“DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS” AND “DUAL-VOICE”:

AMBIVALENCE AND FREE INDIRECT STYLE IN NOVELS AND FILM

by

LEAH M. ANDERST

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2010

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

André Aciman

Date — Chair of Examining Committee

André Aciman

Date — Executive Officer

André Aciman

Jerry Carlson

Giancarlo Lombardi
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

"DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS" AND "DUAL-VOICE":

AMBIVALENCE AND FREE INDIRECT STYLE IN NOVELS AND FILM

by

Leah M. Anderst

Adviser: Professor André Aciman

This project compares and analyzes five novels and three films: Jane Austen's *Emma*, Gustave Flaubert's *Sentimental Education* and Henry James' *The Portrait of a Lady*, *The Ambassadors* and *The Golden Bowl*, Alain Resnais' *Hiroshima mon amour*, Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's *Memories of Underdevelopment* and Eric Rohmer's *My Night at Maud's*. I describe a link between the uses of free indirect style, a "dual-voiced" narrative mode that combines two distinct perspectives into one instance of discourse: that of a narrator and that of a character, and psychological ambivalence, the back and forth wavering of a fictional character. I focus on novels and narrative fiction films that center on one character, and I show the ways in which these works call attention to a character's ambivalence and hesitations while relying on free indirect style, a formally ambivalent narrative mode, to expose and, at times, to create ambivalence in the mind of the reader or viewer. As an interdisciplinary project, this dissertation locates free indirect style in prose and cinematic narration, and it also explores the implications of analyzing a traditionally linguistic and literary mode within cinema.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Professors André Aciman, Jerry Carlson, and Giancarlo Lombardi. I owe particular gratitude to my advisor and mentor, Professor André Aciman, who has supported me throughout my graduate education. I have benefitted enormously from his encouragement, his example, and his generosity. I am grateful for the involvement of my readers, Professors Carlson and Lombardi, who have each generously advised and assisted me throughout this process.

I would also like to thank Professors Anne Humpherys and Eve Sourian for their guidance and direction as I prepared for my oral exams. Special thanks to my family and my friends and especially to Dane Patterson for his love, support, and encouragement.

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Introduction

The novel is of all pictures the most elastic. It will stretch anywhere – it will take in absolutely anything. All it needs is a subject and a painter. But for its subject, magnificently, it has the whole of human consciousness.
Henry James "The Future of the Novel"

The lovers were standing together at one end of the windows. It had a most favorable aspect; and, for half a minute, Emma felt the glory of having schemed successfully. *But it would not do; he had not come to the point*. He had been most agreeable, most delightful; he had told Harriet that he had seen them go by, and had purposely followed them; other little gallantries and allusions had been dropped, but nothing serious.
Jane Austen, *Emma*, p.90 (emphasis mine)

Two common threads unite the writers and filmmakers chosen for this dissertation. Jane Austen, Gustave Flaubert, Henry James, Alain Resnais, Tomás Gutiérrez Alea and Eric Rohmer are each concerned with the workings of an individual consciousness. They examine and represent the hesitations, the doubts, and the mis-readings of a mind facing psychological perplexity. Eric Rohmer calls himself a "*moraliste*." His series of films, the *Contes Moraux*, establishes him as such. Rohmer's *moraliste* is not necessarily interested in questions of morality, questions of right versus wrong or good versus evil. Drawing on the characteristics of the French *moralistes* of the 17th century, Rohmer explains to an interviewer, "A *moraliste* is someone who is interested in the description of what goes on inside man. He's concerned with states of minds and feelings" (110). In "Moralists and the Legacy of Cartesianism," George Van Den Abbeele writes, "the moralist text serves as a diagnostic mirror, one that probes the ego's duplicities, defects, and disguises" (331). Austen, Flaubert, James, Rensais, and Gutiérrez Alea are, like Rohmer, *moralistes*. These novels and films focus on the psyches of their primary characters, their thoughts, their desires, their hesitations, and their self-deceit.

These writers and filmmakers share a concentration on consciousness, but beyond this, each of their primary characters shares a certain indecisive and ambivalent turn of mind. Within the first few pages of James's *The Ambassadors*, we learn, "He was burdened, poor Strether – it had better be confessed at the outset – with the oddity of a *double consciousness*. There was detachment in his zeal and curiosity in his indifference" (56, emphasis mine). Lambert Strether is the quintessential example of ambivalence in a Jamesian character. His "double consciousness" surfaces on the first page of that novel the moment he steps from the transatlantic steamer onto the soil in England. Strether spends the duration of James's novel growing more aware and less decided. The protagonists of these novels and films are each "burdened with … the oddity of a double consciousness" (56). Frédéric Moreau may want to take a degree in law, he may want to run for political office, he may want to marry his young neighbor, but he proves incapable of making these decisions. He vacillates profoundly between his romantic vision and the world around him. James's Isabel Archer and Maggie Verver want to know what their husbands think and how they behave, but they both retreat from knowledge even as circumstances impel them toward discovery. Emmanuelle Riva's unnamed actress in Alain Resnais' *Hiroshima mon amour* wants to tell the story of her madness and her forbidden love to her Japanese lover in Hiroshima, but as she narrates her profound hesitation and guilt cause her to remain largely silent. Neither a revolutionary nor a "gusano," Sergio of Gutierrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarollo* retreats into his memories and fantasies rather than face his ambivalence vis-à-vis Cuba's revolution. Finally, Rohmer's unnamed hero wavers between two women. The first is a pious Catholic the second a free spirited non-believer, but this hesitation uncovers the character's more profound ambivalence between his former life as a womanizer and his recent spirituality and return to the

fold. Like James's Strether, each of these characters suffers from a "double consciousness;" they each waver and hesitate.

The characters in these fictions are deeply ambivalent, and it is this ambivalence that becomes, for each, the hallmark of their relationship with the world. The writers and filmmakers themselves share a common method for representing the indecisive minds of their characters. They favor free indirect style as a chief method for representing an ambivalent consciousness. Free indirect style (hereafter FIS) "[renders] a character's thought in his own idiom while maintaining the third-person reference and the basic tense of narration" (Cohn, 100). A combination of the character's and the narrator's voices or visions into one instance of discourse, FIS is an ambivalent narrative mode, a narrative mode that cannot decide. It is a mode that, in these novels and films, comes to reflect and, at times, generate the psychological ambivalence of the characters. Like their characters, these fictions are themselves intensely ambivalent. Where the characters hesitate to make decisions and to act, these novels and films unfold in an uncertain narrative mode that suggests ambivalence on the authorial level as well.

These works each reveal stylistic ambivalence, a desire to represent, to show the workings of a fictional mind coupled with a preference not to say, not to reveal definitively. These works are inherently ambivalent vis-à-vis representation; they approach revelation tentatively. They evince a propensity toward concealment and uncertainty in their treatment of characters who are themselves mired in indecision. This dissertation argues that ambivalence and uncertainty permeate each of these fictions and that FIS, an ambiguous, "dual-voiced" narrative mode, mirrors the indecisive and hesitating "double consciousness" of the heroes and heroines themselves.

These writers and filmmakers are all preoccupied with the literary and cinematic representation of consciousness, but none turns to a form of narration that would seem to offer a direct and immediate picture of consciousness: internal monologue or first-person narration. There is nothing in these fictions resembling Molly Bloom's monologue in James Joyce's *Ulysses* or the dream sequences in Ingmar Bergman's *Wild Strawberries*. The writers and filmmakers chosen for this dissertation opt for external, third-person narrators who act as continuous intermediaries between the mind of the character and the audience. FIS is a mode that preserves the narrator's control or autonomy over the narration while seeming to share control with a character. As Percy Lubbock's description of FIS indicates, the narrator's presence in FIS is often minimal and overlooked, "nobody notices, but in fact there are now two brains behind that eye; and one of them is the author's" (163). The unnoticed quality of the narrator's voice in much FIS is what gives this mode its seeming immediacy, its seeming proximity to the character's mind. The narrator, however, remains present. FIS in these novels reveals an inherent ambivalence at the level of narration. Where two voices speak at once, where the narration seems unable to "commit" to the character's inner voice, there ambivalence arises. Of Flaubert's language, Roland Barthes writes in *S/Z*, "… *on ne sait jamais s'il est responsable de ce qu'il écrit* … car l'être de l'écriture (le sens du travail qui la constitue) est d'empêcher de jamais répondre à cette question: *Qui parle?* (140, emphasis his). These films and novels each present the "double consciousness," the psychological ambivalence of a character, within an inherently "dual-voiced" or "dual-visioned" narrative. It is not coincidental that each of these fictions is preoccupied with epistemology. These narratives are, in their own way, mysteries. Their characters embark upon a search, and with the important exception of Austen's *Emma*, each of these novels and films ends with indecision and unanswered questions.

Emma is, in fact, an anomaly within this dissertation. Austen's character is not ambivalent or indecisive. Emma misreads; she does not know her own mind, but she does not suffer from indecision. It is precisely Emma's over-confident nature that causes her trouble. Emma is a poor reader of herself and those around her, and Austen's novel centers on this character's education in reading. Austen's novel itself is also not ambivalent. There is a graspable truth in the world of this novel, and the voice of the narrator is an indisputable authority over the narration. The value of Austen's novel within this project lies in its utilization of the formal ambivalence of FIS to portray Emma's education, her progression as a "reader." As she becomes a better reader, Emma's inner voice begins to approach the narrator's voice. From the novel's opening pages where we learn of Emma's self-deception to the novel's end where Emma repairs her thinking so that her inner voice comes to reflect the narrator's more tempered, judicious discourse, we follow Emma's growth. Austen conveys her heroine's progress with sustained views of Emma's mind. Here, again, is the passage cited at the beginning of this dissertation,

> The lovers were standing together at one end of the windows. It had a most favorable aspect; and, for half a minute, Emma felt the glory of having schemed successfully. *But it would not do; he had not come to the point*. He had been most agreeable, most delightful; he had told Harriet that he had seen them go by, and had purposely followed them; other little gallantries and allusions had been dropped, but nothing serious. (90)

In this passage early in the novel, Emma reads Mr. Elton's behavior in light of her desire to match him with Harriet, a young friend. Emma observes her subjects conversing and evaluates the progress of their relationship. The narrator "goes inside" Emma's mind, describing her view of the two subjects.

The sentence in italics is an instance of FIS; within that sentence there is evidence of two combined voices, one belonging to Emma, another to Austen's narrator. The narrator begins by

describing what Emma sees, the scene in front of her. The narrator then moves to a representation of her thoughts on Mr. Elton's actions. We "hear" Emma's voice in this instance of FIS; we hear her exasperation and her desire to push her two subjects to a quick conclusion. At the same time that we hear Emma's voice, we "hear" the narrator's voice blended within Emma's. In this instance, we perceive Emma's voice more forcefully, more "loudly." We seem to hear her thinking, "But this will not do! He has not come to the point." The presence of the narrator's voice, however, results in a dialogic and an ironic reading of Emma's inner voice. The narrator's voice throws a layer of skepticism over Emma's reading, and throughout the novel, Austen's narrator serves as a corrective to Emma's misreading, to her arrogance, and to her egotism. The reader oscillates between the two voices. In this instance of FIS, we may take Emma's reading that Mr. Elton, dragging his feet on the way to proposing to Harriet, will eventually declare his love for Harriet, or we may take the alternative reading offered by the narrator, that Mr. Elton's intentions are uncertain. Austen's FIS offers two possible readings without committing to either. Rather than informing the reader outright that Emma's reading is false, Austen's narrator implies that something may be amiss in Emma's conclusion. In this way, Austen's readers are educated along with Emma. The discourse commits to no one reading, it remains ambivalent, and the reader must thereby exercise her own judgment.

We will eventually learn that Emma had completely misread Mr. Elton. To Emma's great embarrassment, he will declare his love for her rather than for Harriet. FIS in *Emma* becomes the theater where we observe Emma's education in reading, where we watch as she realizes her mistakes and scrambles to repair her own thinking. Before the novel ends, Emma's inner voice comes to echo that of the narrator. She learns to be a better reader, and as she does so, the novel begins to abandon its stylistic ambivalence. *Emma* ends with each character occupying his or her

appropriate place, matched with the correct partner. In the world of Austen's novel, there is a correct reading. Flaubert and James's novels and Resnais, Gutiérrez Alea and Rohmer's films maintain the uncertainty and ambivalence of the various instances of FIS throughout their fictions to suggest that there may be no correct reading. Where Austen weaves ambivalence into local instances of her narration to do away with it eventually, these later novelists and filmmakers create works in which ambivalence and uncertainty are reigning principles. The distinct difference between the narrator's voice and Emma's voice in Austen's novel highlights the dialogic, ambivalent nature of FIS. From the example of her novel, we take our analysis to the remaining novelists and filmmakers.

Before moving deeper into our examination of psychological ambivalence and the effects of FIS on the reading of these novels and films, a few clarifications regarding FIS are necessary. In prose fiction, what I call FIS or "dual-voiced" narration is known alternatively as *style indirect libre, erlebte Rede,* free indirect discourse, narrated monologue, and reported speech and thought. For the purposes of this project, I choose "free indirect style," a translation of the French *style indirect libre*, because it is widely recognized. That the term is firmly rooted in a rhetorical and a linguistic description for this narrative mode in prose, though, admittedly presents problems within a discussion of cinema. "Dual voiced narration" alleviates part of the problem by extricating the terminology from a linguistic framework and reflects the dialogic nature of this mode. "Dual voiced," however, does not wholly encompass film narration, which includes a wide range of visual and aural elements. FIS in cinema appears less "dual voiced" than "dual visioned." A few film theorists have coined cinematic alternatives to FIS. Most notable among these are Jean Mitry's "semi-subjective image" and Pier Paolo Pasolini's "free indirect

subjective." I choose "free indirect style" over these to retain the link between prose and film and for its wide recognition.

A core assumption of this dissertation is the existence of narrators in literary and cinematic narratives. As one of the two components of "dual voiced" discourse, the presence of a narrator's voice is crucial for my claim that FIS is an inherently ambivalent narrative mode. Ann Banfield sparked a controversy with her 1982 publication of *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* and its claim that literary sentences, especially those including FIS (or "reported speech and thought"), contain no linguistic evidence of a narrator, no evidence of a sender or of a receiver. These sentences, she argues, are "unspeakable" because they do not exist within the realm of spoken discourse. "While there have been numerous attempts to submit narrative to the communication paradigm by positing a narrator addressing a reader for every text," Banfield writes, "once communication is defined non-tautologically in rigorous linguistic terms, this position cannot be maintained" (10). Her challenge to the communication model within literary narratives, though taken up by some subsequent theorists and linguists, Monika Fludernik most notably, has been discredited among many narrative theorists for its failure to move beyond the sentence level to account for entire narratives. I take Gérard Genette's position when he addresses Banfield's claims directly in his *Narrative Discourse Revisited*,

> … narrating – with its narrator and its narratee, fictive or not, represented or not, silent or chatty, but always present in what is indeed for me, I fear, an act of communication …. In the most unobtrusive narrative, someone is speaking to me, is telling me a story, is inviting me to listen as he tells it, and this invitation – confiding or urging – constitutes an undeniable stance of narrating, and therefore of a narrator. (101)

I do not wish to belabor the point. Suffice it to be said that I take the narrator as a given within my discussion of narrative fiction. This issue, however, will gain greater urgency as we move to cinema.

Whether films have narrators remains a point for debate among film theorists. Christian Metz argues in *Film Language* that any narration must have a narrator, an agency unfolding the narration. A tale must be told by a teller. In film, he writes, "the spectator perceives images which have obviously been selected (they could have been other images) and arranged (their order could have been different). In a sense, he is leafing through an album of predetermined pictures, and it is not he who turns the pages but some 'master of ceremonies,' some 'grand image-maker'" (20). On the other side of the argument is David Bordwell's 1985 *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Drawing from Russian formalist criticism and fleshing out Boothian concepts such as the "implied author" and the "implied reader" within a cinematic context, this work informs much of the subsequent criticism on cinematic narration. In his discussion of narrators, Bordwell takes a decisive position against the cinematic narrator when he concludes, "To give every film a narrator or implied author is to indulge in an anthropomorphic fiction" (62). In the vein of reception theory, Bordwell places the burden of ordering and arranging the cinematic narrative on the viewer who actualizes the narration by following cues within the film. Conceding that something must supply these cues, Bordwell adopts "the narration" as a sort of agency rather than "narrator."

Like Bordwell, Julio Moreno writes in an essay analyzing point of view in film, "… in cinema it is not possible to speak, in the strict sense, of a *narrator*. The film does not narrate, but rather it places the spectator directly without intermediaries, *in the presence* of the facts narrated" (Moreno, 354, emphasis original). Moreno's claim implies a stronger connection

between cinema and theater than between cinema and narrative prose fiction. In Aristotelian terms, Moreno's argument suggests that film falls within *mimesis* whereas novels and short stories come under *diegesis*. Much more so than theater, however, film *is* mediated. The actors and the settings are not placed "directly without intermediaries" before the viewer. A screen is placed directly before the viewer, and the fictional story of the film unfolds on that screen. To be sure, with cinema, the viewer does not have the sense of a narrative "voice" telling a story. Film does more than "speak." Cinema is a multi-track, hybrid form, and a cinematic narrator, if it is to be comparable to the literary narrator, must be accountable for all of the features of narration. Voice-over narration, then, which is sometimes taken as the *voice* of a film's narrator, must be considered as only one aspect of the cinematic narrator. These positions against the existence of a cinematic narrator are rooted in a discomfort with the personified nature of the literary narrator. Literary critics frequently refer to a narrator as "he" or "she," and in novels like Austen's *Emma*, the narrator, though always outside of the story world, attains the status of a character; readers are able to describe human characteristics of this narrator. A narrator, whether literary or cinematic, need not, however, appear human.

In *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (1990), Seymour Chatman responds directly to Bordwell's position on the cinematic narrator.

> Though film theory tends to limit the word "narrator" to the recorded human voice "over" the visual image track, there is a good case to be made for a more general conception of "cinematic narrator." Films, in my view, are always presented – mostly and often exclusively shown, but sometimes partially told – by a narrator or narrators. The overall agent that does the showing I would call the "cinematic narrator." That narrator is not a human being. The *nomina agentis* here refers to "agent," and agents need not be human. It is the cinematic narrator that shows the film …. The cinematic narrator is the composite of a large and complex variety of communicating devices. (133-134)

Chatman calls attention to the fact that the cinematic narrator, and by extension, any narrator, need not be a human figure. The narrator need not "speak" or "see." Later in his chapter, he will

call this figure the film's "show-er" to further distance the concept from a human figure "telling" a story with a "voice." Chatman's cinematic narrator "shows the film."

Noël Carroll summarizes positions both for and against the concept of the cinematic narrator in the introduction to Part IV: Film Narrative/Narration of his anthology, *Philosophy of Film and Motion Pictures*. Though Carroll will refute the claim he summarizes moments after making it, I find cogent his description of the cinematic narrator's role:

> … if there are these fragments of a fictional world being presented to us, how are they being presented to us? The real author is presenting us with photographic shots of real actors in actual places. But who, then, is drawing our attention to these scenes in the world of fiction? Perhaps it is an implicit fictional narrator, a postulated *metteur en scène* who shows us this and that in order that we may imagine seeing them. (177)

Carroll will quickly rehearse the argument against this point in part by demonstrating the improbability that watching films means that we "imagine seeing" the scene in front of us, that we "imagine" ourselves to be in the position of the camera. He adds, "I cannot be imagining being situated in the midst of a battle scene, viewing the combatants tooth-by-jowl, lest I would also have to imagine the bullets going through me. But who does that?" (178). Though I agree with Carroll's point that "seeing imaginarily" is not what a narrative fiction film asks of us, the remainder of his summary of the pro-narrator position holds. The cinematic narrator, the "show-er," the "grand image maker," is the external agency that organizes the story events and that allows the viewer to view the world of the film as fiction. Though this agency is rarely identified with a "voice" that the viewer hears, an agency exists nonetheless.

The narrator's voice in prose is present and identifiable whether the narrator is intrusive and verbose, commenting overtly on the action and the characters, or impersonal and silent, nearly invisible to the reader. I agree with Metz and with Chatman, that narrative fiction films also have narrators, narrating agencies like those of prose fiction that should not be identified

with a human figure such as the author, the director, the screenwriter, or the cinematographer. The cinematic narrator, like the prose narrator, can be more or less "felt" by the audience. This narrator may be more overt in highly reflexive films, for example, and impersonal and invisible in films that tend to hide the cinematic apparatus. The many channels combined in the unfolding of a film, the visual and aural components, the diegetic and non-diegetic aspects, the use of flashbacks, voice-over, cuts, dissolves, and deep focus, all fall under the control of the cinematic narrator, the film's "master of ceremonies" as Metz prefers.

I take the position that film narrators exist, then, but cinema does not operate within a strict rhetorical system that would render FIS as visible and identifiable as it often appears in prose. Though the cinematic narrator has not a voice to contrast with the character's as in Austen's *Emma*, the filmmaker has at his or her disposal stylistic methods to convey a dual-perspective image, an ambivalent, dialogic image that resists unequivocal readings.

In his 1998 essay, "Hearing Voices in Narrative Texts," Richard Aczel writes, "Much has been written on FID in the last twenty-five years, and there is no need to rehearse the arguments of that massive literature here, especially when much of the literature itself is concerned with its own retrospective" (477). Following Aczel's lead, I shall not delve into a lengthy discussion of the history of FIS in literary studies. I will instead focus only on those writers whose work directly informs this project. The field of writing on cinematic FIS, on the other hand, is comparatively small, and reviewing this literature will be of benefit.

The title of this dissertation borrows the term "dual voice" from Roy Pascal's 1977 *The Dual Voice*. One of the earliest English-language book-length studies of FIS, Pascal provides an overview of past scholarship on FIS in French, German and Russian, and he examines a few 19th century European novels. "Free indirect speech," Pascal writes in his first chapter, "is never

purely and simply the evocation of a character's thought and perception, but always bears, in its vocabulary, its intonation, its syntactical composition and other stylistic features, in its content or its context, or in some combination of these, the mark of the narrator" (43). I borrow Pascal's terminology, and his summary of previous research is useful, but in his individual analyses of novels by Flaubert and Zola, for example, Pascal faults these writers for going too far. He faults them for doing exactly what I value in their works, for equivocating, for creating confusion between these two combined voices.

My reading of FIS in these novels and films relies primarily on Dorrit Cohn's 1978 *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Cohn's book is a taxonomy. It identifies six modes of representing consciousness in prose fiction. Within third-person narration she identifies three: "psycho-narration," a mode dominated by an authorial narrator and more frequently called "omniscient description;" "quoted monologue" which she prefers to "internal monologue;" and finally "narrated monologue," her term for FIS. Cohn prefers "narrated monologue" to FIS because it is "a name that suggests its position astride narration and quotation" (13-14). Cohn defines "narrated monologue" in the following manner,

> Imitating the language a character uses when he talks to himself, it casts that language into the grammar a narrator uses in talking about him, thus superimposing two voices that are kept distinct in the other two forms [quoted monologue and psycho-narration]. And this equivocation in turn creates the characteristic indeterminateness of the narrated monologue's relationship to the language of consciousness, suspending it between the immediacy of quotation and the mediacy of narration. (105-6)

The "education" of Flaubert's novel, the characters' resistance to knowledge in James's novels, and Emmanuelle Riva's inability to "see" Hiroshima in Resnais' film give voice in these works to a common distrust for a fixed conception of truth. These novels and films are each puzzles or mysteries to solve. Only Austen's *Emma* posits a solution. Cohn's description of FIS, its

"equivocation" and its "indeterminateness," are chief factors that forward the uncertainty and the inability to anchor to one authoritative reading that permeates each of these works.

Equally important for my purposes, Cohn connects "narrated monologue" with interpretive effects within the reading process, "narrated monologues tend to commit the narrator to attitudes of sympathy or irony. Precisely because they cast the language of a subjective mind into the grammar of objective narration, they amplify emotional notes, but also throw into ironic relief all false notes struck by the figural mind" (117). Many narrative theorists and linguists are content to analyze and describe the origins and the stylistic features of FIS without examining its role in specific contexts. More than simply an economical manner to convey a character's thoughts or speech, FIS, especially in this group of novels and films, has a profound impact on the narrative, and Cohn's remarks provide an important base from which to begin.

Gérard Genette's *Narrative Discourse* informs this thesis as well. Genette devotes comparably little space to FIS in *Narrative Discourse*, and as he later explains in *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, this omission is due to the dual nature of the earlier book. A work of narrative theory on the one hand and an extended analysis of Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* on the other, Genette's discussion of FIS is limited by Proust's novel in which this narrative mode figures little. Genette does, however, acknowledge the "remarkable advantage" of "that ambiguous transfusion of speeches, that confusion of voices" especially in the use of FIS in Flaubert's novels (172). To this he adds, "in free indirect speech, the narrator takes on the speech of the character, or, if one prefers the character speaks through the voice of the narrator and the two instances are then *merged*…" (174, emphasis original). Genette's influence on this dissertation is primarily derived from his reevaluation of narrative perspective.

Where earlier narrative theorists speak only of "perspective" Genette points to two distinct features within literary perspective: mood and voice. Genette writes,

> To my mind, most of the theoretical works on [perspective] suffer from a regrettable confusion between what I here call *mood* and *voice*, a confusion between the question *who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective?* And the very different question *who is the narrator?* – or, more simply, the question *who sees?* and the question *who speaks?* (186, emphasis original).

Genette later uses the term "focalization" to designate the different visions within "mood." He describes internal, external and zero focalization. The vision guiding the narration, the focalization, may be within the story world; we may view the events of the story from the visual perspective or the experiential frame of a character. Genette calls this "internal focalization," and the novels and films chosen for this dissertation all fall within this category. Internal focalization may be "fixed" on one character as in James's *The Ambassadors*, "variable," switching between a few characters as in *The Golden Bowl*, or "multiple" as in epistolary novels (190). Genette defines "external focalization" as narrations in which "the hero performs in front of us without our ever being allowed to know his thoughts or feelings" (190). A third variety, "zero focalization" includes those narratives told by an omniscient, unlocatable narrator. Genette acknowledges that few novels commit to one variety of focalization. Most combine external with internal focalization with one dominating the other. The focalization of James's *The Ambassadors*, then, is primarily internal; the reader "sees" from Strether's point of view and often knows Strether's thoughts and feelings. The third-person narrator of this novel, however, frequently describes settings, other characters, and Strether himself in ways that the reader assumes Strether would not. These instances are focalized externally. FIS in prose fiction is a mixing of "voices." The reader "hears" the mental idiom of a character while the narrator's voice remains, and confusion arises when readers attempt to determine "who speaks." FIS is also,

however, a combination of external and internal focalization, and this will play an important role in our discussion of film. Cinematic FIS combines internal and external discourses that are not voices but rather ways of seeing, ways of thinking in images that belong to a film's visual track. Genette's distinction between voice and focalization provides us with a vocabulary to describe FIS in both prose and in cinema.

Literary theorists who work on FIS do not defend the presence or the existence of this narrative mode. The keys to recognizing FIS in prose, evidence of a character's personal idiom combined with a narrator's third-person, past-tense frame, are widely agreed upon. As witnessed in our brief summary of the narrator in film theory, however, neither the narrator nor, by extension, FIS occupies stable, agreed upon positions in the analysis of cinematic style. Following our position on the cinematic narrator, it now remains to make the case for cinematic FIS. The bulk of this work will be accomplished through the analysis of films in chapters three and four, however, we will also need to discuss briefly cinematic FIS, its presence in existing film theory as well as this dissertation's view of its component parts and its functions within cinema.

In his discussion of FIS, Richard Aczel (using "FID") describes two "fundamental conclusions" upon which most literary theorists agree regarding this narrative mode, "(1) that FID, though grammatically analyzable is above all contextually identifiable, and (2) that FID is not a "transformational" phenomenon that can be linguistically derived from direct discourse according to a series of generative rules" (477). To state this in another way, FIS may be, and frequently is, recognized by the reader as a combination of a narrator's grammatical frame with a character's voice, but this need not be the case. An often cited example from James's *What Maisie Knew* clarifies Aczel's two conclusions. In that novel, the narrator frequently describes

Maisie's surroundings or her thoughts at length without including her own idiom or inner speech, without lengthy instances of FIS. Within many of these passages of indirect discourse, however, Maisie's father, Mr. Beale, is referred to as "Papa." No one in the novel besides Maisie calls Mr. Beale "Papa," so we can take this designation as one-word instances of FIS within passages that represent Maisie's thoughts in indirect discourse. Only context, not grammar or style, tells the reader that "Papa" is FIS in *Maisie*. Though many examples of FIS, particularly those in Austen's *Emma*, can be transformed "back" into direct discourse, many others are recognized only by context. Aczel's second conclusion also holds for this example from James's *Maisie*. There is no way to write "Papa" another way for it to be immediately present itself as direct discourse. Aczel's conclusions regarding FIS assist in our conception of cinematic FIS, a form in which a fixed grammar and linguistic categories such as direct and indirect discourse are absent.

As a multi-track medium, cinema has at its disposal more possibilities for the actualization of FIS. Where the novel is limited to "voice" cinema has voice, vision, sound, and, if we happen to be watching Jack Cardiff's *Scent of Mystery* or John Waters' *Polyester*, it has scent as well. Cinema has, then, multiple channels through which to convey dual perspective. Cinematic FIS, however, has a very limited existence in film theory. Jean Mitry and Pier Paolo Pasolini are two writers who do specifically discuss and describe cinematic forms similar to our conception of FIS in prose fiction.

Exploring cinema's methods for representing consciousness in his *Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma*, Mitry describes the manner in which a filmmaker can convey the sentiments of a character, and he describes "l'image semi-subjective" as one available filming style,

> …pour 'éprouver' les sentiments d'un personnage quelconque, il suffisait au spectateur d'être *avec* ce personnage, à coté de lui. Vu objectivement, celui-ci pouvait alors assumer

> la responsabilité et les motivations d'un point de vue *partagé*. A la caméra en place du personnage on substitua donc une image cadrant le héros, soit en entier, soit à mi-corps, le suivant dans ses déplacements, voyant avec lui et en même temps que lui. L'image restait descriptive tout en épousant ses points de vue (73, emphasis original)

Mitry's description approaches very closely our conception of the fusing of voices in literary FIS. The "semi-subjective" image shows at once the character seeing and what he or she sees. The perspective of this image is "shared" by both the character and the camera; this image is descriptive, it remains external to the character, but in Mitry's conception it is also internal. Seeing what the character sees, the viewer "'éprouve' les sentiments d'un personnage" (73).

This technique will play a brief role in Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*. Pursuing Françoise after church, Jean-Louis Trintingnant's character drives his car through the narrow, windy roads of the old quarter of Clermont-Ferrand. Françoise is directly ahead on her motor bike. The camera films from the back seat of Trintignant's car, and in this shot, we see the windshield taking up much of the center of the frame with Françoise in sharp focus on her motor bike some distance ahead. In the same shot, the back of Trintignant's head occupies the far left foreground, and his eyes are reflected in the rear view mirror at the top of the image. The viewer sees what Trintignant sees beyond the car but also sees him seeing that view. The viewer sees what he sees from a position very close to his optical perspective. Though it does not hold that simply seeing what a character sees necessarily conveys that character's consciousness, this particular scene does indeed have the shared effect. Because we see more than the back of his head, because we see his eyes also in this shot, the image shares the visual perspective between Trintignant and the cinematic narrator. Cohn's description of the irony that may result from FIS also applies to this image. FIS "throw[s] into ironic relief all false notes struck by the figural mind," and in this scene, the viewer at once identifies with the panic on Trintignant's face as Françoise scoots past

a car that blocks him in *and* laughs at the character for this bizarre method of pursuit when he could have simply spoken to Françoise after church as they both exited.

Though Mitry's language, his "l'image restait descriptive tout en épousant ses points de vue," seems to mirror the way that literary FIS, straddling indirect and direct discourse, is both internal and external, the simple fact of seeing what the character sees does not necessarily connect the viewer to the character's consciousness. The example above from Rohmer's film corresponds to his reading, but another example does not. Robert Montgomery's 1947 *Lady in the Lake* is a film noir drama in which the camera takes on detective Philip Marlowe's optical perspective throughout the entire film. Evidence of Marlowe's physical presence, his hands and rising smoke from his cigarette, frequently remind the viewer that the camera films as if through his eyes. Rather than draw the viewer into proximity with the character's sentiments, however, this film tends to remove the viewer from Marlowe's consciousness. The viewer may have access to Marlowe's optical perspective, but his mind remains shrouded. An adaptation of Raymond Chandler's novel, this shooting style mirrors Chandler's highly descriptive and objective first-person narration. The "semi-subjective image" is, then, one manner for a film to create a dual-visioned image, an image that functions in a similar manner to literary FIS's dual-voiced nature, but the context of the image remains a crucial determinant.

Filmmaker Pier Paolo Pasolini also proceeds into the terrain of cinematic FIS in his 1965 essay, "The Cinema of Poetry." Connecting his propositions to language and literary discursive modes, Pasolini wonders whether cinematic FIS is possible,

> 'Is the technique of free indirect discourse possible in cinema?' Indeed, we shall see below how the birth of a technical tradition of the 'language of poetry' in cinema is bound to a particular form of free indirect cinematic discourse. But first I must specify what I mean by "free indirect discourse." It is simply this: the author penetrates entirely into the spirit of his character, of whom he adopts not only the psychology but also the language. (Pasolini, 549)

This description shares similarities with the description of literary FIS offered by many theorists. Substituting "narrator" for Pasolini's "author," we see that literary FIS frequently appears as a narrator momentarily subsumes the discourse of a character into his own. To be sure, this description places more emphasis on the narrator's position over the character's, but little about Pasolini's definition seems amiss. Pasolini's brief discussion on direct and indirect discourse equivalents in cinema also appears quite valuable, and Gilles Deleuze highlights this aspect of "The Cinema of Poetry" in his *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*. Deleuze summarizes Pasolini's position on this point: "It might be said that a subjective-perception image is a direct discourse and, in a more complex way, that the objective perception image is like an indirect discourse" (72). Literary FIS falls somewhere between direct and indirect discourse, and from this summary of Pasolini's point, we should be able to look for images that appear "in between" the subjective shot and the objective shot. There are, however, a few complications with Pasolini's conception of cinematic FIS.

In Pasolini's view there is not a stylistic distinction between cinematic "interior monologue" and what he names "free indirect subjective." These two modes look the same on screen. Their distinction lies rather in the difference or similarity in situation between the author and the character, "the interior monolog is a discourse relived by the author through a character who is, at least ideally, of the same class and generation" (550). Pasolini then gives as an example of "free indirect subjective" Antonioni's *Red Desert*. In this film, he explains, Antonioni has "substituted, wholly, the world-view of a sick woman for his own vision" (553). For Pasolini free indirect subjective only occurs when a filmmaker produces an internally focalized film in which the focalizing character lives a life totally distinct from the filmmaker's own experiences. When a filmmaker espouses the perspective of a character whose social

situation is approximately the same as his or her own, this is not "free indirect subjective" but "interior monolog." Pasolini's essay does not consider the ambiguity or ambivalence of the image as a factor within cinematic FIS, and from only a quick glance at the three films chosen for this dissertation, none are made by filmmakers whose social situation differs markedly from his main character. To be sure, Resnais's protagonist is a woman, but it is not this difference that marks the instances of FIS in *Hiroshima mon amour*.

My conception of cinematic FIS is largely informed by Bruce Kawin's notions of the presentation of subjectivity in film in *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard, and First-Person Film* (1978) and by George M. Wilson's conceptions of "reflected subjectivity" in *Narration in Light* (1986). Concerned with first-person perspective in cinema, Kawin delineates three ways in which a film narrates in the first-person: voice-over commentary by a character; "subjective film," by which he means point-of-view shots, images shot as if through the character's actual eyes which roughly corresponds to Mitry's semi-subjective image; and "mindscreen," or scenes which display the contents of the mind's eye of a character, his or her visual thoughts, memories, fantasies or dreams. An extreme example of "mindscreen" narration is most of the narrative of *The Wizard of Oz*, which turns out to be Dorothy's dream.

Many filmmakers make use of "mindscreen" narration, and they do so in a manner in which the viewer identifies very closely with the character's thoughts, fantasies, or memories. "Mindscreen" narration gives the viewer the sense of imagining, thinking, or recalling *with* a character, and many filmmakers make use of cinematic tropes that render the transition to mindscreen very clear. Fades and dissolves, changes in the soundtrack, or more subtle changes in the shooting style may be used to signal a switch to the internal perspective of a character. Cinematic FIS may occur when a film cuts to "mindscreen" narration using clear signals but the

images presented as the character's thoughts correspond very poorly with the viewer's conception of that character's mind. As we will see in our discussion of *Hiroshima mon amour* in chapter three, the main character's memory sequences are filmed in a manner that suggests this dual perspective. The viewer understands that the images represent the character's memories of her youth in occupied France, but these same images contain visual prompts that suggest the co-presence of an external, objective narrator. These images invite the viewer into the character's mind, but then refuse complete access. This FIS is essentially a representation of a character's mind partially obscured by a presence external to that mind. As in prose fiction where FIS prompts the reader to question who speaks, this cinematic FIS prompts the viewer to wonder who sees. The image on the screen bears traces of a character's visual thoughts and recollections while it also reflects the presence of an external, third-person perspective. Kawin's conception of "mindscreen" narration is not concerned with ambivalence or visual ambiguity, but his classification presents a strong jumping off point from which to build a model of cinematic FIS.

George M. Wilson explores cinematic point of view in *Narration in Light*, and he identifies a type of subjective narration distinct from the point-of-view shot, from Mitry's "semi-subjective" image, and from Kawin's "mindscreen" narration. Wilson describes "indirect or reflected subjectivity," and this variety of represented subjectivity fits well within our discussion of cinematic FIS especially in Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*. "A certain central character appears in segments throughout the film," Wilson writes, "and the action is only partially, if at all, seen from his or her physical point of view. Features of the projected image or the *mise en scène* are used to depict or symbolize or reflect aspects of the way in which the character perceives and responds to his or her immediate environment" (87). Unlike Kawin's "mindscreen" narration, "indirect or reflected subjectivity" need not appear distinct from the vision of the film's external

narrating agency. As we will see, the instances of "reflected subjectivity" in Rohmer's film underscore the image's dual perspective, and these instances occur when Rohmer's character hesitates profoundly.

Our discussion thus far has engaged in a mostly technical description of literary and cinematic narrators and FIS. This dissertation views the bond between form and content as indivisible in these works. The formal features that signal character indecision, however, are not our sole concern. All of these works share the use FIS, but it is their concentration consciousness, on hesitation and ambivalence that will guide this analysis.

Each of the chapters of this dissertation compares the psychological ambivalence and the use of FIS in two different works. The first chapter examines Austen's *Emma* and Flaubert's *L'Education sentimental*, the second, James's *The Portrait of a Lady* and *The Golden Bowl*. The third chapter moves to an analysis of FIS and ambivalence in the two films *Hiroshima mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarollo*, and the dissertation ends with a chapter on James's *The Ambassadors* and Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*.

The narrator of *Emma* attains a status akin to that of a character; this voice functions as a model for the reader, and it is this voice that stands for the goal to which Emma's education leads. Emma is a poor reader of herself and of the characters surrounding her. As a manifestly better reader than Emma, the narrator's presence in FIS calls attention to Emma's self-deceit and to her misreading of the world around her. The discrepancy between these two voices as they combine in FIS produces the novel's prevailing irony by turning Emma's own judgments of others back onto herself. The FIS that begins as "dialogic" in *Emma* finally emerges as "monologic," as unison between these two voices. Emma learns to read others as accurately as the narrator reads them. In

Austen's novel, FIS serves as the theater of Emma's education as a reader or herself and of her world.

The results of Frédéric's education in Flaubert's novel are not as tangible as Emma's. Flaubert's use of FIS also produces ironic readings of his character, but his is a highly ambiguous irony because Flaubert's novel does not privilege the narrator as an accurate model of reading. He does not set up his narrator's voice as a goal toward which the character's education leads. Flaubert's narrator recedes behind the plot, allowing the plot to unfold as if without a controlling narrating agency. Whereas the dialogic discourse in *Emma* finally emerges as "monologic" by the novel's end when Emma learns to be a better reader, to think and to speak as the narrator, FIS in *L'Education senitmentale* privileges the uncertainty and the ambivalence of the "dialogic" nature of FIS. Frédéric is an indecisive character, and the narration itself, unable to commit to one voice or the other, produces an ambivalent image of him and of his world. Read against one another, *Emma* and *L'Education senitmentale* call attention to the varying effects of irony that arise from FIS.

In chapter two, we compare James's *The Portrait of a Lady* with his last completed novel, *The Golden Bowl*. Reading these two novels in conjunction underscores James's increasing suspicion of knowledge and of truth. In almost all of his works, Henry James's idiosyncratic use of language delays knowledge. As he moves towards his late works, the difficulty of his language and the obscurity of his style increases. This second chapter traces the role of FIS and character ambivalence in James's changing portrayal of consciousness and of knowledge as he moves from an early novel, *The Portrait of a Lady*, to a late novel, *The Golden Bowl*. At a crucial point in both novels, James's protagonists, Isabel Archer and Maggie Verver, experience a realization of trouble in their marriages, and at these points, James turns his narratives to the previously inaccessible minds of these two characters. The two pivotal scenes, chapter 42 of *The*

Portrait and the opening of the second volume of *The Golden Bowl*, are remarkably similar in their focus on the solitary, awakening minds of these two characters, but they are different in execution. Strong use of FIS characterizes both, but James varies his presentation of the consciousnesses of his heroines. James's FIS in *The Portrait* recalls Austen's usage in *Emma* and Flaubert's in *L'Education senitmentale*; the reader "hears" Isabel's verbatim thoughts within the narrator's discourse. FIS in *The Golden Bowl*, on the other hand, frequently presents Maggie's non-verbal consciousness, the elaborate images and metaphors she constructs to interpret the world, rather than the verbal thoughts passing through her mind in her own idiom.

In these two scenes Isabel and Maggie both remain unaware of many truths about their husbands and the motivations of the characters surrounding them, but whereas Isabel takes her impressions, slowly reads and interprets them, Maggie obscures her impressions and intimations, jeopardizing their ability to impart knowledge. Maggie's ambivalence runs very deep. She desires to know. She is tempted by knowledge, but at the same time she distances herself from knowledge. The changing role of FIS and ambivalence within the portrayal of these two characters parallels and highlights James's shift in his late novels to a focus on impossible knowledge and impenetrable consciousness.

Chapter three moves to a discussion of Alain Resnais' *Hiroshima mon amour* and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarrollo*. These films are studies of the ambivalent psyches of their two protagonists. Each of the two films focuses on a character whose ambivalence is tied to his or her memory. These films enact the psychological ambivalence of the characters by portraying memory using cinematic FIS. *Hiroshima, mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarrollo* concentrate on the presentation of the minds' eye of the protagonists. These characters, an unnamed French actress making a film in Hiroshima and Sergio, a wealthy

Europeanized Cuban who remains in Havana while his family and friends emigrate to the United States to flee the growing repressions of the Revolution, are ambivalent vis-à-vis their memories. *Hiroshima*'s actress desires to narrate the story of her German lover to the Japanese lover she meets, *and* she fears the pain that these memories bring. Sergio remains ambivalent about the Revolution and the departure of his friends from Cuba. He remains in Havana, either alone in his large apartment replaying the memories of his wife's final night in Cuba or walking the city's streets recalling his youth. Ultimately, Sergio's ambivalence renders him unable to act; he neither abandons the island nor meets the Revolution with open arms.

These two films present strong examples of Bruce Kawin's "mindscreen," cinematic narration in which a film presents a character's thoughts. These films portray the visual memories of the character, but they both do so in a manner that obscures the character's consciousness. These films combine "mindscreen" with strong visual cues of a third-person, external narrating agency. These films use cinematic form to reflect and convey psychological ambivalence, and though each film focuses on one character, this ambivalence extends outward to the worlds which these characters inhabit, to the events taking place in Hiroshima, in Nevers and in Havana.

The final chapter of the dissertation combines the so far separate discussions of FIS in prose and in cinema. In this fourth chapter we compare the stylistic and psychological ambivalence of James's *The Ambassadors* and Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*. *The Ambassadors* displays most clearly a connection between the ambivalence of the character and the ambivalence in the style. In this novel, James's style does not simply sit below, underscoring or buttressing the character or plot; here style takes part in the creation of ambivalence. During the moments in the novel when Strether hesitates, when he is pulled by competing duties and desires,

those are the moments when James most frequently and forcefully employs FIS. The narration of *Ma nuit chez Maud* behaves similarly to that of *The Ambassadors*; the ambivalent narration highlights the psychological ambivalence of the character within the mind of the viewer. The film revolves around an unnamed character played by Jean-Louis Trintignant, and it portrays his vacillations between two conflicting aspects of his consciousness: his newly strengthened Catholicism and his womanizing past. The viewer connects with his ambivalence chiefly through the film's use of FIS. The narrative style of the film, like the style of James's novel, enacts character ambivalence. More so than the previous novels and films discussed, these two works evince profound hesitation vis-à-vis representing consciousness. More so than *Emma* and *L'Education sentimental*, more than *The Portrait*, *The Golden Bowl*, *Hiroshima mon amour*, and *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud* resist internal narration. Where Lambert Strether and Jean-Louis Trintignant's character hesitate profoundly, so too do the narratives.

Chapter One

From Monologic to Dialogic:
FIS in Austen's *Emma* and Flaubert's *L'Education sentimentale*

Emma (1818) and *L'Education sentimentale* (1869) are portraits: portraits of Emma Woodhouse nearing her twenty-first year as she comes to realize her errors, her self-deceit, and her vanity and of Frédéric Moreau, his years as a student and young adult in Paris, his passions, and his indecisions. These are novels of education. Emma and Frédéric negotiate the world around them, their experiences, and their emotions, and in the process, they each embark on an education in reading and interpreting the world around them. They proceed through the novels reading and misreading the world, their own minds and the minds of those close to them. Emma believes herself a matchmaker. She reads the subjects in her small community, arranging incompatible couples and, from her own elevated position, often judging them very harshly. Influenced by his Romantic readings – "il estimait par-dessus tout la passion; Werther, René, Franck, Lara, Léila … l'enthousiasmaient presque également" – Frédéric perceives and reads the world through a Romantic prism, a prism that, as this novel will demonstrate, does not always correspond to the realities surrounding him (33). These two novels differ dramatically in the eventual outcome of the character's education; whereas *Emma* will end with the protagonist advancing rapidly and cheerfully along the path of her instruction, *L'Education sentimentale* finally undermines the "education" of its title because, lacking an established model of readership or interpretation, Frédéric appears little changed by the novels' end.

Flaubert sets his novel against the backdrop of the 1848 Revolution in Paris, and though this historical moment propels and shapes the character, the novel is essentially centered on Frédéric. Indeed, both works resist developing characters and events outside the two protagonists. Austen and

Flaubert focalize their narratives through these two characters to such intensity that, although written in the third-person, both novels frequently behave as first-person narratives, appearing to allow the reader direct access to the mind of the protagonist. These authors achieve this intensity in part through their use of FIS.

Literally double-voiced, FIS combines two voices – one belonging to the narrator the other to a character – into one instance of narration. This combination typically retains the person and the tense of the narrator's discourse while conveying the emotions and thoughts of a character in his/her own words. FIS allows a mediated portrait of the character's psyche to emerge, a picture of his/her mind and experiences couched in the narrator's discourse. Shared between the two voices, FIS is a *formally ambivalent* narrative mode particularly suited to convey a hesitant, divided mind. Austen and Flaubert favor this mode and its privileging of a narrator who asserts control, be it explicit as in *Emma* or implicit as in *L'Education*, over the character's discourse and the portrait that emerges. FIS produces what Bakhtin refers to in *Discourse in the Novel* as an "image of language," in this case, an "image" of thought (359). These authors *represent* the thoughts and anxieties, of their characters using FIS; the result is an inherently ambivalent or "dialogic" narrative in which the language of both the narrator and the character exist together and cannot be definitively ascribed or separated. The portraits of these characters that emerge are representations that retain the mark of the reporting narrator whose voice remains an ordering and, especially in the case of *Emma*, a corrective presence.

These novels differ, however - and this is quite important within a discussion of FIS - in the role accorded to the narrator. Austen's narrative voice attains a status akin to that of a character; this voice functions as a model for the reader, a model the reader will use to evaluate Austen's characters and especially, Emma herself. As a manifestly better reader than Emma, the narrator's presence in FIS calls attention to Emma's self-deceit and to her misreading, and the discrepancy between these

two voices as they combine in FIS produces this novel's prevailing irony. Flaubert's narrator, on the other hand, recedes behind the plot, allowing the plot to unfold as if without a controlling narrative agency. As Jonathan Culler notes in *Flaubert: The Uses of Uncertainty*, the discourse of *L'Education* operates in a manner that "derails" or "deflates" the reader, and he argues that Flaubert's narrator "does not create for us a personality whom we feel we know" (78). Unlike Austen's narrator, Flaubert does not provide for the reader a clear model of reading and interpretation, a perspective on Frédéric, on the other characters, or on the Revolution. Flaubert's narrator is impersonal. This narrative voice "pans" over a scene to focus on details that fall within its gaze. Like Austen's narrator, Flaubert's functions as an alternative to Frédéric's frequently romantic view of the world and to his romantic language. Unlike Austen's narrator, however, this narrator is not an "authority," or a corrective to Frédéric's perspective. While Emma misreads, Austen's narrator consistently points to a correct reading distinct from Emma's. Emma will progressively come to adopt the narrator's views and language, and when the novel ends, she will have come very far in her education. Flaubert counters Frédéric's romantic readings with the impersonal discourse of his narrative voice, an alternative voice whose presence will underscore the emptiness of Frédéric's language. Here, however, the character's own growing awareness of his romantic view and his romantic language does not alter his actions or his behaviors.

Irony, like FIS, is double-voiced. As Culler writes, "the most basic function of irony is perhaps its dual structure: it presupposes two orders which are in contrast with one another and in whose contrast lies whatever value the form can generate … An ironic statement has a literal meaning, but that meaning is only semblance and the true proposition is hidden and must be reconstructed" (187). Irony proliferates in both of these novels. In *Emma*, the presence of the narrator in FIS turns the apparent focus of this narration around. Where the vast majority of the

instances of FIS in *Emma* present Emma's judgments of the many characters surrounding her, the narrator's voice, in a counter move against Emma, turns that judgment back onto Emma herself, exposing her misreadings and false moves. Austen creates an image of Emma's misguided and frequently arrogant thoughts, an image couched in the voice of a narrator who knows better, who sees Emma's errors as they are represented but does not render them explicit. Irony surfaces in this novel in the narrator's privileged position. The gradual unfolding of Austen's novel brings with it Emma's development and education as a reader, and she will learn, by the novel's end, to read more accurately. Her voice and her opinions, highly misguided and strongly differentiated from the narrator's at the novel's opening, will finally come to resemble the narrator's discourse so that the discrepancy between the two narrows and the irony emerging from their dialogic relationship lessens as we reach the end of the novel. Flaubert's use of FIS also produces ironic readings of his character. Off in his imagination and his fantasies concerning Marie Arnoux, Frédéric's predominant love interest, Frédéric envisions her in terms of the stories told by his preferred Romantic writers. When the narrator's highly objective voice intersects with Frédéric's romantic perspective in FIS, the incongruity of that discourse faced with the world is underscored.

Jane Austen is one of the earliest practitioners of FIS in English; she deploys this form in a number of ways and to a variety of effects. Flaubert's FIS, however, behaves as a standard for its use as a method to display the mind of an indecisive character. Austen employs FIS to display the thoughts of her protagonist infused with both irony and sympathy, and she frequently reports speech and dialogue with FIS. This novel begins with the protagonist unaware of her own errors and flaws, and when she finally comes to understand where she has gone wrong, she repairs her misjudgments and ends by marrying the correct man and espousing the correct notions. What begins as dialogic in *Emma* finally emerges as unison between the two primary voices, and by the end of the novel,

Emma learns to read others as accurately as the narrator reads. FIS serves as the theater of Emma's education as a reader. Much more so than *Emma*, Flaubert's novel remains highly ambivalent, highly dialogic throughout. The results of Frédéric's education are not clear and tangible. This novel ends, and Frédéric remains ambivalent, rebuffing the advances of the woman he has passionately loved because her white hair leaves him cold. Frédéric is an indecisive young man coming into adulthood in a revolutionary and an uncertain age. The formal ambivalence of FIS in Flaubert's novel mirrors the character's psychological ambivalence, his ambivalence between his Romantic views of the world and his growing awareness of the posturing that is his Romantic reading and his Romantic discourse. Frédéric slowly comes to learn that his youthful perspectives are often inconsistent with reality. FIS in Flaubert's novel, as in James's novels after him, establishes the characteristic hesitations and indecisions of the hero; the ambivalence of the character is borne out first at the level of style and subsequently at the thematic level. Flaubert's style puts Frédéric's indecision on display, as it were, even before his character's words and actions communicate ambivalence to the reader.

These two novels share this use of FIS, then, but *Emma* and *L'Education sentimentale* diverge thematically. Austen's character is not indecisive; unlike Frédéric, Emma is not ambivalent. The formal ambivalence of FIS in that novel does not mirror ambivalence in the heroine; it points, rather, to her self-deception, to her eventual education that leads her to repair her judgments, and to the reader's revolving views of her as the novel progresses. As this novel unfolds, FIS will produce an ambivalent reading of Austen's heroine who at times progresses in her education and at other time regresses. As she begins to realize her misreading, Emma's voice within FIS prompts the reader to sympathize whereas her return to misreading and to harsh judgments within FIS leads the reader to critique her. Where the dialogic discourse in *Emma* finally emerges as unison, as monologic discourse, by that novel's end, FIS in *L'Education sentimentale* remains dialogic throughout. Where

Austen's novel conveys the certainty of her narrator's authoritative voice, Flaubert's novel reveals a predilection for uncertainty and undecidability.

***

Emma Woodhouse emerges into young adulthood in Austen's novel within a stable environment cut off from the world beyond her small parish, where she espouses firm notions concerning her social position and her future. She views herself as a matchmaker. She credits herself with matching her former governess and Mr. Weston. Austen's novel opens just after this marriage takes place. Emma is characterized by resolve and persistence. She knows what she is about, what her motivations are, and what her future actions will be. Though Emma is a heroine characterized by independence and decisiveness, she is highly self-deceived. Emma may not be ambivalent, but she is frequently wrong. She misreads herself and those around her, and though nearly every character in the novel praises her as quick, penetrating and intelligent, Emma very often requires explicit information where others are capable of making correct inferences. Austen's novel is a portrait of Emma as she comes to understand, from one misstep to the next and sometimes quite painfully, that she is not always right, and that her mistakes have detrimental consequences.

From the outset of the novel, Austen's narrator prompts an ironic reading of this character. In the frequently quoted first line, we meet the heroine: "Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her" (5). This first line spells out Emma's favorable surface qualities and places her before the reader in a privileged milieu, but it concurrently casts a strong shadow over those qualities. The "alloy" to this description of Emma's perfect life is the word "seemed." Emma "*seemed* to unite some of the best blessings of existence"; in fact she does not (5). As the only qualifier among the many enviable

qualities attributed to Emma, "seemed" takes a privileged role in this sentence and points to negative character traits lurking behind her beauty, wit, and wealth. Austen's narrator pursues this tongue-in-cheek manner throughout the novel, calling attention to Emma's errors and faults by appearing to highlight her attributes. Austen carves a space between the narrator and the character so that the two, though they at times employ very similar language and adopt similar views, are not confused. Later on this first page, Austen's narrator further specifies Emma's character; she has "rather too much her own way," and she thinks "a little too well of herself" (5). Though these descriptions are mitigated by "rather" and "a little," the meaning is clear. Emma is spoiled and conceited, but the narrator refrains from explicit judgment, favoring mild reproaches communicated with indulgence.

The first line of the novel brings to focus the counteractive or corrective role of the narrator's voice. Throughout the novel, Emma believes she is well intentioned, she believes she interprets the behavior of those around her correctly, and most importantly, she believes she knows herself. The continuous presence of the narrator's voice, however, indicates where Emma goes wrong. Austen's use of FIS couples Emma's perspective with that of the narrator, and this allows the reader to experience the two frequently oppositional points of view at once. Though this narrator is not a participant in the plot, the narrator remains a fixed presence throughout the novel, behaving as a model for the reader. As Daniel Gunn suggests, FIS in Austen's novel "foreground[s] the author's exercise of control through the narrator whose intonations and inflections shape our response to the represented figural speech and thought" (43). Austen's narrator is a normalizing presence for the reader, functioning as an ideal of correct reading against which to judge Emma and the myriad characters of Emma's world.

From the extended first episode of this novel involving Emma's plan for Harriet's marriage to the scenes toward the novel's close in which Emma finally realizes her feelings for Mr. Knightly,

Austen's use of FIS shifts and alters the reader's perception of Emma. The stance of the narrator and the reader toward this character changes according to Emma's various actions and meditations, and according to her progressive education as a reader. Because she is a poor reader, Emma's thoughts, combined with the narrator's discourse in FIS, provoke an ironic reading, but as she begins to recognize her errors, her readings of herself and others improve and engender sympathy. Emma's education proceeds in fits and starts so that the reader continually revises and shifts her interpretations of this character. The result of FIS in *Emma* is an ambivalent reading of this character. Though Austen's reader will witness her improvements, false starts and relapses will litter her path.

Ian Watt describes Jane Austen in his *The Rise of the Novel* as one of the earliest English novelists to make use of a non-participating, third-person narrator: "[Austen] dispensed with the participating narrator whether as the author of a memoir as in Defoe, or as a letter writer in Richardson, probably because both of these roles make freedom to comment and evaluate more difficult to arrange; instead she told her stories after Fielding's manner, as a confessed author" (296-297). Austen's emergence in the development of the English novel marks a moment when distinct novelistic forms converge. Watt goes on to describe that though Austen "dispenses with" Defoe and Richardon's first-person narratives, she does not thereby lose the proximity their novels offer to the minds of their characters (297). Austen creates a narrator who is personally uninvolved in the plot, who can at times comment detachedly on the action and who nonetheless provides inner views of her characters. Austen's use of FIS plays a crucial role in maintaining this proximity and in creating the narrator's relationship to Emma.

Drawing upon Watt's remarks, Dorrit Cohn demonstrates in *Transparent Minds* that Austen's fiction and FIS, or "narrated monologue" as she names it, emerge together in the development of the novel:

> … [narrated monologue] makes its appearance rather late in the history of narrative genres. Its growth is also closely tied to a specific moment in the novel's development: the moment when third-person fiction enters the domain previously reserved for first-person (epistolary or confessional) fiction, and begins to focus on the mental and emotional life of its characters. It is not at all surprising, then, that Jane Austen should have been one of the first writers to use the narrated monologue frequently and extensively. (112-113)

As Watt and Cohn show, Austen's novels espouse qualities typical of both first-person and third-person narratives. Austen draws upon the proximity to the mind of the character typical of epistolary novels, but she achieves that proximity, in part, using FIS rather than employing a first-person narrator. Cohn further specifies Austen's position in the development of the novel and places that position in light of her perspectival choices: "in her narrated monologues Austen seems precisely to cast the spirit of epistolary fiction into the mould of third-person narration" (113). Austen's narrative is largely focalized through Emma's mind, and because the use of FIS renders point of view ambiguous, Emma often appears to recount her own story. Her voice and that of the narrator are at times difficult to distinguish. This is especially true during those moments later in the novel when Emma's views coincide with those of the narrator. Emma's internal assessments of the snobby and unpleasant woman whom Mr. Elton marries, for example, are heartily approved of by the narrator who, in these scenes, presents Emma's own perspective on Mrs. Elton as the model for the reader. Even in this example, however, the narrator does not leave the image of Emma's mind entirely free from irony. Much of the internal criticisms and assessments Emma makes of Mrs. Elton – she is haughty and presumptuous as well as arrogant – apply also to herself, and it is the irony born of Austen's FIS that draws out this assessment of Emma.

Austen's narrator straddles the line between impartiality and involvement; as neither an internal character nor a letter writer, this extradiegetic narrator stands apart from the unfolding of the plot and often behaves as an objective reporter, at times allowing Emma's point of view full reign. On the other hand, this narrator functions as an example of correct reading and of correct opinions, and in this way, erects a hierarchy of readings in the world of the novel. Austen's reader imbibes the standards set by the narrator who judges Emma and indirectly comments on her actions and her opinions. Two important hallmarks of this narrator, and of characters such as Mr. Knightly and Mrs. Weston whom Austen places at the top of her hierarchy alongside of her narrator, are generosity and tolerance, and the narrator's censure of Emma is never direct and never severe. Instead, Austen conveys the narrator's disapproval of Emma by prompting ironic readings of Emma's reactions to herself and others.

Austen devotes the first quarter of the novel to Emma's relationship with Harriet Smith, to her desire to educate and assist Harriet, and finally to her attempt to match Harriet with Mr. Elton. This episode inaugurates the pattern that Austen pursues in the novel: Emma begins confident and sure of herself and of her good intentions, various factors attest to Emma's insight and others produce skepticism, and finally the truth of the matter, the opposite of Emma's planned goal or her belief, is brought forcibly to the surface. Emma repeatedly orchestrates events to move her match-making narratives forward only to learn that her first impressions, her intentions, and her assessments are wrong, and she is forced to turn back and recognize her many mistakes along the way. The Harriet episode illustrates the varied uses and effects of FIS in Austen. In *Emma*, this narrative mode will continuously push and pull the reader in different directions vis-à-vis the protagonist, at times prompting an ironic reading of the character, at times lending greater sympathy to her situation.

In this first extended episode of the novel, Austen insists on Emma's arrogance. When she meets Harriet Smith for the first time, among a number of guests invited to her home, Emma considers primarily the ways in which Harriet flatters her vanity:

> She was not struck by any thing remarkably clever in Miss Smith's conversation, but she found her altogether engaging – not inconveniently shy, not unwilling to talk – and yet so far from pushing, shewing so proper and becoming a deference, seeming so pleasantly grateful for being admitted to Hartfield, and so artlessly impressed by the appearance of every thing in so superior a style to what she had been used to, that she must have good sense and deserve encouragement. Encouragement should be given. (23)

Emma responds favorably to Harriet because she is not "remarkably clever"; she converses without reserve, but she does so in a manner revealing her awareness that she counts for less on the social scale – she shows "so proper and becoming a deference" (23). Emma appreciates compliments to her home, and Harriet offers these to an appropriate degree. For these reasons, Emma befriends this young girl. The relationship grows from Emma's vanity. The irony of this passage lies in the combination of Emma's misguided perspective with the narrator's discourse. Austen schools her reader to privilege the narrator's outlook as a model of correct reading, and though the above passage retains numerous aspects of the narrator's discourse, the justifications for befriending Harriet Smith belong to Emma and are not such as this narrator would approve of. The presence of the narrator's voice together with Emma's in this passage uncovers not Harriet Smith's behavior and personality, which seem at first glance to be the topic, but Emma's snobbery, her selfish motivations and finally her self-deception.

Many of the phrases in this passage, their construction and their words, belong to Emma's mind though they are embedded in the narrator's report. Emma's first impressions of Harriet find her "altogether engaging – not inconveniently shy – not unwilling to talk ..." (23). The double-negatives placed in succession indicate Emma's running internal assessment of Harriet, an assessment that must run continuously and include more than the narrator provides, as if Emma ticks off the positive

features of Harriet's company. Austen invokes Emma's voice in this passage with the repeated use of the intensifier "so"; Harriet is "so far from pushing," "shewing so proper and becoming a deference," "so pleasantly grateful," and "so artlessly impressed" (23). More informal than other intensifiers such as "quite" or "very," "so" points to speech or thought rather than written discourse, and the adverbs paired with it, "remarkably," artlessly," and "pleasantly" ring distinctly as Emma's evaluative discourse. This evidence of Emma's thoughts within the narration, the image of her mind within this use of FIS displays a focus on herself even as she reads others. She picks Harriet because in comparison she, Emma, is highly educated, more elegant, and more privileged; Harriet's company will reinforce Emma's own high position and accomplish very little for Harriet. Only much later in the novel will Emma admit to herself that she does not befriend the very accomplished Jane Fairfax, Emma's equal in maturity and wit, because this would damage her pride.

Except perhaps the final two lines of the passage, "she must have good sense and deserve encouragement. Encouragement should be given," this paragraph assessing Harriet, focalized through Emma's perspective, does not precisely or immediately strike as FIS (23). The exclamatory punctuation which typically accompanies Austen's use of FIS is absent; none of these phrases are unquestionably Emma's thoughts, nearly verbatim save for the narrator's person and tense, but FIS encompasses gradations of proximity to the mind of the focalized character at times comprising whole sentences, at times short phrases or single words.

In his seminal essay, "Narrative and Dialogue in Jane Austen," Graham Hough defines five types of discourse in *Emma*. They are: "the authorial voice," "objective narrative," "coloured narrative," "free indirect style" and "direct speech and dialogue" (204-205). Coloured narrative, Hough explains, "hovers between impersonal narration and virtual quotation from Emma's interior monologue ... there is a considerable range in this type of discourse. Sometimes it is almost

indistinguishable from objective narrative, sometimes it shades into the next, more deeply coloured type, the free indirect style" (205). Hough suggests that "coloured narrative" encompasses a continuum from very little coloured to highly coloured, and at one extreme end lies FIS. Invoking a technical, linguistic definition, Hough explains that FIS "occurs ... when the actual mode of expression, the *ipissima verba*, of a fictional character are used, but embedded in the narrative, and with the grammatical forms assimilated to those of reported speech" (205). Hough notes that FIS as such occurs infrequently in *Emma*; coloured narrative, on the other hand, takes up large portions of the novel. These two types of discourse meet with similar results; they indicate a formal ambivalence within the narration, a double-voiced uncertainty in the language itself. Within "coloured narration" and FIS the space between the narrator and the character is erased and the two juxtaposed voices speak together, forming ambivalent narration that finally belongs to neither. The irony resulting from the combination of Emma's and the narrator's voice is achieved in this passage containing Emma's reading of Harriet with the insertion of only a few of Emma's words, "so" and a string of adverbs, within the narrator's discourse to describe Harriet. Austen will also use entire sentences belonging to Emma and produce similarly ironic readings. As dialogic constructions then, Hough's coloured narration" as well as his "free indirect style" fall under the rubric of our FIS.

Hough concludes his discussion of the five levels of discourse in *Emma* with the following assessment; "The characters we are to approve assimilate their speech to the objective narrative, and do so most completely when we most approve of them. In proportion as the characters diverge from this norm they are ridiculous or bad. The objective narrative sets the standard by which all the rest is measured" (220). As we will see, when the novel approaches its end, Emma's speech, her thoughts and the image of her mind portrayed in FIS approach that of the "objective narrative," the "uncoloured ... voice of the narrator" (204). She learns to think and behave more like the narrator,

refraining from snobbery and explicit censure, and appreciating the appropriate connections between people of mutual attraction and social status. When Emma reaches this point, the irony thus far proliferating, diminishes dramatically.

Following her introduction to and her developing relationship with Harriet, Emma quickly begins to act as Harriet's mentor, and her first order of business is to ensure Harriet's continued place within Emma's exclusive social circle. When Emma learns of Harriet's attachment to the young farmer, Robert Martin, she exerts all her influence to remove Harriet from Martin's circle. An accidental meeting with Martin and his proposal of marriage to Harriet bring Emma's negative qualities immediately to view. Emma puts a stop to this well-matched couple by convincing Harriet of the Martin family's less than desirable social status. Emma's first error of matchmaking is her attempt to connect Harriet with the local clergyman, Mr. Elton, a young man of some fortune, a frequent and welcomed visitor to Hartfield, Emma's home, and a person of whom all speak favorably. Mr. Elton conspicuously establishes himself as a friend to Emma and Harriet, his behavior is unmistakably gallant, and he produces a charade, a poem based around the word "courtship," as a contribution to Harriet's collection. Very quickly Emma and Harriet become increasingly convinced of Mr. Elton's attachment to Harriet. The novel is focalized through Emma's point of view, so the reader also comes to read Mr. Elton as she reads him. Emma creates situations that bear out her opinions. The narrator provides hints throughout the episode that produce occasional skepticism, but as this is Emma's first error of misreading, the reader essentially misreads along with her.

In a quite telling paragraph, the narrator appears to espouse Emma's position thereby rendering it credible. In a scene midway through his courtship, Mr. Elton meets the two women by chance on their return to Hartfield, a return that takes them by his home on foot. Mr. Elton offers to

see the two women back, and halfway into the journey, Emma feigns a need to repair her shoe laces. What begins as a pretext to remove herself temporarily transforms into a request to stop in at Mr. Elton's house to repair the torn lace. Emma takes her time, allowing her two subjects ample occasion alone; as she returns to them, we find the following passage:

> The lovers were standing together at one end of the windows. It had a most favorable aspect; and, for half a minute, Emma felt the glory of having schemed successfully. But it would not do; he had not come to the point. He had been most agreeable, most delightful; he had told Harriet that he had seen them go by, and had purposely followed them; other little gallantries and allusions had been dropped, but nothing serious. (90)

This passage begins by describing Harriet and Mr. Elton as "lovers." This places the passage within Emma's mind, Emma's opinion, but the narration emerges within the narrator's third-person perspective. The verb tense and the descriptive nature of the first line of the passage characterize it as belonging to an external narrator and not to a character. The narrator appears, in the first line of the passage, then, to refer to Harriet and Mr. Elton as "lovers," and this reinforces Emma's own belief. It appears as if the narrator and not Emma names the two as lovers. Immediately thereafter, the image of Harriet and Mr. Elton, alone together by a window is described as "most favorable," and this judgment, though also narrated in the third-person, belies Emma's, and not the narrator's, belief that this couple embarks on a progression which will result in marriage. This example presents the opinion of the character in the voice of the narrator, and here those two voices are difficult to distinguish, as only a small portion of the sentence belongs to Emma. In this particular example, FIS appears to render Emma's opinion plausible. Austen sets a trap for the reader, as it were. Believing the third-person narrator, the reader is liable to fall into Emma's error.

The "coloured narrative" of this scene - the narrator's discourse becomes "coloured" by Emma's perspective in the use of the word "lovers" - reinforces Emma's view of Harriet and Mr. Elton as lovers. Austen's subsequent use of FIS, however, injects the scene with skepticism. The

third sentence of the above-cited passage presents the most recognizable and strongest example of FIS, "But it would not do; he had not come to the point" (90). This line, again, retaining the tense and person of the third-person narrator, contains a judgment that can only belong to Emma; besides Harriet, she alone believes that there is a "point" to come to between Mr. Elton and her friend. Only Emma believes that a declaration to Harriet is imminent, and the frustrated impatience evidenced by these words points to Emma's levity vis-à-vis her friend's prospects. The proofs of love for Harriet thus far emerging from Mr. Elton's behavior and words could just as well point to Emma, and the narrator provides strong hints that should render the reader suspicious. These hints gain strength as the narrative moves closer to Mr. Elton's eventual declaration to Emma.

Austen brings her reader very close to Emma's thoughts in this line. Change the wording only a bit, change the verb tense, and one imagines these precise words passing through Emma's thoughts, "But this won't do; he hasn't come to the point." Austen refrains from quoting Emma's thoughts here. Instead, the dialogic discourse creates an image, a representation of Emma's thought, which retains the control of the narrator and introduces ambivalence into the scene. Participating within this representation of Emma's mind, the narrator presents the character's internal discourse ironically and thereby reveals Emma's thoughts while watching her missteps and her misreading. Knowing better than Emma but retaining her language, the narrator's presence brings the reader into greater complicity with the narrator and infuses the latter portion of the scene with uncertainty, sidestepping Emma's focus on Harriet and Mr. Elton in favor of the narrator's focus on Emma's possible misreading. Austen's FIS communicates doubt. Perhaps Mr. Elton has not come to the point because there is no point to come to between him and Harriet. Perhaps his delighted and eager response to Emma's need to visit his home and repair her shoe indicates his feelings for her rather than for Harriet. FIS in this line brings the reader into collusion with the narrator; these combined

voices render the reader more aware, more knowledgeable than Emma and ultimately point to her self-deception.

There is a kinetic process in reading dual-voiced or dialogic narration: the reader swings ambivalently between the two voices. Emma believes that Mr. Elton courts Harriet, and her perspective is one of conviction; she intentionally leaves the two alone, and when she overhears the nature of their conversation - he tells Harriet some insignificant details about a party the evening before - she decides that though they are on the right course, he has not yet come to the point. Things are not moving along fast enough for Emma's satisfaction. This is Emma's perspective, and the reader moves from this to the narrator, present in the same moment, whose position as an astute reader throws a cloud of skepticism over the entire scene. The presence of Emma's opinion inserted within the narrator's description in the initial line of the passage lends credibility to that view because the narrator appears to espouse it; Austen encourages a reading that coincides with Emma's interpretation. The subsequent instance of FIS in the above passage creates skepticism, removing this credibility. As a more careful reader, Austen's narrator would not venture to characterize Harriet and Mr. Elton so quickly and definitively as does Emma; mingled with Emma's voice, then, the narrator calls attention to the heroine's misperceptions, her over-hasty conclusions.

After the subsequent episodes involving Mr. Elton's effusive appreciation for Emma's portrait of Harriet and his easy acceptance of Harriet's illness and absence from the Weston's Christmas Eve dinner party, Mr. Elton finally makes his declaration to Emma. He seizes the opportunity of a carriage ride alone with Emma to proclaim his love and offer himself to her in marriage. Both characters are equally struck when they come to realize what the other suggests. Mr. Elton objects to the mention of Harriet, and Emma fumes that he would deign to consider himself her equal. After the initial shock has passed and both parties have taken grave offence, they separate

abruptly, and, once home, Emma considers the arc of events leading up to just this moment and her own inability to anticipate what had just occurred. Again using FIS, Austen displays an image of Emma's mind, an image that, in a push-pull manner, lends credibility to her reading, creating sympathy for the character *and* renders that reading suspect, highlighting Emma's arrogance and her continuing misreading:

> How could she have been so deceived! - He protested that he had never thought seriously of Harriet - never! She looked back as well as she could; but it was all confusion. She had taken up the idea, she supposed, and made everything bend to it. His manners, however, must have been unmarked, wavering, dubious, or she could not have been so misled.
>
> The picture! - How eager he had been about the picture! - and the charade! - and a hundred other circumstances; - how clearly they had seemed to point at Harriet! To be sure, the charade, with its "ready wit" – but then, the "soft eyes" – in fact it suited neither; it was a jumble without taste or truth. Who could have seen through such thick headed nonsense? (134)

Emma's voice is unmistakable in the first line, "how could she have been so deceived!" The tone of self-reproach, the surprise and confusion, and finally the exclamatory ending place this line very close to what might pass through Emma's mind after such a shock. This instance of FIS decreases the space between Emma and the narrator essentially removing, for a moment, the narrator's ironic or corrective view of the character. Admitting her role in this turn of events, her mistakes and her errors, Emma becomes, for a moment, a better reader, and when she allows that "she had taken up the idea, she supposed, and made everything bend to it," her voice closely mirrors that of the narrator (134). Emma begins to recognize that she had misread Mr. Elton.

Though Emma admits her error of misreading, she quickly appends this admission by blaming what she sees as Mr. Elton's own errors, his "dubious" behavior and his poor writing. This second paragraph in which Emma runs down Mr. Elton's various behaviors and gifts which she misinterprets – his praise of her portrait of Harriet, the charade he writes attesting to his "courtship," "and a hundred other circumstances" - finally distances Emma's voice from the narrator's,

reinscribing the scene with irony because she so quickly follows up her admission of guilt by blaming Mr. Elton (134). The FIS of the first line of this passage brings the narrator and the reader into sympathy with Emma because her voice comes to mirror the narrator; the second instance ends on an ironic note because it underscores Emma's continued self-deception and arrogance, her continued inability to read the people around her. This passage in particular illustrates the revolving positions the novel prompts the reader to take toward Emma. From one line to the next this character swings from progressing in her education and becoming a better reader to returning to her bad habits of misreading, of ungenerously blaming others, and of minimizing her own fault. The character's own internal swinging represented in FIS prompts an ambivalent move on the part of the reader who now sympathizes, now criticizes.

In *Transparent Minds*, Cohn underscores this dual effect of FIS. She explains how this style renders the narrator's view of the character either ironic or sympathetic:

> ... no matter how "impersonal" the tone of the text that surrounds them, narrated monologues tend to commit the narrator to attitudes of sympathy or irony. Precisely because they cast the language of a subjective mind into the grammar of objective narration, they amplify emotional notes, but also throw into ironic relief all false notes struck by the figural mind. (117)

In the example above, Austen's narrator swings back and forth between both attitudes toward the character, and this engenders a parallel swinging of the reader's attitude. The narrator appears to sympathize with Emma's self-questioning, her shock and her return to the events that led her astray. By the latter portion of the passage, by the time she begins blaming Mr. Elton's behavior, which "must have been unmarked, wavering, dubious" and critiquing his charade as "thick-headed nonsense," the narrator turns toward viewing this character ironically (134). In *Emma*, this movement within FIS between sympathy and irony will finally end when Emma learns to be a better reader and when she learns to view others with indulgence.

In part because the narrator, naming Mr. Elton and Harriet "lovers" in the earlier cited scene, appears to espouse Emma's opinions, Austen creates the possibility of a reader who is now just as surprised as Emma and who returns, with her, to these previous episodes to locate the mistakes, misreading, and wrong turns. With Emma, the reader revisits the train of events that led to the belief that Mr. Elton loved Harriet, the tokens that seemed to point toward her rather than someone else. As Emma learns to read more accurately, Austen's reader learns to be more critical of Emma.

Very shortly after the above passage, Emma acknowledges Mr. Elton's "unnecessarily gallant" behavior toward herself during his apparent courtship of Harriet, behavior that she misread at the time. She acknowledges the more astute penetration of the Knightly brothers into Mr. Elton's character and his intentions; together they saw that he would not marry imprudently and that he seemed to favor Emma as his "object." Emma places herself again on the path toward becoming a better reader by admitting that others read Mr. Elton accurately. Austen's next use of FIS, however, returns to a highly ironic and critical reading of Emma:

> But, - that he should talk of encouragement, should consider her as aware of his views, accepting his attentions, meaning (in short), to marry him! – should suppose himself her equal in connection or mind! – look down upon her friend, so well understanding the gradations of rank below him, and be so blind to what rose above, as to fancy himself showing no presumption in addressing her! – It was most provoking. (135-136)

Emma places herself far above Mr. Elton just as she criticizes him for feeling himself high above Harriet. The image of Emma's mind is here an ironic one; Emma easily recognizes Mr. Elton's misjudgment of his position because that misjudgment would place him as her equal, but she cannot recognize that, by so resolutely placing him on a level below her, she behaves no differently than he. "That he ... should suppose himself her equal in connection or mind!" expresses the outrage of Emma's wounded pride, but it does so in the language of the narrator, rendering that outrage ironic. The dialogic nature of FIS here produces a highly ironic reading of Emma's internal discourse

because this anger is incompatible with the norms of the narrator whose voice nonetheless contributes to its expression. Austen further punctuates this irony with the final sentence of the passage: "-it was most provoking!" (136). This short sentence following numerous exclamatory remarks which give voice to Emma's anger and offence, finally remains ambiguous. Emerging in part from Emma's point of view, as do the previous sentences, this phrase refers to Mr. Elton's behavior, his matrimonial aspirations, which Emma cannot tolerate; coming from the narrator's point of view, however, this phrase refers to Emma's own behavior and attitudes within the preceding lines, her failure as a reader and her own hypocrisy.

Throughout this entire episode beginning with Emma's desire to find a wife for Mr. Elton at the opening of the novel and his final declaration of love for her rather than for Harriet, Austen applies FIS, and the reading of this dual-voiced mode alters sometimes profoundly depending on the context. When she uses FIS to create an image of Emma mentally chastising herself for misreading, Austen builds sympathy for this character because this mode brings the experience of the reader very close to Emma's and the narrator's. Austen creates a strong bond between the reader and the character by representing Emma's thoughts in FIS while she realizes her own blindness and her culpability vis-à-vis Harriet. When, however, this mode displays an image of Emma's mind as she takes offense at Mr. Elton's proposal, her thoughts are displayed ironically because she criticizes Mr. Elton for behaving as she also behaves. The narrator and the reader see through Emma's blindness whereas she herself does not. Austen's various uses of FIS in this episode result in a revolving reading of Emma.

As this is the first error of misreading brought forcibly to Emma's own attention, it is also the first brought to the attention of the reader. After this, the reader cannot help but view Emma's interpretations skeptically. When Jane Fairfax receives an extravagant gift, a piano from an unnamed

sender, for example, Emma suspects that Mr. Dixon, the new husband of Jane's close friend, gave it to her as a token of unrequited love for the woman he would have preferred to marry. Emma's reading of Jane's situation, her recent long stay at Highbury and her mysterious gift rings false because she assumes the worst, gravitating toward a reading that revels in Jane's misfortunes rather than viewing Jane's situation with sympathy and with charity, as the narrator would do. Likewise, Emma's view of the level and depth of her interest in Frank Churchill remains too cool, too rational; she reads her own love affair poorly and skepticism proliferates. When Emma concludes that she "shall have been let off easily" from her love for Frank after she imagines refusing his proposal and saving herself from having been "more deeply involved," the narrator views her ironically but - and this is important - does not find fault with her (265). The unfolding plot between Emma, Frank Churchill, and Jane Fairfax begins with an ironic and critical image of Emma who is just as self-deceived here as she is with Mr. Elton and Harriet. By the time this plot advances towards the final revelation of Frank and Jane's secret relationship, however, Austen alters her presentation of Emma. Emma begins to judge Frank as Mr. Knightly judges him and, significantly, as the narrator implicitly judges him as well. While still considering whether she loves him, Emma assesses Frank in this way, "His feelings are warm, but I can imagine them rather changeable" (265). Here Emma reads Frank well. Much of his behavior points toward just such changeability, and even though a portion of her mind continues to assert Frank's great love for her, Emma begins to take on a clear-sightedness hitherto lacking, a clear-sightedness that will eventually lead her discourse to resemble that of the narrator.

The most striking and continued usage of FIS in *Emma* occurs toward the end of the novel, during the moment in which Emma finally realizes her love for Mr. Knightly. Here, Emma recognizes all of her errors and misinterpretations, and she fears that her future happiness is lost.

Emma has already begun to repair her faults, faults that Mr. Knightly brings to her attention, and the narrator to the reader's. More so than an ironic rendering of Emma's mind, these large blocks of FIS late in the novel strengthen the sympathy for this character who begins more and more to resemble the narrator by refraining from explicit and cruel judgment, favoring instead kindness and indulgence.

In *The Rhetoric of Fiction* Wayne Booth characterizes Emma as an essentially unsympathetic character whom Austen has the challenge of depicting in a favorable light. "Though Emma's faults are comic," Booth writes, "they constantly threaten to produce serious harm. Yet she must remain sympathetic or the reader will not wish for and delight sufficiently in her reform" (244). Booth continues, "The solution to the problem of maintaining sympathy despite almost crippling faults was primarily to use the heroine herself as a kind of narrator, though in the third person, reporting on her own experience" (245). Though he never employs the term "free indirect style," Booth's description here closely mirrors its effect in Austen's fiction. Emma is "a kind of narrator ... in the third person." The third-person narrative voice frequently emerges together with Emma's own consciousness in FIS, and especially toward the end of the novel, Emma's consciousness, as rendered through FIS, creates an indulgent and sympathetic reading of the character. Emma's rude comment to Miss Bates on Box Hill, for example, would greatly lower her in the reader's mind were it not for the access Austen provides to Emma's subsequent self-chastising thoughts. Emma humiliates the innocuous Miss Bates, alluding to that character's voluminous and "dull" chatter during a well-attended picnic, and though the joke earns her a laugh from Frank Churchill, the rest of the party quickly disperses. Mr. Knightly, the novel's internal representation of the narrator's external corrections to Emma's perspective, rebukes the heroine, and the direct, quoted thoughts and the image of Emma's mind in FIS that Austen provides when Emma considers her actions give the reader a renewed sense of

sympathy as this character admits her fault and vows to repair her mistake. In the scene quite late in the novel in which Emma recognizes her feelings toward Mr. Knightly the narrator has prepared the reader to feel sympathy for Emma because her mind has been slowly venturing in the direction of the "objective narrative's" perspective. Emma becomes a better reader as the novel progresses, and here she finally understands what the narrator has always understood: she and Mr. Knightly should marry.

Emma's final realization begins during a conversation with Harriet, a conversation in which Emma at last does not allow for the possibility of misreading. After having been swayed by Emma's belief concerning Mr. Elton's intentions, Harriet now believes she has a reason not to mourn the loss of her earlier infatuation. In a series of misinterpreted conversations after which Emma believes that Harriet loves Frank Churchill, she finally understands that Harriet is in love with Mr. Knightly. More shocking to Emma than this is Harriet's evidence attesting to Mr. Knightly's reciprocation of her feelings. Very shortly after Emma learns this we read the following lines, "Why was it so much worse that Harriet should be in love with Mr. Knightly than with Frank Churchill? Why was the evil so dreadfully increased by Harriet's having some hope of a return? It darted through her with the speed of an arrow that Mr. Knightly must marry no one but herself!" (408). Emma discovers that she is in love with Mr. Knightly when the possibility emerges of a Mrs. Knightly who is not herself. Immediately following this realization the reader remains yoked to Emma's mind as she ventures back in her memories through her feelings for Frank Churchill, Harriet's affections for Mr. Martin and for Mr. Elton, her own promotion of Harriet's entitlement to a marriage with a man of consequence, and Mr. Knightly's cautionary advice and rebukes throughout. Emma admits to herself that Harriet may be correct in her reading of Mr. Knightly's behavior; she knows him to be "'…the

last man in the world, who would intentionally give any woman the idea of his feeling for her any more than he really does,'" and she is miserable (411).

Within a space of six or seven pages, the narration does not veer away from Emma's troubled mind, but during this time, Austen does not fully envelope the narrative with her thoughts. The extended examples of FIS during these pages behave as internal monologue, drawing the reader ever closer to Emma's mind, though Austen provides few quoted thoughts. The narrator never entirely places the narrative in the mind of the character. Though seemingly behind the scene and not participating, the narrator remains a strong presence:

> Every moment had brought a fresh surprise; and every surprise must be matter of humiliation to her. How to understand it all! How to understand the deceptions she had been thus practicing on herself, and living under! The blunders, the blindness of her own head and heart! She sat still, she walked about, she tried her own room, she tried the shrubbery – in every place, every posture, she perceived that she had acted most weakly; that she had been imposed on by others in a most mortifying degree; that she had been imposing on herself in a degree yet more mortifying; that she was wretched, and should probably find this day but the beginning of wretchedness. (411-412)

In this passage, Emma suffers greatly, and gone is the irony typical of earlier instances of FIS. The paragraph begins with narratorial commentary; this commentary places the scene over a stretch of time and gives a sense of the frenzied flow of Emma's thoughts. Where the narrator reports the tone of her emotional state in the initial sentence of the paragraph, the next two offer a representation of Emma's mind. Without pause or introduction Austen moves to FIS, and the narrator takes on Emma's thoughts: "How to understand it all! How to understand the deceptions she had been thus practicing on herself, and living under!..." (357). This moment of FIS brings Emma's perspective into line with that of the narrator. She sees her self-deceit, she is desperate, and she finally understands where she went wrong; she understands that she has misread, and she ceases blaming others.

The final clauses of the last sentence, though they are not punctuated as exclamations as are the previous two, also fit closely together with these as residing within Emma's mind: "she had been imposed on by others in a most mortifying degree; that she had been imposing on herself in a degree yet more mortifying; that she was wretched, and should probably find this day but the beginning of wretchedness" (357). This passage, with its moments of FIS and its description of Emma pacing and anxious no matter where she resides, creates a strong image of her as changed, reformed. She understands her faults, and the representation of her mind contributes greatly to an overall sense of sympathy for her plight.

Though the narration remains in the tense and person of the narrator, it belongs also to Emma's mind. She is here "a kind of narrator in the third person" (Booth, 245). Austen's use of FIS conveys a very strong sense of Emma's state of mind, her frenzied confusion and self-reproach without plunging the narration entirely into her thoughts. Though this paragraph leaves the reader with an unmistakable sense of Emma's panic, it does not do so by relating the onslaught of thoughts that must surely be coming at her from many angles at once. FIS here produces a view of Emma's mind without leaving the narration wholly at sea within her thoughts. This mode acts, then, as an ordering screen between the mind of the character and the reader whereby the reader feels the security of the narrator's voice amidst the panic and confusion that must be Emma's mind.

In his study on style, Norman Page makes the following claim about the "free indirect mode" in Austen's novels: "For Jane Austen, this is perhaps the supreme virtue of free indirect speech: that it offers the possibility of achieving something of the vividness of speech without the appearance for a moment of a total silencing of the authorial voice" (134). Though Page's remarks with respect to Austen deal with FIS in speech exclusively, his point is not without application to FIS as it relates to the portrayal of thoughts. When Emma discovers her love for Knightly in that flash, her thoughts

immediately take on a very quick pace as they wander back through her memories all the while searching desperately for a future solution. Without quoting what Emma's thoughts might be in just that moment, Austen conveys the immediacy of her character's panic and her hope without succumbing to Emma's inner voice *and* without tempering the emotions by relating them wholly in the voice of the narrator.

The shifting or revolving presence of irony and sympathy inherent in Austen's use of FIS style places the reader in an ambivalent position vis-à-vis Emma as the novel progresses. We witness Emma's terrible blunders, her misreadings and self-deceit, her vanity, her arrogance and her cruelty to Harriet, to Miss Bates and to Jane Fairfax; the tongue-in-cheek irony and skepticism that proliferates during these moments of FIS point to Emma's flaws. Like Austen's narrator, the reader does not condemn Emma, however, because Austen also allows us an image of her mind engaging in self-reproach and finally in more accurate reading of herself and of those around her. Austen's narrative voice, with its fixed world view and its authoritative perspective on Emma creates a dialogue within FIS in which Emma's voice varies as she learns to be a better reader while the voice of the narrator remains constant. Ambivalence in *Emma* is chiefly a formal feature characteristic of Austen's style, and though it does not affect the protagonist who does not exhibit ambivalence or hesitation and whose voice finally merges in concert with that of the narrator, the reader is not immune to the effects of the formal indecision inherent in the dual-voiced nature of FIS. Throughout, the narration vacillates between ironic and sympathetic views of this character based on Emma's proximity to and distance from the narrator's voice and perspective. As Emma's education reaches a high point by the novel's end, as she learns to be a better, more indulgent reader, the narrator's portrayal of her also reaches a summit, and Austen leaves aside the novel's long-standing irony. Emma ends by embracing the norms of the narrator, and the story ends happily. Emma has

reached a high point in her education as a reader, and the novel loses its stylistic ambivalence. Flaubert's novel, in large part also an education in reading, with its extensive use of FIS as a stylistic device that mirrors the psychological ambivalence of the character, continues in a dialogic, formally ambivalent mode throughout. While the narration in *Emma* gradually but steadily moves toward monologic discourse that privileges the authoritative language of the narrator, as we will see, Flaubert's novel, and the novel's narration, is highly distrustful of certainty and unequivocal readings.

***

In a brief discussion of Flaubert in *S/Z*, differentiating Flaubert's from "classic writing" Roland Barthes writes:

> Flaubert, cependant (on l'a déjà suggéré), en maniant une ironie frappée d'incertitude, opère un malaise salutaire de l'écriture: il n'arrête pas le jeu des codes (ou l'arrête mal), en sorte que (c'est là sans doute la *preuve* de l'écriture) *on ne sait jamais s'il est responsable de ce qu'il écrit* (s'il y a un sujet *derrière* son langage); car l'être de l'écriture (le sens du travail qui la constitue) est d'empêcher de jamais répondre à cette question: *Qui parle?* (140, emphasis original)

Flaubert's desire to achieve a level of impersonality whereby the author in his novel is "everywhere felt, but never seen" undoubtedly contributes to this inability to definitively answer the question Barthes raises. *L'Education sentimentale* is a novel that resists fixed agency; the strong presence of uncertainty and ambiguity noted by many critics in Flaubert's novels tends to push responsibility back, and his impersonal narrator provides the novel with little moral grounding. Austen's narrator in *Emma* exerts continuous control over the narrative, shaping the reader's perceptions and reactions, and in that novel, uncertainty and ambivalence are the result of Emma's own changing internal voice as she learns, through fits and starts, to be a better reader and, by extension, a more sympathetic character. Clarifying Flaubert's impersonality, Jonathan Culler notes,

> Flaubert's much discussed 'impersonality' has relatively little to do with the expression of opinions or judgments ... The language of the text will organize the world, select details, offer judgments, shift its perspectives, adopt momentarily various modes of discourse and types of speech that can be identified, but it does not create for us a personality whom we feel we know. (78)

In other words, Flaubert's novel does not claim an identifiable governing principle or an ordering figure. Individual instances and scenes may produce temporary answers to the question of who speaks, but the novel overall does not appear to rest upon a guiding hand. Whereas the narrative voice in Austen's *Emma* creates "a personality whom we feel we know," a personality and a discourse that Emma comes to adopt once we reach that novel's end, Flaubert's narrator resists such identification (Culler, 78).

The inability to state who speaks is especially important with respect to the proliferation of FIS in *L'Education*. FIS presents narration that is literally tied to no one individual, that ambivalently wavers back and forth between a character and a narrator. In *Emma*, there are two distinct and identifiable voices present in Austen's use of FIS: Emma's and the narrator's. The narrator silently criticizes Emma's thoughts and actions all the while believing in her eventual education and her capacity for change; this narrator ultimately sympathizes with Emma. Flaubert's impersonal narrator, does not, in this way, take an apparent stand, for or against the character. In *L'Education sentimentale,* only one of the voices present in FIS can be linked to a characterized figure or focalizer, Frédéric's. Where the dialogue constructed within FIS in *Emma* is one between a good reader and a poor reader, so that the irony resides in the narrator's recognition of Emma's misreading; the dialogue here rests upon unclear grounds and unfixed figures. The narrative voice remains effaced, but we nonetheless register irony and ambivalence in many of Flaubert's uses of FIS.

Frédéric's romantic outlook and his passionate, far-flung dreams are all facets of the romantic readings he favors, the romantic character he imagines himself to be. Frédéric's romanticism becomes a role among many in this novel, as each of the characters materializes as a 'type' – each speaking the discourse prescribed by his/her station or occupation. In his use of FIS, Flaubert combines Frédéric's perspective with one that remains highly impersonal, and in doing so, Frédéric's perspective comes into very sharp focus. The language of Flaubert's narrator reflects a high realism, even, at times, a naturalistic bent. The naiveté and fantasy of Frédéric's vision of the world are amplified by the presence of the impersonal narrator whose seeming adoption of this perspective in FIS brings that perspective into sudden contrast with the narrator's own impersonality. By the end of the novel, Frédéric reveals his awareness of this *role* he plays as a romantic character; this is particularly the case in his final interaction with Marie Arnoux, but even when he comes into this education, this awareness, Frédéric continues to play the role.

Unlike Emma, Frédéric Moreau is an inherently indecisive character. When he can, he avoids taking action, and he alternates between political and personal positions depending on his particular company. Like Emma, he has "a disposition to think a little too well" of himself, but in doing so, Frédéric does not behave decisively or act resolutely as she so often does (Austen, 5). An important function of FIS in this novel, then, is to draw attention to Frédéric's indecision. Flaubert cultivates and perfects a narrative mode that embodies formal ambivalence, formal indecision; in this way, he produces analogous ambivalences within the overall agency of the novel and within the psyche of this particular character. We cannot say who speaks because Flaubert continuously shares his narrative voice with characters whose minds are not firm. This point demonstrates the primary difference between Austen and Flaubert's uses of FIS. FIS in both authors is dual-voiced which is to say that there are two distinct perspectives "speaking" together, but whereas Austen minimizes the

dialogic aspect of this narrative mode by using it as a means to arrive at monologic narration, Flaubert's FIS remains dialogic throughout his novel. Flaubert's FIS is not a means to an end or to a resolution, to a monologic discourse of final understanding; rather it is an end in itself, an end that points to his character's divided psyche and to the novel's view of knowledge and truth.

Frédéric's ambivalence deserves elaboration; it is not primarily indecision between this or that woman, profession, or obligation. Although Flaubert creates either/or decisions that Frédéric faces, these decisions in themselves do not render him ambivalent. Should he be a painter, a poet, a lawyer, a politician or a secretary to a banker? Should he hold out for the elegant Parisian women he frequents or should he marry the wealthy, but inelegant Louise Roque? Should he give his money to this friend or that? These decisions cause Frédéric to hesitate; he struggles with his conscience over lending 15,000 francs to Jacques Arnoux when, only the day before, he promised them to his childhood companion, Deslauriers, who hopes to start a newspaper. He hesitates over the duel he fights with Cisy. His decisions about the women in his life are never entirely final; he takes up with one, makes promises to another, and gains a foothold in the heart of a third. Frédéric's hesitations faced with such decisions draw a parallel between him and his predecessor in Flaubert's first *L'Education sentimentale*.

Written in 1845, over twenty years prior to the publication of the second version, the first *L'Education sentimental* resembles the second in its pairing of two childhood friends, Henry and Jules, whose oppositional personalities, goals, and educations mirror those of Frédéric and Charles Deslauriers. Toward the end of the first *L'Education*, Flaubert sums up both of his characters over lengthy narratorial passages, and the following description of Henry parallels the later Frédéric:

> Voilà comme il était, merveilleusement propre à accepter toutes sortes d'idées et à agir de toutes sortes de façons; il passait sans difficulté d'une opinion à une autre, d'une raison à une autre contraire, de la brune à la blonde, de l'enjouement à la mélancolie, non par scepticisme

> et par dédain, mais par une sorte de conviction tiède et d'entraînement paisible, qui le rendait dupe de lui-même tout en dupant quelquefois des autres. (261)

Flaubert renders Henry's ambivalence explicit, and he grounds this ambivalence in that character's "luke-warm convictions" (261). This description characterizes Frédéric's own surface indecision as well as his predecessor's, but the later, 1869 *L'Education* extends the scope of its protagonist's ambivalence to his final indecision vis-à-vis even his most ardent desires. In the first *L'Education*, Henry possesses his Mme Arnoux after their first meeting, and he eventually runs away with her to America finally returning her to her husband in Paris a few years later. Henry is fickle and at times quite ambivalent, but he is also capable of bold, decisive action. Frédéric's ambivalence, on the other hand, infects him to the core. This ambivalence implicates his entire view of the world and his role in the world. Frédéric's deep ambivalence paralyzes him from taking any action.

Frédéric's many decisions and his ability to espouse oppositional political and social points of view do not amount to his chief ambivalence because the eventual decisions he makes are those that serve or appear to serve his aspirations for Marie Arnoux. He fights the duel with Cisy, gives Arnoux the money, and does not marry Louise Roque. Frédéric perceives these actions as serving his hopes for Mme Arnoux. He even places his affair with Rosanette under Marie Arnoux's bidding. Frédéric's ambivalence, then, does not reside within the day-to-day decisions he struggles over and finally makes; his ambivalence resides in his competing desires for the world and the people in front of him and the impossible and idealistic world he envisions.

There are moments in which Frédéric exhibits indecision and second guessing vis-à-vis Marie Arnoux. When he rushes off to see her, alone at her husband's ceramics factory, instead of keeping an appointment with the wealthy banker Dambreuse, an appointment that would, in all probability, procure him gainful employment, Frédéric manifests a momentary doubt about his decision. During the train ride, he wonders if he hasn't made a grave mistake. The crucial

ambivalence of this episode, however, arises not from this concern over Dambreuse but rather within his oppositional desires for Mme Arnoux once faced with her. Her extreme perfection, piety, and purity - he often sees her clothes as impossibly heavy - drive his intense physical desire for possession, possession that is necessarily impossible for just the reasons propelling it. Frédéric's ambivalence, his hesitations and his indecisions reside within these oppositional desires. He envisions an idealized world that cannot correspond with the world around him. Like Flaubert's Emma Bovary, Frédéric is a romantic character inhabiting an unromantic world, but unlike her, he is not thereby driven to fatalistic actions or to bold maneuverings because he recognizes their incompatibility with the actual world he also aspires to.

Marie Arnoux functions as the driving force behind Frédéric's life; her resistances, her encouragements, and Frédéric's interpretations of her actions determine his behavior and outlook. He takes up painting and finishes his law degree with gusto because he believes they will bring him closer to her; what he perceives as her encouragement drives him forward. When she comes to his home without her husband to seek Frédéric's financial assistance in delaying M. Dambreuse's collection of a debt, his passion is renewed, and he believes their relationship must materialize soon. Frédéric pursues other women, Rosanette, Louise Roque and Madame Dambreuse, in part out of anger towards Marie Arnoux's resistance or to provoke her jealousy, and in his relationships with these women, he frequently invokes her image to bring him the pleasure they cannot supply, to inspire in him the language they wish to hear. Though he appears at times distracted from his passion for her by a desire for power or for money, Frédéric's image of her underpins the path his life takes. Three particular scenes involving Marie Arnoux are pivotal in demonstrating Frédéric's ambivalence and in displaying the effects of irony and unascribablity within FIS. The novel opens with Frédéric's initial glimpse of Marie on the riverboat leaving Paris in the first chapter, and the final episode of

part two, in which Frédéric waits for her to arrive at the room he rents while the February 1848 insurrection, commences functions as a crucial turning point. Finally, the novel's close, Marie's visit to Frédéric in her old age, reveals Frédéric's continued ambivalence together with his acute awareness of the role-playing quality of his romantic aspirations.

Flaubert begins *L'Education sentimentale* with a river voyage. Frédéric returns to his mother's home outside of Paris by boat on the Seine. The first page combines and juxtaposes the novel's primary focalizer, Frédéric, with the impersonal narrative voice. The novel begins in a very precise moment, "Le 15 septembre 1840, vers six heures du matin," and in a specific geographical space, a riverboat docked on the Seine in Paris. The second paragraph, with its string of short and swiftly moving clauses separated by semi-colons, describes the hurried activities of people boarding the boat:

> Des gens arrivaient hors d'haleine; des barriques, des câbles, des corbeilles de linge gênaient la circulation; les matelots ne répondaient à personne; on se heurtait; les colis montaient entre les deux tambours, et le tapage s'absorbait dans le bruissement de la vapeur, qui, s'échappant par des plaques de tôle, enveloppait tout d'une nuée blanchâtre, tandis que la cloche, à l'avant, tintait sans discontinuer. (19)

The vision behind this long sentence conveys a strong sense of the sights, sounds and movements of the scene in which no one person is yet individualized. This is the voice of Flaubert's narrator, and this narrator here "speaks," but is not seen, is not characterized. Flaubert's narrators are known for their proto-cinematic characteristics, and this paragraph acts as an "establishing shot" for the scene, focusing on details such as baskets of laundry and piling baggage, all the while suggesting the larger mise-en-scène through the aural elements. This is, then, a strong example of Flaubert's impersonality. In his frequently cited letter to Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie, dated Paris March 18, 1857, Flaubert writes, "C'est un de mes principes, qu'il ne faut pas s'écrire. L'artiste doit être dans son œuvre comme Dieu dans la création, invisible et tout-puissant; qu'on le sente partout, mais

qu'on ne le voie pas" (324). Flaubert's narrator allows the scene to show itself, the narrative to unfold on its own. The author's presence is certainly felt in the structure of this paragraph, its short clauses giving the scene its quick pace, but the details given appear to flow organically from one to the next as a camera mutely panning a scene.

In a chapter of his book on Flaubert, *The Perpetual Orgy*, Mario Vargas Llosa examines the "transformations of the narrator" in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*. His remarks on the narrator in *Madame Bovary* are also applicable to *L'Education sentimentale*. The most frequent narrator in this novel is this impersonal narrator, or what Vargas Llosa calls the "invisible" narrator: "an absence that speaks, a glacial, meticulous observer who does not allow himself to be seen, who becomes indistinguishable from the object or the subject of which an account is given" (188). This is the narrator who begins *L'Education sentimentale*, and this is the narrator that combines with Frédéric's voice in FIS. In opposition to Austen's narrator this narrator does not behave as a channel for the reader's view; this narrator refrains from explicitly guiding the reading of the narrative, and this narrator does not overtly comment on Frédéric's point of view in FIS.

A bit further down and still on the first page of the novel, Flaubert begins another paragraph, and the narrator's perspective focuses now on introducing Frédéric within the scene:

> Un jeune homme de dix-huit ans, à longs cheveux et qui tenait un album sous son bras, restait auprès du gouvernail, immobile. A travers le brouillard, il contemplait des clochers, des édifices dont il ne savait pas le noms; puis il embrassa, dans un dernier coup d'œil, l'île Saint-Louis, la Cité, Notre-Dame, et bientôt, Paris disparaissant, il poussa un grand soupir. (19)

As in the earlier passage cited, the first sentence of this paragraph maintains an impersonal narrative view; the perspective here describes aspects of Frédéric's person and his placement on the boat. The vision of the narrator appears to have simply landed on this young man. The narrator's perspective does not venture beyond the riverboat, its passengers and paraphernalia, until it comes into contact

with Frédéric's point of view after the first line of this passage. Whereas the narrator's earlier vision encompasses the particular visual and aural details typical of a riverboat departure with all of its hustle and bustle, Frédéric's perspective does not accommodate such quotidian details as luggage and sailors. His focus lies instead on larger, mythologized subjects whose towering presence dominates Frédéric's desire for this capital city: l'île Saint-Louis, Notre Dame Cathedral, and finally all of Paris. The narrative perspective, initially landing upon the objects and persons falling in its line of sight, is now propelled elsewhere by its contact with Frédéric. The narrator does not here enter Frédéric's mind or display his thoughts; this is not an example of FIS. Here, rather, is an example of the narrator's perspective following the path of Frédéric's; after showing and describing this character, the narrator describes what Frédéric sees, what he focuses on within his field of vision. In this first page of his novel, Flaubert conspicuously displays those things, those everyday details that Frédéric does not see, and he sets up these two figures, Frédéric and this "invisible" narrator, as parallel but contrasting visions. Whereas Frédéric will perceive much of the world emotionally, reading through an idealized vision, this narrative voice is one that "looks" on the world objectively and impersonally. The contrast between these two voices when they intersect in FIS will underscore Frédéric's naïveté.

Frédéric is a romantic character in the sense that his artistic and amorous aspirations are couched in the ideals and the language of the Romantic writers he favors. Like Emma Bovary, Frédéric dreams of romantic adventures and intrigue, and he attempts to write a romantic novel; unlike Mme Bovary, though, his frustration and boredom with his life finally render him passive. He returns to his romanticism frequently, but he also shows signs, especially at the novel's end, of recognizing it as rhetoric. Flaubert's narrator, who is, in these first scenes, characterized by

objectivity and impersonality as a result of his focus on everyday details, grounds the novel in a realist frame.

The river voyage that begins this novel brings Frédéric into contact with Marie Arnoux for the first time. Frédéric's first glimpse of her is introduced in a manner at once prosaic and idealized; "Ce fut comme une apparition:" (22). The sentence, its own full paragraph, is clipped and direct; it is ineloquent even as it stresses the reverence this woman will inspire in Frédéric. Mme Arnoux will remain an "apparition" throughout Frédéric's life, haunting his plans and his relationships, and eventually his imagined vision of her will part ways with the actual woman, notably at the end of the novel. In this brief sentence which signals the start of Frédéric's vision of Mme Arnoux, Flaubert provokes the reader to wonder who speaks: the narrator or Frédéric. The line shares little with the narrative voice that begins the novel because the emotion and anticipation attached is uncharacteristic of that impersonal voice. Neither is it Frédéric's running internal discourse during the scene, though it embodies what we come to learn as his intensely romantic perspective.

Flaubert ends this brief paragraph with a colon, and continues the next paragraph with, "Elle était assise, au milieu du banc, toute seule; ou du moins il ne distingua personne, dans l'éblouissement que lui envoyèrent ses yeux" (22-23). Flaubert divides this sentence by implying two distinct visions. Frédéric's vision presides over the first portion; he sees Mme Arnoux alone, sitting on a bench. This first section does not appear to be FIS because its descriptive quality would seem to place it within the scope of the invisible narrator rather than Frédéric's thought or emotion. A retrospective view, however, with the second half of the sentence in mind, demonstrates that "elle était assise, au milieu du banc, toute seule" represents Frédéric's romantically motivated vision of the scene. Having been blinded by "l'éblouissement que lui envoyèrent ses yeux," Frédéric, and not the narrator, perceives this woman sitting alone (22-23). The second half of the sentence, the half

presided over by the narrator reads, "ou du moins il ne distingua personne, dans l'éblouissement que lui envoyèrent ses yeux" (22-23). The narrator refers back to Frédéric's vision evoked in the previous clause and highlights the limits of that vision which only sees what Frédéric's romantic vision privileges. The phrase, "ou du moins," parsed with less impersonality than Flaubert's narrator has thus far maintained, ironically notes Frédéric's temporary blindness, his spontaneous, romantically charged reaction. The phrase suggests a rather flippant shrugging-of-the-shoulders admission of this alternative to Frédéric's preceding vision, and it causes the reader to return to that earlier vision. The reader re-interprets it as Frédéric's romantically motivated vision rather than as a purely descriptive realistic scene.

As in the opening of the novel, this passage highlights the difference between Frédéric and this narrator. In this scene Frédéric's attention is distracted from other people and activities by Marie Arnoux as he was distracted by Notre-Dame cathedral at the novel's beginning. Then as now, this narrator calls attention to the limits of Frédéric's perspective without thereby faulting him or pointing to a misreading. Unlike Austen's Emma, Frédéric does not misread in this scene; nor does he misread when he does not see the sailors and laundry baskets of the opening scene. Rather than bringing to light flaws in Frédéric's perspective, this narrator's impersonal presence highlights the distinction of that vision, its limits and its inexperience.

After his first sight of Marie Arnoux, Frédéric passes back and forth in front of her as she embroiders; he finally settles near her, watching her while pretending to focus his attention elsewhere. He observes her skin, her hands, her basket, and from his impression he envisions her home, her furniture, and the people she frequents. As Frédéric continues to observe Mme Arnoux, we find the following passage,

> un long châle à bandes violettes était placé derrière son dos, sur le bordage de cuivre. Elle avait dû, bien des fois, au milieu de la mer, durant les soirs humides, en envelopper sa taille,

> s'en couvrir les pieds, dormir dedans! Mais, entraîné par les franges, il glissait peu à peu, il allait tomber dans l'eau, Frédéric fit un bond et le rattrapa. (23-24)

This passage continues the strong distinction underscored on the first page of the novel between Frédéric's perspective focusing on and promoting objects and people that fall in line with his romantic aspirations, and that of the impersonal narrator's voice. The first portion of the passage, "un long châle à bandes violettes était placé derrière son dos, sur le bordage de cuivre" replicates the impersonal narrative voice from the novel's opening; this voice focuses on details without giving them sentimental value (23). When we move to FIS, to a representation of Frédéric's perspective in the second sentence, though, the narration no longer concerns itself with things present, with description. Frédéric focuses instead on potential situations that render the shawl dear, and the importance he ascribes to this shawl emerges from the images he creates rather than from the reality of the shawl. This image of his mind, limited by Frédéric's romantic vision, demonstrates that the object of desire, the actual woman herself, falls just beyond view as Frédéric envisions a scene replete with romantic trimmings. Seeing her, he envisions not exactly the woman but her placement, her role in the idealized narrative he will construct for her. As we witness with this passage, he will transform the existing objects surrounding her, here her shawl, earlier in the scene a workbasket, and later in the novel a silver box in her home, into impossibly meaningful artifacts of his desire. He swings ambivalently between this actual Madame Arnoux and his romantic vision of her just as the narration wavers between the language of the narrator and the language of the character.

Toward the end of this episode, when the riverboat approaches its destination and Frédéric has spent the better part of his time observing Marie Arnoux rather than speaking with her, Flaubert draws attention to his character's sudden panic; "Plus il la contemplait, plus il sentait entre elle et lui se creuser des abîmes. Il songeait qu'il faudrait la quitter toute à l'heure, irrévocablement, sans en avoir arraché une parole, sans lui laisser même un souvenir!" (25). The exclamation point gives

away Flaubert's insistence that at some point these lines combine Frédéric's perspective with that of the narrator. The second sentence begins with the narrator's third-person indirect discourse describing Fréderic's mind, "il songeait…" (25). The narrator reports that the character thinks of soon leaving Marie Arnoux's presence, and for this first half of the sentence, the reader ascribes the narration to the narrator. At the center of the sentence, however, the word "irrévocablement" signals a departure from the narrator as the sole agency. The dramatic weight of "irrevocablement" resembles Frédéric's romantic frame of mind rather than the narrator's impersonality, and the two clauses that follow are clear instances of FIS. These clauses, "sans en avoir arraché une parole, sans lui laisser même un souvenir!" represent Frédéric's consciousness (25). He has been admiring this woman throughout the opening scene of the novel, and now that his destination approaches, he begins to panic at the thought of not having spoken to her, of having left no memory of himself. The exclamation point forcefully signals this panic, and this instance of FIS allows the reader to empathize with Frédéric because his anxiety is legitimate. Quite remarkable about this example of FIS, however, is the paragraph that immediately follows it:

> Une plaine s'étendait à droite; à gauche un herbage allait doucement rejoindre une colline, où l'on apercevait des vignobles, des noyers, un moulin dans la verdure, et des petits chemins au-delà, formant des zig-zags sur la roche blanche qui touchait au bord du ciel. Quel bonheur de monter côte à côte, le bras autour de sa taille, pendant que sa robe balayerait les feuilles jaunies, en écoutant sa voix, sous le rayonnement de ses yeux! Le bateau pouvait s'arrêter, ils n'avaient qu'à descendre; et cette chose bien simple n'était pas plus facile, cependant, que de remuer le soleil! (25-26)

There is an abrupt shift from the line that ends with "sans lui laisser même un souvenir!" to this passage describing the countryside beyond the river. The scene moves from an image of Frédéric's worried thoughts to a description of the hills, vineyards, foot paths and windmill that comprise the surrounding scenery. This shift infuses humor into the scene. Frédéric is distressed over the woman he may never meet again, and his distress is marked by the melodramatic. A happy view of a bucolic

setting, though, alleviates his distress. Though the objective character of the description of this setting indicates the narrator as agency, the rapidity of this move in perspective suggests a parallel shift in Frédéric's own mind. He worries over never seeing Mme Arnoux again, but as he worries, his attention is distracted by the scenery, scenery particularly fitting for his romantic musings. The narrator may move away from Frédéric's mind with this shift, these first few lines of the passage, but he retains Frédéric's vision; the narrator directs his perspective toward the setting beyond the riverboat, the setting Frédéric observes.

The narration returns to Frédéric's mind with another instance of FIS. The first exclamatory sentence which begins toward the middle of this passage is a representation of Frédéric's thoughts, his daydreams : "Quel bonheur de monter côte à côte, le bras autour de sa taille, pendant que sa robe balayerait les feuilles jaunies, en écoutant sa voix, sous le rayonnement de ses yeux!" (25). As he so often will do as the novel continues, Frédéric indulges in his fancies and his imagination of this woman. He fantasizes here but, in marked contrast to the preceding examples, this passage does not prompt an ironic reading of him. The language carries a distinctly romantic tone without leading to impossible fantasy. Scenes very similar to the one he imagines here will, in fact, come to fruition when, late into their relationship, he and Marie reveal their love for one another and share many cherished but chaste moments talking by her fireside. The instance of FIS in the next line of the passage, however, returns to the exaggerated manifestations of his romantic imagination, "Le bateau pouvait s'arrêter, ils n'avaient qu'à descendre; et cette chose bien simple n'était pas plus facile, cependant que de remuer le soleil!" (26). Frédéric recognizes the impossibility of a plan to simply disembark the boat and leave together, but it is this impossibility that renders it desired. Frédéric's narrative is not one of easy attainment and open courting; his narrative prefers exaggerated difficulties to live through and to overcome, difficulties as great as stopping the sun.

Flaubert places this paragraph directly after Frédéric admits a real concern, a concern that he will not see Mme Arnoux, and this placement renders his concern ironic. The panic born from the fear of never seeing Mme Arnoux again, is transformed suddenly into reverie as Frédéric glimpses a setting befitting his romantic aspriations. In this particular scene, Flaubert instills an image of Frédéric's mind as one that removes him from the everyday world around him, propels him to imaginary worlds and situations. Frédéric fears that he will leave Mme Arnoux with no memory of him; he will not have spoken to her, and she will not have spoken to him; this fear is legitimate. Rather than propel him to action, though, Frédéric's worry sends him off into his imagination, to a place where he can *do* nothing but envision what could be, spin his narrative out as he will.

The irony inherent in many of Austen's uses of FIS emerges from the narrative voice that always knows better than Emma and that offers hints of her poor reading. The ambivalence manifest in Frédéric, his movement between Mme Arnoux and his imaginary visions of her, which reflect his larger ambivalence between sentiment and action, is mirrored by the ambivalence within Flaubert's use of FIS. These instances of FIS combine the voice of Flaubert's impersonal narrator with Frédéric's highly romantic internal voice. In this way, these phrases and sentences resist simple agency, and as Frédéric's mind is divided in this particular scene between the woman on the boat and the fantasies that she inspires in him, so too is the reader divided and immobilized between Frédéric's and the narrator's discourse.

***

Flaubert focuses predominantly on the ambivalence of his protagonist throughout the novel – ambivalence most notably present in his views of Marie Arnoux. Flaubert underscores that ambivalence, though, with the political events unfolding in Paris at the same moment. *L'Education* is punctuated with moments of heightened political importance, rallies, speeches and banquets;

Flaubert surrounds Frédéric with characters from a number of social groups, and he passes between them with ease, absorbing and at times expressing the positions of each. The presence of these disparate groups demonstrates the multiple points of view surrounding the political situation, the dissatisfaction of the poor and working classes with France's July monarchy, with voting practices and with the status of the press. February 22, 1848 marks the first day of the insurrection against the monarchy, and in Flaubert's novel this day is positioned as one of great gravity in Frédéric's "sentimental" life. This is the day that Marie Arnoux has agreed, after much time spent together chastely and after much supplication and pain, to a secret meeting, alone with Frédéric, away from their homes and the prying eyes of servants, husbands and children.

Having finally obtained this promise from Marie, Frédéric prepares a small rented room and anticipates the day and the hour when she will meet him. She never arrives, but not allowing the room to go to waste, he returns there the following evening accompanied by Rosanette, a young woman of dubious reputation, and inaugurates their tumultuous relationship. The placement of this episode in conjunction with the insurrection underscores Frédéric's ambivalence about the impending revolution. Flaubert highlights this ambivalence chiefly by lessening the apparent importance of this historical moment within this particular scene. As Richard Terdiman notes, "these most consequential of historical events, in other words, are without consequence for the hero of this most characteristic of midcentury novels. The 'outside' world of social existence is there – *outside*. But it seems to have nothing to do with the inner drama of 'feeling'" (709). While Frédéric waits impatiently for Marie's arrival as the hours advance, he avoids the violent events taking place within a few blocks of his rented room; even though the aggressions he witnesses arouse his indignation against the forces of order, he hides and runs away. Mme Arnoux, for her part, does not arrive, but

she is detained by her son's sudden illness and not out of fear of the insurrection. She has no thought for these events even as her husband departs in the morning to take part.

This episode functions as a turning point in the novel for a number of reasons; it acts as a fork in the road, and the choice made, the path Frédéric eventually takes appears not to have been initially an option. Frédéric chooses between waiting for Marie and taking part in the insurrection at the behest of Deslauriers; he chooses to abandon the insurrection, placing a higher value on his romantic endeavor. Frédéric's choice does not come to fruition, and a third option, not considered at first, arises: a relationship with Rosanette.

The episode moves very quickly, coalescing around its three driving forces: the anxiousness of Frédéric's thoughts when two o'clock, the agreed-upon time, has past; Marie's anxiety for the sudden gravity of her son's illness, an illness which, once passed, she interprets as a warning from God to remain faithful to her husband; and finally the commencement of the insurrection that will result in the decisive removal of the July monarchy. Throughout this episode, the narrative moves through Frédéric's mind, at times giving voice to his quoted thoughts while also maintaining the use of FIS. Flaubert highlights the distinction between these two discourses by frequently placing them in succession. In this scene, Flaubert varies the scope of his narrator. The novel's impersonal narrator whose vision is distinct from Frédéric's is usually limited to Frédéric's mind and knowledge. Frédéric is this narrator's focalizing character, the eyes through which the narrator "sees." In this scene, however, an omniscient narrative voice appears, a voice recounting information about the insurrection, its causes and its eventual results, that must remain unknown to Frédéric. This narrative voice also moves the episode away from Frédéric's perspective quite abruptly to provide Marie Arnoux's situation and point of view. The scenes recounting her son Eugène's illness and eventual recovery remain unknown to Frédéric until much later. The narrator of this scene, however, will also

take on the impersonal voice of the opening chapter, focusing in an objective manner on details and objects immediately present within Fréderic's perspective. The movement between these different perspectives propels the episode forward very quickly even though we are given to understand that it unfolds over many hours, hours that, for both Frédéric and Marie, must be experienced as cruelly slow.

When he awakens on the fated day, Frédéric leaves for the meeting point early, and Flaubert begins this important episode with an instance of FIS: "Et, le lendemain, dès onze heures, Frédéric était sorti. Il voulait donner un dernier coup d'oeil aux préparatifs; puis, qui sait, elle pouvait, par un hasard quelconque, être en avance?" (303). This moment of FIS foreshadows the pathos of the scene. Thus far, Flaubert has not allowed for great successes for this character; rather, Frédéric misses opportunities and suffers disappointments. When he leaves for this rendezvous with Marie Arnoux three hours early, the image of his thoughts as he wonders whether she will also arrive early foreshadows and amplifies his great distress, and this instance of FIS induces the reader to skepticism.

During this period of waiting, Frédéric observes the first acts of violence against the insurrectionists. Watching from a near vantage point, he witnesses arrests and attacks against mounted police. Waiting for Marie, Frédéric dodges the rioters, among whom are certainly his friends, preferring to hide lest he miss this one opportunity with Mme Arnoux. When two o'clock passes, Frédéric begins to panic:

> Sans doute, elle avait un empêchement, et elle en souffrait aussi. Mais quelle joie tout à l'heure! – Car elle allait venir, cela était certain! «Elle me l'a bien promis!» Cependant, une angoisse intolérable le gagnait.
>
> Par un mouvement absurde, il rentra dans l'hôtel, comme si elle avait pu s'y trouver. A l'instant même, elle arrivait peut-être dans la rue. Il s'y jeta. Personne! Et il se remit à battre le trottoir. (305)

These lines give voice to Frédéric's anxiety, his assurance that Marie will arrive and his subsequent doubt. His mind jumps from conviction to reservation; Flaubert employs FIS to great extent here, retaining short sentences embodying sometimes contradictory positions. Frédéric grows impatient as he waits for the designated time, and the voice of the narrator here elicits sympathy for his anticipation and worry. This scene parallels the stretch of pages late in Austen's novel given over to Emma's intense worry over her love for Mr. Knightly. The narration in that scene remains very close to Emma's confused and searching mind, but the ordering hand of the narrator in Austen's use of FIS contains the narration. The narrator maintains order of a mind in all likelihood flooded by disorder.

Flaubert includes here a line of Frédéric's quoted thoughts, "Elle me l'a bien promis!" (305). This line renders the previous lines of FIS plausible because the quoted thought appears to follow upon them naturally. These images of his mind together with his quoted thoughts lend sympathy to Frédéric's plight because they display his naïveté and his youth. The scene is nonetheless ironic because Flaubert has placed Frédéric in a political moment that should eclipse these worries. As a man who expresses interest in public office and who will eventually sit for elections, his disinterestedness vis-à-vis the insurrection points to Frédéric's competing drives and desires, his ultimate passivity faced with decisions and committing to a single courses of action.

This novel advances in its narrative all the time "deflating" the expectations of the reader (Culler, 78). Flaubert takes the reader climbing up a number of high cliffs, the summits visible, but he never allows his narrative to reach those summits. The narrative always falls short and disappoints, and even the failures and disappointments, unspectacular and often trivial, do not compensate. When Mme Arnoux never arrives, then, and Rosanette takes her place, Frédéric's failure with the one woman is offset, is dampened by success with another. As Peter Brooks remarks

in his chapter on *L'Education* in *Reading for the Plot*, "Desire and its objects are ever in a relation of chiasmus: you are never there where desire is to be realized; and when desire is realized, it is never in the right place or with the right person" (192). Rosanette becomes a kind of runner up in Frédéric's hierarchy of desire. When she wonders why he weeps in the middle of the night in the little rented room prepared for Mme Arnoux, Frédéric tells her "C'est excès de bonheur ... Il y avait trop longtemps que je te désirais" (311). Though he weeps for his lost night with Marie Arnoux, he speaks as he knows Rosanette desires; he takes up the role of romantic lover well-suited for her, and she too understands the game.

Marie and Rosanette may be distinguished one from the other as the pure and the fallen, but in Frédéric's perceptions and in his relationships with them, both require that he take on a role and employ a certain language. This moment marks an important step in Flaubert's portrayal of Frédéric. His desire for Marie has been cruelly frustrated, and this turn to Rosanette marks his awareness of the utility of his romantic rhetoric. By speaking these words to Rosanette, he acknowledges the fiction underpinning his romantic language and desires. While Emma learns to be a better reader, while she learns to interpret more accurately, Frédéric's education leads to awareness but does not change his language or his behavior. Over the course of the novel, he comes to understand the emptiness of the romantic outlook he embodies when the novel begins. When Marie fails to meet him and he takes up with Rosanette instead, Frédéric begins to understand the hollowness of his romantic position. Whereas Emma's education causes her to change her habits, Frédéric's more complete understanding results in no such change in behavior or action.

This move from Marie to Rosanette and Frédéric's reaction to the opening events of the insurrection mirrors and points to his problematic relationship with the revolutionary acts taking place in Paris. These events are secondary, and they appear distant though physically near. In his

portrayal of France's recent history, Flaubert falls in line with the characterizations of this period by Karl Marx in his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* (1852) and Alexis de Tocqueville in his posthumously published *Souvenirs* (1893). These writers both underscore the parodic nature of the revolution of 1848; they portray the insurrection and the attitude of its participants as akin to acting and spectacle:

> At the very time when men appear engaged in revolutionizing things and themselves, in bringing about what never was before, at such very epochs of revolutionary crisis do they anxiously conjure up into their service the spirits of the past, assume their names, their battle cries, their costumes to enact a new historic scene... (Marx, 13)

> Nos Français, surtout à Paris, mêlent volontiers les souvenirs de la littérature et du théâtre à leurs manifestations les plus sérieuses; cela fait souvent croire que les sentiments qu'ils montrent sont faux, tandis qu'ils ne sont que maladroitement ornés ... Les hommes de la première révolution étaient vivants dans tous les esprits, leurs actes et leurs mots présents à toutes les mémoires. Tout ce que je vis ce jour-là porta la visible empreinte de ces souvenirs; il me semblait toujours qu'on fût occupé à jouer le Révolution française plus encore qu'à la continuer. (Tocqueville, 72)

Marx and Tocqueville both highlight the role played by earlier revolutions, their heroes and their myths, and rather than draw on these figures of the past in order to propel the revolutionary cause forward, these two writers suggest that the insurrectionists engage in a parody of the former revolutions. Both writers also underline the uncertainty and confusion permeating the minds and attitudes of not only those involved, but of the spectators as well. Tocqueville's account, in particular, stresses the confusion and the uncertainty of the period, the troubled relations between sides but also within these sides. Late into his narrative, Tocqueville describes the hesitation manifested by the words and actions of the socialists elected to the National Assembly, "Après avoir à moitié tiré l'épée, ils semblaient vouloir rengainer; mais il était trop tard, le signal avait été vu par leurs amis du dehors, et, désormais, ils ne dirigeaient plus, ils étaient conduits" (275). More so than the earlier revolutions of the 18th and early 19th Centuries, this revolution is marked by uncertainty; where earlier revolutions manifested resolve, here second guessing and indecision rule.

Like Tocqueville and Marx, Flaubert too draws a strong parallel between literature and life, between reading and living with respect to the revolution. The insurrection and its aftermath remain a spectacle in his portrayal. The morning after Frédéric and Rosanette's first night together, Frédéric descends into the streets to observe the events taking place. Flaubert's language places him unmistakably in the role of spectator rather than participant:

> Les tambours battaient la charge. Des cris aigus, des hourras de triomphe s'élevaient. Un remous continuel faisait osciller la multitude. Frédéric, pris entre deux masses profondes, ne bougeait pas, fasciné d'ailleurs et s'amusant extrêmement. Les blessés qui tombaient, les morts étendus n'avaient pas l'air de vrais blessés, de vrais morts. Il lui semblait assister à un spectacle. (315)

The image of Frédéric caught between two masses, unable to move yet enjoying himself in this state of passivity, is a mis-en-abyme of the entire novel. Frédéric does not place himself on one side or another; he is pushed and jostled by both and sees no need to make a choice while he is born along by the crowd. He meets his friend Hussonnet, and the two observe the unfolding together, but Hussonnet's sudden declaration that the people disgust him prompts Frédéric to reply, "moi, je trouve le peuple sublime" (319). This does not necessarily place him on the side of the people. Frédéric takes a position inflected by his romanticism because he is borne up by the spirit of the events without considering the ramifications.

Frédéric's position with respect to this revolution illustrates an uncertainty likely felt by many, but Flaubert's clearest display of the ambivalence inherent in this insurrection is the character Dussardier. An innocent worker with good intentions and a generous nature, Dussardier is perhaps the only character in *L'Education* who escapes Flaubert's irony. Dussardier is uneducated and sincere. He is finally a victim of the uncertainty felt by the two sides in this insurrection; he is fatally shot by Sénécal, a revolutionary of Frédéric's circle originally fighting for the same cause as Dussardier. Dussardier's death marks the end of Flaubert's narration of the 1848 insurrection and its

immediate consequences; the two chapters that follow this character's death are the final of the novel, and they pick up the thread of the plot many years later.

Dussardier believes in equality and fairness in a general way, but with less education than Frédéric's other friends, he expresses himself simply. Dussardier takes part in the insurrection from the beginning, but it is his attitude later, during the June days, when Frédéric has returned from his "honeymoon" with Rosanette at Fontainebleau, that expresses most succinctly the ambivalence felt toward this struggle. After having been wounded in battle, Dussardier remains in his small apartment, and Frédéric visits him there. They discuss the sides of the revolution, and Dussardier admits his concern about his "side:"

> Peut-être qu'il aurait dû se mettre de l'autre bord, avec les blouses; car enfin on leur avait promis un tas de choses qu'on n'avait pas tenues. Leurs vainqueurs détestaient la République; et puis, on s'était montré bien dur pour eux! Ils avaient tort, sans doute, pas tout à fait, cependant; et le brave garçon était torturé par cette idée qu'il pouvait avoir combattu la justice. (366)

Using FIS, Flaubert reveals the anxiety of this man over the side he has taken; the tone of the FIS mirrors the character's own language. Phrases such as "un tas de choses" and "on s'était montré bien dur pour eux!" mimic language Dussardier himself would use. Placing these words in Dussardier's language, Flaubert heightens the effect of the uncertainty surrounding this revolution. Unlike Frédéric, whose ambivalence and the passivity it engenders are forever on display, Dussardier is a highly sympathetic character unencumbered with idealized readings or a tortured, indecisive psyche. Flaubert's focus remains tied to Frédéric as a wavering figure and to his narrative style that draws that ambivalence out, but the particular period that Flaubert chooses to highlight is one, like his character, that is itself fraught with doubt.

During the turbulent events of the insurrection, the June days, and Frédéric's failed attempts at running for office, the narrative remains tied to Frédéric's sentimental life. While ostensibly starting a family with the pregnant Rosanette, he pursues the wealthy and powerful Mme Dambreuse

with zeal, easily becoming her lover and finally agreeing to her marriage proposal after the death of her husband leaves her penniless. Jacques and Marie Arnoux struggle under financial troubles following the insurrection. After their possessions are set to be auctioned off, Frédéric again hopes to rescue them. When he arrives at their home, however, money in hand, they have already left for the countryside. Chapter five of the third and final part of this novel ends with the 1851 military coup of Louis Napoleon and the violent death of Dussardier, and chapter six opens with the following lines:

> Il voyagea.
> Il connut la mélancolie des paquebots, les froids réveils sous la tente, l'étourdissement des paysages et des ruines, l'amertume des sympathies interrompues.
> Il revint. (450)

Flaubert picks up his narrative in 1867, sixteen years after the events recounted in the previous chapter; he condenses these years into a short paragraph speaking of "insipid" love affairs and the loss of Frédéric's ambitions. The final two chapters of the novel, chapters six and seven, each constitute an ending; the first end brings Frédéric face to face with Marie Arnoux once again, and the second reconciles him with Deslauriers. Frédéric and Marie play out their final meeting, and the two childhood friends reminisce over common acquaintances and experiences. *L'Education* ends with the story of the first attempt of these childhood friends to visit a brothel as very young men, an attempt which failed because Frédéric, pale and embarrassed, could not act faced with the choice of so many women. He ran off while they laughed.

Frédéric's final meeting with Mme Arnoux, more than any other, reveals his ambivalence with respect to the object of his desire. After a number of years have passed, Frédéric resides in his family home in Nogent, and he receives an unexpected visit from Marie. This episode is marked by the drama that both engage in; they speak in the language of romantic novels, even evoking romantic characters they claim to understand through one another. Flaubert has repeatedly stressed the barrier between these two characters, a barrier that proves insurmountable. The divide that we find in this

episode, however, appears to be altered; Frédéric and Mme Arnoux have reversed positions. Whereas much of their interactions involve Frédéric's futile efforts to pursue Marie, here she arrives to pursue him. Mme Arnoux wishes to carry out her "dernière démarche de femme," to give voice to her past feelings for Frédéric and finally to offer herself to him (455). He, on the other hand, enters with her into the romantic discourse but primarily to engage with his past feelings, his past self.

When she arrives, Marie dominates the conversation. She tells him of her current life and her love for Frédéric, and the two talk without reserve about their past relationship. Especially in the first half of this episode, however, Frédéric's subjectivity is muted. This scene includes very few instances of FIS; we see very little of Frédéric's mind. His primary role in this scene is as a spectator of Mme Arnoux's final overflow. When he speaks with her, Frédéric's dialogue is a script that he knows by heart; he speaks so as to match her feelings because he understands their importance for her at this moment, and his words to her reveal little of his mind:

> Votre personne, vos moindres mouvements me semblaient avoir dans le monde une importance extra-humaine. Mon Cœur, comme de la poussière, se soulevait derrière vos pas. Vous me faisiez l'effet d'un clair de lune par une nuit d'été, quand tout est parfums, ombres douces, blancheurs, infini; et les délices de la chair et de l'âme étaient contenues pour moi dans votre nom que je me répétais, en tâchant de le baiser sur mes lèvres. (453)

Frédéric shows himself to be adept at speaking this discourse, at taking up this role. He speaks of her metaphorically, likening her to the moon on a summer's evening. Though over the course of his "sentimental education" Frédéric has "learned" the emptiness of the romantic discourse he uses, this passage nonetheless retains a good deal of truth. Frédéric's earliest desires for Marie Arnoux were unconnected to personal or profession ambition. As Culler explains in his discussion of this late scene in Flaubert's novel, "… Frédéric and Mme Arnoux succeed in severing their romantic discourse from the world of experience and so give the clichés, which are sullied by any attempt to live them, a sacramental purity" (226).Unlike his performances for Rosanette and for Madame

Dambreuse, Frédéric's role vis-à-vis Marie is one that he need not "play." He will soon reject her implicit advance, but the words he speaks come from his memories of her and of her past effect on him. These words may not apply to his current feelings for Madame Arnoux as she sits in front of him at his home, but they are an accurate summary of his youthful perspective on her at the novel's opening and during their early courtship.

With nothing to lose, Marie reveals all of her feelings for Frédéric; she tells him that she hid from him on what would have been their last meeting because she says, "j'avait peur! Oui... peur de vous... de moi!" (451). She tells him of the place where she sits at home outdoors which she has named "le banc Frédéric" and of the apocryphal moment when she realized his love for her, a moment which she recalls to Frédéric, "-C'est un soir que vous m'avez baisé le poignet entre le gant et la manchette. Je me suis dit: « Mais il m'aime... il m'aime!» J'avais peur de m'en assurer, cependant. Votre réserve était si charmante, que j'en jouissais comme d'un hommage involontaire et continu" (453). Marie recalls a past that did not come about between her and Frédéric; a similar incident occurs when Deslauriers arrives at her home many years prior and declares himself in love with her while kissing her wrist. Like Frédéric so many times in the course of the narrative, she must imagine and fantasize situations and conversations, and here what can only be her fantasy of the scene with Frédéric bleeds into reality. Marie Arnoux is the Emma Bovary who resists and rebuffs the advances of Rodolphe, who does not pursue her Léon, but who nonetheless imagines and plays out these love affairs in her mind.

In an often cited and analyzed passage, Frédéric finally rejects Marie Arnoux,

> Frédéric soupçonna Mme Arnoux d'être venue pour s'offrir; et il était repris par une convoitise plus forte que jamais, furieuse, enragée. Cependant, il sentait quelque chose d'inexprimable, une répulsion, et comme l'effroi d'un inceste. Une autre crainte l'arrêta, celle d'en avoir dégoût plus tard. D'ailleurs, quel embarras ce serait!- et tout à la fois par prudence et pour ne pas dégrader son idéal, il tourna sur ses talons et se mit à faire une cigarette. (454)

In this passage, Frédéric manifests attraction for this woman all the while feeling repulsed by her, thereby giving explicit voice to the continual indecision and frustration he feels toward her. This indecision, buttressed as it is by two oppositional impulses finally renders Frédéric unable to seize the moment he has always professed to desire. The line toward the end of the passage cited, however, the only instance of FIS in this episode, deflates the reader's expectation: "D'ailleurs, quel embarras ce serait!" (454). This moment of FIS adds a flippancy that appears to be at odds with the serious tone of the rest of the passage. Frédéric will ultimately determine the course of action within this scene; he will, together with Marie, discuss their relationship in the future anterior ("nous nous serons bien aimées") and stroll with her along the streets of Nogent, but it is his decision alone that nothing more than reminiscing and explanations come from this encounter. He makes a definite decision, but Flaubert maintains his hesitant state of mind throughout.

This passage calls to mind an episode a few chapters earlier. Having ordered the sale of Mme Arnoux's property to repay a debt, Mme Dambreuse takes Frédéric to the auction; jealous of this rival for Frédéric's heart Mme Dambreuse orchestrates the day so that it appears to him as if they have stumbled upon this sale by chance. Frédéric has no idea that she is behind everything; he believes instead that this is Rosanette's vengeance against Marie Arnoux. When Mme Dambreuse insists on outbidding another determined buyer in order to purchase a silver box belonging to Mme Arnoux, a box that spent time in both Marie's and Rosanette's possession, Frédéric, abruptly and without ceremony, sees her to her carriage. He tells the driver to leave, with Mme Dambreuse shocked in the carriage, and we hear little more of this character though Frédéric had promised to marry her. Few are the times when Frédéric makes a decision, an important one at that, and follows through. When he rejects Mme Arnoux's implicit offer of herself in the penultimate scene, Frédéric does not hesitate. These two acts represent for him faithfulness to the same ephemeral figure. He

does not accept Mme Arnoux's offer because what he treasures is the image of her he constructed on the riverboat that first day.

In its placement near the end, this episode parallels the opening chapter in which Frédéric sees Mme Arnoux for the first time. In a novel about the "sentimental education" of the protagonist, this episode might have fit well as an ending. Frédéric and Marie never carry out the relationship both desired and resisted, but here toward the end much is revealed that appears to tie up loose ends. This scene terminating the relationship between Frédéric and Marie is not, however, the final scene of the novel. Flaubert complicates Frédéric's "education" by ending his novel with an episode predating the boat ride on the Seine that brings Frédéric and Marie together for the first time. Flaubert ends with a scene out of Frédéric's distant past rather than the more recent moment of realization that Marie Arnoux is not what he desires. Looking back with Deslauriers on the humiliation of that day at the brothel, Frédéric reinterprets it as the best time of his life. Of this experience he says, "C'est là ce que nous avons eu de meilleur!", and Deslauriers agrees, speaking the novel's final words; "Oui, peut-être bien? C'est là ce que nous avons eu de meilleur! dit Deslauriers" (459). This last line of Flaubert's novel repudiates Frédéric's education. As a very young man, Frédéric does not understand the role one is to play as a lover; he does not know his lines, and he acts on instinct alone. Frédéric is finally ambivalent about the knowledge he gains from his "sentimental education," and this memory from his adolescence represents a time before his romantic vision takes shape, before he recognizes that vision as a false.

Austen and Flaubert's use of FIS provides an alternative reading on the world, an alternative to the readings of the novels' two protagonists. Emma's education in Austen's novel is a forward progression with an ending point easily identified by the reader. Emma has learned to read others. She has learned to read herself. The FIS of this novel is formally ambivalent, but in it we witness the

progression of Emma's education. In Austen's uses of FIS, we may ask, as Barthes does of Flaubert's prose, "Who speaks?" and in individual instances of FIS, the two voices are merged so that the answer is uncertain. Austen makes sure, however, that we know who speaks correctly and who reads others correctly. We see where Emma's education will lead.

The combination of the voices of the character and the narrator in Flaubert's usage of FIS, however, shows an incipient resistance to certainty. In Flaubert's use of FIS we do not see a hierarchy of discourse types. Frédéric's highly romantic language may often be fatuous and amusing, but the narrator's alternative, the objectivity and impersonality of that discourse is not, thereby, a higher authority. Just as Flaubert's prose oscillates between voices, so does the language Frédéric uses. We come to learn, with Frédéric, that his language, his romantic rhetoric and vision, is a role among many to take up and to leave. His vision of the world is couched in rhetoric, and whereas the novel begins with Frédéric reproducing that rhetoric little aware of playing a role, the novel ends with the character more fully aware of the role he plays. Though aware, however, he does not thereby alter his discourse or the idealized fantasies he constructs and participates in. This education does not result in changed behavior. Frédéric evinces a deep ambivalence vis-à-vis the knowledge born of his "sentimental education," and, as we will see in the chapter that follows, so too will James's heroines, Isabel Archer and Maggie Verver. These two characters each display ambivalence toward the truths that they begin to distinguish in *The Portrait of a Lady* and *The Golden Bowl*.

Chapter Two

"If the truth were known…" FIS, Knowledge and Ambivalence in James's *The Portrait of a Lady* and *The Golden Bowl*

"Knowledge, knowledge was a fascination as well as a fear."
The Golden Bowl, Henry James

Henry James's predilection for dramas of consciousness and of knowledge finds itself expressed in all of his novels and stories. His narratives feature heroes and heroines who embark on paths to knowledge and discovery. Very often this knowledge is concrete and disturbing for one reason or another; a murder or an illicit love affair, for example, and James's characters follow the hints and impressions winding and meandering toward the truth. James's epistemology plays a key role in *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881) and *The Golden Bowl* (1904). Isabel Archer and Maggie Verver are carefully shielded from the knowledge of their husbands' past relationships with women who continue to play important roles in their husbands' and therefore wives' lives. Isabel and Maggie are wronged wives who enter into their marriages upon false grounds. When Serena Merle introduces Isabel to Gilbert Osmond, she does not reveal that she is his former lover and the mother of his daughter; nor does she reveal that Isabel's unexpected inheritance fulfills her hopes for a marriage that will bring Osmond and her daughter money. Isabel is deceived, and she falls into the trap. In *The Golden Bowl* Maggie is also deceived. She marries Amerigo without knowing that he was once in love with her impoverished friend Charlotte Stant and that this reciprocated love could never lead to marriage because both are poor. With her wealth, Maggie is a desirable match. Amerigo, Charlotte, and Maggie's close friends the Assinghams continue to guard this secret relationship even as Maggie's father, Adam Verver, proposes to and marries Charlotte, unknowingly creating a dangerously intimate quartet. Maggie is deceived, and she falls into the trap, drawing her father with her.

These intentionally simplified plot summaries lay aside the ways that James complicates – especially in *The Golden Bowl* – dichotomies such as good and evil, innocence and experience, and moral and immoral. These summaries also call attention to the potential for melodramatic intrigue in these novels, but James carefully and intentionally sidesteps suspense and dramatic outbursts. He highlights instead the inner lives of his characters, their motivations and guilt, their frustrations and indignations. James focuses on the readings and misreadings his characters produce of those around them, and his two heroines play important roles initially as indeterminate subjects of reading and then as perceiving consciousnesses reading those around them.

The Portrait begins with Isabel's entrance into the society and the consciousness of her cousin Ralph Touchett, James's first "lucid reflector" and center of consciousness of that novel (Segal). Ralph reads Isabel in order to understand her, but she resists easy reading. Like James's Winterbourne who settles on his interpretation of Daisy Miller as "a pretty American flirt" only to continually revise it as the story unfolds, Ralph remains perplexed about Isabel for much of the narrative (58). *The Portrait* follows Isabel's trip to Europe with her aunt, and over the course of that trip, Isabel receives marriage proposals from an English Lord, from a longtime companion from America, and finally from Gilbert Osmond, the man she will marry. This is a coming of age novel, and Isabel initially resists marriage in order to travel with her aunt, to visit new places, and to acquire new experiences. She chooses Osmond, a man everyone cautions her against, and she begins her life with him and his young daughter Pansy in Italy. Following this point about midway into the novel, James increasingly directs his attention to Isabel's consciousness. After a time in Italy, married to Osmond, she is deeply unhappy and suspicious of her husband though she wavers between the fascination that he initially inspired in her and her

current discontent. Isabel wavers in her readings of many of the characters surrounding her. A poor – because innocent – reader early in the novel, Isabel becomes a better reader chiefly of herself and her past motivations. Like Emma Woodhouse, Isabel will repair her readings of her past decisions. Unlike Emma, however, she will continue to waver in the face of those around her.

Like Isabel, Maggie Verver is initially a subject to read externally. In the first half of *The Golden Bowl*, James limits her exposure to the reader so that we apprehend Maggie only through the eyes of other characters. She is discussed and reported on at great length, but she remains an opaque subject. Divided into two volumes, the novel begins by focusing on Maggie's husband, the Prince Amerigo, and it encompasses the time that leads up to his marriage to Maggie as well as some years later after the birth of their son. Charlotte Stant figures predominantly in the novel's first half. As Amerigo's former love interest, her presence at the wedding as well as her continued stay with the family some time later, creates tension in the narrative. Acting as a matchmaker, Maggie encourages her father's hesitant pursuit of Charlotte, and though the four remain closely connected following this second wedding, they tend to break off into pairs where Maggie and her father leave Amerigo and Charlotte more and more together. Toward the end of the first volume, Amerigo and Charlotte, more connected to one another than ever, become lovers. The second volume of the novel focuses on Maggie, and it is here that James puts her mind on display. She begins to distinguish problems in her familial foursome, and she strives to alter the unhappy pairings first by spending time with Charlotte and later by attending to her husband while Charlotte spends her time with Maggie's father, Adam Verver.

Fanny Assingham, this novel's counterpart to Ralph Touchett, is a strong presence throughout the novel. With her husband, the colonel Bob Assingham, she reads each of the four

primary characters, and her readings, her lengthy conversations with her often-exasperated husband, punctuate the narrative so that her perspective largely supplies the reader's reactions. From the novel's beginning, Fanny appears to read Maggie correctly; James's reader trusts her reading of Maggie who begins the novel as a curiously peripheral character. When James places Maggie's consciousness on display in volume two for the reader to assess without Fanny's assistance, we find that the narrative style of James's discourse presents a still opaque representation of Maggie's mind. She is a character whose motives and whose knowledge remain veiled in uncertainty, and in this second volume she will hesitate profoundly vis-à-vis the awareness she acquires. Whereas Isabel will largely move forward in pursuit of self-awareness and accurate self-readings while remaining ambivalent vis-à-vis what she allows herself to know about others, Maggie's profound ambivalence draws a heavy curtain over the approach of *any* awareness. In the second half of both novels, James turns his focus on these heroines as readers. The narratives enter their minds, and we witness their readings and their psyches. As the narratives unfold, Isabel and Maggie are faced with discoveries. Their gradual internal awareness of deceptions, their silent examination of momentary impressions, and their careful and meticulous return to the past launch them each on a path of discovery, a path both regard with great worry and hesitation.

The concrete secrets kept from Isabel and Maggie are not the primary focus of the novels. The past relationships between Serena Merle and Gilbert Osmond, between Charlotte Stant and Amerigo, are made known to the reader quite early in both novels, and the eventual revelations to Isabel and Maggie are marked not by drama but by banality. Isabel's sister-in-law simply tells her the truth of Serena Merle's identity toward the end of the novel, and this scene passes quickly and quietly. Maggie's fortuitous encounter with a decorative golden bowl and the antiques dealer

who sells it brings her the knowledge of her husband's former intimacy with Charlotte. This dealer sees a photograph of Amerigo and Charlotte in Maggie's home and tells her a story of their intimate adventure days before her wedding as they passed through his shop and encountered the same cracked bowl she has purchased as a gift for her father. This revelatory scene makes its way into the novel not as a scene recounted by the narrator, a scene that would record Maggie's shock and confusion in "real time," but rather as a retrospective report that Maggie makes partially to Fanny Assingham and partially to Amerigo. James privileges not the one moment of knowledge revealed but rather the movement of a psyche as it receives impressions and gropes toward knowledge. He privileges his heroines' mounting impressions before they reach full awareness and their re-composing, re-reading minds following awareness.

Neither Isabel nor Maggie explicitly pursues the truth concerning her husband. Neither character embarks upon a detective hunt searching for evidence that her husband cheats or lies. Maggie will question Fanny as to whether she also suspects something, but she goes no further than this. Maggie takes great pains to conceal even the slightest hint of her suspicion. Isabel and Maggie's journey is internal. They perceive impressions, and they follow the paths these impressions take. Paul B. Armstrong notes that "James's novels of bewilderment show his fascination with the composing powers of consciousness" (487). Isabel and Maggie do not amass physical evidence; rather, they quietly accumulate hints and memories, and they build narratives and metaphors through which to view their growing awareness. Maggie will eventually acquire the golden bowl itself, and this will be her one certainty that she has been deceived, but the certainty of the object is literally broken when Fanny flings it to the floor. The certainty it confers is one that remains clouded in ambiguity. Charlotte and Amerigo had their intimate adventure when they encountered this golden bowl in an antiques shop before his wedding. Of

this Maggie is sure. She has no concrete explanation, no certain knowledge of their recent relationship, and she desires none. She is thankful for none.

Similar though these two novels are, they differ in the position the heroines take vis-à-vis knowledge. Though neither character seeks the truth concerning her husband, both are faced with disturbing impressions that compel them to look closely, to begin to see. Isabel and Maggie hesitate in the face of growing knowledge, but whereas Isabel's hesitation is tied chiefly to instances of her misreading of others rather than of herself, Maggie's pervasive ambivalence causes her to obscure any and all disturbing truths that she begins to observe. As Isabel recognizes that a former lover's continued hopes for her affections drive him to pursue her innocent step-daughter, she closes her eyes to this mounting awareness. When she begins to realize where she is at fault, however, where she misled her husband and obscured her true desires, Isabel welcomes her growing impressions. With strong ties to Jane Austen's Emma Woodhouse, Isabel misreads herself and many of the other characters around her, and as *The Portrait* progresses, she begins to recognize the ways in which she misread. Unlike, Emma, however, this recognition will not always lead her to repair her misreading. Isabel constructs an increasingly accurate reading of herself, but she reacts ambivalently to her readings of others, of Lord Warburton, Serena Merle and Osmond. Maggie, on the other hand will be drawn to her impressions as is Isabel, but unlike her predecessor, she will treat them all equally. She will admit nothing, and she will deflect all of the truths that she can. Whereas Isabel's ambivalence resides on the surface - her readings of others waver - Maggie's ambivalence runs much deeper. Maggie desires to know, she will approach and tap the "outlandish pagoda" that represents the "arrangement" of her familial quartet, but at the same time she distances herself from knowledge

(327). In James's late novels – and this will be equally true of *The Ambassadors* – unequivocal truths and knowledge, tempting though they may be, are kept at bay.

Two scenes in particular stand out as entry ways to Isabel and Maggie's acquisition of knowledge. Chapter forty-two of *The Portrait* and the opening of volume two of *The Golden Bowl* represent James's move to his heroines' psyches; these moments constitute James's first extended treatment of these characters' readings, their motivations, and their hesitations. In these scenes, James's "innocents abroad" acknowledge inklings of trouble and hints of dishonesty in their lives for the first time. In these scenes Isabel and Maggie both remain unaware of many truths, but whereas Isabel gathers in her impressions, reading and interpreting them, Maggie obscures her impressions and intimations, jeopardizing their ability to impart knowledge.

Isabel's silent "vigil" in chapter forty-two follows an aggressive conversation between her and Osmond. Identified by James as "obviously the best thing in the book" in the preface to the New York Edition, chapter forty-two marks a change in the novel itself, but it also functions as a turning point within James's oeuvre, taking him from the concerns and styles characteristic of his early period to those of his middle and late periods: his predilection for metaphor, the preponderance of ambiguity, and his favoring of the perspective of a single consciousness over the perspective of the narrator. Adré Marshall notes in *The Turn of Mind: Constituting Consciousness in Henry James*, "the movement from authorial to figural narration … can be observed in microcosm in *The Portrait*, with its gradual withdrawal of the authorial narrator – so vociferous in the early sections of the novel – and the concomitant increasing prominence of the central reflector" (105). In this chapter the narrative conspicuously enters Isabel's consciousness as she reviews her relationship with a former suitor, the unhappiness and deceptions of her courtship and marriage, and finally her surprise at finding her husband positioned familiarly with

Serena Merle. The opening two chapters of the second volume of *The Golden Bowl* function similarly to chapter forty-two of *The Portrait*. In these chapters the narrative enters Maggie Verver's mind for the first time as she constructs images and metaphors to describe and manage her growing impressions. The volume, entitled "The Princess," opens peculiarly with place, time, and voice kept ambiguous. A ten-day ellipsis between the end of volume one and the beginning of volume two renders this move to Maggie's mind highly ambiguous. The volume opens with a record of Maggie's reaction to incidents of which the reader has no knowledge. This novel unfolds primarily within the minds of its characters, and James writes the incidents of the ten-day ellipsis through Maggie's perception of them. As we read, we watch as Maggie revisits her memory of sitting by the fire at her home waiting for Amerigo to return from his trip with Charlotte, we watch as she reviews her reaction to the way he looked at her when he first entered the room, and we watch her slow but building awareness of an alteration in the previous comfort of her familial quartet. Maggie allows hints and impressions to penetrate her mind, and she mentally notes the course toward knowledge while yet maintaining a desire to shield herself from the truths she prefers not to see clearly. Maggie's circuitous mental wanderings, her elaborate images, and her metaphors tend to obscure the disquieting inklings she registers. We learn of Maggie and of her father that "… knowledge wasn't one of their needs … they were in fact constitutionally inaccessible to it" (274). Maggie finally succeeds at keeping the secrets around her at bay; though she will learn of her husband's past relationship, the details of Amerigo's more recent affair with Charlotte remain unspoken and unacknowledged. These internal views of Isabel and of Maggie emerge primarily in FIS. James's particular use of FIS from the earlier novel to the later, however, encompasses two distinct varieties of this technique: what I will call *verbal FIS* and *non-verbal FIS*.

The more common and more readily visible of the two, James's verbal FIS resembles the FIS that we saw in Austen's *Emma* and in Flaubert's *L'Education sentimentale*. This is a FIS where the character's verbal thoughts and inner idiom are represented within the narrator's rhetorical frame. The reader registers two voices or perspectives present within this FIS. In our mind's ear the two voices "speak" simultaneously, creating an "ambi-valent" discourse in which these two individual perspectives interact and combine with one another so that we read them through one another. In this discourse, however, the reader often "hears" more distinctly the voice of the character. Though the narrator's perspective remains, we tend to "translate" this FIS from third-person narration to the first-person perspective of the character: verb tense moves from pluperfect past tense to simple past while "he" and "she" become "I," and "his" and "hers" become "my." This translation temporarily puts aside the narrator's presence, but FIS reverses this move as the narrator's simultaneous perspective places its own, frequently divergent, emphases on the character's perspective. James's use of verbal FIS is strong in *The Portrait*, and in that novel it highlights Isabel's wavering between admitting "unpleasant truths" about others and denying those truths. Verbal FIS, however, wanes significantly in *The Golden Bowl* in favor of nonverbal FIS.

Nonverbal FIS designates those moments in *The Golden Bowl*, when the narrator represents Maggie's visual thoughts, when we see a convergence of two perspectives but when the portion belonging to the character is images rather than words. James's nonverbal FIS in these cases represents not words the character thinks but images she envisions. This FIS appears to make very little use of Maggie's voice even though her consciousness is represented. Adré Marshall notes that "speech is, by definition, always verbal, whereas thought is, by wide consensus, not necessarily so constituted … (Consciousness is often held to include what

William James called "other mind stuff," which cannot be quoted but only narrated)" (22). William James's reference to nonverbal consciousness occurs in his chapter on the "Stream of Consciousness" in *Principles of Psychology*: "Now we may think about our topic mainly in words, or we may think about it mainly in visual or other images, but this need make no difference as regards the furtherance of our knowledge of the topic …" (168-9). Verbal FIS creates a dialogue between two perspectives that emerge in the same medium; this merger retains words belonging to each. Nonverbal FIS, on the other hand, creates a dialogue between two different mediums: one linguistic, another – in this case – visual. Stefan Oltean's discussion of free indirect discourse (FID) is particularly useful here:

> There is FID that tends to be univocal, specifically where the narrator manifests total identification with the character. This happens especially when FID, functioning as a vehicle of spontaneous, non-reflective consciousness, represents nonverbal or preverbal mental states, usually perceptions. Vocalization creates in this case a percept ascribable only to the narrator, but once the representational conventions of language and literature are accepted, the discourse is readily presumed to render the character's personal experience, including his or her subjectivity. (705)

Nonverbal FIS is "univocal," but it remains dialogic, ambivalent. The narrator's words portray the character's visual consciousness, and "the narrator manifests total identification with the character" (705).

As in the verbal FIS of *The Portrait*, the nonverbal FIS in *The Golden Bowl* places the reader in the inherently ambivalent position of swinging between two perspectives presented simultaneously. The distinction between the two perspectives is indeterminate even though both are present: "however we may try to keep the minds of the narrator and his characters properly distinct, the language of the late novels themselves continually defeats us" (Yeazell,12). As it is more often nonverbal, FIS in *The Golden Bowl* is frequently difficult to recognize. The narrator appears to blend with and take on the perspective of the character so that determining the

demarcation between the two perspectives, already quite fluid, becomes highly problematic. In comparison with *Emma* and with *The Portrait*, we find verbal FIS infrequently in *The Golden Bowl*, but as we will see, Maggie's inner voice sounds quite forcefully in brief instances, occasionally infusing the narrator's discourse with her verbal presence. In this novel, the formally ambivalent discourse shifts between verbal and nonverbal FIS, and in this way, James mirrors the deep ambivalence of his character toward knowledge with the formally ambivalent narration that portrays her visual consciousness. Maggie's psychological ambivalence, her hesitant relationship to knowledge reveals itself within James's own ambiguous and shifting usage of FIS.

It has become commonplace in James criticism to evoke James's predilection for intrigues of knowledge, secrecy, and discovery, his particular brand of "epistemological realism" (Armstrong, 479). After the 1976 publication of Ruth Bernard Yeazell's *Language and Knowledge in the Late Novels of Henry James*, it has also become commonplace to discuss the role of language, metaphor, and dialogue in delaying knowledge in James's oeuvre. What has been left aside is the role played by FIS within James's dramas of consciousness, discovery, and ambivalence. This may be due, in part, to the relative infrequency of FIS in his work overall. Unlike Jane Austen's novel, for example, James's works do not proliferate in pervasive FIS. These two sections of *The Portrait* and *The Golden Bowl*, however, are exceptions. James's marked use of FIS, verbal and nonverbal, in these two crucial scenes points to the distinct attitudes his two heroines take toward knowledge, but it also underscores the gradual move in his work from an early to a late epistemology, from an examination of how characters come to know to an examination of how they resist knowing.

As my focus will be on James's style and his epistemology as they change from the early novel to the late, I will take my quotations from the Library of America edition of *The Portrait of a Lady* which makes use of the 1881 Houghton, Mifflin and Company edition. This publication contains only minimal revisions from the serially published version that began in the *Atlantic Monthly* in November 1880. The revisions of the later New York edition reflect changes that would tend to lessen the stylistic differences between this novel and *The Golden Bowl* (Stafford, 1239).

***

Austen and Flaubert portray Emma Woodhouse and Frédéric Moreau as readers, readers of others, of situations and of themselves. Filtered through their minds and narrated frequently in FIS, *Emma* and *L'Education sentimental* are stamped with the consciousness of the protagonist who interprets and engages with his/her world. Henry James's principle characters in *The Portrait of a Lady* and *The Golden Bowl*, on the other hand, are situated initially as subjects of reading rather than as readers. The cast of characters revolving around Isabel and Maggie supply views and interpretations of them; these surrounding characters represent the majority of the voices that James presents in these novels. Unlike Austen and Flaubert, James creates space for the two protagonist's minds only late into his novels; he focuses on their readings only after the readings of others have been provided and sustained. As readers, we may initially tag along on Emma Woodhouse's adventures in misreading, believing her views of those around her, but this is not the case with Isabel Archer and Maggie Verver. We have already discovered the "truths" that Isabel and Maggie will come to approach.

By the time James turns to his heroines' minds, as readers we have already developed highly nuanced readings of these two characters and the situations of their lives, readings

composed by the numerous characters surrounding them; this has two consequences. We arrive with our perceptions colored by these multiple outside readings. Isabel and Maggie are read and re-read innumerable times prior to their own lengthy self-examination. James highlights the ways that Isabel and Maggie's own interpretations align or misalign with the readings thus far presented. Also, and very importantly, the truths of which Isabel and Maggie each receive inklings and impressions are at the forefront of the narrative from the reader's perspective. The reader is aware of the tangible deceptions practiced against these characters; we know of the lies, the secrets, and the hidden relationships, and we therefore do not accompany these heroines on their journey to knowledge. Rather than following the lead of the characters, the reader watches how and what these characters register, their hesitant back and forth progression, and their precise fitting together of the puzzle pieces. The facts of these cases are, in this way, incidental in favor of James's preferred subject: the drama of consciousness. The reader's knowledge together with James's use of FIS thrusts these wavering consciousnesses as they approach knowledge into a primary position.

***

> Her agitation – for it had not diminished – was very still, very deep. That which had happened was something that for a week past her imagination had been going forward to meet; but here, when it came, she stopped – her imagination halted. The working of this young lady's spirit was strange, and I can only give it to you as I see it, not hoping to make it seem altogether natural. Her imagination stopped, as I say; there was a last vague space it could not cross – a dusky, uncertain tract which looked ambiguous, and even slightly treacherous, like a moorland seen in the winter twilight. But she was to cross it yet. (512)

Immediately following Gilbert Osmond's first declaration of love to Isabel Archer in Rome and their brief dialogue concerning her impending travels around Europe and Asia, James's narrator provides the above assessment of Isabel's state of mind after Osmond has exited and she has spent some time alone before Ralph Touchett's arrival. Osmond has not proposed

marriage to Isabel as have done Lord Warburton and Caspar Goodwood on two previous occasions, but his aspiration for marriage is clear. By not proposing he allows her to spend time traveling and seeing the world, to delay making an important decision; he is a more persuasive lover than the former two who request immediate acceptance, but his implicit proposal together with the request that she visit his daughter Pansy, who is alone in Florence, before she embarks on her travels, leaves Isabel divided and troubled. The narrator's explicit perspective in this passage, the admission that Isabel's "spirit" is given from the narrator's point of view indicates his controlling presence. This passage is an example of what Dorrit Cohn calls "psycho-narration." Isabel's consciousness is described by an external figure who relies entirely on his own language. This narrator reads Isabel, and though her ambivalence is evidenced in the narrator's report of the "halting" of her imagination at that which she had "for a week … been going forward to meet," the narrator maintains the opacity of the character's mind by restricting the reader's access (512).

For much of the novel, James only allows contact with his heroine's mind through the report of the narrator; her consciousness remains veiled by this intermediary, and James does not endow his narrator with omniscience that would allow complete access to her psyche: "The working of this young lady's spirit was strange, and I can only give it to you as I see it" (512). The narrator's apology speaks for the majority of the novel. James maintains an external vantage point that affords only occasional and brief glimpses of Isabel's divided psyche, as we saw with the above example. This narrator presents Isabel's "portrait" but does so as an external reader of Isabel.

Isabel's most astute reader, and the one best positioned as a model for James's reader is her cousin Ralph Touchett. Very shortly after her arrival in England at the novel's opening,

Ralph Touchett considers his cousin as a timely gift to ease the melancholy of his large country home and to banish the boredom of his illness with her entertaining chatter; he compares Isabel to a painting inexplicably and happily handed over for examination. He later likens his cousin to a building remarking to himself, "The key of a beautiful edifice is thrust into my hand, and I am told to walk in and admire" (254). Soon after this passage, the narrator describes Ralph's relationship with this "edifice:"

> He surveyed the edifice from the outside, and admired it greatly; he looked in at the windows, and received an impression of proportions equally fair. But he felt that he saw it only by glimpses, and that he had not yet stood under the roof. The door was fastened, and though he had keys in his pocket he had a conviction that none of them would fit. (254)

Ralph Touchett is James's early reflector in *The Portrait of a Lady*; like Fanny and Bob Assingham in *The Golden Bowl*, Ralph provides a vantage point from which to view this budding heroine. In the above passage we are given to understand that the tools for interpreting others - the keys in Ralph's pocket - will not work for his reading of Isabel. She arrives as a new type for Ralph to consider, a young American girl newly placed in a European environment whose curious motivations and desires will evade him. He recognizes in her a strong but peculiar personality; he recognizes important differences between himself and his cousin, and he sees that she is unlike other women he meets. For these reasons, Ralph is compelled to read Isabel, to examine her character and to attempt to understand her. Throughout the first half of the novel, he observes her development, her interest in life and its various experiences, and at this early point his questions about her are myriad and their answers few.

As the novel progresses, Ralph's reading of Isabel becomes increasingly honed and persuasive, and James portrays this reflector as thoroughly enjoying his position as a reader of Isabel. By forfeiting half of his own inheritance upon his father's death, Ralph ensures Isabel's

continued financial liberty, allowing her to continue along the path he has watched her navigate. Ostensibly for Isabel's benefit, these funds also ensure Ralph, an invalid forever confined by the whims of his body, the continued amusement of following Isabel's adventurous and entertaining life, a life wherein she rejects the marriage proposals of landed English peers and travels with "lady journalists." This inheritance will allow Ralph to keep watching and enjoying his curious and slippery subject of reading.

Ralph finally reads Isabel with ease when, much later in the novel, she discusses with him her engagement to Gilbert Osmond, and this reflector handily sums up Isabel's delusions and justifications vis-à-vis the impecunious Europeanized-American she chooses to marry: "She was wrong, but she believed; she was deluded, but she was consistent. It was wonderfully characteristic of her that she had invented a fine theory about Gilbert Osmond, and loved him, not for what he really possessed, but for his very poverties dressed out as honours" (550). Ralph reads Isabel's self-deceit, and the passage provides an example of James's use of FIS in this novel. Ralph's language and his perspective emerge from the narrator's discourse in phrases such as "wonderfully characteristic" and "a fine theory" (550). By accepting Osmond's proposal, Isabel provides Ralph with the correct "keys" to her character, but her strong conviction renders her delusion and the awareness of this delusion all the more bitter for the cousin who loves her and recognizes his own important contribution to this turn of events. If not for her inheritance, Osmond would have left Isabel alone. Isabel becomes for Ralph a closed book, and the remainder of this narrative for him is deception and regret. From the moment he criticizes her choice and her motivations, he removes himself from his privileged position. Isabel will assume the role of a contented wife for him, and she will only lower that mask when Ralph lies helpless on his death bed near the novel's end.

***

> 'You Americans are almost incredibly romantic.'
> 'Of course we are. That's just what makes everything so nice for us.'
> 'Everything?' He had wondered.
> 'Well, everything that's nice at all. The world, the beautiful world – or everything in it that *is* beautiful. I mean we see so much.'
>
> He looked at her a moment – and he well knew how she had struck him, in respect to the beautiful world, as one of the beautiful, the most beautiful things. But what he had answered was: 'You see too much – that's what may sometimes make you difficulties. When you don't, at least,' he had amended with a further thought, 'see too little.'… He had seen the follies of the romantic disposition, but there seemed somehow no follies in theirs – nothing, one was obliged to recognise, but innocent pleasures, pleasures without penalties. Their enjoyment was a tribute to others without being a loss of themselves. Only the funny thing, he had respectfully submitted, was that her father, though older and wiser, and a man into the bargain, was as bad – that is as good – as herself. (48)

As he does with Isabel Archer, James brings his reader into direct contact with Maggie Verver quite late into *The Golden Bowl*. After Amerigo strolls the streets of London, musing to himself and recalling conversations with his future wife, with his future father-in-law, and with Fanny Assingham, the woman who made the two marriages of this novel possible, after we meet Fanny herself, after Charlotte Stant arrives at the Assingham's home unexpectedly a few days prior to Amerigo's marriage, and finally after Charlotte and Amerigo wander London in search of a wedding gift for Maggie, after all of these key scenes, we finally meet Maggie Verver many pages into the novel in the second book of volume one. James has, however, already introduced this character. Maggie is on everyone's mind when the novel opens: Amerigo replays past conversations with her, Fanny discusses her with her husband the colonel, and Charlotte reports on her to Amerigo. We hear much of Maggie, but this information is limited to the views of her that others provide. James will not delve into Maggie's own consciousness until the second volume, and when that moment arrives, we seem to see Maggie, but we see her only through others' eyes.

The above dialogue between Amerigo and Maggie is narrated retrospectively in Amerigo's memories in the opening chapter so that if an image of Maggie emerges from this dialogue, it must remain stamped with Amerigo's reading of his future wife. This reading of Maggie, of her father and of Americans in general, is marked by indirection and hesitation. Americans are "*almost* incredibly romantic," Maggie's problem is that she "see[s] too much" when she doesn't "see too little," and her father is "as bad – that is as good – as herself" (48). The reader's early impression of Maggie is marked by the problem she presents to interpretation. As Ralph's keys do not initially open the door to a satisfactory reading of Isabel, Maggie is likewise not understood by her future husband. His interpretations of her are chiastic; she appears one way, only to then appear exactly opposite. We begin to perceive in this remembered dialogue, however, what will become Maggie's own selective vision. She will see "so much" as Amerigo recalls her having said, but she will refuse to look squarely on the concrete deceptions that will loom heavily over her and that she herself perpetuates.

As he does with Isabel in *The Portrait*, James introduces Maggie as a subject of reading rather than as a reader. Maggie's most astute and most frequent reader is Fanny Assingham. Ora Segal refers to Fanny as a "choric observer" and she notes that Fanny, though a prolific reader, is not always accurate:

> Mrs. Assingham is often likely to confuse the reader, who in addition to the strenuous efforts he has to make to interpret the motives of the novel's highly complex characters, for whom the maintenance of forms is almost equivalent to morality, must also thread his way through the labyrinth of Mrs. Assingham's ingenious and supersubtle theories, which are, we saw, as often wrong as they are right. (197)

When she reads Charlotte and Amerigo, Fanny Assingham frequently misreads. The reader, who is present at crucial scenes from which Fanny is absent, sees where and how she goes wrong with these characters; quite early in the novel, the reader is more knowledgeable than Fanny. Her

readings of Maggie Verver present themselves, however, as remarkably accurate. Her "ingenious and supersubtle" readings, as Segal describes them, closely parallel the reader's own vision of James's heroine. Following Charlotte's surprise arrival a few days before Amerigo and Maggie's wedding, Fanny and Bob discuss what cannot be told to Maggie:

> 'There are things, my dear – haven't you felt it yourself, coarse as you are? – that no one could tell Maggie. There are things that, upon my word, I shouldn't care to attempt to tell her now.'
>
> The colonel smoked on it. 'She'd be so scandalised?'
>
> 'She'd be so frightened. She'd be, in her strange little way, so hurt. She wasn't born to know evil. She must never know it.' (94)

This conversation represents one of the many readings presented of Maggie before James places that character in action. Unlike the Prince's tentative and uncertain reading of his future wife, Fanny's is marked by confidence and appears accurate. Fanny expresses her acute awareness of Maggie's desire – conscious or unconscious – to spare herself from painful or perplexing knowledge, and the knowledge of Amerigo and Charlotte's relationship falls into that category. This conversation continues James's inclination toward indeterminacy because Fanny does not directly say – and will never directly say – what Maggie "must never know" (94). Fanny's readings of Maggie throughout volume one remain couched in vague terms, and she essentially talks around the specific problems at hand. These readings however establish the ways that James's reader interprets Maggie. We will come to view Maggie as a character averse to knowledge because Fanny recognizes the importance of shielding her from certain "evil" truths. Ralph's large monetary gift to Isabel plays a key role in her marriage to Osmond and her future misfortune, and Ralph's sense of guilt compares with the guilt that Fanny manifests in her own interpretation of Maggie. Fanny brings Amerigo and Maggie together without alerting Maggie to Amerigo's previous relationship with Charlotte, Maggie's childhood friend. Fanny correctly conveys Maggie's ambivalence toward knowledge, but Fanny's language must remain shrouded

in her guilt and in her desire to keep the knowledge of her own involvement from Maggie. Fanny provides the groundwork for the reader's vision of Maggie, but that vision must remain steeped in Fanny's own varied motives. Where *The Portrait* conveys the sense that Ralph's reading of his cousin is colored primarily by his affection for her, in *The Golden Bowl*, our early knowledge of Maggie based on Fanny's readings is profoundly influenced by Fanny's important role in making both of these marriages.

The above dialogue between Bob and Fanny calls to mind a scene early in *The Portrait*. While giving her a tour of Gardencourt, Ralph informs Isabel that the house is haunted, and when she expresses a desire to see the resident ghost, he tells her: "It has never been seen by a young, happy, innocent person like you. You must have first suffered, have suffered greatly, and have gained some miserable knowledge. In that way your eyes are opened to it" (238). Isabel and Maggie both begin as characters free from suffering, who are without knowledge, characters for whom knowledge is unnecessary. Isabel will see a ghost at Gardencourt by that novel's end; she will "have gained some miserable knowledge." Maggie, on the other hand will see only enough to know that she must act to remove the necessity of knowing. She must remove Charlotte. While Isabel's knowledge will be concrete and complete, Maggie's will remain shrouded with questions whose answers she will suppress.

As volume one, "The Prince," nears its end, James devotes two chapters to Fanny and Bob's assessments of the preceding turns of events, and these chapters are roughly divided into two conversations, the first concerning Amerigo and Charlotte, the second concerning Maggie and her father. Volume one ends with the Assingham's cumulative reading of Maggie so that when James begins volume two, "The Princess," when he hands the narration over to Maggie's

consciousness, he does so immediately following a highly involved external reading of her. The final chapter of volume one begins with the following passage:

> 'I can't say more,' … 'than that something in [Maggie's] face, her voice and her whole manner acted upon me as nothing in her had ever acted before and just for the reason, above all, that I felt her trying her very best – and her very best, poor duck, is very good – to be quiet and natural. It's when one sees people who always are natural making little pathetic blinking efforts for it – then it is that one knows something's the matter. I can't describe my impression – you'd have had it for yourself. And the only thing that ever can be the matter with Maggie is that. By "that" I mean her beginning to doubt. To doubt, for the first time,' Mrs. Assingham wound up, ' of her wonderful little judgment of her wonderful little world.' (307)

Fanny's claim that she "can't describe [her] impression," that "you'd have had it for yourself," recalls the narrator's position vis-à-vis Isabel Archer in *The Portrait* (307). James's earlier narrator states: "The working of this young lady's spirit was strange, and I can only give it to you as I see it…" (512). The Assignhams, the "internal readers" of *The Golden Bowl*, manifest a similar perplexity faced with the strangeness of their principal subject. They base their readings primarily on vision; they rely on how the subject appears and behaves. Fanny grounds her assessment on the carriage ride she shares with Maggie as the two women leave Adam Verver's home after Fanny communicates the news of Amerigo and Charlotte's belated return from a weekend trip to a friend's estate at Matcham. As a well-informed reader – Fanny knows, after all, much more about Amerigo and Charlotte than Maggie – Fanny is highly attuned to catching any hint in Maggie's demeanor and language that give away her budding awareness. Like James's reader, Fanny occupies a privileged position of greater knowledge, but her words remain unspecific. Fanny notices "something in her face;" she sees Maggie making "little pathetic blinking efforts" to be natural (307). At the end of the passage, Fanny gestures toward specificity by elaborating her meaning: "By 'that' I mean her beginning to doubt. To doubt, for the first time,' Mrs. Assingham wound up, ' of her wonderful little judgment of her wonderful little

world.'(307). In Jamesian fashion, Fanny's effort at specificity is broken up by the narrator's intrusion of "Mrs. Assingham wound up" in the middle of her sentence. James delays the end of Fanny's sentence, and the reader's knowledge of her meaning arrives piecemeal.

When Ralph compares Isabel to a locked house which his keys will not open, the reader understands that he refers to interactions with and observations of Isabel that the reader also has witnessed as described by James's narrator. The readings of Maggie produced by Fanny and – to a lesser extent – by Amerigo in *The Golden Bowl*, however, are based on scenes that are never narrated; these scenes never unfold under the reader's eyes. The reader pieces these incidents together with Fanny's explanations and descriptions just as we will piece together that crucial encounter with the antiques dealer that is only narrated retrospectively by Maggie.

The Golden Bowl unfolds primarily within the minds of its characters, within their interpretations and their recounting of memories. By placing many scenes and incidents exclusively in the mind of a character, James forces the reader to actively reconstruct through the character's words. He creates a situation for the reader that mirrors the epistemological experiences of his characters. We must read and construct the events of the novel through the readings and re-readings of its characters. James's reader can only know, can only "see" what occurs in this novel through this process of retrospective and selective reading. Amerigo and Fanny will construct their readings of Maggie, and Maggie will build her knowledge out of slight impressions and quick visions. We must build our knowledge of the 'what happens' of this narrative by carefully reading how these characters read each other. In this way, James parallels his character's ambivalence vis-à-vis knowledge with the reader's necessarily incomplete construction of the novel's key events.

James's reader has a picture of Isabel Archer and of Maggie Verver in mind when these characters are placed more directly under view, when we are given access to their minds. We have a picture supplied by the many external readings of these two heroines provided by the characters surrounding them. In this way, we "see" much of what they do not. We see them approach truths, but we also see where they refuse to see those truths. We see more clearly where they hesitate.

***

Suffering, with Isabel, was an active condition; it was not a chill, a stupor, a despair; it was a passion of thought, of speculation, of response to every pressure. She flattered herself, however, that she had kept her failing faith to herself – that no one suspected it but Osmond. Oh, he knew it, and there were times when she thought that he enjoyed it. It had come gradually – it was not until the first year of their marriage had closed that she took the alarm. Then the shadows began to gather; it was as if Osmond deliberately, almost malignantly, had put the lights out one by one. (629)

The transition to figural narration in chapter forty-two of *The Portrait* brings with it an elaboration of Isabel's epistemological journey. Moving to Isabel's mind, James portrays an extended moment of internal ambivalence paired with discovery. Isabel may have "[taken] the alarm" after the close of "the first year of their marriage," as the narrator notes in the passage above, but James holds off her return to and her examination of the many impressions and memories that will together constitute her coming to knowledge until this point following a three year ellipsis in the novel and in Isabel's marriage. A few pages into this chapter we read: "Suffering, with Isabel … was a passion of thought, of speculation, of response to every pressure," and this line sets up the path Isabel will navigate as she wanders among her thoughts (629). Prior to chapter forty-two we have not seen Isabel's "passion[s] of thought," her "speculation[s], or her "response[s] to every pressure" (629). James has thus far revealed very little of this character's inner life. This phrase foregrounds the important move made within the

novel. Isabel may be a subject to read and interpret, but James's move to figural narration demonstrates that the earlier readings, convincing and correct though they may be, are limited by their external vantage point.

Leading up to chapter forty-two, James calls attention to the deep unhappiness of Isabel's marriage; the narrator portrays his heroine as resigned, cynical, and trapped within the motions of her daily life and the appearances she keeps up. Isabel essentially blends in among the many objects and trinkets that her money allows Osmond to purchase. Her life with her husband is a sham, they are disabused of their former illusions, and James continues to portray her from the narrator's external post rather than displaying her consciousness. Of her present life, we learn that Isabel receives visitors on Thursday evenings, that she accompanies Pansy to balls, and that she rarely interacts with her husband. She has no confidantes, she vents her grievances in the form of quickly dropped sarcastic remarks, and for the most part, the narrator throws a heavy fog over her mind. Isabel's unhappiness is a certainty; the stark differences in her character, once so eager for experience and travel, make this unhappiness palpable, but James, on the whole, delves little into her mind which can only be surmised. The move to chapter forty-two shifts profoundly the perspective on Isabel maintained thus far. The portrait of Isabel created with external views now becomes a portrait of her consciousness, of her growing awareness, and of her unhappiness, and this is a portrait constructed through her own mind.

James begins the chapter by placing his heroine in the sitting room alone after her husband has left. The immediate occasion of this nighttime "vigil" is Osmond's suggestion that Isabel ought to play an instrumental role in securing a marriage proposal from Lord Warburton for Osmond's young daughter Pansy. Chapter forty-one closes with Osmond's assertion that Pansy's future with Lord Warburton "lies in [Isabel's] hands" (626). This vigil, however, is also

informed by Isabel's important vision of her husband and Madame Merle "grouped unconsciously and familiarly" a few chapters earlier (639). Isabel witnesses her husband and his old friend in unusual communion in their home, and this vision occurs prior to James's depiction of her mind in chapter forty-two. It marks the first instance in which Isabel registers a suspicious awareness that Madame Merle and Gilbert Osmond conceal the depths of their relationship.

The plot elements of chapter forty-two follow a regular, easily traversable path. Isabel begins by considering Pansy's marriage prospects, and as she silently returns to her memories, her mind moves from one topic to the next in a logically associative manner free from ambiguous jumps in time or in focus. James brings her meditations full-circle when, at the end of the chapter, Isabel returns to her consideration of Pansy's marriage and to the impression of her husband and Madame Merle that she considers at the chapter's opening.

James places this chapter entirely within the psyche of his character, and what strikes as primary concerning the discourse is the increased use of verbal FIS. James rarely quotes Isabel's thoughts; this chapter is not a monologue emerging directly from Isabel's mind. Rather, the discourse skirts the boundary between third-person and first-person narration because James's verbal FIS conveys her words and the turns of her mind couched within the language of the narrator. Isabel's ambivalence vis-à-vis the motivations of the characters surrounding her will be profoundly felt in the instances of verbal FIS in this chapter. Like Emma Woodhouse, Isabel will see where she has gone wrong. She will discover her own flawed motivations, and she will see where she has acted deceptively. Unlike Emma, though, her increasing awareness of others, her distinguishing of disagreeable truths about others, truths formerly unknown will cause her to close her mind. James's use of verbal FIS in this chapter will highlight those moments of Isabel's continued ambivalence.

When this chapter begins, Isabel considers Lord Warburton, the subject of which her husband has instructed her to take charge. With a looming sense of her duty as Osmond's wife, Isabel considers whether she exercises influence over the English Lord and whether his own behavior toward Pansy does not speak to a hidden motive of remaining close to herself. Among the topics Isabel will consider during her meditations, this is by far the simplest. Either Lord Warburton loves Pansy for Pansy or he loves her for her stepmother. The simplicity of the question, however, does not bring Isabel to a satisfying answer. She considers her former suitor very briefly, and James casts this quick train of thought with a very strong presence of verbal FIS. Isabel's ambivalence toward Lord Warburton is apparent; she swings back and forth between skepticism and trust, all the while worrying over his motivations. The following two passages convey this ambivalent movement of Isabel's thoughts:

> The suggestion, from another, that she had a peculiar influence on Lord Warburton, had given her the start that accompanies unexpected recognition. Was it true that there was something still between them that might be a handle to make him declare himself to Pansy – a susceptibility, on his part, to approval, a desire to do what would please her? Isabel had hitherto not asked herself the question, because she had not been forced; but now that it was directly presented to her, she saw the answer, and the answer frightened her. Yes, there was something – something on Lord Warburton's part. (627)

> Was she to cultivate the advantage she possessed, in order to make him commit himself to Pansy, knowing that he would do so for her sake, and not for the young girl's – was this the service her husband had asked of her? This at any rate was the duty with which Isabel found herself confronted from the moment that she admitted to herself that Lord Warburton had still an uneradicated predilection for her society.… Isabel wandered among these ugly possibilities until she completely lost her way; some of them, as she suddenly encountered them, seemed ugly enough. Then she broke out of the labyrinth, rubbing her eyes, and declared that her imagination surely did her little honor, and that her husband's did him even less. Lord Warburton was as disinterested as he need be, and she was no more to him than she need wish. She would rest upon this until the contrary should be proved; proved more effectually than by a cynical intimation of Osmond's. (628)

The many instances of verbal FIS in this passage reveal Isabel's state of mind vis-à-vis Pansy's suitor. She "wanders" between admitting a disagreeable possibility, that Lord Warburton uses

Pansy as an excuse to remain close to her rather than to her step-daughter, and dismissing that possibility as uncharitable. The instances of verbal FIS in these passages focus on Isabel's ambivalent response to Warburton's motivations: "Was it true that there was something still between them … a susceptibility, on his part, to approval, a desire to do what would please her? … Yes, there was something – something on Lord Warburton's part" (627). Isabel questions herself, and from these passages we hear Isabel's thoughts: "*Is* it true that there *is* something still between *us* … a susceptibility, on his part, to approval, a desire to do what would please *me*? Yes, there *is* something." As Isabel continues to "wander," however, she changes her mind from one thought to the next: "Lord Warburton was as disinterested as he need be, and she was no more to him than she need wish" (628). In this instance of FIS we again hear Isabel's voice: "Lord Warburton *is* as disinterested as he need be, and *I am* no more to him than *I* need wish." Isabel's inner voice dominates in these instances FIS, and the translation from third-person to first-person, from past to present tense occurs rapidly as we read. The dual presence of the narrator and the character within this discourse, however, casts the slant of the narrator's perspective over Isabel's portrayed mind. We hear Isabel's thoughts, and we read them with her subjective position in mind, but the narrator's presence in the tense and person of the words causes the reader to register an additional perspective, a divergent perspective that leads the reader to suspect Isabel's inner assertion.

In these passages, Isabel changes her mind, and her indecision concerning Lord Warburton's intentions is witnessed by the reader not only in her thoughts but also in the swinging between two voices – that of the narrator and that of the character – characteristic of this discourse. FIS forces the reader into the ambivalent position between two simultaneous voices speaking the same words together. FIS shapes the portrayal of Isabel's wavering psyche,

and within a few paragraphs, James represents Isabel's contradictory conclusions. First, "Yes, there was something – something on Lord Warburton's part," and shortly thereafter, "Lord Warburton was as disinterested as he need be, and she was no more to him than she need wish" (627,628). By casting Isabel's thoughts in FIS, James mirrors the ambivalence and hesitation of her mind with the ambivalent moves the reader makes between these two coexisting but divergent voices. The language does not settle on one perspective, one voice, just as Isabel cannot settle on either of these readings of Warburton.

The presence of the narrator in these instances and in Isabel's quick dismissal of the issue foregrounds the irony inherent in her hasty and conflicting assertions. Isabel begins by examining Osmond's reading of Warburton, and this brings her "the start that accompanies unexpected recognition" (627). The two cited passages are marked by Isabel's movement toward a reading that faces her with two truths that she prefers not recognize. The double recognition that Warburton loves her still and that her calculating husband wants her to take advantage of his love causes Isabel to shut down: "Isabel wandered among these ugly possibilities until she completely lost her way … Then she broke out of the labyrinth, rubbing her eyes, and declared that her imagination surely did her little honor" (628). Isabel's ambivalence is grounded not only in her reading of Warburton, but in her relationship with this particular knowledge. When she hits on an answer, that Warburton acts with his love for Isabel in mind, she attributes this to her "imagination" in order to view it as merely a possibility rather than a truth. Isabel prefers not to see that Warburton is calculating and deceitful so she forces herself out of the "labyrinth" asserting that these readings are wrong.

James loads this scene with verbal FIS, driving the tempo of the passage forward quickly in a manner that parallels Isabel's own desire to move away from this unpleasant topic whether

or not a satisfying conclusion has been reached. Irony emerges because we see Isabel's forced self-deceit, but also because we know more than Isabel. Some pages earlier, in chapter thirty-nine, Ralph and Lord Warburton discuss their stay in Rome, and Ralph questions Warburton on his intentions with respect to Isabel's step-daughter, Pansy Osmond. Their conversation is marked both by candor and by indirection. Warburton blushes when, after he states that he no longer has any intention to "make love to" Isabel, Ralph questions his purposes: "Permit me to ask whether it is to bring out the fact that you don't mean to make love to [Isabel] that you are so very civil to the little girl?" (603). The discussion turns to marriage, and in a succession of misunderstood statements, Warburton is forced to clarify that "she" in his "Do you think she'll be pleased [about his marriage to Pansy]" refers not to Pansy but to Isabel (603). Without realizing the significance, Warburton places Isabel's pleasure over that of the girl he pursues. Ralph gets to the heart of the question when he wonders aloud shortly thereafter: "I hope you are sure that among Miss Osmond's merits her being a – so near her stepmother isn't a leading one?" (604). Warburton denies this angrily. This dialogue puts the reader on guard. Warburton appears to understand little his own desires, and his actions toward Pansy carry a hint of deception. James schools his reader to trust Ralph's assessments; we believe his reading of Isabel when she informs him of her engagement to Osmond, and we believe him again in his reading of Lord Warburton. He suspects that Warburton is not acting on good intentions, and Warburton's eventual departure from Rome without asking for Pansy's hand acts as proof of Ralph's point.

Isabel's brief consideration of Warburton in chapter forty-two demonstrates her unwillingness to admit to her own continued influence over him. She finally delays considering her indecision by taking the safe and generous route. She comes to tell herself that these suggestions about Warburton are not true, and she "rest[s] upon this" more palatable conclusion

which allows her also to put off considering her own role in Pansy's marriage (628). If she tells herself that she has no influence over Warburton, then she also has no power to cause him to act quickly and decisively vis-à-vis Pansy. Reading this particular dilemma, we see Isabel's self-deceit; we witness her decision to halt her reading of Warburton when that reading brings with it the unpleasant realization that "Yes, there was something – something on Lord Warburton's part" (627). The verbal FIS of these passages thrusts Isabel's indecision into the forefront of our reading; her contradictory conclusions about Lord Warburton reveal not simply her indecision about Warburton himself, but her ambivalence toward painful knowledge of those surrounding her, a desire to shut such knowledge out.

The bulk of the chapter concerns Isabel's consideration of her husband, of their current relationship, and of their early courtship. Unlike her hurried and quickly dismissed inquiry into Lord Warburton's motivations, Isabel sits with these memories for a long while. The FIS of this section seamlessly knits together Isabel's mind and the narrator's voice. The two are both present, but they are more difficult to disentangle one from the other than was the case in the previous section on Warburton. Here, Isabel begins to read correctly – she begins to see where she went wrong, and she makes correct assessments of her marriage in its current state. Just as the ironic posture of FIS decreases in Austen's novel when Emma begins to read more accurately, in this lengthy section of chapter forty-two, Isabel's assessment of her past motivations and the current state of her marriage accord with the narrator's perspective. The following passage comes very early in Isabel's internal investigation of her relationship with Gilbert Osmond:

> Was the fault in himself, or only in the deep mistrust she had conceived for him? This mistrust was the clearest result of their short married life; a gulf had opened between them over which they looked at each other with eyes that were on either side a declaration of the deceptions suffered. It was a strange opposition, of the like of which

> she had never dreamed – an opposition in which the vital principle of the one was a thing of contempt to the other. It was not her fault – she had practiced no deception; she had only admired and believed. (629)

The passage begins with an example of verbal FIS: "Was the fault in himself, or only in the deep mistrust she had conceived for him?" (629). This question, embedded among reports of Isabel's mind, conveys her verbal consciousness, and we read this as a question she poses herself but that retains the narrator's presence, "*Is* the fault in himself or only in the deep mistrust *I* conceived for him?" The middle section of the passage, however, "… a gulf had opened between them over which they looked at each other with eyes that were on either side a declaration of the deceptions suffered," is an indirect report from the narrator's perspective (629). In this example the narrator reports Isabel's consciousness of the deep divide now separating her from her husband, and the narrator does so without irony as she reads the current state of her marriage.

In this section of chapter forty-two, in Isabel's examination of herself and her husband, James calls attention to Isabel's progressive movement toward knowledge, and the narrator's largely indirect report of her mind, punctuated here and there with verbal FIS, moves her away from indecision and toward understanding. In this chapter of the novel, James moves away from FIS as his character moves closer to a full awareness. In these examples, we continue to recognize the perspective of both the narrator and the character, but in these cases those perspectives are very closely aligned. We register both points of view, but this dialogue is one of assent. As she wanders through memories and impressions, Isabel confronts her past mistakes and indecisions, and James's discourse underscores Isabel's acknowledgement of truth. Isabel does not arrive at full awareness at once; within her consciousness she gradually becomes a better reader, at times reverting to ambivalence, at times gaining awareness, and in this way, she

is the Jamesian character who most resembles Austen's *Emma*. Her education in reading moves forward even as it occasionally suffers setbacks.

The previous passage cited ends with the following example of verbal FIS: "It was not her fault – she had practiced no deception; she had only admired and believed" (629). An example of verbal FIS ("It *is* not *my* fault – *I* practiced no deception"), we read this both as the narrator's and as her own words. This FIS returns the reader to the ambivalent pendulum swing typical of dual-voiced discourse. The narrator's perspective within these words ironically points to Isabel's self-deception; throughout the novel we have been trained to privilege Ralph's reading of his cousin. That reading tells us that Isabel *is* at fault, that she picks a husband based on a reversal of qualities; she sees his negative traits as positives. At the same time, if we read this FIS with Isabel's perspective in mind, we see that she is correct, and that she is not at fault – not in the same way as Madame Merle and Osmond himself are. Isabel may not at first see her culpability in what she recognizes as "a gulf … opened between them," but as she continues her meditations she will begin to recognize and repair her misreading.

Unlike her quick move away from her reading of Lord Warburton, Isabel remains on the topic of her husband for a number of pages. She remains very close to the path that opens up before her, the path that will lead her to conclude that "she had not read him right" and that "he despised her" (631, 637). Isabel's ambivalent reaction to Warburton's pursuit of Pansy Osmond causes her to shut her eyes to that problem. The overall progression of her reading of her husband and of herself, however, is forward moving,

> She had a vision of him – she had not read him right. A certain combination of features had touched her, and in them she had seen the most striking of portraits … He was like a skeptical voyager, strolling on the beach while he waited for the tide, looking seaward yet not putting to sea. It was in all this that she found her occasion. She would launch his boat for him; she would be his providence; it would be a good thing to love him. And she loved him – a good deal for what she found in him, but also a good deal for what she

> brought him. As she looked back at the passion of those weeks she perceived in it a kind of maternal strain – the happiness of a woman who felt that she was a contributor, that she came with full hands. But for her money, as she saw to-day, she wouldn't have done it. (631)

We are reminded of Ralph's reading of Isabel some chapters earlier. He saw her self-deception, her ability to see Osmond's faults as positive qualities, and here, in this late chapter of the novel, Isabel recognizes her mistake. This passage presents a particular challenge, though, because James highlights not only the narrator's and Isabel's perspective, but also Isabel's past perspective. Moving through this passage we observe that Isabel reads herself; she re-reads her early view of Osmond. This early view is couched in visual perceptions; Isabel saw Osmond, she imagined him within a visual framework. Isabel's present perspective, however, the perspective she attests to as she sits silently by her fireside is a re-interpretation of her motives based on this reading. The passage opens with an instance of FIS: "She had a vision of him – she had not read him right. A certain combination of features had touched her, and in them she had seen the most striking of portraits…" (631). We implicitly translate this line as: "*I* had a vision of him – *I* did not read him right. A certain combination of features touched *me*, and in them *I* saw the most striking of portraits." Following this we have a representation of Isabel's mind re-reading her past visual perceptions of Osmond: "He was like a skeptical voyager, strolling on the beach while he waited for the tide, looking seaward yet not putting to sea. It was in all this that she found her occasion" (631). Together with the narrator's continued verbal presence, Isabel's present voice combines with her past voice in a retrospective view of her motivations toward Osmond, and there is a hierarchical relationship between the two because Isabel now sees more than she did then. She knows now that she misread. James's narrator remains a strong presence, interacting with and assenting to Isabel's present reading as she reinterprets her past actions. Admitting that she misread, Isabel now reads correctly; she re-interprets her past vision of her

husband and of the role she cast for herself. Alone, reconsidering these memories, Isabel becomes the "narrator" to her past self. She occupies an external, privileged vantage point vis-à-vis the Isabel that is now a character in her mind. Isabel reads that character's impulses accurately, "She would launch his boat for him; she would be his providence; it would be a good thing to love him" (631). FIS represents the bulk of this passage. This discourse is *formally* ambivalent. It is dual-voiced, but rather than revealing indecision or wavering on Isabel's part, this FIS, in which Isabel's voice combines with her past perceptions, moves her toward knowledge and away from ambivalence. She repairs a misreading and dissolves any indecision she might have felt concerning her early view of Gilbert Osmond.

The final example I will cite from Isabel's analysis of her relationship with her husband arrives toward the end of the chapter. She begins to consider what future she can now expect, and she returns to uncertainty:

> What did he think of her – that she was base, vulgar, ignoble? He at least knew now that she had no traditions! …. some of his traditions made her push back her skirts. Did all women have lovers? Did they all lie, and even the best have their price? Were there only three of four that didn't deceive their husbands? …
>
> … It was very simple; he despised her …. What was coming – what was before them? That was her constant question. What would he do – what ought she to do? When a man hated his wife, what did it lead to? She didn't hate him, that she was sure of, for every little while she felt a passionate wish to give him a pleasant surprise. Very often, however, she felt afraid, and it used to come over her, as I have intimated, that she had deceived him at the very first. They were strangely married, at all events, and it was an awful life. (636-637)

In this passage James returns very strongly to verbal FIS and to Isabel's continued indecision concerning what to do next. These questions, "What was coming – what was before them? … What would he do – what ought she to do? When a man hated his wife, what did it lead to?" call to mind an image of the words passing through Isabel's mind (637). James returns to his portrayal of verbal consciousness, and this forceful return foregrounds the indecision that Isabel

will never resolve. Though the similarities between *The Portrait* and *Emma* are strong, where Austen's novel ends with all questions answered and with all uncertainties resolved, James's novel conspicuously resists ending in this manner. Even as this novel comes to a close, Isabel will leave her husband only to return to him without a clear sense of purpose. More importantly, however, James's *The Portrait* begins the move in his oeuvre toward what will become a radical devaluing of univocal reading and of "truth." Isabel may reach definite and "correct" readings, readings to which the narrator assents, but not all in this novel conforms to that goal.

Conspicuously missing from Isabel's growing awareness in chapter forty-two is an examination of her impression of Madame Merle and Osmond, which, together with her husband's request that she influence Lord Warburton, prompts the nighttime vigil. While Isabel sees the correctness of her reading of Lord Warburton, his continued desire to please Isabel, but stops her reading out of a preference not to see, Madame Merle exists in Isabel's mind as a highly opaque subject. The moment of Isabel's impression stands out in the novel as a strong visual image, one in which layouts and stage directions paint an unambiguous image of Isabel's view of her husband and Madame Merle; in this instance they are the subjects of reading and Isabel is their reader. The impression itself occurs prior to chapter forty-two, and James narrates this scene in the voice of the narrator who reports:

> Isabel passed into the drawing-room, the one she herself usually occupied, the second in order from the large ante-chamber which was entered from the staircase, and in which even Gilbert Osmond's rich devices had not been able to correct a look of rather grand nudity. Just beyond the threshold of the drawing-room she stopped short, the reason for her doing so being that she had received an impression. The impression had, in strictness, nothing unprecedented; but she felt it as something new, and the soundlessness of her step gave her time to take in the scene before she interrupted it. Madame Merle sat there in her bonnet, and Gilbert Osmond was talking to her; for a minute they were unaware that she had come in. Isabel had often seen that before, certainly; but what she had not seen, or at least had not noticed – was that their dialogue had for the moment converted itself into a sort of familiar silence, from which she instantly perceived that her entrance would startle them. Madame Merle was standing on the rug, a little way from the fire;

> Osmond was in a deep chair, leaning back and looking at her. Her head was erect, as usual, but her eyes were bent upon his. What struck Isabel first was that he was sitting while Madame Merle stood; there was an anomaly in this that arrested her. Then she perceived that they had arrived at a desultory pause in their exchange of ideas, and were musing, face to face, with the freedom of old friends who sometimes exchange ideas without uttering them. There was nothing shocking in this; they were old friends in fact. But the thing made an image, lasting only a moment, like a sudden flicker of light. Their relative position, their absorbed mutual gaze, struck her as something detected. (611-612)

I have quoted this passage at length because it is one of the few moments in the novel in which James calls such strong attention to the details of mise-en-scène. This passage begins with a detailed description, a map nearly, of the positions occupied by Isabel and by her two subjects in the drawing room. James highlights Isabel's movement from one room to the next, and she remains very near the threshold of the room which her subjects occupy. "Just beyond the threshold of the drawing-room she stopped short" the narrator tells us, and though the reason for her stop on the threshold may be practical – she realizes in an instant that her presence, if noted, will cause this scene to break up – Isabel's physical position parallels her stance vis-à-vis knowledge and consciousness. Isabel stands on the threshold between ignorance and knowledge, and her meditations in chapter forty-two represent a move across the threshold into awareness, but she has not yet stepped entirely into full consciousness. As the narrator repeats a few times, Isabel finds nothing unusual in the scene laid out before her, but, nonetheless, it registers with her as "something detected" (612). Her awareness and her perceptions are growing and expanding; as Isabel reaches new depths of unhappiness, she reads with new eyes, and scenes that might have formerly appeared benign, now carry grains of significance.

What remains quite striking about chapter forty-two is its avoidance of this impression. Isabel cannot obtain facts or explanations about the relationship between these two characters from her nighttime vigil, but she can explore the impression and its effect on her in light of what she already knows about Osmond and Madame Merle. This impression receives, however, only

scant attention, and the following two passages bookend the chapter. She begins and she ends her meditations with this ripe subject, but she pursues it to no great depth. The first passage quoted below occurs very near the chapter's beginning while the second ends the chapter,

> … her soul was haunted with terrors which crowded to the foreground of thought as quickly as a place was made for them. What had suddenly set them into livelier motion she hardly knew, unless it were the strange impression she had received in the afternoon of her husband and Madame Merle being in more direct communication than she suspected. This impression came back to her from time to time, and now she wondered that it had never come before. (628)

> When the clock struck four she got up; she was going to bed at last, for the lamp had long since gone out and the candles had burned down to their sockets. But even then she stopped again in the middle of the room, and stood there gazing at a remembered vision – that of her husband and Madame Merle, grouped unconsciously and familiarly. (639)

These passages emerge primarily from the voice of the narrator who reports on Isabel indirectly. The second passage especially returns Isabel to a subject of view rather than as the chief reader. She may be in the act of seeing, viewing the remembered vision of "her husband and Madame Merle, grouped unconsciously and familiarly," but James restricts access to her consciousness (639). We do not see through her eyes or through her mind; we watch her from the outside as she watches them in her minds' eye. Ending this chapter, this portrayal of Isabel's mind, James returns to the narrator's voice alone and to Isabel's largely closed psyche. If this impression of her husband and Madame Merle represents a path open to Isabel to pursue, she does not take that path in these meditations. Chapter forty-two represents Isabel's steps toward self-awareness, toward self-knowledge, and faced with this path, Isabel proceeds forward. Isabel's gain in self-awareness brings with it parallel acknowledgements of her husband's past motivations and deceptions; as she sees herself more clearly and more accurately, Isabel sees better Osmond's actions and motives which she formerly misread. Madame Merle, however, remains impossibly opaque.

Isabel's psychological ambivalence in *The Portrait* is not the deeply pervasive fact that it will be in *The Golden Bowl*. Isabel arrives at definite knowledge in this particular scene and in the novel: knowledge about herself and about the current state of her marriage. As Isabel moves toward this knowledge, however, she manifests "local" ambivalence and unease, ambivalence regarding other characters such as Warburton and Madame Merle, and she chooses to close her eyes to those truths. The crucial path indicated in this chapter, however, is the path that she takes to arrive at a clear re-reading of herself, her past motivations and deceptions. As Austen's narrator is aligned with Emma when that character repairs her arrogance and her misreading, so James's narrator is closely aligned with Isabel's psyche as she acknowledges her former misreading and her former deceptions. *The Portrait* differs from *Emma*, however, in the continued opacity of the characters surrounding Isabel. In James's novel, Isabel cannot know these other characters, their motivations and their perceptions, with certainty. In *The Portrait of a Lady*, James reveals his concern with questions of *knowability*, of reading and of interpretation; in this novel, knowledge is difficult, but it is not impossible to attain. Maggie's meditations in volume two of *The Golden Bowl*, however, present a theater for her ambivalent maneuvers skirting around any and all knowledge. When he reaches *The Golden Bowl*, James's epistemology permeates all aspects of the novel, and the path toward knowledge as well as the relationship James's late characters have with knowledge is firmly rooted in ambivalence.

****

"She had but wanted to get nearer – nearer to something indeed that she couldn't, that she wouldn't, even to herself, describe; and the degree of this achieved nearness was what had been in advance incalculable." (332)

Volume two of *The Golden Bowl* opens with a curious temporal move: "It wasn't till many days had passed that the Princess began to accept the idea of having done, a little,

something she was not always doing, or indeed that of having listened to any inward voice that spoke in a new tone" (327). James begins the second volume in spatial and in temporal ambiguity. The moment at which the narration takes place is unclear. How many days have passed, and from what date is this passage of time counted? Volume one, "The Prince," ends on the Assingham's two-chapter-long discussion of Charlotte and Amerigo's relationship and of Maggie, of how much she knows about her husband and her stepmother, of her relative innocence, and of how she will conceal her knowledge from her father. This conversation occurs after Fanny alerts Maggie and her father of Amerigo and Charlotte's decision to remain at Matcham for an additional afternoon while the other guests have departed. The subsequent conversation between Fanny and Bob Assingham ends with Fanny's pronouncement that Maggie would sooner die before revealing to her father what she might come to know.

For a number of chapters leading up to the second volume, James traces a clear linear narrative; the Assinghams, together with Charlotte and Amerigo, attend the raucous annual weekend party at Matcham while Maggie and her father characteristically remain home with the *principino*, Maggie and Amerigo's young son. When only Colonel Assingham and Fanny return home at the scheduled time while Charlotte and Amerigo remain an additional afternoon, Fanny interprets this questionable behavior, plays out various scenes and successions, and, importantly, attempts to clear herself of the guilt of involvement with the adulterous couple. Fanny, after all, "made" both Amerigo and Charlotte's marriages to Maggie and Adam, the novel's unsuspecting "innocents." Volume two begins with a strong departure from the novel's heretofore linearity. James places the narrative within Maggie's mind, and we find a peculiar description of Maggie's vision of a pagoda "occupying for months and months the very centre of her garden of life" (327). The volume represents an important shift in the novel. It places Maggie now as an active

reader, and James underscores this shift precisely by ending volume one with a reading of Maggie and beginning volume two with Maggie in the act of reading.

In an article dedicated to this episode of *The Golden Bowl*, Dorrit Cohn describes the difficulty of the first two chapters of this second volume and ascribes that difficulty to discursive shifts in point of view as well as to the temporal ambiguity of the scene. Quoting Seymour Chatman's *The Later Style of Henry James*, Cohn writes:

> As Chatman has shown, James's characters tend to go through a stage of "precognition," in which they ponder or contemplate a situation without drawing definitive conclusions; only later on may this stage be followed by fully conscious cognition (15-16, 31). In chapters 1 and 2 of volume 2 of *The Golden Bowl* the precognition and cognitive stages seem to have been curiously juxtaposed; even as they render the immediacy of Maggie's experience, with its demand for appropriate, socially acceptable responses, they render the moment of full comprehension, when Maggie, in solitary meditation after several days have elapsed, faces the upsettingly surprising realization and allows it to sink into consciousness. (6-7)

Volume two opens in the midst of Maggie's "solitary meditation," and in this portrayal of her mind, James does not locate his heroine in a particular space or time. Whereas the vision of Isabel's mind in *The Portrait* takes place as that heroine sits at her fireside late at night, Maggie's mind is the only stage, her consciousness the only actor. Taking a novel such as *The Portrait* for a model, however, we assume that these meditations follow the scene that closes volume one in which Fanny and Bob Assingham conclude that Maggie "doubts." Reading this scene for the first time, we suppose that Maggie, sitting at her home awaiting her husband, recognizes an unsettling difference because he delays his return from Matcham. A reconstruction of the incidents, however, points to a crucial ellipsis between the end of volume one and the beginning of volume two. Volume two opens ten days after Fanny and Bob's conversation that ended volume one. This volume begins days after Maggie waits impatiently for Amerigo to return home, days after she goes to her father's home the next morning to talk with Charlotte about the

weekend, and after Maggie has put into action her decision to alter the dynamic of her familial quartet by spending more time with Charlotte and leaving her husband to turn to his father-in-law for company.

Maggie's meditations at the opening of this episode, her growing awareness of an alarm, are not the result of the delayed return from Matcham but of her consideration of Amerigo and Charlotte's expressions when they are each separately faced with her after their return. Toward the end of the volume's first chapter, we read: "The blankness [Amerigo] showed her before he was able to *see* might, should she choose to insist upon it, have a meaning – have, as who should say, a historic value – beyond the importance of momentary expressions in general" (336). Amerigo's "historic" expression that Maggie looks back on in this episode of volume two finds a mirror in Charlotte's face the morning following the delayed return from Matcham: "for a minute Charlotte's face, immediately presented to her, affected her as searching her own to see the reminder tell" (347). The likeness of these expressions sets Maggie on a path she had not formerly seen. Together, they alert her to trouble, and she determines to change the dynamics of her family, taking from now on Charlotte instead of her father as her daily companion. When she embarks on the inner examination that begins the second volume of the novel, she has these troubling expressions in mind as well as Charlotte and Amerigo's quick acquiescence to her new plan. James's readers must piece all of this excised information together as we follow the meandering path of Maggie's mind. The opening of volume two does not represent Maggie's first foray into acknowledging a problem; rather, it represents her reflections following actions taken based on the first inklings that we as readers do not witness. James leaves out Maggie's initial reaction to the delayed return of her husband and her stepmother and her first reaction to the expressions she encounters on each of their faces. Instead he writes her *re-reading* of these

first reactions. This scene depicts Maggie's psyche as she looks back on and re-reads a past moment, and the reader is at a distinct epistemological disadvantage. Though the reader knows more than Maggie about Charlotte, Amerigo, and Fanny, the reader does not know the events that give rise to Maggie's consciousness displayed in the opening of this volume.

Like Isabel Archer, Maggie examines her memories and her impressions, and in them she identifies the seeds of very troubling truths. Unlike the provocations that are narrated prior to and that prompt Isabel's vigil in *The Portrait of Lady*, however, Maggie's meditations represent all that James provides by way of narrating the incidents of the ellipsis. We see these incidents through Maggie's eyes only; we see them through her silent meditations after "many days had past" (327). Many of the readings of Maggie ventured by other characters in volume one are based on scenes unobserved by the reader, and this ellipsis in volume two continues James's predilection for unfolding his narrative solely within the mind of his focalizers who internally revisit and recompose these scenes. James presents little in this novel for the reader to assess on his or her own; instead he underscores the filters that arise between readers and knowledge by presenting readings and interpretations rather than events and incidents. *The Golden Bowl* privileges the perceptions of an analytical mind over the direct portrayal of incidents and actions, and in this case, Maggie's perceptions are marked by her strong ambivalence.

A few chapters into the second volume, just before the golden bowl arrives in Maggie's possession, Maggie considers how she has been concealing her suspicions, and how she intends to continue to do so. Within these considerations we find the following line: "Knowledge, knowledge, was a fascination as well as a fear" (422). Maggie's ambivalence lies in her relationship to knowledge. She is tempted by knowledge; she suspects, she doubts, and she wants to "see." Rather than pursing knowledge, though, Maggie constructs metaphors that distance her

from direct examination of her doubts, and she buries her suspicions so that they never escape from her lips. Maggie plans her actions and her behavior with such detail as to prevent any doubt that she doubts. Maggie hides her worry because, in effect, she resists exploring its depths even for herself. She resists her own motives and resists her instinctive reactions: "Unless she were in a position to plead definitely that she was jealous she should be in no position to plead decently that she was dissatisfied … To say anything at all would be in fine to have to say *why* she was jealous; and she could in her private hours but stare long, with suffused eyes, at that impossibility" (349). Maggie acknowledges her jealousy, she acts on it, but she resists exploring its origins. Together with her construction of metaphors, her concealment, and her manner of viewing, James's peculiar, highly ambiguous use of FIS in this episode calls particular attention to Maggie's inherent ambivalence toward knowledge, toward what she will allow herself to "see" about her husband, about Charlotte, even about the Assinghams.

The question of FIS in these two chapters of the opening of volume two in *The Golden Bowl* is a crucial one. Reading the chapters very closely produces few instances of extended verbal FIS in which Maggie's inner thoughts emerge within the narrator's discourse. The verbal FIS of this episode occurs in only very brief moments. Instead, James favors a marriage of Maggie's mind with the narrator's words so that the two are difficult to separate. In *Transparent Minds*, Dorrit Cohn borrows Leo Spitzer's term "stylistic contagion" to describe the blending of FIS ("narrated monologue") with "psycho-narration," or indirect discourse representing the mind of the character. She explains: "'stylistic contagion' can serve to designate places where psycho-narration verges on narrated monologue, marking a kind of mid-point between the two techniques where a reporting syntax is maintained, but where the idiom is strongly affected (or infected) with the mental idiom of the mind it renders" (33). In many of the examples within this

episode, the descriptive discourse of the narrator appears to be "infected" with the intrusion of Maggie's words. James's FIS in the opening of volume two alternates between the verbal and nonverbal varieties, but FIS in this episode of *The Golden Bowl* is chiefly nonverbal. James does not here employ those markers that typically signal FIS: exclamations or questions a character poses to herself. Even the occasional word printed in italics does not stand definitively as verbal FIS. In this episode, James's language admits to its dual perspective, we are acutely aware of Maggie's psyche as our chief stage, but James's language resists even the familiar verbal FIS. As the episode chronicles Maggie's hesitant moves toward awareness, James's ambiguous use of FIS traces a highly tentative move toward portraying her psyche. She cannot "get at" knowledge or truth directly, and the narration cannot unequivocally portray her consciousness.

Fanny's readings of Maggie have already provided the reader with a vision shaped by Maggie's relationship with knowledge. Fanny reads Maggie as a character who prefers not to see and not to understand. We arrive at this depiction of her mind in volume two attuned to Maggie's self-deception, but we also arrive with the knowledge of Charlotte and Amerigo's relationship. The reader knows what is hidden from Maggie, what she may suspect; we are able to watch her "getting warm" as it were, nearing the truth, but we also see her steering clear of "getting hot." "For if James is fascinated by the human need to suppress and conceal," Yeazell writes, "his imagination is equally obsessed by the fateful process of disclosure" (32). In this opening episode of volume two, James portrays Maggie as a character inextricably caught between beginning to see and not wanting to know. As Yeazell's language suggests, Maggie shuts her eyes to knowledge, and she conceals even the little that she begins to see. James's use of FIS in this episode calls attention to the wavering and ambivalence of Maggie's consciousness and continues James's focus on the difficulty of knowledge.

***

"The great decorated surface had remained consistently impenetrable and inscrutable." (327)

The first image of the novel's second volume is the "pagoda" in "the centre of the garden of [Maggie's] life" (327). This "pagoda" or, as she later calls it, the "Mahometan mosque," is both seductive and menacing. Maggie imagines approaching it and lightly tapping its surface, but she also views it as something from which she is excluded. The image of the pagoda emerges within the narration without explanation. It "rears" itself suddenly at the chapter's opening just as Maggie imagines it "rearing" within her life. After the lengthy opening paragraph which provides a description of the pagoda, the narrator reports what this image represents: "the pagoda in her blooming garden figured the arrangement – how otherwise was it to be named? – by which, so strikingly, she had been able to marry without breaking, as she liked to put it, with her past" (328). We hear Maggie's voice in the question posed: "-how otherwise was it to be named?-"; the narrator attunes the reader to Maggie's presence also with "as she liked to put it" which behaves as a signal to her words. These nods to her voice infuse the surrounding sentences with her presence, and they underscore the verbal FIS that may have otherwise gone undetected. This brief instance of verbal FIS highlights Maggie's ambivalence concerning the "arrangement" that this pagoda represents. "How otherwise was it to be named?" suggests Maggie's hesitation to settle on the word "arrangement" and to settle on a reading of the metaphor. If verbal FIS frequently signals character ambivalence, here we see that Maggie's immediate ambivalence concerns how she will read her image. She focuses on the pagoda, and this saves her from having to focus directly on the impressions that lately cause her alarm.

Maggie's mind is inextricably bound to the image of this pagoda as the second volume begins; she is its originator, and her simultaneous attraction and repulsion parallels her

relationship to knowledge. This pagoda is as strange and appealing to the reader as it is to Maggie; it calls out for interpretation, and while it appears, on first read, to stand for the hidden relationship that we know exists between Charlotte and Amerigo, it also defies this reading:

> This situation had been occupying for months and months the very centre of the garden of her life, but it had reared itself there like some strange tall tower of ivory, or perhaps rather some wonderful beautiful but outlandish pagoda, a structure plaited with hard bright porcelain, coloured and figured and adorned at the overhanging eaves with silver bells tinkling ever so charmingly when stirred by chance airs. She had walked round and round it – that was what she felt; she had carried on her existence in the space left her for circulation, a space that seemed sometimes ample, sometimes narrow … At present, however, to her considering mind, it was as if she had ceased merely to circle and to scan the elevation, ceased so vaguely, so quite helplessly to stare and wonder: she had caught herself distinctly in the act of pausing, then in that of lingering, and finally in that of stepping unprecedentedly near. The thing might have been, by the distance at which it kept her, a Mahometan mosque, with which no base heretic could take a liberty, there so hung about it the vision of one's putting off one's shoes to enter and even verily of paying with one's life if found there as an interloper. She hadn't certainly arrived at the conception of paying with her life for anything she might do; but it was nevertheless quite as if she had sounded with a tap or two one of the rare porcelain plates. She had knocked, in short – though she could scarce have said whether for admission or for what; she had applied her hand to a cool, smooth spot, and had waited to see what would happen. Something *had* happened; it was as if a sound, at her touch, after a little, had come back to her from within; a sound sufficiently suggesting that her approach had been noted. (299-300)

This pagoda assumes a primary position in Maggie's consciousness; in this move to her mind in volume two, this image marks the reader's first sally into Maggie's psyche. Isabel's meditations began with her back and forth consideration of Lord Warburton's intentions, deployed in verbal FIS. *The Golden Bowl* moves to Maggie's ambivalent perspective with this heroine's creation of an extended metaphor that ultimately distances her from concrete knowledge. "[I]n James's late fiction," Yeazell remarks, "the metaphoric imagination works with its most feverish intensity when faced with knowledge that is both deeply desired and profoundly terrifying" (54). This pagoda together with the many other metaphors Maggie will construct over the course of these two chapters deflects and conceals knowledge while at the same time it allows her to approach

and to examine in apparent safety. Yeazell argues that James's metaphors often have little, if any, immediately apparent relationship to that which they stand for. She cites the example of the comparison of Maggie to a "silken-coated spaniel who has scrambled out of and who rattles the water from his ears" (302). There is no relationship between Maggie and a spaniel; the image is arbitrarily chosen, and Yeazell attributes the reader's "unease" to this arbitrariness. She writes:

> ... so many late Jamesian metaphors ... arouse in us a persistent unease .... James's metaphors seem almost invariably responses of the brain, not of the senses. The Jamesian universe is not one of material resemblances; though the vehicles of his metaphors are themselves sensuously imagined, conceptual relationships govern the terms of comparison. (41)

In his later works James creates metaphors that often seem out of place and unrelated, and at times the sheer length and space they occupy presents an occasion to lose track of the plot. In the case of the pagoda in this episode in *The Golden Bowl*, such uses of metaphor stress James's focus on the workings of the human mind as it gains awareness and constructs knowledge; the metaphor forces his readers to remain within the mind of the character that constructs, examines, and interacts with the metaphor. As a metaphor that she creates, this pagoda reinforces Maggie's ambivalence vis-à-vis knowledge because her meditations on the pagoda represent an oblique rather than a direct examination of the problem it represents. James's particular use of FIS in this passage calls attention to that ambivalence as well.

As the originator of this metaphor, Maggie envisions it "rear[ing] itself" suddenly out of a "situation so long present to her as practically unattackable," but the narration of this passage is difficult to ascribe (327). The perspective of the narration remains shared between the narrator and the character, but apart from a few words and phrases here and there, the narrator's language dominates. This passage is primarily nonverbal FIS in which the narrator reports the non-vocalized contents of Maggie's mind. The pagoda is an image Maggie envisions, and James

represents her thoughts of it as visual and spatial rather than verbal. This passage describes Maggie in physical relation with the structure she imagines; she sees herself "circling" and touching the structure without being able to enter. These are visual thoughts in which Maggie sees herself in a particular space interacting with particular objects.

In portions of the above passage, for instance, the pagoda itself is compared to a mosque, and the agency of the discourse is highly uncertain. We are within a representation of Maggie's mind; it is she who fears and remains at a distance from the pagoda. The discourse, however, resists extended use of Maggie's voice. Her verbal presence emerges within the pagoda passage in short bursts and in individual words. This style suggests Cohn's "stylistic contagion" embedded within nonverbal FIS:

> The thing might have been, by the distance at which it kept her, a Mahometan mosque, with which no base heretic could take a liberty, there so hung about it the vision of one's putting off one's shoes to enter and even verily of paying with one's life if found there as an interloper. She hadn't certainly arrived at the conception of paying with her life for anything she might do; but it was nevertheless quite as if she had sounded with a tap or two one of the rare porcelain plates. She had knocked, in short – though she could scarce have said whether for admission or for what; she had applied her hand to a cool, smooth spot, and had waited to see what would happen. Something *had* happened; it was as if a sound, at her touch, after a little, had come back to her from within; a sound sufficiently suggesting that her approach had been noted. (299-300)

Though we can with some assurance place certain words or phrases in Maggie's voice. Expressions like "there so hung about it," "verily," "She hadn't certainly," "it was nevertheless quite as if," and "Something *had* happened" with their intensifiers and their sometimes slangy quality, replicate the intonations of speech and highlight Maggie's voice. It must be noted, however, that these instances of verbal FIS are by no means certain. This passage makes much greater use of nonverbal FIS, Maggie's visual consciousness represented in the words of the narrator. Her thoughts do not primarily take the shape of words in these meditations, but her mind remains highly active and perceptive. There is a strong sense in this passage of both

perspectives, but James's discourse removes any clear markers separating Maggie's presence from the narrator's. Here and there we may be able to argue that this word can only belong to Maggie, that only to the narrator. Unlike his use of FIS in *The Portrait*, however, James does not here employ those markers that typically signal verbal FIS: exclamations or questions posed to oneself. Even the occasional word printed in italics does not stand definitively as verbal FIS.

The dialogic relationship between Maggie's nonverbal perspective and the narrator's voice that we see in this lengthy passage creates a situation in which the reader wavers between the two points of view. This wavering, however does not take place at particular moments, from one word or sentence to the next. James creates ambiguity because the narrator appears to merge with Maggie and take on her position throughout the entire passage. This nonverbal FIS obscures agency because, though the narrator "speaks" more frequently, he speaks Maggie's mind. The narration follows the contours of her consciousness without reproducing her words because, in this case, Maggie thinks primarily in images and in elusive impressions. The simultaneous presence of these two perspectives is, then, partially concealed in this narration. In "The Narrator as Center in 'The Wings of the Dove'" Leo Bersani describes the relationship between James's narrator and his centers of consciousness in that novel. Bersani's remarks are equally applicable to this discussion of *The Golden Bowl*:

> 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. Not only are stylistic distinctions between narrator and centers difficult to perceive; the former's thoughts are assimilated to his characters' minds. (131)

Maggie's psychological ambivalence, her hesitant relationship to knowledge reveals itself within James's own ambiguous usage of FIS in this passage. Maggie puts off knowledge by constructing metaphors for her growing perceptions, and James's narration of these metaphors

wavers between two simultaneously present perspectives. This narration behaves toward agency and toward certainty just as Maggie behaves toward knowledge. She registers its presence, but obscures its contours, fashioning her awareness otherwise, choosing to interact with a physical structure whose menace is tempered by stasis and predictability. The combination of verbal and nonverbal FIS in this passage, the manner in which Maggie's voice appears only momentarily and with hesitation renders highly problematic the reader's ascription of the narration.

***

Though much of this opening episode of *The Golden Bowl*'s volume two makes use of nonverbal FIS, moments of verbal FIS punctuate the discourse here and there. A few of these instances remind the reader of Maggie's self-deception and of the reader's own more complete knowledge of the minds of Maggie's adversaries. "… [S]he had been able to marry, as she liked to put it, without breaking with her past. She had surrendered herself to her husband without the shadow of a reserve or a condition and yet hadn't all the while given up her father by the least little inch" (328). The passage begins with a nod to Maggie's internal voice with the narrator's "as she liked to put it," and we presume that the sentence that follows it retains the presence of Maggie's voice. The narration of that sentence, however, is uncertain; the demarcation between Maggie's voice and the narrator's voice remains unclear. We remain wholly within Maggie's consciousness as we will throughout the episode, but James makes greater apparent use of the narrator's voice to report Maggie's consciousness. "She had surrendered herself to her husband without the shadow of a reserve or a condition" registers as the voice of the narrator reporting Maggie's perspective on her early married life, the narrator restating in different words what is given as her phrasing, "she had been able to marry … without breaking with her past" (328). The narrator's restatement does not give itself away as verbal FIS until it reaches its end. As a

colloquial expression, the final phrase, "by the least little inch," inscribes the sentence with Maggie's speech, her verbal presence. We hear this phrase primarily in the tenor of her voice. This allusion to Maggie's voice arrives only at the end of the sentence, and James begins the sentence that follows it with the narrator's voice: "[s]he had compassed the high felicity of seeing the two men beautifully take to each other…" (328). James surrounds this brief instance of Maggie's voice with that of the narrator whose voice will often show a stronger presence than hers in this episode.

In this example, the descriptive discourse of the narrator appears to be "infected" with the intrusion of Maggie's words "by the least little inch." This brief injection of Maggie's voice retrospectively casts the preceding portion of the sentence in Maggie's inner voice so that narration that initially appears as "reporting syntax" becomes verbal FIS. "By the least little inch" recasts the sentence as "*I* surrendered myself to *my* husband without the shadow of a reserve or a condition and yet didn't give up *my* father by the least little inch." Whereas previously "by the least little inch" stood out as the sole instance of Maggie's idiom, we now recognize the drama infused in the expression "without the shadow of a reserve." This insertion of Maggie's words allows the reader to recognize the shared presence of both voices in the preceding portion of the sentence. This retrospective recognition of the dual presence of Maggie's consciousness and the narrator's words in this sentence highlights Maggie's self-deceit and reveals her ambivalence vis-à-vis her reading of her dual roles as a wife and as a daughter. The assertion that Maggie's actions toward her father and her husband are equally appropriate draws suspicion because the two simultaneous perspectives point to a wavering between acceptance and disbelief. Maggie is unable to see from Amerigo and Charlotte's position; she is unable to see that she has not surrendered herself to Amerigo. Rather, she maintains her daily

intimacy with her father, leaving Amerigo to find his own distraction with Charlotte. James's usage of FIS in this instance conceals Maggie's presence until her voice emerges at the end of the sentence, and at that moment, we re-read her presence in the previous words, reading in that discourse her ambivalence and her self-deceit.

The above example calls explicit attention to Maggie's voice at the end of the sentence causing a reevaluation of the earlier portions. In a handful of additional instances of verbal FIS, James incorporate her voice as asides within a sentence; her voice is literally set-off and separated from the surrounding narration with dashes. Shortly following the above example, Maggie's thoughts turn to the image that she and the other three adult members of her family project to their social circle. The "bright testimony" and the "explicit envy" that others express give her satisfaction:

> It had given them pleasure – as how shouldn't it? – to find themselves shed such a glamour; it had certainly that is, given pleasure to her father and herself, both of them distinguishably of a nature so slow to presume that they would scarce have been sure of their triumph without this pretty reflexion of it. So it was that their felicity had fructified; so it was that the ivory tower, visible and admirable doubtless from any point on the social field, had risen stage by stage. (329).

This passage again represents Maggie's consciousness, and it alternates between the two voices but appears to privilege the narrator's voice over Maggie's. Although much of this passage retains the narrator's mark, we hear Maggie's voice in the question " - as how shouldn't it? -" (329). This question calls explicit – even if offset – attention to Maggie's inner voice. As in the earlier example, we read this line as her inner speech, and this parenthetical but forceful reference to her voice prompts us to read the surrounding words also as Maggie's perspective. We re-read these lines as "It gave *us* pleasure to find *our*selves shed such a glamour." There is a difference, however, between these words and the offset question Maggie poses, and this is the relative certainty to which we can attribute them to Maggie. Without "as how shouldn't it?" as

without "by the least little inch" in the previous example, the sentence would not necessarily stand out as verbal FIS. It strikes initially as the narrator's report.

The remainder of the passage also becomes strongly infected by the presence of Maggie's voice. We readily read "it had certainly that is, given pleasure to her father and herself" as verbal FIS for its proximity to Maggie's offset question but also for its "certainly that is," which signals a pause in Maggie's thinking and highlights her reluctance to speak for her husband and stepmother. She can only assert her own and her father's pleasure. The insertion of Maggie's voice in the first sentence of this passage reveals the FIS that may have remained hidden. The upbeat tone of this passage seems to hide Maggie's current perception, her worry about her unusually composed family. In the chapter prior to volume two, Fanny describes Maggie as a "poor duck" "blinking" to keep up the appearance of her innocence and her satisfaction. In this passage, we now see her "blinking" as she tells herself that the composition of this foursome is satisfying and that she takes distinct "pleasure" in outsiders' perceptions. With James's use of FIS flagging Maggie's ambivalence in the discursive style the reader becomes attuned to her willed self-deception.

Late in the first chapter of volume two, James does make use of an extended instance of verbal FIS. We find a representation of Maggie's inner idiom as she worries about her step-mother's perceptions of her. Charlotte has better taste, and Maggie's awareness of her own shortcomings in the area of apparel have been heightened by Charlotte's recent ability to indulge her "genius." Now that she is married to Adam Verver, Charlotte has the wealth necessary to display this "genius:"

> There was a kind of poetic justice in her being at last able in this particular to, thanks to means, thanks quite to omnipotence, freely to exercise her genius. But Maggie would have described herself as, in these connexions, constantly and intimately 'torn'; conscious on one side of the impossibility of sounding her, independently, to the bottom.

> Yes, it was one of those things she should go down to her grave without having known – how Charlotte, after all had been said, *really* thought her stepdaughter looked under any supposedly ingenious personal experiment…. Hadn't Charlotte, with so perfect a critical vision, if the truth were known, given her up as hopeless – hopeless by a serious standard, and thereby invented for her a different and inferior one, in which, as the only thing to be done, she patiently and soothingly abetted her? Hadn't she, in other words assented in secret despair, perhaps even in secret irritation, to her being ridiculous? (334)

Maggie is 'torn' James writes. With James's highly visible use of verbal FIS in this passage, Maggie's ambivalence concerning Charlotte's perceptions is drawn to the style of the discourse. The following instances of verbal FIS, "Yes, it was one of those things she should go down to her grave without having known," and "Hadn't she, in other words assented in secret despair, perhaps even in secret irritation, to her being ridiculous?" voice Maggie's ambivalence. She wants to know what her step-mother thinks, but she cannot, she will not, ask the question. In marked distinction from much of the narration of this episode, this extended passage largely depicts Maggie's *verbal* consciousness. We read these words, and the juxtaposition, the distinction between her voice and that of the narrator is clear. The verbal FIS and the ambivalence it unearths, however, points to Maggie's continued resistance against her growing awareness of more difficult problems. A few pages before the above passage, we read of Maggie, "she had but wanted to get nearer – nearer to something indeed that she couldn't, that she wouldn't, even to herself, describe: and the degree of this achieved nearness was what had been in advance incalculable" (332). This focus on Charlotte's perceptions of Maggie's taste in clothing distracts Maggie, and the narration, from delving into the more disturbing truths that the reader knows exist. This instance of verbal FIS signals both Maggie's surface ambivalence, but more importantly, it underscores her desire to leave unexplored the more difficult and painful impressions she has begun to perceive.

In his preface to *The Portrait* James famously writes: "The house of fiction has in short not one window, but a million – a number of possible windows to be reckoned, rather; every one of which has been pierced, or is still pierceable, in its vast front, by the need of an individual vision and by the pressure of the individual will" (ix). If we apply this metaphor to the action of a single novel, FIS shows the action, the mind, the scene, whatever is being "watched," from two separate windows at once. The discourse is tied to two visions, two "individual will[s]", and the reading of such discourse of necessity results in an ambivalent picture. The move to Maggie's mind constitutes an entire episode in which the narrator's voice may be more profoundly "felt" by the reader. Maggie's inner voice represented in verbal FIS is not as frequent here as we find comparable examples in Austen's *Emma* or in *The Portrait*, but Maggie's consciousness remains the dominant perspective. Maggie's consciousness is the scene, the action that we view through the two windows of Maggie's visions and the narrator's vision in this "house of fiction." "The first episode of volume 2," Yeazell comments, "alternates quite prominently between figural and authorial narrative situations, leaning now to one, now to the other. And even though such alternations are not in themselves unusual in third-person novels, they take a peculiar form here: a form that conveys solely what is happening in the focalizer's mind" (5). The usage of Maggie's verbal consciousness may be minimal in this episode, but James's usage extends and implicates her consciousness as the sole originator of the content of these two chapters whether her voice plays a dominant role or not. Maggie hesitates in her exploration of her impressions and of the awareness of deceptions against her even though she is drawn to and tempted by those impressions. She wants to "get nearer … to something indeed that she couldn't," and James's narration of this particular scene displays a parallel desire yet inability to "get nearer" to Maggie's psyche, to portray her mind.

***

A dismissal of fact, as we shall see, can be liberating; but there is also a kind of playing with it in its absence which allows James's characters both to keep fact out of sight and yet to be constantly teased by it. James increases the power of traumatic scenes – or, more generally, of "truth" – by the *fluttering verbal evasiveness* which surrounds them. The absorption of his characters in the margins or the implications of facts makes the unmentioned facts all the more ominous. And perhaps nowhere is the violence of fact so complete as when the curiosity or terror of it precludes its actual appearance – as if the brutal nature of certain situations could best be shown by their blinding effect on the persons most determined, afraid and finally unable to see. (Bersani, "The Jamesian Lie" p. 60, Emphasis mine.)

One of the essential differences between these two episodes in James's novels is their relative clarity. In both works James focuses on knowledge and its connection to impressions or images, but in the earlier of the two, *The Portrait of a Lady*, the impression conferred upon Isabel that launches her late night meditations is clear. The narrator describes the vision of Gilbert Osmond and Mme Merle "grouped familiarly" as the impetus for the chain reaction in Isabel's mind. This image together with the suggestion that Isabel herself has an influential role to play in securing Lord Warburton as Pansy's husband causes Isabel to consider her current life, her courtship and the early years of her marriage. Chapter forty-two emerges largely from Isabel's consciousness, and its structure, patterned after a mind wandering among associations, is not difficult to follow. In this earlier novel, James demonstrates his epistemological concern by hiding relationships and motives from his heroine, and these are plot elements that are known to the reader. In this way, he is free to show Isabel's meanderings through the hints and impressions she notices while the reader, with greater knowledge, is free to observe how this young woman comes to learn the dark truths of her marriage by wandering among her impressions and her memories.

In his gradual move from his early novels to his late novels, James's style and his thematic focus on knowledge, at once desired and denied, sharpen. Isabel regards some truths

ambivalently, and the "dual-voiced" narration of her consciousness in *The Portrait* highlights her hesitation vis-à-vis awareness of others' motivations and desires. The novel's focus on knowledge as tentative and imperfect, however, penetrates nearly all aspects of *The Golden Bowl*: James's reader must reconstruct the novel's basic plot elements solely through the frequently flawed readings of them produced by the characters, Maggie's tentative relationship with knowledge is the hallmark of her character, and the formal features of James's discourse deny ascription of agency to an extent previously unseen in FIS. Quite similar to *The Golden Bowl*, James's *The Ambassadors* will also take knowledge and ambivalence as two of its key themes, but for this novel, James limits his narration to one central consciousness, one reader through whose eyes his reader witnesses all. Before moving on to *The Ambassadors*, however, we will turn to two films, Alain Resnais's *Hiroshima mon amour* and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarrollo,* whose use of *cinematic* FIS to portray the consciousness and the memories of characters meets with quite similar effects as those explored here.

Chapter Three

Memory, Ambivalence and Cinematic FIS in
Hiroshima mon amour and *Memorias del subdesarrollo*

Comme toi, moi aussi, j'ai essayé de lutter de toutes mes forces contre l'oubli. Comme toi, j'ai oublié. Comme toi, j'ai désiré avoir une inconsolable mémoire, une mémoire d'ombres et de pierre.
Marguerite Duras, *Hiroshima mon amour*, p. 32

Era la segunda vez que veía *Hiroshima, mi amor*. … *Hiroshima, mi amor* es una bomba de profundidad. … la mezcla del amor y la destrucción me llenó de calma y tristeza. … Emmanuelle Riva parece capaz de todo sin escandalizarse. Verde, madura y podrida al mismo tiempo. Dijo una frase que se me quedó clavada en el cerebro; *J'ai désiré avoir une inconsolable mémoire*. Creo que la civilización consiste sólo en eso: en saber relacionar las cosas, en no olvidarse de nada. Por eso aquí no hay civilización posible: el cubano se olvida fácilmente. Fui a ver la película otra vez porque se me habían escapado algunos parlamentos. Hubo dos o tres cosas que no entendí bien…
Edmundo Desnoes, *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, p. 29, 30-31

Sergio, the first-person narrator of Edmundo Desnoes' *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, the 1962 novel that serves as the base for Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's film, views Alain Resnais' *Hiroshima mon amour* (1959) after his family and many of his friends flee Cuba following the Bay of Pigs invasion. In the novel as in the film, Sergio is a flâneur, a "Third World flâneur" (Stam, 8). He leisurely wanders Havana, he watches and describes the city's people on the streets and in shops, he observes the changes that arise as the island becomes socialist and he draws comparisons between Cuba and other countries. He is an indecisive character, remaining in Cuba without a clear sense of his role there, wavering between his desire for "development," a word he correlates with European culture, and his curiosity about the revolution in his "underdeveloped" country. Desnoes' Sergio idealizes Emmanuelle Riva's unnamed character in *Hiroshima mon amour*, holding her up as a model and implicitly comparing the "underdeveloped" Cuban women in his life to this "civilized" and "developed" European woman. He identifies with her, and his description of "el cubano" seems to exclude himself, though Cuban.

Desnoes' Sergio reads *Hiroshima mon amour* poorly. Emmanuelle Riva's "J'ai désiré avoir une inconsolable mémoire" is her character's cry of mourning for the memory that she will narrate to her Japanese lover over the course of that film. The memory that she relives as she narrates it begins to lose its pain; it is *not* an inconsolable memory. Riva's character fears forgetting precisely because she forgets. Sergio reads her as "knowing how to relate to things, not forgetting anything," but the opening line of *Hiroshima mon amour*, her Japanese lover's "Tu n'as *rien* vu. Rien" accuses her of not knowing "how to relate" to Hiroshima, to the sights she takes in, and to the lover she will name only "Hiroshima" at the film's end. "Fui a ver la película otra vez" Sergio remarks, "porque se me habían escapado algunos parlamentos. Hubo dos o tres cosas que no entendí bien…" (124). Sergio's misreading, his conclusion that Resnais' character forgets nothing, and that this is a sign of her "development," becomes ironic in these final two lines of the passage from Desnoes' novel. Sergio's admission that his French is poor, that he missed parts of the dialogue, reveals his larger misreading of the film. Desnoes' character fails to perceive the intense ambivalence undergirding Riva's act of narrating her memory, and he fails to recognize his own growing ambivalence vis-à-vis the revolution in Cuba.

Adapting this novel to the screen in 1968, Tomás Gutiérrez Alea excludes this scene, this viewing of *Hiroshima mon amour*, from his film. Sergio's cultured "Europeanness" enters the film in other ways, through the mise-en-scène, for example, the modern artwork adorning the walls of his apartment. Gutiérrez Alea eliminates this cinematic reference explicitly preferring to root the film within Cuba's revolutionary tradition by quoting Cuban documentary footage and photographs that, in the place of European narrative cinema, will punctuate Sergio's narrative.

Desnoes' novel is a first-person account, a fictional memoir that Sergio writes to ascertain his skills as writer, to determine whether he has anything to say. Sergio's voice-over

narration dominates Gutiérrez Alea's film, and much of the novel enters the film through this channel. Though Gutiérrez Alea leaves aside Sergio's evaluation of Resnais' film, strong connections between these two films remain. Indeed, *Hiroshima mon amour* hovers over Gutiérrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarrollo* casting its shadow on the narration and the portrayal of the mind of the fictional character. Both highly subjective films, *Hiroshima* and *Memorias* devote much of the narration to visual representations of these characters' thoughts, their memories and perceptions. These two films are cinematic studies of the ambivalent psyches of their two protagonists. The stylistic quality of the narration of these films, the use of formally ambivalent cinematic narration that recalls the FIS of prose fiction, mirrors the psychological ambivalence of the protagonists and underscores the films' privileging of hesitation over resolution and ambiguity over certainty.

Grounded in two major events of recent history, the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and the Cuban Revolution, specifically the period between the Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961 and the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, *Hiroshima* and *Memorias* weave archival newsreel footage and photographs into their fictional tales. In this way, these two films each create a dialogue between the fictional stories they tell, between the portrayal of a fictional mind, the memories and fantasies of the characters, and the documentary film footage, photographs, and documentary techniques interwoven throughout the narration. Chiefly concerned with the portrayal of an individual psyche, the largely subjective unfolding of these films is punctuated here and there by moments of "objective" narration and techniques. For much of the two films, subjective narration and documentary techniques are kept formally distinct from one another. During a few key moments, however, this distinction collapses, and the films present cinematic

free indirect narration that combines the subjective portrayal of the character's psyche with markers of objective, documentary cinematic narration.

Hiroshima mon amour and *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, in particular, with their reflexive combinations of fiction and documentary, highlight the distinction between the perspective of the cinematic narrator and that of the characters. FIS in these two films is stylistically very distinct from the portrayal of the characters' subjective experiences, their memories and fantasies, *and* from the narrators' objective, documentary mode. Like highly visible prose FIS, such as that of Jane Austen or Gustave Flaubert, the instances of FIS in these films stand out from the other discursive modes.

Very much in the manner that literary FIS combines the two voices of a character and a third-person narrator thereby casting doubt over the dominant "voice" of the discourse, in these two films, the instances of cinematic FIS complicate narrative agency. The FIS of these two films produces ambivalent discourse, visual and aural discourse that encompasses two simultaneous but distinct points of view. Seeing from two perspectives at once, from the subjective and the documentary, the character's and the narrator's, this discourse ends by seeing neither perspective entirely. FIS in prose results in a partial voicing of the two combined perspectives. Cinematic FIS likewise results in a partial seeing, a reticent and ambivalent seeing that conceals part of the narration. Whether in prose or in cinematic discourse, FIS signals an unwillingness, an inability to wholly narrate a story, a consciousness, or an experience. FIS conveys only a portion of the perceiving and experiencing mind of a character, a portion mediated by the narrator. A narrator always mediates a narration, but FIS reveals and dramatizes that mediation at the work's formal level, revealing a barrier that obstructs the viewer's vision of the character's perspective.

Hiroshima mon amour is the story of the brief love affair between an unnamed Japanese architect played by Eiji Okada and Emmanuelle Riva's unnamed actress on her final two days working on a film that takes place in Hiroshima. The film's primary subject is the actress' narration of the "inconsolable mémoire" of her love affair with a German soldier during the occupation of France in the Second World War. Over the course of one day, she tells Okada the story of this relationship that took place in Nevers, her childhood home, when she was eighteen years old. She tells him of their plans to flee France for Bavaria, of her lover's death upon France's liberation, and of the subsequent humiliation and madness she suffered, branded a traitor by her town and forced into captivity in the basement of her home. This is a memory that she has kept to herself, that she has, until now, resisted telling. Riva guards this memory, this story, for herself. As the film will later reveal, Riva equates narrating the story with infidelity and with forgetting. Inviting an outsider into this intimate story constitutes a betrayal against her memory, against her dead German lover. The story, shared with an outsider, now becomes a feature in her relationship with another, a lens through which this new lover views her. Riva's psychological turmoil, her ambivalence is rooted in the act of narrating this story. Riva will tell this tale, but her words to Okada as well as the film's reticent, ambivalent narration will testify to her profound ambivalence, her desire to relive this experience with this new forbidden lover coupled with her instinct not to divulge all.

Hiroshima mon amour is tied to its protagonist, to this actress. It is focalized through her perspective, telling and showing only those things that she knows and sees, and following her lead in its narrative strategies. Both the film and Riva's character, however, hesitate to reveal all that they know with certainty. Both hold back. Though highly subjective, *Hiroshima* rarely makes use of "point-of-view" shots, shots filmed to indicate the character's eyes or optical

perspective. Rather than a technical first-person position, *Hiroshima mon amour* maintains an external, third-person perspective while revealing Riva's subjective experience in the visual and aural portrayal of her memories. Riva's thoughts and memories arise most profoundly in the film's use of "mindscreen" narration.

One of three cinematic methods for "signifying subjectivity" put forth in Bruce F. Kawin's *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard and First-Person Film,* "mindscreen" narration is defined as filmic narration that portray what a character thinks, "the field of the mind's eye" (10). The other two methods are voice-over narration and subjective camera, or the "point-of-view" shot. Rather than filming what the character sees in front of her, "mindscreen" narration visually portrays what she thinks and imagines. During "mindscreen" narration, the viewer attributes agency to the character whose thoughts are represented on screen. "Mindscreen" is a prominent mode in both *Hiroshima mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarrollo*. Both films, however, work to complicate agency and vision by infusing key instances of "mindscreen" narration, a first-person subjective mode, with markers of third-person objective cinematic discourse. This combination, this collapsing of "mindscreen" with third-person narration results in the formal ambivalence that in *Hiroshima* will mirror Riva's own ambivalence to speak her memory and that in *Memorias* will model Sergio's incomplete vision, his misreadings that are a product of his ambivalence toward Cuba's revolution.

Riva's unnamed character in *Hiroshima mon amour* wavers between the impulse to narrate her memory to another person and the desire to guard and protect her memory, Though Riva's character will finally narrate the many details of her story to her Japanese lover late into the film, its initial return to her consciousness comes in the manner of a Proustian involuntary memory near the film's opening. This memory is brought to her mind abruptly and alarmingly,

and like Marcel Proust's novel, Marguerite Duras' screenplay and Resnais' film explore and dramatize the manifold manifestations of memory. The film's narration of Riva's memory moves in stages from the initial very brief involuntary memory to Riva's eventual extended narration of her madness to her lover over drinks at a Hiroshima tea room. Between these two appearances of this memory there is a middle point, a point during which Riva hesitatingly begins to speak to Okada of her German lover and of their relationship during the war. This particular instance of narration unfolds in a highly abridged manner. Riva reveals very little, and the formal strategies of the film, strategies that combine subjective and objective cinematic techniques in FIS, reinforce her hesitation and ambivalence vis-à-vis the telling of this memory. The film reveals a similar reticence toward the act of narration, and the cinematic style of this particular scene parallels Riva's own ambivalence.

Memorias del subdesarrollo takes place in Havana following the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961, and it ends with the Cuban Missile Crisis in late October of 1962. The film's protagonist, Sergio, a wealthy property owner, remains in revolutionary Cuba chasing women, grappling with his engagement with the revolution, and brooding over his memories and his fantasies as he writes his memoirs. All the while, his family, friends, and others of his social class flee the island for the United States. Over the course of the film, Sergio watches Havana and its people. He remains to write his memoirs, to delve into his memories and his perceptions of his country and its people. The confidence Sergio attests to early in the film, the confidence that the revolution brings something positive, something still unknown, still to come, to Cuba, erodes as the film progresses. Fear replaces Sergio's confidence, and whereas the early portions of the film find him watching and experiencing the present, describing Havana and its people around him, by the film's latter portions, Sergio retreats to his memories and his fantasies of an

earlier time. It is chiefly during these scenes of memory leading up to Sergio's own crisis that we find cinematic FIS in this film.

Like *Hiroshima mon amour*, this film is focalized through the perspective of its protagonist. The viewer is tied to Sergio as we are tied to Riva's character. This film is periodically intercut with pro-revolutionary newsreel footage and still photographs, and Gutiérrez Alea maintains Sergio's near continuous voice-over narration during these intertextual insertions. The documentary footage emerges from Sergio's consciousness, from his memories and thoughts or from his perusal of books and newspapers. More so than *Hiroshima*, *Memorias* makes greater usage of point-of-view shots to convey Sergio's optical perspective. The image on screen is frequently what Sergio sees through his own eyes, and other characters often look directly into the camera when addressing him. This film underscores Sergio's vision. The film regularly places the viewer in a position to view as if through his eyes and highlights objects and techniques that call attention to vision and perspective such as repetition, family snapshots and identification photos, and, importantly, a telescope attached to Sergio's balcony. This telescope appears quite early in the film and reappears at the film's end. Like the FIS of *Memorias*, Sergio's telescope functions also as a symbol for his fragmentary vision, his misperceptions and self-deceit. Looking out over Havana through his telescope, Sergio cannot see the entire city; he only sees small sections excerpted from the city by the telescope.

Sergio's vision represented in the film encompasses his own memories as well. In "mindscreen" narration, the film represents Sergio's subjective experience, his recollections as they pass through his mind. In all of these markers of visual perception, the filming style suggests an ultimate lack of vision, a fracturing of vision. Sergio's outlook remains narrow, and this narrowness and incompleteness manifests itself in the film's use of FIS. The ambivalence of

FIS in prose is born of the double-voiced quality of that discourse. In film, especially in these two films, the ambivalence of FIS emerges from the double-visioned quality of the cinematic image. Sergio's own vision, his outlook on the world around him, is "doubled" by his mixed reaction to revolutionary Cuba. Looking at a photograph of a starving Cuban child, Sergio sees both the abuses of pre-revolutionary Cuba and the embarrassing "underdevelopment" of his island country. Sergio sees from the two perspectives that compete within him just as the cinematic FIS sees from two distinct, and in the case of this film, oppositional visions.

Sergio's ambivalence in the face of the revolution in *Memorias del subdesarrollo* is linked to the film's portrayal of his memories. As he wanders Havana alone, late into the film, Sergio encounters the opulent home of a friend from his youth, a private school he attended as a teenager, and the Catholic high school where he would meet his German lover Hanna before she left Cuba for New York. These places are now fixtures of the revolution. A soldier stands guard outside his childhood friend's home, and Hanna's and his schools are now adorned with revolutionary images rather than religious statuary. The memories portrayed in this film, those that he includes in his memoir, place Sergio within his very privileged social class. Though he tries to connect with the ideologies of the revolution, he reads from a revolutionary book to an old friend and he attends a panel discussion on literature and underdevelopment, Sergio's memories and fantasies, the chief constituents of his memoir, revolve around a youth and young adulthood marked by privilege, shaped by the policies and the culture of pre-revolutionary Cuba. Sergio appears to espouse certain revolutionary ideals, but his memories, especially the film's ambivalent, fractured portrayal of his memories, the use of cinematic FIS during these scenes, underscore his self-deceit. As we will see, his memory of Hanna, his only European lover among the Cuban women he attempts to remake according to his European model, is his most highly

cherished memory, his "inconsolable mémoire." The visual narration of this particular memory combines objective and subjective modes, drawing on the film's overarching dichotomy between documentary and fiction.

In *Hiroshima*, FIS functions as a formal model for Riva's ambivalence toward narrating, toward telling her tale to Okada. The visual narration of Riva's memory will leave large informational gaps in the viewer's knowledge of the tale just as she will leave gaps in the version she narrates to Okada. In *Memorias*, Sergio also manifests profound ambivalence. He is unable to reconcile his growing hatred for the life represented by his privileged upbringing with the comfort of his freedom, his apartment and his routine that the revolution slowly takes away. Sergio is attracted to the revolution, but he cannot relinquish the life he has created. This ambivalence results in Sergio's limited, self-deceived vision of himself and of Cuba. He is a poor reader, and FIS in *Memorias* models Sergio's poor reading, revealing his ambivalent and fragmented vision.

***

Hiroshima mon amour is a film that distrusts vision. The film's opening dialogue inaugurates its focus on the sense of sight,

> Lui : Tu n'as *rien* vu à Hiroshima. Rien.
> Elle : J'ai *tout* vu. *Tout*.
> (Duras, 22)

Before the two lovers have been identified on screen – we see them at intervals during the prefatory opening sequence in extreme close-up and only as anonymous bodies embracing – the fifteen-minute opening scene dramatizes the film's distrust of vision as testimony or knowledge. This sequence, in which the voice-over dialogue between the two characters is dominated by Riva's explanation of what she sees in Hiroshima, combines images that correspond to her

descriptions of her visits to a hospital and a museum with newsreel and documentary footage and filmed reenactments of the aftermath of the bomb.

The first portion of this opening sequence details what Riva saw while visiting Hiroshima: a hospital, a museum visited four times, and a public square. The image track matches her slow and deliberate voice-over narration, and, moving slowly within these spaces at the approximate height of an adult, the camera appears to adopt her point of view during the moment recounted. We see the hospital, the museum, and the square as she describes them. This initial sequence is followed by newsreels and documentary footage, and Riva continues to assert her testimony in voice-over. She saw pictures of crowds protesting and pictures of newly born babies affected by the bomb before their births. She saw the bomb's aftermath in the news and in published photographs. In the newsreel footage included in the film, injured children and adults receive care in a crowded hospital. Nurses and doctors lightly dab their deep wounds and burnt skin with small pieces of cotton while Riva's voice-over narration describes the rebirth of Hiroshima as seen in the news and in photographs fifteen days after the bomb. "Hiroshima se recouvrit de fleurs," she says, "Ce n'étaient partout que bleuets et glaïeuls, et volubilis et belles-d'un-jour qui renaissaient des cendres avec une extraordinaire vigueur, inconnue jusque-là chez les fleurs." As we watch these victims in a crowded hospital, Riva describes the city covered in flowers, and her words conflict with the images, casting doubt over her testimony.

Late into this newsreel sequence is a medium-shot of the head of a deceased woman (Figure 1) into whose closed left eye two pairs of hands insert medical instruments to open the lid, revealing an empty socket as they turn the head toward the camera.

Figure 3.1 – "De même que dans l'amour."

During this shot we hear Riva's voice as she speaks, "De même que dans l'amour cette illusion existe, cette illusion de pouvoir ne jamais oublier, de même j'ai eu l'illusion devant Hiroshima que jamais je n'oublierai. De même que dans l'amour." The missing eye of this victim recalls and reinforces the film's opening line: "Tu n'as *rien* vu à Hiroshima. Rien." Riva equates vision with knowledge. She says that she sees, that she does not invent these details. Both Okada and the film's narrator deny this certainty. *Hiroshima* places an emphasis on seeing, seeing as agency and as a highly fraught source of knowledge. Riva will hesitate in her narration of the story of her German lover; her ambivalence is tied to this act of narration. This film will adopt Riva's perspective – her subjectivity and her mind's eye – even as it undermines that perspective. The film's narration, its envisioning and "seeing" of her memories mirrors Riva's ambivalence by invoking *and* denying her subjectivity just as she will at once reveal and conceal the contents of her memory in her own narration.

The film's first envisioning of Riva's memory demonstrates the film's formal ambivalence, its use of a variation of FIS, a FIS combining two perspectives that both belong to Riva: her perspective as she re-experiences a past event and the perspective of her past self

during the moment the memory took place many years earlier. This scene highlights the ambiguity and uncertainty that results in the combination of multiple visions. The scene, however, does not yet expose Riva's own ambivalence toward narrating her memory. Riva is a "narrator" within the scene insofar as her present perspective frames her past perspective much in the same way that a third-person prose narrator frames the perspective of a character within literary FIS. In this scene, however, she does not narrate to another. She does not tell this portion of the memory to her lover. Rather, this moment anticipates Riva's ambivalence by making visual ambivalence and narrative reticence formal features of the film's narration.

About twenty minutes into *Hiroshima mon amour*, following the film's opening sequence, Riva momentarily recalls a powerful and disturbing instance from her past. Leaning against a door frame that opens onto an expansive balcony overlooking Hiroshima, Riva watches Okada as he sleeps. It is the morning after the two have met for the first time, the morning after the film's opening dialogue during which she describes what she has seen in Hiroshima while he contests her testimony. She watches him sleeping on his stomach with one arm outstretched forming a forty-five degree angle with his body. The palm of his hand is open. The fingers on his hand, curled gently, twitch a few times while he sleeps. Riva holds a cup of coffee and silently but intently watches his twitching fingers. As she directs her attention to his hand, the sound track changes from the light upbeat melody that began the sun-filled morning scene on the hotel balcony to a low single-note drone that increases in volume as Riva's expression grows somber and as she focuses on Okada's hand. The scene cuts abruptly from a close-up of Riva's face – her eyes appear to have lost their focus on the scene in front of her – to a close up of another hand, another palm open with curled, twitching fingers.

This second hand belongs to a man lying on the ground wearing a long-sleeved wool coat, and the camera pans rapidly from a close-up of the twitching hand to a close-up of the man stretched out on his back with his eyes open, bleeding from the nose and mouth. A woman lies on top of him kissing him frantically, bloodying her face and mouth with his. This intercut scene lasts only a few moments, leaving barely enough time for the viewer to distinguish either actor's features, and during those moments the soundtrack is silent.

The scene returns to the present, to the sleeping Japanese lover whose hand twitches more forcefully now as he awakens. Riva's gaze remains unfixed while her lover turns over in bed. She focuses on him, and she offers him coffee. This sudden intercut scene is Riva's memory. The sight of the twitching hand of her sleeping Japanese lover sends her – like a Proustian involuntary memory – to a moment of her past, and the visual and aural narration displays her subjective experience of this flashback. The film enters her mind by cutting from the present mise-en-scène, the hotel room and balcony on a sunny morning in Hiroshima, to "mindscreen" narration, her vision of a distant memory. The abrupt cut to this scene, the rapid, frantic pan from the second twitching hand to the dying man's face, and the changes in the soundtrack all work to place this brief scene within Riva's mind.

Edward Branigan notes in his *Point of View in Cinema* that the typical point of view taken by the mind's eye in recollecting a scene from the past is not the position occupied within that past scene but, rather, an "ideal" position watching the entire scene,

> …at a later time, it is perfectly easy, indeed natural, to see yourself as if you were an invisible witness at the scene observing from an ideal (another) place in the room. In a sense, at this later time, 'you' are no longer 'you'. Thus the memory function reveals a splitting of the subject: you framing yourself in a new 'objective' perspective. The new perspective is a particular transformation of the original experience. (3-4)

The past self becomes, then, an actor within the memory, and Branigan describes this as a "splitting" of the subject. Within this brief but powerful memory, Riva as a young woman is a participant within the scene. She is an actor, and the camera views her on top of her dying lover. The dramatic camera movement, the quick pan from the extreme close-up of the second twitching hand up to the soldier's torso where Riva frantically kisses his face, mirrors her frenzy within the scene – the shock that her lover is dying – as well as the surprise of suddenly reliving this moment years later. The camera in this instance retains a third-person perspective insofar as it does not film from Riva's eyes as she watches a scene in front of her. Rather, the camera films as if from Riva's mind's eye, in "mindscreen" narration, and the momentary silencing of the soundtrack signals for the viewer a change from the "present" Hiroshima location to a depiction of Riva's mind, her thoughts. Riva herself becomes the third-person narrator of this brief scene. There are two perspectives in the scene: Riva's present perspective as she relives her German lover's death and her past perspective as she embraces the body dying beneath her.

The scene manifests the double-voiced, formally ambivalent quality of free indirect narration, and because the very minimal amount of information imparted by this brief shot demonstrates the film's own reticence to tell all, the scene anticipates the ambivalence toward narrating that will become a hallmark of Riva's character. The film's representation of this memory ends very quickly, giving the audience barely enough time to recognize Riva as the woman kissing the dying man. The film holds back, and the audience is left to consider such basic information as the identities of the actors and the time and setting of the scene. The film's narration denies the viewer the knowledge that Riva possesses concerning the scene represented. The film portrays her mind's eye but resists unveiling her memory to the viewer with clarity or with certainty.

Riva's ambivalence is tied to narrating her memory. This first instance of memory in *Hiroshima mon amour* is not one that she narrates. This very brief scene is solely an example of "mindscreen" narration. The image on the screen portrays the contents of her mind, her mind's eye, and the agency of the image rests with Riva. The unfolding of Riva's "inconsolable memory" encompasses two narrative threads, one framed by the other. The film visually and aurally narrates the memory for the viewer. Riva will narrate a portion of it to Okada. Her spoken narration is framed by the film's narration, and it is within this surrounding frame that the film envisions her ambivalence vis-à-vis the act of narrating. Riva's initial involuntary memory belongs solely to the narrative thread between the film and the viewer. From this memory, Riva's lover is excluded as she narrates nothing herself. She remembers and the film narrates. When, later in the film, Riva speaks the key plot elements of her relationship with the German soldier, her abbreviated, summarized telling and the film narrator's accompanying limited and incomplete portrayal of this story deny the viewer and Okada's character access to her memory.

Riva talks about Nevers with her lover the morning after their first meeting, but her discussion is quite general. Her lover's interest in this history begins with a simple attraction to the name of the town where she grew up, "C'est un joli mot français, Nevers." In this initial conversation concerning her past, Riva reveals a few general details that will lead Okada to question her further in subsequent scenes: when the bomb fell on Hiroshima she had only just arrived in Paris, she will never return to Nevers, and she went mad there. As they leave her hotel talking about Nevers and about madness in general, she does not delve into her memories, and none of the details she describes are accompanied by visual representations of her mind.

The narration of Riva's memory begins in earnest later on that second day after Okada has located her and the film crew in Hiroshima. He brings her to his home, and they spend the

afternoon making love. As they lie together in his bed late into the day, Okada asks only one question: "Il était français, l'homme que tu as aimé pendant la guerre?" Riva's response consists of a few sentences, the basic structure of a narrative without details or embellishment, "Non il n'était pas français. … Oui, c'était à Nevers. … On s'est d'abord recontré dans des granges. Puis dans des ruines. Et puis dans des chambers. Comme partout. … Et puis, il est mort. … Moi dix-huit ans et lui vingt-trois ans. … " This scene lasts two minutes, and the speaking of these five lines is broken up by sequences showing Riva as a young woman in Nevers. The ellipses in the above citation mark the moments when the film cuts from the two lovers in bed to the film's representation of Riva's memory of Nevers and her relationship with the German soldier. The film positions Riva's character as the originator of these images. They correspond to the words she speaks, and, as in the first filmed memory – the involuntary memory near the film's opening – these images are not accompanied by diegetic sound or by voice-over narration. We hear none of the sounds surrounding Riva and her German lover in Nevers, and we hear no words exchanged between the two of them. These memory sequences are instead presented with non-diagetic musical accompaniment, and we hear Riva's voice only in the film's "present," only when she speaks to Okada while both characters are on screen.

This view into Riva's memory is quite cursory. The note of melancholy is struck by the soundtrack – the somber music playing over much of the scene – and by Riva's melancholy tone of voice. Though Riva will later delve into the madness brought on by the experience, this first instance of narration keeps her at a far remove from these memories. Unwilling to tell all yet desiring to tell some, she distills the story of her very powerful and upsetting love affair into a few quick sentences that reveal little of her subjective experience. The camera use during the scenes in Nevers reinforces the cursory quality of this first retelling, signaling her ultimate

ambivalence toward narrating this tale. The cinematic narrator framing Riva's narration mirrors her reluctance to narrate and proves just as reticent to reveal this memory to the viewer.

Whereas the involuntary memory near the film's opening asserts its first-person, "mindscreen" perspective both in the visual and aural style of the shot *and* in the authority attributed to the images by the context, the formal style of this scene complicates narrative agency. As we will see, the film continually signals a switch to Riva's mind's eye during her narration to Okada. The film prompts the viewer to "read" these scenes intercut within her narration to Okada as her memory, as "mindscreen" narration. The formal style of the images, however, denies her subjective vision in favor of a third-person, objective point of view. These images seem to be "mindscreens," but the agency of these shots is complicated by the objective, nearly documentary camera work. There is in these shots, then, an intense conflict concerning the authority, the origin behind these images. As in FIS in prose, we can, in these shots, attribute agency at once to Riva and to the film's narrator. This leaves the viewer unable to decide who sees, or whose seeing predominates, and the resulting cinematic discourse is one in which a portion of Riva's perspective and a portion of the narrator's perspective adds up to an incomplete, ambivalent and ambiguous vision.

While she tells this story, Riva and Okada remain together in bed. The camera films them from a very close position, a position that highlights the easy intimacy of their brief relationship. The scene alternates between these shots of Riva and Okada in bed and the film's portrayal of Riva's memory, and in this alternation, we recognize the very stark difference between the shooting styles (Figures 3.2 and 3.3). Whereas the camera remains very close to Riva in the film's present, as if to embrace and caress her while she speaks as Okada himself does as he listens, the camera films her memory sequences from a very far distance. There is no intimacy in

the memory shots. Paired with the extreme closeness of the shots in Hiroshima, the distance and standoffishness of the memory shots calls strong attention to the filming style. Okada asks, "Il était français, l'homme que tu as aimé pendant la guerre?" Riva responds, "Non … il nétait pas français" (Figure 3.2). This intimate scene cuts to the image of a man in an army uniform walking in a public square outside of a café (Figure 3.3).


Figure 3.2 "Non, il n'était pas français."


Figure 3.3 Nevers Public Square

The camera films from inside the café, watching the soldier on the other side of the window. Over a few brief moments, he walks in the direction of the café without revealing any particular intention, never looking at the camera and never behaving as if he recognizes or notices anything. The film sets the viewer up to link the image with Riva, to place her in an originary relationship with the image, to suggest that it exists in her mind. The cut to this image following her description signals the scene as Riva's memory, as "mindscreen" narration, but little else places her in a position of authority over the image. The camera views the soldier from an otherwise quite objective third-person position that offers no visual connection to Riva's perspective.

This image fades back to Riva and Okada in Hiroshima, and she continues, "Oui, c'était à Nevers." The scene again cuts to Nevers, and this time, Riva is present. She appears younger with long, wavy hair (Figures 3.4 and 3.5).


Figure 3.4 – Biking in Nevers.


Figure 3.5 – Biking in Nevers.

In each of these shots, Riva is in motion; she rides her bike first within the walls of the city and then in the woods and fields surrounding the city. Most remarkable about this memory sequence is the position of the camera. At times the camera remains at a fixed point as Riva rides toward or away from the camera. At other moments, it follows her from a parallel position, and in all of these cases, the camera films her from a very far distance. She is a small figure within the frame, and the viewer sees neither her face nor what she sees in front of her.

The initial cut to this sequence signals Riva as the agency behind these images; she narrates her story to her lover, and the audience assumes that these are the images, the visual memories, running through her mind as she speaks. The presentation of these images, the resolutely removed position of the camera and the small size of Riva herself within the frame, asserts, however, an anonymous third-person perspective. These images constitute Riva's memories, but the probability of these images existing as we see them within her mind is low.

The camera position of the final shot of this initial sequence in particular (Figure 6) resists identification with Riva's memory.

Figure 3.6 – Wide shot of a Nevers field.

Positioned far above a large open field with a few rows of small trees and bushes and flanked by a dense forest, in this shot the camera films Riva on her bike as she rides down into the field where the German soldier waits for her in an opening in the row of trees. The camera remains still as she nears him. Riva and the soldier are the visual points of interest in this shot, but they are both very small against the background. The scene fades back to Riva and Okada in bed before she reaches the German soldier. Though the film signals this sequence of shots as residing within Riva's mind, the framing of this and the previous shots of the sequence, the distance and angle from which the camera films, cannot represent Riva's visual recollection of her bike rides to meet her lover. This shot ends the sequence of images corresponding to Riva's "Oui, c'était à Nevers," and these images give a strong sense of the city and its landscape: the road encircling the town, the Loire, the varieties of elevation, and the farmlands. Riva and the

lover she travels to meet, however, are only small, depersonalized figures within that landscape. They are characters in a tale that the spectators cannot penetrate. The visual style of these shots stands in opposition to the agency that the film indicates to the viewer. The camera watches from what appears to be an "objective" or "impersonal" position, a perspective Riva herself cannot access, while the film signals an identification of Riva's mind's eye as the agency behind these images. There is an inherent ambivalence in this narration. Riva's first-person perspective and the third-person perspective that the images evoke work against one another to create uncertainty regarding the narrating agency. This combination of perspectives gives the viewer minimal, highly limited access to Riva's mind, to this narration. The scene activates the viewer's desire to know the story, to identify with Riva's character, to experience this forbidden love affair with her, but the use of FIS does not satisfy the viewer's desire.

Returning briefly to Branigan's discussion of the "splitting of the subject" in memory, we observe that what was true of the earlier instance of cinematic involuntary memory is not true of these memory sequences. Branigan notes, "…it is perfectly easy, indeed natural, to see yourself as if you were an invisible witness at the scene observing from an ideal (another) place" (3-4). Whereas the visualization of Riva's involuntary memory earlier in the film suggests her subjective perspective, her vision of her memory from an "ideal" yet different vantage point, this does not apply to the scenes of which we now speak. The position from which we view Riva in these memories is not an "ideal place." It is a vastly different place from that which she occupied when the moment occurred, and the far distance from which the camera records her dispels the subjectivity linked to these images. This use of FIS limits what the viewer can know and allows the film to narrate without narrating all.

The next two memory sequences intercut within Riva's narration are similarly ambivalent. She explains, "On s'est d'abord rencontré dans des granges. Puis dans des ruines. Et puis dans des chambers. Comme partout," and the scene cuts again to images of Nevers. In these shots Riva and the soldier are together, and they are filmed entering various structures. As in the previous sequence, in these shots the camera stands at a far distance from the couple as they climb into a door-sized opening in the stone walls surrounding the city, as they enter an abandoned shack, and as they embrace standing among ruins outside of the city. Again, these shots purport to belong to Riva's memory. They match her description of the places where she and her lover meet, and the cut from the film's "present" to these shots signals Riva's memory. Again, however, the filming of these scenes suggests an objective agency disconnected from Riva.

The opening shot of this sequence (Figure 3.7) in particular functions as a third-person perspective. After Riva says, "On s'est d'abord rencontré dans des granges. Puis dans des ruines. Et puis dans des chambers. Comme partout," the scene cuts to a shot of a large brick house with many chimneys and dormer windows.


Figure 3.7 – Village Wall, Nevers.


Figure 3.8 – An entrance in the village wall.

The camera is positioned well below and to the left of the house and on the opposite side of a thick stone wall. The image remains on the house for only a few moments before the camera

pans down along the stone wall until Riva and the soldier, on the ground below, come into view (Figure 3.8). They climb into an entrance near the bottom of the wall. He helps her step onto her bike and up into the entrance. The initial shot of the house above and beyond this stone wall functions as something of an "establishing shot", a shot traditionally impersonal and third-person. The shot tells the audience that the two lovers sneak into abandoned spaces beyond the walls of the city – their relationship is forbidden and secret – but nonetheless very close to Nevers. Perhaps the house resides in Riva's memory as her own childhood home or perhaps it is simply a well-known house in Nevers, but rather than envision her mind's eye, the style of this shot denies Riva's subjective vision. Riva and her lover are very small within the frame while the city's wall and the house tower over them. This shot uses the conventions of third-person cinematic discourse to narrate a first-person subjective memory. The remaining shots of this memory sequence all behave similarly.

Riva does not express in words her ambivalence regarding this act of narration. Her expression as she speaks to Okada indicates, on the other hand, a willingness to share this brief version of the story with her lover. Her face and her speech are without animation or eagerness, but she at times smiles gently as she speaks. She does not appear hesitant or particularly jealous of this memory. Riva will later reproach herself bitterly for this indulgence. She will view this narration as a betrayal of her first lover, and she will perceive the gradual process of forgetting brought on by this telling. In this scene, however, Riva does not voice indecision. The visual style of these memory sequences nonetheless exposes Riva's intense ambivalence by taking up a formally ambivalent narrative mode. These scenes that should be "mindscreens," first-person narrations representing Riva's mind's eye, resist her subjective perspective. These images

envision the tension, the psychological conflict that Riva does not voice. Like her own brief telling, these images hold back, revealing only a small portion of this story.

Riva continues in her narration, "Et puis il est mort … Moi dix-huit ans et lui vingt-trois ans." The shots of this final portion of the scene move very quickly between the German soldier waiting, watching, and signaling to his lover and Riva running through fields and forests, climbing over hills and fences before the two finally meet and embrace. But for the playful, upbeat music, this sequence remains quite similar to those preceding it. The two figures, Riva and her German lover, are small within the majority of these shots. As she runs to him and as he awaits her, the camera is distanced from them in a manner that continues to resist subjective revelations. The final five shots of this sequence, however, begin to approach the lovers, allowing them to occupy more space within the frame, allowing the viewer to empathize and identify, even if briefly. After she finally reaches him, the lovers embrace, and for a moment the camera records the joy on their two faces. While giving the actors more space within the frame, however, these shots move forward at a very fast pace. Even though we see Riva's face and expression as she climbs over a wooden fence, even though we see the happiness on the lovers' faces as they embrace, and even though the camera views them in close-up (Figure 3.9) and from above as they lie on the ground together in a barn (Figure 3.10), these shots continue to resist identification with Riva's subjectivity.

Figure 3.9 – Close up on the lovers.

Figure 3.10 – Shot from above the lovers.

Unlike Okada whose face is intimately familiar from very early in the film, and especially in this particular scene, the close-up shots of Riva and her German lover (Figures 3.9 and 3.10) resist this intimacy. As the lovers embrace on the ground of the barn, the position of the camera shows the top of the soldier's head and nothing more, shooting from an angle that excludes the gaze of the camera rather than inviting it. Though this shot brings these two characters very close to the camera, it resists entering their relationship. The camera resists "mindscreen" though the images "intend" to correspond to Riva's story, to her memory.

The camera in this scene unsettles the status of the Nevers sequences as Riva's memories. As in FIS in prose this narration is a combination of Riva's subjective perspective and the objective camera, the film's external narrator, that remains at a distance from the actors filmed and that excludes the viewer from this relationship. There is no apparent attempt to identify the camera with either her first-person vision or her mind's eye. More often than not the camera appears to be an impersonal eye watching Riva on her bike, running to meet her lover, and the two lovers hastily entering abandoned cottages, sheds, and ruins. This camera determinedly declares its third-person perspective by standing at such a far distance, yet the soundtrack and the cuts to these shots in Nevers from Riva's words as she narrates her tale communicate that they are visualizations of her memory, her subjectivity. The narrating of these scenes is shared

between Riva herself who recounts these memories to her lover and the third-person camera that films from a perspective that could not belong to Riva – either within the memory itself or from the vantage point of the film's present. Riva's desire to jealously guard this memory for herself alone translates into the very brief account she here gives and into the reticent visual representations of this memory that ultimately exclude the audience.

In the words that she chooses to narrate this love affair, Riva leaves much out. She narrates only the main events and key pieces of information without revealing her emotions, fears or hopes. The images themselves reveal only slightly more than Riva tells. They fill out certain details that she leaves unsaid, but these images essentially follow and mirror her reticence to disclose this tale. In the next scene, Riva and Okada drink together at a tea house, and she reveals many more of the details of her memory. Unlike the previous scene, the visual and aural narration of this later scene is not formally ambivalent. This later scene, which lasts seventeen minutes, marks the third and final instance of Riva's narration to Okada and the film's portrayal of her mind's eye. She gives a very detailed – though not chronological – account of her madness, of her confinement in the cellar of her home, of the liberation of Nevers, of the shame she brings upon the family for having loved an enemy of France, and finally of her emergence from madness and her eventual liberation, her departure for Paris at nearly the same moment that the United States bombs Hiroshima. In this longer and more thorough narration of the consequences of her love affair, Riva opens her story to Okada and appears to lose her ability to distinguish between the memory and the present, between Okada and the German soldier. Delving into her story, she speaks to him as if he is the lover she mourns while locked away in the cellar. She describes speaking his German name aloud; she says it is the only word she

remembers. She speaks to Okada in the present tense as she describes a cat in the cellar, the regrowth of her hair, and the objects in her bedroom.

In this longer sequence, the scenes in Nevers correspond closely to Riva's words and to what the viewer imagines as her mind's eye. In other words, this third representation of her memories, the film's portrayal of her madness and confinement, does not complicate agency. Rather this scene conforms to the viewer's expectations for the cinematic portrayal of memory. Rather than standing far from the younger, past Riva, rather than offering only ambiguous glimpses of her activities, the narration of this sequence reveals many visual details of the memory. The formal qualities of these shots locate them within her mind as representations of her thoughts, placing Riva in a position of authority. Rather than excluding Okada and the viewer from this portion of her tale, from the often mundane details of her madness and her captivity, she thrives on this act of narration.

When, in response to Riva's declaration that her mother informed her of her twentieth birthday while she was in the cellar, Okada asks, "tu crache sur la visage de ta mère?," she pauses and answers "Oui." Her eyes and her expression as he asks this and as she answers reveal a determination that we do not see in the visual representations of her memories. In the scenes in Nevers in this sequence, Riva is passive and inactive. Her madness is marked by the slow movement of the shadows and the sunlight across the floor, by an interminable and silent waiting. The film does not show Riva lashing out or behaving aggressively. She sits silently and patiently as her head is shaved and as she is taunted by her neighbors. But for the cries that cause her parents to lock her in the basement out of embarrassment, she is expressionless and submissive. The film provides no visual narration of Riva spitting in her mother's face. The film suggests, in fact, that this element of the story does not exist within her memory. Riva's resolute

agreement to Okada's contribution to this narration constitutes a willingness to narrate, a willingness to embellish and enlarge upon her story. Riva's inclination to narrate her madness is made manifest by the film's now unambiguous envisioning of the memories that she speaks and by her acceptance of Okada's contribution to her tale.

The film demonstrates Riva's reluctance, on the other hand, to narrate the story of her love affair by visualizing those memories in a manner that collapses the film's distinction between objective and subjective narration, a manner that combines these two visual narrative modes into a single instance of cinematic discourse. This collapse, this combination of two visions into one shot, Riva's vision filtered through the narrator's, conceals much of the memory from the viewer. This collapse reveals ambivalence and uncertainty rather than a clear picture of Riva's subjective experience, and it thereby models Riva's own manner of narrating. The viewer is to the film's narrator as Okada is to Riva. The film, using FIS, reveals to the viewer only as much as Riva herself reveals to Okada.

Riva's admitted ambivalence vis-à-vis narrating the memory of her lover bookends the film. In the opening sequence she admits to having forgotten, "Comme toi, moi aussi, j'ai essayé de lutter de toutes mes forces contre l'oubli. Comme toi, j'ai oublié. Comme toi, j'ai désiré avoir une inconsolable mémoire, une mémoire d'ombres et de pierre." (32) Toward the film's end, Riva chastises herself for having spoken the memory aloud. Alone in her hotel room after telling Okada everything, she plunges her face into a sink full of water and stands in front of the bathroom mirror in a brief series of shots that will be echoed at the end of *Memorias del subdesarrollo* when Sergio, panicked and uneasy, retreats into his apartment and stands over his own bathroom sink as Cuba awaits the crisis. Riva looks into the hotel mirror, her face and hair dripping, and says aloud, "Elle a eu à Nevers un amour de jeunesse allemand. Nous irons en

Bavière mon amour, et nous nous marierons. Elle n'est jamais allée en Bavière. Que ceux qui ne sont jamais allées en Bavière osent lui parler de l'amour." The first line of this speech is delivered in a cadence and tone of resignation, a tone close to boredom. She rattles off this summary of her story as if reciting a child's lesson, an unexceptional story without consequence or significance, an "histoire de quatre sous." Following this, the viewer hears Riva speak in voice-over, "Tu n'étais pas tout à fait mort. J'ai raconté notre histoire. Je t'ai trompé ce soir avec cet inconnu. J'ai raconté notre histoire. Elle était, vois-tu, racontable … Regard comme je t'oublie…" (110). Riva tells the story that she has until now jealously guarded. Her drive to narrate her tale to this forbidden lover conflicts with her desire to retain the memory for herself alone. Her hesitation compels her to provide only a basic and limited outline of her love affair, and the visual narration of this scene, cinematic FIS, reflects her hesitation and envisions her ambivalence, leaving the viewer with a digest version of Riva's memory. *Memorias del subesarrollo* continues this preoccupation with visual authority and ambivalence, blurring the boundary between subjective and objective cinematic discourse. Like *Hiroshima*, *Memorias* makes use of cinematic FIS within the film's representations of the protagonist's memories to underscore Sergio's psychological ambivalence. FIS in this film, however, also functions as a model for fragmentary and incomplete vision.

***

"En el subdesarrollo nada tiene continuidad, todo se olvida, la gente no es consecuente. Pero tú recuerdas muchas cosas, recuerdas demasiado. Dónde está tu gente, tu trabajo, tu mujer? No eres nada, nada, estás muerto. Ahora empieza, Sergio, tu destrucción final."
Memorias del subdesarrollo, Gutiérrez Alea

Midway through Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, Sergio accompanies Pablo, a longtime friend, to the airport where he will leave Cuba for Miami. In voice-over narration, we hear Sergio's thoughts while Pablo attempts to communicate with him

from the other side of a thick glass partition. Sergio cannot hear Pablo, who gesticulates and mouths words and phrases to him in the waiting area on the other side of the glass. Sergio thinks, "¿Yo era como él antes? Es posible. Le revolución, aunque me destruya, es mi venganza contra la estúpida burguesia cubana, contra los cretinos como Pablo." Sergio deplores "la estúpida burguesia cubana," and he views the revolution as a personal gain for himself. Sergio's material, visual and psychological ties to this group, however, remain unbroken throughout the film. The memories and fantasies he indulges in and explores in his memoirs, locate him squarely within that privileged social milieu. Sergio's indecisiveness in the face of the revolution is aptly summed up by Elena, a young aspiring actress he picks up on the street and brings back to his home. Looking around his well-appointed, spacious, top-floor apartment as he brings out the silver coffee service from the kitchen, Elena smilingly asks whether he is a revolutionary:

> Elena. "Oye… ¿tú eres revolucionario?"
> Sergio. "¿Qué tú crees?"
> Elena. "Yo creo que tú no eres ni revolucionario ni gusano."
> Sergio. "¿Ah, No? ¿Y entonces que soy?"
> Elena. "Nada, no eres nada."

Though the film views Elena essentially as Sergio views her, as a young "underdeveloped" woman whose attachment to him quickly becomes a nuisance, in this instance the viewer – and the film – agrees with her off-the-cuff assessment. Compared to those who take a strong ideological stance vis-à-vis the revolution, those who flee the island definitively, those who fight against Cuba, and those who remain to support the new state and to take their place in Cuba's revolutionary society, Sergio remains stuck in the middle. Unable to choose one side over the other, he remains nowhere. He adheres to neither pole yet is swayed by both, "Sergio is the man in-between, neither revolutionary nor anti-revolutionary, divided by his bystander status in relation to the Cuban revolution and his revulsion for what he calls the "stupid Cuban

bourgeoisie”” (Stam, 21). Sergio relishes his solitary time in Havana. He views the revolution as his opportunity to delve into his inner world, to explore his memories and his fantasies by writing his memoirs. Now that his wife, his parents, and his friends have fled the island, he acquires the time, freedom and solitude to excavate his mind. The revolution brings about this freedom, but its day-to-day manifestations, the sudden transformation of Havana into a provincial town with limited goods and services and the state inspectors who arrive to take stock of his apartment, his property, for instance, leave him unsettled and anxious.

Like *Hiroshima mon amour*, this film is preoccupied with agency, knowledge and vision, and it foregrounds this preoccupation in the opening scenes. *Hiroshima*'s fifteen-minute opening sequence highlights that film's distrust of vision and its related focus on ambiguous narrative agency. The combination of point-of-view shots depicting Riva's visual field in a hospital and a museum in Hiroshima with gruesome newsreel footage casts doubt over the authenticity of her continuous voice-over testimony that expounds upon her character's first line, "J'ai *tout* vu. *Tout*." *Hiroshima* pairs subjective and objective narration in its opening sequence, juxtaposing yet keeping the two modes distinct from one another. This distinction collapses later, in the film's ambivalent narration, its use of cinematic FIS to represent Riva's memories of her love affair in Nevers. *Memorias del subdesarrollo* unfolds making use of a similar pattern. The film opens contrasting subjective narration with objective techniques, and it will eventually blur the distinction between the two, especially in its representation of Sergio's memories, creating a single instances of ambivalent narration that highlights his ambivalence vis-à-vis Cuban's revolution.

The opening credits are set against a lively outdoor carnival. A large crowd of people, made up almost exclusively of Afro-Cubans, dances to music, and the hand-held camera wanders

among the crowd representing a participant within the scene, walking among the revelers without remaining attached to any one group of people. The point-of-view shot dominates this scene, but the film has not yet indicated whose point of view we experience. Three gunshots momentarily send the camera upward to a position high above. During this moment, the point-of-view shot is replaced with a high angle long shot overlooking the crowd as it retreats. The camera returns to the crowd quickly where the confusion and frenzy following the gunshots becomes palpable. The camera rushes through the crowd hastily, and the image frequently blurs while the camera collides with people in its quick weaving through the mob. We come to the injured man, wounded by gunshots, lying on the ground, and the camera looks at him as do the other people there while he is hoisted up by a few men and carried away, the music continuing uninterrupted. The actors quickly resume the dancing prior to the gunshots. Continuing with its point-of-view shot, the camera returns to a non-frenzied position, settling among a group of dancing men and women.

Among these people an Afro-Cuban woman looks over the shoulder of the man facing her and into the camera as she dances. The credits end rather abruptly here. The music stops, and the scene pauses on a still image of this woman looking intently, with determination and provocation, into the camera (Figure 3.11). This opening sequence is highly ambiguous. The viewer does not know the perspective from which she views the scene. The camera is evidently meant to represent the visual field of a participant in the crowd, but its jerky movements and unsettled, frenzied rush among the people places it in conflict with most of the participants there who either mill about or dance in small groups. The ambiguity of the camera's perspective increases by the very strong look, the determined seeing of the woman dancing.

Figure 3.11 – End of the opening credits. A provocation.

She sees forcefully and without hesitation. The film holds her look in a still shot, augmenting the ambiguity, the unwillingness to divulge the agency of the viewer's own perspective. The camera sees her but also remains anonymous and therefore impenetrable, without divulging its agency. The camera is a participant, a subjectivity whose identity remains a mystery and who is nonetheless outside of, an observer of, the carnival.

Gutiérrez Alea frequently repeats scenes in this film, showing what has already occurred from another perspective. This opening scene will return much later toward the end of the film. In its second manifestation, shot with an impersonal third-person camera and lacking the diegetic sound, the live music, of the opening scene, Gutiérrez Alea reveals Sergio's presence. The point-of-view shot of the opening credits envisions *his* visual perspective, and the camera's sense of disconnectedness from the people is a visual reminder of his position as an outsider within this group. At the film's beginning, however, the agency behind this vision is unknown. The film places the camera in a first-person perspective while concealing the identity of that vision. We do not know who sees. Sergio's narrative agency behind this subjective camera remains undisclosed, silenced, until the scene recurs much later. Sergio's seeing is marked by his

disconnectedness, by non-engagement. Without identity, this seeing takes no stand, no position on what it sees.

Directly following the opening credits, the film begins with a scene in a busy airport terminal, and we read the following words in white capital letters: "La Habana 1961 numerosas personas abandonaron el pais." The camera settles for the moment on no one individual, behaving as an objective observer, maintaining an impersonal, nearly documentary mode within a scene in which the people filmed seem not to be actors. The camera records a long line of suitcases waiting to be loaded onto the plane, the interactions of travelers with airport employees, and travelers taking leave of their families and waiting impatiently to board the plane. The camera does not distinguish any one person, and these actors behave as if they are being filmed by an anonymous, documentary camera. They occasionally look into the camera only to look away surreptitiously, momentarily acknowledging its presence while appearing unconcerned. One young girl sticks out her tongue at the camera while her sister laughs. Her father taps her on the head with a fan to stop her, and when the camera pans up to him in reaction, he appears embarrassed and looks away. These few minutes establish the film's precise time and location and differentiate this group of people leaving the country from those dancing during the opening credits. The travelers at the airport are well-dressed, white, middle-class Cubans. The impersonal position of the camera in the beginning of this scene is also a stark contrast to the point-of-view shot of the opening credits.

Memorias del subdesarrollo mixes documentary with fiction all throughout the film, creating a hybrid film, a mixing of subjective and objective narrative modes, or a "film collage," as Gutiérrez Alea will himself name the project when he appears about thirty minutes into the film. The film makes abundant use of actual documentary footage and photographs as well as a

fictional narrative mode inflected with documentary techniques. In one lengthy sequence we see a variety of documentary images: footage of soldiers captured by the Cuban military, still images of a handful of men put on trial after the Bay of Pigs invasion, footage of weapons and human remains as well as still images documenting injuries inflicted on individuals. These are images not unlike the newsreel footage of *Hiroshima mon amour*'s opening sequence recording the injuries sustained by the victims of the bomb. *Memorias*' many instances of documentary are narrated in voice-over by Sergio himself, and he thereby acquires agency over these images. They become a portion of his "mindscreen" narration. Placing Sergio in a position of authority over these images ironically criticizes his engagement with the revolution, with the everyday life of the people on the island surrounding him. His engagement amounts to his leisurely perusal of revolutionary books and his essentially passive decision to remain in Cuba. He criticizes his friend Pablo and "la estúpida burguesía cubana," but he fails to recognize his own complicity with those he criticizes. An ironic view of the protagonist arises because Sergio is the apparent narrative agency of these manifestations of documentary in the film. They are focalized through his consciousness, through his vision, and he acts as voice-over narrator. He is, however, self-deceived. The images and words he narrates "know" more.

Over the course of the film, Sergio speaks with two voices. He speaks in the voice of a wealthy, Europeanized Cuban, deploring the "underdevelopment" of his country, but he also speaks in the voice of a revolutionary, criticizing his friends, his family and his wife for their material concerns. As he reads from revolutionary books and as he narrates statistics on hunger and starvation in Cuba to accompany photographs and newsreel sequences, Sergio's essentially anti-revolutionary voice and positions echo behind the words he speaks uncovering his self-deceit and hypocrisy. Voice-over is only one aspect, one channel of cinematic narration, and

Sergio's apparent agency in these documentary sequences remains framed by the film's narrator, a narrator who views Sergio with a highly critical eye.

Documentary footage and images continue throughout the film, punctuating key moments and infusing Sergio's individual and solitary experiences with the social world bursting around him. Though the first portion of the airport scene is not actual documentary or newsreel footage, this scene nonetheless films a fictional scene in the manner of a documentary, striking a strong contrast with the subjective, though unidentified, point-of-view camera of the opening credits.

This initial airport scene continues, and the camera comes to Sergio as he bids farewell to his parents. He appears put out by their emotional reactions to their imminent departure. Now the camera remains on Sergio and his group. These characters are distinguished from the crowd of anonymous travelers and airport employees. They are actors who do not acknowledge the camera, and they call attention to the beginning of a fictional story that will unfold. Turning from his mother, whose kiss he wipes from his face, Sergio faces a well-dressed woman whose back we see. He shrugs his shoulders and says something like "Bueno ..." but we do not hear his words. The soundtrack of this entire opening scene is made up of general airport sounds: the sounds of stamps and rustling paperwork, overhead announcements, and the hum of people chatting and waiting. We never hear individual conversations. The woman facing Sergio, his wife, turns and walks away before he finishes his sentence. This is our character. He has been singled out as a player in a fictional drama, but there is still a barrier, an aural partition between the camera and the actor, between the fictional story and the narration.

As Sergio watches the plane depart for Miami in the next scene, the camera, which began behind him recording approximately what he sees, circles around him to record only his face in

close-up. Paul A. Schroeder describes this particular shot in his book, *Tomás Gutiérrez Alea: the Dialectics of a Filmmaker*, "the shot is held – a close-up of him looking straight on – as he whistles and watches the plane take off, so that the viewer ends up looking *at* him as well as *with* him. This crucial shot begins a pattern of identification / distantiation that becomes a model for perception throughout the film" (28). In one fluid motion the camera moves from a subjective shot revealing what the character sees in his field of vision to an objective position examining the character himself. Sergio is now both the subject of observation and the observing eye. He is "simultaneously character and narrator" (Stam, 21).

Schroeder's assertion that "this shot begins a pattern of identification / distantiation," aptly describes Sergio's ambivalence vis-à-vis the revolution. The point-of-view shot of the opening credits places him within the group, but its motions and its frenzy keep him disconnected from that group. As we will see, the visualizations of Sergio's memories which combine markers of subjective and objective narration into one instance of cinematic discourse function similarly. They envision his memories, drawing upon the stylistic norms of "mindscreen" narration while inflecting those memories with an aura of impersonality and objectivity. The viewer is drawn into, identifies with, Sergio's subjective memories, but as we will see, the objective element, the use of still images and repetition, distances the viewer from identification with Sergio as the agency of these memories.

On a walk in Havana late into the film Sergio encounters the home of a childhood friend, Francisco de la Cuesta. Sergio narrates in voice-over while the scene fades to his memories, "Aquí vivía Francisco de la Cuesta. Teníamos ocho o diez años. Dónde estará ahora Francisco? Se acordara a qué jugábamos? Yo trato y no puedo." Just before he speaks these words, the film fades from the home today where a soldier stands guard outside, to a view of the house when

Sergio was a boy. The camera approaches the lush property and the luxury car parked in the driveway while the soundtrack, non-diegetic flute music that strikes the melancholy mood of this memory, accompanies Sergio's narration. Two young boys run around the white stone patio and into the house while the camera comes closer and enters the property. The scene fades to a shot of a ground floor room full of children's toys. A train set, a rocking horse, a small billiards table, bookshelves and other childhood objects fill the space as the camera moves from one side of the room to the other. The camera approaches a doorway on one wall that leads outside where we see the two boys huddled together on the floor of the patio with bikes, tennis rackets, and other small items scattered around them. They are far enough away that their precise activity is unseen. As Sergio admits that he cannot recall what games the two friends played, the image dissolves to white before to returning to the present, and Sergio continues walking. This scene fits well within Kawin's conception of "mindscreen" narration. These images visualize Sergio's thoughts, his memories of this home and his friend who lived there, and they stop when he can recall no further. These images follow the limits of his memory, and this sequence conveys Sergio's subjective, first-person perspective. The film attests to Sergio's agency in these shots. The placement of these images within Sergio's narration, the dissolves binding the shots within the sequence, the melancholy score, and the manner of filming work in concert to place this sequence within Sergio's mind. These shots are essentially unambiguous visualizations of Sergio's memory that allow a glimpse into his consciousness.

Later in the film Sergio comes to another location that jogs his memory. He passes a school with a large image of Lenin on the outside of the building covering the space where a statue of Mary used to sit. Sergio will here recall his love affair with Hanna, a young German girl who arrived in Cuba after fleeing Nazi Germany with her family. Of all the memories that Sergio

retraces in this film, this brings him the most regret. The visual narration of this scene, the initial envisioning of Sergio's memories of Hanna, is, like the memory of Francisco de la Cuesta, highly subjective and falls within Kawin's "mindscreen" narration. As we will see, the context as well as the formal and stylistic qualities of these images announce Sergio's first-person perspective, his visual internal monologue. This scene diverges from that earlier memory of Francisco and from the other memory sequences in the film, however, in its use of repetition and still images in the scene's second half. Gutiérrez Alea portrays Sergio's memory of Hanna first in "mindscreen," as a series of moving clips showing Sergio and Hanna interacting with one another. Following this portrayal is a second iteration of the memory in still images apparently drawn from the previous shots. Taking a reflexive turn, the film envisions its own materiality by repeating this memory in a still rather than moving form and thereby complicates the agency behind these images. Rather than concealing portions of the memory from the viewer, as is the case in *Hiroshima,* this use of FIS, the second iteration of Sergio's memory, breaks the memory we have already seem into discrete stills that stand as visual markers for Sergio's fragmentary vision.

Gutiérrez Alea, repeats many key moments in this film. The carnival scene during the opening credits returns toward the end of the film, shot from another perspective, clarifying the ambiguous subjective vision of the earlier scene. The initial airport scene also occurs again when Sergio recalls his family's departure on his way home on a public bus. A recorded conversation and argument between Sergio and his wife, Laura, has two iterations in the film, the first purely aural, the second both aural and visual. As it will with the memory of Hanna, the film repeats the early scenes involving Elena by excerpting stills from those scenes. Elena arrives at Sergio's apartment the day following their evening of love making, the evening that saw her leaving his

apartment in tears. They talk a bit before the film cuts to a series of stills drawn from Sergio's experiences with Elena. These still images repeat each of Elena's scenes thus far. They move backwards in time beginning with the previous evening and ending with their first meeting on the street.

Gutiérrez Alea makes this preoccupation with repetition explicit. At a Chinese restaurant after he picks up Elena, Sergio responds to her reasons for wanting to be an actress with, "une actriz, lo único que hace es repetir miles de veces, de memoria los mismos gestos y las mismas palabras…" The final portion of his line is repeated in Sergio's gradually fading voice four times while Elena's smiling face is held in close-up. When his voice is no longer audible, the scene cuts to a series of five discrete film clips each repeated two, three or four times. An additional clip of Brigitte Bardot and a male actor in bed together ends the sequence of clips and occurs only once. All sexual in nature, these repeated clips, removed from other films by Batista's censors, depict couples kissing and women undressing, naked, or bathing. A highly reflexive move, these clips repeat visually in much the same way that a skipping record repeats aurally, and they draw the viewer's attention to the other, less explicit, instances of repetition in this film. These clips also function technically as a transition between two scenes within the "Elena" portion of the story. These clips end, and the narrative continues in a screening room where Sergio and Elena sit with Tomás Gutiérrez Alea and Ramón F. Suárez, the film's director of photography. Seemingly non-diegetic, these clips retrospectively become diegetic. Gutiérrez Alea explains that he'll use the clips in a film collage he's working on, a project that's now coming along. A key formal trope in the film, repetition forwards the film's stylistic ambivalence. In a film tied so closely to the perspective of the character, visual repetition serves as a reminder of the film narrator's presence and perspective. Repetition during "mindscreen"

narration signals a combination of these two visions. Repetition in *Memorias*, in Sergio's memories in particular, signals cinematic FIS.

This film is focalized through Sergio's consciousness, but repetitions such as these seem to want to remove the film from his mental frame. In the above scene, these erotic clips initially remove that portion of the narration from Sergio's perceiving and experiencing mind. These clips seem to deny his privileged position as the continuous eyes of this film, but when the "story" resumes, these clips take their place within the diegetic frame of Sergio's narrative. *Memorias* plays with agency and with focalization, and the reflexive use of repetition in this instance pushes the tension and conflict surrounding agency to the forefront of the film. The cut to these repeated clips signals a sudden turn away from Sergio's perspective, but the film's narrator subsequently reinscribes them into his perspective. Gutiérrez Alea uses a variation on this trope in his depiction of Sergio's visual memories of Hanna, and from them narrative ambivalence arises in this later scene.

The visualizations of Sergio's memories of Hanna begin as do his memories of Francisco de la Cuesta. He speaks of Hanna in voice-over while the film visualizes scenes involving the two together. This sequence of "mindscreen" narration combines objective visualization, or the memory as seen from an "ideal" perspective with both Sergio and Hanna in the scene with point-of-view shots, or the memory as seen from Sergio's eyes with Hanna looking into the camera. In both cases, the images remain "mindscreen" narration.

After Sergio notices a state run school as he walks alone in Havana (Figure 3.12), the image dissolves to another shot of the school, and this time a statue of Mary stands where Lenin's image will later hang (Figure 3.13).

Figure 3.12 – State School – Present.

Figure 3.13 – Religious School – Past

As in the previous memory sequence, the soundtrack acquires a non-diegetic, delicate and melancholy classical music accompaniment to Sergio's voice-over narration. The camera pans down the wall to the gated entrance of the school's courtyard where young women in uniforms of long dark skirts and white, collared shirts, white ankle socks and dark, flat slip-on shoes exit the gate. Sergio stands outside of the thick stone wall surrounding the school waiting to greet Hanna as she arrives. He appears younger in this scene (Figures 3.14 and 3.15). He wears a casual striped polo shirt and his black, close-cut hair shows no signs of the grey of the film's present. Over seven or eight shots, Sergio narrates,

> Hanna es lo mejor que me ha sucedido en la vida. De eso si estoy seguro. Salieron huyendo de Hitler y cayeron en Cuba. Hanna era más madura, mas mujer que las muchachas subdesarrolladas de aquí. ¿Cuánto tiempo estuve con ella? No logro recordarlo. Sé que es lo mejor que me ha sucedido en la vida. ¿Cómo deje que se fuera? ¿Cómo no corrí tras ella?

Formally the images that accompany his narration remain first-person, "mindscreens." These images are visual representation of Sergio's mind's eye. The sequence, however, is not without the irony of double-voiced discourse. Sergio's description of Hanna as "más madura, mas mujer," than the underdeveloped Cuban women conflicts with Hanna's dress and appearance and with her behavior in these shots. A secondary school student, Hanna wears the modest, girlish uniform required by her Catholic school.

Figure 3.14 – Meeting Hanna after school.

Figure 3.15 – Walking with Hanna.

Her attire and her straight blond hair adorned with a delicate white barrette underscore her already youthful appearance. After the couple walks away from Hanna's school holding hands and talking, the first close-up images of Hanna and Sergio together continue to underscore her youth. Now in an interior space, sitting above Sergio, Hanna draws a moustache on his face as they both laugh. Sergio recalls Hanna as mature, more mature than Cuban women, but the visual representation of his memories highlights her youth. The film challenges Sergio's too simple conception of underdevelopment and development. Sergio regards Elena as underdeveloped. She is Cuban, and she is uninterested in art and literature, yet her behavior, especially the playful quality of her sexual relationship with Sergio, finds visual echoes with these memories of Hanna.

After a few minutes into this memory Hanna and Sergio are in bed together in what appears to be her bedroom. She sits up on the bed combing her hair as she looks into the camera (Figure 3.16). This instance of subjective visualization, a point-of-view shot of Sergio's memory cuts to an objective visualization with the camera behind Hanna while Sergio lays on the bed in front of her, his hands behind his head (Figure 3.17).

Figure 3.16 – POV Shot of Hanna.

Figure 3.17 – Same scene, shot from behind Hanna.

The next shot moves in slow motion as Sergio raises himself from the pillow to embrace and kiss Hanna. They begin to fall back toward the bed, Hanna leaning into Sergio as he leans backwards, and at the same time the camera moves to a closer position. The soundtrack continues with its non-diegetic classical music, and this portion of the scene is free of Sergio's voice-over narration. This first portion of the Hanna sequence visually represents Sergio's thoughts as he speaks in voice-over. The film does not complicate the agency of these images, and apart from the irony communicated in Sergio's perceptions of Hanna's maturity, the scene thus far follows the film's pattern of representing Sergio's memories as "mindscreen" narration. The remainder of this sequence, however, draws on the formal markers of objective, documentary cinematic discourse, complicating the narrative agency.

Immediately following this scene is a series of still images. The first three of these illustrate Sergio's narration, "Cuando se marcho a Nueva York con sus padres íbamos a casarnos." Hanna left Cuba for New York, and these stills are photographs of her there with her family (Figures 3.18 and 3.19).

Figure 3.18 – Snapshot of Hanna in New York

Figure 19 – Snapshot of Hanna with a friend.

The film suggests that Sergio received these pictures from Hanna, and that the two stayed in touch for a period after she left. These first three still photos included are clear examples of photographs that tourists or, in this case, new residents, take of themselves: Hanna posing by herself in front of a building and Hanna and another woman smiling outdoors on a street corner. *Memorias* makes abundant use of documentary techniques, and these still images adhere to that framework. These photos share with the other documentary images and footage of the film a dual existence. They exist within Sergio's consciousness, and in this way, we may place them in the category of "mindscreen." On the other hand, these photographs also exist independently of Sergio's consciousness. The photos are not only his thoughts and his memories of Hanna but physical objects attesting to Hanna's move to New York. These photos, and those that will follow, reside in an intermediary space between Sergio's vision and the film narrator's vision. They carry markers of documentary *and* markers of "mindscreen."

The scene moves quickly through these first three snapshots of Hanna in New York but continues with its use of still images. The New York photos are followed by eleven still images of Hanna and Sergio, and whereas the first three photos carried clear epistemological significance, those that follow are initially ambiguous.

Figure 3.20 – Still of Hanna and Sergio.

Figure 3.21 – Still of Hanna laughing.

A still image (Figure 3.20), a medium long shot of Sergio and Hanna talking to each other in a sunny outdoor setting, follows the final photograph of Hanna in New York. In this still, the couple wears the clothes that they wore when the memory sequence first begins, when Sergio met Hanna after school. Hanna wears her school uniform, and Sergio wears the same polo shirt while he says in voice-over narration, "No creíamos en los papeles pero decidimos que sería mas cómodo." This is a still image ostensibly taken from an earlier portion of the same scene when Sergio and Hanna walk away from her school together while he recalls her maturity in voice-over. This image appears to be an excerpt from the "mindscreen" images depicting Sergio's memory, from portions of that scene that did not appear in its first iteration. Following the photos of Hanna in New York, however, this still retains the documentary quality of those images. The objectivity of those three New York images contaminates the series of stills that follow, and the film appears to leaf through a stack of photographs so that this image acquires an objective, impersonal vision. Unlike the photos of New York, however, there is no indication that this still exists as a photograph independently from Sergio's consciousness. As an instance of cinematic discourse, this particular still image (Figure 3.20) carries markers of subjective and objective perspectives. It shares stylistic qualities with Sergio's memories of Hanna *and* with the three preceding New York photographs.

This first still image of Hanna and Sergio is followed by six more that also appear to come from the same earlier "mindscreen" narration of the scene (Figure 21). These stills are close-ups of Hanna and Sergio kissing and laughing. The film runs through these stills quickly, and as they appear on the screen, Sergio narrates the remainder of his memory, "Teníamos planes … Yo iba a ir a Nueva York, … iba a abrirme paso con ella … Todavía quería ser escritor … Y ella creía en mí." These stills correspond to the earlier scene when the couple walks away from Hanna's school, but they are not stills taken from or "quoted" from that earlier scene. They share the same visual markers, the clothes worn by the actors, the outdoor setting and the time of day as indicated by the afternoon sunlight, and in this way, they appear visually familiar. These are not, however, stills excerpted from a scene we have already scene. These are stills from portions of the scene that are not in the previous portion of the film. They repeat the previous scene but from a perspective and an angle that the film did not show the first time around.

Documentary footage and photographs proliferate in *Memorias*. The film includes non-fictional photographs that illustrate Sergio's narration of starvation in Cuba, photographs of Sergio's youth and young adulthood, photos of the Spanish civil war found in Hemingway's house, photos of Hanna in New York, television clips of Kennedy speaking about Cuba and of American soldiers at Guantanamo. The stills depicting Hanna and Sergio in this memory sequence draw upon these documentary references, and they thereby attain a measure of objectivity. These stills are, nonetheless, drawn from Sergio's consciousness alone, and they are, in this way, "mindscreen" images. Examples of ambivalent cinematic discourse, these stills dismantle Sergio's subjective agency. A reflexive trope, the use of still images and photographs in this film points to the agency of the film's external narrator. The images that accompany Riva's narration of her German lover to Okada in *Hiroshima mon amour* infuse objective,

documentary film techniques into the portrayal of Riva's memories. The stillness of these memory shots likewise infuses the image with objectivity, with materiality, with the presence of the narrator's perspective combined with Sergio's. Where the presence of *Hiroshima*'s narrator in Riva's memory of her lover conceals much of that memory from the viewer, the FIS of *Memorias* repeats Sergio's memory. Breaking Sergio's memory into a series of individual stills, the film's narrator emphasizes the moments between each image, the missing moments that are shown in the first narration of the memory. The film shows what he thinks, what he remembers, and then shows it again, the second time leaving portions out.

This pattern continues for the remainder of this memory sequence. The final four shots are still images that again echo the early portion of this scene. Sergio finishes his narration of this memory, "Hanna es la única persona que creyó en mí. … Me iba a ayudar … Entonces fue cuando mi padre me regalo la mueblería." The first of these final four stills shows Hanna in an interior setting – curtains and blinds are now visible in the background – with Sergio's hand on her cheek. The next two still images (Figures 3.22 and 3.23) correspond to that portion of Sergio's memory when Hanna, sitting up in bed, combs her hair as she faces him.


Figure 3.22 – Still of Hanna and Sergio in bed.


Figure 3.23- Still of Hanna combing her hair.

These two images, unlike the previous stills, are indeed drawn from the earlier moving portion of the scene. These stills constitute visual repetitions of that portion of the scene, and they convey a greater sense of Sergio's agency because they are clearly recognizable. These two stills are

nearly identical to figures 3.16 and 3.17 excerpted from the moving sequence of Sergio's memory. As stills, however, these images retain the documentary aspect of the preceding images. They point to the presence of the film's narrator, the only agency able to excerpt still photographs from previously filmed sequences. As a reflexive move, a move that highlights the material quality of the cinematic medium, celluloid broken up into individual images, this instance of narration makes overt reference to the film's external narrator. Not only does Sergio see Hanna as she combs her hair (Figure 3.23 and Figure 3.16), but so does the film's narrator, the same narrator whose presence is felt by the many documentary photographs in the film. This image, ostensibly an instance of subjective "mindscreen" narration, narration existing solely in the mind of the character, acquires through repetition and stillness, the materiality of the many photographs included in the film. The film's narrator steps in, as it were, to break Sergio's subjective, internal vision into discrete instances, representing formally his manner of seeing and perceiving the world around him and his place therein.

The censored film clips inserted and repeated like a scratched record earlier in *Memorias* call attention to the artificiality, the materiality of the film. We watch a fictional story between Sergio and Elena unfold in a Chinese restaurant and, perhaps, forget that we watch a film, but the sudden insertion of these film clips draws the viewer to an awareness of the constructedness of the film. The film's overall combination of documentary and fictional techniques as well as these still images of Hanna within the film's visualization of Sergio's memory likewise calls attention to the materiality of the cinematic medium. This memory sequence begins by making use of the stylistic features of first-person narration, first-person internal visualization so that we take the moving images projected on the screen for Sergio's thoughts. As Sergio briefly narrates his recollections of Hanna and his regret that he lost her, the viewer implicitly "reads" the images

accompanying his narration as representations of his visual thoughts. As Sergio narrates he imagines himself as a young man meeting Hanna after school. He recollects their time spent together, their love making and their games. When the scene moves to portraying stills of these same memories, stills that do not exist as photographs outside of Sergio's mind and that repeat the previous "mindscreen" sequence, the visual narration combines objective cinematic discourse with the heretofore subjective discourse. The narration becomes ambivalent; Sergio's position as the narrative authority becomes undermined. The narrator inserts his vision, and thereby communicates another way to read Sergio's perceptions, to read them as incomplete and fragmentary.

Memorias constitutes Sergio's seeing, Sergio's perception. FIS reveals the vision of a character with the addition of the film narrator's perspective. The viewer sees with Sergio, but the viewer also sees more than Sergio. Edmundo Desnoes' novel is Sergio's attempt to write, to write his life, his memories, and his perceptions and impression of Cuba, the revolution, and his place therein. Gutiérrez Alea's film, his adaptation of Desnoes' novel, focuses on Sergio's perceptions, his vision of Cuba and of himself, and he reveals Sergio's highly fractured vision. Alea follows Sergio's subjective narration, the "mindscreen" narration of his memories, with discrete, broken up instances plucked from that memory. Alea's use of FIS envisions Sergio's incomplete vision, his incomplete ways of seeing, into a formal, stylistic trait.

By filming Sergio's visual memories of Hanna in a formally ambivalent manner, Gutiérrez Alea calls attention to his unreliability as a narrator of his own tale, as the film's visual agency. Sergio has none of Emmanuelle Riva's reticence to narrate. His story, the film itself, rests upon the premise that Sergio willfully narrates his experiences. Whereas she resists telling her memory, and *Hiroshima* mirrors this resistance in its visual style, Sergio relishes precisely

the telling. *Hiroshima mon amour* interrogates vision, agency and knowledge, and it dramatizes this focus by envisioning Riva's psychological ambivalence in its reticent and incomplete portrayal of her inconsolable memory. *Memorias del subdesarrollo* interrogates Sergio's particular vision, his agency and knowledge. The memory of Riva's German lover is only shown once. Riva tells the story to Okada once, and the film's narrator reveals only one highly reticent envisioning of this memory. The narrator unveils a very small portion to the viewer whose desire to see is as strong as Okada's desire to know. Sergio's memory of Hanna, on the other hand, is shown by the film's narrator twice. The narrator follows an instance of subjective "mindscreen" narration with a free indirect representation of the same memory, now broken up to conceal portions from the first iteration that the viewer knows are missing.

Hiroshima opens with Okada's voice, "Tu n'as *rien* vu à Hiroshima. Rien," and we are reminded of the missing eye, the empty eye socket of one of Hiroshima's many victims of the bomb from the documentary footage of the film's opening sequence. Whereas the missing eye of this victim attests to that film's focus on vision and ambiguous narrative agency, *Memorias del subdesarrollo* makes explicit these same preoccupations by placing a telescope on the balcony of Sergio's apartment. The missing eye in *Hiroshima* admits to a lack at the outset. Riva will not *see* Hiroshima in the Jamesian sense where seeing equals knowing. Sergio's penetrating and intrusive telescope, on the other hand, seems to assert its radical seeing. From the top floor of his tall apartment building, however, Sergio's seeing through the telescope ultimately displaces him from the people and places he sees and signals his distance from the world outside his own space.

Early in the film, in his apartment following the departure of his family for Miami, Sergio steps out onto his balcony to survey the city below him. He looks through the telescope attached

to the railing and comments on the sites before him. The camera, masked with a circular frame to indicate the telescope lens in this point-of-view shot, scans the city. "Everything is the same," he says. Havana looks like a "city of cardboard," a set. The camera pans over the city that has replaced the "imperial eagle" with revolutionary slogans painted on the sides of buildings. Julianne Burton views this telescope as "a visual metaphor for Sergio's distance from his fellow human beings" (18). Peering through the telescope early in the film, the camera reveals only a fragmented vision of the city, a vision that looks closely, but in a way that stresses the discrete, separate images and moments that make up Sergio's view of a city. The telescope cannot see the whole but only narrow, individual sections of the city.

This telescope returns as a strong visual marker at the film's end. As the missile crisis reaches a dangerous pinnacle while revolutionary soldiers ready themselves with tanks and guns in the streets of Havana, Sergio succumbs to his inner turmoil and crisis, sequestered in his apartment in fear of the revolution he should have fled. He gazes into the telescope pointed upward at the moon in the night sky rather than down at the streets and the activity below. The final minutes of the film, edited in a quick and jerky manner juxtapose the anxiety of Sergio's expressions and his pacing, a caged animal, in his apartment with the large-scale, nighttime military preparations unfolding outside. Sergio hovers over his bathroom sink, rinsing and re-rinsing the soapy bubbles down into the drain, he paces from the living room to the kitchen and back again, he smashes a small glass figurine, and he awaits the crisis' end. The film ends on a sequence of moving images overlooking Havana the following morning, a sequence that begins with a shot of Sergio's balcony, a shot that highlights the telescope now without its viewer (Figure 3.24).

Figure 3.24 – Telescope overlooking Havana.

Sergio never saw Havana as this shot sees Havana. His ambivalent vision never apprehends a wide expanse. Always looking to divergent perspectives at once, unable to fix on a position for or against the revolution, Sergio sees only discrete parts rather than the whole. Attached to his point of view for much of the film, the camera maintains a shallow depth of field and rarely opens up to panoramic shots such as this.

> The final sequence ends with a shot of Sergio's telescope in the balcony followed by telephoto shots of the Havana cityscape. This syntagm retraces the montage that inscribed Sergio's position as spectator-in-the-text early in the film, with one salient difference: the shot of the telescope leaves the viewing end out of the frame. The viewer, Sergio, has been deleted by the camera position, his diegetic presence or absence is irrelevant, he is out of the game … Before the film ends, Sergio and I part company. He is the spectator-in-the-text, I the spectator-of-the-text, the witnesses-who-are-always-everywhere. Outside is the street and history. (Fernández, 252)

Sergio's fate is unclear. The final scene of this film removes his perspective, giving only that of the film's narrator.

FIS in prose presents the reader with an instance of "dual-voiced" discourse, discourse in which the intertwined voices of a narrator and a character constitute ambivalent narration, the simultaneous presence of two distinct narrative voices. These two voices together "speak" one

instance of discourse, and though the positions and outlooks of the narrator and the character may differ greatly as in Austen's *Emma* or very little as in James' *The Ambassadors*, in FIS, their voices cannot be separated. We read the character's thoughts through the narrator's frame. Cinematic FIS in *Hiroshima mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarrollo* reflexively combines two "visions" rather than two "voices." These two films envision the ambivalence of the characters by combining the subjective and internal first-person vision of the character – their memories – with the objective, third-person vision of a narrator. This envisioning highlights psychological ambivalence, but it also underscores these films' insistence on the ultimate ambiguity of vision and agency. Sergio and Riva's unnamed character do not see clearly. They do not see holistically. *Hiroshima*'s narrator exposes Riva's limited perception of the city, its inhabitants, and the bomb. Following Riva's lead in the portrayal of the memory of her German lover, however, the narrator conceals this memory with its use of FIS, explicitly leaving information out so that the viewer's knowledge and penetration is limited by the ambivalent narration. The narrator of *Memorias* also mirrors Sergio's ambivalence, but this narrator sees and knows much more than the character and confers that knowledge upon the viewer especially in FIS. Highly focused on psychological ambivalence, these films are equally as focused on vision and on unmasking the self-deceived fragmentary visions of the characters.

Like the novels thus far examined in this project, in their use of cinematic FIS, these two films resist discursive certainty. In the chapter that follows we will consider FIS in James' *The Ambassadors* and Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*. Whereas the FIS of *Hiroshima* and *Memorias*, a highly visible discursive mode, reflects the reflexivity of these two films, *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud* feature less overt narrators whose perspectives rarely conflict with those of the characters. These narrators who seem to remain always behind their characters nonetheless

step forward to speak with, to see with the characters, and the FIS of these two works is quite elusive.

Chapter Four

Jamesian and Rohmerian Epistemology:
FIS in *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud*

Other persons in no small number were to people the scene …. But Strether's sense of these things, and Strether's only, should avail me for showing them; I should know them but through his more or less groping knowledge of them, since his very gropings would figure among his most interesting motions…
Henry James, Preface to *The Ambassdors* (8-9)

So far we have kept our discussion of FIS and psychological ambivalence in prose distinct from our discussion of cinematic FIS. The first two chapters of this dissertation examine the thematic and rhetorical implications of FIS in novels by Austen, Flaubert and James. The third chapter on Resnais and Alea carves out a space for cinema within this discussion, at once arguing for this narrative mode within cinema and describing intentions and effects of cinematic FIS similar to those outlined in the earlier chapters. This chapter, the final of this dissertation, draws from the prior three chapters to link literary and cinematic FIS and psychological ambivalence by comparing Henry James's late novel *The Ambassadors* with the third film of Eric Rohmer's six *Contes moraux*, *Ma nuit chez Maud*.

A focus on knowledge, discovery and psychological conflict connects these two narratives to one another. *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud* find Lambert Strether and Rohmer's unnamed protagonist[1] in difficult moments. The narratives begin with both characters facing unambiguous tasks: Strether's "errand" in Europe is to bring Chad Newsom home to Massachusetts, and Jean-Louis sets out to marry Françoise. Over the course of these tales, the characters are faced with situations and people that force them to question their purpose. Both must acknowledge deep psychological ambivalence where they believed only unclouded determination resided. The basic plotlines of these narratives, the simple tasks alluded to, recede

[1] I will hereafter refer to this character as "Jean-Louis" after the actor, Jean-Louis Trintignant, who plays him.

into the background as both works shift focus to the troubled, developing consciousness of these characters whose hesitations and discoveries direct the narration.

Above all, these are narratives of consciousness. James and Rohmer tether their audience to the perceiving and "groping" minds of their characters. *The Ambassadors* and *Maud* are focalized entirely through the mind of the single protagonist. As James writes in the preface quoted above, the characters and situations of the novel are shown through Strether's mind, "Strether's sense of these things, and Strether's only, should avail me for showing them; I should know them but through his more or less groping knowledge of them" (8). James limits the various scenes within his novel to those Strether himself witnesses, and the camera in Rohmer's film records only situations and settings in which Jean-Louis is present. Also connecting James's novel and Rohmer's film are the stylistic choices that shape the thematic focus of these two works. In quite different ways than the novels and films thus far discussed, these two works employ formal devices that blur the boundary between objective and subjective narration, between the perspective of an external narrator and of an internal character. FIS in both works serves as a powerful tool for this blurred distinction. The effect of FIS in James's novel and in Rohmer's film, however, distinguishes itself from the FIS of the previous works considered here.

The relationship between the narrators and the focalizing characters in James and Rohmer's works differs from the works of the other writers and filmmakers discussed in this dissertation and from James's two novels discussed in Chapter Two. Whereas Austen and Flaubert's narrative voices are strongly distinguished from Emma and Frédéric's inner voices, and whereas Gutiérrez Alea and Resnais's cinematic narrators' visions are quite distinct from those of Sergio and of Riva's character, in *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud*, the relationship between these two agencies is marked by a similarity of voices, a similarity of

visions. Strether often "sounds" like the late Jamesian narrator of *The Ambassadors*, and Jean-Louis "sees" quite similarly to the narrating agency of *Maud*. We find examples of James's late style, the complicated rhetoric, the ambiguous referents, and the frequent piling up of short clauses within sentences, in examples of Strether's speech, in his dialogue with Chad Newsome, with Maria Gostrey and with Madame de Vionnet. In Rohmer's film, many point-of-view shots, shots that represent Jean-Louis's optical perspective, pass by unnoticed because the cinematic narrator "looks" and perceives in the same way as the character.

The effect of this similarity between the narrators and the characters is twofold. In the first place, FIS is at time quite difficult to recognize in these two works because Strether's idiom, for example, does not always stand out against the narrator's. In the second and more important place, these works, though at times quite ironic, deploy an irony that is "so quiet in tone" – to use Ian Watt's phrase – an indulgent irony very much unlike the often critical irony of *L'Education sentimental* and of *Memorias del subdesarrollo* (453). These narrators place themselves in very close proximity to the characters whose views and opinions they mostly espouse. These are "figural" narratives, narratives filtered through the mind of a single consciousness, and Dorrit Cohn's comment on the narration of figural novels is particularly applicable here: "in figural novels especially, where the narration of external reality is intimately related to subjective perception, there is no clear borderline between the external and the internal scene" (49). While this is true of all of the novels and films of this dissertation, it is particularly the case in these two works. The "borderline" between "the external and the internal scene," is even more elusive in *The Ambassadors* and in *Maud* because objective and subjective narration do not "look" very different from another.

FIS remains ambivalent in these two works, and it emerges with the greatest force, as in the earlier discussed works, during moments of acute psychological crisis, moments of intense ambivalence on the part of the characters. The key difference here, however, is the fluidity of movement between these two similar perspectives. These works are highly subjective, highly focused on consciousness and on thinking, but they evince a deep ambivalence vis-à-vis representing consciousness. *The Ambassadors* lacks Strether's quoted thoughts; we only note a few very brief moments of quoted thought. We will very rarely read something like, "Strether wondered, 'What does he mean by virtuous attachment?'" Likewise, *Ma nuit chez Maud* lacks "mindscreen" narration. Rohmer's viewers see only images of the external world, never images that represent Jean-Louis's inner mind, his visual memories or fantasies. As Jean-Louis describes his past to Maud, the visual track of the film remains on him as he speaks and never shows images of his memory, images of him five years ago, say, living with a young woman to whom he is not married. These works are highly subjective, then, but they resist direct representations of consciousness that the previous works discussed do not. Rather than quoted thoughts, these two works convey consciousness through FIS and indirect narration, or what Cohn calls "psycho-narration." The profound psychological indecision of the two characters, of Strether and of Jean-Louis, reaches the reader and the viewer through the medium of a narrative that is itself intensely ambivalent regarding subjective revelations.

Near the end of *The Ambassadors*, Maria Barrace, a secondary character and one of the many Maria/Maries of this novel, speaks the following words to Strether: "'We know you as the hero of the drama, and we're gathered to see what you'll do. … we take such an interest in you. We feel you'll come up to the scratch'" (402). The apparent intrigue of this novel - Chad Newsome's extended stay in Paris, his ambiguous relationship with the fashionable Marie de

Vionnet and the desire of Chad's mother, Mrs. Newsome, in Woollett, Massachusetts to bring her son home to work in the family business – stands as a backdrop to Strether's developing consciousness. Maria Barrace's words point to Strether's development as the primary focus of the action. Strether's impressions, his hesitations, his ambivalence, and his knowledge form the center of interest in *The Ambassadors*.

Lambert Strether is the quintessential example of ambivalence in a Jamesian character. From the outset of the novel, the narrator reveals Strether with his two feet continually straddling disparate territories. As the novel progresses, Strether wavers in the face of his impressions, his memories, and his impulses. Eventually faced with Chad's life in Paris, his friends, and his relationship with Madame de Vionnet, Strether manifests opposing views with respect to the young man's return to his New England home. He arrives with the facts in hand, the facts of what Chad and the Newsome family have to gain in Woollett, ready to present them dispassionately, but as he spends time within Chad's circle, as he recalls his own desires, and as he acquires new experiences, Strether begins to change his mind.

The narrator informs the reader within the first few pages of the novel that "he was burdened, poor Strether – it had better be confessed at the outset – with the oddity of a double consciousness. There was detachment in his zeal and curiosity in his indifference" (56). Strether wavers between home and abroad. He wavers between Mrs. Newsome, his fiancée in Woollett, and Madame de Vionnet, Chad's love interest who Strether himself develops a deep appreciation and attraction for, and between Chad's responsibility to his family and his responsibility to Madame de Vionnet. Eventually the reader infers where Strether lands on each of these points: Strether hopes for Chad's continued stay Paris, he prefers this life of freedom abroad to his day-to-day life in Woollett, and his attraction to Marie de Vionnet; even his attraction to Maria

Gostrey, his guide and his sounding board in Paris, is stronger than his attraction to Mrs. Newsome. We will also infer the answer to the plot's basic question. Strether will learn that Chad's relationship with Marie de Vionnet is everything that it was feared to be by Mrs. Newsome in Woollett. The intimacy of this relationship goes well beyond what Woollett, Strether included, understands as a "virtuous attachment." Chad and Marie de Vionnet are lovers, but neither Strether nor the narrative voice of the novel will speak this truth out loud. The qualification of these inferences lies in the continuous uncertainty of James's narration. The novel reveals its various facts through indirections and suppositions. Strether hesitates profoundly, but so too does the narration.

Many of James's novels and stories could take the title of his middle period novel about the ill-treated young child of divorced parents, *What Maisie Knew*[2]. This is particularly true, however, about *The Ambassadors*. Strether is only the first of a group of ambassadors from Woollett who share the common mission of removing Chad Newsome from Europe, but the book's title is something of a decoy. Woollett's other "ambassadors," Sarah, Jim, and Mamie Pocock, arrive in Paris late in the novel, and they play a limited role. By the time they arrive, Strether is already, as James might put it, "done for." *The Ambassadors* could more aptly be called *What Strether Knew*. Strether's growing awareness of himself, of his impressions, and of others, and his various discoveries and recollections form the core of interest in the novel. What Strether knows is key.

Ruth Bernard Yeazell's *Language and Knowledge in the Late Novels of Henry James* informs our view of James's *The Ambassadors*. Her remarks on the connection between style and knowledge contribute well to our focus on the role of psychological and formal ambivalence

[2] Jonathan Freedman's 2008 article, "What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl* and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Knowledge," published in *The Cambridge Quarterly* is just one example of a James scholar making use of this title formula as a description of James's oeuvre.

in this novel. “For the very rhythms of James’s late style,” Yeazell writes, “enact the relentless unfolding of awareness; in the language itself we sense the peculiar force with which knowledge – half-dreaded, half-desired, thrusts itself upon the conscious mind” (25). This “half-dreaded, half-desired” knowledge, knowledge approached ambivalently by these characters, that we examined in Chapter Two in *The Golden Bowl* is a crucial element in this novel, as it will also be in Rohmer’s *Ma nuit chez Maud*.

The novel ends shortly after Strether comes to understand Chad’s relationship. The four ambassadors will all return to Woollett with Chad in tow. Strether pays his final visit to Maria Gostrey, and she asks him to remain in Paris with her. She wonders what he has to return to in America, and he assures her that his remaining with her would “make him wrong” even though he prefers that Chad remain with the woman who “makes him wrong” (347). As he explains, it is his desire to be “right,” “not, out of the whole affair, to have got anything for [himself]” that attracts Maria to him (346). It is this that, paradoxically, draws Maria to ask him to be “wrong,” to remain with her in Paris. The novel ends with the following line, “‘Then there we are!’ said Strether” (347). James’s novels typically end with a door opening rather than closing. Isabel Archer returns to Italy, to her distasteful husband and her poor stepdaughter at the end of *The Portrait*, and the reader is left, like Isabel’s pursuer Caspar Goodwood, confused and questioning. *The Golden Bowl* ends with the irrevocable split of the two couples; Charlotte and Adam Verver leave Europe to establish a museum in the American west while Maggie and Amerigo remain in England. The questions related to these two now separate narratives are left unanswered. The primary plot element is settled at the end of *The Ambassadors*. Chad will return home. He will not marry Mamie Pocock, but he will take his place in the family business. Strether’s “Then there we are” appears to situate him and Maria Gostrey in a definite space.

"There," however, is an indefinite space. The crucial questions of what is "right" and what is "wrong" and for whom loom over the novel's final conversation between Strether and Miss Gostrey, and they go unanswered. The difficulty, the impossibility, of knowledge permeates this novel. Radically ambivalent vis-à-vis the outcomes of his trip to Paris, Strether defends himself against knowledge and against certainty. FIS, a dual-voiced, indecisive narrative mode draws the novel's epistemological focus to the formal qualities of the discourse. FIS mirrors Strether's inability to decide and it mirrors the difficulty of knowing with a discursive inability to ascribe agency to a single, unique consciousness. The similarity of the two voices, the stylistic features that connect Strether's speech to the narrator's style, represented within FIS compounds the difficulty and ultimate resonance of this discourse.

Something of a Jamesian film, Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*, like *The Ambassadors*, centers on one consciousness. Jean-Louis embarks on a path to knowledge much as James's Lambert Strether travels to Europe, to France, to learn the truth about Chad Newsome, to bring him home, but finally to discover his own ambivalence. *Maud*'s Jean-Louis is a man of thirty-four who, after many years spent in the Americas, has returned to France, to Clermont-Ferrand to work as an engineer for Michelin and to pursue a life of quiet reservation. Outside of work he devotes himself to the study of mathematics, probability and Pascal, to introspection and to his growing dedication to Catholicism. Jean-Louis is a man converted. His life in the Americas was one of society and love affairs, and he seeks in his wintertime move to the *Massif Central* region of France, a life of calm and stability, eschewing society and city life for his temporary home in the quiet, rural countryside surrounding Clermont-Ferrand. The film centers on two pivotal meetings that, taken together, place Jean-Louis in a difficult and troubling situation.

Over the course of the film, Jean-Louis meets Françoise, the young, Catholic woman he chooses for his wife, and at nearly the same moment, he meets Maud, a free thinking atheist. Before he finds the courage and the chance to speak with Françoise, Jean-Louis spends a night at Maud's apartment. A woman who challenges his self-knowledge and self-satisfaction and whose sexual forthrightness recalls the adventures prior to his religious conversion, Maud forces Jean-Louis to recognize his inner indecision and ambivalence. Jean-Louis looks on his spiritual conversion as total. He does not recognize the paradox of subscribing to Christianity and at the same time feeling no regret, no need to do penance for past sins. Jean-Louis's night at Maud's forces him and the viewer to recognize this paradox and finally to doubt his conversion and his pursuit of Françoise.

The film's final scene, rather than offering closure, repeats the same doubts and questions vis-à-vis Jean-Louis's marriage to Françoise. Five years after his night at Maud's, Jean-Louis, Françoise and their young son walk toward a beach, and they encounter Maud, leaving the same beach, alone. In the film's second instance of voice-over narration, (the first, very early on, announced Jean-Louis's intention to marry Françoise) the film's viewer comes to learn of Jean-Louis's final discovery. As he reads his wife's pained expression after his brief talk with Maud, he understands that Françoise's first lover was Maud's ex-husband. He then lies to his wife, telling her that Maud was his own last "fling." Brushing this aside as something they have agreed not to speak of, Françoise stands up and, smiling, beckons her son toward the beach. Jean-Louis follows, and the three head toward the ocean, the young boy swinging from his parents hands as they run ecstatically. Rohmer's film ends on this scene, on this lie that Jean-Louis tells his wife, a lie that, we see, she needs to hear, a lie that assuages her strong sense of guilt and fear.

Strether learns the truth about Chad and Marie de Vionnet just as Jean-Louis learns the truth of his wife's past love affair, but in both cases, this truth only uncovers more and profound questions that the novel and the film do not answer. These two works end with only apparent closure. In his monograph on Rohmer, Pascal Bonitzer writes, "… les films de Rohmer sont d'abord des films policiers, des films à énigme. Leur intrigue s'ordonne toujours autour d'un secret. On aurait bien envie de dire que ce sont des *mystères*" (emphasis original, 7). Bonitzer's remark applies to the mystery that is solved in Rohmer's film – Françoise's lover was Maud's husband – but his remark also highlights Rohmer's epistemological focus. Knowledge and certainty in Rohmer's film as in James's novel, are difficult and troubling. These two characters pursue self-discovery in their intimate conversations with women, but they also recoil from knowledge. As we will see, these works resist certainty on many levels.

James's narrator makes note of Strether's "double consciousness," his ambivalence, very early in *The Ambassadors*. Using the cinematic medium, Rohmer also brings to light the "double consciousness" of his character early in the film. The scene set during a church service dramatizes this character's vacillation between his past, his "aventures féminins," and his present spirituality. Attending mass, Jean-Louis's attention vacillates. His gaze alternates between a young woman and the priest at the altar as he proceeds through the ritual of transubstantiation. As we will see, the camera in this opening scene partially aligns itself with Jean-Louis's visual perspective, and the manner of this alignment, an early instance of Rohmer's cinematic FIS in this film, provides hints to the viewer of this character's inner division.

Maud later brings the protagonist's "double consciousness" to light explicitly when she assesses Jean-Louis in the following manner, "Vous vous dérober. Vous ne prenez pas vos responsabilités. Vous êtes un chrétien honteux doublé d'un Don Juan honteux. C'est bien le

comble." Just as Maria Barrace reads Strether and names him "the hero of the drama," Maud is an internal reader of Jean-Louis. She reads him and voices the ambivalence that he will not admit. "What Strether Knows" will become key within *The Ambassadors*, but it is a key never entirely given to the reader. Similarly "what Jean-Louis knows" about his own motivations and desires will remain veiled in Rohmer's film. Knowledge and certainty are elusive in these works, while indecision and undecidability reign. Strether and Jean-Louis cannot decide between competing desires; the formal qualities of the narration, especially the use of FIS, create ambivalent narration that vacillates between voices and between visions and underscores the uncertainty permeating these two works.

***

James's critical writings and Rohmer's writings on film reveal a shared fondness for what can loosely be called an "objective" style of narration. In his critical essays and the prefaces to his novels, James describes his preference for largely silent third-person narrators to those who speak directly to the reader. In an essay published in 1893, James describes the "impersonality" of Flaubert's narration as that author's "highest morality" (178). Of the narrator's many asides to the reader in Trollope's novels, James has this to say: "These little slaps at credulity … are very discouraging …. It is impossible to imagine what a novelist takes himself to be unless he regard himself as an historian and his narrative as a history. It is only as a historian that he has the smallest *locus standi*" (175). James's preferred "narrator-historian" is one who facilitates the unfolding of a tale with few intrusions and whose limited presence does not signal the fiction of the narration. Though he makes use of the first-person perspective in a few stories and most notably in his late novel, *The Sacred Fount*, James writes disparagingly of it in his preface to *The Ambassadors*, a novel that he feels compelled to defend as a third-person narrative. "It may be

asked why," James writes, "if one so keeps to one's hero, one shouldn't make a single mouthful of "method," …. equip him with the double privilege of subject and object" (11). James finds first-person narration, however, "foredoomed to looseness," and Strether, James writes, "has exhibitional conditions to meet … that forbid the terrible *fluidity* of self-revelation" (emphasis original 10, 11). The "looseness" of first-person narration is replaced in *The Ambassadors* with a third-person narrator who remains very close to Strether's mind but who paints him from an external position.

Many of Rohmer's articles in *Cahiers du cinema*, which he edited from 1957 to 1963, and other publications reflect a similar preference for objectivity and for a non-intrusive cinematic narrator. In language quite similar to James's critique of Trollope, Rohmer writes in "The Classical Age of Cinema," "How strange it is to proclaim Chaplin the most authentic genius of film! Let's salute Murnau, Stroheim, or Dreyer as our true masters. Beware of all winks to the audience, of the sly quest for complicity, of all calls, even discreet, for pity. We must learn to keep our distance" (42). Following André Bazin, Rohmer favors a filming style based on large depth of field or deep-focus photography so that the background as well as the foreground, in short, everything in the frame, is in focus. Also like Bazin, he prefers long-take photography minimizing cuts and variety in camera position. This style records much of the mise-en-scène objectively for an extended period of time rather than small portions pointed out to the viewer explicitly and momentarily. As James's remarks convey his disregard for first-person narration, Rohmer likewise notes his position against the "subjective camera," or the point-of-view shot and what he calls "sentimental cinema,"

> Je suis hostile à la caméra subjective et également au cinéma sentimentale pris dans un sens très large et qui établi entre un personnage et le spectateur une complicité émotionnelle. Pourquoi? Parce que l'émotion ne sera jamais obtenue que par des 'trucs.' (Baby 1976, quoted in Schilling, 116)

Rather than making use of "trucs," of cinematic tropes and tricks that connect a viewer to a character, Rohmer's cinema strives for a detachment that allows the story and the characters to tell their own tales. Derek Schilling calls Rohmer's a "cinema of prose" to distinguish his preference for stylistic "restraint" from the highly reflexive films made by Rohmer's New Wave contemporaries such as Godard, Truffaut and Resnais (92).

This preference for "objectivity" in James and Rohmer translates into narrators who are impersonal. They do not intervene in self-conscious ways nor do they comment explicitly on the art of novel writing or filmmaking. In comparison with Austen's narrator in *Emma* or Gutiérrez Alea's narrator in *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, the narrators of *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud* recede behind the characters. These narrators do not explicitly evaluate the characters or the situations unfolding. James and Rohmer, however, do not adhere unconditionally to their own stylistic preferences. The Jamesian narrator's various, though infrequent, intrusions, his reference to Strether as "our friend" and his periodic use of the first-person pronouns *I*, *we* and *our*, reveal his presence as the novel's organizer, its agency. James's idiosyncratic late style replete with difficult rhetorical flourishes and FIS also renders an otherwise impersonal, non-characterized narrator at times quite intrusive. In the case of *Maud*, in two important scenes early in the film, the camera moves from deep-focus photography to a very shallow depth of field that guides the viewer to recognize only the object of Jean-Louis's focus. The cinematic narrator in these instances "intrudes" to point the viewer's attention in a particular direction. More often than not, however, *Maud*'s cinematic narrator appears quite unobtrusive. As we will see, the filming style is nonetheless marked by frequent yet nearly invisible moves between objective and subjective narration.

James and Rohmer's preference for "objectivity" contributes to the usage and variety of FIS in these two works. A mode that signals the fictionailty of a narrative, FIS is by its very nature reflexive. The FIS of *The Ambassadors* and of *Ma nuit chez Maud*, however, is a highly limited, highly restrained FIS. The similarities between the narrators and the characters in these works results in less self-conscious FIS, in FIS that appears to restrict the representation of the character's psyche. FIS always restricts this representation, but in these works, James and Rohmer's "narrator-historians" strive to "keep their distances" from the inner perspective of their characters all the while remaining forever tied to these characters' experiences, tied unobtrusively to these characters' voices and visions. These works are "figural" in the sense that they are focalized through a single character whose consciousness and perceptions guide the narration, but they also remain quite "authorial" in the formal characteristics of the narration.

We will begin our discussion of FIS in *The Ambassadors* and *Ma nuit chez Maud* with a brief look at the opening scenes of the two works. We will then continue by examining two key scenes in each. Strether's solitary reflections upon reading his first letters from Mrs. Newsome in the Luxembourg Gardens provides an early parallel to the pivotal scenes in James's *The Portrait* and *The Golden Bowl* analyzed in Chapter Two with an important difference. Whereas James delays his portrayal of Isabel Archer and of Maggie Verver's consciousness until the latter half of those two novels, in *The Ambassadors*, he plunges his narrative into Strether's mind very quickly. We will continue our discussion of James with an analysis of Strether's country excursion, the episode late in the novel which faces Strether very forcefully with the "truth" of Chad Newsome's relationship with Madame de Vionnet. Our discussion of *Maud* will begin with a look at a scene very early in the film when Jean-Louis attends a church service. This scene and another that follows it make use of what Jean Mitry names "semi-subjective" imagery and what

George M. Wilson calls "indirect or reflected subjectivity." The cinematic narrator will reveal Jean-Louis's indecision by placing the viewer at once inside of and outside of the character's perception. We will then turn to the lengthy scene toward the middle of the film where Jean-Louis spends a night at Maud's. This crucial scene is filmed primarily with an objective, external camera. As we will see, however, this scene uses FIS to represent Jean-Louis's wavering consciousness in a number of highly understated ways.

***

Lambert Strether's ambivalence, his "double consciousness" is evidenced on the first page of James's novel. After his ship arrives in England, Strether considers the good fortune that his old friend Waymarsh will not meet him immediately at the boat and that Strether has time to imbibe "a qualified draught of Europe" on his own (17). Strether looks forward to his friend's arrival yet relishes its delay,

> The same secret principle, however, that has prompted Strether not absolutely to desire Waymarsh's presence at the dock, that has led him thus to postpone for a few hours his enjoyment of it, now operated to make him feel he could wait still without disappointment. They would dine together at the worst, and with all respect to dear old Waymarsh – if not even, for that matter, to himself – there was little fear that in the sequel they shouldn't see enough of each other. The principle I have just mentioned as operating had been, with the most newly disembarked of the two men, wholly instinctive – the fruit of a sharp sense that, delightful as if would be to find himself looking, after so much separation, into his comrade's face, his business would be a trifle bungled should he simply arrange for this countenance to present itself to the nearing steamer as the first "note," of Europe. (17)

This very early passage presents Strether's first instance of indecision. He recognizes the "delight" of seeing Waymarsh again, but he faces the prospect of continuing to wait for Waymarsh's arrival "without disappointment" (17). He evinces these two paradoxical reactions to his friend at the same moment. Strether's chief ambivalence will concern his freedom, his

sense of escape in Europe and in Paris. The first page of *The Ambassadors* offers hints of Strether's desire for freedom and his parallel recognition of his obligations.

The narrator's external voice reporting on Strether's reactions and motivations dominates this passage. Using indirect discourse, Cohn's "psycho-narration," James's narrator conveys Strether's mind without thereby representing his thoughts or his inner voice. The sentence toward the middle of the passage, however, "They would dine together at the worst, and with all respect to dear old Waymarsh – if not even, for that matter, to himself …" includes a brief representation of Strether's inner voice using FIS. In this line we "hear" Strether's voice in the phrase "dear old Waymarsh." The narrator's discourse, reporting on the character's consciousness, momentarily includes the character's inner idiom, and the voices of the narrator and of the character combine in this phrase. This instance of psychological ambivalence is punctuated by the formal ambivalence of the narration.

In an important essay Ian Watt analyzes the opening paragraph of this novel, and he identifies a number of stylistic features common to James's late works. Some of these are, "the delayed specification of referents … a preference for non-transitive verbs; many abstract nouns; much use of 'that'; a certain amount of elegant variation to avoid piling up personal pronouns and adjectives … and the presence of a great many negatives and near negatives" (443). Watt's central thesis concerning the style of this particular paragraph is the following, "The basic development structure of the passage, then, is one of progressive and yet artfully delayed clarification; and this pattern is also typical of James's general novelistic method" (451). Watt's identification of "delay" in James is echoed by Yeazell, "From the very first moment at which Strether lands at Liverpool, in fact, *The Ambassadors* becomes one long delaying action" (21). FIS functions as a resistance to certainty; it is also a dilatory device that withholds knowledge of

who speaks from the reader. To the extent that its formal structure causes the reader not to know who speaks, FIS mirrors the novel's privileging of uncertainty over certainty, the novel's consistent use of delay.

Of the instance of FIS in the novel's opening paragraph Watt writes, "… 'with all respect to dear old Waymarsh' is obviously Strether's licensed familiarity" (45?). Watt identifies Strether's voice in narration that emerges from the perspective of the narrator, but Strether's inner idiom quickly disappears in favor of the narrator's continuing report on his mind. Watt also notes the irony inherent in the lengthy first paragraph of the novel of which the citation above is a portion:

> … we and the narrator are inside Strether's mind, and yet we are also outside it, knowing more about Strether than he knows about himself. This is the classic posture of irony. Yet I think that to insist too exclusively on the ironic function of James's narrative point of view would be mistaken …. James's later novels in general are most intellectual; but they are also, surely, his most compassionate: and in this particular paragraph Strether's dilemma is developed in such a way that we feel for him even more than we smile at him. This balance of intention, I think, probably explains why James keeps his irony so quiet in tone: we must be aware of Strether's 'secret' ambivalence toward Waymarsh, but not to the point that his unawareness would verge on fatuity… (452-3)

Watt's description of irony in this passage parallels the nature of James's FIS. James's narrative voice is one easily recognized by its distinctive formal features, but in this novel it is a voice that we at times confuse with the character's inner voice. In this novel we find close proximity between the narrator and the novel's focalizing perspective. Not only do these two voices resemble each other in their stylistic idiosyncrasies, the narrative voice also "sides with" Strether, and this is surely why Watt identifies the late novels, *The Ambassadors* among them, as James's "most compassionate." Though rarely inside the character, the narrator remains very close to Strether's mind, and the FIS in this novel is one in which the two combined voices often share a similar opinion on the characters and situations. We nonetheless recognize the

ambivalence of this instance of FIS, and this formal ambivalence highlights Strether's indecision vis-à-vis meeting his friend.

Shortly after the novel's first paragraph comes the following passage in which the narrator unearths Strether's psychological ambivalence while continuing to highlight the narrator's sympathy for this character's plight,

> That he was prepared to be vague to Waymarsh about the hour of the ship's touching, and that he both wanted extremely to see him and enjoyed extremely the duration of the delay – these things, it is to be conceived, were early signs in him that his relation to his actual errand might prove none the simplest. He was burdened, poor Strether – it had best be confessed at the outset – with the oddity of a double consciousness. There was detachment in his zeal and curiosity in his indifference. (18)

The opening of *The Ambassadors* paves the way for James's continued and developing focus on Strether's consciousness and on his coming to knowledge. Strether's ambivalence is a key to this novel, and the narration, the use of FIS, dramatizes this ambivalence at the formal level.

***

Figure 4.1 – Shot of rural Ceyrat.

Figure 4.2 – Jean-Louis on his balcony.

The first shot of *Ma nuit chez Maud* (Figure 4.1) overlooks a rural landscape that descends from the shot's point of origin. It is an image of a small cluster of houses on the foot of a low lying hill surrounded by cultivated land and patches of trees. The camera is situated at a higher point of elevation than the landscape below. This shot lasts a few moments, and it is

followed by a cut to a second shot (Figure 4.2) showing our protagonist, Jean-Louis, standing on the balcony of his house. He is very small in the image, and he leans on the balcony's banister in a dark wool coat, looking to the left of the screen beyond the film's frame. Both shots appear to come from the objective perspective of the cinematic narrator. Neither appear to carry great psychological or subjective weight.

The cut to the film's second shot, however, retrospectively ascribes the agency of the first shot to Jean-Louis. The second shot reveals Jean-Louis looking, and the viewer identifies the landscape of the first shot as the object of his gaze. The viewer re-imagines the film's first image of the rural landscape as a point-of-view shot, a "subjective camera" shot that embodies Jean-Louis's optical perspective as he looks out from his balcony. The viewer sees with the protagonist, sees from his visual perspective, even before the protagonist appears on screen. This is a curious reversal of a standard cinematic editing pattern where the character in the act of seeing occupies the frame *before* the object of his view.

Point-of-view shots (hereafter POV) are common in narrative fiction films. Most films, however, prepare the viewer for a soon-to-come POV shot by first showing a character looking at something off screen, and then following this "preparation" shot with an image of what the character sees. This pattern begins by signaling a "lack" for the viewer. The viewer watches a character seeing without at the same instant knowing what that character sees. This pattern creates momentary instances of suspense that keep a viewer engaged, but the pattern also prepares the viewer to recognize the perspective of one character or another. This pattern renders the film's agency transparent. A character is seen in the frame of a film consulting his wrist watch and looking impatiently off to the right. A cut from this shot then presents a shot of train tracks extending off into the distance with no train approaching. The viewer perceives the second

shot of the train tracks as a POV shot in which she sees what the character sees from that character's precise or approximate physical position. In a section dealing with the subjective camera in *Estétique et psychologie du cinéma : 2 les formes,* Jean Mitry describes the capacity for the POV shot, which is also known as a "subjective shot," to allow for viewer identification with the character's optical perspective as well as his emotional perspective. "L'image, alors, est dite *subjective*," writes Mitry, "parce qu'elle permet au spectateur de se mettre 'à la place' des héros, de voir et de ressentir 'comme eux'" (61). Mitry connects seeing what a character sees with experiencing a character's feelings and emotions. The POV shot allows the viewer to "see and feel" what the character "sees and feels."

Mitry appends this effect of the subjective camera with the following qualification, "de toute façon, l'image subjective ne saurait être qu'un complément. Elle n'a de sens que dans la mesure où elle se rapport à un personnage objectivement décrit et situé" (66). Gilles Deleuze makes a similar qualification for "l'image-subjective" in *Cinema 1: l'image mouvement*, "s'il est facile de vérifier le caractère subjectif de l'image, c'est parce que nous la comparons à l'image modifiée, restituée, supposée objective: … nous avions vu la pipe et la blessé avant de voir la pipe vue par le blessé" (104). According to these two positions, if the viewer does not know that she sees with a character who has previously been objectively portrayed in the film, she does not connect to that character psychologically during a POV shot. Indeed, the POV in such a case will go unnoticed. In *Maud*, then, the film's narrator removes the identification of the viewer with the character in the opening shot by removing the viewer's awareness that she sees with Jean-Louis. This POV shot is the film's first image. The viewer will not identify the film's opening shot as his perspective until the next shot when we see him looking from his balcony off to the left. The

viewer will not know that she sees with the protagonist until that "seeing with" has ended. According to Mitry, then, this film's first shot is not a "subjective" shot.

There remains, however, retrospective subjectivity in the sequence. Seeing Jean-Louis look to the left in the second shot, the viewer knows what he sees. The viewer re-imagines his optical perspective in the same instance that he is seen looking. We connect with his mind because we know, in advance, what it perceives. In this first sequence of shots, the film at once portrays and undercuts Jean-Louis' optical, subjective perspective. The viewer initially "reads" the film's opening shot as objective because the agent motivating the image, Jean-Louis, has not yet been identified. The second shot re-inscribes the first image with Jean-Louis's vision.

Schilling discusses the use of subjective shots in Rohmer's oeuvre. He notes the general lack of POV shots, and he notes the effect of this particular POV shot in the beginning of *Maud*,

> As a general rule, point-of-view shots tend to be informational rather than psychological. Take the inserts of the snowbound hills of Ceyrat viewed from the Michelin engineer's chalet in the opening scene of *Ma nuit chez Maud* …. Even those 'subjective' shots which incorporate movement tend to de-accentuate psychology. (98)

To be sure, POV shots are rare in Rohmer's work. Rohmer prefers, after all, that we keep our distance from the characters. Schilling's point concerning the "informational" aspect of this first shot of Maud is also correct. This shot situates Jean-Louis's residence apart from the city, and the sequence of shots conveys his solitude and the seemingly perpetual silence in this borrowed house. Likewise, this particular subjective shot does not communicate Jean-Louis's consciousness. We need more than simply a character's eyes before we can access his mind. Though the film's first shot does not present Jean-Louis's consciousness, it presents only his vision, it highlights the film narration's particular formal ambivalence vis-à-vis subjectivity, the similarity between this film's objective and subjective narration, between its narrator and its

character. This opening highlights the importance of ambivalent, uncertain "looks" and of agency.

This film is, like *The Ambassadors*, a subjective narrative, but both privilege a highly restrained subjectivity. In the case of the two opening shots of *Maud*, the narrator evokes the internal perspective of the character without informing the viewer. In later scenes, the narration will shift fluidly between perspectives during Rohmer's characteristic long-takes. The film's viewer has a sense of always being either just before or just after Jean-Louis's consciousness and of not knowing exactly where the representation of Jean-Louis's mind begins and ends. The effect is something of a lag or a shift in identification, a *décalage* between the character's represented psyche and the viewer's awareness of that representation. Though the film's first shot represents only Jean-Louis's optical perspective, later scenes will represent his psyche by filming *as* he sees rather than simply what he sees. These scenes constitute the most frequent instances of FIS in this film. Much like Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*, the discourse and the style of James's *The Ambassadors* at once obscures and reveals Strether's consciousness, his knowledge and his motivations. As we will see in our discussion of two scenes from this novel, James's use of FIS represents Strether's ambivalent psyche while it yet remains cloaked behind the presence of James's narrative voice.

***

> "… a week had elapsed since he quitted the ship, and there were more things in his mind than so few days could account for. More than once, during the time, he had regarded himself as admonished; but the admonition this morning was formidably sharp. It took as it hadn't done yet the form of a question – the question of what he was doing with such an extraordinary sense of escape." (112)

As we saw in *The Portrait of a Lady* and *The Golden Bowl*, James privileges extended moments of solitary meditation, moments of envisioned inklings and of incipient realizations.

Whereas the minds of Isabel Archer and of Maggie Verver remain veiled until the second parts of those novels, Strether's mind is the primary subject and the sole focalizing perspective throughout *The Ambassadors*. Quite early in this novel, James turns to an extended portrayal of his character's mind, to a moment of solitary meditation resembling those of Isabel and of Maggie late in *The Portrait* and *The Golden Bowl*.

After a few days spent in England with Waymarsh and a new female acquaintance, Maria Gostrey, Strether travels to Paris to embark upon his "errand." On his second day there, he receives letters from Mrs. Newsome in Woollett, letters whose absence on his first day in Paris caused him some alarm. Strether spends the morning in the Luxembourg Gardens, and he gives careful attention to her letters: "he read the letters successively and slowly, putting others back into his pocket but keeping these for a long time afterwards gathered in his lap" (59). The drama of this scene, Strether's awareness of his freedom, his nostalgia, and his subsequent sense of culpability and responsibility, is catapulted into existence by the reading of the letters. The letters themselves contain nothing that would prompt this crisis. Their content touches only on surface details and on the logistical and financial questions that are resolved for Strether by Mrs. Newsome. It is, rather, their standing in for Mrs. Newsome herself that gives the letters the power that they have over him. His mind moves through memories, regrets, and new opportunities; Strether "passed an hour in which the cup of his impressions seemed truly to overflow" (59). After he quiets his troubled mind, he leaves the Gardens to make his way to Chad's apartment to set the wheels of his "errand" into motion.

The scene strikes the chord of Strether's predominant ambivalence, his ambivalence between an unexpected but powerful desire to recapture the youthful consciousness that his surroundings press upon him and the impression that his obligation to Mrs. Newsome precludes

just this desire. Strether's ambivalence between these two impulses is underscored by the ambivalence of James's discourse, a discourse that vacillates between the voice of the narrator and Strether's inner idiom. We find FIS rather infrequently in this episode, but we nonetheless see a progression in the episode's use of this technique. Strether reads his letters and begins to distinguish his psychological unease, and James's use of FIS at this early point in the episode is minimal, frequently limited to short phrases and single words. As the scene nears its end, Strether plays out scenarios in his mind. He begins to fear the implications of his nostalgia and the enjoyment and appreciation of Paris it entails vis-à-vis his position as an authority figure sent to pluck Chad from the city. As the episode nears its end, as Strether's ambivalence reaches this high pitch, we "hear" Strether's inner voice very sharply. In this moment of crisis, the narrative adopts a highly ambivalent mode, and FIS abounds.

James frames this chapter as well as much of the novel thus far with the voice of the narrator who maintains an external vantage point vis-à-vis Strether, reporting his dialogue with Waymarsh and Maria and describing his surroundings while refraining from depictions of his mind. This second chapter of the second book opens with the narrator again maintaining an external perspective, describing what Strether does and where he goes after retrieving his letters. Though the narration of this early portion of the scene remains external, James communicates Strether's developing ambivalence by his actions. James's narrator follows Strether as he spends an hour putting off reading the letters by meanderings through the streets of Paris,

> Strether, on his side, set himself to walk again – he had his relief in his pocket; and indeed, much as he desired his budget, the growth of restlessness might have been marked in him from the moment he had assured himself of the superscription of most of the missives it contained. This restlessness became therefore his temporary law; he knew he should recognize as soon as see it the best place of all for settling down with his chief correspondent. He had for the next hour an accidental air of looking for it in the windows of shops; he came down the Rue de la Paix in the sun and, passing across the Tuileries and the river, indulged more than once – as if on finding himself determined – in a

> sudden pause before the book-stalls of the opposite quay. In the garden of the Tuileries he had lingered, on two or three spots, to look; it was as if the wonderful Paris spring had stayed him as he roamed. (58)

Strether meanders, for all appearances an aloof *flâneur*, along the winding streets of Paris. Before he reaches his spot in the Luxembourg Gardens, Strether takes his time absorbing the sights and scenes around him. Though he awaited these letters with worried expectation, now that he carries them in his hands, Strether holds off reading them. He maintains his "relief;" his alarm of the previous day has been calmed, by purposely remaining in the space between this relief and the knowledge and instruction that these letters will bring. Before the letters' arrival, Strether was free to pursue any activity of his choosing. Before the letters' arrival, Strether was a visitor in Paris as though without an errand to accomplish; he resolves not to act on his "errand" until he receives Mrs. Newsome's signal. This communication from Woollett relieves Strether's sense of anticipation, then, but it also marks the end of his total, yet brief freedom. We "see" his ambivalence in his movements, his behavior, his acting, as it were, as one who has no obligations. In this passage, the narrator reports on Strether's emotions, on his simultaneous "relief" and "restlessness," but this passage remains overwhelmingly external to the character's mind. The narrator's externality does not preclude him, however, from coming very close to Strether's perspective.

Toward the middle of the above passage, we very briefly "hear" Strether's inner voice in the following sentences, "he knew he should recognize as soon as see it the best place of all for settling down with his chief correspondent" (58). The colloquial phrase "the best place of all," in particular, signals the narration's turn to Strether's inner voice. In that brief phrase, the narrative momentarily combines Strether's voice within the narrator's language. In the same sentence, however, the ironic "settling down with his chief correspondent," reinforces the narrator's

perspective and appears to silence Strether's voice (58). This instance of narration, however, is quite ambiguous. The reference to Mrs. Newsome as Strether's "chief correspondent," a term bespeaking the businesslike task that she envisions for him in Paris, ironically magnifies the formality with which he speaks and thinks of her, and it also underscores the length and quantity of letters she writes (58). We will soon learn of Strether's "fairly open sense of the irony of things," but the irony of "chief correspondent" ill matches the sense of duty and guilt Strether will evince in this scene.

In Cohn's discussion of "psycho-narration," indirect discourse in which a third-person narrator describes in his own words a character's state of mind or thoughts, the mode for presenting consciousness that she calls the "most indirect," Cohn describes a scenario that bears similarities to what we see in James's depictions of Strether's mind in *The Ambassadors*,

> the more conspicuous and idiosyncratic the narrator, the less apt he is to reveal the depth of his characters' psyches or, for that matter, to create psyches that have depth. It almost seems as though the authorial narrator jealously guards his prerogative as the sole thinking agent within his novel, sensing that his equipoise would be endangered by approaching another mind too closely and staying with it too long. (25)

James's narrators are less "conspicuous" than those writers he excoriates for the intrusiveness of their narrators in the prefaces to his novels, but in this brief scene and others like it in this novel, this "idiosyncratic" narrator stands between the reader and the character's mind. Although James's Lambert Strether is certainly a "psyche that [has] depth," and although Cohn will later count James along with Flaubert as one of the early writers who "insisted on the removal of vociferous narrators from fiction," and who were therefore, "the creators of fictional minds with previously unparalleled depth and complexity," we see in James's narration a difficulty, an ambivalence between authorial and figural narration (26). In "The Jamesian Lie," Leo Bersani notes that "[James's] fiction is notoriously dense in what I suppose we have to call psychological

detail, but it is remarkably resistant to an interest in psychological depth" (54-55). "Psychological detail" overflows in *The Ambassadors,* particularly in this passage, but as for "psychological depth," this narrative rarely represents Strether's consciousness and rarely places the reader directly within the character's mind. In the above passage, the narrator remains external to Strether's mind, but in his descriptions of that mind, the narrator moves into very brief, nearly invisible moments of FIS. James's oeuvre, especially the move from his early style to his late style plays out this move from authorial to figural narrative modes[3]. A late novel, to be sure, this passage and others like it in *The Ambassadors* nonetheless offer a microcosm of this movement and this tension, the ambivalence in James's fiction between these two modes.

Strether's crisis, his intense ambivalence upon reading these letters, begins with his acknowledgement of what will become the chief paradox of his experiences in Paris, an oppositional yet unexpected consequence that establishes a pattern of reversals throughout this novel. Strether's very sharp sense of escape from his daily life and responsibilities and his sense of a difference in himself is rooted in the actions of Mrs. Newsome,

> It all sprang at bottom from Mrs. Newsome's desire that he should be worried with nothing that was not the essence of his task; by insisting that he should thoroughly intermit and break she had so provided for his freedom that she would, as it were, have only herself to thank. Strether could not at this point indeed have completed this thought by the image of what she might have to thank herself *for*: the image at best of his own likeness – poor Lambert Strether washed up on the sunny strand by the waves of a single day, poor Lambert Strether thankful for breathing time and stiffening himself while he gasped. (60)

Mrs. Newsome's generosity, her providing for Strether so that he can, in her mind, more easily and without distraction focus his attention on the problem of her son's predicament in Paris, ends by causing Strether to be entirely distracted from his "task" in a manner wholly unexpected and

[3] Adré Marshall chronicles the progression from authorial to figural narration in James's novels along the pattern described by Cohn in the introduction of her book, *The Turn of the Mind: Constituting Consciousness in Henry James*.

unhoped-for. Rather than focusing his attention on her "errand," Mrs. Newsome's provisions, her placing him in Paris, well-provided for and carefree, point Strether in the direction of his nostalgia for this city that formerly held such appeal in his youthful mind. She unwittingly gives him the freedom that her own son has indulged for the past four years, and Strether's path, his self-discoveries and the relationships he develops will follow the pattern Chad has set out before him.

As E.M. Forster tells us in *Aspects of the Novel*, the plot of *The Ambassadors* is fashioned in the shape of an hour-glass, "Strether and Chad … change places, and it is the realization of this that makes the book so satisfying at its close" (140). Strether's recognition, his keen awareness of the paradox of this situation, feeds his psychological ambivalence, and he strives, especially as the novel nears its close, "not, out of the whole affair, to have got anything for [himself]" (346). Much of what Strether learns over the course of this novel, much of what we assume, turns out to be other, often turns out, in fact, to be opposite. Chad's "virtuous attachment" is the opposite. Chad himself is not the changed, cultivated, "wonderful" young man Strether takes him to be; he is the louse who abandons Madame de Vionnet. The figure of the chiasmus has a strong presence in this novel. Stylistically, many of James's sentences, sentences spoken by the narrator as well as sentences spoken by Strether to other characters, are chiastic in their structure. This is perhaps one of the strongest stylistic similarities of these two "voices."

In dialogue with Maria Gostrey late in the novel, for example, Strether explains his desire to remain in Paris even after Chad is ready to leave, "'Paris may grow, from day to day, hot and dusty, as you say; but there are other things that are hotter and dustier. I'm not afraid to stay on; the summer here must be amusing in a wild – if it isn't a tame – way of its own; the place at no time more picturesque. I think I shall like it'" (297). The words he speaks "sound" like the

narrator's descriptions. The amusement of the Parisian summer is first "wild" then "tame." Though he will speak in short sentences and he will pose colloquial questions full of words like "really" and "swell," Strether's idiom is at times very close to the narrator's highly elevated discourse so that the novel's instances of FIS, especially in the early sections of the novel, appear to hide his verbal presence. This stylistic connection between Strether's voice and the narrator's voice further obscures the representation of Strether's mind within the novel's instances of FIS. There is kinship between these two figures; they often appear to share opinions, and the consonance of their voices results in FIS that is highly ambiguous because it is at times difficult to recognize.

After reading Mrs. Newsome's letters, Strether's first reaction to the sharp nostalgia he senses is regret and fatigue. He ponders the "dregs of his youth" and the "dreadful cheerful sociable solitude" that has been his life (61). Strether begins to discern the texture of his ambivalence, his sudden and surprising conflict of interests, and the narrator's description of his turn of mind conveys a distinct attempt to recover himself, to steer his ship back on course,

> If ever a man had come off tired Lambert Strether was that man; and hadn't it been distinctly on the grounds of his fatigue that his wonderful friend at home had so felt for him and so contrived? It seemed to him somehow at these instances that, could he only maintain with sufficient firmness his grasp of that truth, it might become in a manner his compass and his helm. (60-61)

We detect very clearly in this instance of FIS an attempt to recover, an attempt to hold his reason for being in Paris, his reason for having the freedom to rest, at the front of his mind. Strether struggles with his allegiance here. He must will himself to keep Mrs. Newsome's kindness in mind as he feels his desires and his memories urging him to behave and to perceive his surroundings in a manner that he views as defecting from Mrs. Newsome's to Chad's side. We "hear" this instance of struggle, this moment of attempted recuperation, in part, from Strether's

inner perspective. We hear his inner words as the narrative mode switches from indirect discourse, from the narrator's description of his mind, to FIS following the passage's semi-colon. The question mark at the end of the sentence signals this turn to Strether's thoughts, to this incorporation of his inner voice. We read "hadn't it been distinctly on the grounds of his fatigue that his wonderful friend at home had so felt for him and so contrived?," and we feel that the narrative has entered Strether's mind.

As we read this passage, we "hear" Strether thinking, "wasn't it distinctly on the grounds of my fatigue that my wonderful friend at home so felt for me and so contrived?" The representation of Strether's mind is strong. The entire scene emanates from his consciousness and through his perception, and the presence of his idiom together with the narrator's voice signals his own intense ambivalence. Features of this example, the ironic note of designating Mrs. Newsome Strether's "wonderful friend at home" and the repetition of the intensifier "so," "had so felt for him and so contrived," appear to highlight the narrator's organizing presence, but the similarity of the two voices reminds us that they share many stylistic features. This turn to double-voiced, ambivalent discourse presents Strether's ambivalent consciousness to the reader.

Following these short and intermittent instances of FIS in this crucial scene, we find a very long outpouring of FIS that voices Strether's precise ambivalence. During this time that he spends in the Luxembourg gardens, Strether wanders through the old memories of his first trip to Paris, of "the promises to himself that he had after his other visit never kept," and of his wife and young son who died long ago (62). He considers as well the very recent memories of the previous day's "gusts of speculation – sudden flights of fancy in Louvre galleries" and his awareness of "'movements' he was too late for" (63, 64). Strether's thoughts are preoccupied

with nostalgia, with regret, and with duty, but also with the invigorating awareness of the possibilities now open to him thanks to his sudden freedom.

This scene's sudden and lengthy instance of FIS is preceded by Strether's recollection of the entertainments of the previous evening. He attends a play with "poor Waymarsh," and during the spectacle, Strether simultaneously considers that he should have been there with Chad rather than Waymarsh and that had he been there with Chad he might have "undermine[d] his authority … with the graceless youth" (64). We "hear" Strether's inner voice in the following passage,

> Was he to renounce all amusement for the sweet sake of that authority? and would such renouncement give him for Chad a moral glamour? The little problem bristled the more by reason of poor Strether's fairly open sense of the irony of things. Were there then sides on which his predicament threatened to look rather droll to him? Should he have to pretend to believe – either to himself or the wretched boy – that there was anything that could make the latter worse? Wasn't some such pretence on the other hand involved in the assumption of possible processes that would make him better? (64)

This passage marks the moment when Strether's crisis reaches its highest and its most difficult point. His intense ambivalence between his responsibilities to Mrs. Newsome and his unanticipated nostalgia and desire to "live all he can" while he is in Paris is most strongly felt when he considers his position vis-à-vis Mrs. Newsome's son, Chad. He must negotiate his appreciation for Paris and for Chad's freedom there and his duty as the ambassador of Chad's mother. In just this moment of crisis, FIS dominates James's narration. Strether panics under the weight of his intense indecision, and the narration mirrors his ambivalence by combining two distinct voices, two distinct perspectives into one instance of discourse. The resulting narration is itself ambivalent, continually alternating between two poles.

As in the previous very brief instance of FIS, however, this series of questions appears to retain strong characteristics of the Jamesian narrator's distinctive style. The final two lines in particular evince a connection to the narrator, "should he have to pretend to believe – either to

himself or the wretched boy – that there was anything that could make the latter worse? Wasn't some such pretence on the other hand involved in the assumption of possible processes that would make him better?" (64). These two questions retain traces of the narrator's discourse that go beyond grammatical features such as tense and person. The dilatory phrases, "some such" and "on the other hand," as well as the ambiguous "assumption of possible processes" follow the pattern of the narrator's discourse. The clearest trace of the narrator's organizing hand resides, however, in the chiastic imagery of the sentence. In the reversal of the two phrases – what was "worse" becomes "better" – the final two questions of this passage reveal the narrator's formal style. This figure, as we saw, however, is also a characteristic of Strether's own idiom. The similarity of these two voices results in a discourse that we cannot imagine separating out into the two voices. Just as Strether's sense of joy and freedom in Paris is so closely tied to his duty there, his inner idiom is so bound to the narrator's discourse. Addressing James's FIS, Yeazell notes, "although James's style indirect libre keeps us at a certain distance from his men and women, we experience their shocks and fears with a peculiarly disturbing immediacy: the narrative style of the late novels acts as a powerful metaphor for the movement of the characters' troubled and painfully divided minds" (28). The simultaneous mediacy and immediacy of the narration that Yeazell observes mirrors Strether's intense ambivalence.

James's narrator describes Strether's mind but hesitates to include the character's inner discourse, hesitates to quote the character's precise inner idiom. Just as the cinematic FIS of *Hiroshima mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarrollo* only partially reveal the visual contents of their characters' minds, so too does the FIS of James's novel only partially reveal Strether's mind, his inner discourse. Just as Strether wavers, swinging profoundly between happiness and guilt, acknowledging his untenable situation, James's narration plays out a potent formal

ambivalence. Strether's mind cannot express itself but for the constant presence of James's narrator, just as Strether's freedom cannot be felt and appreciated but for the constant presence of his obligation to Mrs. Newsome. Mrs. Newsome and James's narrator exercise a parallel level of control over this character's mind. She allows for his trip to Paris, but Strether views her task as seeking to limit his own personal experiences and impressions taken from the place. James's narrator exercises profound control over this narrative, but that control at times lowers and the reader hears Strether's mind - even if incompletely - within FIS. Strether's mind is always mediated by the narrator just as Strether's nostalgia and his freedom is mediated by his duty to Mrs. Newsome. This early scene in *The Ambassadors* sets the stage for Strether's continuing ambivalence, his continuing struggle between freedom and duty, a struggle that he will project onto Chad's own decisions. His ambivalence will remain at the novel's end, but it will lose this sense of urgency and of guilt, the sense of psychological upending that Strether experiences in this early scene.

Following his morning in the Luxembourg gardens, Strether makes his way to Chad's apartment without having yet contacted the young man. Chad is away, and Strether instead meets John Little Billham. Before Chad returns to Paris, Little Billham attests to Chad's relationship with a woman but names it a "virtuous attachment." When Chad returns to Paris, Srether meets all of the players in this drama. He reads these characters, and he attempts to decipher their respective roles and their ambiguous language all the while falling increasingly under their charms and the pleasures of Paris. About the middle of the novel, Strether's consciousness suffers its most powerful blow, its most powerful trouble vis-à-vis his duty to Mrs. Newsome. At a Garden Party given by the artist Gloriani, Strether experiences a joy and appreciation for the impressions he receives that is greater than any thus far taken from his time in Paris, and this

scene contains not a few instances of FIS as Strether's mind moves farther away from his "errand." Before Chad arrives with Madame and Mlle de Vionett but after he meets Gloriani and has toured the grounds and the home, full of artwork that he has seen in Paris and in America, Strether considers his impression of the artist,

> He was in fact quite to cherish his vision of it, to play with it in idle hours …. Was what it had told him or what it had asked him the greater of the mysteries? Was it the most special flare, unequalled, supreme, of the aesthetic torch, lighting that wondrous world for ever, or was it above all the long straight shaft sunk by a personal acuteness that life had seasoned to steel? …. The deep human expertness in Gloriani's charming smile – oh the terrible life behind it! – was flashed upon him as a test of his stuff. (121)

We find in this passage numerous instances of FIS in which Strether's inner voice mirrors that of the narrator, with its listing of adjectives and its ambiguous metaphors: "the long straight shaft sunk by a personal acuteness." We also find, however, an example of the narrator's discourse mirroring Strether's colloquial, spoken words. "[A] test of his stuff," the narrator's indirect discourse at the end of the passage, strikes of the variety of slang Strether frequently uses, but it is also ambiguous and indirect as is much of the narrator's discourse. In this passage, these two voices intersect and borrow features from each other; the narration shifts fluidly between FIS and indirect discourse. This use of FIS highlights Strether's move toward Chad's perspective but it also dramatizes the incompleteness of that move; it dramatizes his continually wavering mind.

Strether continues to vacillate between his duty to Mrs. Newsome and his appreciation of Paris and the people he meets, but as the novel nears its end, Strether's "duty" has reversed. Where he began as Mrs. Newsome's ambassador, he ends by taking up Madame de Vionnet's cause. He engages to "save" her, to speak of her kindly to Chad's family and to do all he can to keep Chad in Paris after the young man has decided to return to Woollett. Strether's mind has been changed, but his strong sense of culpability continues to color the narrative, though his guilt will begin to be displaced by a new sense of unease faced with Chad's amorous relationship.

Very near the novel's end, when his return to Woollett is imminent, Strether takes his final opportunity to make a solitary trip to the countryside outside of Paris. He chooses a train and a location quite haphazardly, and he spends an idyllic day enjoying his solitude and indulging his memories. This scene mirrors the earlier scene in Paris's Luxembourg Gardens in two important ways. In the structure of the novel, it occupies a precisely opposing post. Strether's solitary meditation over Mrs. Newsome's letters occurs early in the novel's second book, and his country excursion, our final glimpse of his mind and his memories, arrives late in the novel's penultimate book. Both scenes also mark important turns in Strether's awareness.

"The oblong gilt frame disposed its enclosing lines; the poplars and willows, the reeds and river – a river of which he didn't know, and didn't want to know, the name – fell into a composition, full of felicity, within them; the sky was silver and turquoise and varnish; the village on the left was white and the church on the right was grey; it was all there, in short – it was what he wanted: it was Tremont Street, it was France, it was Lambinet. Moreover he was freely walking about in it." (304)

Strether's country excursion marks an important discovery. Late into a long and leisurely day, a day that reminds Strether of a small painting, a Lambinet in a Boston art dealer's gallery, that he still regrets not having been able to purchase many years earlier, Strether makes his way to an inn where he will eat before taking a train back to Paris. He awaits his meal outside on the porch of the inn that overlooks the river, and he there spots a couple in a boat. This couple is none other than Chad and Madame de Vionnet, who, it seems, have chosen just this day and just this place to take a country excursion. Before he recognizes them as his friends, Strether assesses this idyllic couple who are "exactly the right thing" in his scene. He observes that "they were expert, familiar, frequent – that this wouldn't at all events be the first time. They knew how to do it, he vaguely felt – and it made them but the more idyllic" (309). Once he recognizes them, Strether also sees their sudden panic. They recognize him, and they wait, in the hopes, he

believes, that he will not make them out. Strether's acute sense of this near slight causes him to signal to them. The three share a meal at the inn, and together they take the same train back to Paris.

Toward the end of the chapter, we learn that the narration of this scene comprises Strether's later consideration of the events of the day, "an hour or two past midnight … when, at his hotel, for a long time, without a light and without undressing, [he] sat back on his bedroom sofa and stared straight before him" (313). When he is later alone, Strether reconsiders the late afternoon and evening. He recalls their conversation over dinner, Madame de Vionnet's sudden switch to French, and the incongruity that neither of the couple is attired in clothing appropriate for a one-day's-trip. "He kept making of it," James writes, "that there had been simply a lie in the charming affair – a lie on which one could now, detached and deliberate, perfectly put one's finger" (313). Strether quickly understands what "his friends" engage in covering up, and the reader also easily deduces what neither Strether nor the narrator bluntly states: Chad and Madame de Vionnet are lovers. Strether vacillates between knowing this fact, little bothered by it, and wishing not to know it at all. He is also ambivalent about this lie that they perform for him, the lie that he finds at once unnecessary, "they yet needn't, so much as that, have blinked it," and required, "though indeed if they hadn't Strether didn't quite see what else they could have done" (313). Toward this novel's end, Strether's ambivalence has largely altered. He retains a portion of guilt vis-à-vis Mrs. Newsome, but his guilt has for the most part transformed into resignation. Chad will return to Woollett; Strether will return to Mrs. Newsome, and he will then know where he stands. In this scene, Strether wavers between the depths of his knowledge, but he also wavers between the continuing influence of Woollett and the views of the "Bohemian" circle he has become a part of in Paris, a circle for whom this liaison is unremarkable. His

wavering, his mediating between these two views up until this point has permitted Strether to recognize the incongruity of the friendship between Chad and Madame de Vionnet while at the same time allowing it to pass for "beautiful," "It was familiar to him of course that … their friendship, their connexion, took any amount of explaining …. Yet his theory, as we know, had bountifully been that the facts were specifically none of his business, and were, over and above, so far as one had to do with them, intrinsically beautiful" (312). Forced to look their overnight excursion in the face, however, Strether's happy medium between Woollett and "Bohemia" is shattered.

I have quoted the following passage at length, the final paragraph of the scene where we see Strether's psychological ambivalence unearthed, in order to trace the movements of his mind between knowing and not knowing, between seeing the relationship for what it is and seeing it as the couple hopes to present it to him. Instances of FIS are shown in italics,

> He was rather glad, none the less, that they had in point of fact not parted at the Cheval Blanc, that he hadn't been reduced to giving them his blessing for an idyllic retreat down the river. He had had in the actual case to make-believe more than he liked, *but this was nothing*, it struck him, to what the other event would have required. *Could he, literally, quite have faced the other event? Would he have been capable of making the best of it with them?* This was what he was trying to do now; but with the advantage of his being able to give more time to it a good deal counteracted by his sense of what, over and above the central fact itself, he had to swallow. It was the quantity of make-believe involved and so vividly exemplified that most disagreed with his spiritual stomach. He moved, however, from the consternation of that quantity – to say nothing of the consciousness of that organ – back to the other feature of the show, the deep, deep truth of the intimacy revealed. That was what, in his vain vigil, he oftenest reverted to: *intimacy, at such a point, was like that – and what in the world else would one have wished it to be like? It was all very well for him to feel the pity of its being so much like lying*; he almost blushed, in the dark, for the way he had dressed the possibility in vagueness, as a little girl might have dressed her doll. *He had made them – and by no fault of their own – momentarily pull it for him, the possibility, out of this vagueness; and must he not therefore take it now as they had had simply, with whatever thin attenuations, to give it to him?* The very question, it may be added, made him feel lonely and cold. There was the element of the awkward all round, but *Chad and Madame de Vionnet had at least the comfort that they could talk it over together*. *With whom could he talk of such things? – unless indeed always, at almost any stage, with Marie?* He foresaw that Miss

> Gostrey would come again into requisition on the morrow; though it wasn't to be denied that he was already a little afraid of her *"What on earth – that's what I want to know now – had you then supposed?"* He recognized at last that he had really been trying all along to suppose nothing. Verily, verily, his labour had been lost. He found himself supposing innumerable and wonderful things. (315)

With its frequent use of FIS and with its movement between unearthing and covering up, this long passage reveals the particular ambivalence Strether suffers under at this moment. He has, like Maggie Verver, preferred to hold an unpleasant truth away from his "full consciousness" and he is discomforted by the lie the couple engages in for his benefit. Strether chiefly wavers between facing this truth and turning his back, between disdaining the lie and needing the lie. The narrator spells out just this wavering, "It was the quantity of make-believe involved and so vividly exemplified that most disagreed with his spiritual stomach. He moved, however, from the consternation of that quantity … back to the other feature of the show, the deep, deep truth of the intimacy revealed" (315). Between the lie and the truth, Strether cannot decide. This moment of catching that truth out by accident forces off the ambiguities in which Strether has been "dressing" this relationship, and it forces him to recognize the important role he has played in creating the need for the lie.

The instances of FIS in this passage are marked both by the consonance between the two represented voices and by the clear recognizability of this mode. James forms these instances of intersecting voices into questions so that Strether's inner voice sounds clearly. From one to the next, these moments trace Strether's continuing back and forth movement between seeing the truth and effacing the truth. The first instance of FIS shows Strether's attempt to recuperate his image of Madame de Vionnet and Chad. He is thankful that they maintained the lie and returned with him to Paris. Given the alternative, Strether wonders, "Could he, literally, quite have faced the other event? Would he have been capable of making the best of it with them?" (315). Though

he "sees" the truth and though he understands that Chad and Marie have left their belongings at some "quiet retreat," having fully intended to remain together overnight, Strether prefers to maintain his blindness. Strether plays along. This instance of FIS is formally ambivalent, it carries these two voices simultaneously, but it also quite literally voices Strether's psychological crisis. He "face[s] the other event" in his own mind, he understands that, but for his fortuitous arrival, Chad and Madame de Vionnet would have returned to their inn. This he cannot face "with them." That part of his consciousness which is still very tied to Woollett, cannot openly condone this relationship.

In another instance of FIS, Strether, for a moment, lays blame on himself. "He had made them," James writes, "– and by no fault of their own – momentarily pull it for him, the possibility, out of this vagueness; and must he not therefore take it now as they had had simply, with whatever thin attenuations, to give it to him?" (315). He recognizes his role in the creation and perpetuation of the lie, and again this ambivalent discourse is, as Yeazell describes it, a "powerful metaphor" for Strether's indecisive psyche. The ambivalence of this passage multiplies when he recruits the voice of the novel's chief *ficelle*, his friend Maria Gostrey, to join this dual-voiced discourse, "With whom could he talk of such things? – unless indeed always, at almost any stage, with Maria? He foresaw that Miss Gostrey would come again into requisition on the morrow; though it wasn't to be denied that he was already a little afraid of her 'What on earth – that's what I want to know now – had you then supposed?'" (315). In an instance of what I will call "internal FIS," which is quite rare in this novel, the narrator's discourse contains Strether's voice and thoughts which in its turn imagines Maria's voice and reaction. This highly reflexive discursive mise-en-abyme is, however, quite realistic. In a moment of crisis, Strether's

mental turn to his very grounding, very pragmatic friend is natural. This line also dramatizes the relationship between the narrator and Strether internally to the story world.

Adré Marshall uses the term "imputed monologue" for those moments in James, in *The Golden Bowl* in particular, when a character imagines herself having said something to another character (16). As an instance of this, she cites the lengthy section that begins the second part of that novel, "The Princess." In that section we find a passage in which Maggie imagines explaining to Charlotte her own feelings of inadequacy vis-à-vis the latter's consistent good taste in clothing. In this case, however, Strether only imagines Maria's response to his words rather than his own words. A more apt term may be "imputed dialogue." Rather than relying on his own internal discourse to "voice" this truth in his mind, Strether uses Maria's voice, and in this way, he continues to save himself from admitting the unpleasant truth on his own. Maria's voice as an intermediary within his own mind serves as an additional dramatization of his acute ambivalence in this moment.

This passage, for all its varied uses of FIS, dramatizes Strether's intense indecision between knowing and not wanting to know, and the scene overall paints an image of Strether as, according to Yeazell, an "arch-procrastinator" (22). Yeazell discusses this lengthy passage, and her remarks bear strong resemblances to our discussion,

> Yet even at this extreme moment of revelation Strether's thoughts move by postponement and indirection: poor Strether is at once propelled toward discovery and in terrified flight from it. For the closer the Jamesian character comes toward hidden truths, the more intensely he is fascinated by them, the stronger grows his fear as well. Looking closely at the language of Strether's mind, we hear him too calling "Wait!" – though it is only a subconscious voice which speaks, and there is no one to listen but Strether himself. (23-24)

Yeazell's assessment parallels the progression we observe in the lengthy passage above. Like Maggie Verver, another of James's late characters "at once propelled toward discovery and in terrified flight from it," Strether wavers between seeing and not seeing, and he is able to continue

to waver, he is placed in the position to remain undecided, because James creates a narrative where truths and revelations are only partial and always veiled, never direct or certain. As Paul B. Armstrong (1985) notes,

> The "real" for James is thus not a given but a goal which signs lead toward with a kind of inevitability. But the ambiguity of works like *The Sacred Fount* and *The Turn of the Screw* indicates that the force of "reality" may not be strong enough to pull interpretation to a definitive result. And such late works as *The Ambassadors* and *The Golden Bowl* suggest that, perhaps surprisingly, even the discovery of undeniable facts may not have the power to end the conflict between opposed readings. (481)

As we will see as well in Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*, mystery and uncertainty drive this narrative. The protagonists of these two works are marked by indecision, and the narration matches those moments of intense psychological crisis with ambivalence at the discursive level. What is true of James's *The Ambassadors*, "the discovery of undeniable facts may not have the power to end the conflict between opposed readings," will also prove true for Rohmer's film (481). Jean-Louis, the film's focalizing perspective as well as the film's chief object of view, will, like Strether, "learn undeniable facts," but this will not materially alter the "opposed reading," the ambivalence and uncertainty of the film (481).

***

Figure 4.3 – Vidal reads Jean-Louis.

As we move on to Rohmer it will be important to recall the distinction between *Ma nuit chez Maud* and the two films, *Hiroshima mon amour* and *Memorias del subdesarrollo*, discussed in Chapter Three of this dissertation. Unlike these two films, Rohmer's lacks "mindscreen" narration. Gutiérrez Alea and Resnais's films enter the minds of their two protagonists both visually and aurally. That is to say, these two films represent the characters' visual and sonic thoughts. As viewers of these films, we "see" what the characters see inside their "mind's eye." These two films convey, then, a heightened sense of subjectivity. The films are filtered through or focalized through the minds of the two main characters, and it is chiefly in those films' representation of the characters' "mind's eye," specifically their memories and fantasies, that the audience experiences the character's psychological ambivalence.

Rohmer's film is, however, also highly subjective. Like *Hiroshima* and *Memorias, Maud* is tied to its protagonist. The viewers of this film see and hear only what Jean-Louis sees and hears. Like James's *The Ambassadors* which only very rarely quotes Strether's verbatim thoughts, Rohmer's film does not enter the character's mind. The viewer "sees," along with the

camera, always from an external perspective. Like *Hiroshima* and *Memorias*, this film is preoccupied with vision, with looks, and with "reading" others. The image above (figure 4.3) shows Maud and Vidal looking at Jean-Louis, Vidal's hands positioned around his eyes to emphasize the scrutinizing attention they pay to his perspectives on Catholicism and marriage. Vidal's gesture signals the comedy of the scene – they smile at his "obsession" with a married couple attending church – but the gesture also highlights Jean-Louis as our primary object of focus while he yet remains the film's primary perspective, the film's focalizer.

This film remains technically outside of Jean-Louis's mind, but on two brief occasions, once early in the film and again at the very end, Jean-Louis speaks in voice-over narration, and we take these words as his thoughts. These two brief instances of a seemingly unmediated internal perspective, however, retain important extra-diegetic qualities that do not accord with representation of thoughts. Early in the film, while Jean-Louis drives in the evening on the busy streets of Clermont-Ferrand, he says in voice-over, "Ce jour là le lundi 21 décembre l'idée m'est venue, brusque, précise, définitive, que Françoise serait ma femme." Shortly after this line, Françoise passes Jean-Louis's car on her motor bike and rides ahead of him, weaving through traffic. Voice-over narration is often taken for a character's thoughts during the instance of visual narration on screen. This line that Jean-Louis speaks, however, is in the past tense. His voice "over" the visual narration is not simultaneous with that narration. The line does not indicate his thoughts in the precise moment we watch on the screen. It is a subsequent report. The same is true of the film's second and final instance of voice-over narration. After five years, Jean-Louis, Françoise and their young son chance upon Maud on a beach, and he joins his wife by the ocean after talking with Maud alone for a few moments. When he returns to Françoise, he expresses his surprise and adds that it was from Maud's apartment that he left just before meeting his wife five

years earlier. We then hear in voice-over, "J'allais dire: il ne s'est rien passé, quand, tout à coup, je compris que la confusion de Françoise ne ventait pas de ce qu'elle apprenait de moi, mais de ce qu'elle devinait de j'apprenais d'elle et que je découvrais en fait, en ce moment, et seulement en ce moment. Et je dis, tout au contraire: …" Jean-Louis then tells his wife that Maud was his "dernière escapade." As in the first instance of voice-over narration, this is not what he thinks during that moment that we watch on the beach, the moment he realizes the origin of his wife's sudden confusion. The past-tense, especially the use of the passé simple, a written rather than spoken verb form, creates a disjuncture between the visual narration on the screen and the voice-over narration on the sound track. Though voice-over is at times used to represent the thoughts of a character simultaneous with a film's visual narration, in these two instances, the voice-over narration is not consonant with the visual narration. These lines do not represent the character's immediate thoughts; they are not a "going inside" of the character's mind during the filmed moment.

Unlike the other two films, then, *Ma nuit chez Maud* remains outside of the mind of its protagonist, and in this way, it is quite similar to James's *The Ambassadors*. Many who have commented on this film refer to Jean-Louis as the narrator. The title of the film, its "*Ma* nuit," the first-person point of view, and the fact that Rohmer's novella upon which this film is based is a first-person narrative give the sense that this film is also first-person, that Jean-Louis is the film's narrator. Jean-Louis is not, however, the narrating agency controlling every aspect of this film. As a character within the drama, he is not the intention behind the film, the intention that must remain external to the film's story world. Jean-Louis's perspective will at key moments intersect with the narrating agency beyond the story world of the film; the viewer will "see" his psychological ambivalence through a dual-visioned, ambivalent perspective.

The film's opening shots discussed earlier in this chapter lead Jean-Louis to a Sunday church service held at Notre-Dame du Port, a Roman basilica in Clermont-Ferrand. This important scene establishes the crucial difficulty Jean-Louis will experience over the course of the film. With its use of ambivalent discourse, cinematic FIS, as well as its use of shots that alternate between the priest at the altar and a young woman standing to Jean-Louis's right, the formal structure of the scene conveys Jean-Louis's ambivalence, his wavering between his religious conversion and his womanizing past.

As the scene begins, the camera films Jean-Louis approaching the city from inside his car, and a cut takes the film from the street where he parks while the bells of the basilica ring to a shot of the priest standing at the altar late into the mass (figure 4.4).


Figure 4.4 – Jean-Louis attends mass.


Figure 4.5 – The priest at the altar.

Jean-Louis occupies the right foreground of the image. He stands with his back to the camera and faces the altar, watching the priest. The priest appears very small in the upper left corner of the image. He is far away from the camera, but he remains in focus. The shot lasts about twenty seconds. A cut brings the camera to an entirely new position inside the church. The camera in this image (figure 4.5) moves to the center aisle of the church and situates the priest as the central point of focus surrounded by tall stone columns and stained glass windows. The first shot in this sequence (figure 4.4) is an example of what Jean Mitry's names the "semi-subjective"

image, a cinematic image that offers a parallel to FIS in prose. Mitry defines the "semi-subjective" image in this way,

> L'image semi-subjective (ou "associée"). Conservant toutes les qualités de l'image "descriptive", l'image "associée" épouse le point de vue de l'un quelconque des personnages qui, posé objectivement, occupe une situation privilégiée dans le cadre (premier plan, plan moyen ou amorce de premier plan). Le caméra l'accompagne dans ses déplacements, agit avec lui et voit comme lui et en même temps que lui. (77-78)

In this first shot (figure 4.4), Jean-Louis is within the frame, standing in front of the camera so that the camera films him in the image while it also films what he sees. Jean-Louis watches the priest at the altar while Rohmer's viewer watches both Jean-Louis and the priest. The viewer is external to the character; the camera films "objectively," but in the same instant, the viewer sees with the character. This simultaneously objective and subjective image, Mitry argues, allows the viewer not only to see with the character but also to feel with the character. "Pour "éprouver" les sentiments d'un personnage quelconque," Mitry suggests, "il suffisait au spectateur d'être *avec* ce personnage, à coté de lui" (73). We not only see with the character, we also enter into his emotions and feelings. Mitry calls this "semi-subjective" image "un point de vue *partagé*" (73). The "semi-subjective" image is one that combines two visions, that of an objective camera and that of the character, within one image and that thereby brings the viewer into identification and sympathy with the character. Does this image, however, offer a portrayal of Jean-Louis's psyche? The image (figure 4.4) may show the viewer what Jean-Louis sees while he sees, but it does not necessarily reveal the character's mind.

The cut to the second shot in this sequence (figure 4.5) moves the camera away from Jean-Louis's optical perspective. Recalling the first shot in the sequence (figure 4.4) the viewer knows that Jean-Louis faces the priest at an angle. He stands to the left-hand side of the church. This cut takes the camera to the central aisle and films the priest surrounded by the stone

columns encircling the altar. Although this shot removes the viewer from Jean-Louis's optical perspective - this is not a POV shot - the shot brings the viewer closer to the character's mind. Jean-Louis's focus on the altar, the attention he pays to the priest, is more accurately represented by this shot (figure 4.5) that portrays the priest as a central, dominating figure than by the prior shot (figure 4.4) that records Jean-Louis and the priest in the same instant.

George M. Wilson explores cinematic point of view in *Narration in Light*, and he identifies a type of subjective narration distinct from the POV shot, from Mitry's "semi-subjective" image, and from Kawin's "mindscreen" narration examined in Chapter Three. Wilson describes "indirect or reflected subjectivity," and this variety of represented subjectivity fits well within our discussion of cinematic FIS in Rohmer's *Maud*. "A certain central character appears in segments throughout the film," Wilson writes, "and the action is only partially, if at all, seen from his or her physical point of view. Features of the projected image or the *mise en scène* are used to depict or symbolize or reflect aspects of the way in which the character perceives and responds to his or her immediate environment" (87). This shot (figure 4.5) is an example of Wilson's "indirect or reflected subjectivity" (87). Rather than filming through the character's eyes, the camera films in such a way that *represents* the way that the character perceives. "Features of the projected image" in this shot signal Jean-Louis's focus on the priest and act as a metaphor for his religious convictions. The shot remains, however, ambivalent. It causes the vision of the narrator to intersect with that of the character.

The shot's position just following another shot in which the viewer does see the character's physical perspective highlights the externality of this second shot. In other words, the "vision" of the external cinematic narrator in figure five is underscored by the image in figure four which shows precisely where Jean-Louis stands. Figure five is what Wilson calls "indirect

or reflected subjectivity," but we could also name it an example of the cinematic FIS characteristic of Rohmer's film. This shot (figure 4.5) is at once external and internal to the character because we are aware of seeing from a perspective that does not belong to the character, and we are also aware that we continue to see what Jean-Louis sees from a position that mirrors the close attention he pays to the object of vision. This is a mental point-of-view shot, an ambivalent image that contains these two visions, the perspectives of these two agencies, simultaneously. Rohmer may not envision Jean-Louis's thoughts as Resnais and Gutiérrez Alea envision the memories of Emmanuelle Riva's character and Sergio, but the camera in Rohmer's film often records a mise en scène not as Jean-Louis sees it with his eyes but in a manner that conveys the attention he pays, and this particular shot, a formally ambivalent image, primes the viewer for Jean-Louis's intense psychological ambivalence that will mark this scene.

Following this scene's opening two shots, the camera films three alternating subjects: an objective shot of Jean-Louis facing forward, reading his missal, and occasionally turning his attention to his right, with the camera positioned in front of him, and two subjective shots, one of the priest at the altar as he continues to celebrate mass and another of a young woman, who we will later learn is Françoise, filmed in profile standing at Jean-Louis's right. The scene alternates between these three shots so that the viewer watches first Jean-Louis, then the priest and finally Françoise. As the scene progresses, the subjective camera, the camera that films the priest and Françoise, moves closer to its object of view, and the depth of field moves from deep to shallow so that the priest and Françoise become progressively larger in the frame and the mise en scène surrounding these two characters loses focus. Jean-Louis's ambivalence reaches a high pitch as his attention swings between these two characters. Using FIS during this back and forth motion,

the scene unearths the psychological ambivalence that will constitute Jean-Louis's chief indecision.

Following the shot of the priest from the central aisle (figure 4.5), the scene cuts to an image of Jean-Louis facing forward (figure 4.6). Along with the other parishioners, Jean-Louis looks up from his missal and begins to speak the words of the Lord's Prayer. The camera remains on Jean-Louis who speaks very softly. His voice is inaudible as we begin to distinguish a woman's voice among those speaking in unison. Jean-Louis looks down as this voice gains prominence, and the scene cuts to the film's first shot of Françoise (figure 4.7).

Figure 4.6 – Jean-Louis watches the priest.

Figure 4.7 – To the right of Jean-Louis, Françoise.

Jean-Louis does not look to his right before the scene cuts to this image of Françoise. The cut is not motivated by his vision but by his hearing. As we begin to distinguish Françoise's voice, Jean-Louis directs his attention downward just before the scene cuts to film her speaking. As in the scene's earlier cut to the priest filmed from the central aisle (figure 4.5), this scene's first shot of Françoise is not a POV shot. The viewer does not see with Jean-Louis, or from Jean-Louis's optical perspective. Rather, the shot aligns the viewer's gaze with his mental perspective. His attention is distracted from the priest by her voice, but he does not yet look at her. The camera

remains on Françoise for nearly twenty seconds before cutting back to Jean-Louis. When we return to Jean-Louis, he continues to look down as he had been doing.

The two images of Jean-Louis that surround this image of Françoise place him in the position of agency for the shot depicting her. The film cuts to her following an image of him, and the cut away from her returns the film to the same image of him. In both of these surrounding shots, however, Jean-Louis does not look in Françoise's direction. He keeps his eyes down, and Françoise does not behave as though she is aware of being watched. She does not look down, embarrassedly, or look toward Jean-Louis as she will in later shots. She does not, in this take, acknowledge the gaze of a character within the story world of the film because the camera filming her is a third-person agency that resides outside of the narration. This again is an instance of the camera filming in a manner that conveys Jean-Louis's mind. Just as the reader instinctively "translates" FIS in prose into the character's first-person mental voice, we "see" this image of Françoise (figure 4.7) as Jean-Louis's thoughts, as solely his vision.

In an essay on Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud*, Tom Ennis examines this early scene and recognizes the ambiguity of this initial shot of Françoise,

> The service is initially filmed from a respectful distance until the 'Our Father'. There follows a shot of Jean-Louis looking straight ahead and subsequently looking down as Françoise's voice can be heard on the sound track: this is the first sign of his attention being diverted. A reverse shot allows us to see her, also looking ahead. However, the camera in both instances is positioned to the left of the protagonist in question and while these shots appear to be from their respective points of view, they are actually from the viewpoint of an omniscient narrator. This is presented as an objective view of events, although this narrator clearly wants us to be aware of the attraction between the two characters. (312)

Ennis views the shot as solely objective. He identifies the shot's external point of origin even though he concedes that it appears very close to Jean-Louis's optical perspective. Ennis's point hinges on the position of the camera "to the left of the protagonist" (312). For Ennis, it is this

slight spatial dislocation that causes the perspective of the external narrator to dominate. He allows for the representation of the mutual attraction of these two characters within the narrator's perspective, but Ennis does not acknowledge the dual perspective, the dual vision of the image.

This particular shot of Françoise is an instance of cinematic FIS. It is a formally ambivalent image. Its point of origin is that of the external cinematic narrator. This shot also represents, however, the mental perspective of the protagonist whose attention focuses on Françoise as she speaks. This image is motivated by and carries these two perspectives, these two agencies simultaneously. Mirroring the stylistic ambivalence in this shot is Jean-Louis's psychological ambivalence that will become the key thematic focal points of Rohmer's film. Jean-Louis wavers between his religious convictions, the celibacy until marriage demanded by those convictions, and his past as a "coureur de filles." Jean-Louis's ambivalence, his indecision between these two aspects of himself will later be embodied by his wavering between Maud and Françoise, with Françoise representing his plan for a Catholic wife and a settled family while his physical attraction to Maud and her own desire for him recalls his pre-conversion self. In this early scene, however, the viewer is unaware of Françoise as Jean-Louis's future wife, and she stands as the alternative to his religious convictions. Her presence distracts him from the altar and from the service. In this shot, he does not look at her though she occupies his attention. The stylistic ambivalence of the shot, its dual-visioned perspective mirrors his psychological ambivalence.

As this short scene approaches its end, the camera no longer films Jean-Louis. Rather it records only the priest at the altar and Françoise. The camera alternates between these two figures, and with each alternation, the camera moves closer to its object of vision. The priest, originally viewed from a far distance, in a long shot, is later filmed in a medium shot, while the

camera's final view of Françoise is a close-up. This increasing proximity to the object of view demonstrates the increased attention Jean-Louis pays to both. As his attention is gradually more distracted by Françoise, he works to focus more strongly on the priest, and the camera responds by filming the priest from a much closer position. As his attention is pulled away from mass, the camera films Françoise from a very close position.

The final close-up of Françoise in this scene plays a key role in conveying Jean-Louis's indecision and in representing the ambivalence of the film's cinematic discourse. Prior to the scene's final shot, the camera films the priest in a medium shot. He holds up the host and says, "Voici l'agneau de Dieu qui enlève le peché du monde." Following this, the scene cuts to a close-up of Françoise (figure 4.8) as she and the congregation respond in unison, "Seigneur, je ne suis pas digne de te recevoir, mais dis seulement une parole et je serai guéri." The parishioners repeat this sentence three times in succession, but the camera's proximity to and focus on Françoise causes her voice to be clearly distinguished from those blending together around her. Depth of field is quite shallow in this shot; only Françoise is in focus while the other actors in the frame and the candles on the opposite side of the church are blurred. The close-up shot and its very shallow depth of field direct the viewer's attention to Françoise alone. They point the viewer to follow Jean-Louis's mental perspective.


Figure 4.8 – Seigneur, je ne suis pas digne…


Figure 4.9 – Françoise looks to Jean-Louis.

This close-up of Françoise (figure 4.8) is again an instance of FIS, of Jean-Louis's mental point of view represented by the objective camera. He does not look at her, an act that would constitute an important breach of etiquette in this setting, but he thinks only of her. Jean-Louis cannot look at her, but the camera films her as he imagines her, as he would see her were he to look. After she repeats the line three times, the camera lingers on Françoise for a few moments. She looks forward in silence. Shortly thereafter Françoise turns her head to the left (figure 4.9). There is no cut between figures 4.8 and 4.9. After a few moments of silence, Françoise turns her head in reaction to being watched.

Over the twenty-five seconds or so of this long-take of Françoise, the agency of the shot changes. The shot begins in FIS. The "eyes" of the image on screen belong only to the external cinematic narrator while the intense focus on her as she repeats a line attesting to her humbled position vis-à-vis God envisions the attention Jean-Louis pays her. As Françoise responds to the priest's words, she is not aware of begin watched by an agency internal to the film. We watch her for nearly twenty seconds while she indicates no awareness of our gaze. This portion of the shot portrays only Jean-Louis's mental perspective within the external narrator's vision. The camera is very close to her and all else loses focus. Later in the film, Vidal summarizes Jean-Louis's position on women and religion: "la religion ajoute beaucoup aux femmes." This highly intimate close-up shot transforms Françoise's religious conviction, her spiritual experience, into the protagonist's erotic fascination. The camera lingers on her, voyeuristically capturing a private moment while she repeats in a fervent yet hushed tone of voice, "Seigneur, je ne suis pas digne de te recevoir, mais dis seulement une parole et je serai guéri." Shortly after she stops speaking, she turns her head toward the camera to look at Jean-Louis, and this turn indicates that at some point, he looks at her. The long take that began as FIS subsequently becomes a POV shot. She

feels the eyes of someone within the narrative looking at her, and she responds by returning Jean-Louis's gaze. Her look dispels the formal ambivalence of the shot. The look demonstrates Jean-Louis's agency, but at the same time, this look attests to the doubled agency of the earlier section of the long-take.

This film's early scene set in a Sunday morning church service inaugurates the film's overarching theme: Jean-Louis's indecision vis-à-vis his religious conversion and the continuing desire for women that he views as incompatible with Catholicism. His mind focuses on this young woman while he strives to concentrate on the priest and the service taking place around him. This scene also underscores the film's ruling cinematic discourse, its predominant style. The two "visions" of the film, that of the narrator and of the character, are quite similar, and the film will fluidly and quite inconspicuously shift between them, at times combining them into one shot as in the above example and precisely as in the combination of Strether's voice with that of James's narrator. This film represents Jean-Louis's ambivalent mind just as *The Ambassadors* represents Strether's, but the demarcations of that representation are ambiguous, fluid.

Rohmer's films are typically dominated by conversations. His is a "talking cinema" in which characters engage in lengthy, often erudite conversations. The first fifteen minutes or so of *Ma nuit chez Maud*, on the other hand, are largely silent. The priest's voice is the first we hear in the film, and the initial conversations Jean-Louis takes part in are the banal workday platitudes exchanged between colleagues who know one another very little. He discusses living arrangements, local driving conditions and Christmas plans with his colleagues over lunch. This opening section of the film establishes Jean-Louis's cultivated solitude, and it also demonstrates the introspective nature of the film and of the character. By filming from external perspectives, however, the cinematic narrator covers his tracks, as it were, into the character's mind. The

largely silent early portion of the film establishes Jean-Louis's solitude and his ambivalence, and it binds and limits the focus of the narration to this single character.

Following Jean-Louis's chance meeting with Vidal, an old school friend, this film, like most of Rohmer's films, privileges conversation and talking. Intimate conversations that mix personal revelations with self-discovery dominate *Ma nuit chez Maud*. During these conversations, the camera often eschews the shot-reverse-shot pattern, the editing pattern most typical for filming conversations between two individuals. Rohmer favors instead long takes that remain on one character even after he has stopped speaking, while he listens and silently reacts to another character. This camera lingers on a character's face while the speaker remains off screen, hidden from view. The effect of this resistance to cutting and to editing conversation sequences is quite similar to what we have seen in the ambiguous opening shot of the film and the long-takes during church. Holding the camera on one character during a lengthy exchange between two characters confuses agency and motivation and draws attention to vision and perspective.

Rohmer's films do not entirely abandon the shot-reverse-shot pattern; eventually a long-take on Jean-Louis will cut to the face of his interlocutor, but the scene will do so only following a few back and forth verbal exchanges during which the viewer expects to see more than just one face. In his initial meeting with Vidal, for example, the two men, seated across from one another at a small table discuss probability, mathematics, and Pascal's "*pari*" in response to their fortuitous meeting at a restaurant neither frequents. In place of the shot-reverse-shot sequence, this scene uses very few cuts. The camera remains on Jean-Louis long after he has finished speaking and while Vidal responds. This camera remains on characters as they listen and silently react to what others are saying. The viewer notes this resistance to "continuity editing" because

we desire to see a face that speaks. We desire to see what a character sees as he looks and listens. By holding the camera on a character as he listens to another speak, this film highlights the viewer's desire while momentarily leaving it unfulfilled.

As we will see in our discussion of the film's longest scene, Jean-Louis's night at Maud's, Rohmer will use cinematic FIS to underscore his character's hesitation in a number of important ways. The film's narration will become ambivalent by combining the multiple perspectives of the three characters; by filming from positions that Jean-Louis previously occupied, positions familiar as his "vision," his point of view; and by minimally editing conversation sequences, by resisting the shot-reverse-shot pattern. Lasting just over thirty minutes, this scene is the crux of the narrative, and Jean-Louis's ambivalence is most prominent therein. The first half of the scene includes Jean-Louis's introduction to Maud and his dinner and discussions with Maud and Vidal. Over dinner and coffee, the three debate Pascal, the place of marriage in Catholicism, and the paradox of Jean-Louis's multiple mistresses. Vidal expresses his skepticism regarding Jean-Louis's conversion, and finally Vidal leaves abruptly. During the scene's second half following Vidal's exit, Jean-Louis remains alone with Maud and the two share their respective romantic histories. The scene ends with Maud's revelation that there is no extra room where Jean-Louis can sleep, that his only option is to share her bed. He eventually joins her in bed after wrapping a blanked twice around himself, still fully clothed. Over the course of the scene, the dual-visioned narration, the cinematic FIS of the filming and editing style, conveys Jean-Louis's divided consciousness, his temptation vis-à-vis Maud while Françoise remains a strong presence in his mind.

After the three characters have eaten dinner, a series of shots highlights the importance of agency and simultaneous multiple perspectives in this film overall and in this lengthy scene in

particular. While Maud serves the after-dinner coffee Vidal tests Jean-Louis's conviction. In response to Vidal's assertion that Jean-Louis does not renounce anything in his "pari pour" God and infinity, Jean-Louis says that he renounces girls. Vidal then describes the following test for Jean-Louis's renunciation, "supposons que tu te sois trouvé en voyage avec une fille ravissant et que tu savais en plus revoir … Il y a des circonstances dans lesquelles il est difficile de résister." When Jean-Louis responds that he would not take advantage of this situation, Vidal creates a more specific scenario, "mais si demain, si ce soir, une femme aussi belle que Maud … et riche de tempérament, te proposait,… enfin te faisait sentir…" Over the course of this scene in Maud's living room, the filming and editing style has highlighted Jean-Louis's attraction to Maud. Especially while the three sit near her bed rather than around the dinner table, the camera, often aligned with and positioned very nearby Jean-Louis, is drawn to Maud more than to any other character. The camera films in a manner that represents Jean-Louis's turn of mind toward her. Vidal's prescient scenario forces this underlying attraction to the surface.

While he speaks of the imaginary woman "aussi belle que Maud," the image on screen is one that comprises all three characters (figure 4.10). The camera films from behind Vidal who likely looks back and forth at Maud and Jean-Louis as he speaks. Maud returns Vidal's look while Jean-Louis watches only her. A slight smile flits across Jean-Louis's face for a moment as he appears to consider the scenario.

Figure 4.10 – Jean-Louis watches Maud.

Figure 4.11 – Comme s'il pensait à quelqu'un...

This shot (figure 4.10) corresponds to Mitry's description of a "semi-subjective" image, this time from Vidal's subjective position. The viewer watches Vidal in the frame but also sees what he sees very close to how he sees it. Though this and an earlier shot, during which Vidal proclaims two one-night-stands "les plus beaux souvenirs que la vie m'ait laissés," communicate Vidal's mental perspective, his offensive in the battle he wages against Maud, this particular shot (figure 4.10) also communicates Jean-Louis's perspective. Though we see what Vidal sees as he sees it – Maud with an expression of annoyance – we are also drawn into Jean-Louis's gaze and the consciousness it implies. He gaze on Maud is motivated by his consideration of Vidal's proposition, a proposition he, quite ineptly, does not anticipate but that he here considers.

Over the course of this scene, Jean-Louis is tempted. His attraction to Maud is demonstrated by the camera's focus on her, but the viewer knows that Françoise is also always in his mind. He remains silent about Françoise even though both Vidal and Maud remain convinced of his "blonde unique." Jean-Louis wavers. He begins to doubt his conversion and his motives, and in this instance, Rohmer's film presents an ambivalent image. The image pulls the viewer's gaze in the multiple directions of each of these three characters' gazes just as Jean-Louis's mind is divided between Maud and Françoise, whom the viewer knows he hopes to marry.

Though Jean-Louis brushes aside the question posed during this shot (figure 4.10) and jokes about Vidal's drunkenness and the local wine they drank over dinner, Maud requests an answer, and he says with embarrassment, "disons autrefois,… oui. Maintenant, non." During the next image above (figure 4.11), which follows shortly after Jean-Louis's response to Maud and after his further explanation that he has converted, Vidal, speaking off-screen, "reads" Jean-Louis. "Cette conversion me parait très, très, très, très louche. Je trouvais qu'il y avait quelque chose de bizarre dans son comportement. Il a des moments d'absence, de rêverie," Vidal remarks, "Comme s'il pensait à quelqu'un. Pas à quelque chose, à quelqu'un. Il serait amoureux, ça ne m'étonnerait pas." The image (figure 4.11) that accompanies the latter portion of this correct reading of Jean-Louis is, again, one that comprises multiple and divergent perspectives. Jean-Louis looks off-screen at Vidal who speaks while Maud keeps her attention focused on Jean-Louis. Aware of Jean-Louis's fascination with Françoise, a fascination that earlier lead him to chase her fruitlessly in his car through the winding streets of the city's old quarter after church and that lead him to inform the viewer in voice-over that he knew, then, that she would be his wife, the viewer deduces his thoughts in this shot. They must center on Françoise. Maud watches his face for a reaction, but he gives away nothing. He is secretive, and in the moment that follows this image, Jean-Louis will turn to Maud and exclaim, "première nouvelle!" Marion Vidal writes of Jean-Louis in this particular scene, "Il apparaît comme un faible, un velléitaire se dérobant sans cesse derrière un rampart mouvant d'hésitations, de tergiversations et de petits mensonges" (86). Jean-Louis hesitates between these two women. He thinks of Françoise but does not speak of her in the presence of Maud. The narrating agency of this image does not reveal what Jean-Louis sees: Vidal. The narrator shows, on the other hand, Maud's face paired with Jean-Louis's concerned expression, an expression indicative of his inner focus on

Françoise. We see Maud in the image as she reads Jean-Louis, then, but we also "see" Françoise through Jean-Louis's expression. In this way, this image (figure 4.11) envisions his ambivalence between the two women.

The moment of Jean-Louis's strongest ambivalence between Françoise and Maud, however, between his convictions as a Catholic and his past as a "coureur de filles," comes after Vidal has departed, after Jean-Louis has been persuaded by Maud to stay with her. The pair continues to talk about his past relationships. During the scene's initial long take, the camera remains almost exclusively focused on Jean-Louis as he explains his love affairs while he stands behind a chair between him and Maud. He crosses his arms or pushes his hands deep into his pockets, physically withdrawing and reverting to abstract discussions of women and morality as well as the impossibility of sainthood. Jean-Louis is drawn to Maud, but he keeps his temptation under control by discussing these topics, his moral choices and his perspectives on Catholicism. The camera mirrors the moves he makes. As he holds to his intellectual topics the camera films only Jean-Louis. Even when she responds to something he says, Maud's presence is not visually noted. The camera cuts to her in this sequence on only one very brief occasion even though she responds throughout his speech. As he earlier focused only on the priest so as to quiet his attraction to Françoise during church, here he focuses his attention on himself and his past, and the camera films him in such a way that only he exists. As his temptation increases, and as the two broach the topic of their own peculiar relationship, the camera becomes intimate with the couple, filming them together.

Figure 4.12 – Semi-subjective shot.

Figure 4.13- Vous n'avez pas sommeil?

In figure 4.12 above, Maud has just finished telling Jean-Louis why she believes Vidal brought him to her home. She implicitly brings up the topic of their relationship. She believes that Vidal, impossibly in love with her, hopes for an occasion to hate her. The shot (figure 4.12) accompanying her words conforms to Mitry's "semi-subjective" image. We see roughly from Jean-Louis's point of view while he remains paritally in the frame. He listens but offers nothing to her assessment – neither denying nor assenting to her reading of Vidal. She says, "Alors où en étions-nous?" and the camera cuts to another position (figure 4.13). The camera now films roughly from the chair near Maud's bed that Jean-Louis has primarily occupied over the course of the evening, and it films the couple together. Instead of adding to Maud's reading, Jean-Louis, now leaning toward Maud in his ambivalence between the film's two women, reclines on her bed, and asks, in a softened voice, whether she is sleepy. This camera is external to Jean-Louis's perspective, and that externality is highly marked given the "semi-subjective" shot (figure 4.12) that preceded it. This shot is, however, an instance of Wilson's "implied or indirect subjectivity" and of cinematic FIS. The camera films from a familiar position, a position that, at other moments earlier in the scene and at moments still to come, is used as a POV shot from Jean-Louis's persepctive. Though here it is not a POV shot, the image retains traces of Jean-Louis's vision from earlier instances, and in a few minutes, Jean-Louis will himself occupy that position.

This shot (figure 4.13) is unusual for the close physical proximity between Maud and Jean-Louis. Jean-Louis rarely occupies the frame with another person. More often than not, he is a solitary figure, and the film makes sure that we perceive him as such. This film noticeably and intentionally sets him apart from other characters. Speaking to Françoise for the first time, Jean-Louis quickly steps away from her; he steps out of the frame so that they each stand alone rather than together on screen. These characters connect with one another with great difficulty. They are psychologically as well as visually isolated. The sole exceptions are perhaps Maud and Vidal. On screen, they appear unconcerned and natural when together. Jean-Louis, on the other hand, must remain apart. This shot showing him in an intimate conversation with Maud and the many shots of this sequence during which he is greatly tempted, envisions Jean-Louis's ambivalent mind by filming from a position familiar as his, a shot that retains his subjective presence even though the camera films externally.

Following this shot, Maud continues to assess Jean-Louis. She calls him "terriblement tortueux" and claims that he doesn't attach much importance to acts. Recovering from his intimacy with Maud, Jean-Louis returns to an explanation of his various beliefs. He sits up away from her, and the camera moves to follow him. There is a significant loosening of tension in this move. Following his description of the choice he has made for his life, a choice that prevents him from ever having to choose whether or not to sleep with this or that woman, Maud asks him for a glass of water, and the scene cuts to the image below (figure 4.14) of her watching him as he speaks.

Figure 4.14 – Maud asks for water.

Figure 4.15 – Maud listens to Jean-Louis.

He says, "S'il y a une chose que je n'aime pas dans l'église et qui d'ailleurs tente à disparaitre, c'est la comptabilité des actes: des pêchés ou des bonnes actions. Ce qu'il faut c'est la pureté du cœur. Quant on aime vraiment une fille on n'as pas envie de couché avec une autre. Il n'y a pas de problème." The filming of this instance of dialogue remains entirely on Maud in bed. She arranges herself while his back is turned, while he walks away from her, and it remains on her as she smiles again when we imagine that he turns to look at her. This resistance to shot-reverse-shot, this resistance to filming the actor who speaks and to cutting between actors makes the agency of this instance of cinematic discourse ambiguous. The camera "sees" Maud as Jean-Louis will soon see her – he is about to occupy that space himself – but the camera also "sees" what Maud sees, Jean-Louis's bad faith. His facile responses and paradoxical beliefs that allow him to mediate between his competing impulses.

During the lines that he speaks in this shot (figure 4.14), Jean-Louis finishes pouring Maud's drink off-screen, he walks toward her bed, her eyes following him, he hands her the glass, and enters on the left side of the frame, walking in front of the camera to sit down in his usual chair just behind and to the left of the camera. The camera remains on Maud during this time, and as he enters the frame and sits down, she turns to face him (figure 4.15). The agency of

the long take that remains on her during this entire exchange (figure 4.15) begins as an external narrating agency. After Jean-Louis enters the frame and moves near the camera, it intersects with his vision. When Maud looks toward Jean-Louis now sitting in his chair (figure 4.15) the shot is very close to a POV shot, and this reinforces this particular filming position as his perspective.

This pair of images is important for our purposes because, as in the early sequence in church, narrative agency changes without a cut in the take. The narration fluidly combines these two similar "visions" without cutting and without the sort of "trucs" used to connect the spectator with the character that Rohmer dislikes. Agency shifts, and the demarcations between the narrator and Jean-Louis's perspective is blurred. Smiling, Maud looks at Jean-Louis and asks again whether he is in love. She makes the connections that he seems not to see. He does not sleep with her, though tempted, because he is in love with another woman, "quand on aime vraiment une fille, on n'as pas envie de couché avec une autre." Jean-Louis gives himself away.

Also as in the earlier scene in church, when this near POV shot recording Maud eventually cuts to Jean-Louis in his chair, he is not looking at her. He looks down at his hands (figure 4.16).

Figure 4.16 – Jean-Louis looks at his hands.

Rohmer sets up these instances that frustrate the spectator's desire to ascribe agency. The shot seems to come from Jean-Louis's perspective but in fact he does not look at Maud. The earlier shot (figure 4.15) is again an instance of his mental point of view, his ambivalence between these two women. Speaking with her and being tempted by her, Jean-Louis's attention is focused on Maud in this sequence. The camera envisions his mental focus by remaining on her, watching her as she reclines in bed, even though he does not actually look at her. He strives, however, to retain his detached composure and to deflect her advances. The movement from the shot of Maud in bed (figures 4.15) to this next shot of Jean-Louis (figure 4.16) halts the viewer's entrance into this potential relationship. The viewer is also drawn to Maud, and finding Jean-Louis averting his eyes from the previous shot disturbs the progression of the shots.

Jean-Louis will sleep in Maud's bed, he will even respond, for a moment, to her early morning advances before brutally pushing her away. His ambivalence between Maud and Françoise, an ambivalence that Maud recognizes even though he does not speak it explicitly and that stands in for his larger struggle between his religious convictions and his past, manifests

itself in the narration of Rohmer's film. The focus in *Ma nuit chez Maud* as in James's *The Ambassadors*, on vision, on readings, and on perspectives underscores the fluid shifts, the ambivalent moves these two works make between distinct visions, distinct voices that are nonetheless quite similar. In these works, this intersection between two parallel perspectives dramatizes the psychological ambivalences that Strether and Jean-Louis suffer under.

***

Early in Rohmer's *Le genou de Claire*, the fourth of the *Contes moraux*, Aurora, the writer and close friend of the film's protagonist, Jerome, describes a scene depicting Don Quixote, blindfolded and being led by Sancho Panza, painted on a wall of Jerome's empty lakeside home, "Les héros d'une histoire ont toujours leurs yeux bandés." Aurora's assessment will gain greater accuracy vis-à-vis Jerome as that film unfolds. Her evaluation, however, applies also to James's Strether and to Rohmer's Jean-Louis. If these two characters "ont leurs yeux bandés," it is they themselves who maintain these blindfolds. As Yeazell describes Strether as well as James's late characters, these characters are drawn to truths, but they also fear the dangerous knowledge they begin to distinguish. They hesitatingly move from not knowing to knowing without ever quite reaching complete knowledge. All of the protagonists discussed in this dissertation are, in one way or another, blindfolded. They each deceive themselves, and with perhaps the sole exception of Austen's *Emma*, these novels and films do not fully resolve whether the blindfolds stay or go. Jean-Louis understands that his wife's first lover was Maud's husband, but the film does not reveal whether she was the better choice, whether Jean-Louis was "right" to resist Maud. Strether understands that Chad's relationship with Madame de Vionnet is not "virtuous" in the way that he and Woollett understand that word, but James's novel does not tell its reader whether that makes the relationship wrong, or

whether Strether shouldn't also pursue such a relationship. These characters are ambivalent regarding various individual aspects of their lives, but they each share an ambivalence vis-à-vis "truth," and the discourse of these narratives matches every character's ambivalence with formal ambivalence, with cinematic and prose FIS. In their uses of ambivalent, often dilatory discourses, these works resist certainty.

A chief bond uniting the narratives in this dissertation is the ambivalent quality of the narration, of a narrator who seems to want to reveal a scene or a thought to the reader/viewer, but who also does not want to show all. These works make hesitation and indecision a thematic focus all the while hesitating to fully reveal their characters' minds, their motivations or many of the basic "truths" of the plot. Faced with difficult and troubling situations, these characters react with ambivalence. Frédéric Moreau's indecision and his adherence to an ideal informed by his Romantic readings and persuasions bring him to a standstill. He remains indecisive until the novel's end, and Flaubert's famously ambiguous ending, Frédéric's reference to a childhood incident without clear relation to the events of the novel, leaves the loose ends of this narration untied. Gutiérrez Alea ends his film on a note of high tension: Sergio in the midst of a psychological breakdown and Havana preparing for the possibility of nuclear disaster end this film. Though Desnoes's novel ends with Sergio's suicide, Gutiérrez Alea's film provides no such neat ending. Sergio's ambivalence, his own fate and the immediate fate of his country remain a mystery in that film's story world. If Strether comes to definite decisions, if he finally admits to himself that he loves Madame de Vionnet or Maria Gostrey and that he wants to stay in Europe, James never tells the reader. The novel's end, ""Then there we are!" said Strether" is characteristically cryptic (347). These novels and films do not inform their readers and their audiences of the ends; they do not tell their readers "truths." Instead, these novels and films

dramatize the processes of concealment that reflects their own characters' difficulty vis-à-vis knowledge.

These writers and filmmakers focus on individual minds in the instances of discovery, remembrance, and difficulty. These characters cannot decide, and they have minds that are, as Maud describes Jean-Louis, "tortueux." Reflecting their characters' ambivalence, these works each engage ambivalence in the formal structure and stylistic qualities of the narration. Literary and cinematic FIS plays a powerful role in the overall agendas of these works: without saying or showing all, without revealing a mind in its totality, these works root ambivalence into the very fabric of the narration. The characters and situations, fraught with ambivalence, are constructed of radically ambivalent materials.

Bibliography

Aczel, Richard. "Hearing Voices in Narrative Texts." *New Literary History*, 1998, 29: 467-500.

Armstrong, Paul B. "The Hermeneutics of Literary Impressionism: Interpretation and Reality in James, Conrad and Ford." In *Poetics of the elements in the human condition: the sea: from elemental stirrings to symbolic inspiration, language, and life-significance in literary interpretation and theory.* Lancaster: Dordrecht, 1985 (477-499).

---. *The Phenomenology of Henry James*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983.

---. "Reading, Representation, and Realism in *The Ambassadors*." *Amerikastudien* (31:1) 1986 pp.113-125.

Austen, Jane. *The Novels of Jane Austen: The text based on the collation of the early editions.* Volume Four: *Emma*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. 50th Anniversary Edition. Princeton, Princeton UP, 2003.

Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination.* Michael Holquist, Ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: UP of Toronto, 1997.

Banfield, Ann. *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Barnett, Louise K. "Speech in *The Ambassadors*: Woollett and Paris as Linguistic Communities." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. Vol. 16, No. 3. (Spring 1983) 215-229.

Barthes, Roland. *Le plaisir du texte*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972.

---. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.

Bazin, André. *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?: IV. Une esthétique de la Réalité: le néo-réalisme*. Paris: Les Éditions du cerf, 1962.

Bersani, Leo. *A Future for Astyanax: Character and Desire in Literature*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.

---. *Balzac to Beckett*: Center and Circumference in French Fiction. New York: Oxford UP,1970.

---. *The Freudian Body: Psychoanalysis and Art*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986.

---. "The Narrator as Center in *The Wings of the Dove*." *Modern Fiction Studies* Vol. 6 (1961) 131-144.

Blackall, Jean Frantz. "The Experimental Period." *In A Companion to Henry James Studies*. Ed. Daniel Mark Fogel. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993. 147-78.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: UP of Chicago, 1961.

Bonitzer, Pascal. *Eric Rohmer*. Paris: Editions de l'Etoile/Cahiers du cinéma, 1991.

---. Le Champ aveugle: essais sur le cinéma. Paris: Gallimard, 1982.

---. Le Regard et la voix: essais sur le cinéma.

Bordwell, David. *Narration in Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Bradbury, Nicola. *Henry James: The Later Novels*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Branigan, Edward. *Point of view in the Cinema : a theory of narration and subjectivity in classical film*. New York: Mouton, 1984.

---. *Projecting a Camera: Language Games in Film Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Bray, Joe. "The Source of "dramaticized consciousness": Richardson, Austen, and stylistic influence." *Syle* 35:1 (Spring 2001) pp.18-35.

Cama adentro. Dir. Jorge Gaggero. Perf. Norma Aleandro, Norma Argentina. Filmanova. 2005.

Brooks, Peter. *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess*, 2nd Ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

---. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984.

Browne, Nick. *The Rhetoric of Film Narration*. UMI Research Press, 1982.

Butte, George. "Henry James and Deep Intersubjectivity." *The Henry James Review*, 30. (2009): 129-143.

Caws, Mary Ann. *Reading Frames in Modern Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.

Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

---. *The Later Style of Henry James*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.

---. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.

---. "The Cinematic Narrator." In *Film Theory and Criticism*, Braudy and Cohen, Eds. Oxford: OxfordUP, 1997. (473-486).

Citizen Kane. Dir. Orson Welles. Perfs. Orson Welles, Joseph Cotton. Film. RKO Radio Pictures, 1941.

Cixous, Hélène. "Henry James: L'écriture comme placement ou De l'ambiguïté de l'intérêt. *Poetique: Revue de Theorie et d'Analyse Litteraires*, 1 (1970), pp. 35-50.

Cohn, Dorrit. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.

Crary, Jonayjan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth*

Century. Cambridge: MIT P, 1990.

Culler, Jonathan. *Flaubert: The Uses of Uncertainty*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1974.

---. *Structuralist Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975.

Denommé, Robert T. "The Themes of Disintegration in Flaubert's *Education Sentimentale*." Kentucky Romance Quarterly, (1973), pp.163-171.

Deppman, Jed. "History with Style: The Impassible Writing of Flaubert." *Style* 30:1 (Spring 1996) pp. 26-49.

Dillon, George L. and Frederick Kirchhoff. "On the Form and Function of Free Indirect Style." *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*. 1 (1976). 431-440.

Dimock, Wai-chee. *Through Other Continents: American Literature across Deep Time*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

Douthwaite, Julia V, "The Uses of History in Tocqueville's *Souvenirs* and Flaubert's *L'Education sentimentale*." 40-46.

Edel, Leon. *The Psychological Novel: 1900-1950*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1961.

Ennis, Tom. "Textual Interplay: The Case of Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud* and *Conte d'hiver*." *FCS*, vii (1996) 309-319.

Falconer, Graham. "Flaubert, James and the Problem of Undecidability." *Comparative Literature*, 39:1 (1987 Winter), pp. 1-18.

---. "Reading L'Éducation sentimentale: Belief and Disbelief." *Nineteenth Century French Studies*. (12:3) (Spring 1984). pp.329-343.

Fernandez, Henry; Grossvogel, D.I.; Rodriguez Monegal, Emir; Gómez, Isabel C. "3 on 2 Desnoes Gutiérrez Alea." *Diacritics*, 4:4 (Winter 1974), pp.51-64.

Finch, Casey and Bowen, Peter. " 'The Tittle-Tattle of Highbury': Gossip and free indirect Style

in *Emma*." *Representations* 31: (Summer 1990) pp. 1-18.

Flaubert, Gustave. *L'Éducation sentimentale*. Paris: Folio Classiques, 2005.

---. *Madame Bovary*. Paris: Editions Flammarion, 2001.

---. *Trois Contes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1999.

---. The Letters of Gustave Flaubert, ed. and trans. Francis Steegmuller, 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1980.

Fludernik, Monika. "New Wine in Old Bottles? Voice, Focalization and New Writing." *New Literary History*. 2001, 32. 618-638.

---. *The Fictions of Language and the Language of Fiction*.

Georgakas, Dan and Lenny Rubenstein, eds. *The Cineaste Interviews: On the Art and Politics of the Cinema*. Chicago: Lake View Press, 1983.

Gervais, David. "James's Reading of *Madame Bovary*." *Cambridge Quarterly*. 7 (1976) (1-26).

Gibson, Andrew. "'And the Wind Wheezing Through That Organ Once in a While': Voice, Narrative, Film." *New Literary History*. 2001, 32: 639-657

Ginsburg, Michal Peled. *Flaubert Writing: A Study in Narrative Strategies*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.

---. "Free Indirect Discourse: A Reconsideration" *Language and Style*. (1982) pp.133-149.

Grover, Philip. *Henry James and the French Novel: A study in inspiration*. London: Harper & Row, 1973.

Gunn, Daniel P. "Free Indirect Discourse and Narrative Authority in Emma." Narrative (12:1) Jan, 2004. pp. 35-54.

Gunning, Tom. *D.W. Griffith and the Origins of American Narrative Film*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Haig, Stirling. *Flaubert and the Gift of Speech: Dialogue and Discourse in Four "Modern" Novels.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Hedges, Inez. "Substitutionary Narration in the Cinema?" *SubStance* Vol. 3, No.9 (Spring 1975) pp. 45-57.

---. "Form and Meaning in the French Film, II: Narration and Point of View." *The French Review*, Vol. LIII, No. 2 (December 1980) 288-298.

Hiroshima Mon Amour. Dir. Alain Resnais. Perf. 1960.

Hollier, Denis, Ed. *A New History of French Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.

Horne, Philip. "The Lessons of Flaubert: James and *L'Education sentimentale*." Carabine, Keith, Ed. *Conrad, James and Other Relations. Conrad: Eastern and Western Perspectives*. 6. Lublin, Poland: Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, 1998. (313-26)

---. "Writing and Rewriting in Henry James." *Journal of American Studies*. (23:3, December 1989), 357-374.

Hough, Graham. "Narrative and Dialogue in Jane Austen." *Critical Quarterly* (1970) pp. 201-229.

Israel-Pelletier, Aimée. "Godard, Rohmer, and Rancière's *Phrase-Image*." *SubStance* (Vol. 34, No.3, Issue 108), 2005, 33-46.

James, Henry. *The Ambassadors*. New York: Penguin Classics.

---. *The Golden Bowl*. New York: Penguin Classics.

---. *Notes on Novelists*. New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1969.

---. *The Portrait of a Lady*. In *Henry James: Novels 1881-1886*. New York: Library of America, 1985.

---. *Literary Criticism: French Writers, Other European Writers, Prefaces to the New York*

Edition. New York: Library of America, 1984.

Johnson, Courtney, Jr. *Henry James and the Evolution of Consciousness*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1987.

Kawain, Bruce F. *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard and First-Person Film*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.

---. "An Outline of Film Voices." *Film Quarterly*. Vol. 38, No. 2, Winter, 1984-1985, 38-46.

---. *How Movies Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

---. *The Mind of the Novel: Reflexive Fiction and the Ineffable*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982.

Kearns, Michael S. *Metaphors of Mind in Fiction and Psychology*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1987.

Kelly, Dorothy. "Oscillation and Its Effects: Flaubert's *L'Education sentimentale*." *Romanic Review*, 80:2 (1989 Mar.), pp. 207-217.

King, Norman. "Eye for Irony: Eric Rohmer's *Ma nuit chez Maud* (1969)." Hayward, Susan, Ed. In *French Film: Texts and Contexts*. London, England: Routledge, 2000. (202-212).

Krook, Dorothy. *The Ordeal of Consciousness in Henry James.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

---. "'As a man is, so he sees': The Reader in Henry James."

Labrie, Ross. "Henry James's Idea of Consciousness." *American Literature*. (39:4) (Jan. 1968) 517-529.

Lady in the Lake. Dir. Robert Montgomery. Perf. Robert Montgomer. MGM, 1947.

The Last Laugh. Dir. F.W. Murnau. Perf. Emil Jannings. Universum Film, 1924.

Ling, Amy. "Tha Pagoda Image in Henry James's The Golden Bowl." *American Literature* (46:3) (Nov. 1974) 383-388.

Lips, Marguerite. *Le style indirect libre*. Paris: Payot, 1926.

Lock, Charles. "Double Voicing, Sharing Words: Bakhtin's Dialogism and the History of the Theory of Free Indirect Discourse." pp. 71-87. Bruhn, Jørgen Ed. *The Novelness of Bakhtin: Perspectives and Possibilities*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Museum Tusculanum--University of Copenhagen, 2001

Lodge, David. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routlegde, 1990.

Lubbock, Percy. *The Craft of Fiction*. New York: Viking Press, 1957.

Ma nuit chez Maud. Dir. Eric Rohmer. Perf. Fraçoise Fabian, Jean-Louis Trintignant. 1969.

Magny, Joël. *Eric Rohmer*. Paris: Rivages, 1986.

Marshall, Adré. *The Turn of Mind: Constituting Consciousness in Henry James*. Madison: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 1998.

Marx, Karl. *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*. 1852.

McMaster, Juliet. "The Portrait of Isabel Archer." *American Literature* Vol. 45, No. 1 (March, 1973) pp. 50-66.

Memorias del subdesarollo. Dir. Tomás Gutiérrez Alea. Perf. Sergio Corrieri. Instituto Cubano del Arte e Industrias Cinematográficos, 1968.

Metz, Christian. *Film Language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Meyer, E. Nicole. "Flaubert's Irony in L'Education sentimentale." *French Literature Series*, 14 (1987), pp. 162-165.

Mitry, Jean. *The Aesthetics and Psychology of the Cinema*. Benoît Patar, Ed. And Brian Lewis, Trans. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1997.

Molinier, Philippe. *Ma nuit chez Maud d'Éric Rohmer*. Paris: Atlande, 2001.

Monaco, James. *The New Wave: Truffaut, Godard, Chabrol, Rohmer, Rivette*. New York:

Oxford UP, 1976.

Moon, H. Kay. “Description: Flaubert’s “External World” in L’Education sentimentale.” *The French Review* (39:4) (Feb. 1966) 501-512.

Moreno, Julio L. “Subjective Cinema: And the Problem of Film in the First Person.” *The Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television*. 7:4. (Summer 1953) 341-58.

Münsterberg, Hugo. *The Film: A Psychological Study*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1916.

Oltean, Stefan. “A Survey of the Pragmatic and Referential Functions of Free Indirect discourse.” *Poetics Today*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Winter 1993) 691-714.

Orr, Mary. “Reading the Other: Flaubert’s *L’Éducation sentimentale* Revisitied.” *French Studies*. (46:4) (Oct. 1992) 412-423.

Page, Norman. *Language in Jane Austen*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1972.

Pascal, Roy. *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and its Functions in the 19th Century Novel*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. “The Cinema of Poetry.” In vol. 1 of *Movies and Methods*, Bill Nichols, Ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Perosa, Sergio. *Henry James and the Experimental Novel*. New York: NYU Press, 1983.

Poels, F.-L. “Le fonctionnement du style indirect libre dans «L’Education sentimentale». *Revue des sciences humaines*. (36: 143) July-September 1971. (365-372)

Plato. *The Great Dialogues of Plato*. (Trans. W.H.D. Rouse) New York : Signet Classic,1999.

Prince, Gerald. *Dictionary of Narratology*. (revised edition) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

Proust, Marcel. “A propos du « style » de Flaubert.” *Nouvelle Revue Française*. Jan 1, 1920.

Ramazani, Vaheed K. “Historical Cliché: Irony and the Sublime in *L’Education sentimentale*.”

PMLA (108:1) (Jan, 1993) 121-135.

---. The Free Indirect Mode: Flaubert and the Poetics of Irony.

Russian Ark. Dir. Aleksandr Sokurov. Perf. Sergei Dontsov.Egoli Tossell Film, 2002.

Schneider, Daniel J. "The Divided Self in the Fiction of Henry James." *PMLA* (90:3) (May, 1975) 447-460.

Schilling, Derek. *Eric Rohmer*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007.

Schroeder, Paul A. *Tomás Gutiérrez Alea: The Dialectics of a Filmmaker*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Schwartz, Louis-George. "Free Indirect Discourse in Deleuze's Cinema. *SubStance*. #108, Vol 34, no. 3, 2005.

Seed, D. "Henry James's Reading of Flaubert." *Comparative Literature Studies*. (16) 1979 (307-317).

Shaw, Deborah. *Contemporary Cinema of Latin America: 10 Key Films*. New York: Continuum, 2003.

Short, R.W. "The Sentence Structure of Henry James." *American Literature*. (18:2) (May, 1946) pp.71-88.

Sourian, Peter. "Eric Rohmer: Starrring ****** Blaise Pascal." Transatlantic Review, 48. 132-142.

Spiegel, Alan. *Fiction and the Camera Eye: Visual Consciousness in Film and the Modern Novel*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1976.

Stam, Robert. *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film.*

Stanzel, Franz. N*arrative Situations in the Novel: Tom Jones, Moby-Dick, The Ambassadors, Ulysses*. (Trans. James P. Pusack) Bloomington: IU Press Bloomington, 1971.

---. *Reflexivity in Film and Literature: From Don Quixote to Jean-Luc Godard*. 1992.

Starr, G. Gabrielle. *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Steele, H. Meili. *Realism and the Drama of Reference: Strategies of Representation in Balzac, Flaubert, and James*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1988.

---. "Value and Subjectivity: The Dynamics of the Sentence in James's The Ambassadors." Comparative Literature (43:2) Spring 1991 pp.113-133.

Taylor, Gordon O. *The Passages of Thought: Psychological Representations in the American Novel 1870-1900*. New York: Oxford UP, 1969.

Tétu, Jean-François. "Désir et Révolution dans «L'Éducation Sentimentale». *Littérature*, 15 (1974), pp. 89-94.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Souvenirs*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 2000.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Introduction to Poetics*. Trans. Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.

Thibaudet, Albert. *Gustave Flaubert*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1935.

Thurschwell, Pamela. *Literature, Technology and Magical Thinking: 1880-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Trois Couleurs: Bleu. Dir. Krzysztof Kieslowski. Perf. Juliette Binoche. CAB Productions,1993.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. *The Perpetual Orgy: Flaubert and Madame Bovary*. Trans. Helen Lane. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1986.

Vidal, Marion. *Les Contes Moraux d'Eric Rohmer*. Paris : Lherminier, 1977.

Watt, Ian "The First Paragraph of *The Ambassadors*." Essays in Criticism. Vol. 10 (1960). pp. 250-274.

Weinberg, Henry H. “Centers of Consciousness Reconsidered.” *Poetics Today* (5:4) 1984 pp. 767-773.

Wilson, George M. *Narration in Light: Studies in Cinematic Point of View*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. Language and Knowledge in the Late Novels of Henry James. Chicago: University of Chigaco Press, 1976.

---. “Talking in James.” *PMLA* 91:1 (Jan., 1976) pp.66-77.