed forms.

In support of this last idea, he cites the work of two literary theorists, Graham Hough and Dorrit Cohn,
who define additional categories. Hough introduces "coloured narrative" to describe discourse that is "more or less deeply coloured" by "virtual quotation" from characters' idioms involving "continual slight shifts in the point of view." While "coloured narrative" seems very much like neutral (diegetic) narrative at one extreme, it is synonymous with FID at the other end. Hough treats this latter convergence as a "concentration" of "coloured narrative." On the other hand, Cohn would refer to this as "'internal analysis,' since the narrator intervenes more and more to mediate between the characters' discourse and the reader." Although McHale offers an example from Dos Passos, I refer here directly to Hough's article, in which this point finds support in *Emma*:

The longer she considered it the greater was her sense of its expediency. Mr. Elton's situation was most suitable, quite the gentleman himself, and without low connections; at the same time, not of any family that could fairly object to the doubtful birth of Harriet. He had a comfortable home for her, and *Emma* imagined a very sufficient income; for though the
vicarage of Highbury was not large, he was known to have some independent property; and she thought very highly of him as a good-humoured, well-meaning, respectable young man, without any deficiency of useful understanding or knowledge of the world.  

Hough's example of "coloured narrative" includes some of the most important features I find in refracted discourse. The second sentence, which would be termed FID by traditional grammarians, not only reports Emma's thought without any indication from grammatical markers, but it also refracts social values which Austen apparently intends to call to the reader's attention. In my study, I distinguish between sentences such as this, frequently ironic ones (of which Austen is remarkably capable, as the opening lines of *Pride and Prejudice* demonstrate: "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife"), and those which are simply unmarked cases of a character's voice. The elevated language "most suitable, quite the gentleman himself, and without low connections" suggests both the limited way in which Emma evaluates people and the support such an evaluation has in her world. If Austen intended pure
irony, she would debunk the suggested social values; however, low connections, complete lack of fortune, etc., do blight characters in Austen's world. The subtlety of this passage attests to the value of refracted discourse at the hand of a skillful writer: she is able to delineate the acceptable social standards and at the same time hint that Emma needs to broaden her vision, at least to the point that she would give more importance to what are currently almost after-thoughts—Mr. Elton as good-humoured, well-meaning, etc.

Although I would not argue that by using the term "refracted discourse" I could offer a reading of Emma superior to Hough's insightful analysis of its narrative, I do believe that the term "coloured narrative," as Hough defines it, fails to convey the tension that is implicit in the notion of refracting, which involves power relationships. Free indirect style, which Hough describes as a concentration of coloured narrative, is, as other theorists who define FID maintain, primarily an embedded portion of the narrative. Again, embedding, like colouring, does not stress the dialectic between or among voices.

Dorrit Cohn recalls Jan Mukarovsky's assertion that "the dialogic pattern of monologues in literature may be
regarded as a special and specially clear, stylistic display of the coexistence of 'different semantic contexts' within the mind."

Cohn herself introduced a new terminology for the study of narrative, one which she hoped would keep her from "falling between the stools" of the polarized literary scholarship on narrative perspective—"the proliferating finesse of criticism and the reductive geometrie of linguistics."

Her descriptions of narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction mark a significant contribution to the field of narrative theory in general, and provide important categories for talking about consciousness in my study."

The first term Cohn coins, "psycho-narration," resembles "omniscient description" and "internal analysis," terms which she criticizes as too general and misleading respectively. Her neologism identifies both the subject-matter and the activity it denotes—the narration of psychological aspects of characters.

Using Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice* and Joyce's *Portrait of an Artist*, she distinguishes between the prominent narrator who remains distanced from the character, even as he narrates his consciousness, and the narrator who effaces himself, fusing with the
consciousnesses he narrates. Her choice of texts is especially fortunate, since the distanced narrator of *Death in Venice* and the very involved one of *Portrait of the Artist* provide a fine description of both the differences and similarities within this narrative mode.

In Cohn's discussion of stylistic tendencies in "quoted monologue," her name for interior monologue, she points out that novelists have taken little advantage of the possibilities for stylistic experimentation in interior monologue. The obvious reason for this lack is that readers naturally have difficulty when language becomes too idiosyncratic. However, monologic language has changed through time in ways similar to those of the dialogic language that served as its model. I will consider many examples in which literary language transmits quoted interior monologue, emphasizing the unique literary possibilities offered by the use of an unspoken language. Writers color the thoughts of their characters for more significant reasons than mere comprehensibility; yet critics sometimes confuse literary language with character language, resulting in exaggerated notions of characters' sophistication with language and unrealistic assumptions about their perceptiveness. On the other hand, character language
frequently provides the most irrefutable evidence that
the narrative is indeed quoted monologue.

On this last point, Cohn lists the features that
differentiate monologue from dialogue generally,
providing several guidelines for making the kinds of
distinctions that I will note in labelling refracted
discourse:

1. a semantic pattern peculiar to self-address: the free alternation of first and
second person pronouns in reference to the
same subject. . . . 'I' and 'you' coincide, so
that when the grammar of monologue most
resembles dialogue, its semantics are most
careractically monologic . . . .

2. the coexistence of 'different semantic
contexts' within the mind. . . . which vie for
simultaneous linguistic expression. . . . and
variously cancel, support, interrupt, or
interfere with one another, shaping a highly
discontinuous syntax (as Mukarovski points out
when he describes the dialogic pattern of
monologues in literature). . . .

3. mimetically crafted language a character is
made to utter in conversations, abbreviated
and charged with private meanings in inner speech . . . .

Since Joyce is the one writer whom Cohn credits for his experimentation with formal mimesis, she devotes several pages to analyzing his style. Most interestingly, she compares his quoted monologue to the Russian psycho-linguist Vygotsky's study of egocentric speech in children. Vygotsky found that this speech tends to change, but not to disappear, as social speech takes over. In its late phase of radical ellipsis, it focuses on the predicate and the object, generally omitting the subject, which interior speech assumes. Such sentences typically build on the new (the old "subject" in this psychological terminology may indeed carry what is grammatically termed the "predicate"). Vygotsky calls this phenomenon "speech almost without words," illustrating with examples from Ulysses: "Creaky wardrobe," "Strings," "Metempsychosis," "Seemed to like it," "Looked shut," and "Makes you want to sing after." Vygotsky concluded that like the egocentric speech of children, inner speech enriches individual words to counteract the impoverishment of syntax. Relating this assertion to Joyce, Cohn comments on the "special meanings that tie certain common words into 'knots of privacy' for Bloom. . . and for Stephen. . . ."
However, introspection into the dynamics of inner speech is not the only source for inventing characteristic monologic style. The mimetic language which a character utters in conversation provides a stylistic basis for inner language. Cohn comments: "Bloom's monologues might be regarded as a kind of confluence between Joyce's self-knowledge and his knowledge of the world, including Dubliners of Bloom's ilk."¹⁶ I would also call this confluence a dialogue, since Bloom's self-knowledge could be in a dialectical relationship with his knowledge of other things. Thus, Cohn's analysis of quoted monologue provides us with two types of refracted discourse— that which includes the characteristics of children's egocentric speech, and that which reflects the colloquial idioms peculiar to a particular character— while it also supports the idea that writers refract more than one concern within one speech act.

Narrated monologue, which Cohn describes as "linguistically the most complex" of the three types of discourse she discusses, has variously been termed "free indirect speech," indirect interior monologue," and "reported speech," and, in my study, FID.
By rendering a character's thought in his own idiom, while maintaining a third-person reference, a narrator automatically speaks in two voices—presumably his own, and demonstrably a character's. The reasons Cohn offers for why writers use this technique inform my study directly and consistently. Her analysis is thus worth examining in detail:

1. By leaving the relationship between words and thoughts latent, the narrated monologue casts a peculiarly penumbral light on the figural consciousness, suspending it on the threshold of verbalization in a manner that cannot be achieved by direct quotation. This ambiguity is unquestionably one reason why so many writers prefer the less direct technique.

2. Another is the seamless junction between narrated monologues and their narrative context. . . . By employing the same basic tense for the narrator's reporting language and the character's reflecting language, two normally distinct linguistic currents are made to merge.

3. Sudden shifts to quoted dialogue (silent or spoken) underline the potential-actual
relationship between narrated monologue and verbal formulation, creating the impression that a mind's vague ruminations have irresistibly led to a conceptual expression.¹⁷

4. . . . a sentence of psycho-narration [may] shape the transition from the preceding report to the narrated monologue, even as it sets the tone that reigns in [a character's] thoughts. . . . psycho-narration flows readily into a narrated monologue, and the latter clinches the narrator-figure cohesion that the former approximates.¹⁸

As Cohn demonstrates in her grammatical distinction between the three methods she introduces (quoted monologue: [He thought] Am I late? narrated monologue: Was he late? psycho-narration: He wondered if he was late.), narrated-monologue holds a mid-position between the other two forms, "rendering the content of a figural mind more obliquely that the former, more directly than the latter." Because it combines the language a character uses when he talks to himself with the grammar the narrator uses when talking about him, narrated-monologue superimposes two voices which are separate in the other forms. In addressing the question of how we
identify the speaker (or, in other words, how we decide whether we are reading narrator's report or narrated-monologue), Cohn says that contextual, semantic, syntactic, lexical, or a combination of clues will reveal narrated-monologue.

I intend to use "refracted discourse" in a broader sense than I could any of Cohn's three terms--either alone or together--in order to study the phenomenon of double-voiced discourse. While Cohn's neologisms describe narrative modes in a most thorough manner for the study of presenting consciousness in fiction, they do not specifically denote discourse which refracts social values (and thus speaks in the voice of a particular society). Since my interest is in this type of discourse, as well as other double-voiced discourse which reveals the consciousness of characters in a covert manner, "refracted discourse" describes the sections of narrative I study more completely than Cohn's terms would. In addition, while Cohn's separation of these distinct narrative modes and her definitions and analysis of each offer rich insights, the neologisms themselves seem "slippery." Because we do not easily discern psycho-narration from narrated-monologue, for example, on the basis of their names, it
is necessary to refer to the definitions frequently. Nevertheless, I will employ her distinctions among the three modes for presenting consciousness when appropriate and will refer to her valuable insights into the use of covert techniques.

The bivocal and polyvocal explanations of FID by Voloshinov and Bakhtin entail the recognition of the plurality of speakers, which emerges clearly from Voloshinov's polemic against the Vossler School stylisticians. His quarrel with them stems from his theory that FID involves within one and the same sentence two voices which represent the character's empathy and the author's distance, while the Vossler School argues that FID is the coexistence of empathy and distance within the same psyche, that of the author. Voloshinov's interpretation of FID exemplifies his Marxist philosophy of language because it contains in microcosm the concrete "verbal interaction," the utterance spoken in a dialogic situation reflecting the presence of an addressee. He posits this interaction as the basic paradigmatic instance of all language, including the "inner speech" of the psyche.

Bakhtin extends this suggestive analysis of bi- or polyvocality both synchronically and diachronically. He
recognizes polyvocality in the structure of texts, not just at the sentence level, but at the levels "ranging downward to the isolated double-oriented word which participates in a 'micro-dialogue,' and upward to the gross structure of the novel as a whole, its 'grand dialogue' or polyphony of voices." For Bakhtin, dialogism is constitutive of the novel as a genre, with the "modern" (Dosteovskyean) novel representing not a break with the past, but an advance along the same lines as the more limited dialogism of past literature.

Voloshinov's description of the radical polyphony of FID and related techniques speaks to the interests of this study:

The very kind of development quasi-direct discourse has undergone is bound up with the transposition of the larger prose genres into a silent register, i.e., for silent reading. Only this 'silencing' of prose could have made possible the multileveledness and voice-defying complexity of intonational structure that are so characteristic for modern literature.

Although I am not concerned with the "unspeakability" of refracted discourse in a literal
sense (or in the way that Ann Banfield discusses in *Unspeakable Sentences*), I do embrace Voloshinov's notions of multileveledness and voice-defying complexity (which I interpret as descriptive of narrative passages which defy a single-voiced reading, if one wanted to reproduce the "voices" aloud). If we consider Voloshinov's definition metaphorically, we sense the powerfulness of FID and related techniques.

In order to reveal this power and to investigate the problem of how voices affect our relationship with narrators and characters, we need to look at novels which present different types of questions with regard to narrator, character, and reader. For two reasons, Jane Austen's *Persuasion* marks a fortunate starting place. First, Austen's novels witness an advance in the portrayal of character within the third-person narrative voice, thereby increasing the chances of greater quantity and quality in refracted discourse than we find in earlier novels. Secondly, her works rely on sophisticated narrative irony, a feature which suggests a complex narrative. In the first three chapters, for instance, Austen develops a miniature punitive comedy, which, even considering its limits, assures the reader
of a good outcome for the virtuous Anne, despite her suffering. We might well ask what role refracted discourse plays in developing and sustaining these expectations. Moreover, how does refracted discourse guide the reader to like and trust Anne and acknowledge her superiority over other members of her family so quickly? Austen faced the significant structural problem of making Anne seem to be responsible for her own fate, although she is not a character in need of change, and not a character who is in a position to act directly for her own desires. Because readers could not take much pleasure in her final status if it were seen as only a gift of fortune, or of Wentworth, she must change her situation without changing her consistently admirable character. My question specifically concerns whether refracted discourse assists Austen in jumping these structural hurdles while it also has the effect of creating the image of a static character in Anne.

*Middlemarch* features a narrative voice whose strength and constant presence equal that of a character. Given the impact of this voice, we may explore the questions of whether the refracted discourse differs from that of *Persuasion*, and if it does, in what ways and with what consequences for the complexity of
the relationships we are examining. (These kinds of comparative questions will occur finally among all the novels.) Roy Pascal suggests that Eliot uses double-voiced discourse (dual voices, in his terms) to indicate irony of situation, which, if true, will demand an analysis of refracted discourse, irony, and large patterns of plot and theme. In any event, readers typically respond differently to Eliot's characters than to Austen's, and this difference might be accounted for in part by the greater use of refracted discourse. On the one hand, sympathies may be less clearly directed in Middlemarch than in Persuasion (in other words, readers' responses are more ambiguous), but, on the other hand, they may be more intense.

Like Austen's novels, those of Henry James signal a turn in literary style which speaks to the interests of this study. The use of a "focalizer" narrator has the potential for changing the refracted discourse in terms of its relationship to narrator, character, and reader. In addition, James's ambiguity compares to Austen's and Eliot's irony as an indicator of a complex narrative voice. Since The Wings of the Dove has "pockets" of narrative ambiguity, rather than structural ambiguity, we may analyze the contribution of refracted discourse
to the ambiguity of individual passages while avoiding the more complex structural ambiguity of works like *The Turn of the Screw* or *The Sacred Fount*. The intricacy of the narrative problems posed by James's intentions in *The Wings of the Dove* has been detailed by the author himself in "Preface to the New York Edition" of the novel.²⁷ He states that the "idea. . . of a young person conscious of a great capacity for life, but early stricken and doomed. . . " developed into a "formidable" theme. Perplexed by the problem of "placing in the strongest light possible a person infirm and ill," James created centers of consciousness in other characters for the purpose of prefiguring the "elements amid which Milly Theale was to draw her breath in such pain".²⁸ Uppermost among the writer's concerns was that he not end first or finally in predominantly recording a breakdown. These centers also form what James termed "solid blocks of wrought material," each one "true to its pattern" but nevertheless clearly directed to the whole. My study of this novel will concentrate on how refracted discourse contributes to the development of the separate consciousnesses to the ends for which James designed them—the recognition of and special empathy for Milly Theale's ordeal. We might
well note at this point that the recognition and empathy are again different from what we feel for Austen's characters—and also from what we feel for Eliot's. While our sympathies may vacillate in *Middlemarch*, they do finally rest where we feel secure that Eliot wants them; we cannot be so sure where our sympathies lie in *Wings*, however, nor can we be entirely certain about where James would like to direct them.

*Sister Carrie* introduces a very specific use of refracted discourse: in some instances the style of the language apparently corresponds to that of the narrator, when in fact the ruminations are those of the character. The ineffectual natures of some characters and the powerlessness of others become more apparent when this stylistic technique prevails. Carrie's relationship to her world is reproduced in her relationship to the narrator, whose intellectual grasp of the world to which she relates emotionally places him in a position of control: he can give language to her feelings; she finally fails to gain a full understanding of herself because she cannot reason as he (and we) can. We might investigate the psychological effect of the narrator's powerful discourse in comparison to Carrie's in terms of our sympathies, asking the question: "What consequences
does the powerlessness of the characters, suggested by the refracted discourse, have in terms of our sympathies for them?" This novel provides an opportunity for focusing on language and the power it has to influence our reading, since the different styles of language of the characters and the narrator complicate the appropriation of voice. A related concern with language in *Sister Carrie* has been studied by James Phelan, who concludes that although Dreiser is "vague, sloppy, or awkward," his style is "'not quite a destructive' flaw. . . . [because] although the language was deficient, the intention was clear." My study continues this interest in the language, suggesting that its frequently tedious and exaggerated style emphasizes, by contrast, the limited power of most of the characters in the novel.

Unlike Dreiser's style, the minimal narrative commentary of *Mrs. Dalloway* and its reflection of the consciousnesses of a variety of characters imply parallels with and extensions of the other three novels, leaping further ahead on the continuum which plots Austen, Eliot, and James in terms of their fictional creations of consciousness. Woolf fuses her narrator and characters into a polyphonic inner chorus, which
challenges the reader's ability to attribute thoughts and attitudes to certain characters, or instead to the narrator, in a discourse which omits traditional signals. The novel completes the portrait of Mrs. Dalloway, and thus ends with Peter Walsh's revelation, "It is Clarissa, he said. For there she was." But readers must reconstruct the various consciousnesses to determine how and what they know of Clarissa—and thus to experience the full meaning of the final sentence. Once again, our sympathies develop in a large part in response to refracted discourse. However, we might not want to argue that Woolf's novel moves forward on the continuum which measures our intensity of feeling for the characters—even though we have witnessed the tendency of each successive novel to increase our emotional engagement with the characters in this chronologically ordered study.

Any analysis of refracted discourse must acknowledge its mutual relation to other artistic facets of the novel form. In Persuasion the structural qualities, as well as the character development, depend in part on the use of refracted discourse. In Middlemarch irony, both of situation and larger patterns of plot and theme, may be richer because of Eliot's
skill in refracting meaning indirectly. The authorial intention to create a very specific type of character, to elicit just the right response from the reader, and the difficulty of doing both given the qualities of the heroine of *The Wings of the Dove* raises another question. What role does refracted discourse play in the complex process of involving the reader in the consciousnesses of several characters, particularly when the author has warned that readers must not pity the main character, but must instead identify with her strengths while recognizing her agony? In this case structural, thematic, and mimetic qualities all present problems for the writer. *Sister Carrie* emphasizes the relationship between style and refracted discourse, while *Mrs. Dalloway*, a testament to Woolf's impeccable prose style (especially when compared to Dreiser's use of language), suggests the possibility that refracted discourse might offer a principle of organization for a novel. Yet we have a problem not unlike that presented by *Sister Carrie*—we cannot easily answer the question "who is speaking."

My study addresses the question of how without necessarily concerning itself with the what. The selected novels deservedly have had attention devoted to
the latter, and like many other novels are causes for agreement about theme, character, symbolism, and other determiners of meaning. In order to account for this harmony, however, I attempt to explain how we know what we know and how we make judgments. In cases where disagreement prevails, we depend on critical theories to support our conflicting arguments. But beyond even these considerations, knowing how an author creates effects and moves us from one point to another increases our pleasure, as well as it develops our expertise as readers. My intention is to add to the body of critical knowledge about refracted discourse and to provide new insights into the workings of these five novels.

In addition, Wayne Booth’s questions about privilege and limitation in The Rhetoric of Fiction relate to my project. His concerns center on the variations in narrative technique which not only allow more or less omniscience among narrators, but also permit a narrator to convey more or less to the reader. Some refracted discourse, particularly FID, implies privilege, while it simultaneously suggests limits. For example, when Austen uses “coloured narrative” to convey the impressions of Anne Elliot in Persuasion, she demonstrates the narrator’s ability to reflect Annes’s
real feelings about Wentworth, but she denies the narrator the privilege of penetrating deeply into Anne’s mind, exploring her motivations, or laying them out for us (with good results in terms of character development and reader/narrator relationship):

With regard to Captain Wentworth, though Anne hazarded no enquiries, there was voluntary communication sufficient.\textsuperscript{31}

In this passage we witness Austen’s attempt to express Anne’s fears of betraying her interest in Wentworth, an interest which she expresses to herself hesitatingly, responding at the same time to a complex of unexamined emotions which it reflects. At this point the narrator is more aware of Anne’s feeling than Anne is, and while we share the former’s knowledge, the refracted discourse tells us that to some degree Anne senses her suppressed positive interest. We are thus removed less from Anne than if she were totally unaware of her desires.

Privilege into one character’s mind and exclusion from another has consequences for the development of our sympathies. But both privilege and limitation may be used for a variety of purposes, not the least of which is to lend the support of the narrator or the implied author to one or another view.
CHAPTER I

*Persuasion* has been variously noted for its increased narrative summary, its advance in the realization of individual consciousness, and its darker tone, as compared with Austen's earlier novels. All three of these qualities possibly reflect Jane Austen's loss of faith in manners as an indicator of moral conditions, while they surely demonstrate her ability to create powerful effects through the use of specific techniques. As R.S. Crane notes, *Persuasion* is "a love story but... not a love story... which depends for its emotional power solely or chiefly on our general human sympathy with young lovers." Instead, the quality of the response which Austen evokes depends on our perception of Anne Elliot and Captain Wentworth as "moral individuals."

Since Austen did not depend in this novel primarily on direct dialogue, the "commonplace but significant details of action and speech," by which her characters in earlier novels revealed themselves, the increased narrative summary carries the burden of evincing the fine qualities of Anne and Wentworth. As Crane
fine qualities of Anne and Wentworth. As Crane explains, the plot centers in Anne, not in Anne and Wentworth conjointly, but it does not involve a change in her character. Instead, we follow her in events which move her through a series of fluctuating emotional states, beginning with quiet sadness, and ending with complete happiness. At the same time, we are concerned with Wentworth's internal state, as it demonstrates both that he is worthy of Anne and that he will move toward a reunion with her. Austen therefore made the thoughts and feelings of these characters important enough to provide the movement of the plot. Her accomplishment can be attributed to the occasions she creates which allow us to know the characters and to compare Anne and Wentworth to those around them, but neither of these methods would have been effective if she had not been so skillful in using refracted discourse.

The importance of this technique cannot be denied if we consider that when a writer chooses to use direct dialogue sparingly, she faces particular limits and simultaneously gains certain advantages in her depiction of character. The problem with direct dialogue, of course, is that it involves a listener or listeners who affect its nature. At times we learn a good deal about
a character as he or she speaks to others, but often intimate thoughts cannot appropriately be delivered "aloud." The omniscient narrator can readily report private thoughts and feelings, but Austen demonstrates in *Persuasion* in particular that she prefers to reveal character more subtly than writers generally do when they pronounce positively what goes on in the minds and hearts of individuals. Thus, refracted discourse works quite effectively because it allows for the retention of the characters' idiom, as in direct dialogue, while it retains the privacy of unspoken thought—or even, in some instances, unrecognized feeling.

Another purpose served by refracted discourse concerns what has alternately been described as "Jane Austen's newly achieved ability to accept the coexistence of opposed characteristics in a single personality, and her commitment to an exploration of character as her new artistic goal"⁴ and her move away from satirical comment.⁵ In other words, Austen reflects her growing sense of ambiguity in the nature of individuals and society, although this "growing sense" by no means approximates the ambiguity of later writers. The tension of the double voices which become evident in refracted discourse allows for this play, a play which
Bakhtin insists has not been exhausted at the end of a novel. While Elizabeth Langland recognizes Austen's formal innovations in her representation of society, realized by "techniques that enable her to focus simultaneously on the needs and concerns of society and those of the individual. . . . [and] her presentation of society as an adequate context for the complete fulfillment of her most desirable characters," this study will investigate the precise technical feats accomplished by the use of refracted discourse in *Persuasion*, ordering them in terms of least to most complex.

The opening of Chapter One follows a familiar Austen pattern: it introduces the heroine's father. Describing his foolish character with irony and wit, the narrator begins:

Sir Walter Elliot, of Kel Lynch-hall, in Somertsetshire, was a man who, for his own amusement, never took up any book but the Baronetage. . . .

But it is with the help of refracted discourse that Austen makes some of her best stabs at this self-aggrandizing gentleman. Concerned with his appearance in a mere book, he "improves it by adding for his own and
his family's information the particulars of his
daughter, Mary's marriage, and the date of his wife's
death." Grammatically "improved" belongs to the
narrator, but in fact we know that this judgment belongs
to Sir Walter, and that we and the narrator are quite
distanced from him. We learn here that marriage,
especially a marriage to a man of means, has a social
value which Sir Walter apprises beyond any personal
concern, while at the same time, the exact record of
Lady Elliot's death improves the record in its accuracy.

Sir Walter's de-humanization of people and events
signals the implied author's ironic debunking of his
values. Bakhtin describes "the activity of a character
in a novel [as] always ideologically demarcated: he
lives and acts in an ideological world of his own (and
not in the unitary world of the epic), he has his own
perception of the world that is incarnated in his action
and in his discourse." In this small example we
witness the existence of one ideological concept, in
part reflecting the values of the character's social
world, but interpreted in his refracted discourse in an
individual manner. At the same time we experience an
ideological stance refracted through the dialogue by
irony, which gives us one of our first clues about the
implied author.
"Vanity was the beginning and the end of Sir Walter's character; vanity of person and situation."
The narrative comment that "the Sir Walter Elliot, who united these gifts, was the constant object of his [own] warmest respect and devotion" uses "gifts to refract Sir Walter's appraisal of his beauty and baronetcy. Later readings of the novel make this word richer in its significance: Austen does not deny that these qualities are valuable gifts, but she insists on the higher priority of other values, giving "gifts" the task of ironically debunking Sir Walter's values.

The narrator informs us a few paragraphs later that Sir Walter remain[ed] single for his dear daughter's sake." This dear daughter is Elizabeth, whose "dearness" exists for him alone, and the ironic play with the adjective prepares us for the following statement: "His two other children were of very inferior value." Inferior in whose estimation? Clearly they are of lesser value to Sir Walter, and perhaps to others in society who would applaud his "gifts." Refracted discourse underscores Sir Walter's attitudes, and enables the narrator to draw attention to his unattractive qualities. She is also able to lend support to the world of the novel, while she ridicules
him in a convincing yet subtle manner. We need to see the danger of Sir Walter—and must not confuse the threat which he poses to the welfare of all around him as a threat coming from his society itself. Thus, Austen cannot afford to say: "His obsession with the superficial values of his society . . . " because then we would confuse two issues—and would probably place the blame wrongly. In "No, he would never disgrace his name so far," the implied author does not agree that his name would be disgraced by giving up his home, although the narrator suggests that nice homes are nice things to own (we are asked to agree essentially with a practical view that it is better to be rich and healthy than poor and sick!)

The first few pages of Persuasion have revealed that Anne Elliot belongs to a family headed by a man whose lack of discretion, self-awareness, and compassion ought to arouse our suspicion and probably our disdain. At the same time, the implied author supports some aspects of Sir Walter's society—those which suggest the importance of physical comforts and social status—while she judges characters on their interpretation and implementation of those values. The values of Sir Walter's society which place him in the role of
protector with his daughters, and his pleasure in the marriage of one, are conventions which the implied author asks us to share. However, Sir Walter perverts these values with his vanity, as in his suggestion that his "dear daughter is improved." The refracted discourse which describes him is simple, and our relationship with the narrator and implied author is likewise uncomplicated. We, like they, are distanced from this paternal model whose character alerts us to what we should and should not value within his world. A more complex idea emerges, however, concerning the implied author's distinction between respect for social class differences and enslavement to false values. Our ability to judge the actions of the characters on the basis of this distinction, a skill critical to a sensitive reading of Persuasion, depends on the effectiveness of the narrative in communicating the values of the implied author.

Not surprisingly, Austen continues to use a fairly simple type of refracted discourse during the early chapters of the novel. As Alistair Duckworth observes, a substantial estate is no longer the expression of well-being of the characters in this novel. Thus, when we meet Lady Russell, we have clear perceptions of Sir
Walter, as well as we have some insight into the admirable character of Anne, whose qualities have an even greater significance than those of earlier Austen heroines, for whom the support of manners and estates weighed in the balance. The relationship between Anne and Lady Russell has important implications: Anne "was only Anne" to her father: this simple FID puts us on Anne's side, coming as it does after we have learned not to trust the opinions of the old gentleman. But she was held in high esteem by Lady Russell--thus we count on Lady Russell's opinion as one on which we can depend. In addition, we must be able to account for Lady Russell's advice to Anne to reject Wentworth without discrediting him, since his eventual union with Anne we eagerly anticipate by the end of Chapter Four. But we must not lose respect for Anne because she capitulated to Lady Russell, which we would do if we were to see the older woman as totally unworthy of trust, and without evaluating Lady Russell's judgment as so infallible that Anne must have been wrong to have liked Wentworth in the first place. This problem is similar to the one of retaining respect for Wentworth, but it suggests different possibilities because Lady Russell could be infallible, Anne could be wrong in now doubting her, and
Wentworth could still be worthy if Lady Russell had been unknowingly misinformed about him.

However, the narrator describes the case of a woman "of steady age and character, and extremely well-provided for," who loves all the Elliots, but above all Anne, and whose information about Wentworth was correct in fact. Our first hint that Lady Russell might be partially flawed comes in "extremely well-provided for." This is slightly more subtle than the jabs at Sir Walter, but even on this third page of the novel, we can recognize Austen's purpose of unmasking subtle aspects of a character if we note the mildly parodic nature of the words: "extremely" suggests an emphasis on wealth, while "provided for" reminds us of the sheer good fortune of Lady Russell's position (she does not get credit for it herself). Austen thus exposes the real basis for the inclusion of this detail--Lady Russell is rich and that matters both in her social world and to her personally. In this double-accented, double-styled hybrid construction, we learn that her power is derived from this, as well as from her good intentions and intelligence.

Although Lady Russell has been described as an ineffective personality and as Austen's least wise
"mentor" character, Austen compensates for her lack of lifelike qualities by refracting intricate views on society through Lady Russell's consciousness and through narrative commentary about her. In Chapter Two we learn about Lady Russell mainly as she responds to her role in alerting Sir Walter to the danger of his situation and advising him in his course of action. These burdens fall to her from the hands of Sir Walter's legal advisor, who prefers not to dispatch disagreeable suggestions himself. The narrator describes Lady Russell in a double-voiced style which depends for our understanding on the notions of the implied author which we have been developing:

She was a benevolent, charitable, good woman, and capable of strong attachment: most correct in her conduct, strict in her notions of decorum, and with manners that were held a standard of good-breeding. She had a cultivated mind, and was, generally speaking, rational and consistent—but she had prejudices on the side of ancestry; she had a value for rank and consequence, which blinded her a little to the faults of those who possessed them.
The complexity of the refracted discourse in this passage results from the movement back and forth between the voice of society and that of the implied author. "She was a benevolent, charitable, good woman, and capable of strong attachment" conveys the implied author's admiration for Lady Russell. As the sentence moves on, however, we see her in terms of social values: "most correct in her conduct, strict in her notions of decorum, and with manners that were held a standard of good-breeding" all relate to externals, which, while not without consequence, tell us more about the conventions that influence Lady Russell's judgments than about her commitment to Anne (which the first part of the sentence does imply). The second part of the section has the same potential for refraction: "a cultivated mind, both rational and consistent," asks us to trust Lady Russell, but "prejudice, value for rank and consequence, and blind[ness]" unmask her motivations.

Although these two semantic and axiological belief systems have no formal boundaries, we can clearly demarcate them. Because of the insights gained through refracted discourse, we can analyze Lady Russell's continuing friendship with the Elliots. We know that she cares about them even after the death of Lady
Elliot, Sir Walter's clearly "better half." Anne's thoughts make us acutely sensitive to this when we reach Uppercross, and her sister, Mary, and husband, Charles, wax over the removal of the family from Kellynch-hall with disconcerting glibness: "She could only resolve to avoid such self-delusion in the future, and think with heightened gratitude of the extraordinary blessing of having such a truly sympathetic friend as Lady Russell." The friendship that Lady Russell extends to the entire family, even if it is more special toward Anne, helps us to see Anne in a situation that is not so monstrous that it overshadows our other concerns. But, although we believe that Lady Russell would not continue her friendship with Sir Walter and his other daughters if they were truly impossible, we still know that her offer of alliance comes to Sir Walter because of her "prejudice on the side of ancestry."

The reconstructed meanings of the discourse surrounding Lady Russell explain the conflict between her plan for Sir Walter and Elizabeth's retrenchment and Anne's standards for their curtailments. Anne's principles leave no question that severe measures must be taken, since she (and the implied author) values justice and equity: "Every emendation of Ann's had been
on the side of honesty against importance." Although Lady Russell says that "there is still more due to the character of an honest man [than to the feelings of a gentleman]," she equivocates because of the importance she assigns to their ancestry, causing Anne to find her friend's list of reductions "too gentle." The refracted discourse, "through the whole list of Lady Russell's too gentle reductions" tells us that Anne finds Lady Russell's regulations for clearing Sir Walter of his debts not stringent enough. Again, refracted discourse clues us into a character's reactions, this time Sir Walter's: "Lady Russell's had no success at all--could not be put up with--were not to be borne."

In the following, the first quotation reflects the indirect discourse of Anne's thoughts, while the second precedes Sir Walter's direct discourse. (The quotation marks signal direct discourse; the manner of expression is indirect--it is an indirect report of a direct discourse.) Why not then make each one a part of the singl-voiced discourse which either precedes or follows it? The nature of the embedded discourse answers the question: two voices speak to us in each case:

Her knowledge of her father and Elizabeth, inclined her to think that the sacrifice of
one pair of horses would be hardly less painful than of both, and so on, through the whole list of Lady Russell's too gentle reductions. How Anne's more rigid requisitions might have been taken, is of little consequence. Lady Russell's had no success at all—could not be borne. 'What! Every comfort of life knocked off! Journeys, London, servants, horses, table,—contractions and restrictions every where. To live no longer with the decencies even of a private gentleman! No, he would sooner quit Kellynch-hall at once, than remain in it on such disgraceful terms.'

The analysis of the refracted discourse differs from that of the indirect or the semi-direct discourse, especially when the latter is taken out of context, as in the first references to them, because we are not tempted when these instances are in isolation to merge their voices with another. In the case of Anne's thought, that the sacrifice of one pair of horses would be almost as painful as that of both (a wonderful estimation of Elizabeth and her father in their blind adherence to values that are both false and that
recognize no priorities), we may infer that the implied author would agree with Anne. However, the insight is hers, the narrator has reported them, and we sense that Anne is very close to what we know of the values of the implied author. The "too gentle" tells us unequivocally, given what we know of her, that the implied author joins Anne in this statement. The two form a chorus in this part of the sentence belonging grammatically only to the narrator, not to Anne. Without it, we do not have any evidence for the implied author's opinion of Lady Russell's position. Indeed, this is a small point— one might say that we could have accurately guessed that position—but it is nevertheless significant as an example of how refracted discourse works to form our notions of the implied author (and thus leads us to adopt views and emotional attachments almost subconsciously).

While we do not register these brief and subtle authorial intrusions on the conscious level, we cannot analyze them without the help of earlier portions of the text which have let us know more explicitly, through unmasking and ironic debunking, how we should estimate a particular character or world view. In the case of Sir Walter, ironic debunking precedes the report of direct
discourse, so that we have authorial comment without
direct narratorial report. The implied author's view
that Sir Walter is an old windbag could hardly be more
effectively conveyed than it is here. We can hear Sir
Walter saying, "I cannot bear this; I cannot put up with
such suggestions," and the quotation marks following the
double-voices tell us that he did indeed say comparable
things. However, what comes within the quotation tells
us only what Sir Walter said, not what the implied
author thinks of it. Again, we could guess at that, but
the force of the refracted discourse is much stronger
than our silent conjectures about authorial stance would
be.

We can appreciate the complexity of Lady Russell's
position on the earlier Anne-Wentworth engagement
because of the insights we have gained through refracted
discourse and by Austen's continued use of its technical
possibilities:

Anne Elliot, with all her claims of birth,
beauty, and mind, to throw herself away at
nineteen in an engagement with a young man,
who had nothing to recommend him, had no hopes
of attaining affluence. . . would be indeed, a
throwing away, which she grieved to think
of! 3
The stylized language of this passage follows a paragraph in which the narrator discusses the earlier romance of Anne and Wentworth in gentle terms, describing Wentworth as "a remarkably fine young man, with a great deal of intelligence, spirit and brilliancy" and he and Anne as "deeply in love." No grammatical markers signal a change in voice from the narrator's description to the next paragraph, but we do know by the ending comments about the romance that we are entering Lady Russell's character zone: "and Lady Russell, though with a more tempered and pardonable pride [than that of the haughty Sir Walter], received it as a most unfortunate [engagement]."

Why does the narrator not say, then, that Lady Russell thought this was an unfortunate situation? I submit that such a technique would undervalue the insight we gain through the unmarked parodic stylization because the latter forces us to ask whether the implied author still concurs with any of the vision and how we are to view it. If we were not forced to think we would say, "Oh, yes, that is Lady Russell thinking," and be done with it. A closer analysis, stirred by the double voices, reveals that the implied author agrees that Anne has claims of birth, beauty, and mind, but she knows
that Anne's superiority goes beyond these. The implied author would not use such a term as "throw herself away," and she does not necessarily think that affluence is a prerequisite for marriage (although physical comfort is). However, she does believe that "the chances of a most uncertain profession" calls for concern, and in this, Lady Russell, society, the implied author, and Anne, herself, are united:

Anne Elliot, so young; known to so few, to be snatched off by a stranger without alliance or fortune; or rather sunk by him into a state of most wearing, anxious, youth-killing dependance! It must not be, if by any fair interference of friendship, any representations from one who had almost a mother's love, and mother's rights, it would be prevented.¹⁴

The depiction of Lady Russell's emotional connection with Anne's welfare demonstrates the former's "strong attachment," while it also reveals that she indulges in an overly-emotional perspective when advising Anne ("snatched off" and "sunk by him" carry strong connotations about the older woman's fear of the unfamiliar, untested, and "unancestered"). Now we may
go on to hope for Anne's engagement to Wentworth unencumbered by reservations instilled by Lady Russell's early objections to him, and enlightened by Anne's acceptance of the "wretchedness" of the counsel. Lady Russell is not malevolent; she is just a "little blind," and some of her claims against Wentworth were justified at the time she made them. Her later reactions to the supposed romance between Wentworth and Louisa depends on the same insights into her character. But not only does this several-faceted depiction of Lady Russell serve structural needs of the author, but it attests to her earlier mentioned acceptance of contradictory qualities within the same individual and her commitment to reveal character artistically.15

Refracted discourse naturally tends to become more complex as narratives progress because the accumulating insights allow for an increasingly dialogic representation of characters and society. Building on the early elements she developed, Austen faced challenging technical problems which account for a continued and more complicated use of refracted discourse: Anne's family is thoroughly unattractive, but Austen sought at the same time as she presented them negatively, to create an image in her heroine of a young
woman whose loyalty to her father and sisters we would admire. Furthermore, choosing to endow Anne with fine critical perceptions, so that we might indeed expect her to detect and disapprove of what are sometimes dangerous moral defects, not just foibles, in Sir Walter, Elizabeth, and Mary, she had to account for Anne’s acceptance yet her equally firm awareness of her family’s deficits. She also had to make it believable that such a fine woman was produced in an unnurturing environment. If we depend on Lady Russell’s approbation of the Elliots as an explanation, we must consider that it may be based, after all, on their public and small private gatherings—we still must question their inner motivations. Anne’s ability to blossom almost like Stephen Crane’s Maggie, in a mud puddle, needs explanation, which her narrative provided by the refraction of the implied author’s judgments of Sir Walter, Elizabeth, and Mary (and those minor characters who exhibit characteristics similar to theirs through their own language). In this way Anne is absolved of much of the responsibility for any possible malevolence, while we understand, through Austen’s artfully crafted narrative, the influence which made Anne the wonderful woman she is.
Although much of Anne's blossom has faded during seven years, since the break between her and Wentworth, through a skillful use of story and refracted discourse, Austen illuminates Anne's forebearance, indeed her dignity, in the face of others' thoughtlessness. This characteristic finds expression in the case of the Musgroves' deference to their daughters' musical performance, despite the superior quality of Anne's playing. In this instance, we not only have proof of Anne's moral integrity, but we find a delicate, yet indisputable, reason for it. Anne receives "much more pleasure for their sakes than mortification for her own." How can we account for such an unselfish nature? In large part, we have been prepared for this vision of Anne in the ways described above. It is important to note that here we have an instance where Anne's inclination might be to experience some of the pity which we feel for her and to thereby increase our sense of her humanness. Austen creates such an instance, however, not to make us aware of the commonness of Anne's humanity, but of its uniqueness. In addition, the narrative is colored by one significant phrase, "dear mother," which refracts Anne's feeling and the implied author's value. We are thus reminded of the
woman whose lovely nature is described in the first chapter and referred to again in the thoughts of Lady Russell. Without much difficulty, we can accept that during her fourteen years with Anne, this mother, "dear" in Anne's memory, provided her daughter with enough self-esteem to withstand the feelings of dejection we might expect her to have as the "outsider." When the Musgroves choose to favor their own children, Anne's response reflects the selfless love she enjoyed from her own mother.

It is the "dear," of course, that reminds us of Anne's mother's qualities and which assures us that the relationship contributed significantly to Anne's development. We witness the power of just one word of refracted discourse: our previous knowledge of Lady Elliot increases the meaning of the word, and reciprocally, the word, denoting a construct of feeling, adds to our sense of her mother's importance to Anne. Sir Walter does not earn this feeling from even the daughter on whom he bestows his best affections because his preference stems from his self-centeredness—his recognition in Elizabeth of those qualities for which he prides himself, namely good looks and false pride. We not only realize that to be preferred by Sir Walter is a
liability, but also that we can make distinctions within Anne's family which account for her superior nature. We accept that Anne had the opportunity to develop fine qualities because of her mother—and we know her mother through Anne's excellence. The other ingredient in this circular relationship is the implied author, whose values we understood before we knew very much about Anne.

Anne responds admirably to the Musgroves when a little later they praise her justly for playing unrelentingly for their less affluent cousins. Had we seen Anne as suffering from a want of attention, this recognition would have been tainted with our sense of its inadequacy—it would have fallen short of what we needed Anne to have. Moreover, we would have been developing an animus towards the Musgroves which Anne's gentle nature has discouraged. By holding us just at the edge of pity for Anne, Austen increases our engagement with her heroine, but keeps us from sentimentalizing. Again, one word of refracted discourse, "dear," helps us to support this structure by making it plausible that one individual might stand in such remarkable contrast to her family background and behave so well in her present circumstances.
Occasionally Austen gives us very complex views on the social world in which her characters move. Like other facets of the novel, these increase our awareness of the values of the implied author, as well as they enrich our sense of the environment and the ways in which we might be asked to judge particular characters. The introduction of Mary and her in-laws at Uppercross provides such an example and supports W. A. Craik's observation that in Austen's novels in general, and in *Persuasion* in particular, the minor characters reveal themselves ironically. Mary possesses what seem to be the only unattractive qualities missing from her oldest sister and father. The simple narrative description, "Though better endowed than the elder sister, Mary had not Anne's understanding or temper," prepares the way for the depiction of one of literature's great whiners. Her dialogue with Anne reveals her discontent, while it demonstrates Anne's tact and patience when faced with her sister's tediousness. As if Mary's complaints were not enough, Anne must endure a trip to the Musgroves immediately upon her arrival. In a few lines, characterized by their polyglot nature, Anne gives way to the thought which her advent at Uppercross stimulates:
Oh! Could the originals of the portraits against the wainscot, could the gentlemen in brown velvet and the ladies in blue satin have seen what was going on, have been conscious of such an overthrow of all order and neatness! The portraits themselves seemed to be staring in astonishment.17

The mocking language of this hybrid construction, similar to those of Dickens, reveals a pseudo-objective motivation. On the surface (and this is very superficial!) Anne is criticizing the Musgroves, who flout social expectations. However, Anne’s estimation of Mary’s in-laws is unlike her true opinion of her sister. This paragraph has served to debunk the society which would devalue the Musgroves for their untidiness.

The stylization denotes two individual linguistic consciousnesses, that of the stylizer and that of the one being stylized, and in this case the two representers, Anne, through refracted discourse, and the narrator, directly, expose society. Bakhtin’s prescription for the representing language, that it have an internal logic of its own and be capable of revealing a world bound up with it, returns us to our conception of the implied author.
The next paragraph suggests, in a narratorial voice, the value of the Musgroves, "... a very good sort of people; friendly and hospitable, not much educated, and not at all elegant." We realize, through an economical use of language, from the stylized narrative to the direct narratorial report, that a particular decorum had been the custom. As well as defending the Musgroves in their naivety and occasional boorishness, Austen highlights Anne's keen awareness of the value of particular individuals, all the while remaining mindful of the mores of the larger group.

Therefore, Austen's stylization in this instance can contain ironic debunking reservations, without misleading us to a total rejection of societal values. The portraits would be astonished at the "chaos" of the Musgroves parlour (old value), but the Musgroves "were in a state of alteration, perhaps of improvement" (value of the new generation). The support for both sides continues: the Musgroves are commended for their friendliness and hospitality; the grown children, Henrietta and Louisa, have "the usual stock of accomplishments" (a mild putting down of British public school education), but are nevertheless worthy of Anne's admiration. They are regarded favorably at home and
elsewhere, are cheerful and pretty, and seem to Anne to be unusually happy young women.

Nonetheless, the narrator assures us of Anne's superiority: she possesses a "more elegant and cultivated mind." We have no question that the latter is preferable to even the lovely qualities of the two Musgrove women, but we have become acquainted with numerous and overlapping systems in these two passages. First, the old often rejects the new, as refracted in the allusion to the portraits on the parlour wall; second, the older generation should be respected for their congeniality, if not their education; third, "good" and expensive educations frequently result in superficial unserviceable gains; fourth, this superficiality does not always have purely negative consequences (dramatized in the persons of Louisa and Henrietta); fifth, an "elegant and cultivated mind" exceeds in value external accomplishments, and, moreover, is capable of discerning all the nuances of the preceding social values. The juxtaposition of refracted discourse and the next paragraph, demonstrating an extensive use of heteroglossia, appears not to be accidental. The former introduces us to a dialogic relationship between thoughts of an individual
character and social values; the second continues this dialogue between narrator and society, bringing back the character finally (in a slightly more subjective role than the narrator) to create a three-way dialectic. Austen's accomplishments in these paragraphs are worth noting: she had directed the reader to view issues and characters on several levels (which is, of course, a distinct part of their reality) and to reserve easy prej udgments of minor characters, while she adds to our vision of Anne as a distinctly fine person.

Finally, the most complex use of refracted discourse concerns Austen's manipulation of how we know what we know about Anne. While she has established in the first few chapters what qualities Anne must have in order to be the most attractive woman Austen can develop, she chooses what Virginia Woolf noted was common for her--"the dangerous path whereby one slip means death." Anne's self-awareness must be great enough for us to admire her, but she must not be a boastful young woman. She also must not be pathetic. In fact, since she is at this stage of the novel a character in a static fate, our interest in her greatly depends on Austen's ability to make Anne's consciousness dramatically moving.¹⁸ The presentation of Anne's inner
self, through FID and augmented by other sorts of refracted discourse, accomplishes Austen's obvious intention, leaving a small burden to the plot, which in and of itself is rather simple. What seems most compelling about *Persuasion* is Anne's "elegant and cultivated mind."

Were Anne not imbued with such qualities of discernment, the reader might find it incredible that she calmly accepts her situation at Uppercross—amid relatively unfeeling personages, whose main concerns revolve around trivia of one sort or another. But, given her astuteness, we expect awareness as well as acceptance from Anne, and find pleasure in the exposition of the former in a narratorial sentence colored by Anne's impressions: "Mary was not so repulsive and unsisterly as Elizabeth nor so inaccessible to all influence of hers..." (underlining mine). Both the judgmental character of the underlined words and the previous sentence, "She had no dread of these two months" tell us that we are experiencing Anne's point of view. If Anne described Elizabeth as repulsive and unsisterly, her image would change for us ever so slightly. We do not see our heroine as contentious—that is precisely what she is
not, both in her family situation and in her relationship with Wentworth. But Anne does realize, at some level of consciousness, Elizabeth's sinister traits, Mary's absurd mannerisms, and the qualitative difference between the two. Refracted discourse allows a division of responsibility: the narrator assumes the task of reporting and lending support to Anne's impressions, embedding them in phrases of direct narratorial report, but Anne is accountable for the perceptions themselves. Because Anne's realizations about her sisters is not situated in time or place, it gains in factual status. (When the reader witnesses the development of impressions and perceptions, she is invited to judge their reliability, even if ever so slightly.) This characteristic, combined with the narrator's authority, convinces us that Anne has not erred in her judgment. Anne's sensibilities and pain in her situation do not go undocumented, however, but their revelation through refracted discourse leads to a comparison of Mary and Anne:

So passed the first three weeks. Michaelmas came; and now Anne's heart must be in Kellynch again. A beloved home made over to others; all the precious rooms and furniture, groves,
and prospects, beginning to own other eyes and
other limbs! . . .[Mary's direct dialogue]:
'Dear me! is not this the day the Crofts were
to come to Kellynch? I am glad I did not
think of it before. How low it makes me!'
The juxtaposition of Anne's gentle attachment to
Kellynch-hall, beloved home, precious rooms, and
furniture, groves, and prospects and Mary's verbal,
self-indulgent proclamation reveals the difference
between the two sisters (and reminds us, also, of the
earlier greediness of Sir Walter and Elizabeth). The
contrast between the sisters gains its poignancy from
the subtlety refracted discourse affords.

Austen uses refracted discourse with equal
effectiveness when she describes Wentworth's attitude
toward Anne after their initial reunion. This narrative
passage clearly conveys the strength of Wentworth's
position:

He had thought her wretchedly altered, and, in
the first moment of appeal, had spoken as he
felt. He had not forgiven Anne Elliot. She
had used him ill; deserted and disappointed
him; and worse, she had shewn a feebleness of
character in doing so, which his own decided,
confident temper could not endure. She had given him up to oblige others. It had been the effect of over-persuasion. It had been weakness and timidity.20

In this passage, reminiscent in its use of "wretched" of an earlier instance which conveyed Anne’s feelings about Lady Russell’s early counsel, the narrator sympathizes with Wentworth in his feelings that he was ill-treated, since he does not understand Anne’s situation entirely. The narrator hints in the description of "his own decided confident temper" that he might be slightly arrogant, and thus unable to sympathize with the position Anne had been in at nineteen years of age. Since Wentworth was unsettled in his profession at the time of their engagement, and since he is not from the class of old money like the Elliots, Anne was especially amenable to suggestions that she break off their engagement. Although we join with the implied author in sympathizing with Wentworth’s hurt, we also resist his haughty dismissal of Anne. The refracted discourse calls up our previous knowledge about Anne, her world, Lady Russell, and the implied author’s distinctive voice.
In the next paragraph, the double-voiced style continues: "Her power with him was gone for ever." Clearly, this is Wentworth's belief about Anne, not a factual assertion by the narrator, nor an instance of ironic collusion between reader and narrator. While we welcome the prospect for Anne's future which the reappearance of Captain Wentworth intimates, we realize the complications we must see safely resolved before our expectations can be fulfilled—especially that Wentworth must get over the hurt pride which he suffered at Anne's rejection. The narrative style allows us to sympathize with Wentworth and Anne simultaneously. This achievement marks a move away from characters whose motivations stem from external complications, as in drama, toward the exciting novelistic accomplishment of creating characters whose actions depend on internal states. The dramatic portrayal of these states is in fact analogous to a soliloquy in a drama.

The delicate presentation of Anne's overwhelming emotional response to Wentworth could not be developed without the technique of refracted discourse. "Once so much to each other! Now nothing!" asks us to yearn with Anne for that resolution. Yet, why has the narrator not reported Anne's thought through indirect discourse? Why
are we given only FID, so that we must remain unsure of the level of conscious awareness Anne has of her own desires? The distance between the reader and Anne increases in such a case (we are sure of her feeling; we are not sure that she is sure of those feelings). For one thing, Austen offers us the added pleasure of anticipating Anne’s own full recognition while we ride along, as Wayne Booth would say, in the back seat with the implied author, enjoying the ironic distance created by our greater knowledge of Anne’s emotional state. Of course, we must not feel actually superior to Anne, and paradoxically, we are kept from doing so by the same FID which gives us the pleasure of heightened awareness.

Comparing Anne again to her sister, Mary, illustrates Anne’s superiority. Mary complains continually about a series of trivial matters, communicated by direct discourse. Anne’s refusal to dwell excessively, even in her own mind, on the unfortunate nature of her earlier mistake, on the misjudgment of Lady Russell exercised, or on her present uneasiness in the face of the constant reminder of her lost opportunity makes her dignity all the more impressive. Narrative reports through indirect discourse of Anne’s misery would tend to arouse more
pity than admiration fro the reader. Were the narrator to be repeating, "she thought," "she sadly recalled," "she agonized," "she felt," etc., she would be making a strong bid for our pity. To the contrary, we enter Anne's mind without qualifications. Our experience is immediate, as we realize Anne's is, and that immediacy, that lack of prolonged thought, leaves open the question of Anne's own engagement with her dolorous feelings. In other words, the refracted discourse gives us feeling, more than intellectual processing. On the mimetic level, we consider characters more responsible for their intellectual attitudes than for their feelings. An important part of Anne's character concerns not only how she behaves outwardly (even Mary can bring herself to embark on a pleasant walk with the two sisters-in-law about whom she had just been complaining), but even more with how she deals internally with the facts and the feelings which she cannot change.

In this analysis, we might consider indirect discourse and narrative report to be levels of discourse which stimulate the greatest admiration for Anne, since at that level her thoughts are private (thus she might reveal less attractive qualities than she would publicly in direct discourse), and they are also conscious and
frequently responsive to moral and value judgments. In addition, narrative report includes narrative judgment, as the following reveals:

... but Anne, at seven and twenty, thought very differently from what she had been made to think at nineteen. She did not blame Lady Russell, she did not blame herself for having been guided by her; but she felt that were any young person, in similar circumstances, to apply to her for counsel, they would never receive any of such certain immediate wretchedness, such uncertain future good.21

One element which is missing from such narrative report is spontaneity (which we do frequently experience in refracted discourse, particularly in FID), but we have instead its antithesis, well thought-out beliefs and ideas. The only hint of subjectivity to Anne's emotional state in this passage is "wretchedness," an example of Anne's true sadness over her youthful persuadable nature. Refracted discourse, however, results in shared experience between character and reader, often including the implied author and the narrator.
We become engaged again with Anne's feelings toward Wentworth through refracted discourse after Louisa is on the mend. Anne and Lady Russell have decided to pay a visit to the Crofts at Kellynch-hall (a visit which Anne dreads less than Lady Russell does, inured as she is to the pain of new occupants in her home by her awareness of the superior natures of the tenants to the "rightful inhabitants"), and there hear news of Captain Wentworth from his sister, Mrs. Croft. Her message concerning Wentworth's concern for Miss Elliot's welfare after her exertions in behalf of Louisa--exertions which he esteemed as great--bring the response "This was handsome," a narrative comment colored by Anne's judgment. The narrator's following comment that this gave Anne much pleasure emphasizes the "handsome," but does not diminish the importance of the word as a special reflection of Anne's feelings. When Anne learns during this same visit that the Crofts will be away for a few weeks, the narrator reports:

So ended all danger to Anne of meeting Captain Wentworth at Kellynch-hall, or of seeing him in company with her friend. Everything was safe enough and she smiled over the many anxious feelings she had wasted on the
With regard to Captain Wentworth, though Anne hazarded no enquiries, there was voluntary communication sufficient\(^2\) (underlining mine).

The underlined words of refracted discourse serve to distance us from Anne, as we share their irony with the narrator. Paradoxically, they bring us close to Anne in the sense that we realize how uncomfortable she is with her strong feelings for Wentworth, how jealous she really is of his attentions to Louisa (a little earlier an indirect discourse report of Anne's thought revealed her confidence that Wentworth and Louisa indeed would have a future together), and how she must distance herself from such feelings. The dramatic irony has the effect of making the reader feel anxious about Anne's attempts at self-delusion, just as he would if she failed to realize some situational element of which he were aware. Refracted discorse offers Austen an important possibility in this instance: she can skirt the issue of Anne's awareness of the depth of her feeling—how dangerous would it be to see Wentworth and Louisa? How painful not to see Wentworth at all? How comfortable is such "safety," and are hours spent in such anxious suffering "wasted," or are they endured?
Indirect discourse would suggest a different commitment on Anne's part and would reduce the ironic effect and the security it offers us in continuing to expect the reunion of Anne and Wentworth.

Sometimes refracted discourse can only be ascertained in second and later readings. For example, the lines regarding Wentworth, "He was only wrong in accepting the attentions (for accepting must be the word) of two young women at once" could be construed as narrative comment—or at least as colored narrative, following as they do Anne's indirect discourse. However, realizing later Wentworth's innocence with regard to the young Musgrove women, we must attribute the thought to Anne, and to the narrator only as ironic. An example of irony and Anne's hidden desire occurs in the following passage:

Anne found herself by this time growing so much more hardened to being in Captain Wentworth's company than she had at first imagined could ever be, that the sitting down to the same table with him now, and the interchange of the common civilities attending on it—(they never got beyond) was become a mere nothing²³ (underlining mine).
The judgmental and emphatic "mere nothing" is Anne's language. Placed as it is in FID, it has a special role. We are alerted that we are in Anne's mind by "Anne found," but the language is the narrator's. The last three words indicate FID in the sense of language, but they communicate something quite different from "hardened." A paraphrase would be: "While Anne was not as uncomfortable as she had been formerly in Wentworth's company, she wished he were for her a mere nothing." It is not difficult to see that something significant would be lost if Austen were to address her audience thus. We would be denied the pleasure of deciding on our own that Anne did not consider Wentworth a mere nothing—and the mode of recognition is hardly irrelevant. Secret understandings such as we and the narrator share here increase intimacy and delight, whether they happen in literature or life. This, like many passages of refracted discourse, imitates the experience of friends joined in a common insight.

Refracted discourse is also quite complex when it provides major insights on minor characters and influences our responses to plot developments. Narrative report, colored by Mary's judgment, demonstrates this: "Mary had had her evils... when
they dined with the Harvilles there had been only a maid-servant to wait . . . ." We are reminded of Mary's flawed character in the underlined word of qualification and might contrast her slighting of the Harvilles with Anne's closeness to Mrs. Smith. The following narratorial report of Mary's disdain for Captain Benwick gains in its implications because we have been reminded of Mary's superficiality:

Whether from not considering [him] . . . entitled by birth and situation to be in love with an Elliot, or from not wanting to believe Anne a greater attraction to Upercross than herself, must be left to be guessed. 24

Of course, we guess that Mary is capable of succumbing to both motivations, while we gain respect for Benwick, whose attentions flatter Anne. Just as her father's repudiation of Wentworth works in his favor, Mary's self-centered reflections on Benwick place him in our category of "worthy person" (although, as some critics suggest, he assumes that distinction only marginally 25). This has the long-range gain of foreshadowing and increasing our sense-of-well-being about Louisa's engagement to Benwick, and the short-term gain of
allowing us to see the young gentleman as a potential threat to the happy engagement of Anne and Wentworth.

We might ask why refracted discourse is used with restraint at a time when we most want to know Anne's feelings. After Louisa's fall, the narrator says "The horror of that moment to all who stood around" was overwhelming. But we are caught up with Anne's actions. She becomes a part of a group, joined in mutual distress, which we would not sense if she were lost in her own thoughts. Instead, we learn, "As to the wretched party left behind, it could scarcely be said which of the three, who were completely rational, was suffering the most, Captain Wentworth, Anne, or Charles."

However, it can be said, and is by the narrator, that one member lends the most support to the wretched group—and that is Anne. While we might anticipate jealousy, or at least some indifference, in a lesser character, our expectations for Anne's superiority are realized. Of course, we would enjoy a look into Anne's heart at this moment—is she not pained at Wentworth's seeming devotion to Louisa? On a first reading, we cannot perhaps help but wonder at this, but subsequent readings confirm Austen's choice not to reveal this as a
wise one. When we learn about Anne's emotions later, we realize that during the crisis, they were naturally in abeyance. Austen could do only one thing here--have Anne act or react--and she makes the appropriate choice. What we do get later, on the other hand, satisfies our need for knowing Anne's emotional state: after witnessing on the ride home with Henrietta and Wentworth the latter's grief for the injured party ("Dear, sweet, Louisa," he cries), she wonders whether he now might consider firmness of character, the quality which he found lacking in Anne, but attributed to Louisa, an advantage only when in proportion and limit. The indirect discourse keeps us at a greater remove from Anne's inner self (more in her mind than in her heart) than would FID. Thus the incident ends without giving insight into Anne and uncomplicated by over-charged emotion.

Austen renders the reunion scene of Anne and Captain Wentworth in refracted discourse. In this case, the narrator reports the direct dialogue of the lovers, interspersed with the dialogue itself. The combination reveals that each character's language, similar in style and emotional quality, resembles the narrator's. This lack of distinction in style corresponds to the lack of
tension among narrator, characters, and society. For example, the following reports sound very much alike, the first one in the narrator's language and the second in Wentworth's:

He persisted in having loved none but her. She had never been supplanted. He never even believed himself to see her equal. Thus much indeed he was obliged to acknowledge—that he had been constant unconsciously, nay unintentionally; that he had meant to forget her, and believed it to be done. He had imagined himself indifferent, when he had only been angry; and he had been unjust to her merits, because he had been a sufferer from them.

'I found,' said he, 'that I was considered by Harville an engaged man! That neither Harville nor his wife entertained a doubt of our mutual attachment. I was startled and shocked. To a degree, I could contradict this instantly; but, when I began to reflect that others might have felt the same—her own family, nay, perhaps herself, I was no longer at my own disposal. I was hers in honour as
she wished it. . . . I had not considered that my excessive intimacy must have its danger of ill consequence in many ways. . . ."26

The two voices sound alike, from the qualifying "nay" to the formal and literary-sounding phrases, "constant unconsciously" and "danger of ill consequence," "imagined himself indifferent," and "considered that my excessive intimacy," and the judgmental nouns, ""sufferer," "engaged man," "honour," "intimacy," as well as the emotionally overladen verbs and verbal phrases, "loved," "had been angry," "startled and shocked," modified by ones of reflections, "believed," "imagined," "reflect" and "had not considered."

Because Austen intends to provide evidence that her narrative statement, "There they returned again into the past, more exquisitely happy . . . more tender, more tried, more fixed in a knowledge of each other's character truth and attachment; more equal to act, more justified in acting," which introduces this scene is indeed equal to her act of writing and justified in what we have learned, she removes any sense of distance between what we know and feel and what the characters know and feel. The perfection of her world, darker though this one may be, depends on such an unqualified union of forces, both of thought and feeling.
A loose strand remaining at the end of the reunion concerns Lady Russell. If we were to take her seriously at all, and I have argued that we must if we were to take Anne's following her advice as plausible, then her reaction to the engagement demands consideration before Austen can end the novel. And here again we see refracted discourse providing the means for her to convey complexities:

Anne knew that Lady Russell must be suffering some pain in understanding and relinquishing Mr. Elliot, and be making some struggles to become truly acquainted with, and do justice to Captain Wentworth. This however was what Lady Russell had now to do. She must learn to feel that she had been mistaken with regard to both; that she had been unfairly influenced by appearances in each; that because Captain Wentworth's manner had not suited her own ideas, she had been too quick in suspecting them to indicate a character of dangerous impetuosity; and that because Mr. Elliot's manners had precisely pleased her in their propriety and correctness, their general politeness and suavity, she had been too quick
in receiving them as the certain result of the most correct opinions and well regulated mind. There was nothing less for Lady Russell to do, than to admit that she had been pretty completely wrong, and to take up a new set of opinions and of hopes.27

The technique of using Anne's FID, which surely refracts the narrator's opinion as well, re-emphasizes that the novel is more concerned with Anne's growth than with Lady Russell's opinions. The conviction which this FID asserts makes us all the more aware of the firmness of Anne's character now and reveals her once again as a person capable of fine discriminations and strong attachments to others.

Thus, we are able to leave Anne with Wentworth, still surrounded by some foolish characters, and not worry that they will ever undermine her integrity. She cannot reject Sir Walter, Mrs. Clay, Mary, or Elizabeth totally, which is perhaps why Douglas Bush argues that Anne's character and experience do not invite the usual play of irony.28 On the other hand, late in the novel she has been able in her FID to reveal the strength of her animus toward superficial, foolish creatures:
It was bad enough that a Mrs. Clay should always be before her; but that a deeper hypocrite should be added to their party, seemed the destruction of everything peace and comfort. It was so humiliating to reflect on the constant deception practised on her father and Elizabeth; to consider the various sources of mortification for them! Mrs. Clay's selfishness was not so complicated nor so revolting as his [Sir William's]. . . .

And as Anne endures the entrance of Sir Walter and Elizabeth into a room of company including Captain Wentworth, refracted discourse boldly asserts her feelings:

The comfort, the freedom, the gaiety of the room was over, hushed into cold composure, determined silence, or insipid talk, to meet the heartless elegance of her father and sister. How mortifying to feel that it was so!

As in the discourse of the reunion, here the implied author, character, and reader have almost one voice. The forcefulness of these passages, like the one about Lady Russell, assure us that Anne is not just
equal to acting, but that she is indeed more tried and more fixed in her knowledge of not just Wentworth, but others in her society. Because her early refracted discourse led us to believe that Anne would reach this point, we feel justified in this happy end.

In the next chapter, we should keep in mind W.A. Craik's observation that *Persuasion* looks forward to George Eliot, who creates narrators who indicate, by the tone and rhythm of the language, that a particular view belongs to a character, and that the character is wrong, rather than to the narrator who superficially reports it as fact.³¹
In our study of refracted discourse in *Persuasion*, we learned that although indirect narrative techniques might be used to emphasize the nature of any of the novel's characters, Austen reserved it mainly for illuminating the character of Anne Eliot. Sometimes the refracted discourse allows us to experience an ironic tension, created by the gap between what we know about Anne's attitudes and emotions, and what we think she knows; at other times we "listen in" to thoughts of Anne's which would lose their particular effect were they reported in another mode; and frequently we evaluate Anne against a background of social values which we interpret and analyze in the heteroglossia that reports those values and Anne's reactions to them. In all instances, however, our positive impressions of Austen's near-perfect heroine are intensified.

On the other hand, George Eliot uses refracted discourse to create, sustain, or augment complexities in the nature of her characters and in their world. Because of the realities of the Middlemarch community, a society in which individuals and events are interwoven
in a spider-like web, Eliot does not limit her use of this technique to the central character. Reva Strump defines this web as "the fabric of human life which George Eliot partially unravels and examines in order to discover whatever is discernible about that fabric, what some parts are and how they relate to the whole."¹ These relationships are enhanced by the refracted discourse which surrounds the direct discourse, while narrative descriptions of other characters embellish long narrative passages, and thus moves the novel in the direction of what W.D. Howells described as "its truth to motives as well as results."²

We might argue that Eliot's divergent use of the technique reflects the difference between her intentions and Austen's. Austen depicts a society in which clearly discernible rules and expectations govern the lives of her characters, who either operate successfully within that world, or suffer the consequences. A good life is the reward for those few who have the wisdom to integrate humanistic, individual and social values. As readers we can make distinctions among characters and assess social values with assurance because of the "tight" construction of *Persuasion*. Eliot's very different perception of the potentials, limits and
expressions of human existence, which inform Middlemarch, finds a voice in her refracted discourse. Any notion we might develop of a particular character, based on his direct or indirect discourse, actions, or on the reports of other characters, may be modified by the refracted discourse surrounding that character. Barbara Hardy has studied the structural qualities of a chapter of the novel and concludes that Eliot's typical chapter in Middlemarch exhibits a "loose unity, often with a local concentration of ideas, atmosphere and symbol, as well as of time and place." The "local concentration of ideas" frequently includes refracted discourse--either in the FID of characters or in the ironic or otherwise double-voiced sections of narrator's passages--binding each chapter in a "loose unity."

Eliot's rich and varied use of this mode of discourse offers a number of useful ways into studying its functions, but again, I think, we are able to perceive the most important functions through an examination of the major characters; thus I have chosen Dorothea and Lydgate as the centers of my study. To study Dorothea and Lydgate fully, it is also necessary to study Casaubon and Rosamond since it is through the emotions, attitudes, and interactions involving their
respective mates that Dorothea and Lydgate may be best understood. In addition, these two central characters provide an important basis for contrast: Dorothea embraces honorable ideals, but she does not have the power to realize her lofty goals; Lydgate also expresses noble ambitions, and as a male in a patriarchal, conservative society, he has the greater potential for attaining his ends.

The complexity of this contrast and the modifications which Eliot insists we make in our judgments of each of these characters result mainly from her very effective use of refracted discourse. In general, the use of refracted discourse in connection with Dorothea increases our sympathy for her, while its use in connection with Lydgate highlights his limitations. At the same time, its use with Casaubon also increases our sympathy, while its use with Rosamond sometimes increases, sometimes decreases, our sympathy. The details and consequences of these effects will be the focus of my study in this chapter.

D.H. Lawrence might well have been thinking of Middlemarch when he wrote:

If we can't hear the cries far down in our own forests of dark veins, we can look in the real
novels, and there listen-in. Not listen to the didactic statements of the author, but to the low, calling cries of characters, as they wander in the dark woods of their destiny. Although Arnold Kettle argues that *Middlemarch* is "mechanistic and undialectical" as a result of Eliot's high-minded and serious attitude, I will argue that the effects of didactic statements in the novel are significantly modified by refracted discourse. Not only does Eliot pay attention to "the place of passions in the psychic unity of character," but she subtly embeds meaning in narrative through subtle methods.

In a number of instances, Eliot uses a single word repeatedly to refract social and individual norms, revealing through the various meanings of this word the values with which her readers might identify: the word I will focus on is the word "poor." "Poor" frequently modifies the names of characters who are in mental distress or who suffer under false apprehensions.

Since we will look first at Dorothea, it will be helpful to look at the way that the narrator uses poor with regard to her. "Poor Dorothea [claims that] marriage is a state of higher duties. I never thought of it as mere personal ease." The adjective suggests
the narrator's pity, while her questioning of Dorothea's attitude implies another possible standard—one which would perhaps come between higher duties and mere personal ease. We might conjecture that Eliot is hinting at the idea that marriage can be a place for interdependency and sharing of duties, pleasures, and difficulties.

In another instance, the narrator's report of "poor" Dorothea includes adjectives which refract the intensity of Dorothea's response, remaining sympathetic to Dorothea even while asserting a superiority to her: "[to] poor Dorothea these severe classical nudities and smirking Renaissance Correggiosities were painfully inexplicable, staring into the midst of her Puritanic conceptions: she had never been taught how she could bring them into any sort of relevance with her life."8 Eliot uses the sentence to give us a good sense of Dorothea's dilemma—she operates with a Puritan code; she sees these examples of culture, whose subject-matter is at odds with the code. Although she knows that they are not evil, she cannot see their value: in other words, their relevance to the Puritanic code. Again, Dorothea's rational concern for filling higher duties tells her that art must have a purpose. The narrator,
who asks us to consider life less theologically, suggests the same analysis when Dorothea finds herself unable to appreciate "the oppressive masquerade of ages" in Rome.

These examples, and many others I will cite later, demonstrate that the function of the adjective "poor" is to register social values versus authorial stance, and thus to indicate either narrative irony or cues for reader sympathy. In addition, we are prepared to analyze the usefulness of this technique in establishing a philosophy critical to the organization of the novel, once we have seen how rich and varied the meanings of this one word can be. Taken together, the many times Eliot supplies the adjective "poor" for characters reveal the significance she places on an individual's ability to perceive reality and to adjust to it.

When characters are described as "poor," they are either unable to integrate reality with their expectations and desires, or they fail to assess their situations accurately because of their myopic perspectives. We might think of Dorothea and Lydgate as each suffering from one of these disabilities. Although early in the novel Dorothea's vision is severely limited as a consequence of what W. J. Harvey terms in his introduction to the novel "[her aspiration] to do great
good in a world which cramps and confines her ardor. . . .

"She begins to perceive harsh and inescapable realities soon after she marries Casaubon. What we experience through Dorothea, with compassion, intrigue, and sometimes criticism, involves the struggle of a young woman whose integrity compels her to view her expectations and desires in terms of the truths she discovers. Conversely, Lydgate often appears to realize his mistakes only vaguely. His attempts at integration always proceed at the mercy of his limited perceptions. Paradoxically, the character who had appeared to have more control over his life finally loses his power partly in an attempt to protect himself from painful truths; and the one who seemed to bear the yoke of social limitations searches within herself for the strength to break from it and to assess her own behavior objectively.

Eliot generally directs our sympathies toward Dorothea, frequently doing so in an indirect, complex manner, which tempers those sympathies by showing Dorothea in error. This direction has not always met with favorable reviews, however. F.R. Leavis praises Middlemarch for the most part, but he criticizes it for its weakness in the character of Dorothea. Claiming
that Eliot is too sympathetic toward her, he makes the following judgment:

Dorothea... is a product of George Eliot’s own ‘soul-hunger’—another day-dream ideal self. This persistence, in the midst of so much that is so other, of an unreduced enclave of the old immaturity is disconcerting in the extreme. We have an alternation between the poised impersonal insight of a finely tempered wisdom and something like the emotional confusions and self-importance of adolescence.

Moreover, Leavis describes her love-affair with Will as filled with "unacceptable valuations and day-dream self-indulgences," while her relations with Lydgate show her to be "all-comprehending and irresistibly good, asserting that:

Such a failure in touch, in so intelligent a novelist, is more than a surface matter; it betrays a radical disorder... The emotional ‘fullness’ represented by Dorothea depends for its exalting potency on an abeyance of intelligence and self-knowledge, and the situations offered by way of ‘objective correlative’ have the day-dream
relation to experience; they are generated by a need to soar above the indocile facts and conditions of the real world.\textsuperscript{10}

Although Leavis's argument is well-known, it bears repetition because of the important questions it raises for this study. If, indeed, Leavis's criticisms are correct, then the refracted discourse fails to achieve its purpose in the novel, at least in the case of Dorothea, and she surely represents a critical case in Middlemarch. What Leavis says implies that Eliot did not achieve a dialogic relationship in the novel, at least not with regard to her central character, because a "day-dream ideal self" which relates to experience mainly by "soar[ing] above the indocile facts and conditions of the real world" fails to engage in the "struggle against various kinds and degrees of authority" that Bakhtin describes as a constant tension in literary languages.\textsuperscript{11}

On the other hand, Arnold Kettle, who praises Leavis's comments on Eliot's soul-hunger and her consequent idealization of Dorothea, says that it is hard to agree entirely with Leavis's conclusion that "the weakness of the book... is in Dorothea." Kettle argues instead that Dorothea, as the most captivating
character in the novel, provides "the great positive force" of the book and "counteracts the tendency to present society as a static, invincible force outside the characters themselves." This accomplishment again depends on Eliot's skillful use of refracted discourse, since we must feel the tension that Dorothea experiences in her interactions with the world of Middlemarch.

We do not have to go beyond the first chapter before we witness the dialectical nature of Dorothea's relationships, even within her own family. Her interchange with Celia about inherited jewelry at first suggests that Dorothea rationalizes conflicting aspects of her personality in a self-deluding manner. She refuses any interest in the gems, until one catches her eye, causing her to try "to justify her delight in the colours by merging them in her mystic religious joy." In the second chapter, Celia once again spots the contradictions in her sister's personality, providing additional testimony to Dorothea's moral righteousness, as well as her wit:

'Your sister is given to self-motivation, is she not?' [Sir James] continued, turning to Celia. I think she is,' said Celia . . . .
'She likes giving up.'
'If that were true, my giving up would be self-indulgence, not self-mortification. But there may be good reasons for choosing not to do what is very agreeable,' said Dorothea.13

Perhaps Dorothea's claim to Sir James that she is "rather short-sighted" might apply to more than visual perception, since her self-denial does involve self-indulgence. Because these are not very attractive qualities—short-sightedness and self-indulgence—Eliot must guard against the possibility of presenting Dorothea in too critical a light. Refracted discourse has the potential for revealing Dorothea's inmost thoughts while, often at the same time, coloured narrative unmasks the social pressures which contribute to these thoughts, relieving Dorothea of total responsibility for her attitudes. An instance of FID conveys a different sense of Dorothea than the previous passages:

In the beginning of dinner, the party being small and the room still, these motes from the mass of a magistrate's mind fell too noticeably. . . . He [Casaubon] had the spare form and the pale complexion which became a student; as different as possible from the
blooming Englishman of the red-whiskered type represented by Sir James Chettam.\textsuperscript{14}

Weighty and pretentious intellectuality does not appeal to Dorothea, her FID says, but neither does the "blooming Englishman" whose nature we are given reason to suspect, is clearly superficial. We know through Dorothea's consciousness that her serious approach to life and to men has roots in a sincere interest in discerning the real from the false.

In a passage of refracted discourse, colored significantly by Dorothea's emotions, the narrator provides an unmistakeable message about Dorothea's desires:

But something she yearned for by which her life might be filled with action at once rational and ardent, and since the time was gone by for guiding visions and spiritual directors, since prayer heightened yearning but not instruction, what lamp was there but knowledge: Surely learned men kept the only oil; and who more learned than Mr Casaubon?\textsuperscript{15}

The questions posed in this narrative ask that the reader examine the society of Middlemarch and Dorothea's position vis-à-vis this world. Specifically, what
"lamp" might Dorothea choose to guide her along a path not commonly taken by mid-nineteenth century English women? And whom does she know who is more learned than Casaubon? Yet, with the use of "surely," the implied author hints that Dorothea's chosen lamp will not shed the proper light, and that the way in which Casaubon is learned may not be satisfactory. The sentence actually means: "Surely not only learned men kept the oil; but if so, surely there are those more learned than Casaubon." We can interpret Eliot's meaning this way because she has already attributed so much stature to Dorothea that the idea that only a man would have the oil is inconsistent with the values of the novel, and the question mark in the second clause suggests the ironic nature of the praise for Casaubon. The narrator later describes Dorothea as ardent in her enthusiasm for Casaubon, who seems to be rational in the sense that he is not flightly or given to unwonted emotion, thus adding weight to the importance of this passage.

These early insights into Dorothea's nature contribute to our sense that she has some character flaws which might cause trouble for her (even though we are given ample reason to feel very positive about her), and that she is subject to the limitations outside of
the traditional marriage-related accomplishments. Since we must then understand her largely through our efforts to analyze her choice of a mate, her rejection of Sir James in favor of Casaubon presents a particular challenge: we must know Sir James well enough to judge Dorothea's decision. Thus, Eliot is obliged to reveal Sir James' qualities in terms of the social constructs of the novel (which we know only slightly at this point), even as she judges those constructs—and him. The following complex paragraph responds to both these requirements:

When Miss Brooke was at the tea-table, Sir James came to sit down by her, not having felt her mode of answering him at all offensive. Why should he? He thought it probable that Miss Brooke liked him, and manners must be very marked indeed before they cease to be interpreted by preconceptions either confident or distrustful. She was thoroughly charming to him, but of course he theorized a little about his attachment. He was made of excellent human dough, and had the rare merit of knowing that his talents, even if let loose, would not set the smallest stream in
the county on fire: hence he liked the prospect of a wife to whom he could say, 'What shall we do?' about this or that, who could help her husband out with reasons, and would also have the proper qualifications for doing so. As to the excessive religiousness alleged against Miss Brooke, he had a very indefinite notion of what it consisted in, and thought that it would die out with marriage. In short, he felt himself to have fallen in love in the right place and was ready to endure a great deal of predominance, which, after all, a man could always put down when he liked. Sir James had no idea that he should ever like to put down the predominance of this handsome girl, in whose cleverness he delighted. Why not? a man's mind—what there is of it—always has the advantage of being masculine—as the smallest birch-tree is of a higher kind than the most soaring palm—and even his ignorance is of a sounder quality. Sir James might not have originated this estimate; but a kind Providence furnishes the limpest personality with a little gum or starch in the form of tradition.16
Our first response to such a passage might be to delight in the notion of the great fun Eliot must have had in writing it. Yet, we should not overlook its importance both as a register of Middlemarch values through the character of Sir James, and as a refraction of authorial values. Each of these effects of the quoted discourse has consequences for our vision of Dorothea. "Why should he?" is a question raised by both narrator and character; the narrator says that manners must be very unusual before one would take note of them, while Sir James finds Dorothea's manner to be quite in order. The implied author would ask the reader to make finer distinctions, however. Because "thoroughly charming" describes the way Sir James sees Dorothea, this phrase belongs to him more than to the narrator, who would judge Dorothea's assertiveness more carefully. When it results in her frequent caustic remarks to Celia, as well as when it cuts the unknowing Sir James, we may agree with Dorothea (while Sir James does not get the point at all), may even be cheering at her outspokenness, but we would probably not call it "thoroughly charming." The narrator talks very sincerely about Sir James' sound qualities, but the social value, "property qualification," which intrudes
at the end of the sentence, reveals a Middlemarch concern, while it undermines the potential interpretation that Sir James would turn to his wife simply in respect to her intelligence or competence. In fact, his notion that Dorothea's religiosity would die out with marriage broadens this hint that he might, without much difficulty, discount the true person Dorothea is.

Not only does the refracted discourse "in love in the right place" convey a lack of sincerity and an alliance with superficial social values (consider what it might be to be in love in the wrong place), but the following refracted discourse, "a man could always put down [predominance in his wife] when he liked," situates Sir James in a different value system from the implied author. Sir James believes that, indeed, he could put down a woman's predominance, and thus he need not consider too seriously Dorothea's predelictions. And, stated as this is in narrative report, it has some credibility—it is a belief shared by at least some of Middlemarch society, but it clearly has overtones of irony. The first clue is the word "always": this overstates the case; second, "put down" is a brash term, which we are unlikely to associate with the
implied author; third "when he liked" suggests an arbitrary and aloof dismissal of one's mate, which again is uncharacteristic of authorial values in general. Thus, while we do not sympathize with this notion, we know that in a certain sense it is true. A Middlemarch wife will probably not behave publicly in a way which her husband finds objectionable. The "handsome girl, in whose cleverness he delighted" is coloured narrative which has different connotations for each voice.

The implied author acknowledges Dorothea's handsomeness, indeed appreciates it, but surely our heroine is more than just handsome and clever—and even more important, she uses her cleverness to both recognize what is lacking in Sir James and to chide him wittily when he displays his own lack of cleverness! Yet Sir James appreciates her handsome and clever nature within the context of the mental list revealed in this passage, and possibly also values it in the order in which its appearance on the list would suggest. "Surely such virtues would add to the stature of a man who possessed such a wife," is what we intuit to be this socially ambitious young man's unconscious thought when we analyze the discourse.
"Why not?" poses a question which reflects back on Sir James and introduces a superbly undercut exposition of his thoughts on men and women: "a man's mind [Sir James' thought]—what there is of it [the narrator's comment]—has always the advantage of being masculine [Sir James' belief, reflecting social opinion]—as the smallest birchtree is of a higher kind than the most soaring palm [again Sir James, reflecting social opinion, but this time in narrator's literary language]—and even his ignorance is of a sounder quality [narrator's ironic debunking]. Sir James might not have originated this estimate [narrator's assertion that it is embedded in the society]; but a kind Providence furnishes the limpest personality with a little gum or starch in the form of tradition. [In referring to Sir James in this manner, the implied author offers her estimation of him, while she asserts the power of the conventional belief in male superiority to contribute to an exaggerated sense of self-worth, even among the least deserving members of the sex.]

Another advantage we can realize when analyzing Sir James's refracted discourse relates to Casaubon. The former provides an outsider's vision of the older gentleman, while still revealing his own myopic
tendencies: "It never occurred to him that a girl to whom he was meditating an offer of marriage could care for a \textit{dried bookworm} towards fifty, except, indeed, in a religious sort of way, as for a \textit{clergyman} of some distinction."\cite{17} The underlined words of refracted discourse suggest a slight degree of narratorial agreement because they are embedded subtly, are not ironic, and share the same authority as the rest of the sentence. No direct narrational comment refutes the notion that Casaubon is a "dried bookworm"; only Dorothea's adulation and Celia's mortification have registered Casaubon's qualities so far. (Celia, as we will later see, can be counted on to provide reliable comment on certain aspects of her sister's nature, and even at this early stage she offers a counterpoing to Dorothea's over-zealousness in several matters.) If, indeed, we regard Casaubon as just a "dried bookworm," or dwell too long on images of his "moles and sallowness" which obsess Celia, we will be greatly relieved for Dorothea at the end of Chapter 48, when "the silence in her husband's ear was never more to be broken," and it will be very difficult to identify with her anguish. Since Sir James' voice allows for the narrator's to register some agreement (unlike that of a
thoroughly untrustworthy character), he is a good choice for equivocal narrative expression. Eliot provides support for criticism of Casaubon in this way, but at the same time she distances us from Sir James: what never occurs to him, that Dorothea might be interested in Casaubon, is apparent to us, and might have been to him had he been more discerning.

We, however, need to discern why Dorothea chooses Casaubon. Laurence Lerner says that "[h]e is almost the most wonderful thing in Middlemarch." He supports this bold claim by pointing out that we must be convinced that Dorothea might really wish to marry him while at the same time we realize what he is like. Eliot then faced a problem not entirely unlike the one Austen had in Persuasion, since she had to make it plausible that Anne would have rejected Wentworth, yet make him desirable, and still not make Anne seem to have been too foolish in her rejection. In each novel, refracted discourse has technical advantages which allow the authors to persuade us at once into seemingly contradictory positions. Because none of the other characters seems to have a very high regard for Casaubon, it is particularly instructive to look at those passages which explore Dorothea's motivations for
Marrying him. While Eliot offers a very fine portrait of Casaubon by showing (we could argue that his actions form the reader's judgments even more than the opinions of other characters do) and by telling, she depends on refracted discourse to create sympathy for him.

For instance, the double-voiced discourse which reveals and implicitly evaluates Dorothea's social and psychological world often modifies our judgments of Casaubon. "Here was something beyond the shallows of ladies'-school literature" does not mean that the narrator believes that Casaubon offers the best escape from the humdrum existence which her society offers Dorothea, but that Dorothea herself envisions this method of transcendence. The voice is the narrator's; the perception that ladies'-school literature is shallow belongs to both narrator and character; but the vision that Casaubon represents "something beyond" is positive for Dorothea, while the narrator loads a different meaning onto the phrase. David Carroll says that "the sight of an hypothesis resisting contrary evidence, is for George Eliot the epitome of stupidity and pride" and describes Casaubon's mind as "in the grip of a presupposition." To be "something beyond" in these terms has a very different meaning than Dorothea imagines it will.
Although the author expresses Dorothea's aspirations to give special meaning to her life in narratorial and indirect discourse, she returns to FID to re-emphasize Dorothea's vision of Casaubon:

He was all she had at first imagined him to be: almost everything he had said seemed like a specimen from a mine, or the inscription on the door of a museum which might open on the treasures of past ages; and this trust in his mental wealth was all the deeper and more effective on her inclination because it was now obvious that his visits were made for her sake. This accomplished man condescended to think of a young girl, and take the pains to talk to her, not with absurd compliment, but with an appeal to her understanding, and sometimes with instructive correction. What delightful companionship. Mr Casaubon seemed unconscious that trivialities existed, and never handed round that small-talk of heavy men which is as acceptable as stale bride-cake brought forth with an odour of cupboard. He talked of what he was interested in, or else he was silent and bowed with sad civility.10
We have been prepared for this passage by the refracted discourse which described the type of man who presents an alternative choice for Dorothea—Sir James—and revealed the consciousness of a young woman who most sincerely wants to devote her life to serious matters. If we had not had those passages, and others like them, we would not be able to appreciate the effects of this refracted discourse as completely. We know why Dorothea imagined such grand things about Casaubon; thus the term "mental wealth," in the narrator's language, suggests Dorothea's strong feelings about his intellectual ambitions. While the narrator does not think that Casaubon is an "accomplished man," she does not chastise Dorothea for her lack of perception. The notion that he condescends to look at her reminds us of her insecurity in terms of her ability to carry our her desires to do something important, and his appeal to her understanding and correction might not impress us as "delightful companionship"; nevertheless, neither Mr. Brooke nor Sir James seems any more delightful than he. "The small talk of heavy men" refers back to "the blooming Englishmen" whom Dorothea disdains and gains force from the metaphorical language which describes such talk. The irony, wit, and insight of this passage combine to
increase our awareness of Dorothea’s misguided opinions, while they nonetheless augment our sympathies.

Thus, when the narrator’s language delivers Dorothea’s feelings, in “How good of him—nay, it would be almost as if a winged messenger suddenly stood beside her path and held out his hand to her!” we understand Dorothea’s enthusiasm, although we do not share it. Another significant preview into the relationship between Casaubon and Dorothea is reported in direct narratorial style, but derives its full meaning from two words of FID: “On one, only one—of her favourite themes was she disappointed. Mr Casaubon apparently did not care for building cottages. . . .” Building cottages is not one of Dorothea’s favorite themes; it is her very favorite theme. Our shared commitment to this social value has its roots in our relationship with the implied author. She has fostered concern for Dorothea’s altruistic motives, while the narrator, who enjoys omniscience, has reported the various conflicts which her aspirations create for her.

In light of the knowledge that Dorothea has gained about Casaubon’s attitude toward her dedication to social reform, the narrator’s plea for complete sympathy with her naïveté seems excessive:
How could it occur to her to examine the letter, to look at it critically as a profession of love? Her whole soul was possessed by the fact that a fuller life was opening before her: she was a neophyte about to enter on a higher grade of initiation. She was going to have room for the energies which stirred uneasily under the dimness and pressure of her own ignorance and the petty peremptoriness of the world’s habits.22

"A neophyte about to enter on a higher grade of initiation" describes Dorothea’s yearnings for something better than she already possesses in the narrator’s language, while "the dimness and pressure of her own ignorance" refracts ours and the narrator’s knowledge that what Dorothea anticipates will not happen. Also, Dorothea, and we along with her, have been given one very significant clue about how the "higher grade of initiation" will require her to abandon her own interests. The narrator had earlier reported two realities about Dorothea’s situation: first, Dorothea was greatly agitated when Casaubon dismissed her cottage plans with a causal reference to the dwellings of the ancient Egyptians, as if the life of those under the
"admitted wickedness of pagan despots" bore comparison with present English society; and second, she rationalized that she could "occupy herself during leisure moments" with her project. While the reader still must hope that Dorothea will adhere to her fine principles, the notion that she might rightfully feel as she does is not denied: "Her whole soul possessed by the fact that a fuller life was opening before her" says that Dorothea is young, innocent, and idealistic—qualities which evoke a positive response.

Thus, the ambiguity of the refracted discourse which expresses Dorothea's plan for modification of her intentions in mock narratorial language allows us room for feelings on both sides of the question. We may regret that the young woman's innocence leads her to such false adulation (we are beyond her in our analysis of Casaubon, and we understand more fully than she does that she is rationalizing), especially because we have reason to expect better from her. Yet we cannot avoid reacting to a psychological state natural to someone whose lofty ideals have summoned a vision of the world to correspond with her dreams, nor can we forget that the world reveals its petty peremptoriness in Middlemarch, as elsewhere.
At this point we might gain in our perspective on refracted discourse by looking at examples of other types of narrative style which are intended to accomplish similar ends—to guide us in our understanding of Dorothea's selection of a mate. In her descriptions of Casaubon, the narrator's direct comments seem quite different from the coloured narrative:

Moreover, if Mr Casaubon, speaking for himself, has rather chilling rhetoric, it is not therefore certain that there is no good work or fine feeling in him. Did not an immortal physicist and interpreter of hieroglyphs write detestable verses? [a reference to Thomas Young a physician, physicist, and Egyptologist]. . . . the chief reason that we think [our neighbor] asks too large a place in our consideration must be our want of room for him, since we refer him to the Divine regard with perfect confidence; nay, it is even held sublime for our neighbour to expect the utmost here, however little he may have got from us. Mr Casaubon, too, was the centre of his own world; if he was liable to think that others were providentially made
for him, and especially to consider them in the light of their fitness for the author of a Key to all Mythologies, this trait is not quite alien to us, and, like the other mendicant hopes of mortals, claims some of our pity.22

Passages like this one, which contribute significantly to the bulk of Middlemarch, would have very different consequences for our reading if their effect were not modified by less direct discourse. Although they provide a basis for interpreting authorial values, their sermonic narrative style, which Kettle would attribute to Eliot's "high-minded moral seriousness."24 might make Casaubon even less sympathetic.

On the other hand, some direct narrative passages display Eliot's humor as well as her desire to make absolutely clear her intended meaning:

It was this [her charming naturalness and honesty] which made Dorothea so childlike, and according to some judges, so stupid, with all her reputed cleverness; as, for example, in the present case of throwing herself, metaphorically speaking, at Mr Casaubon's feet, and kissing his unfashionable shoe-ties
as if he were a Protestant Pope. She was not in the least teaching Mr Casaubon to ask if he were good enough for her, but merely asking herself seriously how she could be good enough for Mr Casaubon.  

In this instance, taking advantage of the economic value of direct narrative comment, and embellishing her remarks with psychological acuity and wit, Eliot highlights what is admirable in Dorothea, even as her naïveté is leading her to make this grave mistake. Otherwise, she would have had to create several complex scenes or passages of FID. Although summary may sometimes be preferable to scene or to refracted discourse, it is not difficult to imagine the different consequences if all our knowledge were derived from this narrative style: most notably, we would not be aware of the same vacillations in distance from implied author, narrator, and character.

To cite a contrasting example, another instance of the use of the adjective "poor" captures some of the values of the novel and demonstrates another use of refracted discourse. Not only does Eliot gain sympathy for a minor character, but she foreshadows the climactic scene in which Dorothea, in seclusion, examines her
deepest motives (demonstrating considerable growth since the earlier last quoted passage). The scene concerns Harriet Bulstrode, whose fellow townspeople label her as "poor" on two accounts: she had misplaced trust in her husband; and she will have to reckon with the social consequences of his behavior. But the narrator reserves the term for her reference to the "stirring of that secret uneasiness which had always been present in her since the last visit of Raffles to The Shrubs." The absence of "poor" in the narrator's discourse describing the actual event and town attitude toward Harriet, as well as its specific use with regard to the injured woman's psychological and emotional state, imply an incongruence in social view and authorial value. This contradistinction between two value systems finds expression in the "diversity of speech, and not the unity of a normative shared language, that is the ground of style." Because Eliot uses the adjective with discrimination, she is able to offer a fine shade of meaning through contrast: the townspeople place the highest value on one's social image (the reader might not, after all, question the women's value too critically without this specific authorial guidance because of the seriousness of Bulstrode's culpability in
moral and social terms); but the implied author considers Harriet's desire to be deceived, even if temporarily, and even if understandably, to be the only real issue. As Harriet Bulstrode forces herself to face a painful reality, and then to find a way to deal with it, she undergoes the most symbolic type of human experience depicted in Middlemarch.

Notwithstanding the quantity or the persuasiveness of our reasons for developing a strong animus toward Casaubon, the refracted discourse still has the potential to move us. When he is "touched with an unknown delight (what man would not have been?) at this childlike unrestrained ardor,"28 we might wonder whose voice reports the implicit judgment of Dorothea. The sentence suggests that Casaubon and the narrator share the view that Dorothea's ardor is childlike: the narrator identifies the ardor; Casaubon delights in it; and, we can assume, the implied author believes that Dorothea would do better not to be so childlike, although she well understands why she is. Thus, while Casaubon's response magnifies the distance between him and his prospective bride, not just in terms of age, but in their potential for feeling, Dorothea's immature ardor is one factor in her settling for less than she
might seem to deserve. We may well be inclined to sympathize with Casaubon because he has not plotted against Dorothea, but has responded as one would expect to the "unrestrained ardour" of a lovely young woman. And we might also remember the narrator's opening words in Chapter 29: "One morning, some weeks after her arrival at Lowick, Dorothea—-but why always Dorothea? Was her point of view the only possible one with regard to this marriage?"

Clearly, Dorothea's point of view has been proven to be faulty. A possible consequence of our awareness that Casaubon may not be entirely at fault is that we will be ambivalent about where to place responsibility for the Dorothea/Casaubon relationship. For example, when Dorothea begins to agonize over disappointment in her yet quite new marriage, a voice asks mockingly:

But was not Mr Casaubon just as learned as before? Had his forms of expression changed, or his sentiments become less laudable? O waywardness of womanhood! Did his chronology fail him, or his ability to state not only a theory but the names of those who held it; or his provision for giving the heads of any subject on demand? And was not Rome the place
in all the world to give free play to such accomplishments? Besides, had not Dorothea's enthusiasm especially dwelt on the prospect of relieving the weight and perhaps the sadness with which great tasks lie on him who has to achieve them?—And that such weight pressed on Mr Casaubon was only plainer than before.  

The double-accented language we find here mocks the notion that Casaubon's "achievements" were more important than other qualities which Dorothea really needed in a husband; woman (Dorothea) is not wayward, but the expectation that she would be satisfied in this union simply because her husband was knowledgeable is untoward. Dorothea wants to deny her own more sensuous pleasures--society says not to marry a "dried bookworm," but Dorothea says "yes." The narrator finds it less ironic, however, that she wishes to alleviate the burdens of another. Here Dorothea and society unite in the common value defining a woman's role as nurturer, comforter, and moral booster.

The narrative which follows this alludes to the imperfections of courtship: "... life could never have gone on at any period but for this liberal allowance of conclusion, which has facilitated marriage
under the difficulties of civilization." Similarly, the final sentence of the preceding paragraph and the first sentence of the next reveal a change in voice. In the first case: "... the early months of marriage often are times of critical tumult—whether that of a shrimp pool or of deeper waters—which afterwards subsides into cheerful peace," and the second, "All of these are crushing questions, but whatever else remained the same, the light had changed, and you cannot find the pearly dawn at noonday," the shift in voice makes it clear that the previous sentences reflect thoughts and feelings of someone other than the narrator. The eloquent exposition on the tribulations of courtship and marriage primarily reflects the implied author's philosophical bent. However, the sentence also reflects the very kind of realities which must be recognized, according to the novel's values, as we saw in one use of "poor."

Most importantly, though, these sentences which frame the quoted passages underline two meanings: in the preceding the author asserts that many marriages start off in a precarious manner, so we should not condemn Dorothea or Casaubon if either one imagines that theirs will be reconciled in a similar way: and in the second,
she warns that we should not expect this marriage to culminate in "cheerful peace" because the harsh reality which "noonday" will expose to their view will be inescapable and perhaps unacceptable to them. This last sentence may be said to "unmask the chorus," a phrase which Bakhtin uses to define hybrid constructions which attempt to restore the truth by indirection: "Truth is restored by reducing the lie to an absurdity, but truth itself does not seek words; she is afraid to entangle herself in the word, to soil herself in verbal pathos." Eliot borders on verbal pathos here, perhaps, but she finally avoids it nicely by not saying explicitly these things which I have analyzed in the indirect speech. Isabel Armstrong asserts that Eliot's tone is one of "generous compassionateness, considered and fair-minded," although she adds that "[t]his way of becoming chorus to her own novel and using choric comment to provide a moral gloss on the action has, of course, never been very popular with twentieth century critics." The sympathy Eliot creates for Casaubon plays a critical role in the novel, even though many readers may remember him as a sallow and mole-faced pretending scholar. The complex refracted discourse which reports
on the growing conflict between Casaubon and Dorothea reflects some of this sympathy:

In Mr Casaubon's ear, Dorothea's voice gave loud emphatic iteration to those muffled suggestions to consciousness which it was possible to explain as mere fancy, the illusion of exaggerated sensitiveness: always when such suggestions are unmistakably repeated from without, they are resisted as cruel and unjust. We are angered even by the full acceptance of our humiliating confessions—how much more by hearing in hard distinct syllables from the lips of a near observer, those confused murmurs which we try to call morbid, and strive against as if they were the oncoming of numbness! And this cruel outward accuser was there in the shape of a wife—nay, of a young bride, who, instead of observing his abundant pen scratches and amplitude of paper with the uncritical awe of an elegant-minded canary-bird, seemed to present herself as a spy watching everything with a malign power of inference.
Because this passage, filled with refraced discourse, is preceded by direct narratorial comment about Dorothea, the interpretation of possibly ambiguous messages becomes easier. The narrator asserts that Dorothea was "as blind to his inward troubles as he to hers;" and that she had not learned as much about him as we have, adding that our pity is thus greater. When she explains, "She had not yet listened patiently to his heart-beats, but only felt that her own was beating violently," we know that Dorothea has been lacking in the kind of sensitivity that she would probably expect of herself. Peter Garrett asserts the importance of the narrator's presenting both Dorothea's and Casaubon's situation from more than a single point of view, thus allowing us to see them as others do. The shifting focus, which emphasizes the distortions and limitations of each, he claims, help the reader to realize, as Dorothea must, that Casaubon has "an equivalent centre of self." 24

Thus we should note the various ways in which the narrator comments on this failing marriage in a complex passage such as the last. We have good reason to think that Casaubon himself is responsible for Dorothea's inability to "listen to his heartbeats"—did he allow
her to come close enough to hear them? And would he have been able to accept the kind of sympathy and understanding which he needs had Dorothea provided it? Surely his own evasion of his problems would limit his openness to another’s perceptions. Furthermore, this man, with his advantages of maturity and learning, might be expected to provide more in the way of understanding toward his wife than she could offer him. Fortunately, the following indirect style provides clues for interpreting Casaubon’s feelings and for discovering the implied author’s attitude toward the deficiencies the narrator points to in Dorothea’s character.

For example, "We are angered even by the full acceptance of our humiliating confessions" clearly is a reference to Casaubon’s anger, but the “we” makes the anger acceptable—a result of a natural human response. The “hard distinct syllables” emanate from the lips of the “near observer” Dorothea, whose nearness is apparently not always dear, and whose behavior, furthermore, imitates that of many others; in other words, she is not presented here as worthier than most people. Thus, when the language designates her in particular, "this cruel outward accuser... in the shape of a wife--nay, of a young bride," we have cause
to believe that the implied author is in sympathy with Casaubon for his perception, even though she knows that Dorothea cannot behave differently. Casaubon wants desperately to believe that his "abundant pen scratches" amount to more than just an "amplitude of paper," and, while the implied author does not admire him for the scratches or for the lack of will to look at them for what they are (or at Dorothea for what she is—certainly more than just a listener to what she knows are just dying-out heartbeats), she recognizes the all too-human weaknesses to which Casaubon is prey, and bends down to peer through his clouded vision at the world. She detects, along with him, the "spy watching everything with a malign power of inference," but still criticizes him for desiring the uncritical awe of an elegant-minded canary-bird." And we, remembering Eliot's description of the "poor" characters who are unable to rise above their circumstances, extend our sympathy to this man who has failed to examine his own and his wife's inner-life. In other words, Eliot has tempered justice with mercy.

Paradoxically, at the same time as this modifies our criticism of the frightened gentleman, its hyperbolic quality unmasks his tendency toward paranoia, and thus makes Dorothea seem less offensive. Is it not
possible for the implied author to see at once with Casaubon that Dorothea appears to be a spy and a cruel accuser and to know simultaneously that this vision may be shared only by adopting his biases? Might she not be sensitive to Dorothea's vulnerability as "a young bride" at least as much as she is to Casaubon's pain as a disappointed husband? Obviously both parties are guilty of collusion: Casaubon needs Dorothea to function as a kind of superego, so that he can objectify his misery, peer at it in all its ominous portentousness, and then displace these disturbing insights onto her; Dorothea needs to be needed (she is a "neophyte enter[ing] on a higher grade of initiation," stirred by the "prospect of relieving the weight and perhaps the sadness with which tasks lie on him who has to achieve them"), and cannot refuse the task which her husband places heavily on her shoulders. Ironically, a role reversal has taken place between Dorothea and Casaubon, which is succinctly expressed in this passage: Dorothea, playing Casaubon's superego, becomes the parent, and Casaubon becomes a self-pitying child. Her "childlike ardour," turned to parental disapproval, changes his position as "centre of his own world" from one of illusory power to one of childish self-pity. While these insights have
significant consequences for our reading of *Middlemarch*, the way in which we reach them is at least equally important. We do not, in fact, learn from an authority that either Dorothea or Casaubon is this or that, nor do we find an explicit analysis of their relationship. Instead, we know them as they affect one another and as they are influenced by the world in which they live. This mimetic representation of the psychological experience of coming to know others (in the sense of understanding them, seeing the world through their eyes, at least momentarily, and becoming sensitive to them) brings us closer to Dorothea and Casaubon, while we share the values of our guide, the implied author.

Finally, this passage refracts the norms of the *Middlemarch* world. Success is measured in terms of one's worldly possessions and accomplishments. Casaubon does not worry about his inner self; he does not chastise himself for his insensitivity to his spouse, but he agonizes over his professional failures. We are not to believe that these are inconsequential, I think, but we should recognize the priority they have for him. In the scheme of things, he would only rise to the stature of a Caleb Garth if he concentrated on his inner worth, while he lives in a world which values different kinds of
worth at a higher price. (We will see the effects of this reality on Lydgate, while we need only think of Bulstrode to conjure images of the importance of power-seeking and self-aggrandizing behavior.)

We might also question whether women generally behave as "cruel outward accuser[s]" since in the preceding paragraph Dorothea makes threatening inquiries about his work to Casaubon, which the narrator tags in the following way: "Dorothea, in a most unaccountable, darkly-feminine manner, ended with a slight sob and eyes full of tears." Who is responsible for the adjective "darkly" or for the notion that Dorothea's attack is feminine, for that matter? We might say, since Casaubon receives the message, that he might be the one, and the only one, who classifies Dorothea's behavior this way. The "darkly" may have sexual overtones—as the woman, dark and feminine in various ways (as described in literary tradition) threatens the man, while she attracts him. On the other hand, the syntax gives no clues that this interpretation belongs to Casaubon in particular. In addition, we have no grounds for identifying these beliefs with the implied author. However, another alternative which we have in the case of a complete lack of attribution is that it reflects a
social perception. Thus, Casaubon, insecure when he first met Dorothea, can hardly help being intimidated by her if he accepts the social inferences—which must abound in his world—that women are dark, and that attacks, tears, and sobs are all feminine modes of expression. Moreover, this behavior is "most unaccountable," so one cannot even depend on a woman's rationality. (We will see that Rosamond takes full advantage of this last stereotype.)

The adjective "poor" also helps to establish some sympathy for Casaubon, while it simultaneously reveals some of his faults. When he fails to experience a joy in his engagement commensurate with what he had anticipated during his many years of bachelorhood, the narrator refers to him as "poor Mr. Casaubon." And on several occasions she prefices her remarks about him with this same adjective: "Poor Mr Casaubon . . . felt that no man had juster cause for disgust and suspicion than he"; "Poor Mr Casaubon was distrustful of everybody's feeling toward him"; and a passage which lends important insights into his character begins in the same way:

Poor Mr Casaubon! This suffering was the harder to bear because it seemed like a
betrayal: the young creature who had worshipped him with perfect trust had quickly turned into the critical wife; and early instances of criticism and resentment had made an impression which no tenderness and submission afterwards could remove. To his suspicious interpretation Dorothea's silence now was a suppressed rebellion ... The tenacity with which he strove to hide this inward drama made it the more vivid for him; as we hear with the more keenness what we wish others not to hear.

The descriptions of "poor Mr Casaubon," combining Casaubon's language (the underlined words belong to Casaubon more than to the narrator) with the narrator's in several examples, evoke varying sorts of sympathy. The first two encourage pity for the narcissistic gentleman who views the world through the clouded glasses of paranoia. However, the last suggests reasons for Casaubon's interpretations which ask for genuine sympathy, which results from the explanation that "we" experience, if not the same thing, something similar. Casaubon had envisioned his wife as a "young creature," and depended on her "perfect trust" to ensure him
against the ravages of self-discovery. His "suspicious interpretation" has roots in reality, since Dorothea, suspecting that his ambition lies fallow, has begun to sow her own seeds of discontent which might well grow into a "suppressed rebellion." And how can the reader avoid suffering with this man who, by hiding his most painful thoughts, increases his agony just as we hear more acutely what we don’t want others to hear?

If the very complex messages of this narrative leave us with more sympathy for Casaubon than we would otherwise have, we will find our notions undercut by his direct discourse which follows them. His characteristically cold delivery, intended to disguise his insecurity with a disdain for others and a further assertion of the value of his life’s work, results in distancing rhetoric: "'My love,'" he said, with irritation reined in by propriety, 'You may rely on me for knowing the times and the seasons, adapted to the different stages of a work which is not to be measured by the facile conjectures of ignorant onlookers.'"37

Because we remember that Dorothea once revelled in "the joyous maiden surprise that she was chosen by the man whom her admiration [not her heart] had chosen,"38 we know all too well that she invited this misery into her
life. Garrett notes that the shifting narrative focus contributes to "the interest and effort at understanding of the less appealing Casaubon becomes an exercise of the moral imagination, a recognition of the existence and claims of another." Yet, our compassion for Casaubon does not make us wish for the punishment Dorothea now suffers in her realistic awakening to the nature of her husband and her marriage.

Our recognition of Dorothea's suffering is shared by several of the characters, but by none so well as Ladislaw, who, partly as a result of these sensitivities, embodies an alternative to Casaubon. As Dorothea begins to realize that her husband is unable to provide the "large vistas and wide fresh air which she had dreamed of finding in [his] mind," and that he will instead lead her into "ante-rooms and winding passages which seemed to lead nowhither," Ladislaw offers a supporting perspective. Since he dislikes Casaubon rather intensely, the use of refracted discourse deflects the bias the reader would have to account for were the thoughts strictly Ladislaw's:

He had never been fond of Mr Casaubon, and if it had not been for the sense of obligation, would have laughed at him as a Bat of
Erudition. But the idea of this dried up pedant, this elaborator of small explanations about as important as the surplus stock of false antiquities kept in a vendor's back chamber, having first got this adorable young creature to marry him, and then passing his honeymoon away from her, groping after his mouldy futilities (Will was given to hyperbole)—this sudden picture stirred him with a sort of comic disgust: he was divided between the impulse to laugh aloud and the equally unseasonable impulse to burst into scornful invective.31

The language of this passage—"Bat of Erudition" and "dried-up pedant, this elaborator of small explanations about as important as the surplus stock of false antiquities . . . ," and "mouldy futilities"—sound like the narrator's, but she tells us that Will was given to hyperbole, so we cannot be sure—either the language or the emotion may be hyperbolic. We do, however, again have the sense of earlier less figurative refracted discourse which related to the most negative images of Casaubon that Celia felt, and which the narrator refracts from time to time—all of which relate to Armstrong's notions about Eliot's choric comments.
In contrast to these examples of coloured narrative, "this adorable young creature" describes Dorothea in language which we recognize as Will's (it would be far too fawning for the narrator or implied author), while we subconsciously register authorial support for his infatuation. This is yet another case of foregrounding—or requesting a different sort of attention from the reader—in free indirect speech: the language does more than just convey information, but it does not create very much tension in voice or meaning in this instance. Recalling the coloured narrative which attaches the label "this handsome girl, in whose cleverness he [Sir James] delighted" to Dorothea, we can register the difference in tone with either suggests: in the case of Ladislaw, authorial support without duplication of feeling; and, in the case of Sir James, authorial agreement and duplication of feeling, but distinction in extended interpretation. In other words, although we may find Ladislaw's descriptive "adorable young creature" excessive, we are not distanced by it as we were by Sir James.

Further evidence that the implied author supports Will to some extent comes in the same scene, as the narrator joins Dorothea in her appreciation of the young cousin:
Will Ladislaw's smile was delightful, unless you were angry with him beforehand: it was a gush of inward light illuminating the transparent skin as well as the eyes, and playing about every curve and line as if some Ariel were touching them with a new charm, and banishing for ever the traces of moodiness. The reflection of that smile could but have a little merriment in it too, even under dark eyelashes still moist, as Dorothea said inquiringly, 'Something amuses you?'

"Delightful," with its subjective and emotional overtones, tells what Dorothea thinks of Ladislaw; "unless you were angry with him beforehand" clearly belongs to the narrator, since Dorothea has not been angry with him. The allusion is instead to Casaubon, who often has been and will continue to be angry with and jealous of Will. The foregrounding of the simile, "as if some Ariel were touching them with a new charm," continues the systematic use of figurative language, while the remainder of the sentence gives insight into Ladislaw's character (the entire quotation suggests that his moodiness is not too serious). In short, this narrative segment brings us close to Dorothea in a mutual admira-
tion of Ladislaw, which has been indicated by the narrator and supported by the implied author.

Does this mean that any sympathy which we have developed for the "learned gentleman" was undeserved? What voice can answer this question? It seems that the narratorial voice cannot provide uni-direction while it is so busy pointing both ways, lending support now to Dorothea, another time to Casaubon. Although the implied author does not know what to make of Dorothea's situation, she direct us to identify with her through refracted voices. Considering the spider-web nature of the narrative, how might the reader integrate Ladislaw's incisive attack on Casaubon with Dorothea's original adulations, her present disillusionment, her perhaps unfair treatment of her husband, and other characters' negative opinions of him? The narrative support for Ladislaw suggests that he is a credible and hyperbolic witness to his cousin's character; yet the insights into the unfortunate Casaubon's mind cannot be legitimately dismissed. This ambiguity can be partially resolved by the explanation that only the reader, narrator, and implied author share the vision of Casaubon's secret self. I use the term "partially resolved" because this secrecy results from Casaubon's
inability to reveal himself even to his wife. While self-delusion is not uncommon among the characters in Middlemarch, Eliot asks only that we understand it, not that we admire it. Thus, Casaubon's secrecy, which protects and sustains his delusions, cannot be offered as a defense of him without some reluctance. He is surely complicit in others' failure to understand him. However, we are forced to make moral judgments of Casaubon on the basis of dramatic realizations of his personality: how does he treat others? Were we not antipathetic to him for his inability to relate intimately to Dorothea, we would finally be unable to resist developing an animus toward him on the basis of his mistreatment of Ladislaw. But the dramatic realizations are undercut by the refracted discourse, which does not ask for a change in moral standards but attempts to create sympathetic understanding. As Barbara Hardy asserts: "It is not just the action of waiting with which many of the chapters of this book are concerned, but the feelings with which human beings wait." 41

Just as if we were analyzing two real people whose lives are interrelated, depending in part on the opinion of still another involved person, we have limited
objective reality on which to depend for our conclusions about Dorothea and Casaubon, and then in connection with them, Ladislaw. Again, in a highly mimetic fashion, we gather information from a variety of sources, and find ourselves sometimes guilty of circular reasoning. In a most summary description of our attitudes, we can say that since we like Dorothea, we like Ladislaw, who admires and supports her. But I think that we must give ourselves, and Eliot, more credit than this would suggest. In this close reading especially, but in more casual readings as well, we surely respond to signals which Eliot has carefully provided for our analysis of the characters. What she will not let us do is to make either automatic or absolute decisions about her characters. As in a real life encounter, this mimetic experience requires our commitment to particular values, while at the same time it emphasizes our limited ability to estimate how, why, and even if others honor these same values.

Our initial introduction to Lydgate includes historical details about medical practices, and his position vis-a-vis antiquated methods and attitudes, as well as it depicts social values of mid-nineteenth
century England. A brief summary of Lydgate's personal history describes his character as responsible and ambitious. Yet, the narrator refers to the possibility of "commonness in a man so well-bred, so ambitious of social distinction, so generous and unusual in his views of social duty," explaining that such spots revealed themselves in his regard for furniture, women, and his social position (in the sense that he would enjoy having others recognize his superiority to the average country doctor). After recounting Lydgate's experience in Paris with the immoral Laure, the narrative reports in refracted discourse:

But he had more reason than ever for trusting his judgment, now that it was so experienced; and henceforth he would take a strictly scientific view of woman, entertaining no expectations, but such as were justified beforehand.43

"But" signals pseudo-objective motivation, revealing the presence of another's speech in that of the narrator: in this case the discourse actually reveals Lydgate's beliefs quite accurately; yet the certainty of those beliefs also suggests their error. The importance of assigning responsibility for this
assertion to him cannot be exaggerated because it
defines the basis for his faulty estimation of Rosamond.
The foreshadowing of Lydgate's "fall" enables the reader
to interpret the refracted discourse (colored signifi-
cantly by social values) which reports his early
impressions of Rosamond:

Certainly, small feet and perfectly turned
shoulders aid the impression of refined
manners, and the right thing said seems quite
astonishingly right when it is accompanied
with exquisite curves of lip and eyelid. And
Rosamond could say the right thing; for she
was clever with that sort of cleverness which
catches every tone except the humorous.
Happily she never attempted to joke, and this
was perhaps the most decisive mark of her
cleverness.44

In this instance, "certainly" alerts us to the
pseudo-objective underpinning governing the sentence,
which is clearly not a simple authorial statement.
Instead, Lydgate's non-rational response to Rosamond
finds a voice here, as do particular norms of the
society with which both young people find themselves
comfortable. Current opinion would have it that such
physical attributes as Rosamond possesses—proper manners, and a sense of what to say in polite company—define a desirable young woman. But the remaining comments ironically debunk this value: the "right thing" said is emptied of its usual meaning, here denoting only an outward form; and Rosamond's lack of humor makes "happily" a double-directed word which says that it is fortunate that she suspects her own limitations enough not to risk joking, but that the deficit in her personality is clearly not happy.

Lydgate is no more discerning than Sir James was in the case of Dorothea: proper manners and charm deceive each man into thinking that he is the object of a woman's desire. Although Rosamond does desire Lydgate, he misinterprets the basis and quality of her admiration—her appealing looks and charm disguise her real interest. At the same time, Lydgate's own motivations with regard to his developing romance are suspect:

... it would have been quite safe with a creature like this Miss Vincy, who had just the kind of intelligence one would desire in a woman--polished, refined, docile ...
The definition of intelligence does not belong to the implied author, nor does the notion that a "safe" marriage is ideal. But Lydgate, closing the door to passion, now looks for a "safe" relationship. And it is not difficult to infer that once he has made this decision, the qualities he will seek in a wife will be superficial, since on first examination they are the least threatening. Lydgate's incorrect assumption that a relationship with a woman like Rosamond would not have malefic consequences for him is as misguided as Dorothea's idea that marriage to Casaubon would bring her stimulating sources of fulfillment.

Eliot uses refracted discourse to invoke various levels of sympathy, or no sympathy at all. In this instance, the refracted discourse encourages some sympathy for the young woman who will be chosen because she appears to be what her admirer wishes her to be. Referring again to Rosamond's cleverness, the narrator explains her mercenary attitude toward the man whom she hopes will become her fiance:

... but the piquant fact about Lydgate was his good birth, which distinguished him from all Middlemarch admirers, and presented marriage as a prospect of rising in rank and
getting a little nearer to that celestial condition on earth in which she would have nothing to do with vulgar people, and perhaps at least associate with relatives quite equal to the county people who looked down on the Middlemarchers. 

While the "celestial condition" which Rosamond anticipates is delivered in the narrator's mocking words, the phrase "vulgar people" and "relatives quite equal to the county people" are further on the continuum toward Rosamond's language. Eliot's technique is economical here because of the use of refracted discourse rather than direct narrative report; to say that the conditions which Rosamond imagines are what one might call celestial and that she considers the people whom she often must associate with to be vulgar is simply too burdensome. What is more, the social class system has a voice through Rosamond's vision.

When Rosamond declares that she never gives up anything that she chooses to do, Lydgate says "God bless you!" The narrator says, "This constancy of purpose was adorable," clearly supplying Lydgate's word for description. As Rosamond deftly moves their courtship along, the narrator reports:
Of course it was unnecessary to defer the mention of anything to mamma, who did not readily take views that were not cheerful, and being a happy wife herself, had hardly any feeling but pride in her daughter's marriage. But Rosamond had good reasons for suggesting to Lydgate that papa should be appealed to in writing.47

The familiar "mamma" and "papa" tell the reader that the vision is Rosamond's, not the narrator's. The narrator had already humorously noted that "Mr Vincy . . . had as little of his own way as if he had been a prime minister,"48 and in Rosamond's refracted discourse he is referred to cryptically: "Papa was not a rock." On the other hand, "it was unnecessary to defer the mention of anything to mamma . . . [but] papa should be appealed to in writing" suggests the manipulations of Rosamond's relationship with her father: he reasons better than "mamma," but since he hardly ever has his way, he is a man of straw. The knowledge of this characteristic (revealed in the "papa" of "was not a rock" and substantiated in the narrator's assertion that he had his own way as often as a prime minister), gives Rosamond the courage to proceed with her plans to marry.
The familiar "papa" signals that Rosamond is aware of her father’s weaknesses and suggests that she will depend on his leniency. She is rightly confident that he will not thwart her engagement by inquiring thoroughly into Lydgate’s situation or by refusing to provide the young couple with some financial assistance.

However assured Rosamond might be of her father’s submission to her wishes, she ought not to be quite so certain that it will ultimately work in her best interests. Lydgate’s refracted discourse indicates that his values and attitudes are ones which a prospective father-in-law might do well to scrutinize:

And happening the next day to accompany a patient to Brassing, he saw a dinner-service there which struck him as so exactly the right thing that he bought it at once. It saved time to do these things just when you thought of them, and Lydgate hated ugly crockery. The dinner service in question was expensive, but that might be in the nature of dinner-services. Furnishing was necessarily expensive; but then it had to be done only once . . . . [H]e did not waste time in conjecturing how much his father-in-law would
give in the form of dowry, to make payment easy. He was not going to do anything extravagant, but the requisite things must be bought, and it would be bad economy to imagine himself pursuing [his profession] in such a home as Wrench had—the doors all open, the oil-cloth worn, the children in soiled pinafores, and lunch lingering in the form of bones, black-handled knives, and willow-pattern. But Wrench had a wretched sympathetic wife who had made a mummy of herself indoors in a large shawl; and he must have altogether begun with an ill-chosen domestic apparatus.

The mention of the willow-pattern brings to mind Sir Willoughby Patterne in Meredith's The Egoist, a novel which depicts a central character who is an incarnation of the worst faults hinted at in Meredith's novel. In an essay on Meredith's novel, Robert Mayo summarizes the story of the popular china pattern: "... a widower possessed of a lovely daughter... intended to marry [her] to a wealthy suitor of high degree, but the maiden opposed her parent's wish. She had chosen for her love a poor and honorable man... and had exchanged vows with him in the clandestine meetings under the
blossoming trees of the Willow Pattern. . . . After further developments, the gods turned them into birds in token of their fidelity."50 Although Eliot probably chose to mention the willow pattern because of its common nature (which Lydgate's refracted discourse confirms), the rich associations of this tale with the Lydgate-Rosamond story provides for interesting conjecture, when we consider the consequence of Lydgate's fidelity.

More important, this passage reflects some of the most valuable uses of refracted discourse. Eliot not only reveals indirectly Lydgate's tendency toward superficiality, but she refracts social values which define a significant aspect of Middlemarch society: having the "proper" things affects one's status in the community, his self-concept, and perhaps even his own estimation of his professional competence. That Lydgate cares for the "requisite things" and for their quality, and that he disparages Wrench's home might alone suggest that these matters were of social consequence; however, it is always possible that a particular character misjudges his world. By reporting this vision in refracted discourse, Eliot assures the reader's attribution of the implicit values to the society as well as to
Lydgate. In addition, she refracts the implied author's judgments ironically: he did not "waste time" alerts us that he did not use time wisely, for he should at the very least have assured himself that he could afford these furnishings; the hyperbolic language, "exactly the right thing," "hated" (very strong emotions in a devoted young physician for crockery!), "anything extravagant," and the entire description of Wrench's home debunk Lydgate's values.

As we might expect, the insights which Lydgate provides into the Vincy family through his refracted discourse tell us at least as much about him as about the Vincys. He resents that part of his courtship with Rosamond which forces him to be in the Vincy home, participating in "gossip, whilst-playing and general futility," as well as he notices that Mr. Vincy decides questions with "trenchant ignorance." Although we join in these appraisals of the Vincys, we must wonder that Lydgate is so enamored of Rosamond that he does not see that the "subtle offence" which her mother gives, the general tediousness of her father, and the senseless household customs will have a bearing on his future. He is so responsive to Rosamond's manipulations that he is willingly blinded to the reality of his situation. In a
sense, this refutes Garret's argument that Lydgate's awareness makes his deterioration tragic—we see through refracted discourse that he is not always so aware.\textsuperscript{51}

Can it be true, as the narrator says, that "his notion of remaining much longer a bachelor had been a mistake: marriage would not be an obstruction but a furtherance"? Because the subjunctive mood usually indicates the thoughts of a character, the following passage seems to reflect Lydgate's psychological state rather than the narrator's opinion:

Of course he must be married in a year—perhaps even in half a year. This was not what he had intended; but other schemes would not be hindered: they would simply adjust themselves anew. Marriage, of course, must be prepared for in the usual way. A house must be taken instead of the rooms he at present occupied. \ldots \textsuperscript{52}

In this instance, Lydgate's rationalizations suggest the same mentality which deems it "bad economy" to buy less expensive items than he desires for his new home and which allows him to fit Rosamond and her dearest interests into a scheme which finally, he believes, will enhance his career. Gradually he invites criticism: he
has been too methodical, too scientific, in his outlook, perhaps because he was burned by his earlier passion.

We do note some pity for Rosamond again with the use of the adjective "poor." "Poor Rosamond" suffers from "pained confused vision," the results of which the narrator describes more explicitly in a passage colored with Rosamond's perceptions (expressed in the underlined words):

Poor Rosamond for months had begun to associate her husband with feelings of
disappointment, and the terribly inflexible relation of marriage had lost its charm of encouraging delightful dreams. Rosamond finds the terms of marriage to be "terribly inflexible," but this opinion is debunked by "charm" and "delightful dreams." If the relation of marriage is terribly inflexible, how could one hope for it to encourage delightful dreams? In contrast to Dorothea's initial interest in an inflexible relation of higher duties, devoid of delightful dreams, Rosamond's notions of duty are deplorably absent and dedicated to no other purpose than self-gratification, especially through material indulgences. Since the implied author implicitly criticizes Rosamond's lack of judgment and
unrealistic expectations, "poor" suggest pity rather than sympathy in her case.

Yet, Eliot does not really invite us to sympathize with a vision Lydgate has of Rosamond, which we might respond to more positively in the case of a character for whom we cared more than we do for Lydgate's fiancée. The narrator's voice and Lydgate's vision comment on Rosamond as she and Lydgate walk in the young doctor's garden: "... is there not a soul beyond utterance, half nymph, half child, in those delicate petals which glow and breathe about the centres of deep colour?"54 Lydgate's interest in "taking care of" Rosamond depends on his view of her as weak and needy, and somehow not entirely of this world (a profile which she easily assumes), almost as if she were a patient. And, of course, we cannot forget her superficiality and her craftiness, particularly since the narrator says just two paragraphs earlier that her thoughts were mainly of the evenings dresses she would wear to the anxiously-awaited visit to Sir Godwin Lydgate's, not of those things one might imagine a "half-nymph, half-child" would dream.

When the narrator describes Lydgate as "poor," she says that he finds himself "in a common human predicament" which she describes philosophically:
We are on a perilous margin when we begin to look passively at our future selves, and see our own figures led with dull consent into insipid misdoing and shabby achievement.55

But the reader knows that Lydgate acts in accordance with his particular personal weakness:

Poor Lydgate! The 'if Rosamond will not mind', which had fallen from him involuntarily as a part of his thought, was a significant mark of the yoke he bore.58

These internal views of Lydgate serve to modify our original impressions of him, which came with the narrator's warning: "... a man may be ... known merely as a cluster of signs for his neighbours' false suppositions."42 Yet, Eliot carefully tells us that is "rather more uncommon than any general practitioner in Middlemarch," explaining finally that he is emotional and has a sense of fellowship which enables him to care for the individual, not just the case as a physician. His veneration of modern medical practices, his intelligence, and his chance for opportunity seemed to predict great success for him. But we can make different predictions after we understand his reasons for making the unfortunate match he makes with Rosamond.
We can compare the effects of refracted discourse in the examples of Dorothea and Lydgate to demonstrate the rich, varied nature of the technique. It effectively distances us from Lydgate, encouraging us to sympathize with him with the reservation that his mistake does indeed reveal a streak of commonness. The revelation of this commonness depends upon the way that we respond to the metonymic language in his free indirect speech. Because it is colored with such words and phrases as economy, refined manners, the right thing said, cleverness, obstruction, furtherance, saved time, ugly crockery, expensive, schemes, must be married, we associate Lydgate with material and social ambitions. The teleological nature of his outlook suggests a hardness—even a calculating mind. But since refracted discourse works subtly, we can maintain more sympathy for Lydgate than we could if Eliot had overtly described him as a man eager for success socially and professionally, afraid, thus unaware, of his own deepest emotions. He has not suffered under the heavy hand of a narrator who spells out in no uncertain terms his least admirable traits, but is revealed instead by one who can present him at other times quite favorably without contradiction. In general, the complex technique corresponds to the character’s complexity.
On the other hand, Dorothea's free indirect discourse appropriates phrases which emphasize her weaknesses as ones often "born of virtue; action at once rational and ardent; knowledged; learned; visions; spiritual directors; mental wealth; initiation; and energies. Her inner life is filled with intellectual and spiritual values. Although Lydgate also operates from some altruistic motives, the characterological difference between the two reveals itself in refracted discourse. Clearly, the actions and direct speech of each character emphasizes these differences, but the refracted discourse moves us subconsciously as it surrounds characters with the dynamic residue of language which appears to be on close scrutiny either partially or totally theirs.

The consequences of the distinctions between these two are realized in the novel in Lydgate's failure to take adequate advantage of his opportunities, and in Dorothea's ability to create her own advantages. Lydgate is young, handsome, intelligent, well-trained for his career, and filled with several types of ambition. It is this last quality of indiscriminate ambitiousness, as we have seen, which limits him and causes him to settle for a life of resignation, rather
than to continue to struggle for one of achievement. Conversely, Dorothea suffers in the way that Harriet Bulstrode does. Unlike Lydgate, who responds to his ill-fated dealings with Bulstrode with "bitter irony," Dorothea allows her most intense emotions and her most critical reasoning powers free rein. But we may be privy to the psychological conditions which distinguish these two only by analyzing the refracted discourse, which we understand as well as we do because of the various ways in which Eliot uses double-voiced discourse.

Eliot’s awareness of the qualities of language and communication suggest that she intended to direct her readers in a quite complex fashion. Barbara Hardy explains that the strong feelings in the novel allow the moral scheme to work: Lydgate changes when he realizes his compassion for Dorothea in Chapter 30, and at that point, Dorothea’s commitment to her husband gains in moral vision.57 While we should have no doubt of Eliot’s ability to use language to create the sense of strong feelings, among other things, an explicit example of Eliot’s astute perceptions occurs in Chapter Three when the narrator says: "Signs are small measurable things, but interpretations are illimitable . . . ."
CHAPTER III

Our study of Persuasion demonstrates that Austen enriches her heroine's character by the occasional use of refracted discourse; a similar analysis of Middlemarch indicates that Eliot relies more heavily on this technique to develop all her major characters. And in both novels double voices refract individual, social and authorial values, creating and sustaining dialogic relationships among them. In The Wings of the Dove these techniques attain a new status, since the novel depends almost entirely on them for its character development, its dramatic effect, and the constantly fluctuating relationships among narrator, character, and reader. We could almost imagine that Austen and Eliot experimented with covert narrative styles so that James might later use them to the limits of their powers.

In part, James's very different sense of psychological realism accounts for the increased use of these narrative methods. First, his substitution of the traditional third-person narrator with centres of consciousness required that he find a new way to
represent his characters' mental lives. Second, his motive to dramatize the ambiguities inherent in the individual psyche and in human relationships could be realized more effectively in less direct discourse. Both of these concerns require mimetic representation: centres of consciousness are intended to afford readers a "lifelike" experience through which they apprehend other characters and events much as the character who forms the centre does; and ambiguous situations reveal the limits of human perceptions, as their opaqueness is a consequence of a subjective rather than an objective view (James does not suggest that the latter is recoverable, of course).

Not surprisingly, then, James provides the example of the most complex use of refracted discourse. Thus I will analyze that complexity to show just how intricate his treatment is; I will also show that the intricacy is significantly functional in the novel as a whole—there are certain effects James intends with all three main character that are only achieved through that intricacy.

The unusually complex syntax of the late James has been the focus of many studies. Richard Bridgman, for example, in his examination of colloquial language patterns in literary language, demonstrates that James
patterns in literary language, demonstrates that James first produced a type of dialogue which, although superficially simple, did in fact reflect a strong psychological bent. Acting on the possibilities this dialogue suggested, he began to use "radical punctuation, fragmented expressions, and odd verbalisms" in his attempt to imitate the mind talking. However, Bridgman argues that in his last works, James had become more concerned with aesthetic than realistic presentation, and thus used the colloquial rhythms of fragmentation, stress, and repetition to "strengthen and variegate a prose of almost unrelieved abstraction and attenuation."²

With a somewhat different emphasis, Ruth Yeazell argues against F.O. Matthiessen's assertion that the novels of the major phase "are strictly novels of intelligence rather than of full consciousness," claiming instead that "what the late style dramatizes is the painful struggle of the intelligence literally to come to terms with full consciousness."³ I would add to Yeazell's response that the late style accomplishes the purpose of demonstrating at the narrative level that reality is elusive, fragmentary, and difficult to
ascertain; thus the struggle is rendered even more challenging by the tenuousness of both the objective and subjective realities which might be the fomenters of the act of "coming to terms."

Paradoxically, the greatest chances for misunderstandings and for deep understandings occur at the same time because of the convolutions of this style. Although Bridgman describes the aesthetic and realistic features of James's narrative as satisfying separate intentions, in *The Wings of the Dove* the two qualities unite so effectively that it would be fruitless to argue that one or the other claimed a prior position in the author's scheme. To the contrary, his aesthetic inventions depict the psychological realism he hoped to achieve better than his earlier, more direct narrative.

For example, we might ask if a reader could possibly know Daisy Miller (who frequently bears the title of Milly's Jamesian prototype) as he knows Milly Theale? The answer would have to explain that we have an overview of Daisy—a perspective which takes precedence over other possibilities in the narrative and develops her mimetic function of representing a certain segment of American society in a particular setting. In
contrast, we know Milly variously, through the vision of
Merton, of Kate, and through our receptions of her
consciousness, as well as through narrative report. The
risk of misunderstanding these various clues increases
proportionately with the value (in part a result of the
complexity) of the insights. Clearly, the difficulty of
penetrating the syntactical obscurities may be enough to
discourage some very astute readers, but even those who
not only survive but live on to write scholarly critical
analyses have not entirely met the challenge the master
offers.

One of the results of misunderstanding narrative
cues occurs in an otherwise impressive study by Nicola
Bradbury. She has paid close attention to the stylistic
variations in the late James which direct us toward an
interest in the process by which questions about the
characters and plot merge with questions about the novel
process itself. Among her many insightful critical
views of Wings, Bradbury reveals the following qualities
of the novel:

The imaginative force is outward, straining
towards a meaning not to be found within the
work, but beyond it, escaping the
constrictions of Kate's mean world and of Milly's death-bound 'box': a meaning Densher will come to recognize only in its absence, as an opportunity passed: the state to which those who can never again be 'as we were' might have aspired.4

We might agree that the meaning is "outside" the work in the same way as the meaning of A Farewell to Arms or The Crying of Lot 49 is outside each novel. But this forces us to say that the relationship between the implied author and the reader creates meaning outside rather than within the novel. In our study that all-important nexus has been considered to be "inside" the novel; yet, Bradbury's concern with the possible consequences of narrative style mirror those of our study. Clearly, only the narrative complexities could account for meaning beyond the work, even if the case finally rests on gaps and silences.

Thus it is no surprise that Bradbury discusses the distinctions between narrator and character vision in her analysis of the opening scene of Wings. Although she points out that our assumptions about narrative control are challenged by James's tendency to "mediat[e] between
the powers of the novelist and those of the character," her astute observations fail to provide a precise analysis of voice and vision, and for that reason, Bradbury makes some significant errors in her claims about Kate Croy.

As we look at the character of Kate Croy, we might consider that James later feared that perhaps he had given too much attention to her in the beginning of the novel. But at the same time, we should keep in mind interpretations which, despite the scrupulous care James gave to the creation of Kate, fail to piece together the many facets of the narrative which give definition and explanation to her character. An obvious error a reader might make in terms of a work as complex as Wings would be to allegorise the characters at the expense of acknowledging their intricate natures. Thus, we find a generally thoughtful critic, Charles Samuels, asserting that in Wings "evil is persuasive, but virtue-- inadvertently--is not" and that Kate is "the book's chief embodiment of evil." In addition, he argues that the reality created in "our first glimpse of her 'face positively pale with . . . irritation' in a 'vulgar little street'" remains throughout the novel. Defining
her world as one whose only values are material, Samuels describes Kate as ashamed of her want, willing to do whatever she has to for what she desires, and finally failing because she loses her soul through duplicity. He finds her destructive power immensely convincing (an "egoism acting on a selflessness that must exist even in erotic love"), especially because evil is a "familiar reality." Because he does not consider the possibility of distinctions between voice and vision, or acknowledge the subtle transitions from one voice to another, Samuels perhaps attributed most of Kate's revealed vulnerabilities as narratorial comment rather than expressions of her psychological and emotional state.

Leo Bersani, who argues that "the psychological center of the drama in James's late novels is in the narrator's mind," supports the idea of allegory in his comment that the characters function mainly as allegorical representations of the narrator's moral choices (or the Jamesian centre's choices, as Bersani says, suggesting in fact that it is the author himself wrestling with the options). While I will argue against Bersani throughout my investigation of the novel by offering alternative explanations for the examples he
cites in the case of each of the three central characters, we should focus first on his general comment on Kate, which reflects his notions about the narrator's mind and the allegorical qualities of the characters. Claiming that Kate represents power, possessions, and active engagement with the world, he maintains that she functions in the novel as an opposition to the moral choice Milly embodies by giving to the world and taking nothing. In general, his criticism offers a fairly unsympathetic view toward James's intentions, especially when he argues that the narrator's relation to his character is diminished by "James's failure to conceive of a meaningful contact with the human community."

On the other hand, Sallie Sears' formalist interpretation of Wings describes Kate in less absolute terms. She claims that only in the most general sense is the novel "an anatomy of guilt"; it is instead a book with a dynamic subject, the changing relationship between the deceived and the deceiver and the phenomenon of manipulation. Given this phenomenological definition, it is no surprise that Sears acknowledges the many facets of Kate's personality. However, she makes the following problematic assertion about the novel in general and Kate in particular:
Her personality with both its resources and its susceptibilities, its passion and its narcissism, is one of the givens of the novel, the concern of which as a study of human guilt is phenomenological rather than psychological. To the extent that the novel is concerned with causes, it is as they exist in the combination of character and circumstance, not as they relate to the origins of character itself. And though James is one of the great scholars of human motives, his interest is in their processes: in the effects, the implications, the reverberations of self-interest and not in its psychodynamics. 7

This assertion leads Sears to conclude that we don't identify with Merton against Kate, but that, instead, we admire the "harrowing consistency of Kate's character." Because Kate is the active agent, Sears claims that she becomes more attractive than Merton, who is passive and inclined to rationalizations. In general, she assumes that James emphasizes the consequences of behavior more than the causes for it and
thereby limits her ability to analyze the discourse as fully as she might.

In her analysis of the all-important shifting process in the narrative structure, one which moves from revealing the operations of consciousness to suggesting authority, Bradbury cites what she terms "an odd metaphor, switching from verbal to musical terms":

Her father's life, her sister's, her own, that of her two lost brothers--the whole history of their house had the effect of some fine florid, voluminous phrase, say even a musical, that dropped first into words, into notes, without sense, and then, hanging unfinished, into no words, no notes at all.*

Kate's metaphor, as Bradbury terms it, "is merely one of a series of expressions which endow Kate herself, either explicitly or by implication, with the imagination of a novelist." Somewhat surprisingly, Bradbury indeed asserts that Kate has the talents of a novelist, quoting the next sentence as testimony to Kate's "delight in expression, a wry turn of phrase":

Why should a set of people have been put in motion, on such a scale, and with such an air
of being equipped for a profitable journey, only to break down without an accident, to stretch themselves in the wayside dust without a reason?¹⁰

Apparently, this question reflects in addition Kate's ability to view the circumstance as "as a matter of elements and forms, and of the relation between them: character and motive, plot and theme." Such interpretations of the narrative allow Bradbury to make further assertions: that Kate herself abstracts her experience in a manner much like the modern structuralist analysis of character and its function ("Like the structuralists, she uses the metaphor of language to convey this form: 'She hadn't given up yet, and the broken sentence, if she was the last word, would end with a sort of meaning'"; and that the use of character as a force, not just an element of plot, is accomplished by Kate's ability to create impressions of herself and her situation. This ability also has the function of extending the world of the novel "beyond surfaces and forms."

The rather large claims that Bradbury makes rest, unfortunately, on some faulty assumptions about the
narrative process. Recalling the Spanish critic Ortega's definition of the introspection and psychological theory which a novelist draws on as "imaginary psychology . . . the psychology of possible human minds . . . proper to the novel," we might gain insight into Bradbury's analysis: she could believe that all the diegetic narrative might be attributed to whichever centre of consciousness governs the section. Thus a continuous "psychology of a possible human mind" would render a narrative which reveals the consciousness of a character, and the suggested authority which she mentions would be the exception in the structure. On the other hand, she might well have been influenced by Bersani's position, which says that "any attempt to delimit with precision the boundaries between the centers' expressions of their own thoughts and the narrator's presentation of them, or indeed even his comments, ends in much uncertainty and confusion." 

Cohn suggests that instead the figural consciousness detracts from the emotional and intellectual energy which was the narrator's. The implications of this distinction form a critical notion for my arguments about the nature of Kate's
consciousness, as well as Milly’s and Merton’s, but I will consider whether emotional energy may be separated from intellectual control. Since it is Kate whom we first meet, and whose encounter with her father, in spite of James’s fears that they were given too much space, remind us throughout the novel of the bearing one’s past has on one’s present.

Since Kate becomes a very real and a complex character within a few "volumes," we should take note of the way that James prepares us for her character in this first scene, placing her in her father’s dreary rooms, anxiously anticipating that the "worst" will result from this contact. James’s use of quote marks for this word add to the contextual evidence that Kate herself thinks of her current predicament in dismal terms. The "failure of fortune and of honour" which the narrator describes in a combination of psycho-narration, diegesis, and free indirect discourse has many ramifications; yet the most important to Kate can be adduced from the following:

It was the name, above all, she would take in hand—the precious name she so liked and that, in spite of the harm her wretched father had done it, wasn’t yet past praying for.14
The two underlined words of FID suggest Kate's emotional responses, which are unambiguous, unlike her intellectual perspective, and uncomplicated, unlike the narrator's complex report of the present and the past in each of the other possible voices. The narrator supports Kate's emotional response, but adds a whimsical end to the matter: "She loved it in fact the more tenderly for that bleeding wound. But what could a penniless girl do with it but let it go?" The distinction between the narrator and Kate, which Bradbury fails to consider, accounts for the difference between the voice which tells us that the name is "precious" and that the father is "wretched," and the one that asks the important question of what a woman in Kate's circumstance could do with the name she held so dear but let it go.

The narrator then employs a technique reminiscent of the raconteur of *Tom Jones*: he says that her father had written her that he was too ill to leave his room "and that he must see her without delay; and if this had been, as was probable, the sketch of a design he was indifferent even to the moderate finish required for deception." Of course, our narrator, like Fielding's
who claims ignorance of the events of twelve years' time, knows the only "reality" which exists about any of the characters' behaviors. While recognizing this similarity between the two narrative ploys, we ought to note an instructive difference: Fielding's irony plays on the reader's sense of the "truth" of the "history" he is reading, but the example in James draws attention to the character's voice in the narrator's speech. The "if" does not belong to the narrator, of course; it belongs to Kate. Following this with "as was probable," James adds certainty to our suspicion that Mr. Croy is dealing from his "greasy old pack," without having to attribute the assertion to Kate. The importance of this distinction between our knowledge and Kate's, minimal though it is, since she is quite shrewd in her analysis of her father, lies in its subtle allusion to the filial loyalty which still remains in a small way part of Kate's response to her father. It would be quite a different thing if the narrator asserted, "she knew that this was the sketch of a design. . . .," telling us thereby not only that Kate felt that her father was wretched, but even more that she no longer believed in him at all.
James introduces a curious change in pronouns in the next sentence, one which he uses throughout the paragraph and sporadically through the novel. Although it is possible that he switched from third to second person arbitrarily, James's general attention to detail suggests that we should consider his probable intention:

He had clearly wanted, for the perversities he called his reasons, to see her, just as she herself had sharpened for a talk; but she now again felt, in the inevitability of the freedom he used with her, all the old ache, her poor mother's very own, that he couldn't touch you ever so lightly without setting up. No relation with him could be so short or so superficial as not to be somehow to your hurt; and this, in the strangest way in the world, not because he desired it to be--feeling often, as he surely must, the profit for him of its not being--but because there was never a mistake for you that he could leave unmade, nor a conviction of his impossibility in you that he could approach you without strengthening. . . .this was the weariness of
every fresh meeting; he dealt out lies as he might the cards from the greasy old pack for the game of diplomacy to which you were to sit down with him. The inconvenience--as always happens in such cases--was not that you minded what was false, but that you missed what was true. He might be ill and it might suit you to know it, but no contact with him, for this, could ever be straight enough. Just so he even might die, but Kate fairly wondered on what evidence of his own she would some day have to believe it.15

In his discussion of "elegant variation" in The Later Style of Henry James, Seymour Chatman interprets James's variations as a way of pre-selecting the audience. Although Chatman's "variations" refers specifically to the synonymic change in nouns, he makes an analogy which suggests the similarity in various narrative complexities in the late James: "The effort involved--like the effort to identify pronouns--is, presumably salubrious: it promotes a thoughtful, a puzzling-out-attitude, the kind of reading that James wanted."16 The pronouns which refer to characters in
the novel concern Chatman; yet the variation we are considering stimulates the same kind of reading. Chatman’s example from *The Ambassadors* lends further insight into our problem. He says that "Strether has a 'secret principle' which operates and is instinctive—a 'fruit' of a 'sharp sense' of something. The principle is then referred to more vaguely as an 'everything' (mixed with it is an apprehension'). Finally it is a 'happier device.' As Chatman claims, the reader's attempts to figure out why the variety is necessary leads him to a much fuller understanding of the "secret principle." (Thus the astute reader is a member of the "pre-selected audience.")

In the same way, the reader who tries to understand who the "you" is in our quoted section has to ask the all-important question, "Why does the change occur?" My sense is that the second person pronoun establishes those sentences in which it occurs as ones of FID. The juxtaposed sentences which use the third person pronoun then seem not to be psycho-narration, but instead diegetic report. Let us consider a few examples.

The first sentence describes the motives of both Kate and her father (that they each wanted to talk to
the other) from an objective perspective. However, the language soon becomes Kate's: even before the narrator's stated move Kate, "But she now again felt...", we might well imagine Kate herself saying (of course, now she is thinking), "for the perversities he called his reasons... He couldn't touch you ever so lightly without setting up," just as we might imagine the clauses which follow as ones coming directly from Kate. In fact, Kate undoubtedly means "me" in these clauses: "... there was never a mistake for [me] that he could leave unmade..." The switch back to the third person pronoun in "He might have awaited her on the sofa..." signals a change to the narrator's perspective which, on the one hand underscores Kate's perceptions, and on the other says that we and the narrator are in a slightly better position to analyze Mr. Croy than his daughter is.

What do we say when a single sentence incorporates figurative language which seems too literary for Kate to "own," with the second person pronoun, which allows us to posit that we are not reading authorial transcripts of inchoate figural thoughts? It seems to me that we have two choices: we can either say that James was
uncharacteristically "sloppy" here; or we can say that he was predictably clever. In deference not only to his general level of narrative accomplishments, but also to the demands of this particular section, I will continue to work on the latter assumption. The sentence which especially asks for an explanation of the shared narrative language offers the wonderful metaphor "greasy old pack for the game of diplomacy to which you were to sit down with him." Unless we revert to Bradbury's analysis of Kate's ability of a most unusual sort for self-expression, we have to believe that the narrator provides the metaphor. If indeed the narrator and Kate do share responsibility for this passage, the switch to Kate's language in "you were to sit down with him" makes clear her feelings about the games which her father plays, but perhaps James is blurring the vision/voice distinction here, leaving us to wonder whether we should attribute the very sophisticated metaphor to her. As Jacques Lacan discovered, metaphors distance individuals, and help to sustain the distinction between self and other. Clearly, the metaphor does help to us to see Kate as an objective observer of her father; yet, we see that he inevitably
attracts her while her repels her--just as he has done to others. On the surface, this may not seem obvious, since the older and younger Croy seem to be unusually estranged. However, their estrangement is not complete--Kate still remains more attached to this parental figure than we might expect, based not on the norms for father/daughter relationships, but on the nature of this father.

Again, the use of "you" brings us close to Kate in "was not that you minded what was false, but that you missed what was true." This paradoxical assertion surely reveals what troubled Kate in the relationship, and foreshadows what we find in her alternate life: Aunt Maud does not offer the truth either, and Kate's life seems to turn on her acceptance of the false and her inability to discover the truth. Yet, once again the narrator must claim the clever expression as his.

The difference between these expressions and those psycho-narrations which employ the third-person pronoun seems to be one of distance. In the latter, James filters the narrative through the consciousness of the character, using the technique a little differently than other novelists, or he himself, may at other times. His
method allows the narrator to retain a good deal of control—so when he needs to bring the reader closer to the character, he must use another technique, such as FID. Bersani might argue that the narrator retains too much control, enabling him to develop all the consciousnesses as one with his, but I have another idea. Very often the consciousnesses are just forming: as Lubbock puts it, James never "expounds" the substance of [Strether's] thought; he is content to give us its mere surface. Chatman says that the thoughts are kept on the surface by their "vague, incipient, inchoate, yet to be formed" characterization.17 Thus, when we "hear Kate say" that "he might be ill and it might suit you to know it," we know that she is quite conscious of this thought. In another sentence, "She was glad to be spared the sight of such penetralia, but it would have reminded her a little less that there was no truth in him," we may infer that this sense of relief is just on the verge of Kate's consciousness.

Unlike the Kate whom Samuels describes, the Kate with whom we are becoming acquainted through this narrative analysis has strong mimetic qualities. The final sentence of the quoted passage sums up our
observations: "Just so he even might die, but Kate fairly wondered on what evidence of his own she would have to believe it." The light touch here juxtaposed to the sinister thoughts of the previous sentences imitates Kate’s psychological state. She sees her father most clearly in his effect on her (demonstrated in the many "you" constructions, which tell how she feels when in contact with him), but she needs to maintain some illusions about him nevertheless.

The following passage alludes to the difficulty Kate has in maintaining her illusions (ones which are not lofty, but which enable her to believe that her parent has some value as a human being, or as a father). Further, it offers an insight into his social appearance:

He had not at present come down from his room, which she knew to be above the one they were in: he had already been out of the house, though he would either, should she challenge him, deny it or present it as a proof of his extremity. She had, however, by this time, quite ceased to challenge him; not only, face to face with him, vain irritation dropped,
but he breathed upon the tragic consciousness in such a way that after a moment nothing of it was left. The difficulty was not less that he breathed in the same way upon the comic: she almost believed that with this latter she might still have found a foothold for clinging to him. He had ceased to be amusing—he was really too inhuman. His perfect look, which had floated him so long, was practically perfect still; but one had long since for every occasion taken it for granted. Nothing could have better shown than the actual how right one had been. He looked exactly as much as usual—all pink and silver as to skin and hair, all straightness and starch as to figure and dress; the man in the world least connected with anything unpleasant. He was so particularly the English gentleman and the fortunate settled normal person. Seen at a foreign table d'hote he suggested but one thing: 'In what perfection England produces them!' He had kind safe eyes, and a voice which, for all its clean fulness, told the
quiet tale of its having never had once to raise itself. Life had met him so, halfway, and had turned round so to walk with him, placing a hand in his arm and fondly leaving him to choose the pace. Those who knew him a little said 'How he does dress!'—those who knew him better said 'How does he?' The one stray gleam of comedy just now in his daughter's eyes was the absurd feeling he momentarily made her have of being herself 'looked up' by him in sordid lodgings. For a minute after he came in it was as if the place were her own and he the visitor with susceptibilities. He gave you absurd feelings, he had indescribable arts, that quite turned the tables: this had been always how he came to see her mother so long as her mother would see him. He came from places they had often not known about, but he patronised Lexham Gardens. Kate's only actual expression of impatience, however, was 'I'm glad you're so much better!'
The voice in this paragraph shifts from the narrator's to Kate's subtly, while it combines narrator and character vision, as well as narrator and social view. By establishing which information and which opinions Kate might herself hold, we can begin to get a sense of the differences. Kate seems to know that her father had already been out of the house, indicated by the clause "should she challenge him." Furthermore, we can assume since she does not ask him that she knows that it would be fruitless to do so. The narrator shares the insight that she has "ceased to challenge him" and that, moreover, her "tragic consciousness" was gone after a moment in his company. But the assertion, "He had ceased to be amusing—he was really too inhuman," is either psycho-narration or FID (the either/or question must remain, since it is impossible to tell whether the language is Kate's or the narrator's—the "really too inhuman" sounds like character language, but is not clearly distinguishable from psycho-narration).

Although "his perfect look" is described in psycho-narration, double-voiced discourse refracts social opinion beginning with "he was so particularly the English gentleman" and going through "'how does he?'"
Here we see James at his ironic best. Embedded in these sentences are powerful statements about social values; implicit in them are the values of the implied author. The English gentleman is equated with the "fortunate settled normal person." Thus, to be unsettled, as are Kate, Merton, and Milly, makes one perhaps abnormal, surely unfortunate. This society will not label those who are not established as adventurous, romantic, curious, or necessarily ambitious (although misfortune surely leads to ambitiousness in Wings); they are simply unfortunate and unsettled. As a window to the soul, "kind safe eyes" apparently offer a more socially acceptable view than other sorts (such as flashing, bright, lovely—or any of the many adjectives novelists have used for characters' eyes). And the quiet voice which has never had to raise itself speaks of refinement, decorum, and, considering the real nature of the man, repression. Clearly, his evil deeds have been carried out with taste—no bellowing and raging for this Jamesian gentleman. The fanciful metaphor, "Life had met him so, halfway..." suggests the epitome of privilege in this world, evaluated by money first, then social status, then beauty. Mr. Croy possesses the
third quality, pretends, apparently successfully, to the second, but sorely lacks the first.

The attraction/repulsion which we find Kate engaging in with regard to her aunt must have had its roots in her response to her father. Her instant suppression of the vexation she feels leads her to greet him both vocally and silently in a positive way:

'Oh papa, it’s long since I’ve ceased to see you otherwise than as you really are! I think we’ve all arrived by this time at the right word for that: You’re beautiful—n’en parlons plus. You’re as beautiful as ever— you look lovely.' He judged meanwhile her own appearance, as she knew she could always trust him to do; recognising, estimating, sometimes disapproving, what she wore, showing her the interest he continued to take in her. He might really take none at all, yet she virtually knew herself the creature in the world to whom he was least indifferent. She had often enough wondered what on earth, at the pass he had reached, could give him pleasure, and had come back on these occasions
to that. It gave him pleasure that she was handsome, that she was in her way a tangible value.¹⁹

While the dismal events of Kate's past explain in part her world view, they might be used in support of Sears' argument that James is concerned with consequences of psychological states, but not with the dynamics which caused them. The relationship between Kate and her father, however, refutes Sears' claim by adding a significant dimension to the psychodynamics of the daughter's development. It is difficult to imagine a more psychologically suggestive relationship than the one which we initially meet in Wings. To begin with, the reality of Mr. Croy is so astounding that simply by suspecting what he is like, Kate opens herself to painful awarenesses from which she must shield herself with elaborate defenses. Because Kate does recognize a great many of her father's qualities, we have to decide which insights she shares with us and the narrator, as we have been doing, and then analyze the way she deals with them. In part, her responses take the form of actions, and in part, of thoughts.
As we see not only in her greeting to her father, but in the very fact that she has come to him, Kate chooses to act on positive impulses. Yet, she does not deny to herself the way in which he regards her: he examines her superficial person mentally, but she nevertheless interprets this as a sign of interest, as opposed to apathy, which would presumably be worse (as in the case of his attitude toward his other daughter, Marian). She augments this positive thought by realizing that although the interest he takes in her at any given time might well be negligible, she surpasses anyone else whom he might choose to acknowledge among his concerns (particularly Marian). Such "chosenness," poverty-stricken as it may be, plays a role in even an adult child's life.

In addition, Kate is able to efface herself from a total knowledge of her father's character, simply because of a lack of information about what seems to be a very critical matter. The following lines make clear her relief at being uninformed:

*His plausibility had been the heaviest of her mother's crosses; inevitably so much more present to the world than whatever it was*
that was horrid—thank God they didn’t really know!—that he had done. He had positively been, in his way, by the force of his particular type, a terrible husband not to live with; his type reflecting so invidiously on the woman who had found him distasteful.  

The exclamatory parenthetical, a case of psycho-narration which is very close to FID in tone and feeling (it need only a change from "they" to "we" to be the latter), leaves no question that Kate would not attempt to reconstruct the exact nature of her father’s erring ways. The explanation follows, in the clever oxymoron, "a terrible husband not to live with." Kate’s father is also a terrible father to reject—the charm he uses so effectively on outsiders does not pass unnoticed by his daughter, who thinks of him as "no light thing to leave uncompanion’d." Lest we think that Kate finally succumbs entirely to his charms, the narrator assures us, after Mr. Croy has refused his daughter’s offer to live with him but has admitted that he doesn’t "get on," of the depth of Kate’s reaction:

His daughter took the place in again, and it might well have seemed odd that with so
little to meet the eye there should be so much
to show. What showed was the ugliness—so
positive and palpable that it was somehow
sustaining. It was a medium, a setting, and to
that extent, after all, a dreadful sign of
life. . . .21

While Samuels interprets Kate’s "face positively
pale with . . . irritation" in "a vulgar little room" on
a "vulgar little street" as witness to her having been
"twisted into the shape of evil by other hands," this
later passage reinterprets the earlier one to mean that
Kate understandably responds to the psychological
atmosphere by focusing on the equally vulgar physical
surroundings. Her reluctance to see her father as
without a shred of decency, and the small chance he
offers her for avoiding the reality find expression in
the narrator’s report of Kate’s view of the physical
space.

We might well use the insights we have about Kate
vis-à-vis Aunt Maud to help integrate the various
implications of the opening scene of the novel.
Considering that Kate has had a thorough introduction to
the world to which her father would aspire through her
aunt, she could well be attracted to the money, status, and beauty on which it builds its foundations. And, of course, she is seduced by these very things, as she herself had learned during her meditative time upstairs at Mrs. Lowder’s home. Ironically, the very appeal of her father derives from his pretensions to be a member of the group of "haves." It is for this, not for his pathetic reality—his poverty or his deceitfulness—that Kate feels an attachment toward him.

Complicating this ambivalent feeling is her father's preference for her over her sister (a bias which he and Aunt Maud have in common). Both of the Croys feel, although only Kate will act positively on the feeling, that Marian lives a most unfortunate existence. Lionel Croy regards his older daughter as even unworthy of her sister's generosity, but the latter brings him some pleasure because of her fine looks, especially because they may win her the opportunity someday to bring tangible good to him. Kate's sense of this attitude—and her tendency to be seduced by it—have been foreshadowed by her thoughts about the "precious name," and are later supported by her thoughts about Aunt Maud and what she has to offer.
Paradoxically, her father claims that, despite Maud’s total rejection of him and her attempts to bribe Kate to follow her example, he would support his sister-in-law in her objections to Kate’s penniless suitor. Although they have come upon quite different fortunes, Lionel and Maud share the same values and employ the same methods in their use of others.

What then seems most critical for us to know about Kate is that her background has not prepared her for the one thing for which we might most admire her—not her offer to her father, not her gestures toward her sister, not even her friendship with Milly—but the strength to leave her aunt in order to marry Merton Densher. Such a move would have no basis in her past. Her family’s suffering did not ennoble them—the accidental and random ways that events befell them hardly provided security for the victims; the father’s abandonment of his family and continuing selfishness which has turned, of all things, to dependency on those he injured, smacks of the meanest degradation. We must ask why James has gone to such lengths to describe this family, to create the father in such a despicable image, but at the same time to endow him with a few irresistible charms, and to
reveal the complexities of Kate's reactions to him, to her past, and to her present life both with her sister and with her aunt. The answer clearly has to do with the ambiguity he intends.

In the defense of his argument that James assimilates the narrator's thoughts to his characters' minds, Bersani refers to the image of Kate's aunt, Mrs. Lowder, as a lioness, which he says James develops "when Kate is the center of consciousness and at another time when our reflector is Densher--without bothering to account for the strikingly similar language used in the thinking of the two characters."22 We need to look at this development for two reasons: first, it is an early and critical example (because it accounts for many attitudes and values which we will encounter in the novel) of how James uses psycho-narration, as well as other stylistic devices in Wings; and secondly, Bersani uses James's technique here as an illustration of parallel thought and figurative language among the centers which "suggest[s] the fusion of all the possible points of view on the story--the characters' and the narrator's--into the perspective of a single consciousness."23
Just prior to the description of Mrs. Lowder, Kate has had two realizations. First, she recognizes that "material things spoke to her... She liked the charming quarters her aunt had assigned her—liked them literally more than she had in all her other days liked anything; and nothing could have been more uneasy than her suspicion of her relative's view of this truth."
The other insight is that "so far from having been for Mrs. Lowder a subject of superficial consideration, the blighted home in Lexham Gardens [the home of the Croys before the death of Kate's mother] had haunted her nights and her days." These are Kate's insights—but they are reported in the narrator's language.

Cohn insightfully describes the paradox of narrative fiction as the attainment of the "greatest 'air of reality' in the representation of a lone figure thinking thoughts she will never communicate to anyone."
Her example for this phenomenon comes from The Portrait of a Lady, in which James creates the memorable scene in Chapter 42 which he termed "my young woman's extraordinary meditative vigil." Discussing this same novel, Bridgman claims that James summarizes mental discourse, using his own words to state a character's ideas. Since
"his prose flowed over bounds, now recording talk, now summarizing it, now recording thought, now summarizing it. . . . James is always present, animating his characters with his sensibility. . . . they are all fragments of the parent organism."26 If, indeed, James is the parent organism who uses his own words to state a character's ideas, is it then true that the characters are allegorical? Or does a lone figure thinking thoughts to herself give the greatest air of reality? If Bridgman is correct in asserting that "James stylized the mind's verbal patterns, but not in the direction of slick, superficial clarity. . . .[but instead] toward those repeated phrases that establish psychological distinctions, and. . . awkward additions. . . representative of the mind building its responses in time" can he at the same time be creating allegorical characters?27 Or is Kate so talented in expression that she thinks in metaphors and other poetic forms of speech?

A further examination of Kate's analysis of her aunt might suggest an alternate explanation. James introduces a long paragraph about Aunt Maud with a metaphor which will function throughout not only the
paragraph, but the novel itself: "It was perfectly present to Kate that she might be devoured, and she compared herself to a trembling kid, kept apart a day or two till her turn should come, but sure sooner or later to be introduced into the cage of the lioness." The verb "compared" tells us that Kate is consciously aware of and responsible for the simile—she thinks that she is like a "trembling kid." We must imagine further that she actually thinks of her aunt as a lioness. But the next paragraph creates important differences in the narrative structure:

The cage was Aunt Maud's own room, her office, her countinghouse, her battlefield, her especial scene, in fine, of action, situated on the ground-floor, opening from the main hall and figuring rather to our young woman on exit and entrance as a guard-house or a toll-gate. The lioness waited—the kid had at least that consciousness; was aware of the neighbourhood of a morsel she had reason to suppose tender.  

James has moved from indirect discourse to a very special style in psycho-narration which has the
distinction of reporting Kate's feelings and thoughts in a language which does all we can probably imagine language could do in the way of reporting mental states which are not vocalized. Surely Kate would not call herself "our young woman" or "the kid," so we know that our narrator continues to be the source of language; however, in the next sentence he no longer reflects Kate's thoughts, but instead offers a clearly narratorial embellishment, a change which has been prepared for by the qualification "the kid had at least that consciousness" --in other words, she is not conscious of all other possibilities.

She would have been meanwhile a wonderful lioness for a show, an extraordinary figure in a cage or anywhere; majestic, magnificent, high-coloured, all brilliant gloss, perpetual satin, twinkling bugles and flashing gems, with a lustre of agate eyes, a sheen of raven hair, a polish of complexion that was like that of well-kept china and that--as if the skin were too tight--told especially at curves and corners.
Another clue for judging this sentence to be solely the narrator's, without a concomitant realization on the part of the character, is the qualifying "meanwhile." This adverb, suggesting "during the intervening time" moves us spatially and temporally from Kate. We see Aunt Maud in her time and place in terms of her society—a view which we do not have reason to attribute to Kate, but one which is always in the purview of a third-person narrator. James thus tells us that Aunt Maud is quite the lioness Kate considers her to be, and that she is, moreover, a formidable instance of her society's potentialities for superficial magnificence. However, Kate is not without enough cleverness to suggest to herself a metaphor which reflects a high degree of social awareness:

Her niece had a quiet name for her—she kept it quiet: thinking of her, with a free fancy, as somehow typically insular, she talked to herself of Britannia of the Market Place—Britannia unmistakeable but with a pen on her ear—and felt she should not be happy till she might on some occasion add to the rest of the panoply a helmet, a shield, a trident and a ledger.\(^2\)
Once again James seems to blur the vision-voice distinction in the sentence following the dashes. The case bears similarity to the instance in *What Maisie Knew*, where the child character could not possibly relate her perceptions in complex "Jamesian language," but where the single word "papa" tells us that indeed the young Maisie owns the thought or feeling. We surely feel that Kate is at least not using the word "panoply" to herself, while she is saying "Britannia" in her own mind, since it is her "quiet name" for her aunt. James maintains narrative power in this manner—he can add emphasis to a thought ("panoply" underlines the ceremonial nature of Maud’s being), and he can qualify a feeling ("unmistakeable" tells us that Kate is quite right in her observations).

Why worry about the distinctions in such a passage, we might ask? Does it matter that the narrator’s voice does not include Kate’s mental life in specific instances? If we are not convinced that it does matter in the double-voiced discourse which refracts social values while waxing eloquent on the “wonderful lioness for a show,” we should at least know without a doubt that the following must be attributed accurately:
It was in fact as a besieger, we have hinted, that our young lady, in the provisioned citadel, had for the present most to think of her, and what made her formidable in this character was that she was unscrupulous and immoral.  

As previous examples have demonstrated, the implicit acknowledgement of the reader in "our young lady" and in "we" does suggest the narrator's immediacy with the reader; yet it does not necessitate the absence of character thought or feeling. Therefore, we cannot rely on these potential narrative clues to tell us where we are not. Fortunately, we do have a piece of evidence in the next sentence which strongly suggests that Kate has not come to precisely this decision about Aunt Maud:  

So at all events in silent sessions and a youthful off-hand way Kate conveniently pictured her: what this sufficiently represented being that her weight was in the scale of certain dangers--those dangers that, by our showing, made the younger woman linger and lurk above, while the elder, below, both militant and diplomatic, covered as much of the ground as possible.
Clearly, a "youthful off-hand way" of picturing someone would not be as unscrupulous and immoral, although Kate could be youthful and offhand while thinking of Maud as a lioness or as Britannia. Furthermore, Kate does know that she is lingering and lurking above while her aunt is below, but her consciousness of this is different from her consciousness of Maud's lioness qualities or of her image as Britannia, since it is not something about which she is thinking; it is something she is doing--staying upstairs away from her aunt.

We should then make these important distinctions: Kate thinks that her aunt is a formidable woman, for whom the comparisons to a lioness and to Britannia are appropriate, and as she works through her period of mourning, she thinks of this woman downstairs and considers her impact on the past and present situations she herself faces; we, however, know that while Maud provides a particularly clear example of what London upper-class society deems desirable, she is actually unscrupulous and immoral. Furthermore, we should interpret Kate's attitude toward her aunt, although it is insightful, in light of her youth and her desire to
satisfy her own convenience. If, indeed, as Bersani says, Kate's consciousness is quite the same as the narrator's, these important differences in the narrative would not be possible.

What about the similarity between the presentation of Kate's impressions and those of Densher? We can see that the narrator's report of Densher's thoughts repeats a metaphor used to describe Kate's consciousness:

She was in fine quite the largest possible quantity to deal with; and he was in the cage of the lioness without his whip—the whip, in a word, of a supply of proper retorts.31

The language of this sentence is quite like that which describes Kate's thoughts about Mrs. Lowder (even to the idiosyncratic "in fine"), and represents the entire passage concerning Densher's thoughts and feelings about her, with the exception of a report of a quip Densher had once almost made to Kate. At the last moment, he had stifled the comment, clearly a dangerous one: "When all's said and done, you know, she's colossally vulgar." Despite the similar language used to report Kate's and Densher's thoughts, I cannot find any reason to criticize James on this stylistic point,
since psycho-narration naturally uses the same language—that of the narrator—consistently. Therefore, when Bersani insists that "such parallels not only of thought but also of figurative language among the centers of the novel suggest the fusion of all the possible points of view on the story—the characters’ and the narrator’s—into the perspective of a single consciousness," he has said a good deal more than we should be willing to accept. If we compare Densher’s desire to expose Aunt Maud’s colossal vulgarity to Kate’s metaphor for her, "Britannia," we can account for an important difference in the position of each character.

Since the metaphor takes on additional meaning in the summary of Kate’s confession to her lover of all the miseries of her family, which occurs in the novel before Densher becomes a centre, it is a particularly apt figure of speech for comparison. Kate’s older brother who had been a middy on the Britannia drowned. The incident is infused with symbolic import for Kate, since he drowned "not by even an accident at sea, but by cramp, unrescued, while bathing, too late in the home of a shipmate." Because she recounts this pathetic story
along with others—the equally "unreasonable" death of the eldest brother, who contracted typhoid fever at "a poisonous little place, as they had afterwards found out, that they had taken for a summer," the dishonour her father had brought them, the abandoned state of her mother, and the "unnatural marriage" of her sister—the association of the name Britannia with the desultory nature of her family seems unavoidable. Combining this with the "play on the feminine personification of Britain and the British Empire, often celebrated in the heavy bronze sculptures of the Victorian period" suggests that Aunt Maud is far more than just "colossally vulgar" to her niece.

Such distinctions in the two consciousnesses were possible for James because of his narrative method. It is far from inconsequential to our interpretation of the entire novel that we understand that Kate knows the danger her aunt presents, that it is quite a different thing to her than to Densher, and that the reasons for their different abilities to own up fully to the danger are not just that Kate stands to come out better if she cultivates the relationship than he would (in fact we do know that Maud likes Densher--just not for her niece--
and that she would presumably "do" for him). But, of course, James could simply have told us this, or he could have used distinctly different language for each character, as Bersani would have liked. I think that he did not do the latter not only because he wanted to emphasize the similarity in knowledge between the lovers, but also because in order for us to understand the complexity of such feelings, he would need to rely on the strength of his usual style. As for telling his readers in distinctly narratorial report, James would have lost the marvelous opportunity for recreating Kate's feelings and predicament in the special way that he does.

Strangely enough, the creation of Kate's character, which James accomplishes with such finesse, seems to elude many critics. While Samuels is convinced of her evil nature, and while Sears fails to see the psychodynamics involved in such a creation, Kate's character incorporates the very ambiguities for which James is so well-known. She cannot, therefore, be completely evil, nor can the psychological intricacies responsible for her nature have been disregarded. The quick summary of Kate's description of her pathetic
family focuses the image which the narrative has been developing since the opening scene of the novel. Initially wounded by the father's "folly and cruelty and wickedness," the mother and children lived at best a drab existence and at worst a life of random, tragic, meaningless events. Into this world appeared, on occasion, Maud Lowder, who apparently both pitied and despised the meanness of her sister's lot. The resentment went both ways, however, for Mrs. Croy taught her children to follow her example in assuring their aunt "that they sufficed--thanks awfully--to themselves." Nevertheless, Kate came to realize that the true source of the Croys' grievance was not that their aunt gave them charity, but that, truly, she did not give them enough: "It wounded them--there was the rub!--because it fell short." This last phrase of free indirect discourse conveys the irony and the pain that Kate acknowledges, carrying with it the sad little indignation of the whole family.

This has important consequences for Kate's character. She learned at a young age to expect the world (in the visible form of her prodigious aunt) to take some interest in making good her losses, and that
if it failed to do this well enough, she could protect her pride under a guise of disinterest in the very help she wanted and expected. Since "the tall rich heavy house at Lancaster Gate, on the other side of the Park and the long South Kensington stretches, had figured to her, through childhood, through girlhood, as the remotest limit her vague young world" and could "be reached through through long, straight, discouraging vistas" she had undoubtedly learned that the world offered treasures which were, on the one hand, not available to her, but, on the other, close enough to be quite tempting. Quite naturally, she developed an attraction/repulsion response to her aunt and to the world she represented. The alternatives, taken up by each of her relatives in turn, hardly would have been a more satisfactory answer for her. As we noted, her mother desired her sister's charity just as she renounced it for its insufficiency (determinedly teaching her children to do the same); her brothers failed to combat the dangers of the world; her sister succumbed to an unfeasible marriage, in which she was forced to lead a life as desultory as the one she had left; and her father, guilty of treacheries too painful
to name (thus they remain unnamed in any specific manner in the narrative), demonstrates in the first pages of the novel his unethical, heartless manner of coping. All manners of dependency flourish in what is left of this family—Marian and her children, the father, and Kate alike are unable to manage satisfactorily on their own.

The Croys' responses to the vicissitudes of their lives derive their strong mimetic flavor not from their larger manifestations, but from the subtleties embedded in the narrative. In this way, they become natural and palpable to the reader, whose awarenesses seem to develop along with Kate's. On the story level, James creates a simple situation: a young woman has recently lost her mother and has moved into her mother's sister's home. This aunt, wealthy and powerful, reminds her niece of all that was wrong with her own life: her family was disgraced by the actions of their father, dismayed by the affluence of the aunt, disintegrated by the deaths of the older brothers, and disappointed in the marriage of the older sister. The story has potential for distancing readers, which is perhaps a partial explanation for critical interpretations which
describe Kate in absolute terms. However, the finely orchestrated psycho-narrative descriptions of Kate's inner life must touch the experiences and understandings of every reader. It is hard to imagine that a summary such as the one I provided could effect the mimetic experience which James realizes. Indeed, such a summary might make it difficult to feel sympathetic to a family who resents their benefactor, even acts slightly belligerent toward her—or, of course, the wealthy and condescending relative could appear to be totally to blame for the reception given her. Such black and white pictures were not for James, however, and thus we can situate ourselves in the circumstances; we can say, "Ah, yes, this is how it would be."

Kate is evil when she acts against Milly. Our response to her plan may well be one of shock—it is surely one of horror. But is it possible that the deed is somehow to be distinguished from the doer? Is Kate able to see other persons in a less selfless way? She has been misused by her aunt and her father, and her sister is unable to care for others, so demanding is her own situation. We can even conclude that her mother used all her children, as all we know of her is that she
trained them to respond to their aunt in terms of her own feelings. Because Kate is a victim of the world in which she lives, her actions reveal more about her society than about her internal motivations. Dorothea Krook's penetrating look at this world reveals it as one in which the upper-class English person, losing the economic ability to continue his traditionally high standard of living, has an especially uneasy relation with Americans, who are steadily growing richer.

In terms of the image of Americans, Samuels alludes to its effects when he asserts the "central emptiness" of the dove herself, by blaming James for oversentimentality and lack of authorial distance. Citing the lines which reflect a thought of Susan Stringham, "When Milly smiled it was a public event—when she didn't it was a chapter of history," Samuels claims that James did not attempt to qualify the spirit of this impression. He further quotes Susan's mental ruminations: during their journey through the Alps, Susan sees Milly "looking down on the kingdoms of the earth," and wonders "was she choosing among them or did she want them all?" Samuels concludes that James's mind associated Milly with Jesus Christ on the basis of this.
Strangely enough, he says that "if one reads *The Wings of the Dove*, this allusion may seem inspirational, but if we recall that Milly isn't God but rather a fabulously rich girl avid for life, the implication is sinister." Of course, he reads the novel allegorically, and is left with a dilemma when he infers that James contradicts himself when he means Milly to be Christ-like in her mercy and selfless (by the act of leaving her fortune to the man who has betrayed her).

Samuels rests his argument on the claim that James did not attempt to qualify the spirit of Mrs. Stringham's thought, and on his assumption that her glimpse of Milly corresponds to James's glimpse. The lack of distinction among narrative voices and visions allows him to ignore the possibility that James can endow Milly with selfless mercy and an appetite for life at the same time. In much the same way as Kate can be selfishly unmerciful, yet sensitive and vulnerable herself, Milly can be both things which Samuels says she cannot.

If we did not know Kate so intimately as we are able to through our narrative analysis, it might be impossible to feel anything but repulsion toward her
after her announcement to Densher of what their plan ought to be. But Kate should not be for us either an allegorical representation of the evil possible in the world or of a woman able to objectify her experiences and to extrapolate from them so that she is able to express them with a novelist’s imagination. Instead, she is a character whose past explains her present psychological state, and whose present situation explains her actions. She is not a consciousness equal to that of the narrator, of Densher, or of Milly either. FID passages render consciousness as separate from the controlling narrative voice. Although we may question the similarity of language for the different character consciousnesses, we should remember that the same author created all of them. If substantive differences distinguish them, we may judge them to be more than just different parts of the same mind—that of the narrator. My analysis of Densher will consider this again.

We should not be content to rest our argument against Bersani on just one example of the distinction between Kate's and Densher's consciousness. Distinguishing between the narrator and Densher when the latter sees Milly for the first time in London
demonstrates the difference between the two consciousnesses quite clearly:

It was probably while they were so occupied--
as the young man subsequently reconceived--
that they had stumbled upon his little New York friend.35

The first clue we have about Merton's feelings comes in the verb "stumbled." As well as "came upon unexpectedly," the word means "made an error or blundered." We can easily imagine being dismayed by someone's suggestion that he "stumbled" on us, and we may well take note that this verb is not reflective of our esteem for Milly. Secondly, the expression "his little New York friend" underlines the suggested meanings of "stumbled." The third person narrator would never speak of Milly in this way, and the embedding process gives us the effect of a startling revelation. This is a departure from Kate's, Aunt Maud's and Susan's descriptions of Milly. Because we have known Merton through Kate and through Milly, we are quite disposed to like him, and this diminutive expression for Milly, who already looms in our view as large in importance and potential for the finest human attributes, thus loses some of its acerbic quality.
But it is not only the structure of the novel which has placed us on Merton's side—it is the precise narrative technique surrounding the FID, "stumbled" and little New York friend," which modifies its effects. The qualification, "It was probably while they were so occupied—as the young man subsequently reconceived," tells us only that Merton did not realize at the moment he and Kate were trying to look natural that Mily was viewing them in their attempts. Since it does not state that these are Merton's thoughts at the exact moment that the narrator reports them, the "little" could be direct report, which would have the potential for defining Milly this way absolutely. Yet, "little" does not comply with our notions of the character in question, and the sentence which follows it explains the use of the term quite explicitly:

He thought of her for some reason al slittle, though she was of about Kate's height, to which, any more than to any other fleicility in his mistress, he had never applied the diminutive.

We know from this passage that the adjective in question belongs to Merton. A less sophisticated
rendition of the brief section of narrative we have been looking at might be:

Merton later realized that it was while he and Kate were attempting to look thus [natural] that they had accidentally come upon his New York friend. He thought of Milly as little, though she was of about Kate's height; yet he never termed Kate's height as little, just as he never applied the diminutive to any part of her.

James's move immediately following the quoted passage into one of the most omniscient forms of narrative report has yet another consequence for our understanding. The narrator relates: "What was to be in the retrospect more distinct to him was the process by which he had become aware that Kate's acquaintance with her was greater than he had gathered," not only providing direct information about Merton's thoughts, but reporting what will be in the future—"What was to be in retrospect. . . ." Of course, we note this narrative liberty in Eliot quite often, but the difference here is that we have been engaged with a centre of consciousness.
The consequence for our understanding, then, is different because we move from the consciousness at one level to a deeper level in the FID (in other words, we cannot be sure of Merton's own awareness of the illogical diminutive he uses for Milly) to a level above Merton with the narrator's explanation that he does not think in this way of Kate at all, and then to yet a higher level when we learn what something will mean to Merton in the future (this discrepancy in time of our realizing and time of Merton's realizing need be only momentary for it to have the same effect on the narrative). What I suggest in such an instance is that we have a relationship with Merton which imitates reality. For example, when a friend tells us his story, we see with him, but we may or may not know more about particular features of the situation he describes. We mentally register the connotations of his languages, not always knowing how aware he is of his suggested meaning. Furthermore, we make our own observations on whether the reporting language is consistent with our friend's expressions in similar situations; and then we may even silently predict what this story will mean to him in the future.
In retrospect, Merton appears to be on the verge of consciousness in this scene. He will of course change his attitude toward "little Miss Theale," and will be unable to think again that "he was seeing but too many little Miss Theales." Although Merton attains the level of moral superiority on which the narrator and Milly exist, his growth toward that attainment cannot be accounted for if we agree with Bersani. In addition, his consciousness must necessarily he distinguished from Kate's, as her final words, "We shall never be again as we were," reveal her failure to achieve his moral level.

The scenes in which Merton's moving and subtly anticipated moral growth unfolds provide some of the most dramatic moments of this novel which has hardly lacked in dramatic power so far. After he learns from Kate what he later thinks of as his "private and particular shabby realities"—indeed, he had learned of them almost through intuition, so in touch was he with the needs and desires of the life-force that is Kate's—Merton's mind and heart open to new experience. We cannot attribute his growth to Milly alone, for she had opportunities to affect Kate and Mrs. Lowder in perhaps similar ways.
Instead, we must recognize that Densher offers possibilities which the other two do not, and strangely enough, these possibilities have perhaps been revealed to us by the way he loves Kate: his potential for caring and commitment, once combined with the sort of intelligence and integrity which enable him to note the "absurdities," even if not until after the fact, that "Kate took it in at every pore, that there was nobody with whom she had less in common than a remarkably handsome girl married to a man unable to make her on any such lines as that the least little present." lead him toward change. (F.O. Matthiessen notes that "As Kate continues to dwell on the beauty of the pearls, he realizes with a twinge that "pearls were exactly what Merton Densher would never be able to give her."

While these are indeed the lines, the ones I quote are followed by "of these absurdities, however, it was not till afterwards that Densher thought." Thus Matthiessen's claim, while valid in a sense, overlooks the difference in story and narrative time in Densher's realization of Kate's perspective. Such differences amount to a great deal through the narrative, as they chart growth and mark differences in narrator and
character awareness, finally giving a good deal of strength to the narrator's voice.)

The scene which details the growth of Merton and Milly's relationship differs significantly from the wrenching dramatization of Kate's intentions and Merton's recognition and acceptance. James apparently decided to control the former scene with dialogue and narrative report, and thus to keep Merton's consciousness relatively inaccessible. Here the prolepses serve the function of further guarding his innermost thoughts at the moment while offering an answer to the obvious reader question, "What indeed is Merton thinking of all this?" For instance, when he asks Kate how she can manage the idea of him being with Milly (in all senses of the word, we imagine James intends us to think), she answers that she doesn't like it, but that she is "a person, thank goodness, who can do what [she doesn't] like." The narrator gives us a report that allows James to "have it both ways," so to speak:

It wasn't till afterwards that, going back to it, he was to read into this speech a kind of heroic ring, a note of character that
belittled his own incapacity for action. Yet he saw indeed even at the time the greatness of knowing so well what one wanted. At the time, too, moreover, he next reflected that he after all knew what he did. But something else on his lips was uppermost. 'What I don't make out then is how you can even bear it.'

James tells us that Merton will realize his own incapacity for action—and, of course, he might have acted to arrest Kate's plan at its inception, had he her courage. This refers back to a refracted notion derived from "bravely" in "But her lips bravely moved. 'To marry her.'" Kate's bravery in uttering these unspeakable words, we understand, is laudable in the sense that she has overcome her uninspired background to march on with vitality and intention. Of course, this bravery is contemptible in its heedlessness, at best, and its calculated manipulations, at worst. The comparison tells us that although Merton was weak, he will not always be, and that if he had acted on his feelings, rather than simply forming them into a question for Kate, he would have behaved differently. Thus, James allows us only the briefest glimpse into Merton's mind.
at this awful moment, he appeases our curiosity to know more with predictions for Merton's growth, and he deals with the present in direct dialogue, thereby masking the deeper levels of consciousness.

The one action which Merton does take--of asking Kate to come to his rooms if he is to agree to her plan--carries symbolic import throughout his recognition of Milly's superiority and his own desire to match it. As James frequently did in the case of Kate's attitude toward her father, he again delivers a narrative report of character's consciousness in exceptionally poetic language:

Kate had come to him; it was only once--and this not from any failure of their need, but from such impossibilities, for bravery alike and for subtlety, as there was at the last no blinking; yet she had come, that once, to stay, as people called it; and what survived of her, what remained and insisted, was something he couldn't have banished if he had wished. Luckily he didn't wish, even though there might be for a man almost a shade of the awful in so unqualified a consequence of his
act. It had simply worked, his idea, the idea he had made her accept; all erect before him.

. . . It played for him—certainly in this prime afterglow—the part of a treasure kept at home in safety and sanctity, something he was sure of finding in its place when, with each return, he worked his heavy old key in the lock. The door had but to open for him to be with it again and for it to be all there; so intensely there that, (as we say), no other act was possible to him than the renewed act, almost the hallucination, of intimacy. . . . it was in view as, when the curtain has risen, the play on the stage is in view, night after night, for the fiddlers. He remained thus, in his own theatre, in his single person, perpetual orchestra to the ordered drama, the confirmed 'run'; playing low and slow, moreover, in the regular way, for the situations of most importance. . . . (Never was a consciousness) more rounded and fastened down over what filled it; which is precisely (what we have spoken of as), in its degree,
the oppression of success, the somewhat
chilled state--tending to the solitary--of
supreme recognition!39 (underlining and
bracketing mine).

Here we have James at his best in the creation of
imagistic realizations of consciousness. The exceptions
to the imagery include the underlined phrase and words
and the bracketed-old-typed phrases. We might define the
first group as Merton's FID if we think of reading the
passage aloud and consider the emphasis they would
receive vocally as a reflection of the intensity of
feeling they convey. They do not lack in significance
because of the minimal in number, but are significant
in the strength of feeling they convey. At the other
extreme, the bold typed phrases represent the most
revealed state of the narrator--the "we" calls attention
to our joining in an act of reading and interpreting
fiction, just as does the reference to consciousness,
particularly since the development of the
consciousnesses is so central to this novel. Finally,
the combination of literary language, occasional FID,
and the emphasis on the process of coming to know a
character's consciousness combine to focus us on and in
Merton almost simultaneously.
In addition, the passage has the effect of making us pay attention to the remembered moments' impact on Merton throughout his time with Milly as one indicator of his growth. On the one hand, Kate cannot remain so vivid in his mind if he is to fully appreciate Milly; on the other hand, the passion that accompanies his memories describe Merton as a man receptive to forces springing from deep feelings. In other words, we need to know that Merton is able to feel this way, and we need to see him let this feeling dissipate—not only so that he may become attached to Milly, but so that we may mark the difference between him and Kate, for whom fidelity's other name is careful action. "Nothing, he perfectly knew, was less like careful action than the immersion he enjoyed at home... [a]s Kate was all in his poor rooms..."40

What precipitates the change for Merton is quite simply Milly's goodness, which she expresses for him very personally in the interest she takes in him. Despite the tremendous interest which Milly's case excites in those around her, nowhere in the novel do we witness the genuine selflessness which her concern for him demonstrates. James chooses to register the initial effects of this in FID:
She was so full of interest that he shouldn't perhaps after all be too easily let off. . . .
She was so interested that she presently asked him if he found his rooms propitious . . . . He should need it [a brazen mask] quite particularly were she to express again her imagination of coming to tea with him. . . . He wasn't inhuman, in fine so long as it [tact] would serve. It had to serve now, accordingly, to help him not to sweeten Milly's hopes.
(and when Merton inadvertently reminds Milly of her illness): . . . . he knew as little what to do as he had ever known in his life. He couldn't emphasize that he thought of her as dying, yet he couldn't pretend he thought of her as indifferent to precautions.
(and when Milly says 'We want you not to go'): It was beautiful how she spoke for Mrs. Stringham.41

Direct dialogue and narrative report provide the bulk of the scene—James again uses a prolepsis to let us know that Merton is on his way to a change: "His
great scruple suddenly broke, giving way to something inordinately strange, something of a nature to become clear to him only when he had left her. 'You can come,' he said, 'when you like.' Merton assents to Milly and Susan's desire to visit his rooms—the sanctified place where he had been keeping the vision of Kate alive, where we learned earlier "he couldn't for his life, he felt, have opened his door to a third person." However the quoted FID passages convey feeling, whereas the narrative report tends to deliver more conscious, deliberate, less spontaneous thought. For instance, "he knew as little what to do. . . ." is preceded by:

He had done what, so unforgettably, she had asked him in London not to do; he had touched, all alone with her here, the supersensitive nerve of which she had warned him. He had not, since the occasion in London, touched it again till now; but he saw himself freshly warned that it was able to bear still less.42

We can see that direct narrative report on Merton's consciousness elaborates in important ways on the events and the ways in which Merton thinks about them.
The FID, which occurs with increased frequency, however, plots Merton's change in attitude in a concise way. In the following selection of a number of the FID passages, we can follow the course of Merton's moral development:

The speech in question at least wasn't disloyal to Kate; that was the very tone of their bargain. So was it, by being loyal, another kind of lie, the lie of the uncandid profession of a motive. He was staying so little 'for' Milly that he was staying positively against her. He didn't, none the less, know, and at last, thank goodness, didn't care. The only thing he could say might make it either better or worse. . . . He was only not to budge without the girl's [Milly's] leave. . . . A false step would bring it down, and it must hang as long as possible. . . . His manager might wire that he was wanted, but he could easily be deaf to his manager. His money for idle life might be none too much; happily, however, Venice was cheap. . . . There had to be a delicate art in it,
for he wasn't trying—quite the contrary—to be either distant or dull. That would not have been being 'nice,' which in its own form was the real law.43

It was his own fault if the vulgar view, the view that might have been taken of an inferior man, happened so incorrigibly to fit him. [The narrator uses the phrase 'our young man' repeatedly during this section where Merton's sense of his own image in the eyes of the servant, Eugenio, agonizes him. The phrase seems intended to lift us out of Merton's vision of himself and to ask us to sympathize with him]. One had come to a queer pass when a servant's opinion so mattered. . . . It was the more disagreeable accordingly that the vision of appearances was quite right, and yet was scarcely less low.44

The weather had changed, the rain was ugly, the wind wicked, the sea impossible, because of Lord Mark. It was because of him, a fortiori, that the palace was closed. [As Merton dwells on Lord Mark's presence, his consciousness sounds like Kate's as she thought of her father dealing from his greasy old pack]: You couldn't drop on the poor girl that way without, by the fact,
being brutal. Such a visit was a descent, an invasion, an aggression, constituting precisely one or other of the stupid shocks he himself had so decently sought to spare her. . . . the only delicate and honorable way of treating a person in such a state was to treat her as he, Merton Densher, did. It was he, the brute [Lord Mark] who had stumbled into just the wrong inspirations. . . .

That would be his one way [staying in Venice], purified though he was, to mark his virtue beyond any mistake. It would be accepting the disagreeable, and the disagreeable would be a proof; a proof of his not having stayed for the thing—the agreeable as it were—that Kate had named. It was part of the odium as actual too that Kate was, for her comfort, just now well aloof. These were the first hours since her flight in which his sense of what she had done for him on the even of that event was to incur a qualification.

These direct communications with Merton's consciousness tell us that after he realizes the goodness of Milly, he still thinks of remaining faithful to Kate, but he must rationalize in order to believe that keeps their bargain ("at least wasn't disloyal to
Kate"). He then recognizes the importance of remaining in Venice in a new way: Milly needs him, and "a false step would bring it down." He then sees, through Eugenio's eyes, his own guilt, which, ironically enables him to know Lord Mark's treachery, since he can better recognize the potential for cruelty now that his vision of himself has become more objective. As he begins to feel almost righteous about his fine consideration for Milly's welfare, he realizes that come what may, he must stay in Venice, and for her, not for his and Kate's plan. At this time, the narrator tells us (bold type) that he consciously thinks differently about his intimacy with Kate (as we were warned he would when he offered an invitation to tea to Milly and Susan).

When Susan comes to tell Merton that Kate "has turned her face to the wall," another instance of prolepsis indicates that Merton will wonder afterwards at how quickly he and Susan came to the subject of Milly's retreat from life. James again alternates the inner view with the omniscient, letting us know from within and without that Merton's heart so filled with concern for Milly that he will relive the scene with Susan again in his mind.
Reliving and suffering silently, Merton's consciousness questions: "What then was his odious position but that again and again he was afraid?" FID tells us that he is afraid of being "shabby... poor." But through his consciousness we know that he is neither: when he meets Kate again and reveals what he knows of Milly's turn, FID tell us that his awareness of Kate has changed: "Of course it was to be remembered that she always simplified ... the very sense that so often before had moved him to admiration."

James uses dramatic techniques—direct dialogue and action—in the scenes that follow in London, as Merton comes to terms with his new awarenesses and endures the inevitable "wait" to hear of Milly's death, frequently in the company of Maud Lowder.

The narrator maintains a firm hold on the remaining scenes; yet the power of what has happened to Merton has gained immeasurable force from the glimpses into the recesses of his mind and heart. Although some passages resemble in structure and language those of Kate, as I have noted, the FID distinguishes Merton from the narrator. Whether it differs enough from Kate's to make each really unique can be argued. As Bersani admits,
they are different in substance, but I do not agree that they are simply different moral choices of one consciousness—the narrator’s. Again, his is different from theirs, and, although it is far greater in volume than theirs, it may finally not be more effective in making the remarkably complex centres alive for us.
CHAPTER IV

According to Alfred Kazin, Theodore Dreiser was "belabored and derided for not resembling the newly resurrected Henry James" in the 1940's, while earlier in the century he had been "excoriated for 'immorality.'" Although Dreiser's narrative differs considerably from James's, his intentions are served in spite of his style, and sometimes because of it. The immorality charges perhaps reflect early readers' responses to his clumsiness, as well as to his plot in Sister Carrie, since the immorality of human actions which James dramatizes in The Wings of the Dove, for example, far surpasses what Carrie Meeber and Hurstwood could have imagined.

Both of these matters concern our study because Dreiser's accomplishment in creating the consciousness of a character who feels far more than she thinks contrasts in significant ways with James's centres of consciousness, whose thoughts the narrator reveals in complex, often figurative language, as well as refractions of feelings. In addition, Dreiser directs our sympathies and thus our attitudes toward moral issues in
the Carrie/Hurstwood relationship in much the same way as Eliot did in the case of Dorothea and Casaubon. The focus of this chapter, then, will be on the role of refracted discourse in two related aspects of this novel: the development of the consciousness of a character whose capacity for feeling far outweighs her ability to reason abstractly; and the development of our sympathies for Carrie and Hurstwood.

We cannot overlook the issue of Dreiser's clumsy language, especially since it recurs as a focus in discussions of his novels, despite their success. As Kazin observes, "The jabbing at Dreiser never stops, but his place among the major American writers is assured." Several critics examine the effect of language on the success of Sister Carrie and conclude that the novel as a whole overcomes the negative effects of its style. James Phelan, arguing against David Lodge's assertion that "a work of art cannot be successfully achieved if its medium is misused," which in practice means that any novel is either well-written or is a bad novel, demonstrates that Dreiser's novel succeeds despite the burden of misuse of the medium. Phelan's perceptive analysis of the novel illuminates Dreiser's subtle accomplishment (often gained through less than subtle
means): he creates sympathy for Carrie while at the same
time he develops the important thematic concept that her
notion of what constitutes happiness is deficient.
Because of this, Phelan explains, we come to recognize
that Carrie has achieved a limited victory in the end.4
We can push Phelan's argument further by suggesting that
Dreiser's verbosity, though not his pronoun errors,
sloppy syntax, or general awkwardness, is not merely a
neutral factor in terms of this achievement, but it may
play an important role in insuring the appropriate
reader responses. Since much of the objectionable
language in Sister Carrie involves refracted discourse,
we have an opportunity to investigate whether this
technique which we have been praising for its subtlety
might be effective when it is overt, even overdone.

Several insights into more covert techniques emerge
in Julian Markels' perceptive essay on Sister Carrie.
Defining articulateness as "the ability to recognize. .
desires, to name them, and to pursue their objects
actively instead of passively," and consciousness as
"the ability to judge those desires, to anticipate the
consequences of pursuing them for some larger system of
values, and hence to become responsible for [one's]
active choices," Markels makes a useful distinction
between articulateness and consciousness. It is possible, for example, that Carrie might become articulate, but that she would still not have attained consciousness. Most significantly, however, Markels’ contention that "Dreiser's style is the necessary defect of his virtue" supports the notion that the difference between the narrator's articulateness and that of the characters plays a crucial role in realizing the author's intentions. Markels arrives at this conclusion by arguing the following: the sequence of episodes in the plot dramatizes the absence of purpose in the universe, which the characters in turn reflect; their failure to achieve a fully conscious state can be seen as a failure of Dreiser's method of construction to enable him to portray "the emergence in human experience of moral consciousness and its corollary, literary style;" at the same time "his own conception of the inarticulate drift of experience" demands that his characters remain without consciousness.

Our initial introduction to Carrie sets the stage for many of the responses she later has to her world. In particular, the narrator signals her uncritical attraction to superficial appearances during the train ride of the opening scene. But at the same time, he
refracts the values which will easily impose themselves on the unresisting Carrie. Our task includes deciding which words and phrases describe Carrie's perception in these early moments of her introduction to big city life, which refract attitudes that she has not yet considered, and where and how the implied author directs our sympathies in these passages.

As Carrie travels toward Chicago, a "drummer," or manufacturer's travelling representative, speaks briefly to her. The narrator gives us the slang expression for his profession, and continues to describe him in terms of his dress, using such connotative words and phrases as "calculated to elicit," "masher," linen cuffs "protuded," "common yellow agates," ever-enduring heavy seal [of one of his rings]," and "whatever he had to recommend him." The paragraph ends with the narrator's comment, "whatever he had to recommend him, you may be sure was not lost upon Carrie, in this, her first glance," suggesting that Carrie has noticed all this, the next paragraph embellishes on what this first includes:

Lest this order of individual should permanently pass, let me put down some of the most striking characteristics of his most
successful manner and method. Good clothes, of course, were the first essential, the things without which he was nothing. A strong physical nature, actuated by a keen desire for the feminine, was the next. A mind free of any consideration of the problems or forces of the world and actuated not by pleasure. His method was always simple. Its principal element was daring, backed, of course, by an intense desire and admiration for the sex. 

The paragraph becomes more analytical and more general in its description of this type of individual as it goes on, finally depicting hypothetical situations and possible responses to them. Surely Carrie cannot be responsible for these last insights— the state of mind of another never enters the purview of Carrie. Such things occur to Jamesian characters, but Dreiser uses the language of definite pronouncement, reflecting a sureness about the nature of the characters which would be quite uncharacteristic of the late James. If we consider the early descriptions of Lionel Croy, for instance, we can recognize the difference: "Life had met him so, halfway, and had turned round so to walk with him, placing a hand in his arm and fondly leaving
him to choose the pace." And, for reasons such as this, Lionel "had positively been, in his way, by the force of his particular type, a terrible husband not to live with; his type reflecting so invidiously on the woman who had found him distasteful." Moreover, whatever the source of his disgrace might be James never mentions. We know Lionel Croy in a most mimetically plausible way--through a perspective limited by the fictional counterpart of our inability to see everything and by Lionel's reluctance to reveal himself.

In our terms, this means that James often refracts in his narrative the complex nature of knowledge, both in the sense of the "knower" and the "known." Dreiser, on the other hand, more often refracts the observable values and comments on their consequences. As we can see in the passage in question, Dreiser is confident in his description: Drouet is a type, one whom the ironic first sentence suggests will not disappear, given his "most successful manner" (although the implied author does not want us to applaud his success, except in a very limited way which concerns his ability to survive in a hard world, since he is one of the factors making the world less lovely than it might be). He is nothing without good clothes because they insure his success
Carrie has not yet been educated into this system, but her eye naturally catches the details of his dress. What this means for Carrie is that she enters now, for the first time, a world which rewards such types as "mashers"—at least in the terms they ask. The individuals, while not malicious, think little about the serious matters of life, instead indulging themselves in available pleasures. We may hope that Carrie will not be prey to such men, but we understand within several chapters that she will be unable to develop a resistance, given the slim support she receives from her sister and husband and the working world in this unyielding city.

Richard Lingeman asserts that Carrie is seduced by the city itself, not by the men whom she meets there, in his study of Dreiser, *Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates of the City, 1871-1907.* Indeed, Dreiser's descriptions of the city convey the sense that the city holds wonders which a naive country girl would find irresistible, although I would argue that the men are part of the city life and that separating them as Lingemann suggests is arbitrary and probably inaccurate. However, the refracted discourse suggests that the implied author would describe the city in additional ways. The
following description embeds several ideas and values about the city:

To the child, the genius with imagination, or the wholly untravelled, the approach to a great city for the first time is a wonderful thing. Particularly if it be evening—that mystic period between the glare and gloom of the world when life is changing from one sphere or condition to another. Ah, the promise of the night. What does it not hold for the weary! What old illusion of hope is not here forever repeated! Says the soul of the toiler to itself, 'I shall soon be free. I shall be in the ways and the hosts of the merry. The streets, the lamps, the lighted chamber set for dining, are for me. The theatre, the halls, the parties, the ways of rest and the paths of song—these are mine in the night.' Though all humanity be still enclosed in the shops, the thrill runs abroad. It is in the air. The dullest feel something which they may not always express or describe. It is the lifting of the burden of toil.¹⁰
Dreiser recreates the magic of the city and the sense of an inspiring dream which it invokes as it is seen in the eyes of the child, the genius, or the untravelled, who approach it for the first time, for the weary as they see it again and again, while he simultaneously implies the illusory qualities of such dreams. As he refracts desire and disappointment in a single word or phrase—"promise of the night," "mystic period," "glare and gloom," "old illusion of hope... forever repeated"—the implied author asks that we recognize that this response is quite common. In the superior position we assume with him, we look down at Carrie, but not condescendingly. The empathy which this passage creates has important implications for our sympathy with Carrie: our superior ability to consciously evaluate her situation at all times and the narrator's articulate (even if clumsy) revelations should work to make us understand and sympathize; they should not encourage us to regard her unfeelingly.

Another sort of sympathy for Carrie has its roots in this passage—one which might also be termed admiration. As Carrie gazes out the window, we have our first sense of her "emotional greatness." Markels explains the phrase "emotional greatness" with the following justification:
When we see Carrie Meeber respond to her experience directly in fear and desire, without imposing on it any moral categories or expectations, when we see her enlarge her worldly status and her human identity by her unquestioning submission to the 'whatever is' of her experience, then we know why Dreiser attributes to Carrie the quality of 'emotional greatness.'

Although we will need to know a great deal more about Carrie before we will be struck with the appropriateness of this phrase when used to describe her, this early hint derives its power because it expresses Carrie's ability to see things without the dull tinge which weariness brings, ironically distancing us from her as it helps us to understand her. As she renews interest in the city for her companion, we admire her innocence and enthusiasm. Later, when the narrator queries, "How was it that, in so little a while, the narrow life of the country had fallen from her as a garment, and the city, with all its mystery, taken its place?" we should note how ironic this question seems in light of both the impressions of Carrie and of the city which the narrator has drawn together.
The two sources of fantasy for Carrie—the superficial effects of one's physical appearance and the excitement of the city—work their illusory powers on both men and women. However, Dreiser makes clear the idea that women are more vulnerable. For example, when Drouet endeavors to convince Carrie to take his monetary gift, the narrator reveals, "like all women, she was there to object and be convinced. It was for him to brush the doubts away and clear the path if he could." This double-voiced message says in fact that women play the suggested role, but, given other evidence in the novel, the modification of the male role with "if he could" is ironic because there is no "he who can." A practical source of women's vulnerability finds explanation in the following:

A woman should some day write the complete philosophy of clothes. No matter how young, it is one of the things she wholly comprehends. There is an indescribably faint line in the matter of man's apparel which somehow divides for her those who are worth glancing at and those who are not. . . . There is. . . a line at which the dress of a man will cause her to study her own. This line
the individual at her elbow now marked for Carrie. She became conscious of an inequality.\textsuperscript{14} This is modified by the later comment on Drouet:

He was vain, he was boastful, he was as deluded by fine clothes as any silly-headed girl. A truly deep-dyed villain could have hornswoggled him as readily as he could have flattered a pretty shop-girl.

He had just enough of the feminine love of dress to be a good judge—not of intellect, but of clothes.\textsuperscript{15} Providing further reflections on clothing, the narrator again refracts the norms of a particular world and offers his own comments on both the values and the world from which they emerge. Carrie, however, does not analyze her response to this super- ficial sign of human worth; in fact, the narrator embeds in these evaluations the idea that most women would be incapable of self- scrutiny in terms of their penchant for fine apparel.

When the narrator philosophizes, "A thought will colour a world for us,"\textsuperscript{16} he intimates that a simple notion may affect the way one sees the world. Although the comment refers to Carrie's feelings for Hanson, we
may infer that the idea carries over to other "thoughts" in the novel—and in the case of clothes, appealing ones do at times color the world for Carrie, just as for "any silly-headed girl." Outward signs often best define Carrie's attitudes—they are what she best understands—but the narrator uses them to describe the inequality between the sexes, also. Whether or not Dreiser intends to give credibility to the stereotypes, he uses them to make distinctions and also to suggest similarities between the sexes.

Dreiser directs our sympathy for Carrie by showing the way in which Minnie and Hanson's home offers her no real comfort or solace. The plainness of their existence spells out a lack of more than financial resources—a reality Carrie comprehends because "[s]he had some slight gift of observation and that sense, so rich in every woman—intuition." The governing intelligence of the novel, which Irving Howe refers to as "more copious and flexible than any of the characters" then describes the poor surroundings, which to Carrie "felt [as] the drag of a lean and narrow life." The separation between the narrator's detailing of the physical conditions and Carrie's feelings about the situation works well in defining Carrie's
experiences as ones of intuition, in contrast to the narrator's perceptions of intellectual understanding. We should not necessarily think that Carrie is included in the "one" in "one could see that the furniture was of that poor, hurriedly patched together quality sold by the instalment houses." As Shapiro points out in his study of Dreiser, the author used the details for which he was criticized on the basis of style to emphasize a theme central to his novels—that "things" dominate the American scene. And, clearly, Carrie could not articulate this theme.

When the narrator reports Minnie's thoughts about Carrie's existence with her and her husband, pseudo-objective underpinning works to make the account appear to be a mere reflection of Minnie's thoughts, while it instead refracts values which have significant implications for the novel:

It [Carrie's board] would pay the rent and would make the subject of expenditure a little less difficult to talk about with her husband. But if Carrie was going to think of running around in the beginning there would be a hitch somewhere. Unless Carrie submitted to a solemn round of industry and saw the need of
hard work without longing for play, how was her coming to the city to profit them?\textsuperscript{20}

In the underlined words, we hear Minnie’s voice, but the implied author’s can also be heard, asking us to consider what it means to welcome one’s sibling as a source of profit. If we remember his earlier term of “weary” for those who succumb to lives of hard labor and little profit, we may sense his sympathy for Minnie. He may well believe that in an ideal world, one would not seek profit from her own sister, but his narrative and dramatic realizations of the difficulties of life in the city for the common person, which work in favor of sympathy for Carrie, paradoxically support at least a tolerance for Minnie’s seemingly crass evaluation of her sister.

Carrie’s experiences at work are hardly more inspiring than Minnie’s attitude toward her. Dreiser refracts the unpleasant nature of the work-world in the labels he attaches to Carrie and others in their jobs: “little shop-girl,” “drummer,” “masher,” “little toiler,” “store-girl,” “work-seeker,” and “Jew.” Each of these names conjures stereotypical images of either the diminutive role one plays as a shop worker or pitiful toiler, the hunger of those desperately looking
for jobs, or even the aggressiveness of managers, implied in the "sharp, quick-mannered Jew." Thus, Dreiser embeds in the narrative negative connotations about the world of work, as well as he creates dramatic examples to describe how difficult Carrie's venture into it is.

The unambiguous message of the refracted discourse—that Carrie faces a new world filled with unfamiliar and wearying challenges—creates sympathy for her plight. Dreiser effectively presents the obstacles and Carrie separately, unlike James's method in *Wings*. Because the refracted discourse surrounds Carrie, but seldom comes from her consciousness, we have no reason to expect that she is aware at the level of consciousness of what we know about this society. This technique emphasizes her inarticulateness and thus suggests that she relates to her experiences on an emotional level. We, on the other hand, know and feel.

The oppressive nature of the city, particularly for those unsophisticated in its ways, must be felt by the reader, who also understands its causes. The language of the narrative passages, including the refracted discourse, reimagines an aura of oppression which can hardly fail to evoke corresponding feelings in the
reader. This nexus of feeling and intellectual awareness on our parts forms the basis of our sympathy for Carrie. We not only understand what she fails to comprehend, but we also know why she fails to consciously register and articulate her experiences. The city often does not provide what it seemingly offers; women are apparently quite susceptible to its glamour nonetheless; and this we must see as a consequence of their status as the more oppressed among the downtrodden. By not giving us any reason to expect a girl with Carrie's background to grasp the larger sense of her complex and overwhelming world, Dreiser creates sympathy, not disappointment.

Thus, when the narrator of *Sister Carrie* describes its heroine's emotional response to her impending dramatic performance, we identify with Carrie as she strives to master her own fate, suffering all the while from the fear that she will be unsuccessful:

That little student had mastered her part to her own satisfaction, much as she trembled for her fate when she should once face the gathered throng. . . . She tried to console herself with the thought that a score of other persons, men and women, were equally tremulous.
but she could not disassociate the general danger from her own individual liability. She feared that she would forget her lines, that she might be unable to master the feeling which she now felt concerning her own movements in the play . . . . she trembled lest she should be paralyzed with fear and stand white and gasping, not knowing what to say and spoiling the entire performance.²¹

Even a casual reader would probably accuse Dreiser of abusing the potential power of language to imitate an emotional state on the basis of this example. The underlined words and phrases suggest one characteristic of Dreiser—painful redundancy. Yet, since Carrie's performance in the play is a metaphor for her performance in life, Dreiser does not want to leave any question about the awesome threat which a "performance" on the larger stage poses for this performer. The underlined words and phrases describe the relationship Carrie has with her world; she is "little" compared to the world she faces, and her sense of mastery dissipates when she is no longer alone. The phrase "consoling herself" emphasizes an alleviation of grief or mitigation of sense of loss, rather than a distinct or
full relief. Sensing a significant danger, Carrie experiences fear to the point of paralysis and trembles at the recognition of her inability to master either the situation or her own response to it. This is neither more nor less overwhelming than her experience with life has been so far.

The rest of the underlined words and phrases refract the narrator's understanding of the tension between the individual and a society which frequently refuses to yield to her desires. Dreiser gives voice to social factors in the labels which he attaches to both major and minor characters. In fact, the very title of the work suggests that Carrie exists mainly in relation to something else: she is someone's sister. Of course, she does not seek her identity as Minnie's sister (or as Drouet's, although she assumes a residence with him under the pretext of being his sister), but her decision to travel to Chicago because her sister lives there foreshadows her later decisions. Carrie acts according to either the convenience, the lack of hospitality, the invitation, the external image, or the piece of advice of someone else.

We might ask whether Dreiser compensates for or perhaps even utilizes such overstatements for defining
Carrie and other characters and increasing reader sympathy. One argument in defense of Dreiser, which bears a relation to the arguments I have made so far, concerns the refracted meanings of "loaded" words in the passage. Since Dreiser uses the adjective "little" so often, we can surmise about its possible meaning in the novel. In general, the word underlines the notion of powerlessness: Carrie and others, such as shop-girls and toilers, are not necessarily little in their potential, in their vision, or, from what we know of Carrie, in terms of capacity for feeling. Carrie cannot disassociate the "general danger" from her "individual liability" because she cannot abstract her experience and place it in the context of a larger scene.

Another example of the way in which Dreiser uses "little" demonstrates further that he intends it to signal our sympathy by its use:

That little soldier of fortune took her good turn in an easy way. She felt a little out of place, but the great room soothed her and the view of the well-dressed throng outside seemed a splendid thing. Ah, what was it not to have money. . . . He seemed quite a figure of a man, and she wondered at his friendship and regard for her.22
Although "soldier of fortune" reverberates with the narrator's condescension, "little" modifies its parodic effect. Carrie handles herself well here because she has already intuited the importance of great rooms and well-dressed throngs. She instinctively responds to her surroundings, which we estimate with this and earlier refractions of social values. Carrie's instincts also warn her that she may not deserve the friendship and regard of someone in better circumstances than she—again, her feeling is not "little," although her power to articulate is. Because we view Carrie sympathetically, we are in a position to admire her at least for the way she handles an unfamiliar situation. She does not shrink from opportunity, and while we have no reason to share her value for the superficial, our sensitivity to her reasons for doing so tell us that her behavior here is commendable on its own terms.

In another instance, again beginning with a devaluing adjective for Carrie, we may not agree with the implied values while we nevertheless sympathize with her:

The poor girl thrilled as she walked away from Drouet. She felt ashamed in part because she had been weak enough to take it [the twenty
dollars he had given her], but her need was so
dire, she was still glad. Now she would have
a nice new jacket! Now she would buy a pretty
pair of button shoes. She would get
stockings, too and a skirt, and and—until
already, as in the matter of her prospective
salary, she had got beyond, in her desires,
twice the purchasing power of her bill.²³

Beginning with "Now she would" and ending with "and- -,"
Carrie's FID suggests that she is responding
predictably—spontaneously, without consideration for
the best way to spend the sum or for the full
implications of accepting it. The narrator's report in
the beginning justifies her response: he refers to her
as "the poor girl" and as consciously ashamed of her
weakness, which results from her dire straits. At the
end he undercuts the justification somewhat by saying
that not only here, but "in the matter of her
prospective salary," she has responded without caution.

However, the FID moves us more than the narrator's
explanations, so that we gain in our sympathy for Carrie
because of it and in spite of the irresponsibility to
which the narrator alludes. FID which exposes
unmediated human desire works more powerfully in
Influencing readers than narratorial comment if the character to whom it belongs tends to be a sympathetic one and if the desire is not itself seen as totally reprehensible. Thus, we again note Carrie’s over-emphasis on clothing, but instead of simply registering a negative judgment of her character, we remain in a superior position, and as we look down, we register her mistakes without holding her responsible for them.

In another instance, the narrative seemingly mocks Carrie for her infatuation with clothes, but a careful analysis suggests that although Dreiser goes to the extent of personifying the clothes that Carrie intends to purchase so that they may mock her, our sympathy may still be reclaimed in what seems to be a very parodic passage:

Once these things were in her hand, on her person, she might dream of giving them up; the method by which they came might intrude itself so forcibly that she would ached to be rid of the thought of it, but she would not give them up. 'Put on the old clothes—that torn pair of shoes,' was called to her by her conscience in vain. She could possibly have conquered the fear of hunger and gone back; the thought of
hard work and a narrow round of suffering would, under the last pressure of conscience, have yielded, but spoil her appearance?—be old-clothed and poor-appearing?—never! \(^{24}\)

In these derisive words, the narrator refracts the values of a society whose approval—indeed demand—for lovely things outweighs even a well-meaning conscience. What we learn is not that the things in and of themselves are so important to Carrie—she could "dream of giving them up," and she would be haunted by the way that they came to her. But she cannot accept the desultory nature of her life without them, and since no desirable alternative exists for her within the realities Dreiser has depicted, we cannot completely wish for her to renounce her desires. Furthermore, she is understandably influenced by Drouet, who has played the role of her saviour, and who "loved the thing that women love in themselves, grace. At this, their own shrine, he knelt with them, an ardent devotee." \(^{25}\)

In the following description of the rooms that Carrie and Drouet take together, the narrator uses clever debunking adjectives, which deliver more comment on the values of society than of Carrie, since she did not select the furnishings:
The rooms were comfortably enough furnished. There was a good Brussels carpet on the floor, rich in dull red and lemon shades, and representing large jardinières filled with gorgeous, impossible flowers.  

"Good" connotes a value to those who care about the quality of carpet—something which, given Carrie's ambiguous life circumstances, can hardly be considered of consequence. The carpet is "rich" in its dullness, and its flowers are not simply "gorgeous," but they are "impossible"! Such we might say of Carrie's life itself: it may seem rich, but it is dull; she may have some beautiful embellishments, including her own looks, but they may not offer her practical good (the embellishments are like gorgeous impossible flowers). Since similar debunkings of material goods continue through the novel, it becomes increasingly clear that Dreiser intends to distance us from the characters' values, but not necessarily from a particular character, and to repudiate those aspects of society which encourage superficiality.

When refracted discourse describes the sources of Carrie's greatest attraction—Hurstwood and Mrs. Vance, each of whom symbolizes to her the finest possibilities
the city has to offer—the same analysis of the implied author's debunkings and simultaneous understanding of Carrie reveals complex meanings:

He was so handsome, so daring!... This man, to whose bosom she was being pressed, was strong; he was passionate, he loved her, and she was alone. If she did not turn to him—accept of his love—where else might she go?"7

Shortly before this, the narrator conjectured, "The great city held much. Possibly she would come out of bondage into freedom—who knows? Perhaps she would be happy.... These thoughts raised her above the level of erring. She was saved in that she was hopeful." If we had not suspected the flimsiness of Carrie's hopes and the improbability that she will indeed be happy, her FID exclamations about Hurstwood would convince us that she has not been raised above the level of erring. What we do realize is that although reason does not number among Carrie's virtues, hopefulness does. The implied author suggests that it is better to be optimistic in the face of troubling circumstances than to greet them with all the gloom they deserve (as the symbolic weather conditions, among other things, tell us that Hurstwood does). In other words, since Carrie has not been born
to particularly fortunate circumstances, and since she
does not have great power of reasoning, she must rely on
her inclination to put a favorable construction on
actions and happenings and to anticipate the best
possible outcome.

Carrie's excitement, in the wake of meeting Mrs.
Vance, expressed in FID, stirs the same quiet
desperation, born of unexamined values and
powerlessness, which her enthusiasm for Hurstwood
reveals

Ah, how fortunate was Mrs. Vance; young,
beautiful, and well off—at least,
sufficiently so to come here in a coach. What
a wonderful thing it was to be rich. Dreiser often hints at irony with an introductory "ah,"
but we would hardly have missed the gap between the
values of the implied author and those of Carrie in
these assertions had he left it out. Carrie's instant
judgment of Mrs. Vance corresponds with her reactions to
other superficial stimuli (Mrs. Vance is in fact no more
than a stimulus to Carrie's craving for riches and
beauty). "[S]ufficiently so to come here in a coach"
undercuts "well off" by signalling Carrie's easy
assumptions about others' worth, both financial and
personal. Furthermore, this dramatizes both her unanalytical nature and her low estimation of herself, since she so quickly envies whatever appears attractive. While passages like the last two do not reduce sympathy for Carrie, they instead serve the purpose of moving the moving our sympathies. However, they do depend on earlier understandings through refracted discourse and our continuing efforts at noting distinctions between Carrie's FID and the values of the implied author.

Essentially, the refracted discourse allows us to identify with her motives but also comprehend her failures.

As well understanding Carrie's deficiencies, however, we need to account for her strength. Her self-image is revealed through refracted discourse in a scene in front of a mirror:

The mirror convinced her of a few things which she had long believed. She was pretty, yes, indeed! How nice her hat set, and weren't her eyes pretty. She caught her little red lip with her teeth and felt her first thrill of power. Drouet was so good.29

While we question Carrie's placing such importance on having pretty eyes, we see her take a small step toward
a sense of self that will later stand her in good stead. Before she realizes her own potential, though, she uses this beauty to establish another relationship in which she is dependent.

In an early scene of Carrie and Hurstwood's developing romance, Carrie's FID signals her trust in her new-found admirer: "He sympathised with her and showed her what her true value was. He needed her, while Drouet did not care." However, the narrator proceeds to describe a scene which would suggest just the opposite, if its meaning were applied to the relationship between Carrie and Hurstwood. They, along with Drouet, pass a beggar on the street, but the latter is the only one to take note of him, a distinction which the narrator explains in the following manner:

The plea was that of a gaunt-faced man of about thirty, who looked the picture of privation and wretchedness. Drouet was the first to see. He handed over a dime with an upwelling feeling of pity in his heart. Hurstwood scarcely noticed the incident. Carrie quickly forgot.

Carrie's vision of Hurstwood differs at this point from the narrator's, whose we naturally accept. However, this
is not the only basis for suspecting that the implied author does not endorse Carrie's FID about Hurstwood. She makes her judgment without close examination of the many possibilities for the different behaviors of her two suitors, concluding subjectively: Drouet seemingly won't marry her; Hurstwood pays her flattering (and new) attention; thus, Hurstwood is more sincere! We, of course, know both men through their FID, and while Hurstwood's frequently involves self-deception, Drouet's, recognizable for its "By George" trademark, is innocent and casual, as in "By George, it was a shame young girls had to be knocked around like that. Cold weather coming on and no clothes. Tough." This is not to suggest that Drouet would be a good choice for Carrie, since the narrator has made clear through refracted and overt discourse that he embodies the superficial values most reflective of his "type." However, the passage does imply that Hurstwood may be a poor judge of another's true value, if that value depends on a sympathetic outlook.

Since nothing in the relationship between Carrie and Hurstwood suggests intimacy, we have no basis for expecting that she cares about Hurstwood, the man, as opposed to Hurstwood, the manager. In fact, the
sections detailing the early days of their "marriage" are singularly lacking in descriptions which would give insight into the private life of Hurstwood and Carrie. After learning in the first page and a half of Chapter 31 about the externals of their marriage, one cannot help wondering, "Do they like each other?"

When Hurstwood changes, Carrie has to confront the difference in him and try to account for it. We must see her as able to feel the change, but we should not expect her to look beneath surfaces, since she has not done so before. Thus, when her FID says, "He took his situation too philosophically," we should not be surprised, but we may want to think about how her offhand manner makes us feel about her, especially since at this point we have some sympathy for Hurstwood, and we have to decide whether the implied author agrees that Hurstwood is indeed too philosophical. In the first case, since we have no reason to be disappointed in our expectations, we can judge this as just another example of Carrie's tendency to examine only surfaces. We may wish that she felt more sympathy for the man from whom she gladly would have accepted all he had to offer had his fortunes gone in another direction but consistency of character, as we know it through the refracted
discourse, tells us that this would be beyond Carrie's ability. In the second case, our construction of the implied author suggests sympathy for Hurstwood (which I will analyze in more detail later), but not admiration for his philosophical insights.

We should not be surprised, however much we may sympathize with Hurstwood, at Carrie's response to his worsening condition:

This was the life cut out for her, was it? To live cooped up in a small flat with some one who was out of work, idle, and indifferent to her. She was merely a servant to him now, nothing more.

Oh, how this man had changed! All day and all day, here he sat, reading his papers... He had some money, he had a decent suit remaining, he was not bad looking when dressed up... He had never tried. He did not even consult the ads in the papers anymore.

It didn't matter about him. She was not going to be dragged into poverty and something worse to suit him. She could act. She could get something and then work up. What would he say then?...
Even though the narrator interjects between "reading his papers" and "He had some money" that Carrie did not forget her own hard time in Chicago or that she had never ceased trying, she nevertheless seems to indulge in predictable "knee-jerk" responses. We have been conditioned throughout the novel to expect such reactions from her, especially if we have paid attention to seemingly insignificant instances where her offhandedness is clearly just that—and not an acting out of a more important relationship. For example, when the narrator reports, "She came to thoroughly dislike the light-headed young fellows of the shop. Not one of them had a show of refinement. She saw only their workday side," the men lack refinement in Carrie's eyes, not in an objective view. Nevertheless, we remain sympathetic to Carrie, while we experience similar feelings for Hurstwood. Carrie's typical knee-jerk response has a validity here, since she is dependent on Hurstwood, and he does not try hard to help either one of them. Dreiser's skill here is in making us sympathetic to both of them, while they are not particularly sympathetic to one another.

The consistency of Carrie's character mitigates our temptation to become angry with her, while the refracted
discourse deserves credit for this consistency—or what Markels terms an "unfolding of a process." Many of the sentences of the quoted passages begin with "he" plus a verb, dramatizing the lack of fluidity in Carrie's thought patterns. She leaps from one notion to the next without making the connections which would lead to real understanding—the kinds of connections which Bridgman acknowledges as both sources and consequences of the attenuated discourse describing characters' consciousness in the late James.

One character does make such connections in Sister Carrie, brief as his appearances are, voicing the values of the implied author with the latter's intelligence. Ames reveals a critical message of the novel in the penultimate chapter, in case any reader has missed it:

'The world is always struggling to express itself,' he went on. 'Most people are not capable of voicing their feelings. They depend upon others.'

Carrie, who has found Ames's praise for her to be "keen and analytical," feels justly complimented when he tells her that she is a talented actress because she communicates feelings and desires in her facial expressions. Yet, at the end of the novel, this unique ability has failed to defray her ultimate loneliness:
Sitting alone, she was now an illustration of the devious ways by which one who feels, rather than reasons, may be led in the pursuit of beauty. Though often disillusioned, she was still waiting for that halcyon day when she should be led forth among dreams become real.\textsuperscript{36}

To some extent Hurstwood functions in \textit{Sister Carrie} in the same ways as Casaubon does in \textit{Middlemarch}. Like Casaubon, Hurstwood is less courageous than the woman with whom he lives, and like Casaubon, he represents an unavoidable mistake for the woman who chooses him. In each case, we must have some sympathy for the male character in order to accept the woman's choice, but we need to admire her more than him and to consider the death of each man fortunate for their respective mates. However, many readers are quite sympathetic to Hurstwood, and some critics even consider Dreiser's artistic portrayal of him to be better than his portrayal of Carrie.\textsuperscript{37}

Although my study of the refracted discourse suggests that Dreiser successfully creates a novel primarily about Carrie rather than Hurstwood, I will
argue that we develop significant sympathy toward him--more than we do toward Casaubon. When Hurstwood first decides that Carrie will be his, FID alerts us to his attitude toward her:

The manager looked at his lovely prize, so beautiful, so winsome, so difficult to be won, and made strange resolutions. His passion had gotten to that stage now where it was no longer coloured with reason. He did not trouble over little barriers of this sort in the face of so much loveliness. He would accept the situation with all its difficulties; he wuld not try to answer the objections which cold truth thrust upon him. He would promise anything, everything, and trust to fortune to disentangle him. He would make a try for Paradise, whatever might be the result. He would be happy, by the Lord, if it cost all honesty of statement, all abandonment of truth.38

When the narrator refers to Hurstwood as "the manager," he hints that we should assume a slightly greater distance from the character, particularly as we consider his actions in terms of his social role and status. We
might also suspect some irony in terms of Hurstwood's
title and his inability to "manage" his personal
affairs. The description of Carrie, "lovely prize, so
beautiful, so winsome, so difficult to be won," belongs
to Hurstwood, while it also refracts the values of the
marketplace: a beautiful woman is a prize, and one who
is difficult to win even dearer (of course we know that
Carrie is not so difficult to win!)

On the other hand, the adjective for Hurstwood's
resolutions comes directly from the narrator, and we
have no trouble agreeing--these resolutions are indeed
strange. The next sentence delivers a straight report
from the narrator. In the litotes "little barrier,"
"little" is an ironic adjective, since the "barriers" of
a marriage and family deserve a much stronger
description. That "he would accept the situation with
all its difficulties" refers to Hurstwood's resignation
to the problems and even hints that he will not change
them. However, that "he would not try to answer the
objections which cold truth thrust upon him" conveys
more of a sense of his reaction to his dilemma:
Hurstwood finds the truth to be "cold," and what is
more, he does not create the truth, it is "thrust upon
him." While the language tends to be hyperbolic, it
communicates the emotions of one who feels the oppression of his circumstances and who avoids responsibility for them. Further, the two clauses together suggest that he is not really seeing "the situation with all its difficulties" that he has resolved to accept.

The subjunctive sentences which conclude the paragraph surely belong to Hurstwood, but the way in which they belong to him deserves some close analysis. Are we to believe that the smitten gentleman thinks to himself in precisely these words: "I will not try to answer the objections which cold truth thrust upon me, etc."? Although the language is not metaphorical, as in the case of Kate Croy, some of the words and phrases seem unlikely to be Hurstwood's, such as "disentangle," "try for paradise," (although we surely cannot think that the narrator sees Hurstwood's future as paradisal, so the term is ironic), "honesty of statement," and "all abandonment of truth" (here we should realize that the narrator knows that his decision to pursue Carrie will cost him his honesty and will end in an abandonment of his chances of gaining consciousness—or truth). Moreover, the self-awareness which Hurstwood would have to possess in order to analyze any of these
contingencies does not fit with our impression of him. In fact, the narrator described him on his first appearance in the novel as "composed in part of his fine clothes, his clean linen, his jewels, and above all, his own sense of his importance . . . . [and] shrewd and clever in many little things." The most credible translation of these sentences seems to be that if Hurstwood had to respond to direct questioning about his intentions, he would respond in this way. Since he is not sophisticated enough to carry on such a dialogue with his own conscience, I think that we are to believe that he senses the danger he invites and meets it with the determination of spirit suggested here. The ironic juxtaposition of "by the Lord" and "abandonment of truth" shows the narrator's role in asking us to judge Hurstwood critically.

Once again, an analysis of this sort aids us in making appropriate judgments of character. If we interpret Hurstwood's character as one interested in weighing his situation and making conscious vows to himself, we will expect more analysis from him of his situation later on. We may also sense that the narrator intimates that Hurstwood "protesteth too much" when he asserts that he will be happy. Even though Hurstwood
doesn't say this to himself, we know that his emotional state can be translated into this declaration. After all, the narrator says that "his passion. . . [is] no longer coloured with reason." Unlike the Jamesian characters who reason ad infinitum, Dreiser's characters thoughts and emotions may be presented without ambiguity (hence Phelan's illustration depicting the absurdity of Dreiser's messages in Jamesian language). Sometimes a passage of this sort makes one which appears later in overt style seem more acceptable, since we feel that the comment is justified by the author's more subtle communications:

Hurstwood was a man of authority and some fine feeling, and it irritated him excessively to find himself sur-rounded more and more by a world upon which he had no hold, and of which he had a lessening understanding.

In a dramatic presentation, we learn that Hurstwood has a weak relationship with his children. Hurstwood feels despondent when the streetcar he travel on arrives across the street from the building where his son works. The narrator recalls that the father had called on his son there several times, and that the "lad" had not responded at all, concluding that "his absence did not
seem to be noticed by either of his children." The next sentence apparently belongs to Hurstwood, but it could possibly instead be an ironic remark of the narrator's: "Well, well, fortune plays a man queer tricks." If we attribute this to the narrator, we may say that we suspect irony because of the "well, well," and that we feel confirmed in our judgment because the narrator knows that the absence of attention to their father suggests malice aforethought on the parts of Hurstwood's spoiled children, not just mere chance. On the other hand, if this is Hurstwood's thought, we again must charge him with failure to appraise his situation intelligently. Remembering the passage quoted above which says that Hurstwood had less control and understanding of his world, we know that he should not expect his authority to carry much weight at home. In addition, we know that his daughter, who "puts on airs," speaks our of "cynical indifference" or in "sharp defence," while his son "manifested even greater touchiness and exaggeration in the matter of his individual rights. . . ." 41

While the difference between these two possibilities is not enormous—in either case fortune is not solely responsible—it is significant. In the first
instance, we are simply reminded by the narrator that Hurstwood has general family problems. We should hold him responsible to some extent for this reality, since the lines, "the misfortune of the Hurstwood household was due to the fact that jealousy, having been born of love, did not perish with it" introduce a paragraph depicting the emotional hostility this has been a part of the household. However, in the second choice, which seems to be the likely one because Hurstwood is emoting at this point, we are not only reminded of this, but in addition, we again find Hurstwood to be unanalytical. Thus, we see how our narrative discriminations influence meaning.

When the narrator explains that Hurstwood does not understand the nature of emotional greatness, he suggests that the manager is incapable of this quality himself. Although he implicitly distinguishes between emotional and intellectual greatness, he does not describe what makes Carrie emotionally great. We might conjecture that her imagination or her perseverance in the face of odds earns for her these words of praise, or that Dreiser's assertion that "She felt, though she seldom expressed them, sad thoughts" comments on her greater than usual emotional capacity--she can feel
rather than think thoughts! Markels' analysis supports our findings—in fact those things which he suggests Carrie does not impose on her experience are precisely what I would suggest are lacking in her unanalytical responses. Therefore, we might expand our examination of Hurstwood's mental flights from reality to include the possibility that he, unlike Carrie, does impose moral categories and expectations on his experience, and that he does not unquestioningly submit to the "whatever is" of his experience.

In an early instance of his FID, Hurstwood thinks that "[h]e would enjoy this new gift over and above his ordinary allowance of pleasure. He would be happy with her and his own affairs would go on as they had, undisturbed." Prefacing these thoughts with the information that Hurstwood was thinking only of pleasure without responsibility, and that he considered his home life to be stable, if unsatisfying, the narrator provides information which adds to the sense that this is a man who is trying to morally justify his actions. Referring silently to Carrie's love as a "gift," Hurstwood absolves himself of responsibility—people do not requisition gifts; they are freely given. In fact, the word implies that it might be rude for
Hurstwood to refuse Carrie’s love. Furthermore, he will be appreciative; he will enjoy the love more than he usually allows himself to enjoy anything. This will be a just repayment. And, then, no one will be hurt—life will continue undisturbed—so guilt would be inappropriate. We, of course, see through his rationalization of what is actually an appeal to his vanity, wounded in his home particularly, but we also should register the moral imperatives suggested by his silent assertions.

In terms of Hurstwood’s home life, his most revealing FID passage says “[h]e was being made to follow, was not leading.” Because Hurstwood had fallen short in a social sense, his wife besieged him with open snarls and irritating goads, making him vulnerable to Carrie’s superficial loveliness and, more importantly, to her high regard for him. These psychological realities form the implied author’s defense of Hurstwood. However, we should not take them for moral defenses—Mrs. Hurstwood’s abuse does not justify his adultery, although it may have caused it. Thus, Hurstwood constantly finds himself in the position of needing to search for excuses and to hide from himself when he cannot find any. Often we hear the note of
fear, stimulated by his sense of immorality, in his imaginative constructions of reality:

Could something have happened out there to keep her away? Could she have been reached by his wife? Surely not. She had not been able to get away this morning. That was why no letter notifying him had come. He would get one to-day. It would probably be on his desk when he got back. He would look for it at once.\(^2\)

However, Hurstwood’s infidelity to his wife has a strong psychological basis, expressed often in refracted discourse, even if it is not morally desirable. Dreiser creates no sympathy for Mrs. Hurstwood, whose FID reflects social values which we easily reject because of the consistently negative characterizations of her. While her attitudes encourage our sympathy for her husband — who wouldn’t want to get away from such a shallow woman? — we should also consider how cleverly Dreiser makes a statement about the typical view of male/female relationships through her thoughts:

He had been seen at the theatre with people whom he called Moy’s friends; now he was seen driving, and, most likely, would have an
excuse for that. Perhaps there were others of
whom she did not hear, or why should he be so
busy, so indifferent, of late? In the last
six weeks he had become strangely irritable—
strangely satisfied to pick up and go out,
whether things were right or wrong in the
house. Why? . . . Evidently, along with other
things, he was taking her to be getting old
and uninteresting. He saw her wrinkles,
perhaps. She was fading, while he was still
preening himself in his elegance and youth.
He was still an interested factor in the
merry-makings of the world, while she—
did not pursue the thought. 43

Obviously, Dreiser is emphasizing again the
importance of appearance to the characters, but here we
see that such a concern knows no limits. After years of
marriage, Mrs. Hurstwood imagines that her husband's
interest in her, or lack thereof, depends on the way she
looks. The danger of such an attitude lies in its
potential for masking real problems. Because she looks
no further for causes, Mrs. Hurstwood ignores the
realities of her marital relationship, and by doing so
she avoids taking responsibility, as well as she misses
the possibility of changing her reality. While we may not take her too seriously, we ought to take seriously the message that people fail to assume responsibility by not looking beneath surfaces. In addition, this passage hints at the different consequences of aging for men and women, although we have no cause to envy Hurstwood. Finally, it at least neutralizes our response to Hurstwood's abandoning his family.

The dramatization of Hurstwood's search for a different reality than the one he is living reaches a peak in the scene of his theft, a scene which has been acclaimed by critics for its powerfulness. However, previous criticism has not dealt with the role of refracted discourse per se in this section. Referring to Hurstwood primarily as "the manager" in this scene, Dreiser employs a type of refracted discourse—the allusion to social role—to remind us of the responsibilities and privileges of Hurstwood's job which ironically enable him to complete this act, both practically and psychologically. Furthermore, Hurstwood acts almost as if in a dream, or a nightmare, suggesting a sense of separateness from self that the title underscores. In the following examples, the use of "the manager" instead of Hurstwood seem particularly poignant:
It was the manager’s duty, as well as his custom, after all were gone to see that everything was safely closed up for the night. Lo, the manager remembered that he had never had so much. The manager floundered among a jumble of thoughts. The manager was no fool to be led blindly away by such an errant proposition as this, but his situation was peculiar.45

In each case, we can relate to Hurstwood as a type: the man to whom responsibility is entrusted (and thus who faces the temptation to abuse that trust); the man whose position, though quite comfortable, has not offered him riches; the man whose intelligence and moral fiber leaves him “floundering”; and the man whose situation blinds him to what he might otherwise see. The narrator refers to Hurstwood by his proper name once he has mentally and then actually committed the deed. Possibly Dreiser wanted us to see Hurstwood as an individual once his choice was made—to underline the moral precept that many are alike in that they are faced with overwhelming temptations and battles with conscience, but once a decision has been made, the
person stands as an individual. Dreiser's method gains sympathy for Hurstwood, paradoxically, just as it holds him responsible: we see him as the manager confronted with the vicissitudes of his life, and we perhaps say, "How will you handle your situation? You are being sorely tested now." And when he fails the test, we regret his show of weakness, but we know that it was a difficult test, and that in his case particularly, the chance of failure was great.

If we take the sentences of FID together which occur in this section, placed originally one to two paragraphs apart, we can see the development of Hurstwood's response to his own desire, which is expressed in direct dialogue (I have put direct narrative report where necessary for clarification in parentheses):

'Did you ever have ten thousand dollars in ready money?'

He was worth more than forty thousand, all told—but she [his wife] would get that.

What was this thing, making him suspicious: Why did he wish to move about so quietly?

'The safe is open,' said a voice. 'There is just the least little crack in it. The lock has not been sprung.'
That money would do it. If he had that and Carrie.

'What about it?'

He could get Carrie. Oh, yes, he could! He could get rid of his wife. That letter, too, [from his wife's attorney] was waiting discussion to-morrow morning. He would not need to answer that.

Lord! what was that? . . .Not a soul was present. Not a sound. Someone was shuffling by on the sidewalk.

No one had observed him. He was quite alone. No one could tell what he wished to do. He could work this thing out for himself.

There was the money! Surely no harm could come from looking at it!

They [the bills] were so smooth, so compact, so portable. How little they made, after all. (He decided he would take them.) Yes, he would. He would put them in his pocket. (Then he looked at that and saw they would not go there.) His hand satchel! to be sure, his hand satchel. They would go in that—-all of it would. No one would think anything of it either.
(After he had all the money in the hand bag, a revulsion of feeling seized him.) He would not do it—no! Think of what a scandal it would make. The police! They would be after him. He would have to fly, and where? Oh, the terror of being a fugitive from justice! Why be afraid? [while he was attempting to replace the money]

(While the money was in his hand the lock clicked.) It had sprung! Did he do it? (He grabbed at the knob and pulled vigorously). It had closed. Heavens! he was in for it now, sure enough.

He must get out of the city, and that quickly.  

Hurstwood first receives the temptation (of course from his own repressed desires); then he denies it momentarily ("What was this thing, making him suspicious, etc.?); next he builds up a case for taking it; he battles briefly with his conscience; he takes the money, finding it "so smooth, so compact, so portable"—i.e., so wonderful to have; he considers the consequences and attempts to return it; and he finally finds himself with the money (which he could still
return, we realize), and with a need to flee. Since Hurstwood’s FID said that he would abandon all truth and make a try for "paradise," no matter the cost, it is logical that he does not return the money and that he is morally responsible for taking it. Consider the dramatic impact of this discourse as compared with Dreiser’s sermonizing which intrudes several times during the sequence:

To those who have never wavered in conscience, the predicament of the individual whose mind is less strongly constituted and who trembles in the balance between duty and desire is scarcely appreciable, unless graphically portrayed. Those who have never heard that solemn voice of the ghostly clock which ticks with awful distinctness, 'thou shalt,' 'thou shalt not,' 'thou shalt,' 'thou shalt not,' are in no position to judge. Not alone in sensitive, highly organised natures is such a mental conflict possible. The dullest specimen of humanity, when drawn by desire toward evil, is recalled by a sense of right, which is proportionate in power and strength to his evil tendency. We must
remember that it may not be knowledge of right, for no knowledge of right is predicated of the animal's instinctive recoil at evil. Men are still led by instinct before they are regulated by knowledge. It is instinct which recalls the criminal—it is instinct (where highly organised reasoning is absent) which gives the criminal his feeling of danger, his fear of wrong. He did not know what evil might result from it to him—how soon he might come to grief. The true ethics of the situation never once occurred to him, and never would have, under any circumstances.47

We might question whether we need such elaborate explanations as the first example offers, or whether we appreciate the directness of the second. However we would decide those questions, we would probably determine that the FID has a dramatic impact which moves us sympathetically in terms of Hurstwood's predicament and his actions, while the direct didactic narrative creates, at best, an identification with authorial values. Since the warning and the admonition in the second quotation place us above Hurstwood, we may
consider the FID in terms of its potential for helping us to identify with him in spite of this superior position. Quite possibly, Dreiser did not trust the power of the refracted discourse enough, and thus took away some of our pleasure in forming our own conclusions; yet the refracted discourse does in fact account for the success of this section.

Hurstwood's decline can also be detailed through his FID, which alternates for awhile between despair and fanciful imaginings, until he loses the ability to create the latter. While Carrie thinks to herself that he takes his situation "too philosophically," his FID disproves her judgment:

He would have to hire out as a clerk....What had he done--what in the world--that should bar him out this way and heap such difficulties upon him?

He could not apply to them [hotel owners who knew of his dealings with Fitzgerald and Moy]. . . . Would he have to go personally and ask; wait outside an office door, and, then distinguished and affluent looking, announce that he was looking for something to do? . . . No, he could not do that.
Bartender--he, the ex-manager!

How gay were the youths he saw, how pretty the women. Such fine clothes they all wore. They were so intent upon getting somewhere. Ah, the money it required to train with such--how well he knew! How long it had been since he had had the opportunity to do so!...

Where to, where to? [meaning where could he go if he went out]

This was no day to be out; he would go home. He had lived with this woman too long.

...he had worked so hard to make expenses seem light. He had been 'doing' butcher and baker in order not to call on her. He had eaten very little--almost nothing. It was too cheap to sit around after such an insinuation as this. Why, after a little, he would be standing anything.

It was a tough thing to have to come to [his job as a motorman]. ... He could do something--this, even--for a while. It would get better. He would save a little.

Ah, she was in the walled city now! Its splendid gates had opened, admitting her from a cold, dreary outside.
These lines of FID describe the emotional pattern of Hurstwood's decline at least as well as the descriptions of his pathetic encounters with what he finds to be a forbidding world do. The realities reported in the narrator's discourse help us to understand why this psychological state develops: the FID tells us what the state is and registers it as an individual experience. In addition, we can assume the implied author's sympathy for Hurstwood because the sequence of events emphasizes the contrast between his fate and Carrie's in a way which makes our pity inevitable. On the other hand, when he says to himself of Carrie, "She isn't so much," the narrator tells us "in his heart of hearts he did not believe this." Quoting Hurstwood's thought directly allows the narrator to correct it, something he could not do if the thought were in FID. Frequently, then, Dreiser's choice to use uncorrected FID asks us to evaluate, on the basis of the entire novel, whether we should sympathize with it or not.

What emerges from these two protratis explains to a large extent our differing responses to Carrie and Hurstwool. Carrie experiences her world through feelings, often ones of confusion and pain. We cannot criticize her for succumbing to outside forces, however,
when we understand both the internal and external nature of her existence. What we admire about her is her courage, which has enabled her to confront her reality even though she could not articulate its qualities. Finally she has only herself, but she always had only herself. Her success is limited because she has not been able to abstract from her experience the kinds of lessons which would have perhaps changed her values to those of Ames, thus opening up new avenues of fulfillment for her.

Hurstwood, on the other hand, experiences a decline. He, too, faces the world alone, but we may hold him more responsible for his failed relationships than we do Carrie for hers. In each case, however, Dreiser provides sufficient evidence that the city has worked its ways on its inhabitants. Hurstwood's brief encounter with his conscience gives way easily to his desires. As in the case of Carrie, the failure to examine these desires intellectually and the understandable inability to comprehend the world with the encompassing perspective that we and the narrator share prevents Hurstwood from making a positive change.

Like Eliot, Dreiser suggests that words cannot express all:
How true it is that words are but the vague shadows of the volumes we mean. Little audible links, they are, chaining together great inaudible feelings and purposes. People in general attach too much importance to words. They are under the illusion that talking effects great results. As a matter of fact, words are, as a rule, the shallowest portion of all the argument. They but dimly represent the great surging feelings and desires which lie behind. When the distraction of the tongue is removed, the heart listens.\textsuperscript{50}

With such pessimistic view of the power of the word, we might wonder why Dreiser chose to write! However, we can see in his technique the attempt to use words to go beyond the limits of language. Refracted discourse seems to have the power to "colour a world." The ways in which it colors the world of \textit{Sister Carrie} often come through refracted discourse, which allows Dreiser to maintain a strong control as the voice of thought, opposed to the characters' worlds of feeling, and it also permits him to emphasize the dialogic relationship between individual and society.
Mrs. Dalloway provides a compelling example of the modernist tradition in its fragmentation and recombination of human experience. Refracted discourse works very well in Woolf’s style: it highlights fragmentation, which allows for partial expression of different voices; it combines the fragments in a new way; and it emphasizes more than one perception. We saw in Persuasion that double-voiced discourse was important because of its potential for reporting Anne’s inner life from time to time and its effectiveness in debunking social values. The uses of the method were obviously limited, and in the classical narrative style of this novel, relatively easy to identify and to analyze. At the other end of the continuum, the narrative style of Mrs. Dalloway is dense: the shifts in consciousness are not always clearly marked; the narrator’s voice intrudes without warning; and the revealed consciousnesses are as apt to conceal as to reveal the “true” feelings of the characters.
Another, and related, continuum on which I could plot the novels in my study concerns their representations of reality. Austen is wonderfully sure of the nature of the world in which her characters live, and although one character lives quite differently from another in this world, it is nevertheless definable, predictable, and whole. This assuredness begins to change somewhat in *Middlemarch*, as the well-known lines of Chapter Twenty-seven suggest:

... but place now against it [your pier glass] a lighted candle as a centre of illumination, and lo! the scratches will seem to arrange themselves in a fine series of concentric circles round that little sun. It is demonstrable that the scratches are going everywhere impartially, and that it is only your candle which produces the flattering illusion of a concentric arrangement, its light falling with an exclusive optical selection. These things are a parable. The scratches are events, and the candle is the egoism of any person now absent. . . .

James bases his development of centres of consciousness on the assumption that reality can be
better determined by "piecing together" the clearly individual renderings of a shared experience. Dreiser clearly defines the external reality of his characters' world, while he also refracts its nature in reports of characters' feelings, so that we know them and their society internally as well. But our awareness of internal states is limited to unanalytical responses generally; we do not have a sense of characters coming to terms with their world through intellectual processes. Although I have not been directly concerned with the notions of reality which inform each of the novels, my analyses of the refracted discourse have revealed changes from novel to novel. The double-voices become more evident in the later works, carrying as they do the increased burden of demonstrating the concepts of individual perceptions of reality and the stratification of consciousness, which become critical to modern philosophy and art.

In an essay on Woolf, John Bayley suggests that Mrs. Dalloway's consciousness is diminished by Woolf's bringing her in from *The Voyage Out* and taking her over. She is instantly alive in the earlier novel, just as Jane Austen would have made her, according to Bayley. This claim raises an interesting point for our study: is
Clarissa taken over by the narrator? Is our central relationship with her, the implied author, or the narrator? Since the narrator's language occurs most often—in fact, the language of the different characters is nearly indistinguishable, except in the case of the commoners—we necessarily feel that we are always in the narrator's company. Are we then equally involved and objective toward all the characters—at least the major ones? Probably we are not: since the novel is entitled *Mrs. Dalloway*, and since as a whole it reveals a portrait of her, we can safely assume that Woolf intended that the novel work toward an identification with Clarissa, in particular.

However, we arrive at an understanding of Clarissa Dalloway in a manner quite different from that which leads us to identify with Anne Elliot, for example. Although Woolf esteemed Austen above almost all other writers, she could hardly construct consciousnesses like those of Austen's characters. Not only did Woolf depict a world which was devoid of the order and stability which an early nineteenth century writer might comfortably recreate, but the human minds which inhabit her universe cannot define themselves with the kind of precision that an Austen character finally can. The
only exceptions to this in *Mrs. Dalloway* are those who, like Dr. Bradshaw and Lady Bruton, construct illusions of reality which isolate them in an egotistical vacuum. In *Mrs. Dalloway* nothing actually needs to happen, as it does in each of the other novels we have studied -- indeed as it needed to in most novels before the modern period. The only occurrence in the novel which cannot be considered "everyday" is Septimus's suicide.

Like T.S. Eliot, Woolf regarded the present moment as infused with the past. And both these modernists share Whitman's concern with the tension created by the simultaneous existence of the self as an individual and as part of the mass. These perceptions made Woolf's art radically different from Austen's, in which the present time and the individual in it were self-contained, and distinct also from George Eliot's, which describes the social impact of the past on the present, and regards the individual versus the mass as an ethical rather than an existential matter. Even James avoids confronting the intrusive force of memories on consciousness, instead ascribing to the past responsibility for present psychological states, not in the act of remembering, but in the past formation of psychological qualities. Nor does he express a tension between individual and group
identity; instead, he engages one aspect of the modern concern—the isolation of the individual in his own consciousness. Dreiser emphasizes the importance of Carrie's background in her present attitudes, abilities, and fortunes, but she is not consciously bound to memories. Since her relationship to her world is one which reveals the potential oppressiveness of society rather than the possibility for integrating self and others, Dreiser creates a world which is surprisingly like those of many of James's works—one in which individuals cannot bridge the gap between self and other. But T.S. Eliot and Woolf share the modernist tension between skepticism of a common dwelling place for individual consciousnesses, either in time or space, and the "connectedness" of human experience; and, at the same time they are aware of one's loss of self-identity as he confronts the masses.

Given these concerns—the fragmentation of experience, the inability of an individual to know herself or her world with assurance, and the unrelenting waves of past experience in present consciousness—Woolf had to develop a new narrative style. My questions concerning with whom we establish relationships and how we measure them occurs as a natural consequence of
Woolf's style. Had she developed these relationships in a smooth linear narrative, she would have betrayed her own intention in her form. Once again, the distinction between narrator's language and voice deserves close attention. As mentioned above, her language dominates the novel. Yet, her voice seldom speaks for an entire page, and most often must be detected in its embedded form within a character's consciousness. Woolf seems to deliberately blur the distinction between character and narrator voice, but she maintains the option of reintroducing it at any point. Our awareness of the distinction fluctuates: at times obvious irony, such as in the discourse surrounding Dr. Bradshaw and Lady Bruton, alerts us to the such a distinction, while at other times, we may be inclined to attribute passages to characters and narrator simultaneously, especially in the case of Clarissa.

Proust and other modern writers believe that interior discourse hides more than it reveals. Indeed, in *Mrs. Dalloway* each consciousness demonstrates at moments the potential for hiding unwanted truths from oneself. Lest she move her readers as well away from the truth, Woolf provides signals, often in the form of irony, that a thought conceals a real feeling or
attitude. Overstatement and conflicting evidence in an action or in the consciousness of another character frequently signal concealment. I will examine these methods closely later, but throughout the study of this novel, I will be working on the assumption that we cannot accept the expressed thought or feeling of a character as a final disclosure without scrutinizing it in light of the whole work. What is most interesting about this statement, perhaps, is that it raises the question of how we can construe the whole if we cannot analyze its parts without first knowing that whole. Although this question can be asked for any of the novels we have studied, Mrs. Dalloway asks it most relentlessly.

The answer to this question may seem more like a hedge, but it in fact describes the way that we always construct notions about the whole of a literary work. As we read Mrs. Dalloway, we make assumptions about the world of the novel and the values of the implied author. We are constantly engaged in the act of comparing these assumptions to the gathering evidence, which may either validate or modify them. The judgments we make about single issues has a reciprocal relationship with the whole: for example, we judge Septimus's thoughts as
insane, as we look at them in isolation, but we use them to reflect on the nature of the whole. If we had no sense of the whole, we could not decide whether his thoughts were rational, but if we did not have his thoughts, we would know less about the world of the novel—just how destructive characters like Dr. Holmes and Dr. Bradshaw can be, for instance. James Phelan provides a very detailed and well-supported explanation of how we understand a literary text, in which he makes the following assertion:

. . . the literary text is not autonomous because we cannot properly construe that language without some conception, either conscious or intuitive, of its author's organizing intention, which again may be conscious or intuitive. Our notion of the author's intention, though formed from the language of the text, and hence being constantly refined as we read, is distinct from the literal meaning of the text, guides our understanding of that meaning, and, indeed, allows us to judge the relative efficacy of the meaning of the parts, when considered one by one.4
In response to these particular concerns in Mrs. Dalloway, I will study the role of refracted discourse in four related matters: 1) the representation of the narrator's voice in the characters' consciousnesses (a reverse of our previous concern with the intrusion of character voice in narrative sections); 2) the duplication of images in different consciousnesses; 3) the revelation of social values in narrative passages; and 4) the "effort" by a character to conceal from him or herself certain feelings or attitudes. These inquiries should tell us whether the use of refracted discourse in a novel which depends almost entirely on the depiction of individual consciousnesses differs from its use in a novel which relies more on action and narratorial analyses. In other words, does the refracted discourse have a role in making meaningful a novel which is "only" about an upper-class British woman who gives parties?

The first sentence of Mrs. Dalloway suggests the difficulty in separating narrator and character voice. Seymour Chatman analyzes this so incisively that I cannot define it better:

Brilliant examples of the 'neutralized' indirect free style occur in Virginia Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway. The first sentences:
'Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself. For Lucy had her work cut out for her. The doors would be taken off their hinges; Rumplemayer's men were coming.'

A sympathetic effect arises because there is no reason to assume that Clarissa's idiolect differs significantly from the narrator's. Such statements imply that character and narrator are so close, in such sympathy, that it does not matter to whom we assign the statement. Indifferently 'For you see, dear reader, Lucy had her work cut out for her' (that is, 'I, the narrator observe that'), or [Mrs. Dalloway remembered that] Lucy had her work cut out for her.' Indeed the ambiguity goes further, since a speech could as easily be implied: '[Mrs. Dalloway said that] Lucy had her work cut out for her.' All three possibilities hover above the sentence. A feeling is established that the narrator possesses not only access to but an unusual affinity or 'vibration' with the character's
mind. There is the suggestion of a kind of 'in-group' psychology: 'It was understood by all the parties, including 'myself' (the narrator) that Lucy had her work cut out for her.' The content of the first sentence prepares us for this consensus: Mrs. Dalloway is reported simply as saying that she would buy the flowers, not saying that to any particular person. It seems more pronouncement than dialogue. There arises a sense of the broader social context: Mrs. Dalloway is accustomed to having a cooperative audience, maids, cooks and butlers.

As Chatman suggests, the difficulty which this first sentence presents results in a beneficial effect. What he refers to as "neutralized" indirect free style may in other instances be termed ambiguity, but in this instance the blending of character and narrator voices strengthens the authority of the narrator. In addition, it creates an affinity between the two voices which we are invited to share. Mrs. Dalloway may or may not be saying these words to herself at this precise moment in narrative time, but since we know that she once said them, we attribute them to her. Regardless of the voice, we have only Clarissa's vision her.
On the other hand, the next sentences need to be analyzed in terms of the precise language they employ:

And then, thought Clarissa Dalloway, what a morning--fresh as if issued to children on a beach. What a lark! What a plunge! For so it had always seemed to her, when, with a little squeak of the hinges, which she could hear now, she had burst open the French windows and plunged at Bourton into the open air.

Does Clarissa think the words "as if issued to children on a beach" to herself? If so, she may have the talents of a writer, but as in the case of Kate in Wings, it seems more reasonable to assume that the literary language belongs to the narrator. Since Clarissa finds the morning so fresh, the narrator chooses the simile which best expresses her feeling. "What a lark! What a plunge" can be translated into feeling, also expressed in the narrator's language, suggesting that Clarissa experiences a sense of abandonment along with her appreciation of the fine morning. The narrator makes the transition to her reverie with "for so it had always seemed to her," and follows with a description of the remembered material, which is perhaps visualized by Clarissa.
The following lines pose a problem in terms of ownership and consequent notions about Clarissa's perceptions:

How fresh, how calm, stiller than this of course, the air was in the early morning; like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn, feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen; looking at the flowers, at the trees with the smoke winging off them and the rooks rising, falling.

In the first sentence, the qualifying "of course" suggests that character language describes the air of the early morning, but "like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave" seems again to be narrator language. Thus Woolf does not provide a solid clue for attributing the parenthetical (throughout the novel parentheses themselves do not define the speaker or thinker), so it is not possible to say if Clarissa looks objectively at her former self—a girl of just eighteen, or if she feels as if she is still very much the eighteen-year-old girl she was. Information about her age at the particu-
lar past moment is important to the reader, so it could be included here because of that alone, or it could also serve to define Mrs. Dalloway's distance from her earlier self--her awareness that her solemnity was uncharacteristic of someone so young.

In any event, Woolf has established a discourse time separate from story time by taking Clarissa back in time in her memory. She needs to make that memory vivid for us, something which she accomplishes beautifully in her poetic language. While we know that Clarissa's mind is focused on this time, and on the discourse space and events described, the manner of description need not be hers. The distance is not like the distance created by language in *Sister Carrie*, however. In that case, we are especially aware of Carrie's inability to articulate her feelings. I think that we believe that Clarissa might express herself eloquently, if for no other reason than that she remembers the sorts of scenes that she does. But the narrator's control over the expression only gives way in cases of FID, not figurative language.

The lines which follow suggest at least one sort of connection with this youthful self:

    ... standing and looking until Peter Walsh said, 'Musing among the vegetables?'--was that
it?--'I prefer men to cauliflowers'--was that it? He must have said it at breakfast one morning when she had gone out on to the terrace--Peter Walsh. He would be back from India one of these days, June or July, she forgot which, for his letters were awfully dull; it was his sayings one remembered; his eyes, his pocket-knife, his smile, his grumpiness and, when millions of things had utterly vanished--how strange it was!--a few sayings like this about cabbages.

The fragmented thoughts, recombined experiences, and emphasis on a particular moment attest to the workings of an individual consciousness, unmediated by either narrator language or comment. "He would be back from India one of these days, June or July" imitates the natural flow of consciousness from past to present. If it were not for the "she forgot which," the sentence passage would read exactly as if it were pure mimesis, but as a phrase of attribution, it stands among the very subjective "his letters were awfully dull; it was his sayings one remembered" and so on. In terms of the story, we know that Clarissa's attachment to past feelings about Peter exists in the present and influences her response to his return.
In terms of the narrative technique, we also gain important information in this, the first long paragraph of the novel. Woolf demonstrates that a covert narrator functions in some of the ways that an overt narrator does: she can embellish a character's thoughts with her superior use of language; she can make comments on a character's reflection, i.e., "for a girl of eighteen, as she then was"; or, (in the same example), she can leave ownership of an idea ambiguous. However, she often effaces herself completely, as in the last part of the paragraph. Typically, critics analyze the role of such a narrator in terms of its effacement; however, the "audibility" of the narrator's voice in Mrs. Dalloway suggests the possibility that covert narrators function through refracted discourse, remaining effaced much less than one might expect.

For example, in the following passage the narrator summarizes qualities and conditions of Clarissa's which influence the meaning of the entire passage:

She would not say of any one in the world now that they were this or that. She felt very young; at the same time unspeakably aged. She sliced like a knife through everything; at the same time was outside, looking on. She had a
perpetual sense, as she watched the taxi cabs, of being out, out, far out to sea and alone; she always had the feeling that it was very, very dangerous to live even one day. Not that she thought herself clever, or much out of the ordinary. How she had got through life on the few twigs of knowledge Fraulein Daniels gave them she could not think. She knew nothing; no language, no history; she scarcely read a book now, except memoirs in bed; and yet to her it was absolutely absorbing; all this; the cabs passing; and she would not say of Peter, she would not say of herself, I am this, I am that.6

Again Woolf use the narrator's voice to describe character vision. Clarissa's consciousness does not say, "I slice like a knife through everything"; like the watching of taxis, an activity which the narrator reports, much as she would say that Clarissa walked across the street, "slicing like a knife" is a condition that the narrator describes. The character is or does something--but the consciousness "registers" it rather than thinks about it. On the other hand, "that it was very, very dangerous to live even one day," occurring
within the same sentence as the report of her watching the cabs, reveals Clarissa's feeling, again in the narrator's voice, which is a part of her subjective experience (as opposed to the objective experience of watching taxis) and which she feels at this moment in particular (as opposed to the "perpetual sense of being out" which by definition she continuously feels).
Clarissa does not say to herself, "I do not think myself clever, or much out of the ordinary"—this is a quality of her being, again articulated in the narrator's voice. The remaining sentences report her conscious thoughts, punctuated with character language in "knew nothing" and "scarcely read." But the narrator's voice and vision claim the phrase, "and yet to her it was absolutely absorbing," although the "yet" may be Clarissa's qualification. What this means is that Clarissa is absorbed, but if she is absorbed in what she sees, she cannot very well be absorbed in thinking that she is absorbed!

The effect of this passage, typical of many in Mrs. Dalloway, is quite different from those delivered in either pure narrative or character voice. The summary which the narrator offers—of Clarissa's perpetual sense of being out, yet her involvement in things—gives us an
objective sense of the character in the present and past, and for the future. Woolf avoids sentimentality by not having Clarissa's consciousness say, "I am not clever," but she increases sympathy for the character when she places in her consciousness, "She would not say of anyone in the world now that they were this or were that. . . . she would not say of Peter, she would not say of herself, I am this, I am that."

Another narrative section, however, depends more on the narrator's voice than Clarissa's to convey the strength of her feelings:

It rasped her though, to have stirring about in her this brutal monster! to hear twigs cracking and feel hooves planted down in the depths of that leaf-encumbered forest, the soul; never to be content quite, or quite secure, for at any moment the brute would be stirring, this hatred, which, especially since her illness, had power to make her feel scraped, hurt in her spine; gave her physical pain, and made all pleasure in beauty, in friendship, in being well, in being loved and making her home delightful rock, quiver, and bend as if indeed there were a monster
grubbing at the roots, as if the whole panoply of content were nothing but self love! this hatred!

It seems unlikely (on the basis of the distinction make about narrator and character in the case of literary language) that Clarissa's consciousness says "stirring about in me this brutal monster! ... especially since my illness, has the power to make me feel scraped, etc." Just as the literariness of the word "panoply" helped to establish the voice of the narrator in Kate's consciousness in Wings, it and the poetic quality of the rest of the passage reveal that the narrator's voice and the character's feelings working together to create a sense of the intensity of the emotions and to allow Woolf to express them in almost poetic language. In fact, the passage is so effective in the second manner that it can be enjoyed by itself.

Until this point, we have looked only at passages which concern Clarissa's thoughts about herself: what happens when she thinks about someone else? The passage which immediately precedes this last one gives some indication:

Elizabeth really cared for her dog most of all. The whole house this morning smelt of
tar. Still, better poor Grizzle than Miss Kilman; better distemper and tar and all the rest of it than sitting mewed in a stuffy bedroom with a prayer book! Better anything, she was inclined to say.8

For another page and a half Clarissa continues her ruminations about Miss Kilman, gathering force as she goes on: "so insensitive she was;" "she perspired;" "one of those spectres who stand astride us and suck up half our life-blood." The narrator's voice rarely intrudes (an occasion when it does is referred to below), as if Clarissa does not need help in expressing her opinion of someone else as much as she does in creating her own image of herself.

Another passage, this one concerning Clarissa's thoughts about Sally Seaton, resounds with Clarissa's own voice, also:

She sat on the floor—that was her first impression of Sally—she sat on the floor with her arms round her knees, smoking a cigarette. Where could it have been? The Mannings? The Kinloch-Jones's? At some party (where, she could not be certain), for she had a distinct recollection of saying to the man she was
with, 'Who is that?' And he had told her, and said that Sally’s parents did not get on (how that shocked her—that one’s parents should quarrel!) . . . But Aunt Helena never liked discussion of anything (when Sally gave her William Morris, it had to be wrapped in brown paper).9

Of course, characters’ feelings about themselves belong to them, even if they are concealments rather than disclosures. On the other hand, their opinions of another character may seem to be instead "factual" report from a narrator whose voice takes over. Thus, pure character voice in expressions about other characters seems logical.

Like James, Woolf uses "you" in the midst of a third-person narrative, and again like James follows it with "one" and then, in the case of Woolf, with "our":

. . . she was never in the room five minutes without making you feel her superiority, your inferiority; how poor she was; how rich you were; how she lived in a slum without a cushion or a bed or a rug or whatever it might be. . . . For it was not her one hated but the idea of her. . . .
Interestingly the syntax, the language, and the caricature imitate almost exactly James's description, through Kate's consciousness, of Lionel Croy, whose presence always evokes feelings of insecurity and conflict in his daughter. ("No relation with him could be so short or so superficial as not to be somehow to your hurt. . . . He gave you absurd feelings, he had indescribable arts, that quite turned the tables. . . .")

Like James's use of the second-person pronoun, Woolf's creates an increased sense of a character almost speaking aloud to herself (we can sense her giving way to her deepest feelings, as one would do with a confidant--thus the second-person pronoun).

The "one" moves the discourse back to a more intellectual plane, objectifying the feelings slightly (as it does in *Wings*: "His perfect look . . . was practically perfect still; but one had long since for every occasion taken it for granted. Nothing could have better shown than the actual how right one had been"; and the "our" (". . . suck up half our life-blood") suggests Clarissa's sense of the presence of Miss Kilmans in the world--we are all amenable to their powers, she implies. This generalization works to engage the reader's sympathy, much as does its first part: "For
it was not her one hated but the idea of her . . . ." and Kate Croy's very similar reflection on her father:
"The inconvenience . . . was not that you minded what was false, but that you missed what was true." In both instances the narrator refracts through the consciousness of the character his or her own judgment of the impact of Lionel and Miss Kilman in particular, and threatening people in general. In the case of Clarissa's insight, however, the language may be either that of the narrator or the character, while the cleverness of Kate's recalls the narrator's language. Another difference between the two novels deserves comment: Woolf proceeds in the next paragraph to the passage quoted previously, but James continues instead with descriptions of the intellectual notions which Kate entertained, leaving large gaps for us to fill with assumptions about the feelings she would naturally have in her various circumstances.

We need to look at other characters' consciousnesses to see whether the narrator's role is the same in relatively parallel narrative sections. To begin with, Peter Walsh reflects on Clarissa's friends in his own voice:
It was Sally Seton—the last person in the world one would have expected to marry a rich man and live in a large house near Manchester, the wild, the daring, the romantic Sally! But of all that ancient lot, Clarissa’s friends—Whitbreeds, Kinderleys, Cunninghams, Kinloch-Jones’s—Sally was probably the best. She tried to get hold of things by the right end anyhow. She saw through Hugh Whitbread anyhow—the admirable Hugh—when Clarissa and the rest were at his feet.12

However, when Woolf wants to show Peter’s feelings about himself, we hear intonations of the narrator:

There they are! he thought. Do what you like with them, Clarissa! There they are! And second by second it seemed to him that the wife of the Major in the Indian Army (his Daisy) and her two small children became more and more lovely as Clarissa looked at them; as if he had set light to a grey pellet on a plate and there had risen up a lovely tree in the brisk sea-salted air of their intimacy (for in some ways no one understood him, felt with him, as Clarissa did)—their exquisite intimacy.13
The literary language of "as if he had set light to a grey pellet on a plate and there had risen up a lovely tree in the brisk sea-salted air of their intimacy" signals the voice of the narrator, commenting on Peter's feelings, which, though they required no more than his own voice in the beginning of the passage, are communicated better through metaphor at this higher level of abstraction. The vision belongs to Peter; but the narrator's voice, expressing what Peter thinks better than his own voice might, also creates more sympathy for him than his own voice did. We should not assume that the character's voice will always be the more effective one in establishing our identity with him or her. In this case, while Peter's voice "sounds" angry, the narrator's voice uses language which artistically and sensitively imagines the effect on Peter of Clarissa's looking at the pictures. Peter might say "no one understood me, felt with me, as Clarissa," but "the brisk sea-salted air of their intimacy" describes in an uplifting manner the nature of Peter's feelings for Clarissa, helping us to feel very positive about him, but if we thought that his voice said "sea-salted air of... intimacy," we would be put-off by his pretentiousness.
Not surprisingly, when Peter responds to the sensations of returning to London, the narrator takes charge to an even greater extent:

The amusing thing about coming back to England, after five years, was the way it made, anyhow the first days, things stand out as if one had never seen them before; lovers squabbling under a tree; the domestic family life of the parks. Never had he seen London look so enchanting—the softness of the distances; the richness; the greenness; the civilisation, after India, he thought, strolling across the grass. This susceptibility to impressions had been his undoing no doubt. Still at his age he had, like a boy or a girl even, these alternations of mood. . . .

Woolf's intentions in passages of this sort are twofold: one, to create a sense of Peter's mental experiences; and two, to communicate a view of London life which is more objective than we might expect from an individual consciousness. Unlike the former passage, this more restrained discourse avoids exclamations, offering analysis instead. For example, we know that Peter
responds in amusement directly from the narrator’s report, rather from our own judgment of his thoughts; we know also that he is impressionistic, not because we are witnessing this susceptibility, but because an "interpreter" tells us. The technique of infiltrating character consciousness with narrator language enables Woolf to accomplish her two intentions simultaneously and more effectively than if she had written separate passages to serve each need. Not only does she reveal Peter’s consciousness, but she provides an objective view of his experience in her refraction of habits and values of Londoners, while she reduces the distance that narrative descriptions often create.

The narrator’s relationship to Septimus is particularly interesting, since he perceives the world in a refracted manner himself. We might imagine that the narrator would counter his thoughts with a realistic view; however, she enters into Septimus’s sections in much the same way as she does that of other characters. After his voice has expressed his strangely fragmented consciousness, the narrator’s language extends his last thought in her own poetic language:

Men must not cut down trees. There is a God.

(He noted such revelations on the backs of
envelopes.) Change the world. No one kills from hatred. Make it known (he wrote it down). He waited. He listened. A sparrow perched on the railing opposite chirped Septimus, Septimus, four or five times over and went on, drawing its notes out, to sing freshly and piercingly in Greek words how there is no crime and, joined by another sparrow, they sang in voices prolonged and piercing in Greek words, from trees in the meadow of life beyond a river where the dead walk, how there is not death.\textsuperscript{15}

When Septimus watches Rezia at her sewing, the passage follows an identical pattern, moving from character voice and language to narrator language:

So she sewed. When she sewed, he thought, she made a sound like a kettle on the hob; bubbling, murmuring, always busy, her strong little pointed fingers pinching and poking; her needle flashing straight. The sun might go in and out, on the tassels, on the wall-paper, but he would wait, he thought, stretching out his feet, looking at his ringed sock at the end of the sofa;
he would wait in this warm place, this pocket of still air, which one comes on at the edge of a wood sometimes in the evening, when, because of a fall in the ground, or some arrangement of the trees (one must be scientific above all, scientific), warmth lingers, and the air buffets the cheek like the wing of a bird.16

Beginning with "... this pocket of still air," and continuing through to the end, figurative language embroiders Septimus's thoughts, which would otherwise be delivered in the staccato style of the previous sentences. We could perhaps make an argument against those critics who judge Septimus to be totally insane by demonstrating that the narrator's language is in fact responsible for the many of his most "outlandish" configurations. Although Woolf's style could scarcely be said to recall Poe's, her recreations of a mind "on the border" of sanity/insanity reveals a similar interest to his in the very fine distinctions between one mental state another, despite the confidence with which society attempts to delimit each. Critics often refer to Septimus as insane or, in Chatman's words, to his "distorted, uncomprehending and incomprehensible,
deeply immersed in delusions of grandeur" preoccupa-
tions. Yet, what seems significant is not the degree
to which Septimus is insane, but the similarity that his
thoughts bear to those of other characters.

An entirely different case, Richard Dalloway
represents the world of the sane, the stable, the
settled, the secure. The discourse of his consciousness
moves back and forth between narrator and character
language, allowing Woolf to make social comments along
the way:

Life had thrown up this wreckage; shop windows
full of coloured paste, and one stood stark
with the lethargy of the old, stiff with the
rigidity of the old, looking in [narrator’s
language]. Evelyn Whitbread might like to buy
this Spanish necklace--so she might. Yawn he
must. Hugh was going into the shop. 'Right
you are!' said Richard, following [direct
discourse]. Goodness knows he didn't want to
go buying necklaces with Hugh [Richard’s
language]. Morning meets afternoon. borne
like a frail shallop on deep, deep floods,
Lady Bruton's great-grandfather and his memoir
and his campaigns in North America were
whelmed and sunk [narrator's language]. And
Millicent Bruton too. She went under
[Richard’s language].18
Interestingly, this passage does not distinguish Richard
from Septimus nearly so much as we might expect. The
narrator’s description of morning and afternoon, for
example, does not seem any less an individualistic
response to reality. On the level of the narrative
intrusions—if we were to take them and string them all
together, that is—we might have a long poem which
interprets a certain social world. In any event, the
back and forth movement is characteristic of Richard’s
sections, perhaps because long segments on expression of
feeling do not fit a character whose engagement with his
own emotions is more fleeting. Moreover, the narrator
may have a special engagement with Richard. He is less
subjective than other characters, and since he is not
closed out from the mainstream of London life, as are
many of the others for one reason or another, his
sections may provide a place for the narrator to reflect
the most objective realities—thus she intrudes often.
I will say more about this when we consider examples of
refraction of social values specifically.
Since the same images recur within not only an individual consciousness, but from one consciousness to another, irrespective of the affinity between or among the characters, I attribute images to narrator language. This language then refracts either social values or psychological concepts which Woolf wants to impress on her readers, regardless of their sympathy for the character in whose consciousness the image is embedded.

One of the most prolific examples in the novel concerns "slicing through" and all the implements which may be effective in cutting into a matter or, symbolically, entering a consciousness. Peter's pocket-knife is mentioned as early as page four, and between pages sixty and sixty-nine, his knife is mentioned seven times, while the paper knife in Clarissa's room is referred to several times, also. Other images of sharpness occur in these pages as well, but they do not all have the same consequences for our understanding. In fact, the refraction of values and psychological concepts depends on the character to whom an object is related as well as to the object itself.

In the following instance, the story time uses the event of clocks chiming to fuse two discourse descriptions of Sir William's consciousness and Hugh
Whitbread's, with a brief mention of Rezia Warren Smith who "cried, walking down Harley Street, that she did not like that man [Sir William]." (Chatman defines the reminiscences of characters in *Mrs. Dalloway* as narrative events, but in a strict sense, we can say that story time can be followed in the events of the June day, and that although the story is about the consciousnesses, they may still be considered technically part of discourse. One might then argue further about what constitutes an event in this novel.)

What the clocks symbolically cause reimagines the knife image in an encompassing view:

Shredding and slicing, dividing and subdividing, the clocks of Harley Street nibbled at the June day, counselled submission, upheld authority and pointed out in chorus the supreme advantages of a sense of proportion, until the mound of time was so far diminished that a commercial clock, suspended above a shop in Oxford Street, announced, genially and fraternally, as is it were a pleasure to Messrs. Rigby and Lowndes to give the information gratis, that it was half-past one.
The earlier part of the passage follows directly Rezia’s cry, which is preceded by a lengthy description of Sir William which leaves little question, though much of the narrative refracts subtly power hungry and superficial values of upper-middle class British society, that he is a treacherous man. "Shredding and slicing, dividing and subdividing" imply the way that Sir William treats his patients and their families, foreshadowing, along with Rezia’s declaration, his final effect on Septimus. On the other end of the passage, the words "genially and fraternally" announce the next consciousness, Hugh’s, as well as they describe the clocks. Sir William counsels submission, points out in chorus with those who uphold him the "supreme advantages of a sense of proportion," while Hugh continues to make geniality and fraternity supreme virtues, in a commercial world, like the commercial clock. Entering Hugh’s "character zone," the narrator says "this gratitude [in Hugh] naturally took the form later of buying off Rigby and Lowndes socks or shoes. . . . He did not go deeply. He brushed surfaces. . . ." Clearly, the image of shredding and slicing has gone far beyond its usual sphere both directly and in comparison with an alternate image of commercial geniality--interestingly,
these two supposed extremes are joined by "sense of proportion," that which the more fierce and the more pleasant have in common.

We do not have to be very sophisticated psychoanalytic interpreters to guess that Woolf intends Peter's constant playing with his pocket-knife to suggest phallic images, but these images may be ones of fertility, impotence, violence, or even obsessiveness (a sort of mental masturbation). The first mention of a knife during Peter's visit to Clarissa, an occasion when knives dominate the scene symbolically, refers to "the mounted paper-knife," which, along with the other objects on Clarissa's inlaid table—the "dolphin and the candlesticks, the chair-covers and the old valuable English tinted prints"—reminds Peter of his own failure and stirs a violent response in his mind: "I detest the smugness of the whole affair, he thought; Richard's doing, not Clarissa's; save that she married him." As he continues thinking in this vein, he takes out "his old horn-handled knife," an act reported through Clarissa's consciousness, which also notes: "What an extraordinary habit that was... always playing with a knife." And the narrator describes her unanticipated reception of Peter as that of "a Queen whose guards have fallen asleep and left her unprotected..."
Clarissa loses patience with Peter's extraordinary habit when "she cried to herself in irrepressible irritation... leave your knife alone!" At the same time she thinks, "It was his silly unconventionality, his weakness; his lack of the ghost of a notion what anyone else was feeling that annoyed her, had always annoyed her; and now at his age, how silly!" The interchange between the former lovers has centered on Peter's new love, an Indian woman who is still married. Clarissa thinks that he has "shap[ed] the woman, the wife of the Major in the Indian Army, with three strokes of a knife," and when she challenges him on the difficulty of proceeding in such a case as he describes, Peter thinks "I know what I'm up against... running his finger along the blade of his knife." But any sign of power that this may suggest is undercut not just by the various possibilities uses of the knife, but by Peter, "to his utter surprise, suddenly thrown through the air, he burst into tears; wept; wept without the least shame, sitting on the sofa, the tears running down his cheeks."

Clearly, Peter's response to the knife on Clarissa's table reflects his jealousy--of Richard, of successful people, and probably of Clarissa, herself,
although he does not register this consciously. The potential power of his anger dissipates, however, in the face of Clarissa, evidenced as much in her consciousness as in his. Rather than regarding his knife as a symbol of male authority, she sees his obsession with the object as somewhat ridiculous and quite irritating. Perhaps her observation that he has "clenched his fist upon it" evokes images of a masturbating individual— one who is self-absorbed, without "a ghost of a notion what anyone else was feeling."

It is his bursting into tears that draws Clarissa to him— certainly not his "running his finger along the blade of his knife"— and allows her to think "impulsively... [t]ake me with you." Her view of him departing reimagines the knife symbol as part of his demeanor: [m]asterly and dry and desolate he looked, his thin shoulder-blades lifting his coat slightly; blowing his nose violently." Thus, in this scene the image culminates in suggestions of vulnerability combined with a type of masterliness, and an aura of excitement— but "the five acts of a play that had been very exciting and moving were now over. . . ."

At the same time, Clarissa holds scissors and a needle, as she works on a green silk dress. These
objects, however, allow Woolf to refract very different values than those of male authority versus impotence: in their immediate connection with a "female activity," they are associated more with nurturing and involvement with other people (as opposed to Peter's relationship with a woman who is physically distant, married, and amenable to "shaping ... with three strokes of a knife").

The first mention of the green dress occurs just before Peter's intrusion, preceded by images of knife-like sharpness:

She pursed her lips when she looked in the glass. It was to give her face point. That was her self--pointed; dartlike; definite. That was her self when some effort, some call on her to be her self, drew the parts together, she alone knew how different, how incompatible and composed so for the world only into one centre, one diamond, one woman who sat in her drawing-room and made a meeting-point, a radiancy no doubt in some dull lives, a refuge for the lonely to come to, perhaps; she had helped young people, who were grateful to her; had tried to be the same
always, never showing a sign of all the other sides of her—faults, jealousies, vanities, suspicions, like this of Lady Bruton not asking her to lunch; which, she thought... is utterly base!

Woolf thus prepares for a meditative scene in which Clarissa considers various parts of herself. Clarissa’s earlier mental self-reflections foreshadow this scene in its refraction of female versus male stereotypes and its suggestion of a search for individual identity:

She would have rather been, like Lady Bexborough, slow and stately, rather large; interested in politics like a man; with a country house; very dignified, very sincere. Instead of which she had a narrow pea-stick figure; ridiculous little face, beaked like a bird’s. ... She had the oddest sense of being herself invisible; unseen; unknown; there being no more marrying, no more having of children now, but only this astonishing and rather solemn progress with the rest of them, up Bond Street, this being Mrs. Dalloway; not even Clarissa any more; this being Mrs. Richard Dalloway.
Clarissa's analysis of her physical self prefigures "pointed; dartlike; definite"; however, Woolf refracts other notions in the meditative scene. First, her approach to the dress suggests a feminine gentleness, "plunging her hand into the softness, gently detach[ing] the green dress and carr[y]ing it to the window." Next, Woolf symbolizes feelings of jealousy in the color of the dress, but, importantly, "[b]y artificial light the green shone, but lost its colour now in the sun." In other words, as Clarissa regards the fabric in the real versus the artificial light, her jealousy "loses its colour." She takes her scissors and thimble (the latter for protection against sharpness) with 40-her to mend the dress. Assuming this chore, which might otherwise fall to her maids, Clarissa demonstrates her sensitivity (as in Chatman's example, here "[h]er maids had too much to do" brings the narrator and character together in a neutralized fashion, but we can infer that Clarissa responds kindly to the busy-ness of her helpers). As she pauses on the landing, she "assembl[es] that diamond shape, that single person, strange how a mistress knows the very moment, the very temper of her house!"

The narrator describes Lucy coming into the room, arranging the "giant candlesticks on the mantlepiece."
the crystal dolphin towards the clock [Clarissa will turn it straight, presumably a symbolic gesture to avoid a reminder of the passage of time]. . . . [and] the paper-knife on the inlaid table," suggesting the benevolent aspects of these objects which Peter soon embues with symbolic power and reflections of his own failure. To Lucy, "her mistress was the loveliest," and the lovely objects, as well as the symbol of the passage of time (the clock) all combine with an aura of elegance and excitement. Clarissa returns Lucy's respect, we learn "inadvertently," because she allows her servants to stay out later (to see the end of a play, for instance), if they ask her. Thanking Lucy profusely for offering to help her with her dress, Clarissa considers her "gratitude to her servants generally for helping her to be like this, to be what she wanted, gentle, generous-hearted."

As she works on her dress, "[q]uiet descended on her, calm, content, as her needle drawing the silk smoothly to its gentle pause, collected the green folds together and attached them, very lightly, to the belt." Further definitions of Clarissa's mood prefigure The Waves:
So on a summer's day waves collect, overbalance, and fall; collect and fall; and the whole world seems to be saying 'that is all' more and more ponderously, until even the heart in the body which lies in the sun on the beach says too, That is all. Fear no more, says the heart. Fear no more, says the heart, committing its burden to some sea, which sighs collectively for all sorrows, and renews, begins, collects, lets fall. And the body alone listens to the passing bee; the wave breaking; the dog barking, far away and barking and barking.22

Since the narrator's voice and language deliver these poetic phrases, they reflect Clarissa's mood rather than her thoughts, suggesting that while she may not have resolved her ambivalences and frequent overwhelming feelings of insecurity, she does find in her act of sewing--her use of sharp instruments, a scissors which cuts, and a needle which penetrates--peace through an attunement with natural forces. The earlier reference to "the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn" had filled her with foreboding.23 At that time,
too, she was approached by Peter, and noticed his pocket-knife. Upon her realization that an "intruder" had come (quotation marks mine), Clarissa had "made to hide her dress, like a virgin protecting chastity, respecting privacy." Surely it was prudent to think of protecting herself, for, like the younger Peter who had chided Clarissa with "'Musing among the vegetables?'" this older version of the man thinks to himself that Clarissa has been doing nothing more than mending and going to parties all the time that he has been in India, concluding that marriage is bad for some women. Yet, he finally does acknowledge the specialness of Clarissa in her act of sewing--her bringing together, mending, and taking care of. His vision corresponds to several of Septimus's, in which he observes Rezia sewing, and notes the flashing, pointed nature of the needle as she performs the domestic ritual which initially drew him to her. Peter imagines that "sewing, with her scissors, Daisy would look ordinary beside Clarissa." And it is this very comparison of the two women--that Peter loves "the younger woman" and not her--that initially brings a resurgence of Clarissa's jealousy (which she had felt as a consequence of Lady Bruton's snubbing and, earlier, of Lady Bexborough's demeanor). Yet, through her mending--
her bringing people together, her awareness of the
temper of her house, and her bonding with "the things
she liked; her husband; Elizabeth; her self, in short,
which Peter hardly knew now"--she surmounts these pain­
ful emotions; her strengths "come about her and beat off
the enemy." 

The earlier quoted passage in which Septimus
regards Rezia sewing, as well as other references to
sewing, add further dimensions to the image of sharp
objects in terms of the feminine act of mending and the
masculine obsession with phallic-like objects. In the
case of the curative powers of bringing together,
Septimus remembers:

When peace came he was in Milan, billeted in
the house of an innkeeper, with a courtyard,
flowers in tubs, little tables in the open,
daughters making hats, and to Lucrezia, the
younger daughter, he became engaged one
evening when the panic was on him--that he
could not feel.

Septimus's consciousness refracts the image of the
daughters sewing hats, surrounded by flowers and out in
the open (images which occur among other characters, but
neither suggests exclusively the common associations of
flowers or the freedom of openness). Although the connotations of sewing may be positive, another possibility suggests itself—that an individual might be unable to experience the normal associations we make in one situation or another. Septimus suffered too much pain and fear during the war to risk feeling any longer, and, although other characters have had more mundane experiences than he, they, too, often resist feeling. Thus, we see that things which often bring pleasure may also be sources of pain for someone whose sensitivities are raw. But Septimus is not the only vulnerable character—rather, he lacks defenses to a greater degree than others.

When Septimus's consciousness absorbs the vision of his wife sewing, suggestions about the curative powers of the act of bringing together, creating, and mending are replaced by connotations of probing and perhaps power without positive associations: "her strong little pointed fingers pinching and poking." In its entirety, the passage reveals Septimus's best moments—he helps Rezia while she makes a hat, and thinks, "It was wonderful. Never had he done anything which made him feel so proud. It was so real, it was so substantial, Mrs. Peters' hat." But when Rezia moves away from him
to go to the door, he fears that Dr. Bradshaw has already come, and although it is the neighbor's child, he quickly moves to a state of terror.

Rezia's strength, symbolized in her sewing here and elsewhere, does have the possibility for bringing momentary pleasure to Septimus, who still can relate fleetingly to an act of creation; yet Rezia's strong fingers, in their pinching and poking, resemble her "poking" into Septimus's deranged state and bringing forth doctors who finally destroy his last shreds of hope. His reversion to memories of Milan make the connection even stronger:

Nobody was there (Rezia had taken the child to its mother. It was bedtime). That was it: to be alone forever. That was the doom pronounced in Milan when he came into the room and saw them cutting out buckram shapes with their scissors; to be alone forever.27

Septimus's mind dwells morbidly on love as it does on other matters: "Love between man and woman was repulsive to Shakespeare. The business of copulation was filth to him before the end. But, Rezia, said, she must have children. They had been married five years."28 And he immediately remembers going to the Tower--an image of
less than loving human relationships, a place where human existence was defiled. In the case of Rezia and Septimus, the female attempts to be a nurturer, but her methods turn on her and her pitiful husband. Yet, neither in this way nor any other should we consider them exceptions—they are the integral to the shaping of a novel which explores, among other things, the limits of human consciousness in several directions.

The images of male and female mix together and separate again, as they do throughout the novel. In the particular images I have analyzed, Woolf refracts the values of a society which apprises things apparently male: an interest in politics and history, a predisposition to spend time alone in the country (as Richard does), and power, symbolized in the knife which Peter fondles while he thirsts for the authority and conquests unavailable to him. The refraction of female qualities reveals that women are concerned with nurturing and joining things together by a very different use of sharp objects, one which culminates in a connection with other people and in solitary moments, with nature. Yet, even this image is not pure—Lady Bradshaw embroiders and knits, seemingly more as a fulfillment of social expectation, while we saw needles described as
instruments of "strong little pointed fingers pinching and poking" in Septimus's consciousness. In a number of examples, images have a dialectical relationship within themselves, not just as they are juxtaposed to opposing images. Woolf both refracts values and the inaccurate stereotypes that accompany them.

This dialectic between the male and female involves a vacillation into the other territory, as we saw in the case of Clarissa wishing to be more like a man, and in Peter's feelings of weakness in the face of male forces (personified in Richard Dalloway) and his weeping. After Peter leaves Clarissa, he remembers her "among her scissors and silks," and although he thinks that she is too concerned with "rank and society," he admits to himself that she is honest, and even begins to think generously about her parties. When he realizes the cause of his emotion, his tears, he thinks, "It was jealousy that was at the bottom of it--jealousy which survives every other passion of mankind... holding his pocket-knife at arm's length." The tension of the two systems is not lessened by this, however; in fact, this movement increases the sense of forces which are arbitrary and thus firmly held to (no one needs to worry too much about natural differences, since they will occur
spontaneously and continue without enforcement).
Interpretations of natural events (men are larger, thus somehow superior, for example) and impositions of artificial ones (men like politics and history; women like to have parties) are embedded throughout Mrs. Dalloway, and owe their pervasiveness to the refraction accomplished through the use of images.

Woolf refracts the values of the implied author in the same way. The images of gentleness, softness, coming to terms with one's own deficiencies—physical, psychological, and spiritual—caring about others' feelings, and bringing people together without attempting to control them are all portrayed positively (and within the feminine sphere). Because Clarissa sometimes withdraws, because she describes herself as physically sharp and hard, and because Peter defines her as cold and hard, Woolf apparently does not expect one individual to encompass at all times or in the eyes of all others the finest qualities described in the novel.

Woolf deals in another way with the values of her society. While the scene between Clarissa and Peter describes the complexity of the patriarchal world and exposes its potential for destruction, the characters of Dr. Bradshaw and Miss Kilman reveal more malevolent
aspects of upper-middle class British society. In the first case, the character embodies authoritarian values to an extreme, visiting on the world his talent for undermining others while in the guise of a healer. In the second case, a woman seeks to refute the values of the society, but in doing so she alienates, intimidates, and often revolts those whom she would wish to reform (or perhaps to imitate!) Her methods finally duplicate those of her "enemies," while her goals may not be so different from theirs, either.

For several pages, the narrator sustains a highly ironic portrait of Sir William, so that it is hard to select only a few lines to give the full impact of her debunking discourse. However, the following lines probably represent as well as any others what transpires in these pages:

There were moreover, family affection; honour; courage; and a brilliant career. All of these had in Sir William a resolute champion. If they failed him, he had to support police and the good of society, which, he remarked very quietly, would take care, down in Surrey, that these unsocial impulses, bred more than anything by the lack of good blood, were held
in control. And then stole out that Goddess whose lust is to override opposition, to stamp indelibly in the sanctuaries of others the image of herself. Naked, defenceless, the exhausted, the friendless received the impress of Sir William's will. He swooped; he devoured. He shut people up. It was this combination of decision and humanity that endeared Sir William so greatly to the relations of his victims.  

The last sentence recalls many of Dickens', such as the following, which also use hybrid constructions to parodically stylize the language of a character:

It followed that Mrs. Merdle, as a woman of fashion and good breeding who had been sacrificed to wiles of a vulgar barbarian (for Mr. Merdle was found out from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, the moment he was found out in his pocket), must be actively championed by her order for her order's sake.  

Bakhtin analyzes the Dicken's excerpt as "a hybrid construction in which the definition provided by the general opinion of society--'a sacrifice to the wiles of
a vulgar barbarian'--merges with authorial speech, exposing the hypocrisy and greed of common opinion."

Similarly, the society which not only allows, but admires, Sir William's shutting up, his devourings, considers "decision and humanity" differently than Woolf asks us to. However, refracted through the consciousness of all the characters is the desire not to become too intimate with others--or the desire to, and yet their fears of intimacy. In part, Clarissa clings to notions of love for Sally, and feels virginal, although she has given birth, because accession to the world of Sir William, which represents much of the patriarchal world, even if in an exaggerated form, terrifies her. How much is her Richard a part of that world, and how much is Peter, in his heart, desiring of the power of that world--the power to use his knife against jealousy, for instance?

The description of how Miss Kilman "found religion," expresses in the narrator's voice, follows the pattern of the earlier construction concerning Sir William:

Bitter and burning, Miss Kilman had turned into a church two years three months ago. She had heard the Rev. Edward Whittaker preach;
the boys sing; had seen the solemn light
descend, and whether it was the music, or the
voices (she herself when alone in the evening
found comfort in a violin; but the sound was
excruciating; she had no ear), the hot and
turbulent feelings which boiled and surged in
her had been assuaged as she sat there, and
she had wept copiously, and gone to call on
Mr. Whittaker at his private house in
Kensington. It was the hand of God, he said.
The Lord had shown her the way. So now,
whenever the hot and painful feelings boiled
within her, this hatred of Mrs. Dalloway, this
grudge against the world, she thought of God.
She thought of Mr. Whittaker. Rage was
succeeded by calm. A sweet savour filled her
veins, her lips parted, and, standing
formidable upon the landing in her mackintosh,
she looked with steady and sinister serenity
at Mrs. Dalloway, who came out with her
daughter.31

Bitter and burning, Miss Kilman finds religion, and
religion helps her to sustain her rage under the guise
of her cool control. While she deplores the rich, she
finds a minister in the fashionable Kensington, and binds herself to Elizabeth, the daughter of those whom she hates. What has religion done for the mackintosh-clad spinster? It has enabled her to stand calmly and savour the victory she achieves by looking formidable and staring with "steady and sinister serenity" at her enemy. As talented as Dickens at debunking social values, Woolf delivers this diatribe against the benefits of religion in this, the "religious" character of the novel.

Although social values come under continuous attack in this novel, and are a part of my study of it throughout, in the instance of Sir William and Miss Kilman, the characters seem to function mainly to enable Woolf attack those things for which they stand, unlike the others, whose functions are more diverse (Miss Kilman of course functions as a representative of Clarissa's worst fears, but our concern with her fear of Miss Kilman is subsumed by the hypocrisy of the character).

Miss Kilman's consciousness is one which conceals more than it reveals—a characteristic of human consciousness which Woolf explores all the time—but in this instance it is tied to the hypocritical religious stance of the character. Consider these lines:
Miss Kilman did not hate Mrs. Dalloway. Turning her large gooseberry-coloured eyes upon Clarissa, observing her small pink face, her delicate body, her air of freshness and fashion, Miss Kilman felt, Fool! Simpleton! You who have known neither sorrow nor pleasure; who have trifled your life away! And there rose in her an overmastering desire to overcome her; to unmask her. If she could have felled her it would have eased her.\textsuperscript{32}

The spinster continues ranting to herself, exposing with each phrase the hypocrisy of the first sentence. In a short while, she says to herself, "But why wish to resemble her? Why? She despised Mrs. Dalloway from the bottom of her heart."\textsuperscript{33} The root of Miss Kilman's hatred is jealousy--like the jealousy which rears its ugly head in the consciousness of Clarissa, Peter, Richard, and others. Is the only way to avoid it to become as disengaged as Septimus? Perhaps, but even he expresses a form of jealousy in his justifiable response to his physicians who maintain control over the world.

Miss Kilman is not the only one, surely, who deceives herself in her own consciousness--this too she has in common with the others. But we see a different
expression of it in Richard Dalloway, for example. Richard wants to buy Clarissa something, but he feels insecure about his selection of gifts, so he brings her flowers. He is overwhelmed with thoughts of his love for her, as he makes his way home through Westminster yard. Yet, when he comes home, he cannot tell her that he loves her. And he cannot push his consciousness to tell him why this is. He knows that he loves her; he knows that he would like to say that to her, but, as in his jealousy of Peter, he deals with it in such a fragmented way that he avoids it. His thoughts then allow him to escape what is beneath the thoughts, as if the conscious raising of an issue might protect oneself from the many insights it involves—might prevent the intrusion of the deeper, underlying thoughts. Richard’s mind takes flight as soon as an uncomfortable thought penetrates it:

‘I love you.’ Why not? Really it was a miracle thinking of the war, and thousands of poor chaps, with all their lives before them, shovelled together. . . . Here he was walking across London to say to Clarissa in so many words that he loved her. Which one never does say, he thought. Partly one’s lazy; partly
one's shy. And Clarissa--it was difficult to think of her; except in starts, as at lunch-eon, when he saw her quite distinctly; their whole life. . . . For he would say it in so many words, when he came into the room. Because it is a thousand pities never to say what one feels, he thought, crossing the Green Park . . . .

Richard's mind absorbs the images of the families, and other people and objects in the park, letting his train of thought take him where it will, safely away from self-analysis (but surely not where Septimus's goes when he thinks of love, repulsion, and the Tower all at once). As he reaches the end of the park, he remembers his old jealousy of Peter, thinks of Clarissa having wanted to marry Peter, but having married him for support—and then quickly focuses on Buckingham Palace and all the things for which it stands. We may like Richard immensely; we may recognize ourselves in his consciousness, but we cannot expect him to delve further into causes than this.

Although the novel creates a portrait of Clarissa Dalloway, we see her character, and those of the others
in the novel, through a technique which is significantly
different from the other four novels. Not surprisingly, the refracted discourse thus has a unique role: it functions as an organizing principle. In the other novels, we know the characters to a great extent through their actions, while the refracted discourse modifies our interpretations of those actions. In Mrs. Dalloway we know the characters through their consciousnesses, which we evaluate in terms of its own refracted discourse, the refractions of other characters, and the more general refractions the narrator provides through the novel. In other words, we see the characters as they relate to what we know from this special discourse.
CONCLUSION

Throughout this study we have witnessed what we might call an embryonic development of a feature of narrative style. While refracted discourse can be seen as changing in use historically, from the early nineteenth century in Austen to the early twentieth century in Woolf, I would like to tie the development loosely to an historical perspective. Changing views of reality influence greatly the way that an author might choose to use the technique, as I suggested in the early pages of Chapter Five. On the other hand, various intentions guide the way refracted discourse works in any one novel.

However, to leave our conclusions as vague as this would not do justice to the analysis of five separate and quite different works. Since I have presented the novels chronologically, we might again consider them in that order, keeping in mind that historical changes in literature and philosophy affect the works, but do not solely determine their narrative styles.

In the first case, Persuasion uses refracted discourse to modify both our notions about society and
about Anne Elliot's mental life. If we were to judge Anne only on her actions and her direct dialogue, we would have no evidence that she perceived her world with at least the critical acumen that the narrator's irony and Anne's world require. In that sense, Austen supports our notions that Anne and the narrator generally agree on the nature of upper-class British life and on the qualities of the various characters. On several occasions, however, the discourse creates suspense when we are unsure of the degree to which Anne recognizes her own feelings. This tension, mild though it is, provides a necessary element in the discourse, which tends to assure us all along that the Anne will find a happy resolution to her former mistake.

In terms of social complications, Austen uses the technique just enough to ask us to question the more superficial aspects of her world and to consider the possibility of slight changes, which are dramatically enacted in Anne's marrying someone whose social status is not quite so high as that of her family. Austen has not presented us with a simple world: clearly few people could attain the goodness and fortune of Anne Elliot; instead, many of the characters live the lonely lives of widows or widowers, or persist in activities
emptied of meaning. The refracted discourse helps us to know what is wrong in the society, so that we may judge all the characters, whom we know externally (except for Wentworth at one point), while we more fully appreciate the internal qualities of Anne and commend her insight into the faults we recognize.

Middlemarch takes us to a world where we can no longer confidently state what constitutes a successful life, or how an individual might achieve a sense of meaning in his or her existence. Refracted discourse enables Eliot to make sharp distinctions between the values of the implied author and the general Middlemarch community. We can note the increased use of this narrative technique as we sense the growing gap between what society has to offer and what a moral character needs to have. Because social role determines the actions of the characters, Eliot concentrates on the nexus between the internal and external lives of the characters, refracting from within and without values, thoughts, and emotions which interconnect in the Middlemarch world.

James demonstrates a somewhat narrower concern with the outside world in The Wings of the Dove than does Eliot in Middlemarch, although the changing fortunes of
the British upper classes informs the novel to some degree. What interests him most in the novel are the consciousnesses of the individual characters—how they evaluate their lives and how they respond to one another. Refracted discourse works very well to help dramatize the ambiguities of human existence, especially in terms of the immense difficulties one has in knowing himself or another individual completely. Because James was such a fine artist, he was able to use this technique to make the characters alternately opaque and clear. The moral growth of one individual, Merton Densher, takes on meaning as we compare him to the other centres—the one to whose goodness he aspires, and the one from whose grasp he frees himself—and as we register his development as an indicator of human potential in a complex world of individual psyches and conflicting values and interests.

On the other hand, Dreiser concentrates a great deal on the nature of the society in which his characters live. If we think of this study as examining novels which chart a growth in the writers’ abilities to refract the consciousness of the characters, Dreiser is out of place. As we have seen, his characters are victims of society to some extent, while they also fail
to control their lives because of the inarticulate way in which they absorb their experience. Yet *Sister Carrie* fits into this study as an example of an increased use of refracted discourse in creating tension between the values of the implied author and those of society. Since our notions of a good life cannot come from the characters in this novel, although Carrie does achieve some success, they must be represented in the tension between the characters' lives and the desired values.

*Mrs. Dalloway* represents the use of refracted discourse as an organizing principle of the novel. The images and narrative reveries which both tie together and separate the characters depend for our understanding on the tension they express among the individuals and in the society as a whole. The fragmented nature of Woolf's world is at an extreme from Austen's. While neither James nor Dreiser express much confidence in the stability or the accessibility of the worlds in which their characters live, neither of them quite gives the sense of the separateness of each individual existence that Woolf does. It is remarkable, then, that she also joins her characters in time and place through images and various reflections of their consciousnesses. While
each image, and each consciousness may seem single-voiced at the time of its occurrence, it lacks its ultimate meaning without the tension created by its repetition in other consciousnesses, other times, and other situations.
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