UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Things Passed Over: The Modernist Novel and the Scandal of Revision

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5bz6353g

Author
Creasy, Charles Franklin Sanders

Publication Date
2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Things Passed Over: The Modernist Novel and the Scandal of Revision

By

Charles Franklin Sanders Creasy

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

and the Designated Emphasis

in

Critical Theory

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in Charge:

Professor C.D. Blanton, Chair
Professor Judith Butler
Professor Martin Jay
Professor Kent Puckett

Summer 2017

© Charles Franklin Sanders Creasy, 2017

Abstract

Things Passed Over: The Modernist Novel and the Scandal of Revision

by

Charles Franklin Sanders Creasy

Doctor of Philosophy in English

With a Designated Emphasis in Critical Theory

Professor C.D. Blanton, Chair

This dissertation argues that some of the most important 19th- and 20th-century experimental novels are simply not all there. Why did the 1857 obscenity trial of *Madame Bovary* obsess over precisely the passages that were editorially cut from the text on trial? Why did Wilde proclaim *The Picture of Dorian Gray*'s timeless perfection in a preface that tacitly quotes but does not acknowledge the newspaper controversy that shaped the novel's 1891 revisions? What do the asterisks that litter Barnes's *Ryder* (1928) mean? Why did Beckett intentionally embed a referential dead-end in a persistent erratum within many editions of *Watt* (1953)? Quandaries like these, I claim, are the sites where the modernist novel transforms both its aestheticism and its relation to the social world. In each case, what begins as a query about histories of composition, revision, and reception ends up reframing large and consequential questions about literary form and its relation to history. I take up some of contemporary scholarship's increasingly central methodological tools—reception history, textual theory, genetic criticism—to grasp the consequences, at once formal and historical, of these minute and questionable details. In the process, *Things Passed Over* gives a different history of the modernist novel's emergence out of 19th-century aestheticist avant-gardes and their scandals, arguing that the modernist novel's material connection to its social background lurks in its techniques of formal omission and their worldly repercussions.

In part one I attend to the scandals of 19th-century aestheticism, suggesting that its moral transgressions derive from but also confess a deeper pattern of formal omissions. Strangely, what is most controversial proves to be the very revisions that incorporate such scandals as intrinsic parts of the work's "final" public form. In part two I argue that, drawing directly on Flaubert and Wilde, Barnes and Beckett turn aestheticism's intransigent authorial intentions inside out, thereby internalizing its scandals. They seize this social dynamic as a formal principle: in high and late modernist novels, the scandalously social turns up in cancelled and erroneous elements, in aporias of textual genesis and authorial intention, that become integral to the work even before it appears in public. This forces us to study of genetic history and manuscripts, but also to move beyond the horizons of textual and genetic scholarship. The most experimental and hermetic works harness the prosaic charge of earlier social scandals, in order to alter novelistic reference and figuration at the most basic level.

Across this history, aestheticism's social scandals are metabolized in modernism's textual ones. To grasp this trajectory, I bring careful formal analysis to bear on textual details that go missing but nonetheless engage the social forces that shape their meaning. I show that revision by omission develops from an effect of social scandal into a key experimental modernist principle. It enables the novel to touch the world without representing it—expressing itself by enfolding more than it says. *Things Passed Over* thus generates, from out of the small bibliographic matter of textual losses, a materialist aesthetics of the experimental modernist novel.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

The research and composition of this dissertation was supported by an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation/Council for European Studies Dissertation Fellowship (Columbia University) and by grants from the Center for British Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. Archival research for chapter two was facilitated and funded by a Harry Ransom Center Humanities Research Fellowship (jointly funded by the Creekmore and Adele Fath Charitable Foundation and the University of Texas at Austin Office of Graduate Studies). Material from chapter one was presented at the 2013 Nineteenth-Century French Studies Colloquium in Richmond, Virginia. I am indebted to the participants for their questions and comments. A portion of chapter two was presented at the 2015 Modernist Studies Association Conference in Boston, Massachusetts. I am particularly grateful to Donald Calabrese, Finn Fordham, Michael Groden, Riley McDonald, and Hannah Sullivan for the lively discussion; additional thanks to Finn for the subsequent suggestions. Part of chapter four was presented at the 2014 Modernist Studies Association Conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I would like especially to thank Leah Flack, Sarah Keller, and Beth Blum for their questions and comments.

This project would be nothing had it not been for the gracious care, wise advice, and sheer brilliance of C.D. Blanton, Judith Butler, Martin Jay, and Kent Puckett. I am in their debt in ways beyond words. Kent has been an unequaled mentor, interlocutor, and friend since I arrived at Berkeley. His intellectual capaciousness is nearly incredible, and his ability to move effortlessly in conversation from the nineteenth-century novel to nineties noise rock kept me refreshed. Marty, too, has been there since the beginning. I cannot thank him enough for his keen editorial eye, for his ability to catch me just before I went down a conceptual rabbit hole not worth the effort, and most of all for his patient kindness. Judith once told me that she would be my "Hegelian reflection" and she has more than done so—quietly awaiting me at the end of every dialectical labyrinth I thought I had plumbed, ready to show me yet another twist. Who could ask for more? I am likewise obliged to her for encouraging me to write on Kafka and then being so gracious when I wrote so much that it would not fit in this dissertation. And Dan—what to say about Dan? He was always there to read every ill-conceived piece of trash I committed to paper or word document, as though he did not already have more than a fair share of demands on his time. And his comments always managed to be at once encouraging and incisive. He knew where I was going long before I did, and he knew how to give me just what I needed in order find my own way in the dark. His faith that I would was sometimes hard to credit; but he was right, as ever. Thank you.

Once I made the reckless decision that academia would suit me better than manual labor had done, I was fortunate to find at Reed College the support of a group of amazing teachers who continue to inspire me, and without whom I would still be laying carpet, rather than being amongst those who "wear the carpet with their shoes." For showing me the true meaning of education—for all that they have done for me—I am grateful to Jay Dickson, Nathalia King, Robert Knapp, Jan Mieszkowski, Roger Porter, Bill Ray, and Catherine Witt.

Over the past eight years I have been aided and abetted by many other teachers, mentors, colleagues, and friends who have read and responded to my work, given me advice, and in myriad other ways helped keep my soul from flying off. My time at Berkeley has been enriched by Elizabeth Abel, Ted Alexander, Charlie Altieri, Oliver Arnold, Ann Banfield, Jeff Blevins, Emma Buffton, Pheng Cheah, Spencer Coldren, Jesse Cordes Selbin, Jessica Crewe, Eliot D'Silva, Katrina Dodson, Ian Duncan, Hannah Ehrlinspiel and Will Gemma, Eric Falci, Katie Fleishman, Catherine Flynn, Anne-Lise François, Andrea Gadberry, Mark Goble, Kevis Goodman, Jordan Greenwald, Jane Gregory, Suzanne Guerlac, LiHe Han and Derek Deroche, Lyn Hejinian, Daniel Hoffmann, Alek Jeziorek, Sarah Jessica Johnson, Katie Kadue, Andy Key, Maya Kronfeld, Dave Landreth, Jos

Lavery, Jess Ling, Jennifer Lorden, Michael Lucey, Leila Mansouri, James Marks, Ramsey McGlazer, Christopher Patrick Miller, Emina Mušanović, Ramona Naddaff, Megan O'Connor, Emily O'Rourke, Sam Otter, Gina Patnaik, Nathan Pippinger, Samia Rahimtoola and Lisa Bartfai, Sue Schweik, Jonathan Shelley, George Starr, Spencer Strub, Cate Talley, Elisa Tamarkin, Bradford Taylor, Luke Terlaak Poot, Michelle Ty, Althea Wasow, Brandon White, Wendy Xin, Irene Yoon, Damon Young, and Isaac Zisman. Beyond the confines of the Berkeley community (although some of them also spent time here), I would like to thank for their various kindnesses Chris Ackerley, Yasna Bozhkova, Marshall Brown, Eric Bulson, Maria Luise Caputo-Mayr, Stanley Corngold, Vic Fusilero, John Havard, David Hollingshead, Audrey Jaffe, Julia Jarcho, Mike Jennings, Ewan Jones, Sophie Mayer, Bill Olmsted, Laurence Porter, Zach Samalin, Vince Sherry, David Simon, and Cecily Swanson.

I owe a few people even greater debts of gratitude for their wisdom, sympathy, and patience. Why they let me hang around is beyond me, but I am grateful—without them I never would have made it. I first came to know Kathryn Crim in Berlin, where she was kind to an unpleasant person in need of a friend. Her friendship—and her reliable, compassionate but skeptical intelligence—have been indispensable since. Also in Berlin, Alex Dubilet and Jessie Hock took me in like a stray cat and have cared for me in countless ways. I cannot express what their friendship, from the ceaseless metaphysical debates to the ongoing billiards tournament, has meant to me. Alexandra Dumont was the first friend I made at Berkeley: first she told me that we were friends, then she told me every detail of her personal life. And in time she somehow managed to drag me outside of myself. I am grateful to Alex for her constancy, her wit and charm, and for showing me the meaning of compassion. Marta Figlerowicz was, for all of the roughly ten minutes she was a graduate student, the perfect companion, whether in silent study, in intense conversation, or on a walk though the Polish forest. She continues to be an astute critic of my work and a caring friend. R.D. Perry has been everything to me: neighbor, intellectual sounding-board (and, when needed, counterbalance), drinking partner, emotional caretaker, TV guide. Thank you, Ryan, for all that and more, and for reminding me that good things do occasionally come out of the South.

Finally, what I owe Rebecca Gaydos cannot be put into words.

Introduction

'Now forsake ȝe þis silke,' sayde þe burde þenne,
For hit is symple in hitself? And so hit wel semez:
Lo! So hit is littel and lasse hit is worþy.
Bot whoso knew þe costes þat knit ar þerinne,
He wolde hit prayse at more prys, parauenture
— *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*

And now he seeks in book or manuscript
What he shall never find
— W.B. Yeats

I. The Modernist Novel Revises the Bibliographical into the Aesthetic

The modernist novel forces us at times to ask some apparently simple-minded, even petty questions. Here are two that have troubled me considerably over the past five years or so: Who wrote the asterisks that litter the text of Djuna Barnes's 1928 *Ryder*, and what are they meant to express? To what is Watt referring when, in Samuel Beckett's eponymously named novel (1953; 1959), he wonders "what had become of the duck" that appears nowhere else in the pages of that text?[1]

Now, each of these questions is open, on the face of it, to the reproach of triviality, if not of unanswerability. Nonetheless, this is just the sort of grain of sand irritating this dissertation into motion, obstinately unsatisfied with all the reasonable answers that abound. Answers like this: the asterisks in Barnes's novel, as her foreword makes plain, mark the places where the editors deemed censorship necessary to avoid legal prosecution, and if Barnes "wrote" them, they express nothing other than her outrage at the violence done to her work in the name of a morality she found hypocritical. And this: Watt refers to a duck whose appearance, like the very passage in which he wonders about it, Beckett marked for excision in the second edition of the novel. However, the typesetters only removed the passage wherein the duck appears, inadvertently leaving in place the later query about what became of it.

I am afraid I am not to be mollified by such answers. They do not seem to me to solve the real dilemmas involved in these little mysteries, dilemmas about the historical "textual condition"[2] but also about the historical aesthetics of the modernist novel. In other words, I take such minor and seemingly extraneous matters to be indices of a different kind of literary work, a different sort of problem, which the novelists I shall discuss put into the world. And if such details are indices that the novel is becoming a different sort of literary object, then another question follows: what is this object—if object is the right word—and what kind of formal innovations are stipulated such that Barnes's asterisks, or Beckett's erratum, are meaningful elements of that object? The answers to these questions, I shall claim, are to be found in space where formal innovation, social reception, and the novel's textual-material existence in the literary marketplace meet one another.

Hence, the empirical answers to my questions about *Ryder* and *Watt* tell us almost nothing. Another sort of response, however, might begin to emerge from the perspective of textual or editorial theory and genetic criticism, two related fields that are increasingly central to contemporary scholarship on (but of course not only on) modernist literature. In fact, some minimal recourse to these fields was necessary even to give the (deeply unsatisfying) answers evoked above. Textual or editorial theory—with its rigorous attention to the establishment and transmission of texts through

[1] Samuel Beckett, *Watt* (New York: Grove, 1959), 80.
[2] See Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991) and Josephine M. Guy and Ian Small, *The Textual Condition of Nineteenth-Century Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

various compositional and editorial states, and more importantly through publication history—can begin to untangle the knot between, on one end, Barnes's or Beckett's authorial text and, on the other, the published texts in various editions of *Ryder* or *Watt* (not to mention the larger œuvre of which each novel is a pivotal and insufficiently understood element). But the answers it could offer—that Barnes submitted to censorship and thereafter refused to restore the deleted text; that Beckett wanted the duck and the question both cut, but when the question remained he deliberately let it remain in roughly half of the subsequent editions—only give rise to deeper questions. Why this intentional maintenance of something that looks like an extra-aesthetic error, something that interposes gaps and lacunae in the work? What kind of work is *Ryder* or *Watt* if it includes these "things passed over?"

As for genetic criticism, its sophisticated mechanisms for tabulating and scrutinizing compositional pre-history across the sequence of a work's "avant-textes"[3] is uniquely appropriate to assessing the stylistic and formal moves inscribed in works that foreground their material mediation as forcefully as these do.[4] But genetic criticism would take the occasion of such textual irregularities as just that, an occasion—for a meticulous analysis of the flow of literary composition as such. Unless that sort of analysis is given conceptual and methodological grounding, it quickly devolves into no more than a celebration of "genius." That does not interest me. Nonetheless, these two related approaches are not just indifferent methods with as legitimate an application to the modernist novel as to any other literary historical field or generic form. No. They are approaches particularly warranted and indeed demanded by their objects of inquiry, as is equally the case with even more canonical modernist works like T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*, Ezra Pound's *Cantos*, James Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, or Virginia Woolf's *The Years*.[5]

In other words, if editorial theory and genetic criticism seem to have become major components of modernist literary scholarship, then it is because they respond to dilemmas actively posed by their objects of inquiry. But their responses are really reactions—to felt but not necessarily clearly perceived dilemmas. Textual and genetic studies are necessary tools for criticism of modernist works because they are picking up on the right cues. However, these methods stand in need of a fundamental motivating reason. On their own, they register but do not attend to deeper historical-aesthetic transformations subtending the presence of textual and genetic concerns in their objects of inquiry. The true reason they are peculiarly appropriate to this field is because the authors who comprise it were already actively metabolizing the textual and the genetic as a defining moment within their literary practice. The lineage of experimental modernist novels I shall trace forces textual

---

[3] This term was introduced by Jean Bellemin-Noël, in order to steer clear of the implication seen to haunt the term "variant," namely that a variant exists as a phenomenon only secondary to the unitary text. Bellemin-Noël defines "avant-texte" as "l'ensemble constitué par les brouillons, les manuscrits, les épreuves, les 'variantes,' vu sous l'angle de *ce qui précède matériellement* un ouvrage quand celui-ci est traité comme un *texte*, et *qui peut faire système avec lui*" (the whole constituted by the drafts, manuscripts, proofs, and 'variants,' considered as *what materially precedes* a work when it is considered as a *text*, and *which together with the latter forms a system*) (*Le texte et l'avant-texte: Les brouillons d'un poème de Milosz* [Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1972], 15). Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own.

[4] *Ryder*'s asterisks replace twelve instances of deleted text of varying lengths. *Watt* forces the issue even more insistently, with a number of seemingly editorial footnotes and typographical incursions like "(Hiatus in MS)," "(MS illegible)," and " ? "; as well as the final "Addenda" section, the title of which bears a footnote reading "The following precious and illuminating material should be carefully studied. Only fatigue and disgust prevented its incorporation" (*Watt* 196; 198; 25; 205).

[5] I am, then, situating Barnes and Beckett in relation to something like what Jean-Michel Rabaté, speaking primarily of Joyce and Pound, has called "genetic Modernism"—a style or historical textual condition that "has forced critics to take the reading act into account, an act which also stresses the progressive and historical mode of any textualization ([i.e.] all the procedures which contribute to the production of the text as we read it)." See "Pound, Joyce and Eco: Modernism and the 'Ideal Genetic Reader'," *Romanic Review* 86.3 (May 1995): 485-501, at 485.

and genetic questions because this is the locus of one of its important defining features, what distinguishes it formally and historically. One could turn back, of course, and Jerome McGann has done so most influentially, to the end of the 18th century for the historical shift when bibliographical aspects of literary works impinge on the content, form, and aesthetic self-conception of those works.[6] However, I shall argue that the later-19th- and 20th-century experimental novel—from Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (1856) through Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890/1891) to Barnes's *Ryder* and Beckett's *Watt*—has its own particular relation to the minor facts of composition and reception history, of textual and bibliographical detail. Across the history I chart, the novel deploys seemingly extraneous textual details as a newly decisive aesthetic element and thereby revises itself into a different kind of literary work. So, the deepest questions of this dissertation shall be: what is that work? What is this thing that takes the place of the conventionally understood novel, that is, of the narrative artwork as an aesthetic whole? What has become of the novel if such details now feature as meaningful elements within it—but also in a sense passed over within it? What formal and stylistic techniques, and what aesthetic conceptions, are used to construct it? What methods are required if literary criticism is going to grasp it? And, perhaps, what does grasping this different kind of literary work mean for literary history?

Hence, I am suggesting that although the questions about Barnes's asterisks and Beckett's duck could give the impression of pettifoggery, they are in fact quandaries that go to the heart of those authors' writing—their literary productions and practices, their aesthetics, and the history of the relations between those two terms. And further, that these particular quandaries are distinct from the ones raised by those other modernist benchmarks I mentioned. The differences can be distinguished easily enough, along two axes: the generic axis that opposes the poem to the novel; the formal or stylistic axis that opposes modes of inclusion to modes of exclusion. Along the first axis, it would be easy to uncover similar textual oddities and questions from details in *The Waste Land* (Eliot's consequential mistranslation of part of Ugolino's story from *Inferno* XXXIII, for instance, or his footnotes themselves),[7] but the aesthetic or formal procedures such details would be found to index are different from those that I shall show to be indexed by similar bibliographic elements entangled in narrative forms. As we shall see, the latter make social, historical, and textual interventions that are properly novelistic in both mode and consequence.

Secondly, Barnes's and Beckett's novels share with, say, *Ulysses* or *Finnegans Wake* a "modern 'textual condition,' which takes its point of departure in errors, repetitions, interpolations which foreground…textuality…and all the material trappings indispensable to the constitution of an archive."[8] But unlike any of the novelists addressed in this book, Joyce makes the (Poundian) bet of including everything, beginning with history. And as for Woolf's *The Years*, the distinction can be drawn even more sharply. For while the compositional backstory—the attempted hybrid form, the existence of *The Pargiters*, the possibility that the published novel is a product of something like self-

[6] See for instance *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1983, 1992): "[T]he classical problem which originally established the terms of modern textual criticism—the absence of the authoritative text—no longer pertains" (18). "Blake perfectly exemplifies [the fundamentally social nature of the literary work] precisely because he tried to produce his own work in deliberate defiance of his period's normal avenues of publication. Blake retreated to a method of literary production which antedated even the patronage system of the eighteenth century," not to mention the "commercial system of his own day" (44). "Blake's decision to seek complete freedom from [the newly emergent literary institution], though futile, is nonetheless an important limiting case, for it sharply underscores the determining authority of the institution" (53).

[7] On this issue, see C.D. Blanton, *Epic Negation: The Dialectical Poetics of Late Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 22-85.

[8] Rabaté, "Pound, Joyce and Eco" 485.

censorship, etc.[9]—is undoubtedly an important and decisive aspect of her late work and therefore necessary to situating her in the literary history of modernism, *The Years* does not make itself impossible to read except in and through that backstory. In other words, while arguably we should engage in some excavatory, genetic study in order to understand Woolf's writing and likewise some of the repressive aspects of the literary institution, a reader is in principle able to approach the novel while ignoring the genetic and publication history that eventuated in it. *The Years* does not internalize or metabolize its textual and genetic condition as a hinge element of its form, meaning, or aesthetic self-conception in the same way that *Ryder* does with its asterisks. (This is, I think, a particular instance of the more general fact that Woolf's experimentalism lies in a register of impressionism and psychology that maintains a baseline naturalism of representation, whereas the figures discussed in this dissertation, like later Joyce, militate against exactly that representational premise.)

Barnes and Beckett, then, unlike Woolf (but also unlike Joyce), situate their novels within a lineage that looks to the Flaubert of *Madame Bovary* rather than the (*idée reçue* of the) Flaubert of *Bouvard et Pécuchet*,[10] and to an unnoticed Wildean aestheticism, and that finds there a different principle of figuration and a different principle by which to order a relation to history, the social world, and all the rest of it. This turns out to be a principle of generative omission, of something like what classical rhetoric calls "paralipsis" (the device of drawing attention to a thing in the act of passing over it). In short, to define and describe the different kind of prose work that the figures I address present to literary history, it will be necessary to come to grips with a style of positive, productive elision, a paraliptical mode—understood both as a set of innovative literary techniques and as a series of social effects. Flaubert, Wilde, Barnes, and Beckett manage to build novels that are not all there, and but what is not there is a positive, productive force, both stylistically or formally (when Flaubert voids out a scene of adultery or Beckett precludes the referential fulfillment of a name, meaning is generated in a different register) and socially (a judicial, marketplace, editorial, or professional act of reading is compelled to fill in what is perceived as a gap).

In turn, understanding this strange principle of omission, and understanding the specific textual imperative that these writers pose, it becomes necessary to reconstruct a longer historical genealogy across which all this unfolds and develops into a specific novelistic form. And that reconstruction will locate the textual imperative of the experimental modernist novel in questions that do not have merely textual or genetic answers. Another way to say this is that, for a literary criticism informed by textual and genetic methodologies (and I believe it can no longer be otherwise), there remains the basic question of what its objects of study really are. And what aesthetic demands such works make on the methodologies they necessitate. Addressing these questions, as I said, entails a literary historical inquiry, a properly historical inquiry into literary aesthetics. The horizons of textual and editorial theory (with its privileging of intention, final or otherwise, its focus on establishing a textually stable text, and its consequently necessary recourse to some notion of an "ideal work") and those of genetic criticism (with—I shall not mince words—its fetishizing of a prepublication "dance" of compositional "genesis" and its consequently undertheorized category of the literary work)[11] provide answers that will not resolve the deeper

---

[9] See Brenda R. Silver, "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice: Or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf Part II," in *Representing Modernist Texts*, ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 193-222.

[10] For a strong reading of Flaubert in such terms, see Jacques Rancière, *La parole muette: Essai sur les contradictions de la littérature* (Paris: Hachette Littératures, 1998), and *Politique de la littérature* (Paris: Galilée, 2007). For a less reductive understanding of Flaubert that avoids that *idée reçue*, see Leo Bersani's *The Culture of Redemption* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

[11] Daniel Ferrer, "Production, Invention, and Reproduction" (*Reimagining Textuality: Textual Studies in the Late Age of Print*, eds. Elizabeth Bergmann Loizeaux and Neil Fraistat [Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002], 48-59, at 49 and 56).

quandary, the questions within the question: why are things like the asterisks and the duck problematic, indeed scandalous, in the first place? Why can no thoroughgoing reading of these novels ignore them as the superfluities they appear to be? If they are significant elements, then within what conception of the novel are they significant elements? How do they function to help generate that novel and/or be a part of it? And what can they tell us about a neglected, a perhaps extreme but crucially important, genealogy of novelistic aesthetics in the 19th and 20th centuries, and its unique mode of relating to the social world in the very act of excluding such a relation?[12]

Since I have suggested that textual studies and genetic criticism will not suffice to unravel these concerns, let me summarize briefly what I think are the underlying problems with those approaches, insofar as they are not grounded by coherent methodological positions about aesthetics (about the nature of the literary) and history (about the relation of the literary to the socio-historical world). Genetic criticism itself often formulates the basic reproach to textual studies: it is too practical and non-interpretive; arising essentially out of editorial practice, it lacks a real self-reflexive theoretical grounding for that practice.[13] It is not, however, strictly a fair charge to level at a discipline traditionally concerned not with interpretation but with establishing viable editorial practices. On the other hand, Jerome McGann's decades-long work to bring literary hermeneutics and editorial theory into productive dialogue does lend support to the thought that textual studies' debates about authorial intention (final or otherwise) and textual "versions,"[14] copy-text rationales, the theory of critical editions, and so on, have tended to miss the benefit of literary and philosophical theorizations of the concepts underlying those debates.

McGann's longstanding critique of textual criticism's reliance on authorial intention, its failure to consider social forces in relation to which an author's agency is constructed, and its indifference to matters of interpretation and criticism, has led to the development of an alternative model of the "social text," understood as a properly social construction of authorial authority and textual coherence. This is a productive development that also enriches interpretive criticism with textual (and sociological) tools. All too often, though, it devolves into a fairly doctrinaire sort of sociology of the literary marketplace. And, as forceful as McGann's criticisms are, and as suggestive as his excurses into the relevance of social determinants of publication on the nature and meaning of texts are, I have yet to read a book of his on this subject (they are many) that truly overcomes the idealism he attributes to final-intentionalist textual critics, or that fully and persuasively demonstrates how what he terms "bibliographical code" does more than transparently redouble a meaning that is already available in the "linguistic code" to which criticism has always attended.[15] In other words, the insights of social text theory—into the complex network of different elements and agents that impinge on the production of the apparently "authorial intentional object" that is the published literary text—have not quite been done justice. This is because criticism informed by these insights tends not to demonstrate how such an approach tells us anything different about the nature, meaning, and significance of a work than could be gleaned from an approach resolutely unconcerned with the text's social and material construction. (In this sense, the present labor is an

---

[12] In my emphasis on the explanatory force of the extreme, I am following T.J. Clark, who explains his attention to "limit cases" in his book on modernist visual art by appeal to the thesis that in limit cases "the pressures and capacities of a particular mode of representation (maybe we should call it a family of modes) will tend to be clearest, just because the capacities are pressed to the breaking point" (*Farewell to an Idea: Episodes from a History of Modernism* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999], 7; see also 105).

[13] See for example Ferrer, "Production, Invention, and Reproduction."

[14] See Hans Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231-264.

[15] See e.g. *The Textual Condition* 56ff.

attempt to make some small headway in doing justice to those insights while remaining true to literary criticism as a discipline predicated on aesthetic concerns.)

If McGann and others are right to insist that both the transformations in literary theory and criticism in the past half-century and the historical shift (marked, for McGann, particularly by William Blake's adventures in printing) into a period in which the preservation of authorial manuscripts and other pre-publication materials alters the nature of editorial practice (and the very nature of literature's material existence), then genetic criticism can be said to be one way of responding to these theoretical and historical changes. First, the field emerges (initially in France) under the concatenation of two governing conditions: the proliferation of what is loosely called "poststructural theory" (e.g. thinkers like Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, and others) and the acquisition by the Bibliothèque nationale de France of large manuscript collections of writers like Heinrich Heine and Victor Hugo.

But genetic criticism is not simply a development within textual studies that adds a dash of *différance*. In an introductory essay on the field Daniel Ferrer writes that, in contradistinction to textual studies, genetic criticism "is concerned with the entire range of documents as evidence of the multiple decisions that were taken along the way, not because they throw light on the proper tenor of the text and help in making new (editorial) decisions, but because the object of genetic criticism is inseparable from the decision-making process itself." It is "a more and a less material pursuit than textual criticism. It is more abstract because its final object is not a printable text but a movement, the process of writing, that can only be approximately reconstituted from existing documents.…It is also more concrete, insofar as it does not go beyond the existing documents toward an ideal text that never existed anywhere, but instead strives to reconstruct…a historically attested chain of events."[16] These views, fairly representative of genetic criticism's self-image,[17] harbor a significant theoretical problem, which can be seen emerging in the contradiction between these last two quoted sentences: Ferrer begins by admitting the ideality of its object and then concludes by denying it. This is, in my view, typical of genetic criticism's desire to have it both ways.

In another introductory essay Ferrer co-wrote with Jed Deppman and Michael Groden, the contradiction is spelled out in such a way as to make clear the debt to a watered-down, frankly naïve "poststructuralist" idea that "all texts are fields of free-playing signifiers": "for geneticists, instead of a fixed, finished object in relation to which all previous states are considered [as with textual critics], a given text becomes—or texts become—the contingent manifestations of a *diachronous* play of signifiers."[18] And the key analytic fodder for genetic criticism, the "avant-texte," "always carries with it the assumption that the material of textual genetics is not a given but rather a critical construction elaborated in relation to a postulated terminal—so-called definitive—state of the work."[19] Here again, the desire to have it both ways is patent. The appositive qualifier "so-called definitive" applied to the idea of the literary work's telos in publication appears as a concession to reality but hampers the genetic critic from saying what he or she truly wants to be able to say: that what is essential is something that slips through our fingers when "writing" turns into a published "text" falsely construed as definitive. But of course the valorization of some ethereal process of writing cannot have any meaning whatsoever without a relationship of one sort or another to its material existence (of which the published text is the paradigm), and this explains the hemming and hawing according to which "One could even say that genetic criticism is not concerned with texts at all but only with

[16] "Production, Invention, and Reproduction" 49.

[17] See also Almuth Grésillon, *Éléments de critique génétique: Lire les manuscrits modernes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), especially 14-31, 136-140, and 203-210.

[18] "Introduction: A Genesis of French Genetic Criticism," in *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*, ed. Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 5.

[19] Deppman, Ferrer, and Groden, "A Genesis of Genetic Criticism" 8.

the writing processes that engender them.…But there is nothing mystical in the activities of genetic criticism, which pursues an immaterial object (a process) through the concrete analysis of the material traces left by that process" (11).

I confess that to me, this sure sounds like a description of one sort of mysticism, a suspicion lent color by the various terms that Ferrer's essay proposes to name genetic criticism's elusive "object"—an ideal "movement," "process," or even "fire" or "dance" of writing's "genesis."[20] Indeed, the very word "genesis" as it is regularly employed (to substitute for something more concrete like "composition") already attests to the theologically weighted idealization to which scholarship becomes susceptible when it when replaces an avowedly ideal conception of the "work" (to be instantiated by a published or publishable text) with the (disavowed) ideal abstraction of "a movement, the process of writing, that can only be approximately reconstituted from existing documents and only imperfectly represented." (49).

Hence, if genetic criticism makes the sort of shift McGann suggests is necessary also to textual studies, it differs in its predominant interest in prepublication documents in their own right, as the legible traces of something it variously terms "movement" or "process" of writing. However, this idea that the *avant-texte* is important in its own right is paradoxical, since the very term implies a constitutive relation to the text it precedes (despite the term having been coined precisely to avoid that implication). This paradox is not necessarily insurmountable, but it can lead to serious methodological and conceptual problems if, as is frequently the case, genetic critics forgo establishing a robust category of the "work." Genetic criticism alleges that textual studies conflates its own eclectic edition with the "ideal work" and thinks that in eschewing the practical goal of the former it has no truck with the latter. But in practice it conflates the (imaginary) totality of a work's *avant-textes* with what it refuses to admit is the "ideal work;" or, even more problematically, it equates it with something like the author's mind or some abstraction like "writing."[21]

My sense, then, is that both textual studies (as critiqued by, but also as practiced by, McGann) and genetic criticism suffer from theoretical incoherencies connected to the problem of defining their (idealized) object of inquiry (whether "work" or "writing"), a related problem concerning the status of authorial intention, and a resulting tendency to evaporate the necessary work of interpretation in one or another of its registers. Whereas McGann's dispute with final-intention editing points out the danger of reifying the author in textual studies, Pierre Bourdieu's rejection of genetic criticism seizes on that field's analogous problem from a (predictably) more intransigently sociological vantage: "In the infinite regress [of genetic documents] towards the primary cause and the ultimate foundation of the artwork's value, one must stop somewhere.…Notions which have become as obvious and banal as those of the artist or 'creator,' like the very words which designate and constitute them, are the products of a long historical process" but, Bourdieu implies, genetic criticism's fetish for precisely this category of the genius artist prevents it from becoming a genuinely genetic science of literary artworks.[22] Or again, "The labour needed to reconstruct the generative formula at the source of a work has nothing to do with that sort of direct and immediate identification between the reader's unique ego and the creator's unique ego which is evoked by the romantic vision of the 'living reading,' understood…as a sort of divinatory intuition of the author's soul.…In short, one cannot re-live or help someone else re-live the experience of others."[23]

---

[20] Ferrer, "Production, Invention, and Reproduction" 49 and 56.

[21] For a (to my mind unconvincing) rejoinder to those hostile to genetic criticism, see Louis Hay, "Critiques de la critique génétique," *The Romanic Review* 86.3 (May 1995): 403-417.

[22] *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 290-91 (translation modified; see *Les règles de l'art: Genèse et structure du champ littéraire* [Paris: Seuil, 1992], 474-75).

[23] Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art* 303 (translation modified; see *Les règles de l'art* 493-94).

Finally, then, if textual studies tends to lack interpretive power, and tends to absolutize authorial intention's finality, genetic criticism lacks a concept of the work or a justification for its guiding interest (which in turn means that it absolutizes authorial genius). In this dissertation I shall draw on both of these fields, taking from (particularly McGann's social text version of) textual theory a concern for the particularity and social constitution of the modernist novel's textual condition, and taking from genetic criticism its scrupulous interpretive attention on the processual development of style. However, I share Bourdieu's belief that "[T]he analysis of the successive versions of a text could not take on its full explanatory force without trying to reconstruct (no doubt a little artificially) the logic of the labor of writing understood as an effort accomplished under the structural constraint of the field and the space of possibles it offers."[24] But as much as it aggrieves me to have agreed with Bourdieu just now, I am happily able to part company with him almost immediately, for I shall be concerned with the actual aesthetics of this situation, whereas his fetishized notion of "science" has no room for a real concept of representation or figuration. We need, I contend, to grasp how the modernist novel already deliberately engages with the stuff of textual and genetic studies, incorporating it as an important hinge on which its aesthetics turn, and through which it relates to the social world without being a mere image of that world.

II. Censorship and Paralipsis—Scandal and *Skándalon*

> Nie darf man kleinlich sein beim Streichen.
> — Theodor W. Adorno

As I suggested above, this program calls for a longer history of the modernist novel than we often get. Moreover, it requires a turn to the field of reception and social scandal in the 19th century. That is to say, in order to address these deeper, properly historical and aesthetic questions, we have to go back to the beginning, to the moment when, as Beckett puts it, "le grand Gustave…entend[it] craquer les bancs de la cour d'assises" (the great Gustave…heard the benches creaking in the court of assizes).[25] That moment—the 1857 obscenity trial of Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, the acquittal, and the ensuing archetypal *succès de scandale*—inaugurates the radical novelistic modernism with which I shall be concerned. Between that point of emergence and the *terminus ad absurdum* in Samuel Beckett's mature postwar writing, an odd literary form with an equally odd relation to the socio-historical world unfolds itself, elaborates its concept. The story I shall try to tell is not exactly the history of a scandalous, heroically transgressive modernism—that tale has been told eloquently and often. But it is a history that begins in scandal, and in the relationship between scandal and a nascent modernist aesthetics. In general literary scandals would seem to come about when a work says publicly what (according to the courts, the postmasters, the journalistic "fourth estate," and so on) it should have kept under wraps. That is evidently what befell Flaubert and a long series of other well-known instances—Baudelaire, Zola, Pater, Wilde, Hardy, Joyce, D.H. Lawrence, Barnes, Radclyffe Hall, Woolf, Henry Miller, Nabokov….

However, a curious thing about Flaubert's trial is that there is no good explanation of just why he ran afoul of the Second Empire judiciary. As Dominick LaCapra has noted, "One can bring together a number of plausible or possible reasons, but they do not add up to a fully convincing explanation of why Flaubert was tried for what he had written. There even seemed to have been

---

[24] *The Rules of Art* 196-97 (translation modified; see *Les règles de l'art* 324-25). Bourdieu quotes from Pierre-Marc de Biasi's editor's foreword to Gustave Flaubert, *Carnets de travail* (Paris: Balland, 1988), 7.

[25] *Molloy* (Paris: Minuit, 1982), 172; *Three Novels: Molloy, Malone Dies, The Unnamable* (New York: Groves Press, 2013), 121.

forceful grounds for the dismissal of the case."[26] The most common assumption, then as now, is that Flaubert's novel was a pretext, a way of getting at the *Revue de Paris* that published it—the journal was considered to be affiliated with a republican opposition to Louis Napoleon's government,[27] and had already received two official warnings earlier in 1856 for what were considered to be actionable infractions against the newly increased restrictions on the freedom of the press. The editors of the *Revue* therefore certainly made every effort to avoid drawing unwanted imperial attention, deleting so many passages in their serialization of Flaubert's novel that the author insisted on inserting footnotes written in his name that announced the excisions and disavowed the text as "des fragments et non pas un ensemble" (fragments and not an ensemble).[28] This act perhaps drew further attention to the serialization, but in an earlier installment the editors had already excised the now-notorious *fiacre* passage (where Emma Bovary and Léon Dupuis consummate their adulterous affair during a six-hour carriage ride around Rouen) and had suggested its obscenity in the footnote they used to mark the deletion. Flaubert's attorney Jules Senard argues in his *plaidoirie* that this caused the trial ("Eh bien, cette malheureuse suppression, c'est le procès!" [that unfortunate suppression, that's the whole trial!]).[29]

Whatever the (finally contingent) occasion for the trial, the point is that the difficulty of naming such an occasion, of proving that any potential occasion truly matters, echoes a deeper and yet stranger truth: a close look finds that there is nothing actually indecent or morally outrageous in the novel on trial. There is no one place or set of places where one could point and say: here, these are the sentences that constitute an "outrage à la morale publique et religieuse et aux bonnes mœurs" (outrage against public and religious morals and to common decency).[30] The defense attorney insists on this point and, in the process, brings into focus one of the main structural features of the trial as an act of reading. We can see this in his repeated comparisons between the subtlety of Flaubert's touch "quand il arrive aux parties difficiles, précisément à la dégradation" (when he arrives at the difficult parts, precisely at degradation), and the more explicit and salacious, if also more obviously and appropriately judgmental, treatments of comparable subjects and scenes by "nos grands auteurs classiques" (our great classic authors) (*Œuvres* 488). Senard claims that, rather than describing a morally questionable occurrence, Flaubert "se contente d'un mot" (contents himself with a word). And the attorney follows his client's lead, deploying a tactic of paralipsis in court: "Si nous avions écrit la moitié ou le quart de ce qu'a écrit M. Mérimée, j'éprouverais quelque embarras dans la tâche qui m'est donnée, ou plutôt je la modifierais. Au lieu de dire ce que j'ai dit…je dirais: la littérature a ses droits….Je m'en tiendrais là, j'absoudrais, et vous absoudriez" (If we had written half or a quarter of what Monsieur Mérimée wrote, I would suffer some little embarrassment in the task that is given me, or rather I would modify it. Instead of saying what I said…I would say: literature has its rights.…I would hold fast to that, I would acquit, and you would acquit) (495).

But that is precisely where his reading methods differ from those of Ernest Pinard, the imperial prosecutor. For his part, Pinard obsesses precisely over the omitted "fiacre" passage as an index to all the novel's outrages and spares no effort to demonstrate that "si la *Revue de Paris* baisse les stores du fiacre, elle nous laisse pénétrer dans la chambre où se donnent les rendez-vous" (But if

---

[26] Madame Bovary *on Trial* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982), 16-17.

[27] Yvan Leclerc, *Crimes écrits: La littérature en procès au 19e siècle* (Paris: Plon, 1991), 139. See also Christine Haynes, "The Politics of Publishing during the Second Empire: The Trial of *Madame Bovary* Revisited," *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 23.2 (2005): 1-27 and LaCapra, Madame Bovary *on Trial* 20ff.

[28] Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary (Mœurs de Province)* [October-December 1856], *Revue de Paris*, vol. 40 (Geneva: Slatkine, 1972), 250.

[29] Flaubert, *Œuvres complètes, Tome III: 1851-1862*, ed. Claudine Gothot-Mersch, et al. (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 2013), 495.

[30] Flaubert, *Œuvres* 517.

the *Revue de Paris* lowers the blinds of the carriage, it lets us penetrate into the room where the trysts are held) (473)—in other words, that what is passed over by the editorial excisions is supplied in other parts of the text. (And Pinard's claim effectively makes the editorial suppressions into a part of the text itself, a drawing down of blinds within the story itself.) The point is that Senard and Pinard are both right and both wrong. Senard is right that "ce n'est pas par omission qu'un auteur peut pécher en pareille matière" (an author cannot sin by omission in such a situation), and the *fiacre* passage is an omission (495). But Pinard—however unsuccessful he is at locating positive instances of what troubles him about *Madame Bovary*, something he easily could do with a piece of journalism tried under the same law—is right to intuit something scandalous in the novel.

It is here worth recalling the etymological background of the word scandal here: the Greek *skándalon*, meaning "a trap, a stumbling block, a cause or occasion of stumbling," but also, as René Girard has shown, an obstacle that both attracts and repels at once. It is a perennial error to think of it as solely a material object.[31] I do not wish to belabor the history of this word (the figurative meaning of which gives us our contemporary concept of "scandal" entirely through the Judeo-Christian use in the Torah and the Gospels),[32] but it is worth noting that it has a polyvalent meaning. In the New Testament, for instance, it means the Gospel both as incitement to conversion and as obstacle to such faith (the discrepancy between Christ's humanity and his ministry); both an offense that repulses and a temptation that entices. In Matthew 16:18-23, Christ calls Peter the foundation-stone upon which the Church will be built, and almost immediately afterwards rebukes Peter for tempting him to refuse his martyrdom ("Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence [*skándalon*] unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." As Gustav Stählin notes, "Because the way of Jesus to the cross became a *skándalon* for Peter, [Peter] became a *skándalon* for Jesus, i.e. a personified temptation to turn aside from God's will."[33]

There are two things I want to get from this. First, Christ's reprimand reveals that the *skándalon* is basically the index of a difference between the divine or absolute perspective and the empirical or human perspective. In other words, Peter stumbles over the thought of an intolerable human suffering, but in so doing reifies Jesus as an object, or even a scapegoat, and thereby misses the point. Secondly, concerning this passage in particular, Girard remarks that "Le scandale est un rapport aussi néfaste pour celui qui le provoque que pour celui qui le subit. Le scandale est toujours double et la distinction entre l'être scandaleux et l'être scandalisé tend toujours à s'abolir ; c'est le scandalisé qui répand le scandale autour de lui" (the scandal is a relation as nefarious for the one who provokes it as for the one who undergoes it. The scandal is always double and the distinction between the scandalous being and the scandalized being always tends to abolish itself; it is the

---

[31] See *Des choses cachées depuis la fondation du monde* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1978): "Dans les Évangiles, le *skandalon* n'est jamais un objet matériel, c'est toujours autrui, ou c'est moi-même en tant que je suis aliéné à l'autre" (In the Gospels, the *skándalon* is not a material object; it is always another [or others], or it is me myself insofar as I am alienated from the other) (439). Likewise, "Même dans son acception moderne, qui fait du scandale une simple représentation, le scandaleux ne peut jamais se définir de façon univoque. En lui, le désir et l'indignation se renforcent réciproquement par un feedback qui ne peut se ramener à rien d'autre ici qu'au jeu des interférences mimétiques; le scandaleux ne serait pas scandaleux s'il ne se constituait pas en exemple irrésistible et impossible offert à l'imitation des hommes, modèle et antimodèle tout à la fois" (Even in its modern acceptation, which turns the scandal into a mere representation, what is scandalous can never be defined in a univocal fashion. In it, desire and indignation reinforce one another reciprocally in a feedback loop that comes down to nothing other than the play of mimetic interferences; the scandalous would not be scandalous if it did not constitute an irresistible and impossible example open to human imitation, model and anti-model all at once) (448).

[32] Outside of this tradition, where the Greek term translates an analogous Hebrew term, the word is used exclusively literally. See Gustav Stählin's article on "σκάνδαλον" in Gerhard Friedrich, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Volume VII (Grand Rapids Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1964), 339-358.

[33] Stählin, "σκάνδαλον" 348.

scandalized one who spreads the scandal around him- or herself).[34] Or again, more generally: "L'indignation scandalisée est toujours désir fébrile de différencier le coupable et l'innocent, d'assigner les responsabilités, de dévoiler l'ignominie jusqu'au bout et de la châtier comme elle le mérite.…Cet élément de curiosité avide et morbide rejoint, bien sûr, la passion démystificatrice.…C'est toujours le scandale qui appelle la démystification" but crucially, "la démystification, loin de mettre fin au scandale, le propage et l'universalise" (Scandalized indignation is always a feverish desire to differentiate the guilty and the innocent, to assign responsibilities, to expose ignominy completely and to punish it as it deserves.…This element of avid, morbid curiosity certainly relates to the passion for demystification.…It is always a scandal that incites demystification [but crucially] demystification, far from putting an end to the scandal, propagates and universalizes it).[35] This is because the offended, the scandalized, wants to remove the scandal, *qua* seemingly determinate obstacle, and to punish the party responsible, the scapegoat. This desire, however, misrecognizes a deeper and ineluctable stumbling block that cannot be precisely localized but which nonetheless forces a reaction. What is scandalous, then, is not exactly a particular empirical object; it is a relation, and one that proliferates.

These two points about a scandalousness subtending but irreducible to our conventional sense of scandal—that it indexes an incommensurability between an empirical and a non-empirical perspective, that it entails a mimetic relation of simultaneous attraction and repulsion that in turn proliferates itself—have an important conceptual bearing on the ways that social reception reacts to modernist novels which, like Flaubert's, manage to be scandalous by way of omission. In each chapter, we shall see a social act of reading (a tribunal, newspapers, the literary marketplace, professional criticism, and finally the act of reading as such) that emerges so as to try and fill in the holes that characterize the "whole novel."

In Flaubert's case, the prosecutor's error is not that he intuits a scandal; it is that he wrongly separates what troubles him about the novel (in other words, the superficial moral and social controversy) from the deeper stumbling block hidden within the more obvious methodological obstacle to the prosecution's argument: "Quand on soumet à votre appréciation un article de journal, on voit tout de suite où le délit commence et où il finit [mais] ici il ne s'agit pas d'un article de journal, mais d'un roman tout entier.…Que faire dans cette situation?…Lire tout le roman? C'est impossible" (When one submits a journal article for your judgment, one sees right away where the offense begins and where it ends [but] at issue here is not a journal article but an entire novel.…What is to be done in such a situation?…Read all of the novel? Impossible).[36] It was in fact impossible, for more reasons than one. This is the real scandal, the stumbling block. Immediately, of course, there is the fact of the editorial excisions. But it turns out that Flaubert's novel—even and especially within the very deleted passages where obscenity was sure to be found—functions paraliptically, as we shall see in detail in chapter one. That is to say, Pinard's methodological stumbling block is also an aesthetic one—and the social or moral scandal is its epiphenomenon. The imperial prosecutor intuits and registers the deeper scandal when he admits that prosecuting the superficial one runs into a problem: it cannot grasp the novel as a unified object. Because Flaubert's novel is not a narrative totality or the sum total of a series of details or passages. Because it is what Flaubert calls (in a footnote to the *Revue de Paris* serialization disavowing the printed text) an

---

[34] Girard, *Des choses cachées* 441.

[35] Girard, *Des choses cachées* 448-49. Likewise, see *Le bouc émissaire* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1982): "Le scandale finit toujours par investir et s'incorporer ce qui lui échappe le plus complètement, ce qui devrait lui rester le plus étranger" (The scandal always ends up investing and incorporating that which eludes it most completely, that which should be most foreign to it) (191).

[36] Flaubert, *Œuvres* 439.

"ensemble" irreducible to the sum of details comprising it, and it is constructed by way of omission, elision, paralipsis.

Hence, at each stage—from the editorial demands for excisions to the prosecution's frenetic attempts to lend positive form to the transgressions felt but not present in the *fiacre* passage, and finally to the defense's repeated reliance on literal acts of paralipsis—the reception of *Madame Bovary* responds to a scandal underneath the more obvious controversy, a scandal in and of the form that Flaubert achieves with the novel. In short, the scandal of *Madame Bovary*, that which is the (aesthetic) substantial ground or sufficient reason for the more quotidian controversy that is the trial, is not any salacious or "lascivious" content, but rather a deeper evocation, an unnamed formal development to which the trial stands as a slightly bewildered reaction. The social and legal controversy of *Madame Bovary*'s reception is an expression of the felt need to name what is not there in Flaubert's novel, what is in the most literal of senses obscene. And therefore also an attempt to define what kind of stumbling block Flaubert had offered the public.

Yvan Leclerc perceptively remarks that, after his acquittal, and as soon as he received a copy of the first volume edition of *Madame Bovary*, Flaubert marked all of the places where the *Revue de Paris* editors had effected alterations. "Flaubert est sans doute le premier à inscrire la censure dans le corps même de l'œuvre, à intégrer dans le texte l'un des moments de sa genèse, ou de son antigenèse" (Flaubert is doubtless the first to inscribe censorship within the very body of the work, to integrate into the text one of the moments of its genesis, or of its antigenesis).[37] This retrospective gesture—restoring the excisions themselves as positive facts alongside the restored text they deleted—suggests the extent to which, even prior to the trial, the scandal of revision is indelibly inscribed within Flaubert's text. More broadly, as Leclerc's formidable genetic analysis of Flaubert's preserialization revisions shows, while the moral impulses of the specific editorial demands (which strikingly prefigure the trial's own choices of textual attention) were anathema to Flaubert, he put those demands to aesthetic purpose, refining and subtilizing—moving from the conventional notion of "le mot juste" toward a paraliptical mode of figuration.[38] In short, the work that inaugurates novelistic modernism is built out of what it excludes: the internalization of censorship, the transformation of a so-called "realist style" through methods of innuendo and paralipsis, and finally, with the "definitive" 1873 Charpentier edition's inclusion of the trial record as an appendix, the integration of the novel's own antagonist into what I call, following Flaubert, its "ensemble." Moreover, the novel as an ensemble constructed paraliptically comes to light uniquely through the trial—and the trial becomes one element of that ensemble.

But if Flaubert was "the first to inscribe censorship within the very body of the work, to integrate into the text…its genesis, or its antigenesis," he was not the last. And the modernism that can and must say along with Joyce that "G.F[.] can rest having made me"[39] will be definitively shaped not only by the radical aestheticism Flaubert espoused, but also by this peculiar kind of scandal. This is the scandal, the stumbling block, of revision: in which the bibliographical, the editorial, and other "extraneous" elements figure as the indices of a deeper paraliptical formal gesture incorporating compositional prehistories and publication and reception histories within a new kind of novelistic work. And this dissertation will trace the permutations it undergoes from Flaubert in the wake of the 1848 revolutions to Beckett in the storm of World War II. In each instance the underlying questions will be: what is this newly transformed thing that is instantiated by the novelistic work and takes the place of an aesthetic whole as traditionally conceived? What

[37] Leclerc, *Crimes écrits* 216.
[38] See *Crimes écrits* 153-167.
[39] *The James Joyce Archive*, ed. Michael Groden, et al., vol. 30 (New York: Garland, 1977-79), 329.

versions of a paraliptical mode or style does the text marshal, and in what social forms of publication and reception are they registered?

In chapter one, as I have been suggesting, the new scandalous thing—the literary work as stumbling block—is something that Flaubert calls the "ensemble." This amounts to the text of the novel we think we know, but also the editorial suppressions (as positive facts) and also the trial itself. As we shall see, Flaubert's methods of pushing the generic form of the novel to its limits work by paralipsis, and these take two primary forms, each of which is uniquely registered in the jurists' readings of the novel in court. First, with respect to the central *fiacre* passage, the trial shows by its obsession with a bit of text that could not possibly be legally culpable (since it was not printed) that the effect and the formal structure of the passage is that of insinuation-by-omission. The description of the six-hour carriage ride is not a description of adultery but of various banal locales along its route. These details work by what I shall term "referential alibi"—a mode of novelistic description that voids out its "real" referent in order to insert a generative lacuna within it. The assumedly obscene sexual innuendo can inhere as what is significant or real only because it is effected paraliptically, through (but not present or localizable in) banal empirical details that in turn exist only in order to show that they do not exhaust the real. In other words, there is no fact of the unrepresented adultery behind or preexisting the *fiacre* passage that effects it by paralipsis.

The second of Flaubert's paraliptical techniques is his odd use of narrative perspective and judgment. If the *fiacre* passage requires us to reconceive of Flaubertian description and things like the reality effect, then with the other focal points of the trial (likewise marked by suppressions) questions of narratorial perspective, judgment, and citation will demand a reworking of the category of *style indirect libre* (free indirect discourse). The anterior discourse that seems to be indirectly represented is actually conjured up as something unlocalizable, and the opposed perspectives of character and narrator are a consequence of this and of their reciprocal complicity. There is no way to restore the discourse as a "whole"—that is, the imagined direct discourse of the character along with a narratorial judgment on it. The point of *style indirect libre* in *Madame Bovary* is that it works by paralipsis. It effects an unlocalizable, absent direct discourse that it thereby puts in question. It effects strictly unlocalizable perspectives of character and narrator. And, as was the case with the *fiacre* passage, one assumes these things are localized. But the point is that generating such effects paraliptically means that "the narrator" participates just as much as Emma does in the various "formes convenues" (conventional forms) and clichés that fill out her life.[40] As we shall see, Pinard and Senard are both right and both wrong as they theorize two of the most fundamental and influential aspects of Flaubertian style, what passes for detailed descriptive realism and what comes to be called *style indirect libre*. Referential alibi and *style indirect libre* are, then, *Madame Bovary*'s main versions of paralipsis; they are the mode of appearance of Flaubert's ensemble. And so to understand what we think we already know about Flaubert, we must come to understand how *Madame Bovary* transgresses the limits of the novelistic, and the limits of the novel, to forge an ensemble.

I shall turn in the second chapter to the British *fin de siècle* and Oscar Wilde, whose inheritance of a Flaubertian aesthetic is filtered through Paterian aestheticism. Here the problem shifts from the novel as a generic problem to the artwork as a conceptual one: not what is "un livre sur rien," but what is the work of art in the *fin de siècle*? In this chapter I shall argue that the minor controversy of *The Picture*'s 1890 reviews (and Wilde's epistolary disputes with the journal reviewers and editors) work much as did Flaubert's obscenity trial in the first chapter. It is a social instantiation or epiphenomenon of the deeper stumbling block into which Wilde transforms his novelistic artwork. The Wildean analogue to Flaubert's ensemble is built out of a novel (about the

[40] Flaubert, *Œuvres* 187.

incommensurable relation between a man and a picture that might be his soul) that exists in two incommensurable forms (the 1890 journal edition and the 1891 volume edition), as well as a press dispute that Wilde disavows but reincorporates into that novel by way of a preface of aestheticist epigrams drawn often verbatim from that epistolary dispute (and first published in a journal before migrating into the 1891 text). But this is not all. Wilde revises both the novel and the nature of aestheticism across the disputes and the compositional changes they subtly inform, finally making *The Picture* into something else. Moving from Flaubert's transformation of the novel, Wilde turns the question from a concern with generic form to a concern with the work of art as such. Wilde's new novelistic artwork also enfolds an entire career of aestheticist art criticism itself concerned with the Renaissance question of the *paragone* (the relations of the different arts) as well as the relation of art and journalism. In other words, Wilde's one novel manages to include (by omission) not only its reception and revisions, but also the entire antagonism between his aestheticism and the journalistic world, as a revisionary realization of his larger project of "the Critic as Artist." This, as we shall see, is what Wilde means when he criticizes Paterian aestheticism for not fully living up to the task of "realiz[ing] the nineteenth century" by including and retroactively transforming "the dreams and ideas and feelings of myriad generations," but also refusing to recoil from the ephemerality of the journalistic literary marketplace into some ostensibly timeless realm of pure art.[41]

Wilde's most intelligent interlocutor in the review debacle tempts us to follow him in dubbing this new notion of the work an "apotheosis," but my argument will be that across the newspaper controversy Wilde revises the static aestheticism implicit in that word. For his aestheticism is but the visible effulgence of his deeper transformation of the nature of the artwork in the *fin-de-siècle* world. Consequently, I shall term Wilde's analogue to the Flaubertian ensemble, quite (deceptively) simply, a "picture." Wilde constructs his picture by two main modes of paralipsis, and each hinges on an essential heterogeneity, perhaps even an ekphrastic duplicity, related to that of the novel's titular picture. The first is to be found in the newspaper debates over whether or not the journal edition of the novel was immoral: there Wilde's posture of contempt for reviewers passes over how his own counter-interpretations of the 1890 text subtly revise that text in advance. Review as paraliptical revision. But moreover, the aestheticist novelist enlists compositional help from the plebian critics he utterly rejects. Secondly, the revised 1891 volume uses this mode of revision to realize the novel through a kind of allusion-by-omission. The volume's preface responded to this quarrel by ostentatiously rejecting both the language of morality and the journalistic marketplace as beneath art's notice. But it did so in epigrams drawn verbatim from the earlier newspaper clashes, quietly transforming the relation between aestheticist text and marketplace context. This shift, I hope to demonstrate, also stands at the heart of the novel's revisions. Wilde's changes make a virtue of incompletion, regrounding the novel in an interpolated allusion to the Ovidian myth of Cephalus and Procris. The allusion itself, however, only becomes legible in light of Wilde's reference to it elsewhere, in a contemporary journalistic piece he wrote on the newspaper art critic T.G. Wainewright and an unfinished painting of the same myth by Giulio Romano. The allusion itself thus encodes—by paraliptically revising—the relation between art and journalism. In order to grasp *The Picture*'s surprising anticipation of a modernist "mythical method," the novel must be read through the newspaper journalism it disavows. Later techniques of allusion thus emerge as successors to a Wildean social sin of omission, which revises aestheticism by mirroring a classicist eternity in the inconstant waters of newspaper ephemera.

The transition from the 19th century to the 20th is characterized, in the story I shall tell, not so much by a rejection of decadence and aestheticism (as in Wyndham Lewis's

---

41 "Mr Pater's Last Volume" (*The Speaker*, 22 March 1890), rpt. in *The Soul of Man under Socialism and Selected Critical Prose*, ed. Linda Dowling (New York: Penguin, 2001), 25-26.

"BLAST…VICTORIAN VAMPIRE" and "CURSE…THE BRITANNIC ÆSTHETE CREAM OF THE SNOBBISH EARTH…SNEAK AND SWOT OF THE SCHOOLROOM")[42] as by an intensification, a radicalization, a formal metabolization, of the transformed Wildean aestheticism. Whereas the issue of defining Flaubert's and Wilde's works as novelistic stumbling blocks occurred in the registers of the generic and the conceptual, respectively, with Barnes's interwar novel *Ryder* and Beckett's wartime novel *Watt*, those earlier dilemmas seep down into the bedrock of the text, the very substance of the novel. And the site of reading and its scandals is no longer the Imperial courtroom or the "fourth estate" courtroom of the press; it moves inward.

In chapter three, we shall see Barnes internalizing, as the formal syntax of her novel, the *frisson* of those earlier 19th-century social/textual scandals. That charge comes to invest the very fabric of meaning, expression, and style in *Ryder*. For the asterisks are a scandalous matter, in the first instance because they constitute Barnes's decision to make visible to every reader the editorial decision to avoid the controversy of a legal battle. But beyond their tangential relation to (possible) social controversy in the more usual sense, the asterisks are a scandal, a stumbling block. Again, the site has moved inward from Flaubert and Wilde: the stumbling block is not something only noticeable by recourse to a social controversy of reception (although that spectre haunts the novel). Rather, every reader stumbles over *Ryder*, necessarily. The asterisks are unavoidable. But they are just one amongst a plethora of stylistic mannerisms the novel deploys. If one is going to read *Ryder*, not only does one have to read the asterisks; one also has to read styles ranging from Chaucerian verse and Jacobean broadsheets to the picaresque and the sentimental, and most crucially, Freudian dream-narratives. The asterisks, then, as something one must read, are recuperated or reconstructed as another stylistic manner—the style of censorship, itself essentially connected with the dream-work.

For Barnes, then, the corollary to Flaubert's ensemble and Wilde's picture is something to be grasped in terms of the dream-work: rather than producing a unified work with hidden depths, Barnes's stylistic mannerisms work paratactically, traversing lateral boundaries while flattening out the vertical dimension of surface and depth each style paraliptically conjures. And that work (process not product) is a new kind of literary entity, what Barnes herself calls a "reconstruction."[43] If Barnes's novel should be defined as "reconstruction" understood in some sense psychoanalytically, then the primary techniques of paralipsis by which the work of reconstruction proceeds are construable in terms of the neglected fourth term of Freudian dream-work, "secondary working-over." Barnes's paraliptical method is to be found in a mannerism of style that conjures up the effects of depths, secrets, latent contents paraliptically, while displacing that sort of semantic or symbolic fulfillment onto the syntax amongst given manners.

This is most immediately available in the way she recuperates the style of censorship via the asterisks. But the editorial censorship, the decision to represent it typographically in the text, and the rhetorical framing of the foreword together restage the same interpretive dilemma involved in the novel's omnipresent gesture of adverting to hidden depths the excavation of which turns out to be distinctly non-revelatory. And if the asterisks will enable us to understand how *Ryder*'s novelistic mannerism eludes a latent/manifest paradigm, they are significant precisely because they disturb our ability to interpret them in conventional ways, as symbolizing or encoding or representing some latent content. They disturb us in the same way that what Sigmund Freud calls "the navel of the

[42] Wyndham Lewis, ed., *BLAST 1* [June 20, 1914] (Santa Rosa, CA: Black Sparrow Press, 2002) 11, 13.
[43] Djuna Barnes, *Ryder* [1928, 1979] (Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive, 1990), vii.

dream" disturbs both dreamer and interpreter.[44] Like Wilde but even more deliberately, she enfolds an antagonistic external reception back within the novel itself; but she also intensifies this dynamic. Not merely an invitation to read *Ryder* in terms of its censorship, her gesture is to make it impossible to do anything else. The issue is no longer only a question of defining the novel as a generic object (Flaubert), or the work of art as a conceptual object (Wilde); now all of this has been internalized as the very substance of the text. The Wildean question of style becomes a first-order problem of the actual words on the page.

Finally, the fourth chapter will address Samuel Beckett's transitional novel *Watt*, written mostly while the author was in hiding in unoccupied France (having fled from the Gestapo in Paris when his Resistance cell was compromised), and published in 1953 (in a limited Parisian printing, followed by a broader American publication in 1959). With the question of the duck, the story is more labyrinthine than with Barnes's asterisks, and its scandalousness hinges on an involved genetic inquiry, although the shadow of social controversy hangs over it. Three of the determining factors in that story, which I shall leave in the background, are the editorial demand for an additional story for Beckett's 1934 volume *More Pricks than Kicks* and its subsequent rejection by the same editor; Beckett's witness for the prosecution in Morris Sinclair's 1937 libel case against Oliver St. John Gogarty and his novel-memoir *As I Was Going Down Sackville Street* (which involved a cross-examination of his own books that had been banned in Ireland); and the police seizure of printing plates of *Watt* from the publisher Olympia Press, on the misinformation that they were pornographic.[45] More important than these informing threats of social controversy is the fact that, like Barnes's novel, *Watt* makes the very act of reading its own stumbling block—from the wealth of seemingly editorial footnotes and markers of unreliable or failed transmission, such as " ? " and "(Hiatus in MS),"[46] to the presence of the "Addenda," a final section of thirty-seven manuscript fragments with no clear relationship to the narrative or the body of the text. But while Barnes's work made the question of intention paramount by way of fusing literal censorship to psychic censorship via her mannerist stylizations, Beckett's attacks an issue of intention (the final addendum is "no symbols where none intended") by way of fusing the structure of reference to the issue of textual genetics.

I shall approach the question by way of an erratum that appears in many published editions of *Watt*. As I noted earlier, Beckett knowingly let an uncertain reference to an otherwise deleted duck persist in roughly half of the novel's editions because it indexes a series of referential and genetic links spanning his entire career in print. While he had initially marked it for deletion, the typesetter missed the eponymous character's question "what had become of the duck." This erratum instantiates—at the intersection where Beckett's formal practice meets both the material textual condition of publication history and the complicated network of prepublication genetic prehistory,—an otherwise abstract Beckettian theme. The erroneous question incorporates the duck partially and as something missing into *Watt*, indexing a referential/genetic relay that not only traverses the novel's composition but also what Beckett called "the series" of his works, lodging an archive of deleted writings within all of those works. But this means lodging them there as genetic references that obtain only partially. With *Watt*, Beckett achieves a mode of figuration that will characterize the rest of his career: from this point onward, figuration is essentially referential, but reference is a kind of revision-by-decomposition. Even first-order reference is problematic in Beckett's work, because nothing signifies fully in one

---

[44] *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*, 24 vols., gen. ed. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974), 4:111n and 5:525; *Gesammelte Werke*, 18 vols., ed. Anna Freud, et al. (Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 1991-1998), 2/3: 116n1 and 530.

[45] Maurice Girodias, the owner of Olympia Press, did publish pornography and of course had already raised the hackles of the censors he published Nabokov's *Lolita* in 1955.

[46] *Watt* 23; 196.

register and nothing signifies only in one register. By tracing the genetic and referential links opened up by the duck erratum, I shall uncover a non-sequential dynamic of relations that keep propagating meaningful relations across registers precisely because they never achieve closure or fulfillment in one register. This is Beckett's paraliptical technique for building something akin to Flaubert's impossible ensemble.

And its procedure not only means that *Watt* paraliptically includes its unpublished genetic prehistory within it, for it turns out that the referential/genetic relations go beyond the limits of the individual novel, to include an earlier short story (written in 1933), which Beckett later abandoned but which was posthumously published in 2014. The new kind of novelistic work—the stumbling block—that Beckett forges with *Watt* is, then, something we can understand (once again borrowing a term from the author) as "the series." Beckett used this term to refer to the sequence of novels he had written in the 1940s, but it has come to mean his whole œuvre. But the series is not a linear development of discrete individual literary works. It is a polyvalent, nonteleological series of referential/genetic relations that manages to include within any given text the half-present, half-absent rumor of any number of other texts and serial relations between texts (from unpublished manuscripts to seemingly unrelated published works).

Across this trajectory from Flaubert to Beckett, I shall argue that in the most hermetic modernist novels, the social repressed returns in the aesthetics of the textual. I shall draw on textual scholarship's rigor, but exceeds its horizons so as to explain the aesthetic logic whereby uncompromising novels let the social world in by omission, forcing us to register what is no longer there.

III. Aesthetics and the Textuality of Things Passed Over

To get a sense of the interrelation of the twin heritage of a different sort of aestheticism inaugurated by Flaubert and a bibliographical-*cum*-aesthetic scandal defined by revision, as well as to showcase both the benefits and the limits of textual and genetic approaches, it is helpful to take a glance at Flaubert's notes on Hegel's lectures on aesthetics, which were just recently transcribed and published.[47] It is in the course of his first partial reading, in the mid-1840s, of Charles Bénard's abridged translation of Hegel's lectures (based on Hotho's 1835 text) that many of the essential aspects of Flaubert's aesthetics begin to develop.[48] But the notes are revealing in other ways as well. I would like to seize on a small moment in Flaubert's notes from the introductory lectures. It is a moment that not only helps to clear up some persistent misunderstandings of Flaubert's ideas on art but also, by way of an inadvertent error in transcription (or perhaps the loss of a page or more of Flaubert's notes?), interposes a peculiar and peculiarly telling lacuna.

Taking notes from the introductory section on the concept of the beauty of art (subsection on the artwork as both derived from the sensuous or sensible realm and presented to the senses), Flaubert transcribes and underlines Hegel's claim about the relationship between the ideal and the material, the spiritual and the natural, the intellectual and the sensuous elements in art: "der Geist sucht im Sinnlichen des Kunstwerks weder die konkrete Materiatur…welche die Begierde verlangt, noch den allgemeinen, nur ideellen Gedanken, sondern er will sinnliche Gegenwart, die zwar sinnlich bleiben, aber ebensosehr von dem Gerüste seiner bloßen Materialität befreit werden soll" (spirit seeks in the sensuous aspect of the artwork neither the concrete materialization…that the

[47] "Gustave Flaubert 5, Dix ans de critique: Notes inédites de Flaubert sur l'*Esthétique* de Hegel," *La Revue des lettres modernes* 816-824, ed. Gisèle Séginger (Paris-Caen: Lettres modernes minard, 2005).

[48] He would return to take another set of notes in 1872, with a view to *Bouvard et Pécuchet*.

appetites crave nor the universal, merely ideal thoughts, rather it wants sensuous presence, which indeed should remain sensuous, but likewise should equally be liberated from the scaffolding of its mere materiality).[49]

This is followed, in Hegel's text, by the phrase "Deshalb ist das Sinnliche im Kunstwerk im Vergleich mit dem unmittelbaren Dasein der Naturdinge zum bloßen *Schein* erhoben, und das Kunstwerk steht in der *Mitte* zwischen der unmittelbaren Sinnlichkeit und dem ideellen Gedanken" (There by the sensuous in the artwork, in comparison with the immediate determinate existence of things in nature, is raised up to mere appearance, and the artwork stands in the middle between immediate sensuousness and ideal thought).[50] Bénard's abbreviated translation of this passage, however, gives "un objet sensible dégagé de tout l'échafaudage de la matérialité. L'objet d'art tient le milieu entre le sensible et le rationnel. C'est quelque chose d'idéal qui apparaît comme matériel" (a sensuous object released from all the scaffolding of materiality. The art object holds the middle ground between the sensuous and the rational. It is something ideal that appears as material),[51] of which Flaubert copies the first phrase, then skips down to the bottom of Bénard's page and summarizes.

Here is the Bénard passage that Flaubert next summarizes, with the parts he picks up emphasized: "Comment le côté sensible se retrouve-t-il *dans l'artiste* aussi bien que dans l'œuvre d'art ? Il en est ici du sujet qui crée comme de l'objet qu'il produit. *Nous retrouvons en lui les mêmes principes. D'abord c'est l'esprit qui est en jeu, mais de manière à renfermer en lui-même le moment de la sensibilité.* Ce n'est pas un travail mécanique, une habilité manuelle qui n'a pas conscience de ce qu'elle fait, ou qui est dirigée par des règles apprises ; ce n'est pas non plus une manière de produire semblable à celle du savant, qui part du sensible pour s'élever aux conceptions pure de la raison ; mais *l'élément de l'intelligence et celui de la sensibilité sont combinés et fondus ensemble dans le travail créateur de l'artiste*" (How is the sensuous side found *within the artist* just as much as within the artwork? It is here inherent in the subject who creates just as it is inherent in the object he produces. *We find in him the same principles. Primarily, it is spirit that is at stake, but in such a way as to contain within it the moment of the sensuous.* This is not a mechanical activity, a physical facility unconscious of what it does, or which is directed by rote rules; it is likewise not a manner of production comparable to the scientist's or scholar's, which parts from the sensuous so as to elevate itself to the pure conceptions of reason; rather *the element of the intellect and that of the sensuous are combined and merged together in the creative labor of the artist*).[52] Flaubert's notes: "Chez l'artiste, même partie d'élément sensible; c'est l'esprit qui est en jeu mais de manière à renfermer en lui-même le moment de la sensibilité. L'élément de l'intelligence et celui de…" (In the artist, same portion of the sensuous element; it is spirit that is at stake but in such a way as to contain within it the moment of the sensuous. The element of the intellect and that of…).[53]

At this point, and at the end of a page, Flaubert's notes stop. On the next page (not on the verso but on a new sheet) they pick up with

> et la fatalité, les intérêts particuliers et les intérêts généraux etc. Hegel pense que cette opposition constitue la vérité même, le fond et l'essence de toutes choses, le but suprême de l'univers est la solution que donne Hegel au problème fondamental de toute philosophie et par conséquent aussi à la question morale, solution qu'il

[49] G.W.F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik*, 3 vols., Bände 13-15 in *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, new rev. ed., ed. Eva Moldenhauer und Karl Markus Michel (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1969-79), I: 60; *Hegel's Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, 2 vols., trans. T.M. Knox (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, 1988), I: 38, translation modified.
[50] Hegel, *Vorlesungen* I: 60.
[51] Charles Bénard, trans., *Cours d'esthétique, par W.-Fr. Hegel*, vol. 1 (Paris: André, 1840), 34.
[52] Bénard, *Cours d'esthétique* 34-35. Bénard's text here is, again, a condensation of Hegel's.
[53] Séginger, "Gustave Flaubert 5" 266; Bénard, *Cours d'esthétique* 34. This summarizes Hegel, *Vorlesungen* I: 62.

> revendique en faveur de l'art dans l'hypothèse qui lui donne pour but le perfectionnement morale. – Dans toutes les doctrines énoncées, l'art est relatif à quelque chose qui lui est étranger – l'art est appelé à manifester la vérité sous la forme de la représentation sensible. À ce titre, il a son but en lui-même dans cette représentation et cette manifestation[.] (underlining in original)[54]
>
> and fatality, particular interests and general interests etc. Hegel thinks that this opposition constitutes the truth itself, the ground and the essence of all things, the supreme end of the universe is the solution that Hegel gives to the fundamental problem of every philosophy and in consequence also to the question of morality, solution that he advocates for with respect to art in terms of the hypothesis that ascribes to it the end and aim of moral improvement. – In all the doctrines discussed, art is relative to something that is foreign to it – art is called to manifest the truth in the form of sensuous representation. As such, it has its end and aim within itself in this representation and this manifestation[.]

There are two things I want to extract and emphasize from this passage in Flaubert's notes. The first is conceptual and abstractly aesthetic, and it concerns what Hegel calls the absolute, as a "higher standpoint" or a more fundamental dialectical relation than that of morality's opposition between (intelligible, universal) duty or will and (sensuous, particular) interests and appetites. The second is textual, and it concerns how the accidental and sensuous materiality of Flaubert's notes (and Bénard's translation, and Hotho's compiled notes of Hegel's lectures) manages to work its way into the interior of an aesthetic concept that Flaubert develops partly from Hegel—precisely in the moment when, for Hegel, art has become a thing of the past.

The first point is that here we have *in nuce*, if not the source, then one of the main influences of all those now-cliché dicta of Flaubertian aesthetics drawn primarily from the correspondence with Louise Colet that became so central to Flaubert's life shortly after taking these notes. But they suggest a different inflection of those aesthetic principles than is critical custom. The emblematic instance is of course the famous "livre sur rien" letter from 1852:

> Ce qui me semble beau, ce que je voudrais faire, c'est un livre sur rien, un livre sans attache extérieure, qui se tiendrait de lui-même par la force interne de son style, comme la terre sans être soutenue se tient en l'air, un livre qui n'aurait *presque* pas de sujet ou du moins où le sujet serait *presque* invisible, si cela se peut.…*La forme, en devenant habile, s'atténue.*…*Cet affranchissement de la matérialité se retrouve en tout.*…C'est pour cela qu'il n'y a ni beaux ni vilains sujets et qu'on *pourrait presque* établir comme axiome, en se posant au point de vue de l'Art pur, *qu'il n'y en a aucun*, le style étant à lui tout seul une manière absolue de voir les choses.
>
> What seems beautiful to me, what I would like to do, is a book on nothing, a book without external ties, which would present itself of itself [or cohere of itself] by the internal force of its style, as the earth coheres itself in the air without being supported, a book that *almost* would not have a subject or at least where the subject would be *almost* invisible, if that could be.…*Form, becoming more adroit, attenuates itself.*…*This liberation of/from materiality occurs everywhere.*…It is on this account that there are neither good nor bad subjects and that one *could almost* establish as maxim,

[54] Séginger, "Gustave Flaubert 5" 266; Bénard, *Cours d'esthétique* 49-51. This summarizes Hegel, *Vorlesungen* I: 80-82.

> placing oneself at the standpoint of pure Art, *that there are none at all*, style being all by itself an absolute manner of seeing things.[55]

I have emphasized here the vacillations between the disappearance of form in favor of content and vice versa: Flaubert's ideal style is not the empty formalism it is often read as being.[56] The phrase "this liberation of/from materiality"—the established practice is to translate it "as liberation from materiality," but it seems to me that, not only syntactically but also conceptually, the converse is equally present. Flaubert is being dialectical here, which should come as no surprise. If form attenuates itself, then this easily could be construed as a liberation of materiality. When read in this way, but without foreclosing on its counterpart (liberation from materiality), the complexities deepen, and should caution us against any easy reductive notion of what "subject" means in the context. Likewise, the repeated emphasis on the incomplete ("almost") and counterfactual (the subjunctive of the last phrase) in that style is not to be overlooked.

In short, Flaubert's revolution in the novel form cannot be grasped properly without understanding its relationship to Hegelian aesthetics, which (as the above-quoted passages from his notes on Hegel suggest) involves a question about how art transcends the horizon of morality, with its entailed and rigid oppositions between the sensible and the intelligible, the universal and the particular, and so on. Flaubert sees clearly that if art is to become "absolute" (where this means both Hegel's absolute and his own "absolute style") and sublate any threatened subordination to another sphere (what the notes call its "relati[ivity] to something that is foreign to it" or what the 1852 letter calls "external ties"), it has to mediate those oppositions. And while it was once common to imagine that *Madame Bovary* was the "livre sur rien" in the sense that *Seinfeld* was a "show about nothing," more recently critics have begun to notice the obvious—that Flaubert formulates that idea in distinction to what (in 1852) he feels he must do with the novel he is then writing. But there again, the pendulum swinging too far in the other direction yields only the mirror image, another one-sided falsity. *Madame Bovary* is neither the antithesis nor the enactment of a "livre sur rien" as it is typically and wrongly understood. It does not mean a pure abstraction, a pure anti-realist formalism without details or local color. It is a tentative formula for a novelistic form that would achieve the "ultimate end and aim" described in Hegel's lectures as interpreted by Flaubert—in other words an absolute style. And let us not condescend either to Flaubert or to Hegel: in neither case does absolute mean something purely "ideal," contentless and bereft of the dialectical movement between materiality and ideality, universal and particular, intelligible and sensuous.

No. Flaubert's unparalleled realization of a post-Hegelian novelistic aesthetics helps to relieve us of the perennial error of believing that when Hegel said "absolute" he meant ideal and not material, timeless and not temporal, universal and not particular, when of course the entire point of speculative philosophy is that the absolute is built out of the concrete dialectics between those seemingly irreconcilable terms.[57] And correspondingly, Hegel's aesthetics help us to see what Flaubert's novel is up to. But in order to nail this down (and to avoid the pitfall of construing this dialectic as something simply "positive")[58] we need to turn to the second point I want to derive from

---

[55] Flaubert, *Correspondance*, vol. II, ed. Jean Bruneau (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 1980), 31; emphases added.

[56] See, most recently, Rancière's version of this reductive reading in *La parole muette*.

[57] For a brief but reliable overview of the idea of the absolute as a totality (or perhaps, an infinity), see Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 53-60. See also note 65 below.

[58] Of course, the reference here is to Adorno, who in characteristic fashion gives pointed accounts of Hegel's dialectics as both positive and negative. Aside from *Negative Dialektik* (*Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 6, ed. Rolf Tiedemann et al. [Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1970, 2003]) (for instance the introduction, 144-146, 148-149, 161-163, and 397-400)—a text for which there is no tenable English translation—see *Lectures on Negative Dialectics*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Rodney

the passage of Flaubert's notes quoted above. As I said, the first point was conceptual and abstractly aesthetic, whereas the second is textual and materially aesthetic.

Initially, I want to note an idea that Hegel develops in the passage Flaubert notes down, but which is abridged summarily in Bénard's translation, although the basic point is captured. Hegel's text further elaborates on the idea of "a sensible object released from all the scaffolding of materiality," arguing the necessary unity of "the spiritual and sensuous aspects" in artistic production, a genuine artwork being determined wholly by neither side. Rather,

> die Seiten des Geistigen und Sinnlichen müssen im künstlerischen Produzieren eins sein. So könnte man z. B. bei poetischen Hervorbringungen so verfahren wollen, daß man das Darzustellende schon vorher als prosaischen Gedanken auffaßte und diesen dann in Bilder, Reime usf. brächte, so daß nun das Bildliche bloß als Zier und Schmuck den abstrakten Reflexionen angehängt würde. Doch möchte solches Verfahren nur eine schlechte Poesie zuwege bringen, denn hier würde das als *getrennte* Tätigkeit wirksam sein, was bei der künstlerischen Produktivität nur in seiner ungetrennten Einheit Gültigkeit hat.[59]

> the spiritual and sensuous sides must be one in artistic production. For example, someone might propose to proceed in poetic composition by grasping what is to be presented, beforehand, as a prosaic thought and then putting it into figures, rhyme, and so forth, so that now the figural would be hung merely as ornament and decoration onto the abstract reflections. Yet such a procedure could only produce bad poetry, because in it, that which in artistic production has validity only in its undivided unity would be operative as *divided* activity.

The thought here is that an external, or simply causal, connection is an untenable model for the relationship between inner idea or theme, on the one hand, and sensuous form or imagery, on the other. One cannot write a *roman à thèse* and palm it off on Hegel as art. The subject matter must be in internal parity with the form, the ground with the surface details.

For instance, a novel "about" the passions of a Norman peasant girl would need to be written in a style and with imagery utterly inextricable from that idea. Otherwise an excess of meaningless superfluities and ornaments would encumber the presentation. (One is permitted to wonder, of course, whether in Hegel's eyes a Norman peasant girl's passions could legitimately be a substantial poetic idea.) More fundamentally, the image, form, or mode of presentation is not superadded to a readymade idea or content; rather, the latter comes into being only in the incarnation which is that image. It is unsurprising that Flaubert would be drawn to such a notion (only sketched out, it is true, in his French translation). Moreover, it accords with his resistance to the editorial cuts that would be demanded of him by the *Revue de Paris* prior to the 1856 serialization of *Madame Bovary*—attempts, in the words of editor Maxime du Camp, to save the novel from the

---

Livinsgstone (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008) and *Hegel: Three Studies*, trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993), particularly 30ff and 82-88 (where the notion of a *skándalon* comes up, as it happens). With more direct bearing on aesthetics, see *Aesthetic Theory*, trans. and ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), for instance 79-81, 88-91, 146-47, 157-58, and especially 178: "Whatever in the artwork may be called totality is not the structure integrating all of its parts. There remains even in its objectivation a developing process by virtue of the propensities active in it. Conversely, the parts are not—as analysis, almost inevitably, wrongly takes them to be—givens: rather, [they are] energy-centers that drive towards the whole, out of a necessity that is pre-formed just as much by them" (translation modified) (see *Ästhetische Theorie* [*Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 7], 266).

[59] Hegel *Vorlesungen* I: 62; *Hegel's Aesthetics* I: 39-40 (translation modified).

"tas de choses, bien faites, mais inutiles" (pile of things, well made, but useless), or in Hegel's terms, the "ornament and decoration," under which it had been buried.[60]

So, despite Bénard having passed over some of the particular detail of Hegel's discussion of this thought, Flaubert manages to pick up (and embrace) the point, which is about the role, in the construction of an artwork, of a genuine dialectic of sensible and intelligible, material and ideal—or, in the terms that Flaubert will use to describe it during the serialization of *Madame Bovary* (when he was being linked to the so-called school of realism), the antagonism of "ideality" and "realism."[61] More curious, however, is the lacuna I remarked as occurring in Flaubert's, where he stops mid-phrase (after "l'élément de l'intelligence et celui de") (the intellectual element and that of) and then begins again at the top of a new page with a different phrase ("et la fatalité, les intérêts particuliers et les intérêts généraux etc") (and necessity, particular interests and general interests, etc.).[62]

Here Flaubert leaps from Hegel's above-cited phrase "die Seiten des Geistigen und Sinnlichen müssen im künstlerischen Produzieren eins sein" (The spiritual and sensuous sides must be one in artistic production)[63] to a passage a dozen pages later, at the end of the subsection on the aim of art. In that later passage, as we saw above through Flaubert's notes, Hegel contests the view that art's purpose is mere moral betterment, on the grounds of the bad infinity inherent in morality's opposition between spiritual universal will and empirical particular will.[64] He argues that morality as such depends on an unmediated contradiction, a version of the fundamental opposition between the infinite and the finite—the absolute and the empirical—and he lists some of its other modalities, such as freedom and necessity.[65] This is the point where Flaubert's notes touch ground again.

But for the supernumerary connector ("et") the hiatus in the notes might have been (almost) invisible. It is not, as defense attorney Senard will call the Imperial prosecutor's selective textual interpretations during the *Madame Bovary* trial, a "découpur[e] artistement fait[e]."[66] Rather, this

---

[60] Flaubert, *Correspondance* II: 869.

[61] "On me croit épris du réel, tandis que je l'exècre. Car c'est en haine du réalisme que j'ai entrepris ce roman. Mais je n'en déteste pas moins la fausse idéalité" (People think I am in love with the real, when in fact I loathe it. For it was in hatred of realism that I undertook this novel. But I detest no less the false ideality) (*Correspondance* II: 643-44).

[62] Séginger, "Gustave Flaubert 5," 266; Bénard, *Cours d'esthétique* 35, 49; Hegel, *Vorlesungen* I: 62, I: 80; see *Hegel's Aesthetics* I: 39, 53-54.

[63] Hegel, *Vorlesungen* I: 62; *Hegel's Aesthetics* I: 39. Bénard translates this "l'élément de l'intelligence et celui de la sensibilité sont combinés et fondus ensemble dans le travail créateur de l'artiste" (*Cours d'esthétique* 35).

[64] Hegel *Vorlesungen* I: 78-82, at 80; *Hegel's Aesthetics* I: 52-55, at 53-54. For other versions of the issue of bad infinity in Hegel, see also *Wissenschaft der Logik* (*Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, vol. 5), 149-173 (*The Science of Logic*, trans. and ed. George di Giovanni [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010], 108-125); *Enzyklopädie der philosophischne Wissenschaften im Grundrisse*, part one (*Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, vol. 8), §94, §§104-106, §136, and §153 (*The Encyclopædia Logic*, trans. T.F. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H.S. Harris [Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991], §94, §§104-106, §136, and §153); and especially *Glauben und Wissen* in *Jenaer Schriften* (*Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, vol. 2), 341-353 (*Faith and Knowledge*, trans. and ed. Walter Cerf and H.S. Harris [Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1977], 104-114).

[65] In *Faith and Knowledge* Hegel gives an early articulation of his idea of the absolute as an infinity, with recourse to Spinoza's *Letter XIX*, which gives a "mathematical example" of what he calls bounded or "actual infinite" (*Jenaer Schriften* 341-353; *Faith and Knowledge* 104-114). The inequalities between segments traversing the space between two non-concentric circles, Spinoza demonstrates, are "beyond numerical expression." This has nothing to do with the measurability of the circles, or with the determination of the minimum and maximum inequalities, which can easily be measured. The reason rather is that "number is not applicable to the nature of the space between [these] non-concentric circles" (Spinoza, *Letter XIX*, in *Complete Works*, trans. Samuel Shirley, ed. Michael L. Morgan [Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002], 787-791). In what follows, I shall suggest that a similar non-numerical sort of relation, a bounded infinity, characterizes the new kind of novelistic work Flaubert inaugurates, and is constituted by the effects of lacunae, omissions, and paralipses that circulate in the relations amongst the overlapping but "non-concentric" spheres of literary form, bibliographical or textual details, and reception histories.

[66] Senard refers to Pinard's selective quotations of the novel as "artistically chosen excisions" (Flaubert, *Œuvres complètes* III: 514).

lacuna occurs with all the contingency and superfluity of mere error. Whether the gap is due to Flaubert putting down the book and mistaking his place on return (what textual scholarship calls an "eye skip" or a "saut du même au même"), due to Flaubert simply skipping ahead to a part that interested him more, due or finally to the loss of an intervening page of the manuscript is, to my mind, immaterial. This much we owe to textual and genetic methods of study. But if that is all there is to it, then it is hard to see what it tells us that we do not already know.

This is where the basic move of this dissertation comes in: elaborating the ways in which the textual or bibliographical emerges to become aesthetic, as well as the ways in which such things passed over revise the very category of the "work" as a whole. In this particular instance, we find Flaubert—who in the trial would be charged, basically, with too much sensuousness and whose mania for copying is not limited to his unfinished *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, since we owe the 1857 trial transcript to that mania and to it alone—preserving a significant moment in the genesis of his aesthetics in the form of a miniscule error or omission (whether in transcription or manuscript transmission). This makes of these notes a text complete with omissions, a text that passes over or suppresses the sensuous while delineating its contours. For the passage effectively forges a slightly stuttering ("and / and") but immediate connection between issues rather not immediately (but essentially and mediately) related in Hegel's lectures. This passing over or omission—and precisely the omission of "the sensuous," be it those very words of Hegel's text or the sensuous materiality of a lost sheet of paper—thus serves as a short-circuit marking the question of the relationship of particular detail and the whole, what Flaubert calls the "ensemble," as a question not just of universal moral will and particular sensuous desire (which, as we shall see, is the judicial version of the legal and editorial question concerning *Madame Bovary*), or even the general sum and the individual part (which is the hermeneutic version of that same question), but of the absolute and the empirical, of what Hegel and Flaubert both call truth.

This connection is made and marked by an elision, a contingent and erroneous textual detail, which nevertheless draws our attention to what it passes over. Or, in other words, a hole in the genetic record that is capable of generating meaning despite, or even because of, its contingency. It is the more perfect a figure of Flaubertian style and the question of how it constructs a new kind of novelistic work, because it is an absolutely accidental bibliographical defect, while still revealing a paradox lurking in the relation between absolute universal and empirical particular, or between the new novelistic work and its "things passed over." This defect's place in Flaubert's development of a concept of absolute style, if taken seriously, helps show that his novelistic innovation is to be found neither in a banal notion of realism nor in the (dream of a) "livre sur rien"—in the sense of a subjectless, purely abstract book about nothing. In this respect, the question of Flaubert's novel—both in the courtroom's legal and moral terms and in literary criticism's formal terms—is the question not of the whole but of an ensemble that is, as Jean Hyppolite said of the (related) Hegelian absolute, "more than itself."[67] Here the Adornian caveat is helpful: "the mistake of traditional aesthetics is that it exaggerates the relationship of the whole to the parts to [the point of] the absolute whole, to totality. Through this confusion, harmony comes to triumph over the heterogeneous—a banner of illusory positivity."[68] For the present discussion, this means that if something like the absolute is what displaces a normal idea of the totality or the whole, then the

[67] Jean Hyppolite, *Logique et existence: Essai sur la logique de Hegel* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961): "le Logos est nécessairement plus que lui-même" (Logos is necessarily more than itself) (92), or again "Le Logos est l'Absolu…mais cette pensée se dépasse elle-même, elle est plus que soi" (Logos is the Absolute…but this thought sublates [or outstrips] itself, it is more than itself) (135). Here again I would interpret the absolute in the terms Hegel lays out in *Faith and Knowledge*, following Spinoza's concept of a bounded infinity, rather than as a totality, as many commentators tend to construe it. See note 65 above.

[68] Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory* 157; translation modified. See *Ästhetische Theorie* 236.

absolute could only be "more than itself" qualitatively or by elision. So it is a question of the particular detail, the part, and how it gets passed over in an ensemble that is both more and less than the sum of its parts. If the modernist novelistic aesthetics that *Madame Bovary* inaugurates is a matter of "things passed over"—in the conceptual logic of the serialization and trial, in the formal logic of the novel, in Flaubert's own (partly and partially Hegelian) thinking, and in the overlaps between these three—then accidental minutiae like the lacuna in Flaubert's notes are, paradoxically, of the essence of that matter.

Chapter I
Impossible. Flaubert and the Ensemble

Qu'on rêve, si l'on peut, cet ensemble.
— Victor Hugo

I. *Le mot juriste*

In the history of the novel, Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* inaugurates a new kind of problem. And as would prove to be the case only a few months later with his friend Charles Baudelaire's major published work, this novel and the new problem it introduces were marked by a controversial obscenity trial in January 1857. But how, it might reasonably be asked, could there be anything left to say about *Madame Bovary* or about its trial, one of the most famous of modern literary history? Doubtless, all that there is to be said has been said? If I insist on taking another pass, it is less because I have the hubris to propose that I have discovered the definitive truth of the matter, than because I suspect that *Madame Bovary* and its trial together discovered a way of enfolding the things less said, the things not said—the left out, the passed over—within them. This novel, so often espoused as the prototypical modernist novel, ushers in a scandal other than the more obvious moral one debated in the courtroom and the press.

The problem was explicitly noted at the very outset of the trial when, in his *réquisitoire* indicting Flaubert's book with outrages against public and religious morals and against common decency, Imperial Prosecutor Ernest Pinard exclaimed: "Lire tout le roman? C'est impossible" (read all of the novel? Impossible).[1] The admission is strikingly apt, and, in a sense, all I will attempt in this chapter—indeed in this dissertation overall—is to elaborate some of its ramifications. It turns out literally to have been impossible to read all of the novel. Because the novel was not all there. Several passages, importantly including one of the novel's most celebrated and notorious moments—the *fiacre* passage, wherein Emma Bovary and Léon Dupuis take an aimless, six-hour-long carriage ride around Rouen, through the meticulously detailed description of which the reader infers that they consummate their affair—were censored by the editors of the *Revue de Paris* prior to serial publication and thus not in the novel on trial.[2] Logically, then, the trial ought to have passed over these moments in silence.[3]

---

[1] Flaubert, *Œuvres complètes, Tome III: 1851-1862*, ed. Claudine Gothot-Mersch, et al. (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 2013), 461. Subsequent references will be cited *Œuvres* in the body of the text. Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own, although I consulted translations of *Madame Bovary*, especially Lydia Davis's. Unlike her, I have often sacrificed beauty and fluidity to semantic and syntactical specificity. In this period, trials such as this were not regularly recorded, and the law (in its 1852 revision) under which the novel was tried prevented the press from covering cases that concerned the press. The transcript of the trial was preserved only due to Flaubert's mania for copying: he paid a private stenographer to transcribe it, and in 1873, after some convincing, he published this transcript as an appendix to the novel in the "definitive" Charpentier edition. Shortly after Flaubert's death, Pinard contested that his *réquisitoire* was not faithfully reproduced by this document and disavowed it (much as Flaubert had disavowed the bowdlerized serialization of his novel). Pinard published his own text of his arguments in his memoirs, but I have detected no substantive differences between the two versions, though there are some very minor differences in formulation. I follow Flaubert's stenographer's text.

[2] In fact, Pinard appears not to have had access to the fiacre passage at all, which makes what follows all the more uncanny. Flaubert initially wished to press a handful of copies of the unexpurgated novel, with his marginal annotations, for the tribunal, but the court did not allow it. See Yvan Leclerc, *Crimes écrits: La littérature en procès au 19e siècle* (Paris: Plon, 1991), 117; also Flaubert, *Correspondance*, vol. II, ed. Jean Bruneau (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 1980), 874, 1341n3.

[3] The preserialization history is complex and involves much that would alter the prevailing theoretical constructions of the figure of the author, the nature of censorship and its relation to revision, and the relation of the textual to the para- and extratextual. For a detailed account of this genetic and publication history, see Leclerc, *Crimes écrits* 142–81. More

Regardless of this, and regardless of the fact that it is less overtly salacious than other moments in Emma's erotic career, the *fiacre* passage in particular became an important, if perhaps unlocalizable, hinge on which the trial's interpretive debate turned. Pinard placed singular emphasis on the immorality that could warrant its editorial censorship, and defense attorney Jules Senard claimed that the suppression itself was the real cause of the trial. When he read the passage aloud in court to prove it harmless, he effectively published it for the first time. It is as though, despite its own logic, the trial needed to fill in the lacuna effected by the editorial suppression of this passage. If one wanted to overstate the case, one would say that the *fiacre* passage permeates the trial the way the adultery permeates the carriage ride. Hence, a reading of the trial in the novel and the novel in the trial is called for.

This is in part because both Pinard and Senard reacted to a deep paradox of Flaubertian style, uncannily recirculating its operations while attempting to encircle it in the constraints of an external (legal and moral) logic; but they did so as though all unawares, passing over the paradox in the very act of drawing attention to it. In turn, the trial's reading of the novel has had a powerful influence on subsequent narrative theory and literary criticism, which repeats aspects of the trial's rhetorical structures much as the trial repeats and permutes the novel's. Questions of description and narratorial judgment, immoral "realist" detail and perspective have occupied analyses of Flaubert from the preserial revision and the trial to the present. And at least since Gérard Genette and Jean-Paul Sartre, the *fiacre* passage has functioned as a kind of index of those problems. Little attention has been paid, however, to the relationship between such formal questions on the one hand and the bibliographic detail of suppression and the social fact of the trial on the other. The lacuna of the *fiacre* passage in the initial serial edition is not merely the minor irregularity in the textual history of *Madame Bovary* that it might appear. It is, as I shall hope to show, a crucial element of the novel's form. The reception of the novel begins with the serial emendations and the trial, but in a sense the composition of the novel does not end until at least the first volume edition, a few months after the trial. In other words, Pinard's exclamation leads to the insight that it is impossible to read "all of the novel," because *Madame Bovary* is not a sum total, not a quantity of discrete but homogeneous textual units, but rather an ensemble of heterogeneous elements, including the serial suppressions, the trial, and the effects of what is passed over in them.

Let me stress that ensemble is the Flaubertian *mot juste* here: it is in fact the word Flaubert used when addressing the same problem Pinard notes, though from the perspective of literary form rather than that of legal procedure. For if Pinard meant that he could not read every word of the novel aloud in court, then Flaubert saw red when his every word was not printed, and he duly insisted on a note in the sixth and final installment (December 15, 1856), in which he implores the reader "de n'y voir que des fragments et non pas un ensemble" (to view [the printed text] as fragments and not an ensemble).[4] I shall, then, be taking the term Flaubert used to define his novel as a whole,[5] and using it to name the new novelistic work that begins to emerge with *Madame Bovary* and is revealed by the trial it occasions. Essentially, the scandal is not that Flaubert wrote a novel that was obscenely explicit and that thus called for legal reprimand, or that self-interested or

---

recently, Ramona Naddaff has analyzed the issue of the redactions and censorships occurring before and during the novel's serialization, arguing for an expanded critical notion of censorship and its relations to the concept of the author "Confronting the Frugal Editors: The *Revue de Paris*' *Madame Bovary*," *Law, Culture, and the Humanities* 3 (2007): 266-292.

[4] *Madame Bovary (Mœurs de Province)* [October-December 1856], *Revue de Paris*, vol. 40 (Geneva: Slatkine, 1972), 251n1. Further references to the serial version of the novel will be cited *Madame Bovary* in the body of the text.

[5] "Un livre sur rien, un livre sans attache extérieure, qui se tiendrait de lui-même par la force interne de son style, comme la terre sans être soutenue se tient en l'air" (A book about [or rather, resting on] nothing, a book without external ties, which would hold itself together by the internal force of its style, as the earth without being supported holds itself in the air) (*Correspondance* II: 31).

shortsighted editorial suppressions gave rise to a false impression of obscenity (these are the respective positions of the jurists). Rather, the scandal is that Flaubert pushed against the generic limits of novelistic form in such a way as to occasion the trial, and to entail it as an unlocalizable, unquantifiable part of the work of the novel. This scandal underneath the social controversy, then, is my concern, and I want to suggest that until we attend to it we have misrecognized the work, both formally and historically. *Madame Bovary* is not simply a novel; it is an ensemble of the text that we think we know and things that are not patently there. It includes a series of seemingly extra-textual and extra-literary elements like the editorial suppressions (both as textual lacunae and as positive presences in the serial edition) and Flaubert's notes marking and responding to them; the discourse of the trial; and the later "definitive" Charpentier edition, which not only rededicates the book to Flaubert's attorney but also reincorporates the trial itself into the novel as an appendix.

That, then, is Flaubert's impossible ensemble, the new novelistic stumbling block that he bequeaths to literary modernity, and which is revealed in the first instance by the trial. But in order to grasp this ensemble, we need to attend to its mode of appearance. And as the lacuna of the *fiacre* passage in particular suggests, Flaubert's ensemble is traversed by figures of passing over that we can conceptualize in terms of the rhetorical gesture of paralipsis: drawing attention to something in the act of passing over it. For if Pinard becomes obsessed with what was not present in the serial edition, and if Senard argues that the editorial censorship gave an inadvertent and false impression of obscenity, then the attorneys are both unwittingly recirculating within the juridical discourse the paraliptical style that defines both the deleted passages and the novel in general. Flaubert criticism in turn is partly shaped by, and part of, this relay. Some of its most exemplary and influential moments relive the way the trial simultaneously registered and did not see, discussed and did not speak of, the deeper scandal of the inaugural novel of experimental modernism.

If the ensemble is the real problem underlying the social controversy, and if its mode of appearance is paralipsis, then it will be essential to come to terms with the particular novelistic versions of paralipsis that *Madame Bovary* deploys. In the next section of this chapter I shall attend to this by tracing out how the jurists deal with this essentially passed over passage in the courtroom, conceptualizing it in terms of notions like alibi and rhetorics of paralipsis. Turning in the third section to the passage itself, I shall argue that, rather than being an exemplary instance of Flaubert's celebrated pictorial realist description (as Pinard argues) or a chaste narrative demurral in the face of a pre-diegetic fact of adultery (as Senard would have it), the *fiacre* passage works by what might be called a referential alibi. This is a kind of detail, a mode of reference, that provides an alibi to the charged of depicting moral outrages: rather than depict the morally unrepresentable adultery, unrelated details and pieces of local color insinuate a transgression that is localizable nowhere. The referential alibi is, then, something akin to Barthes's "reality effect." But instead of emptying out denotative narrative non-significance so as to connote a general category of the real, referential alibi denotes only the empirical particular so as to void it out, to insert a lacuna within it. In the *fiacre* passage, the sexual innuendo can inhere as what is significant or real only because it is effected paraliptically, through (but not present or localizable in) banal empirical details that in turn exist only in order to show that they do not exhaust the real. In other words, there is no fact of the unrepresented adultery behind or preexisting the *fiacre* passage that effects it by paralipsis. This is what is scandalous about it.

If the *fiacre* passage is obscene only in the most literal of senses—being offstage, out of the scene, even when we read the words of that passage—then, Pinard reasons, the more quotidian sort of obscenity it insinuates must be fleshed elsewhere. In the final two sections of this chapter I shall follow the jurists' lead, looking to places in the novel that they try to use to fill in the lacuna of the *fiacre* passage—that is, both the bibliographical lacuna created by the passage's suppression and the representational lacuna that is its primary literary effect—but also to find a "fond" or ground

organizing such obscenities and submitting them to judgment. If the *fiacre* passage requires us to reconceive of Flaubertian description and things like the reality effect, then with the other focal points of the trial (likewise marked by suppressions) questions of narratorial perspective, judgment, and citation will demand a reworking of the category of *style indirect libre*. As Hans Robert Jauss notes, the trial was the first time that *style indirect libre* was theorized. However, Flaubert's use of this technique is even subtler than has been grasped. Rather than an ironic narratorial judgment of a character's limitations or errors, as Senard and generations of literary critics after him have claimed, Flaubert's style conjures up the effects an anterior direct discourse, a character with an interior, and an "impersonal" external narrator (who is still a person) paraliptically. And the result is a form of irony that "n'enlève rien au pathétique" (removes nothing from the pathos) but "l'outre au contraire" (on the contrary intensifies it).[6]

This is because the anterior discourse seemingly represented is conjured up as something unlocalizable, and the opposed perspectives of character and narrator are the effect of their reciprocal complicity. There is no way to restore the discourse as a "whole"—that is, the imagined direct discourse of the character along with a narratorial judgment on it. The point of *style indirect libre* in *Madame Bovary* is that it works by paralipsis. It effects and unlocalizable, absent direct discourse that it thereby puts in question. It effects strictly unlocalizable perspectives of character and narrator. And, as was the case with the *fiacre* passage, one assumes these things are localized. But the point is that generating such effects paraliptically means that "the narrator" participates just as much as Emma does in the various "formes convenues" (conventional forms) and clichés that fill out her life (*Œuvres* 187). As we shall see, Pinard and Senard are both right and both wrong as they theorize two of the most fundamental and influential aspects of Flaubertian style, what passes for detailed descriptive realism and what comes to be called *style indirect libre*. Referential alibi and *style indirect libre* are, then, *Madame Bovary*'s main versions of paralipsis; they are the mode of appearance of Flaubert's ensemble. And so to understand what we think we already know about Flaubert, we must come to understand how *Madame Bovary* transgresses the limits of the novelistic, and the limits of the novel, to forge an ensemble.

II. The *Fiacre* Passage in the Courtroom

Flaubert, of course, thought the *fiacre* passage essential to the novel. When he gave the novel to the *Revue de Paris*, Maxime du Camp and the other editors demanded cuts, initially for ostensibly aesthetic and later more baldly political reasons. Just before the penultimate installment's appearance, du Camp wrote Flaubert to say that the *fiacre* passage was "impossible." "On monte en fiacre et plus tard on en descend, cela peut parfaitement passer, mais le détail est réellement dangereux" (They enter a carriage and later on they alight, that could pass perfectly well, but the detail is truly dangerous) (Flaubert, *Correspondance* II: 872–73). Flaubert balked but conceded, and the fiacre passage was deleted and replaced with a note from the editors: "La direction s'est vue dans la nécessité de supprimer ici un passage qui ne pouvait convenir à la rédaction de la *Revue de Paris*; nous en donnons acte à l'auteur. M. D. [Maxime du Camp]" (The editors were confronted here with the necessity of suppressing a passage that could not convene with the editorial principles of the Revue de Paris; we formally acknowledge this to the author. M. D.) (*Madame Bovary* 45).

And when du Camp and publisher Léon Laurent-Pichat cut passages in the final installment, Flaubert insisted on his own note: "Des considérations que je n'ai pas à apprécier ont contraint la

[6] Flaubert, *Correspondance*, II: 172 (to Louise Colet, October 9, 1852). It is perhaps worth noting that the verb "outrer" might also be translated as "outrage."

Revue de Paris à faire une suppression dans le numéro du 1er décembre. Ses scrupules s'étant renouvelés à l'occasion du présent numéro, elle a jugé convenable d'enlever encore plusieurs passages. En conséquence, je déclare denier la responsabilité des lignes qui suivent; le lecteur est donc prié de n'y voir que des fragments et non pas un ensemble. Gustave Flaubert" (Considerations of which I will be no judge have compelled the *Revue de Paris* to delete a passage in the issue of December 1. Its scruples being renewed in the current issue, I declare that I deny responsibility for the lines that follow; the reader is therefore implored to consider them as fragments and not an ensemble. Gustave Flaubert) (250). As the trial's debate suggests, these notes in the last two installments of the serial might be construed to imply that there was something positively unconscionable in the suppressed passages. But what was it that was so scandalous? Pinard tries to give a precise answer to that question in his *réquisitoire*, and Senard contends in his *plaidoirie* that the answer is precisely nothing. But there is more to Flaubert's note than this implication of immorality, and Flaubert himself consistently maintained that at stake is the more profound question of the ensemble.

In an earlier letter to the editors, he relates the question of the scandalous directly to the question of the ensemble. "En supprimant le passage du fiacre, vous n'avez rien ôté de ce qui scandalise, et en supprimant, dans le sixième numéro, ce qu'on me demande, vous n'ôterez rien encore. Vous attaquez à des détails, c'est à l'ensemble qu'il faut s'en prendre. L'élément brutal est au fond et non à la surface" (By suppressing the carriage ride passage, you have removed none of what scandalizes, and in suppressing in the sixth installment what is demanded of me, you will remove nothing yet again. You attack the details, it is the ensemble that should be seized. The brutal element is in the foundations and not on the surface) (*Correspondance* II: 649–50). But if the "fond" of the novel is the outrage and suppressing details insufficient to cleanse the novel, nevertheless the "ensemble" of the novel does include details the serialization passed over. Furthermore, although they were not a part of the version of the novel on trial, the suppressions and the paratextual notes signaling them nevertheless were assumed to be part of the novel by the trial and became part of the novel in the trial. The prosaic question (what was scandalous about *Madame Bovary*?) thus becomes a less clearly empirical question about the nature of Flaubert's style: what is the scandal of *Madame Bovary*? If Flaubert's letter helps us to see that the scandal is a question of the ensemble, then I suggest that this ensemble is more complicated than even Flaubert would have imagined. It is not only what Pierre-Marc de Biasi has perceptively called "une esthétique de médiatisations: une relation permanente entre la partie et le tout, une attention obsessionnelle au détail, une 'bifurcation' généralisée des significations qui ne tiennent plus leur sens que du lien à l'ensemble du récit, la cohésion d'un monde entièrement imaginé" (an aesthetic of mediations: a permanent relation between the part and the whole, an obsessional attention to the detail, a generalized "bifurcation" of significations that holds no longer to their sense as to their link to the ensemble of the story, the cohesion of a world entirely imagined).[7] It is also an ensemble irreducible to a narrative whole, an ensemble—at once discursively heterogeneous and aesthetically coherent—of the novel, the editorial suppressions in its initial periodical appearance, and the trial.

All Pinard really meant, though, when he said it was impossible to read all of the novel, was that applying the 1819 Serre laws[8] (originally devised to restrict political dissent in the public press

[7] Pierre-Marc de Biasi, "Secrets d'écriture, écritures du secret: Les procédures de cryptage dans *Madame Bovary*," *Modern Language Notes* 122.4 (2007): 779-796.

[8] Chapter 2, article 8 states that "tout outrage à la morale publique et religieuse, ou aux bonnes mœurs, par l'un des moyens énoncés en l'article 1er, sera puni d'un emprisonnement d'un mois à un an, et d'une amende de seize francs à cinq cents francs" (any outrage against public and religious morals, or common decency, by one of the means enumerated in article 1, will be punished by imprisonment of from one month to one year, and a fine of from sixteen francs to five hundred francs). Article 1 refers to methods including "des discours, des cris ou menaces proférés dans des

and further tightened in 1852 under Louis Napoléon) to a novel raises pragmatic difficulties. The laws consist of "expressions un peu vagues, un peu élastiques, qu'il est nécessaire de préciser" (expressions that are a bit vague, a bit elastic, which it is necessary to specify).

> Quand on parle à des esprits droits et pratiques, il est facile de s'entendre à cet égard, de distinguer si telle page d'un livre porte ou non atteinte à la religion ou à la morale. La difficulté n'est pas dans notre prévention, elle est plutôt, elle est davantage dans l'étendue de l'œuvre que vous avez à juger. Il s'agit d'un roman tout entier.…Que faire dans cette situation?…Lire tout le roman? C'est impossible. (Flaubert, *Œuvres* 461)

> When one speaks to upright and practical minds, it is easy to reach an understanding in this respect, to distinguish whether or not a certain page of a book attacks religion or morality. The difficulty is not with our proscriptions, it is rather, it is more, with the extent of the work you must judge. It is an entire novel.…What is to be done in such a situation?…Read all of the novel? Impossible.

Pinard implies that only parts of the novel constitute its offense and that a novel does not admit of division as easily as a journalistic article. The solution he proposes is "de raconter d'abord tout le roman sans en lire…puis de lire, d'incriminer en citant le texte" (first to recount the novel without reading from it…then to read, to incriminate by citing the text), since "si [l'on n'expose] pas le procès dans toutes ses parties" (if one does not expound every part of the argument thoroughly), one is open to a charge of deception (461). Reading the whole novel is impossible, in Pinard's estimation, only in that it would be time-consuming and bootless to read every word of the novel aloud in court, especially since, if there are "incriminated passages," there are also other passages that contain nothing incriminating. But this is hardly a satisfactory resolution of the problem that arises in the confrontation of the law with literature.

Senard objects to the prosecution's interpretation along the very lines that Pinard anticipates—that, in the prosecution's words, "si vous passez ce qui précède et ce qui suit les passages incriminés, il est évident que vous étouffez le débat en restreignant le terrain de la discussion" (if you pass over what precedes and follows the incriminated passages, it is obvious that you stifle the debate by limiting the terrain of discussion) (461). Senard accuses Pinard of reading only a small fraction of the whole text and claims that "cette proportion de un à cinq cents n'est pas une couleur lascive, n'est nulle part; elle n'existe que sous la condition des découpures et des commentaires" (this proportion of one to five hundred does not yield a lascivious color, it is not there at all; it does not exist except by virtue of deletions and commentaries) (485). The prosecutor's interpretation is simply wrong: the quantity of "lascivious" passages is so disproportionately small that Flaubert's condemnation of Emma is self-evident to anyone who reads the sum total of the text—that is, the novel without the editorial deletions and without the prosecution's "artistically made" selections (514). The author's moral rectitude and judgment against Emma Bovary "is found in every line of the book" (488), and any imputation of outrage to morality is the illegitimate effect of the prosecution's incomplete citations and misguided editorial censorship in the serial publication.

---

lieux ou réunions publiques,…des écrits, des imprimés, des dessins, des gravures, des peintures ou emblèmes vendus ou distribués, mis en vente, ou exposés dans des lieux ou réunions publiques" (discourses, cries, or threats made in public places or gatherings,…writings, printings, drawings, engravings, paintings or emblems sold or distributed, or exhibited in public places or gatherings) (qtd. in Leclerc, *Crimes écrits* 19–20). See also Christine Haynes, "The Politics of Publishing during the Second Empire: The Trial of *Madame Bovary* Revisited," *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 23.2 (2005): 1-27.

Senard's defense thus hinges on restoring "tout le roman"—the novel as a quantitative total—by recovering the details that editorial suppressions and prosecutorial elisions subtracted from it. Although he emphasizes that "je n'ai pas ici de profession de foi à faire, je n'ai que le livre à défendre" (I do not need to make a profession of faith here, I only need to defend the book), his defense nevertheless aims at proving the morality of that book (518). For he too insists that there is "rien de plus utile et de plus nécessaire que le sentiment religieux, mais le sentiment religieux grave et…sévère" (nothing more useful and necessary than religious sentiment, but a solemn and…severe religious sentiment), a corrective that Flaubert's novel provides by showing the results of Emma's fusion of abstract religious sentiment with sensualism (499-500).[9] In short, Senard's ultimate horizon, his "fond," is the same as Pinard's, not Flaubert's.

But for the prosecution, the *fiacre* passage in particular embodies the novel's immoral defamation of marriage, its depiction of "l'adultère dans toute sa poésie" (adultery in all its poetry). He admits, however, that it embodies this immorality in a strange way: "Nous savons maintenant, messieurs, que la chute n'a pas lieu dans le fiacre. Par un scrupule qui l'honore, le rédacteur de la *Revue* a supprimé le passage.…Mais si la *Revue de Paris* baisse les stores du fiacre, elle nous laisse pénétrer dans la chambre où se donnent les rendez-vous" (We now know, sirs, that the fall did not take place in the carriage. Following a scruple that does him honor, the editor of the *Revue* censored the passage.…But if the *Revue de Paris* lowers the blinds of the carriage, it lets us penetrate into the room where the trysts are held) (472-73). He appeals, then, to the culpability of a passage that does not take place anywhere, but would be outrageous if it had not been cut. According to his inference its very absence incriminates other passages that we can locate, while they in turn incarnate the vague threat intimated by the editorial note—substituting for it, "representing" it. Pinard here applies the notion of the alibi (literally, "elsewhere" or "in another place") in a rather curious manner, arguing that if the *fiacre* passage has the airtight alibi of not taking place anywhere in the text, then the scene of the crime must be elsewhere, in more public places. As he says, "en cette matière, il n'y a pas de délit sans publicité" (in this matter, there is no offense without publicity) (478). (And, in an odd way, he conflates the diegetic action in the absent passage with both the "publicity" of the serial publication and the "publicity" of the trial as its own mode of publication. In other words, as I noted in the introduction, Pinard's claim that the editors of the *Revue* draw down the blinds of the carriage effectively makes the editorial suppressions into a part of the text itself, a drawing down of blinds internal to the story.)

From the alibi that the editorial censorship affords, then, Pinard adduces that an offense was perpetrated and that he need only turn from this vague unlocalizable textual space toward other sites in the novel in order to find the explicit transgression in all its shameless "publicity." The inference is, of course, fallacious. I shall consider these other sites (where Emma's body as spectacle becomes the focal point) in my later discussions of narrative perspective, Emma's relation to "formes convenues" (187), and what Pinard alleges to be the "mélange du sacré au profane" (477), but I want here to underscore the way in which Pinard responds to the effect of the suppression, its evocation of an immorality all the more scandalous for being present only as passed over. In this light, the trial takes up the editorial deletion of the *fiacre* passage as something like a limit-case of paralipsis.

Senard seizes upon that idea in order to argue that "cette malheureuse suppression, c'est le procès" (that unfortunate suppression, that's the whole trial) (495). This is not because any

[9] Emma is described as being "incapable…de comprendre ce qu'elle n'éprouvait pas, comme de croire à tout ce qui ne se manifestait point par des formes convenues" (incapable…of comprehending what she did not feel, as of believing in all that did not manifest itself in conventional forms) (187). This, taken simply as condemnation, is among the moralizing commonplaces that the trial bequeaths to literary critical posterity: some of its most recent incarnations are to be found in Jacques Rancière's *Politique de la littérature* (Paris: Galilée, 2007), and Barbara Vinken's "Loving, Reading, Eating: The Passion of Madame Bovary," *MLN* 122.4 (2007): 759-788.

immorality is actually present in the deleted text but rather because for him the suppression itself generates, by an unintentional sort of paralipsis, the prosecutor's supposition of moral outrage. "Ce fut là un excès de réserve de la part de la *Revue*…[qui a donné] matière à un procès. Ce qu'on ne voit pas, ce qui est supprimé ainsi parait une chose fort étrange. On a supposé beaucoup de choses qui n'existaient pas" (It was an excess of reserve on the part of the *Revue*…that caused the trial. What nobody sees, what is deleted thus appears to be a very strange thing. People imagined many things that did not exist) (494–95). But if Flaubert had written such things as, for example, an honored member of the Académie Française like Prosper Mérimée had done in his novella *La double méprise*…

> Si nous avions écrit la moitié ou le quart de ce qu'a écrit M. Mérimée, j'éprouverais quelque embarras dans la tâche qui m'est donnée, ou plutôt je la modifierais. Au lieu de dire ce que j'ai dit, ce que j'affirme, que M. Flaubert a écrit un bon livre, un livre honnête, utile, moral, je dirais : la littérature a ses droits ; M. Mérimée a fait une œuvre littéraire très remarquable, et il ne faut pas se montrer si difficile sur les détails quand l'ensemble est irréprochable. Je m'en tiendrais là, j'absoudrais, et vous absoudriez. Eh ! mon Dieu ! ce n'est pas par omission qu'un auteur peut pécher en pareille matière. Et, d'ailleurs, vous aurez le détail de ce qui se passa dans le fiacre. Mais comme mon client, lui, s'était contenté de faire une course, et que l'intérieur ne s'était révélé que par 'une main nue'…personne n'en savait rien, et tout le monde supposait—par la suppression même—qu'il avait dit au moins autant que le membre de L'Académie française. Vous avez vu qu'il n'en était rien. (495)
>
> If we had written half or a quarter of what Monsieur Mérimée wrote, I would suffer some little embarrassment in the task that is given me, or rather I would modify it. Instead of saying what I said, what I affirm, that Monsieur Flaubert has written a good book, a book that is honest, useful, moral, I would say: literature has its rights; Monsieur Mérimée has created a very remarkable literary work, and one should not make such a commotion about details when the whole is irreproachable. I would hold fast to that, I would acquit, and you would acquit. Good God! An author cannot sin by omission in such a situation. And as my client, for his part, contented himself with going for a ride, and as the interior is not revealed except by "a naked hand"…no one knew anything about it, and everyone imagined—because of the suppression itself—that he had said at least as much as the member of the Académie Française. You have seen that there is nothing at all in it.

Here Senard's celebrated rhetorical prowess is on full display. Appropriating Pinard's idea that "there is no offense without publicity," he turns it back against the prosecutor and enfolds it in his own gesture of paralipsis. The suppressed, unpublished passage only appears to be so scandalous because it does not "exist." Its visible invisibility indeed allows for illegitimate constructions, but Senard claims that the passage itself suppressed or rejected immorality before the editors had a chance: Flaubert "contents himself with taking a ride." Reading the entire passage aloud in court, Senard points out that the "interior" is not revealed, save for Emma's naked white hand, and so no one can know anything about it. But even if the passage had contained what is attributed to it, Senard would claim the "rights of literature."

Hence the defense attorney's own paralipsis is directed toward exorcising the one that the prosecutor projects into the editorial censorship. In true rhetorical fashion, his quantitative notion of

the novel as a totality generates the idea of the rights of literature by implying their presupposition.[10] That is, Senard claims that he has no need of recourse to the rights of literature because Flaubert did not write "half or a quarter" of what Mérimée wrote (in an equally blameless work). The fact that Flaubert did not write so much would have been self-evident had the unexpurgated totality of what he did write been published. Thus his gesture insinuates that there are guaranteed, positive rights of literature to which he could have appealed had it been necessary. The rights of literature, then, "exist" within the same kind of counterfactual space the *fiacre* passage occupies—that is, through paralipsis. The two main motifs of the defense, the professional specificity of literature and the curative moral judgment of the author, "take place" counterfactually, through Senard's gesture of reappropriating the editorial suppression of the *fiacre* passage. In other words, by pointing out that inadvertent paralipsis, he turns it to advantage as his own intentional paralipsis.

But the defense is also at pains to differentiate the mechanism of the passage itself from the inadvertent, misleading effect of paralipsis caused by the suppression. He claims that Flaubert's work effectively preempts what Pinard called the "scruple" (472) that led the editors to censor the passage:

> [Q]uand il arrive aux parties difficiles, précisément à la dégradation,…au lieu de faire comme nos grands auteurs classiques, qui, lorsqu'ils ont rencontré des scènes de l'union des sens chez l'homme et la femme, n'ont pas manqué de tout décrire, M. Flaubert se contente d'un mot. Là, toute sa puissance descriptive disparaît, parce que sa pensée est chaste, parce que là où il pourrait écrire à sa manière et avec toute la magie du style, il sent qu'il y a des choses qui ne peuvent pas être abordées, décrites. (488–89)
>
> When he arrives at the difficult parts, precisely at degradation,…instead of proceeding like our great classic authors, who, when they encountered scenes of intimate union between man and woman, did not fail to describe everything, Monsieur Flaubert contents himself with a word. There, his descriptive power disappears, because his thinking is chaste, because there where he could write in his own manner and with all the magic of style, he senses that there are things that cannot be gone into, described.

Senard reappropriates the prosecutor's praise of the editor's scruples, attributing it instead to Flaubert: the editorial suppression was superfluous because it merely repeated the moral gesture of Flaubert's description of the episode. Flaubert confronts the immoral act as a preexisting diegetic given but refrains from dignifying it with a description—for Senard, this is chaste moral judgment, not glorification and certainly not paralipsis. Although he would have been justified in following Mérimée fully, he stops short and passes over the morally unrepresentable. The rectitude of his thought is manifested aesthetically by this refusal to enter into the closed interiors of sin.

However effective it was in court to seize the inadvertent editorial paralipsis of the fiacre passage and recirculate its force as part of his own paraliptical claim for the rights of literature, this convergence of rhetorical forms between the editorial suppression, the trial's discourse, and the

[10] Frances Ferguson has argued that the trial's judgment "accorded Flaubert's novel the same kind of standing that the logics of the professions enjoyed.…It was granted a professional jargon, even as that jargon was seen to be coextensive with the natural language.…The obscenity trial…[reflects] the argument that art is not art simply by virtue of its author's conviction but by virtue of its having a recognizable value to its readers" (*Pornography, the Theory: What Utilitarianism Did to Action* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004], 100-101). For another view, see Christine Haynes, "The Politics of Publishing."

passage itself is less self-evidently blameless than Senard avers. His rhetorical recirculation of the editorial paralipsis is at variance with his own concept of the novel as a quantitative sum of its textual units and reinforces the prosecutor's view that there is something "in" that sum total. If the moral outrage does not exactly appear, it nevertheless permeates the text, and of course Senard could hardly dispute the fact that Emma and Léon committed adultery in the carriage. In a way, the two attorneys are both right and wrong at the same time: if the scandal of Emma's transgression with Léon does not take place in the carriage, it is less because we can find it in other places than because the passage's suppression takes its place. In other words, the bibliographical fact of editorial suppression garners its rhetorical charge from the scandalous paralipsis coursing through the deleted passage itself. Senard says that "Flaubert s'est offensé de la suppression. Il n'a pas voulu qu'elle eût lieu sans qu'un note fût placée au bas de la page" (Flaubert took offense at the suppression. He did not wish for it to take place without a note being placed at the bottom of the page) (492). But by the same token, Senard is wrong to think that restoring every word to the novel will remove the threat—the editorial excision and the trial are both caught up in the formal mechanism of the passage itself. The ensemble of the novel turns out to include things by passing over them, as we shall see by considering the excised passage itself.

III. The *Fiacre* Passage in the Novel

In truth, the prosecutor's intuited "reading" of a passage to which he had no access is more sensitive to Flaubert's style than is Senard's rhetoric. That with which Flaubert "contents himself" here is a sort of sublated paralipsis, using "all the magic" of his style to saturate the text with innuendo. The effect of sexual innuendo builds gradually, and it is not fully isolable in any given detail or particular phrase. Just as the novel is not a sum total of narrated events and descriptions, the passage is not merely a sum of discrete *double ententes*, although it does feature some—such as the exclusively feminine pronouns referring to the carriage (Flaubert carefully uses synonyms like "la voiture" or "la machine" rather than "le fiacre" just prior to pronominal repetitions), along with the use of an equestrian imagery already deeply sexualized by the scene of Emma's first seduction by Rodolphe ("elle entra au grand galop dans la gare du chemin de fer; trotta doucement" [it entered the train station at a great gallop; trotted softly] [366]). This vaguely erotic, animalistic imagery is then connected to the horses drawing the carriage (while, confused by his patrons' pointless "locomotion," the coachman "cinglait de plus belle ses deux rosses tout en sueur…démoralisé, et presque pleurant de soif, de fatigue et de tristesse" (would lash ever harder into his two nags covered in sweat…demoralized, and almost weeping from thirst, fatigue, and sorrow) (366-67).

The innuendo permeating the carriage ride—what du Camp called "the detail" that made it "impossible" (*Correspondance* II: 872)—is thus inseparable from the "la lourde machine" (the heavy machine) of its own expression (*Œuvres* 366); the machine of description is itself subject to its procedures. The insinuated sex is an atmospheric, secondary effect of the detailed description of Rouen, although at certain moments the relationship between the aimless description and the unnarrated action is quite close to the surface, so to speak. The feminine pronouns referring to the carriage, along with the lack of gender marker for the voice urging the coachman onward, seem to conflate the carriage with Emma and imply that she is the dominant, more driving of the two lovers; while phrases like "fureur de la locomotion" (fury of locomotion), "deux rosses tout en sueur" (two nags covered in sweat), or "une main nue" (Emma's bare hand, the only body part seen in the passage) might even seem overstated once one perceives the sexual connotations available in them (366-67). Even these, however, operate to make sexual innuendo inseparable from the self-

proclaiming awkwardness of a description incapable of depicting or referring to the act around which it circles. By the time the carriage makes a third halt and the voice inside demands that it continue, a potential cause for this pause in the narrative and geographical trajectory (that the passengers have no desire for linear, teleological progression; that they are engaged in a wholly different sort of "locomotion") can be inferred only on the basis of the increasingly self-evident arbitrariness of the ride and the description itself. Both ride and narrative drift aimlessly, "sans parti pris ni direction, au hasard" (without any fixed plan or direction, at random) (367), and the trajectory devolves into a series of insistently meaningless places (or rather place-names) by which it passes.[11]

Inference of the occulted event is not available intradiegetically, however. The coachman is not master of this "passage:" "Il ne comprenait pas quelle fureur de la locomotion poussait ces individus à ne vouloir point s'arrêter" (He could not comprehend what fury of locomotion was pushing these individuals to never wish to stop) (367). William Olmsted remarks that the indirection of the passage "mirrors the false naïveté on the driver's part, given that the use of a carriage for sex was a well-established visual and literary image."[12] However, the driver's distinctly provincial ignorance appears genuine and verisimilar in the context of Léon's affected metropolitan contempt for Rouen (he convinces Emma to take the ride by saying that "cela se fait à Paris" [it is done in Paris] [Flaubert, *Œuvres* 365]) or the Rouennais' incomprehension of the carriage ride spectacle ("les bourgeois ouvraient de grands yeux ébahis devant cette chose si extraordinaire en province, une voiture à stores tendus, et qui apparaissait ainsi continuellement, plus close qu'un tombeau et ballottée comme un navire" (the townspeople would stare wide-eyed, stunned at this thing so unknown in the country, a coach with blinds drawn, that kept appearing continually thus, sealed closer than a tomb and rocked like a ship at sea) (367).

More than this, the driver (as figure for an effect not wholly present to him or under his control) connects the outrage of a morally unrepresentable act to another, more demoralizing scandal: of a representational mode whose inherent inconclusiveness is coterminous with its proliferation.[13] In other words, in the *fiacre* passage, a morally unrepresentable event itself becomes a figure—a figure that the passage essentially passes over, does not represent—for a scandal inherent to the novel's own figural logic, which is expressive by way of omission. And in apposition to the figure of the driver, the bourgeois spectators of this so strange occurrence embed an innuendo of unrepresentable transgression within the spectacle of its obtrusive presence and representational excess: the driver and the crowd are wearied, confused, and demoralized by the spectacular and by

---

[11] The classical reference is Genette's "Silences de Flaubert," which argues that Flaubert's description "se développe pour elle-même, aux dépens de l'action qu'elle éclaire bien moins qu'elle ne cherche, dirait-on, à la suspendre et à l'éloigner" (develops of itself, at the expense of the action, which it illuminates much less than it seeks, one could say, to suspend and distantiate) (*Figures I* [Paris: Seuil, 1966], 234). The *fiacre* passage in particular, Genette claims, defines Flaubertian style by breaking narrative teleology "en prenant la tangente" (in pursuing a tangent) (240). Rancière rightly contends that the novel is not divisible into a classical "ligne droite du récit" (straight line of the narrative) and proto-modernist "silences 'littéraires' qui l'interrompraient" ("literary" silences that interrupt it) (*La parole muette* [Paris: Hachette Littératures, 1998], 115), but his corrective tends toward reducing the novel to the former—a cautionary tale of Emma's departure from the strait gate and narrow way.

[12] "Improper Appearances: Censorship and the Carriage Scene in *Madame Bovary*," in *Efficacité/Efficacy: How to Do Things with Words and Images?* ed. Véronique Plesch and Catriona MacLeod (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011) 276. Olmsted's essay, which complicates the received idea that the novel is morally scandalous in any simple way, elaborates some of the ways in which it invites and plays with different standards of propriety. He alludes here to, but more broadly builds upon, Michael Riffaterre's "Flaubert's Presuppositions," *Diacritics* 11.4 (1981): 2-11.

[13] If LaCapra is right to say, following Sartre, that "Emma and Léon are depersonalized in an extreme way" and that "dramatic illusion is trenchantly rejected" (Madame Bovary *on Trial* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982], 164), then one might add that the ironic force of the language reveals less a narrator at an infinite remove from the scene he describes than a bewildered driver at the mercy of an inscrutable transitivity or force. See also Jean-Paul Sartre, *L'idiot de la famille*, vol. 2 (Paris: Gallimard, 1972), 1275-83.

the meaningless in equal measure. The unrepresentable "exists" in direct proportion to the excess of expression and the impossibility of apprehension. Hence the *fiacre* passage is structured like a figure for the ensemble—made up of the overlapping spheres of the novel, the editorial apparatus, and the trial. But how might this figure be characterized more precisely?

Yvan Leclerc's *Crimes écrits*—the most exhaustive piece of scholarship on the *Madame Bovary* trial—makes a helpful, if passing, remark about the *fiacre* passage in its relationship to literary form and the morality of "realism": "Ce n'est [pas]…par une simple volonté de coller à la topographie rouennaise que le fiacre…passe au lieu-dit les 'Trois-Pipes': qu'il existe réellement permet à Flaubert de trouver *un alibi référentiel* à une connotation qui ne l'est pas moins" (It is not because of a simple will to cleave to the topography of Rouen that the carriage…passes the locality "Trois-Pipes": the fact that it really exists permits Flaubert to find *a referential alibi* for a connotation that is no less real).[14] I would like to take this phrase "referential alibi" and develop it into a concept so as to lend precision to the thought I advanced above, that the passage functions by a specific form of paralipsis. The detail "Trois-Pipes," though of exactly the sort that Barthes famously referred to as "un effet de réel" (reality effect), is in truth motivated—at the very least by a phallic innuendo, as Leclerc's remark implies. It is not exactly a functionless or "insignificant notation" of the type Barthes theorizes.[15] To the contrary, the real function of "Trois-Pipes" is not to be a notation of any thing, phallic or empirical.

Empirically, it was the name of a cabaret on the outskirts of Rouen, built circa 1830. But the name derives neither from the presence of pipes nor from any architectural detail nor even from the inevitable smoking pipes that would have been in evidence there. Rather, it "refers" to the three barrels that held the cider served there.[16] But this reference itself dissolves in light of the fact that the word "pipe" refers with equal primacy to barrels containing alcohol, the measures of the alcohol itself, or the musical instruments that would be played in the cabaret.[17] This suggests that the name—the bedrock of a putatively realist representational mode of description—already operates

---

[14] *Crimes écrits* 142*;* emphases added.

[15] Roland Barthes, *Le bruissement de la langue* (Paris: Seuil, 1984), 184.

[16] "Origine du nom des 'trois pipes,'" *Groupe d'Histoire et d'Études de Bihorel*, <gheb.pagesperso-orange.fr/trois_pipes.htm> (accessed 4 June 2015).

[17] *Pipe* can mean several related things: an old, regionally variable measurement of liquid (particularly alcohol), a large barrel (again variable in size and primarily devoted to containing alcohol), or, metonymically, the contents of the barrel ("Pipe": définition, *Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales*, <www.cnrtl.fr/definition/pipe> [accessed 4 June 2015]). However, like "pipe" in English (which is cognate in these meanings), these senses all derive etymologically from the classical Latin *pīpāre* are (to peep, cheep, or chirp, and in postclassical Latin also to blow on a pipe), itself evidently of onomatopoeic origin ("Pipe" [n.1, n.2], *Oxford English Dictionary* < www.oed.com/view/Entry/144381?isAdvanced =false&result=1&rskey=hqeCQT&>; "Pipe," n.2, <www.oed.com/view/Entry/144382?isAdvanced=false&result =2&rskey=hqeCQT& > [accessed June 4, 2015]; "Pipe": étymologie, *Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales*). The different senses activated by the name (whether the measure or the barrel because it is a cabaret, or the musical or even more obvious smoking sense, again because it is a cabaret) are equally plausible, and it is difficult to say which is the ground of which. Behind them all is the notion of a container that holds—or through which flows—another substance. This is as close to the sense of "pipe" as a slang term for fellatio as it is to any other more seemingly "literal" sense grounding the name "Trois-Pipes." Moreover, if the alibi derives in the first place from the referential function (the cabaret "Trois-Pipes"), it also forces the question of what meaning is authorized in that reference, which cannot be answered with the kind of certainty it pretends to guarantee. Thus the problem proliferates a series of mutually interdependent but equally "literal" meanings, all of which plausibly insinuate what is hidden within the reference: as a name for the barrels, their measure, or their contents, "Trois-Pipes" is a metonym for the cabaret but also a metaphor for the long-winded sexual intercourse that is present only in the metonymic form of the *fiacre* that contains it. Six hours may measure the time of the ride; there may be three "halts" in its journey to match the three 'pipes'; the distance the *fiacre* might be calculated; but all the same the significance of what is contained within is not measurable.

tropologically.[18] Hence, even if one follows denotation and reference all the way down, the detail "Trois-Pipes" remains irreducibly scandalous to "functional" and realist notions of literary representation. There is no empirical referent at the foundation, and certainly no empirical reality. But the referential alibi does have a function: to disrupt the moral scandal of this "scene" of adultery by predicating it on details that involve a kind of scandal of particularity.

"Trois-Pipes" is a referential alibi, then, not merely in the sense that realistic detail acquits Flaubert of moral transgression while also managing to effect it. More fundamentally, its force is defined by being elsewhere than in its reference. Its significance is thus not simply nonreferential: like the reality effect, "Trois-Pipes" only means something in the text because it is a "real" place. But what it thereby expresses is not what it intends referentially. What matters is not reference to reality, whether by particular denotation or, as in Barthes's reality effect, by categorical connotation. The passage works more strangely than that. The *raison d'être* of the "real" empirical world (e.g. reference to Trois-Pipes) is that it exists essentially as that which is insignificant—not signified or real. The innuendo of adultery can inhere as what is significant or real only through empirical details like "Trois-Pipes," but the empirical can exist only as that which cannot exhaustive the real. Such a figure is perhaps comparable to catachresis, although it does not name or represent, transgressively, that which has no name or nonfigurative mode of representation proper to it. Rather, it names only what can be named and, by doing so, denatures the status of both the nameable and the unnamable. Instead of a denotation of an insignificant object being transformed into a connotation of the category "the real," there is a denotation of the empirical that interpolates "quelque chose de subtil" (something somehow subtle) into its object (Flaubert, *Œuvres* 293), that inserts a lacuna (but not simply an absence) into the order of quantifiable reality. The heterogeneous unnamable, here inhering as a morally "unrepresentable" act, may be the effect of the empirical reference, but without it the empirical reference would be as senseless as the carriage driver believes the ride to be—that is, it would be what Barthes calls a reality effect. Put simply, the detail "Trois-Pipes" would be so vague as to have no real content at all if its content were not a kind of nonentity to which it cannot refer. The unrepresentable thing is not the adultery, for the adultery in a fundamental sense does not take place in the novel—it is a nonevent in an elsewhere. The unrepresentable is not even a thing subject to notation. As Leclerc says, Flaubert "ne cherche pas la provocation par le petit détail 'réaliste' mais il vise une signification globale à travers un mot indispensable par le son et le sens" (does not attempt provocation with a little "realist" detail, he aims at a global signification traversing a word that is indispensable sonically and semantically).[19]

If this is plausible, then the referential alibi of "Trois-Pipes" suggests that no amount of detail will be able to give to the fiacre passage the kind of precision or publicity demanded by the law. The text does appear to acknowledge that some things cannot be represented. In the trial, Senard words it this way: "[I]l y a des choses qui ne peuvent pas être abordées, décrites" (There are things that cannot be gone into, described [or, perhaps, carriages that cannot be *abordés*, that is, "boarded"?]) (Flaubert, *Œuvres* 489). But by this remark, he tries to shift the terrain of the dispute, tacitly figuring the adultery as a kind of extant prediegetic fact over which Flaubert has no control. This reduction of figural and rhetorical force to the description or notation of independent,

[18] Though, as the *Pléiade* edition's editors note, Trois-Pipes is not a toponym but the name of a café, the area has since inherited the name, following the disappearance of the café (and the barrels) (Flaubert, *Œuvres* 1181n14). According to the Groupe d'Histoire et d'Études de Bihorel, one can now find in the general area a horseracing track and a mechanic's garage ("Origine du nom des 'trois pipes"), as if existing solely in order to vindicate Flaubert's remark to Louise Colet about a moment from *Novembre* that "c'était alors purement imaginé, et l'autre jour ç'à été éprouvé. Tout ce qu'on invente est vrai, sois-en sûre" (at the time it was purely imaginary, and the other day it proved true. All that one invents is true, be sure of it) (*Correspondance* II: 392).

[19] *Crimes écrits* 157.

preexisting things or facts is the presupposition on which notions like Barthes's reality effect are grounded. And although that interpretive move is unwarranted, it helps to reveal this paraliptical style emerging right in the teeth of textual and social scandal.

The assumption also lies behind other influential critical paradigms. I take Mieke Bal's narratological analysis of *Madame Bovary* to be one of the most persuasive direct critiques of Barthes's reality effect. As Bal shows, the predictive character of narrated events (which Barthes opposes to description) is linked directly to Emma Bovary's (deluded) perspective, and one of Flaubert's techniques for elaborating the distinction between how Emma perceives things and how things really are, "à côté de l'ironie et du fameux discours indirect libre" (alongside irony and the famous free indirect discourse), is precisely description.[20] Thus what appear to be functionless notations (reality effects) always have a narrative function, even if it is of a second order. However, this objection, persuasive in its own terms, overlooks Barthes's primary insight. For Barthes's essay is important not least because it takes seriously the possibility that totalizing, quantitative analysis is constitutively inapplicable to (at least certain) novels. Bal's narratological riposte to Barthes is thus a partial analogue to Senard's riposte to Pinard. In both cases, we find a shared presupposition about the possibilities of literary representation and about the signifying totality or ensemble that constitutes a self-enclosed narrative work. The point is that what is scandalous about *Madame Bovary* is how it invokes and revokes such presuppositions, which in turn function as the social index of an emergent formal practice.

The critical inheritance of the trial's hermeneutics can be seen perhaps even more clearly in the most persuasive and insightful piece of scholarship on the *fiacre* passage, Michael Riffaterre's "Flaubert's Presuppositions." There is much to say about Riffaterre's interpretation of "our Yonville Messalina" (this is a tellingly unacknowledged paraphrase of Pinard's epithet for Emma).[21] In the present context, one of the strengths of his account of the *fiacre* as a trope conventionally associated with adultery is how it helps bring into relief the real scandal of Flaubert's passage. It is not simply that the passage is a clearly legible metonymic figuration of adultery—its conventionality and prevalence ought in fact to make it uncontroversial. Rather, the scandal is in the way in which, to use Riffaterre's terminology, Flaubert's use of the trope pushes it beyond the limits of the sociolect. In other words, but contrary to Riffaterre's argument, the fact that we are "bound to imagine [what goes] on inside" does not "fully [explain]" the suppression (9). This fact actually makes the suppression less comprehensible, as is suggested by Senard's references to a similar passage in Mérimée's novel as well as the fact that the *Revue* did not cut the much more overtly sexualized scene surrounding Emma's tryst with Rodolphe. The scandal is irreducible to its apparent empirical ground (that it "represents" Emma's adultery), and it exceeds any opposition between verisimilitude and semiosis (or even intertextuality). It is not that the trial misconstrues Flaubert's formally innovative use of a conventional trope for moral transgression, mistaking the use of the trope for the transgression it figures. Rather, the trial's reading of the novel accurately registers the scandalousness of the novel, but its moral horizon distorts the nature and terms of that scandal. The "descriptive system" of the adulteress is undeniably crucial to *Madame Bovary* (8), but Riffaterre installs this moral horizon as a formal precondition of the novel's significance. As with Barthes and Bal, Riffaterre's theoretically sophisticated analysis inherits a set of presuppositions inaugurated by the trial.

---

[20] Mieke Bal, "Fonction de la description Romanesque: La description de Rouen dans *Madame Bovary*," *Revue des Langues Vivants/Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen* 40.2 (1974): 132-149.

[21] Riffaterre, "Flaubert's Presuppositions" 7.

The aim of this excursus into a few key moments of what could be called "the Golden Age of Flaubert studies" (following Diana Knight but expanding the duration of the epoch)[22] is certainly not to rehash interpretive debates or discredit analyses that, within their own terms, are quite persuasive. Rather, it is to suggest the way in which these apparently purely academic literary questions are already enfolded within the trial's encounter with the *fiacre* passage. Part of what shapes the contours of Flaubert criticism is the trial's contradictorily legal and moral hermeneutic, which in turn is predicated in no small degree on the fact that it registers the scandal of the *fiacre* passage by passing over it. These critics' works help clarify the dilemmas at stake in the trial, partly because they perpetuate the theoretical and moral presuppositions at work in the trial. While Barthes and Bal help us to name the problem of narrative totality and connect it to issues of verisimilitude and realism, Riffaterre connects it to the social morality of those issues: like Pinard, he appeals to an extra-aesthetic, patently moral totality, a "fond…par [laquelle] tout s'explique et s'éclaircit" (ground…by which everything is explained and clarified) (Flaubert, *Œuvres* 480), which in turn reproduces Senard's (and Barthes's and Bal's) quantitative logic in its explanatory (accusatory) procedures. These misrecognitions and paradoxes, I claim, are immanent not merely to the trial but also to what we might be tempted to call the novel's essence or form. The point is that Flaubert's aesthetics as *Madame Bovary* constitutes them—what this novel is and what it means to literary history—are inextricable from the effect the trial had on how we read the novel, the effect the trial had on the novel, and the effect the novel had on the way in which the trial learned to read.

This is a kind of ensemble irreconcilable with the quantitative notion of "the whole novel" that the trial's attorneys presuppose. But the different ways in which they register this fact (Pinard's insistence that there is something morally and legally culpable "in" an unpublished passage, his odd use of the notion of the alibi; Senard's rhetorical paralipsis) show us that the trial nonetheless participates in that ensemble. The editorial censorship, the trial's reading of it, and the censored passage itself are like overlapping paralipses—and they constitute not discrete, finite units of a sum to be reconstructed, but a dynamic relation. In other words, the relation between the ensemble (the whole) and the inessential particular detail (a given phrase or scene) is also the relationship between the novel and the controversy it precipitates.

There is, finally, no fact of the unrepresented adultery behind or preexisting the *fiacre* passage that effects it paraliptically. This is essential to its scandalous nature—the referential alibi is effective, but doubly or even duplicitously so. And, *pace* Senard, Flaubert's descriptive power does not disappear here. If anything, it proliferates. It is of the essence of the adultery not to take place, to be passed over by referential alibi. As we have seen, details arising from what Pinard condemns as deceitful "local color" (in his eyes, a "realist" euphemism for "couleur lascive" [lascivious color] [465]) form the referential alibi's principle, the force of which both depends on and undermines representation considered as pictorial realism, referential accuracy, or even the reality effect. In other words, Flaubert's novel deploys a tactic that can resemble a mode associated with a vague notion of realism, but the complexities of the *fiacre* passage undermine the principles of that mode.

The implications of the trial's rhetorical entanglement with the censorship of the passage and the passage itself have theoretical ramifications for the relation between the novel and the trial. Pinard considers what he calls local color to be a pretext (or a false alibi) for the glorification of the immoral—descriptive fidelity as refusal of narrative judgment. While his conception of local color as pictorial literalizes a metaphor, he is correct, in a sense: what looks like local color is an alibi. But it is not the kind of alibi that shackles the text to a prefabricated moral condemnation of pictorial realism. Contrariwise, Senard is right to contest the reifying reaction to a paraliptical style (although

[22] "Whatever Happened to Bouvard and Pécuchet?", *New Approaches in Flaubert Studies*, ed. Tony Williams and Mary Orr (Lewiston: NY: Mellen, 1999), 170-74.

we have seen that he engages in it all the same). The prosecution and defense put their own rhetorics of paralipsis and alibi in service of establishing a coherent vantage or space from which to cast a judgment (whether Flaubert's or their own), but such a judgment only recirculates the structure of paralipsis and innuendo that is the real transgression.

The scandal of Flaubert's novel, therefore, is embodied in this curious process of passing over. The *fiacre* passage, in an odd sense, epitomizes Flaubertian style—but it does so in virtue of its being passed over, through the elsewhere it occupies in the trial's encounter with it. In short, *Madame Bovary* relies essentially on things passed over. And what seem to be, from the perspective of aesthetic form, the contingencies of the passage's editorial suppression and the trial are part of the novel. They are the logical consequences of Flaubert's paraliptical techniques. The trial uniquely reveals that, rather than something like Barthes's reality effect, there is a referential alibi, a kind of paralipsis not isolable as a notation or a reference in the sense that the trial imagines, but rather permeating the text with what Flaubert called a delocalized "l'élément brutal" (*Correspondance* II: 649-50). This is an element or medium of brutality not to be found in, but available nowhere else than through, the details that point to it elsewhere. This means that the detail appears as a detail, as both cause and effect of another heterogeneous order inhering elsewhere—the ensemble.

In short, the *fiacre* passage is the crux of the obscenity trial in the first place because it reveals that the real cause for alarm was not that the novel was obscene, was too explicit. This is where Senard is absolutely right: the novel's transgression proceeds by way of withholding, not by way of prurience. Flaubert's is not the squalid realism of the unseemly detail unflinchingly and non-judgmentally represented, but a narrative mode characterized by trading on the utter banality of the empirical, hollowing it out to be the vessel for an effect not graspable in representational terms or as a finite unit (a phrase or a passage that might be censored). That is the sense of Flaubert's complaint to his editors that "Vous attaquez à des détails, c'est à l'ensemble qu'il faut s'en prendre. L'élément brutal est au fond et non à la surface" (You attack the details, it is the ensemble that should be seized. The brutal element is in the foundations and not on the surface) (*Correspondance* II: 649-50). But if the upsetting element of the novel is that it is paraliptical, then this implies that the editorial suppressions, which suggest that there is something explicitly outrageous in the book even if it cannot be seized at the particular points the editors withheld, supply an editorial/bibliographical instantiation of the novel's own device. Further, the trial's own discourse becomes an unwitting participant by recirculating (in the juridical forms of Pinard's conventional notion of an alibi and Senard's rhetorical use of paralipsis) Flaubert's referential alibi. It is a kind of index to the primary formal innovation that runs throughout Flaubertian style; the editors and the trial dimly intuit this in their attempts to fill in the representational and moral void that it rends in narrative form. In other words, the importance of the passage is that it works the same way in the novel that it works in the trial.

It is for this reason—the fact that the *fiacre* passage is essentially paraliptical rather than excessively, amorally representational—that the trial finds it necessary to turn to other scenes in the novel in order to try and grasp the outrage that turns out not to be localizable in that passage. By considering a handful of those scenes, which were likewise marked by major suppressions in the serial edition, we shall be able also to account for the other face of the *Madame Bovary* scandal—namely the connected issues of moral judgment and narrative perspective. If Flaubert's famously meticulous descriptive realism turns out to hinge on referential alibi, then his equally seminal use of *style indirect libre* will also turn out to be a species of paralipsis.

IV. Narrative Perspective, Moral Judgment, and "Formes Convenues"

In consequence of the foregoing discussion of the *fiacre* passage and its referential alibi Pinard's *réquisitoire* is forced to a conclusion that in a sense converges with Flaubert's own arguments against cutting the passage. First, in order to pivot from the passed-over *fiacre* passage to ostensibly more explicitly outrageous moments in the novel, the prosecutor declares that "Nous savons maintenant, messieurs, que la chute n'a pas lieu dans le fiacre.…Mais si la *Revue de Paris* baisse les stores du fiacre, elle nous laisse pénétrer dans la chambre où se donnent les rendez-vous" (We now know, sirs, that the fall did not take place in the carriage.…But if the *Revue de Paris* lowers the blinds of the carriage, it lets us penetrate into the room where the trysts are held) (*Œuvres* 472-73). In other words, given the editorial alibi of censorship (not to mention the deeper referential alibi of the passage itself), "il faut donc chercher ailleurs…dans le livre" (it is therefore necessary to look elsewhere…in the book) to find the insinuated outrage fleshed out explicitly (480). And this entails scenes turn out to be defined by another of Flaubert's famous stylistic innovations, his complex use of narrative perspective and specifically *style indirect libre*. Here again, the prosecutor's admission that it would be "impossible" to read all of the novel is crucial. This is partly because, as I noted, instead of trying to read out every word in court, Pinard opts for a procedure that works much like *style indirect libre*: "raconter d'abord tout le roman sans en lire…puis de lire, d'incriminer en citant le texte" (first to recount the novel without reading from it…then to read, to incriminate by citing the text) (461). At the conclusion of his argument, having intuited the main effect of that style—not ironic condemnation, as so often is assumed, but rather complicity and a delocalization or occulting of discourse—Pinard will have searched in vain to find a character or even an extra-diegetic narrative perspective that provides appropriate judgment against Emma's immoralities. "Il n'y a pas dans le livre un personnage qui puisse la condamner.…Messaline a raison contre Juvénal" (There is not a character in the book who could condemn her….Messalina wins out over Juvenal) (479-480). Pinard therefore concludes that "Il faut donc chercher ailleurs que dans le livre, il faut chercher dans cette morale chrétienne qui est *le fond* des civilisations modernes" (It is therefore necessary to look elsewhere than in the book, it is necessary to look in the christian morality that is *the foundation* of modern civilizations) (480; emphasis added).

At heart, this conclusion is in accord with Flaubert's remark to the editors that "L'élément brutal est au fond et non à la surface" (The brutal element is in the foundations and not on the surface) (*Correspondance* II: 649-50). The referential alibi that characterizes such details pushes interpretation towards the "fond" that subtends them. The difference is that for Pinard (and Senard), the "fond" is a moral horizon, whereas for Flaubert it is an aesthetic horizon, the ensemble. Again, this ensemble is constituted not as the sum total of a quantity of details, but paraliptically, as the element or medium in which those heterogeneous terms commune. In other words, the trial's christian morality would require as its narratological correlate a narrator acting as a personal god, judging and redeeming. But as a closer look at the nuances of narrative perspective in a few scenes the trial discusses will show, this is absolutely the wrong way to understand Flaubert's notorious remark that "L'auteur, dans son œuvre, doit être comme Dieu dans l'univers, présent partout, et visible nulle part.…[Q]ue l'on sente dans tous les atomes, à tous les aspects, une impassibilité cachée et infinie" (The author, in his work, ought to be like God in the universe, present everywhere, and visible in no place….[S]o that one senses in every atom, in every aspect, a hidden and infinite impassibility) (*Correspondance* II: 204). In other words, "pas de réflexions, personnalité de l'auteur absente" (no reflections, personality of the author absent) (*Correspondance* II: 40). This will mean a use of narrative perspective that proceeds paraliptically, generating the effects of both a character with interiority and a personal narrator capable of reflection and judgment by dislocating—or rather

delocalizing—discourse itself. As with the referential alibi, we shall see that Flaubert's trademark mixture of direct and indirect discourse works paraliptically. It conjures the effect of character and narrator while preventing their isolation. And by generating the effect of some anterior discourse and simultaneously delocalizing it, rendering it unlocalizable, Flaubert's use of the style interpolates "quelque chose de subtil" (something somehow subtle) into the conventional form of narrative discourse (*Œuvres* 293).

Pinard intuits that the possibility of narratorial (moral) judgment is preempted by such a move, and thus argues that what is at stake here is ultimately a mélange "du sacré au profane" (477). Most often, the important scenes that feature *style indirect libre* or related moves with perspective focus on Emma's own body as a vessel into which, unlike the *fiacre*, one can see. In this section I shall consider three such scenes that the trial discusses in this respect. As each of these scenes offers a different, paraliptical sense of *style indirect libre*, we shall also see how crucial are the "formes convenues" in which Flaubert's narrator participates as much as Emma does. If *Madame Bovary*'s manipulations of narrative perspective insert an unlocalizable lacuna where narratorial judgment should be, they also work on the terrain of conventional forms and clichés, performing them but incompletely, in what the prosecution will call a "mélange du sacré au profane."

One such moment to which Pinard turns is Emma's return home just after her first act of adultery with Rodolphe (469).

> [E]n s'apercevant dans la glace, elle s'étonna de son visage. Jamais elle n'avait eu les yeux si grands, si noirs, ni d'une telle profondeur. *Quelque chose de subtil épandu sur sa personne la transfigurait*. Elle se répétait: 'J'ai un amant! un amant!'…Elle allait donc posséder enfin ces joies de l'amour, cette fièvre du bonheur dont elle avait désespéré. Elle entrait dans quelque chose de merveilleux où tout serait passion, extase, délire… (293; emphases added)

> [P]erceiving herself in the mirror, she was amazed by her face. She had never had eyes so big, so black, or of such profundity. *Something somehow subtle spread across her being was transfiguring her*. She repeated to herself: "I have a lover! A lover!"…So, at last, she was going to possess those joys of love, that fever of happiness of which she had despaired. She was entering into something somehow marvelous, where all would be passion, ecstasy, delirium…

According to Pinard, reflection on Emma's sin amounts to "glorification de l'adultère, elle chante le cantique de l'adultère, sa poésie, ses voluptés" (glorification of adultery, she chants the canticle of adultery, its poetry, its sensual dissolutions) an act "bien plus immoral[e] que la chute elle-même" (much more immoral than the fall [from grace] itself) (469). And the moment is emblematic of the novel's glorification of Emma through its refusal to judge her.

Against this reading, Hans Robert Jauss interprets the passage as a definitive instance of *style indirect libre*.

> The prosecuting attorney took the last sentences for an objective depiction that included the judgment of the narrator and was upset over the 'glorification of adultery.'…Yet Flaubert's accuser thereby succumbed to an error, as the defense immediately demonstrated. For the incriminating sentences are not any objective statement of the narrator's to which the reader can attribute belief, but rather a subjective opinion of the character, who is thereby to be characterized in her feelings that are formed according to novels.…The reader himself has to decide whether he

> should take the sentence for a true declaration or understand it as an opinion characteristic of this character. Indeed, Emma Bovary is 'judged, simply through a plain description of her existence, out of her own feelings.' This result of a modern stylistic analysis agrees exactly with the counterargument of the defense attorney Senard, who emphasized that…'the dénouement for morality is found in each line of the book.'[23]

Jauss's tacit agreement with Senard ultimately turns the passage back into a second-order judgment that cannot escape the problem Pinard alleges (palpable for example in his casual acceptance of the prosecution's claim that the lines are "incriminating"). Asserting that the passage is in *style indirect libre*, and displacing the seat of judgment to the reader's armchair, is insufficient to establish a principle by which to measure the effect of narratorial ironic judgment or complicity. In fact, one can easily imagine Pinard accepting the stylistic analysis—which falsely reduces the relation to a dichotomy, either condemnation or valorization—as further evidence of Flaubert's (narrator's) moral collusion with Emma.

Nonetheless, Jauss is right to point out that in moments like these the trial already theorizes *style indirect libre*: it is "only that Senard himself could not yet name the artistic device that was not yet recorded at this time!".[24] The point should be made even more forcefully: the moral judgment against Emma, from which Jauss never swerves, shows the degree to which most conceptions of *style indirect libre* are complicit with the vantage of the trial and in a sense derive from it even when they scorn Pinard's interpretive ineptitude. In this respect Jauss's analysis is analogous to Riffaterre's work on the *fiacre* passage. Both of these influential (and largely compelling) readings have premises inherited from the morality of the trial's discourse, which result from registering but failing to grasp fully the paraliptical force at work here.

As with many instances of Flaubert's manipulation of *style indirect libre*, there are not sufficient, or sufficiently objective, markers to situate definitively the perspective the last two sentences ("Elle allait donc posséder enfin ces joies de l'amour…Elle entrait dans quelque chose de merveilleux…" [So, at last, she was going to possess those joys of love.…She was entering into something somehow marvelous…] [293]). Deriving a notion of *style indirect libre* and narratorial morality through this kind of reflecting judgment can never be more than a conjectural postulate. We might, of course, imagine they are an indirect representation of an initially direct discourse, inflected by narratorial statement. However, Vaheed Ramazani's account of Emma's "self-alienating specularity"—she sees herself as object in the mirror of a "codified subject of an anonymous romantic intertext"—suggests that the "illusion of a preexistent" direct discourse is precisely a paraliptical effect of *style indirect libre*, not unlike the conjured but unrepresentable narrative event in the *fiacre*.[25] In this light, the last two phrases cited above are perhaps better understood as a performance of, or participation in, sentimental generic clichés (including the clichés of a one-dimensional character and a moral narrator). In other words, if there is any preexistent discourse that is being inflected here, it is more certainly that of a sentimental romantic cliché with which both Emma and the novel are colluding, than a direct thought or speech in Emma's mind or mouth. Essentially, then, there is no difference in kind between the narrator inhabiting the cliché and Emma doing so.

---

[23] Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 42-43. Jauss's quotations in this passage are of Senard's *plaidoirie.*

[24] Jauss, *Toward and Aesthetic of Reception* 43.

[25] *The Free Indirect Mode: Flaubert and the Poetics of Irony* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1988), 44-46.

Judgment, construed as either validation or condemnation, is an insufficient concept for the effects of this complex of polyvalent voices and lines of sight. The defense may theorize *style indirect libre* in all but name, as Jauss maintains, but the prosecution's reaction to this perspectival "mélange" (*Œuvres* 477), to the material inseparability of "subjective opinion" and "objective statement" is the more sensitive to the effects of the text. For instance, the second sentence of the passage ("quelque chose de subtil épandu sur sa personne la transfigurait" [something somehow subtle spread across her being was transfiguring her] [293]) is not easy to place as simply one or the other perspective. If we take the idea that something "transfigured her" seriously, then such a meeting of the human and the divine would indeed be sacrilegious, whether it suggested the meeting of the creator-narrator and character, or of the miserable quotidian with divinity found in an extra-marital affair. Moreover, "transfigured" implies a spectator; but if the narrator is that spectator, he is only looking at Emma in the mirror and over her shoulder. She is just as much the spectator of this transformed figure. And what is the provenance of this "something somehow subtle?" The complexities of *style indirect libre* in this passage are a form of irony that "n'enlève rien au pathétique" (removes nothing from the pathos) but "l'outre au contraire" (on the contrary intensifies it).[26] In other words, Flaubert's narrator colludes with, merges with, Emma as much as he could be said to judge her. In fact, we can infer him only through her—and vice versa.

This is in part because the diegetic fact of a mirror restages at the level of image, or embodies within the physical diegetic reality, the entire problem of *style indirect libre*: if one sees Emma's inner thoughts reflected or refracted by an external, indirect discourse, then she also sees herself, literally as well as figuratively, in and with the light of that same discourse. She has a specular relationship to her own self, as we are told earlier in the novel: she can read or visualize herself in external form only when it is refracted by "formes convenues" (conventional forms) of sentimental modes of literature and subjectivity (*Œuvres* 187). The narrator's relationship to such forms is the same, and such forms are the terrain on which important moments of *style indirect libre* can take place. Rather than an external narrator's translation of an anterior direct discourse lodged in the interior of a character, this is a passage that generates the effect of—and the difficulty of distinguishing between—the figures of an empirical character and an omniscient, transcendent narrator. It conjures them in a manner akin to the way the *fiacre* passage's referential alibi conjured the effect of adultery.[27] And if, as Riffaterre pointed out, the trope of the *fiacre* as a metonym for adultery was already a cliché by the 1850s,[28] likewise here a cliché, a "forme convenue," is the vehicle for interposing

---

[26] Flaubert, *Correspondance* II: 172. It is perhaps worth noting that the verb "outrer" might also be translated as "outrage."

[27] In a fascinating essay on Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, Steven Justice develops the notion of a "subjectivity effect," whereby "supplying details that imply a coherence they do not disclose—of mental acts, of physical space—can prompt an investigative desire to discern the principles of coherence; the act of seeking it tacitly concedes the reality of the materials supposed to cohere; and it thereby accepts the illusion of its existence" ("Chaucer's History-Effect," in *Answerable Style: The Idea of the Literary in Medieval England*, ed. Andrew Galloway and Frank Grady [Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2013], 169; 183-184). For instance, Criseyde's yielding denial to yield to Troilus is a "deflating response [that] creates an uncertainty whether she was pretending before or is pretending now. The work gives us no grounds for deciding; again, just posing a problem does all that the moment needs, inducing the question and with it the assumption that there is evidence *in there that*, if excavated, could explain her" (179). This is a remarkably deft description that would seem to apply easily to passages of *style indirect libre* in *Madame Bovary*. In fact, Justice remarks that something like this device becomes very "familiar…in prose fiction (Flaubert would scarcely exist without it)," but, he says, "character in classical and medieval narrative most often expresses itself rhetorically, complexities of thought and motive laid out exhaustively in direct discourse and explicit narration" (173). Part of my argument here is precisely that most ways of reading Flaubertian style involves the presumption of a (hidden) ground of fact—be it character psychology or empirical reality—and thus falls into an error analogous to what Justice calls "the fault of counting Lady Macbeth's children was the fault of treating characters as *explanantia* rather than *explananda*, as the sources rather than the products of literary discourse. But correcting the fault does not require pretending that the effects do not exist or matter" (171-172).

[28] Riffaterre, "Flaubert's Presuppositions" 9.

"quelque chose de subtil," an unlocalizable quality, within the discourse. As the novel is constituted through its performance of or participation in clichés, so is the idea of an omniscient but personal narrator constituted through its participation in its characters (and vice versa). If Emma becomes who she is by identifying with a cliché, an identification the partial failure (or incomplete performance) of which allows her to observe herself (more than this: if she becomes a character precisely in observing how her externalized self incompletely coincides with her imagoes), then this process equally generates the effect of a narrator capable of judging her. To put it another way, what Kent Puckett has called *Madame Bovary*'s "interiority effect" of character is inextricably bound up with the effect of a narrator.[29] And as we shall see, both are crucially bound up with performing conventions incompletely.

Modern literary criticism no less than the trial, and following its lead, appeals to "the narrator" as the ground, the "fond," of at least two interrelated presumptions: first, of the moral vantage of the novel, its intentionality with respect those characters made in its image (Riffaterre or Jauss); second, of the diegetic reality or representational realism of the novel (Barthes or Bal). However, these two assumptions—of the narrator as ground of the novel's moral judgment *qua* truth, of the narrator as ground of the novel's diegetic reality *qua* truth—presuppose one another. Ostensibly, if the narrator intervenes to mold or inflect an assumedly preexistent direct discourse or empirical diegetic reality, he does so in part to balance the subjective perspective of the character with the objective world: Emma may think this or that, but that is not how things work in the real (moral) world, which is implicitly given alongside Emma's fantasies. As I have suggested, however, the reciprocity of character-effect and narrator-effect is the truth of this misrecognition: such are the effects paraliptically generated by, but simultaneously destabilized by, *Madame Bovary*.[30] The point here is to see that *style indirect libre* is a kind of contradiction into which both readers and the novel must fall, but whose paradoxes cannot be swept away in order to misrecognize it as a hermeneutic solution. For Flaubert manipulates *style indirect libre* in order to insinuate unlocalizable lacunae into the effects it generates.

These lacunae have everything to do with the "formes convenues" (*Œuvres* 187) that seem to crop up at the major instances of something like *style indirect libre* in *Madame Bovary*. We can see this more clearly in a series of specular scenes that take place, as Pinard says, in "la chambre où se donnent les rendez-vous" (the bedroom where the rendez-vous are kept), and into which, unlike the *fiacre*, the *Revue de Paris* "nous laisse pénétrer" (allows us to penetrate) (472-73). This rented room is not only the site of rendez-vous but also of initiation into the rites of desire. If Emma's desire—along with her characterological interiority and the effect of an external reflecting narrator—is constituted through the medium or element of romantic clichés, then Léon in turn learns the art of the affair from and through Emma. Her inconstancy, "la diversité de son humeur" (the diversity of her humour), teaches him desires, and makes her into "l'amoureuse de tous les romans, l'héroïne de tous les drames, le vague *elle* de tous les volumes de vers" (the beloved of all novels, the heroine of all drama, the vague *she* of all volumes of verse) (384). In analogue to the "j'ai un amant" passage, this moment generates the content of Léon as a character across his focalized desire for Emma. She is the idealized grammatical subject of desire *elle*, and he thus desires her as that vague, elastic pronoun rather than its antecedent. But there is something lurking in her incarnation of this vague form that neither Léon nor any other of Emma's men (Charles, Rodolphe, the narrator, Pinard,

[29] *Bad Form: Social Mistakes and the Nineteenth-Century Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 77, 80.

[30] These reflections might also offer a way of reconsidering Flaubert's last minute alteration of the novel's *incipit*—the famous "nous." What I would call this absolutely irresolvable crux of Flaubert studies might be a diegetic figure for the problem of *style indirect libre* that I am addressing here. For an influential reading of this scene, see Alan Raitt, "'Nous étions à l'étude'," *Flaubert II: Mythes et religions* (*Revue des lettres modernes* 777: 1986), 161-192.

Senard…) can put a finger on. As we shall see, Léon's failed reification operates much in the same matter that Pinard's reading of the rite of extreme unction does. The point, I suggest, is that the diversity of Emma's humor (or passion) is its irreducible, unlocalizable, impersonal singularity. The "j'ai un amant" passage showed how the effects of an external narrator and his moral vantage are generated out of *style indirect libre*, with its ambiguities of detachment and participation, irony and empathy. Here, an analogous structure obtains, this time intradiegetically, between two characters, helping to draw out the importance of the element of conventional performance.

This moment is part of a sequence of iterative tryst scenes that reaches its pinnacle in another instance of *style indirect libre* focalized through Léon. Emma demands at each meeting that he bring a love poem he has written for her. Incapable of finding a rhyme for the second line, he generally ends up copying out some sonnet or other, "dans le seul but de lui complaire" (with the sole aim of pleasing her). "[I]l devenait sa maîtresse plutôt qu'elle n'était la sienne. Elle avait des paroles tendres qui lui enflammaient la chair avec des baisers dévorateurs qui lui emportaient l'âme. Où donc avait-elle appris cette luxure presque immatérielle, à force d'être profonde et dissimulée ?" ([H]e was becoming her mistress more than she was his. She had tender words that inflamed his flesh with devouring kisses that transported his soul. Where then had she learned this luxuriousness that was almost immaterial, by dint of being deep and dissembled?).[31] Pinard interprets these troubling lines in terms of other, simpler examples of *style indirect libre* ("n'était-ce pas…une vraie maîtresse, enfin ?" [wasn't this…a real mistress, finally?] [384]), but his disquiet about the sentence is perceptive despite, or because of, his unsophisticated narratology. It is precisely impossible that Léon knows that her *luxure*—luxuriousness, lust, but also incontinence or superabundance—is both profound and dissimulated. The initial part of the question is his (he suspects that she has acquired her sexual and romantic fervor from a previous lover). And there is irony here. However, the irony is less in the disillusionment of Léon's romantic naïveté, than in the fact that the final adjectival clause ("à force d'être profonde et dissimulée") can only be given from the narrator's perspective. Again, this is an irony that only intensifies the pathos: this is not, or not only, narratorial ridicule of the poor boy. It is equally a participation in his stupefaction.

But this in turn destabilizes the very ground, the concept of an omniscient narrator, making it not merely a diegetic or rhetorical but an actual question, leveling the irony at the position (or very possibility) of judgment. The narrator knows where she learned it, and so do we, but these empirical answers misconstrue the force of the question. The novel's more fundamental work is in asking but not answering a question behind the superficial one: how can it be that Emma's life is constructed from such platitudinous meaninglessness, and yet her passion is profound? Profound and dissimulated (disguised or deceitful, but also occulted or perhaps delocalized)? It thus becomes a question of how the paucity of the plot, or the banality of the passion Emma learns from the "formes convenues" of her world, could become a vehicle for a "luxure presque immatérielle" that is not exhausted by its performance. That is, a question of how such a "luxure" is effected paraliptically. In this respect, *style indirect libre*'s play of perspectives generates the same kind of effect that banal references like "Trois-Pipes" generate.

Now, were what I have been calling the ensemble merely Emma's "luxure presque immatérielle," which might well be its diegetic name, we might be forced to agree with Rancière's deflationary reading of Flaubert as what Hegel called romantic caprice, only raised to the second

[31] *Œuvres* 474, quoting *Madame Bovary* 69. Pinard misreads "cette luxure" as "ces caresses," hypostatizing this singular, ungraspable passion into a set of physical acts, turning the "cette" into a deictic physically and temporally localizable in the diegesis. In the volume edition the passage is slightly altered: "Elle avait des paroles tendres avec des baisers qui lui emportaient l'âme. Où donc avait-elle appris cette corruption…" (395).

power.[32] But, as I have been suggesting, the point is that Pinard's worries are more legitimate than he knows. Correlatively, Senard's attempts to show that "there is nothing in it" reveal that the shared presuppositions of the jurists prevent them from fully grasping the nature of Flaubert's strange novelistic achievement. Nonetheless, they intuit and unwittingly register it. Consequently, it is through the interaction of the trial with the novel that we can best articulate the relation of diegetic figures like "luxure presque immatérielle" and Flaubert's ensemble—a unitary medium in which heterogeneous parts interconnect and interact, rather than a quantitative sum of textual units. Here it is a question of mélange of the profane and the sacrosanct, as well as a question of perspective and judgment. But I am suggesting that those two issues come together in relation to "formes convenues." As I noted earlier, conventional forms were always a central problem for Emma: she is "incapable…de croire à tout ce qui ne se manifestait point par des formes convenues" (incapable…of believing in anything that never manifested itself by conventional forms) (*Œuvres* 187). This incapacity renders possible Pinard's allegation of a mélange of the sacred and the profane (477), because it is symptom of the scandalous way the vague and the precise converge—the way the forms of character, of narration, and of moral judgment get performed incompletely through plays of perspective typified by *style indirect libre*. A question of scandalously incomplete embodiment or performance (of conventional forms) has been at work in the previous passages of *style indirect libre*, but they come to the fore with Emma's last rites.

But before turning to that final moment in the trials' interpretive debate, it should be noted that Emma's last rites come twice: before the rite of extreme unction that immediately precedes her death, there is a moment (in II.xiv) when she believes herself dying and calls for a final communion. Pinard bridles. "Je n'aime pas beaucoup à rencontrer des choses saintes dans un roman, mais au moins, quand on en parle, faudrait-il ne pas les travestir par le langage" (I am not fond of encountering sacred things in a novel, but at least, when one speaks of them, one must not travesty them with one's language) (471). Among language's acts of travesty (we should observer that to travesty is to disguise or dress up, to caricature or ridicule by grotesque parody) are these lines: "Emma sentait quelque chose de fort passant sur elle, qui la débarrassait de ses douleurs, de toute perception, de tout sentiment. Sa chair allégée ne pesait plus, une autre vie commençait; il lui sembla que son être montant vers Dieu allait s'anéantir dans cet amour" (Emma felt something somehow powerful passing over her, unyoking her of her sufferings, of all perception, of all feeling. Her flesh, lightened, burdened no more, a new life was beginning; it seemed that her whole being, mounting towards God, was going to dissolve itself to nothing in that love) (338).[33]

---

[32] See *La parole muette* 62-69 and 103-119, especially 110ff: "En effet, l'opposition de l'objectivisme hégélien au subjectivisme des penseurs et des poètes de l'*Athanæum* reposait, en dernière instance, sur une même présupposition fondamentale.…L'idéalité esthétique était la présence du sens au cœur du sensible, de la parole au cœur du mutisme.…Mais quand la 'libre volonté' flaubertienne vient s'identifier avec l'absolu dessaisissement du sujet, la conception de l'idée elle-même s'est retournée. L'idée est proprement l'équivalence de toute détermination avec la puissance de l'indéterminé, elle est le devenir-insensé de tout sens" (Indeed, the Hegelian objectivist opposition to the subjectivism of the thinkers and poets of the *Athanæum* rested, in the final instance, on the very same fundamental presupposition.…Aesthetic ideality was the presence of meaning in the heart of the sensuous, of speech in the heart of muteness.…But when Flaubertian 'free will' identified itself with the absolute renunciation of the subject, the conception of the idea itself falls back [into subjectivism]. The idea is, properly, the equivalence of every determination with the power of the undetermined, it is the becoming-senseless of all sense.) See also *La chair des mots* (Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1998) 179-203, where Rancière calls Flaubert's Antoine (himself a metonym for Rancière's Flaubert) "un spinoziste contemporain de Schopenhauer" (182).

[33] This again echoes the "j'ai un amant" passage in the language of merging with the divine. There it was transfiguration, but here it seems to be dissolution of the finite self. Likewise, "quelque chose de fort" recalls both that passage and the moment when Léon sensed a "quelque chose" separating Emma from him, even at her most ostensibly intimate presence. For a reading of this passage in light of Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, see Jacques Neefs, "'Du réel écrit…'," *MLN* 122:4 (2007): 697-712. In light of the analyses this section is elaborating, (what I would argue to be)

Pinard interprets this as a parody that interpolates the content of an illicit affair into the prayer's form.

> Dans quelle langue prie-t-on Dieu avec les paroles adressées à l'amant dans les épanchements de l'adultère? Sans doute on parlera de couleur locale, et on s'excusera en disant qu'une femme vaporeuse, romanesque, ne fait pas, même en religion, les choses comme tout le monde. Il n'y a pas de couleur locale qui excuse ce mélange! Voluptueuse un jour, religieuse le lendemain, nulle femme, même dans d'autres régions, même sous le ciel d'Espagne ou d'Italie, ne murmure à Dieu les caresses adultères qu'elle donnait à l'amant. Vous apprécierez ce langage, messieurs, et vous n'excuserez pas ces paroles de l'adultère introduites, en quelque sorte, dans le sanctuaire de la divinité ! (471-72)
>
> In what language does one pray to God with phrases addressed to a love in the effusions of adultery? Doubtless, on would talk about local colour, and make excuses by saying that a hysterical, fantastical woman does unusual things—even when it comes to religion. There is no local colour that could excuse this intermixing! Voluptuous one day, religious the next, no woman, even in other regions, even under the sky of Spain or Italy, murmurs the same adulterous caresses to God that she bestowed on her lover. You will assess this language, sirs, and you will not excuse these words of adultery introduced, in some fashion, into the sanctuary of divinity!

Immediately, one wonders what grounds his judgment, since there are no words spoken in the passage, either to God or to the lover. It is as though, having intuited that the troubling effect of Flaubertian *style indirect libre* is that it merges a character's (sinful) perspective with what ought to be the divine narrator's (moral) one, he reads a scene thematizing such a convergence as if it were written in *style indirect libre*. But it is difficult to appreciate "these words," to condemn their introduction into the sanctuary of the divine, since the demonstrative determiner "these" refers to no antecedent. Pinard quotes nothing from the novel featuring a prayer mixed with adulterous phrases. Furthermore, Emma seems if anything spiritualized or disembodied, rather than sensualized. Such moments seem at first to legitimate the commonplace that the trial had no idea how to read the novel, or that Pinard, like Homais, is nothing but a figure of fun.

Nonetheless, Senard's rebuttal—that the charges are the false effect of a disingenuously incomplete citation—misses something important. For Pinard actually refers to lines from several pages later in the same episode, in a kind of 'free indirect citation' (that is, without directly quoting): "quand elle se mettait à genoux sur son prie-Dieu gothique, elle adressait au Seigneur les mêmes paroles de suavité qu'elle murmurait jadis à son amant, dans les épanchements de l'adultère" (when she when knelt down on her gothic prie-dieu, she would address to the Lord the same words of sweetness that she used to murmur to her lover, in the effusions of adultery) (340). Even once the reference is located, however, it becomes clear that Emma's words are not quoted as direct discourse in the text but rather are "racontés," just as the rite of extreme unction will be, and just as the "all of the novel" is by Pinard's argument (461). So, the prosecutor treats the above-quoted passage he as a kind of direct discourse that he then remediates with his own narratorial judgment, blending the

---

Merleau-Ponty's ultimately Cartesian subjectivism makes him a problematic theoretical model for assessing *Madame Bovary*'s modes of description, character construction, and *style indirect libre*.

voices of juridical "narrator" and literary "character"—although here, the two perspectives do preexist their mélange in a manner I have shown to be specious in the novel's own *style indirect libre*.

Whereas we have seen it to be fundamental to Flaubert's *style indirect libre* to make two perspectives and discourses in principle inseparable and in fact generate the effect of each through its complicity with the other, Pinard's intentional aim—the narrator's moral judgment against the character—is absolutely clear. It is a judgment against Flaubertian narration for refusing to judge its characters, for blending profane character and a narrative perspective that should be, or at least reproduce, the divine "fond" of christian morality.[34] The prosecutor's entanglement with that literary form is premised rhetorically on the radical separation of the judicial and literary spheres or discourses. This obscures their more fundamental (if paradoxical) correlation, but Senard's diametrically opposed reading—that "le dénouement pour la moralité se trouve à chaque ligne du livre" (the dénouement for morality is found in each line of the book)—is equally predicated on the same moral principle (488). In truth, each of the jurists offers a mélange wherein purportedly exact citation is "travestied" by a moral judgment occurring in the form the citation takes.

As a result, Senard's determination to restore the whole text will never absolve it, although it helps us appreciate how it figures the problem, and how Pinard's engagement circulates effects that appear, if at all, in a "terrain" to which he never had access. And if Pinard recirculates some of Flaubert's narrative procedures in the form of his own relentlessly hypostatized *style indirect libre* (that is, where the entire point is to separate the culpable perspective from the one that indirectly presents it in order to judge it), then Senard's approach to such passages will be to insist that everything is direct discourse, exactly and punctiliously copied. Again, although there were editorial suppressions connected to some of these passages, here the concern is less with censorship than with citation, narrative perspective, and the performance of conventional forms.

In light of these three passages ("j'ai un amant," "le vague *elle*" and "luxure presque immatérielle," the final communion), and considering that, as Riffaterre has shown, the trope of the *fiacre* is itself a "forme convenue,"[35] we can see the extent to which the issues of narrative perspective and judgment that arise here complement the insights of the preceding analysis of the *fiacre* passage and its suppression. It is as though Pinard dimly intuits that Flaubert's *style indirect libre* not only refuses judgment, it invalidates it: because the vantage of a narrator-god is as much an effect of an incomplete performance as is the interiority of the character (and, in the case of the final communion, because the rite is just such another conventional form). This novel's nimble manipulations of perspective manage both to luxuriate in the sensuous and pass over it, since it is always more than itself, something "presque immatérielle" that is the passed over within the enactment of a conventional form. That is to say that here, too, an interior is fabricated or conjured up out of surface effects.

Finally, I should like to emphasize here that, just as the present discussion brings out the questions of judgment more latent in the previous section, the more explicit nature of the suppression of the *fiacre* scene helps us to think through the more dispersed deletions and things passed over in these later moments of the novel's serialization. For the fact of the *fiacre* passage's suppression is, as I have shown, crucial to the edifice of Pinard's *réquisitoire*, whereas with the final linchpin of the argument, he is most concerned not with suppressed passages exactly, but a passage that stands in the shadow of Flaubert's note, and thus in a shadow of paralipsis just as much as the *fiacre* suppression. Moreover, it is a scene that recounts the performance of a Catholic rite, and does

[34] As I remarked above, Riffaterre repeats this gesture in his own indirect citation of Pinard, though it is in the context of an implicit but obvious agreement with Senard's positive assessment of Flaubert's alleged narratorial judgment.
[35] See "Flaubert's Presuppositions" 9.

so in a manner that brings Flaubert's paraliptical games with narrative perspective together with its relation to conventional forms, tropes, and clichés (such as the *fiacre* trope).

V. The Rite of Extreme Unction

> God is a witness that cannot be sworn.
> — Samuel Beckett

For Pinard, the Catholic rite performed on Emma at her deathbed has its sanctity as a form threatened by its narrative enactment—the linchpin of the prosecution, tying the vague threats effected by referential alibi together with the mélange and moral complicity effected by the oddities of perspective. The prosecution opens this last of his close readings by insisting on the sanctity of the Catholic rite of extreme unction as a kind of direct discourse that the novel subjects to a profaning, indirect and incomplete performance.

> Sans un remords, sans un aveu, sans une larme de repentir sur ce suicide qui s'achève et les adultères de la veille, elle va recevoir le sacrement des mourants. Pourquoi le sacrement, puisque, dans sa pensée de tout à l'heure, elle va au néant? Pourquoi, quand il n'y a pas une larme, pas un soupir de Madeleine sur son crime d'incrédulité, sur son suicide, sur ses adultères?…[L'extrême-onction,] *ce sont des paroles saintes et sacrées pour tous.* C'est avec *ces paroles-là* que nous avons endormi nos aïeux, nos pères ou nos proches, et c'est avec elles qu'un jour nos enfants endormiront. *Quand on veut les reproduire, il faut le faire exactement; il ne faut pas du moins les accompagner d'une image voluptueuse sur la vie passée.*
>
> Vous le savez, le prêtre fait les onctions saintes sur le front, sur les oreilles, sur la bouche, sur les pieds, en prononçant *ces phrases* liturgiques : *Quidquid per pedes, per aures, per pectus*, etc., toujours suivies des mots *misericordia…péché d'un côté, miséricorde de l'autre. Il faut les reproduire exactement ces paroles saintes et sacrées ; si vous ne les reproduisez pas exactement, au moins n'y mettez rien de voluptueux.* (*Œuvres* 475-76; emphases added)

> Without remorse, without an avowal, without a tear to repent for this suicide in progress or the adulteries of yesterday, she is going to receive the sacrament of the dying. Why the sacrament, since according to her thoughts just a moment before, she is passing into nothingness? Why, when there is not a tear, not a Magdalene sigh [of penitence] for her crime of disbelief, for her suicide, for her adulteries?…[The extreme unction,] *these are holy words, and sacred for all.* It is with *these very words* that we put our forebears, our fathers or those dear to us, and it is with them that one day our children will put us to rest. *When one wants to reproduce them, it has to be done exactly; at the very least, they cannot be accompanied by a licentious image of past life.*
>
> As you know, the priest applies the holy anointments on the brow, on the ears, on the mouth, on the feed, while pronouncing *these liturgical phrases*: *Quidquid per pedes, per aures, per pectus*, etc., always followed by the words *misericordia…sin on one side, forgiveness on the other. They must be reproduced exactly, these holy and sacred words; if you do not reproduce them exactly, at the very least do not introduce anything licentious.*

The problem with the scene seems to be that it corrupts the sanctity of the religious rite by its narrative mélange of quotation and paraphrase, of performance and description. In place of a

faithful reproduction of the rite, the novel enacts it in bad faith, sacrilegiously. Or perhaps more strongly still, this travesty takes the place of a proper judgment against Emma—either at the diegetic level of a refusal to perform the rite on an inveterate sinner, or at the extra-diegetic level of omitting the rite altogether. The prosecutor effectively treats the words of the rite as a sacred direct discourse. With the deictic phrase "ces paroles-là" he refers to the words of the rite *and* the words of the text, between which there is no difference in kind or indeed in number, since the novel reproduces them in this scene in precisely the same sense that "we" reproduce them every time we lay those dear to us to rest. The reference is to one and the same object, meaning that two different perspectives or performances are potentially mixed, just as with *style indirect libre*.

But what is that object, if Flaubert's reproduction is inexact, the performance a grotesque parody? Here the rite, as reproduced or performed by the novel, is:

> il récita le *Misereatur* et l'*Indulgentiam*, trempa son pouce droit dans l'huile et commença les onctions ; d'abord sur les yeux, qui avaient tant convoité toutes les somptuosités terrestres ; puis sur les narines, friandes de brises tièdes et de senteurs amoureuses ; puis la bouche, qui s'était ouverte pour le mensonge, qui avait gémi d'orgueil et crié dans la luxure ; puis sur les mains, qui se délectaient aux contacts suaves, et enfin sur la plante des pieds, si rapides autrefois quand elle courait à l'assouvissance de ses désirs, et qui maintenant ne marcheraient plus. (436)
>
> He recited the *Misereatur* and the *Indulgentiam*, dipped his right thumb in the oil, and began the unctions: first on the eyes, which had so coveted all the opulences of the earth; then on the nostrils, avid of mild breezes and the smells of love; then on the mouth, which had opened for falsehood, which had moaned with pride and cried out in lust; then on the hands, which had so delighted at the touch of elegance, and lastly on the soles of the feet, once so swift when she ran toward the satiation of her desires, and which now would walk no more.

Interpolating his citation of this passage with editorializing descriptions of the rite, Pinard denounces the text's own interpolated descriptions of the parts of the offending body. These descriptions contaminate the rite itself, luxuriating in the details of the acts it is supposed to absolve. Even to depict a scene of extreme unction is a problem of realism's representational immorality, its perceived threat to moral and social order: such irreverently exact replication "was seen to promote unseemly mimetic identifications between reader and dramatic character, to foster inappropriate social and sexual behaviors and desires, and to lead the innocent reader down an unforgiving road of moral decay."[36] For Pinard, the rite is performed under false pretenses, given the facts—that Emma is a suicide, is unrepentant, and thinks "c'est bien peu de chose, la mort !…Je vais m'endormir, et tout sera fini" (it's a little thing, really, death!…I'll fall asleep, and it will all be over) (428). Absolving her would be like burying her on hallowed ground (which, of course, though she is a suicide, is done). It might seem odd, then, to be concerned that Bournisien's rite will deceive the divine into allowing Emma into heaven.

But this is not merely a case of an illegitimate and therefore failed performative. As with the scenes of *style indirect libre* that I discussed, the problem is the convergence of discourses, performances, perspectives, and the implication that the absence of a stably transcendent vantage of narratorial judgment is equivalent to moral collusion with the sinner. This is complicated by the fact that Pinard judges the novel's description of the rite's performance as if it were a performance of the

[36] Naddaff, "Confronting the Frugal Editors" 275.

rite in direct discourse and as if, rather than Emma speaking contritely as respondent, her body spoke voluptuously as a kind of condensation (or self-detached contemplation) of the acts that somehow incarnate that "luxure," performing her sins again, embodying and embedding them within the rite meant to absolve her of them just as her corporeal life dissolves. Thus, in the trial's discussion of the passage (as Senard's rejoinder will underscore), Flaubert's technique of mixing direct and indirect discourse, of delocalizing the core act that discourse purportedly represents, suddenly marks within what is called "real sacrilege" a lacuna: a possible, but undetermined distinction between the reproduction (performance) of a rite and the literary representation (image) of a theological situation. In other words, there is a confusion, a "mélange" of the sacred liturgy and the profane literary: is the problem that Flaubert represents a travesty of the rite, or that Flaubert travesties the rite, sacrilegiously performing it himself?[37]

It seems that, for Pinard, the offense either is of the latter sort, or simply does not admit of such a distinction. And it is clearly of a piece with his interpretation of Flaubert's moral collusion with Emma that we saw with passages of *style indirect libre*, despite the fact that the novel cannot be said to reproduce or perform the rite but only to recount it as Pinard "raconte" the novel itself (*Œuvres* 461). The trial, on the other hand, does reproduce it—if not in Pinard's incomplete citations, then in Senard's more exhaustive one. The defense attorney argues that Flaubert's is a scrupulously faithful translation. In fact, according to Senard, it is precisely in moments like these—just as with the *fiacre* passage—that Flaubert's moral rectitude can be seen most clearly. For Senard also objects to Emma's "christianisme sensuel," and his contention is that the novel's virtue consists in its unflinching representation and therefore judgment of the ways that religion and morality are "sensualized" by mysticism. In other words, for Senard, Flaubert is either giving us the direct (intertextual) discourses, or that they can be isolated and used to show that the narrator's discourse does separate from and judge his sinful character. Thus, he argues that, to find the originals from which this scene copies, beginning with Emma kissing the crucifix, one need not "chercher dans Fénelon le mysticisme de Mme Guyon" (go looking in Fénelon for the mysticism of Madame Guyon), but merely go to Bossuet, whose doctrinal orthodoxy opposed the former with the argument that "Jésus veut qu'on soit avec lui ; il veut jouir, il veut qu'on jouisse de lui" (Jesus wants us to be with him; he wants to enjoy, he wants us to enjoy him) (*Œuvres* 522). In short, "tous ces passages incriminés ne sont, non pas des plagiats,—l'homme qui s'est approprié une idée n'est pas un plagiaire,—mais que des imitations de Bossuet" (all these incriminated passages, they're not plagiaries—the man who makes an idea his own is not plagiarist—but rather emulations of Bossuet) (515).

But Senard does not stop at appealing to the religious authority of Louis XIV's court priest—he makes recourse to the same line of argumentation he used concerning the *fiacre* passage. Flaubert, in "copying" sacramental language "avec une fidélité scrupuleuse" (with a scrupulous fidelity), and adding the particular sins of each organ, is doing nothing more than Sainte-Beuve did with his *Volupté*, which also translates the rite into the vulgate and describes the particular sins (523). Flaubert simply "a usé du droit, qui appartient à tout écrivain, d'ajouter à ce qu'a dit un autre écrivain, de compléter un sujet" (exercised the right belonging to every writer, to add to what another writer has said, to fill out the subject) (524). Next, moving beyond the more generalized appeal to Bossuet, Senard turns to the Abbott Ambroise Guillois, a curate in Mans whose 1849 treatise on the catechism was one of Flaubert's sources.[38] The defense attorney begins his quotation

[37] For a discussion of some of the theoretical and political implications of such a distinction, see Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York: Routledge, 1997), particularly 65-69.

[38] See Stéphanie Dord-Crouslé, "Les deux bibliothèques religieuses de *Madame Bovary,*" in Madame Bovary *et les savoirs*, ed. Gisèle Séginger and Pierre-Louis Rey (Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009), 147-155.

from Guillois's treatment of the rite of extreme unction by saying "ce n'est plus maintenant M. Sainte-Beuve, un artiste, un fantaisiste littéraire que je cite ; *écoutez l'Église elle-même*" (it is no longer M. Sainte-Beuve, an artist, a literary fantasist that I quote; *listen to the Church herself*), and then shows how Guillois dwells on the sensuous, sinful corporeality the rite absolves by confronting (524-26, emphases added).[39] Flaubert has not "mêlé le profane au sacré, quand, à chacun des sens, [il a] indiqué le péché commis par ce sens, puisque c'est le langage de l'Église elle-même" (blended the profane with the sacred when, at each of the senses, he has indicated the sin committed by that sense, since this is the language of the Church herself). In fact, Flaubert has not even included all of the body parts and sins described in Guillois: "et nous pourrions, d'après le Rituel, parler d'autre chose encore que de la poitrine, mais Dieu sait quelle sainte colère nous aurions excitée chez le ministère public, si nous avions parlé des reins" (and we could, following the Rite, speak of still other things than the stomach, but God knows what holy wrath we would have excited in the state prosecutor, if we had spoken of the loins). The scene is rather a faithful copying, a metabolization of an anterior direct discourse that partakes of its sanctity; or a performance that follows all the formulae with a good conscience (526).

Hence, the implication is that one can always exhume and isolate direct discourse, and hence one can always extract the narrator's moral vantage. So, the rite of extreme unction is also a matter of something like *style indirect libre*, for Senard responds to Pinard's conflation of direct and indirect discourse (his mélange of citation and judgment of the cited) on the same terrain: Flaubert "a mis dans la bouche du prêtre, en réunissant les deux parties, *ce qui doit être dans sa pensée et en même temps dans la pensée du malade. Il a copié purement et simplement*" (put into the mouth of the priest, in joining the two parts, *what must have been in his thought and at the same time in the thought of the sufferer. He copied, purely and simply*) (525; emphasis added). In other words, where Pinard spoke of the scene as if it were in direct discourse but subjected it to his own condemnatory sort of indirect discursive representation, Senard points out that the passage is at least partly a *style indirect libre* presentation focalized through Bournisien and/or Emma; but he treats it as a pure copy of the form, a direct discourse.

What Pinard considers a profane incarnation of sacred form, Senard calls a simple copy. However, he defines simple copying by reference to the narrator's interpolation into the cited rite of "what must have been in the thoughts" of a character. As Jauss suggests, Senard is perhaps the first theorist of *style indirect libre*, despite arguing as though the passage were direct discourse. It is important to note that the defense's interpretation constitutes an attempt to isolate a transcendent narrator as ground of the novel's morality. This fact has ramifications for the subsequent history of narrative theory and criticism. The passage is clearly not spoken by "the mouth of the priest"—although it might be construed as *style indirect libre* of his thoughts—but Senard claims that it is a copy of what must have been in his and Emma's thoughts. It is the (presumptively external) narrator that performs the rite, uniting the two minds of the characters through a moment of judgment or grace. This therefore would be a real communion of the faithful—*style indirect libre* as the Holy Ghost, sanctification rather than profanation, absolution rather than mélange. Senard's interpretive claim about this passage is therefore the inverse of Pinard's. Nevertheless the moral "fond" is the same.

While unpersuasive as *explication de texte*, Senard's rebuttal underscores the connection between the problems of incompletely performed conventional forms, quotation and indirect recounting, and perspective. As with the *fiacre* passage, which passed over what eminently respectable writers had addressed explicitly, Flaubert's "copying" of the rite of extreme unction from

[39] See Ambroise Guillois, *Explication historique, dogmatique, morale, liturgique et canonique du catéchisme, avec la réponse aux principales objections tires des sciences contre la religion*, 4 vols. (Le Mans: Lanier et Monnoyer, 1849); the rite is described in detail in III: 378-385.

Guillois passes over the loins. But revealing such lacunae does more than show Flaubert in the light of a moralist—it suggests that Pinard's suspicions are founded, even if not within the reified quantitative register in terms of which Senard refutes him. Moreover, the complications mount when we note that, rather than impiously performing the rite of extreme unction, as Pinard seems to think, or faithfully copying it, as Senard contends, the passage describes or recounts it. This indirect or mixed discourse, as Senard's misreading helps show, interposes "quelque chose de subtil" (*Œuvres* 293), something beyond the reach of the jurists, but which they still register.

Pinard reads the scene as glorifying voluptuousness rather than repenting its sinfulness. What are to him Flaubert's interpolations of the sensuous into the rite, and what are for Senard Flaubert's suppression of the most sensuous of these corporeal details, are at once interpolations of Emma's particular body parts and lacunae, metonymic insinuations of an unlocalizable "luxure presque immatérielle." Pinard is more right than he knows, then, to scrutinize the rite of extreme unction: the interpolation of Emma's body parts as lacunae confirm his suspicions, albeit in ways that exceed their logic. And if Pinard is right despite himself, then Senard helps articulate this precisely because he insists on restoring all the lost passages: he tries to show that they consist of pure copying rather than interpolation, but he also reveals that not only are they lacunae, they interpolate lacunae into the procedure of copying. Here, a lacuna is introduced: a narrative mode of performance that renders the form essentially incomplete, interpolating "quleque chose de subtil" in the figure of Emma herself. Senard is wrong, this is not chaste circumlocution within the literary procedure of 'copying,' but his argument helps us see the more profound implications of Pinard's intuitions.

The fact that the rite is incomplete, that its description (or paraphrase, or performance, or copied reproduction) somehow manages to insinuate an unlocalizable lacuna, is marked by the reactions it provokes, particularly Emma's reaction. But, for Charles, at least momentarily, the rite seems to have been as successful as Pinard worries.

> [E]lle n'était pas aussi pale, et son visage avait une expression de sérénité, *comme si le sacrement l'eût guérie*. Le prêtre ne manqua point d'en faire l'observation ; il expliqua même à Bovary que le Seigneur, quelquefois, prolongeait l'existence des personnes *lorsqu'il le jugeait convenable* pour le salut ; *et Charles se rappela un jour où, ainsi près de mourir, elle avait reçu la communion*.…En effet, elle regarda tout autour d'elle, lentement, comme quelqu'un qui se réveille d'un songe ; puis, d'une voix distincte, *elle demanda son miroir*, et elle resta penchée dessus quelque temps, jusqu'au moment où des grosses larmes lui découlèrent des yeux. (436; emphases added)
>
> [S]he was not so pale, and her face wore an expression of serenity, as if the sacrament had cured her. The priest did not fail to point this out; he even explained to Bovary that the Lord, sometimes, would prolong people's lives *when he deemed it convenient* to their salvation; *and Charles recalled a day when, just as close to dying as now, she had received communion*.…Indeed, she looked all around her, slowly, like someone waking from a dream; then, in a distinct voice, *she asked for her mirror*, and she remained bent over it for some time, until large tears poured from her eyes.

The moment of Emma's death thus explicitly recalls or interpolates her earlier, incomplete and not-so-final communion, where she attempted to merge with the divine. Charles's focalized ignorance of this renewed failure intensifies the pathos and also confirms the prosecution's insight that these scenes are connected by more than their shared topic of religious ritual. Moreover, the mirror likewise literalizes again the drama we saw in the "j'ai un amant" scene's use of *style indirect libre*—the

drama of Emma observing herself in terms of an incomplete performance of clichés, imagoes, or conventional forms. In the present moment, that entire dynamic recurs with the hand mirror, as she looks for signs of her *salut* (absolution and/or dissolution) in her own reflection. More than this, she is looking for signs of her interiority. In other words, she has no other form of access to her interiority. This gives double confirmation to my reading of the paraliptical effect of *style indirect libre* in the "j'ai un amant" scene. Emma is veiled even to herself, and the effect of an interior is just that. This whole process is a figure for the trial's problem with the scene, with Flaubert's paraliptical style, with *Madame Bovary* as ensemble: it both is and is not the thing it appears to be.

The upshot of this paraliptical perspective at Emma's death is given in what is for Pinard the novel's final desecration of the sacred, when Charles approaches Emma's corpse. Moreover, this final object of the jurists' interpretation brings us back explicitly to the terms of the debate surrounding the *fiacre* passage, where the concern is with what du Camp called "impossible" descriptive details and a physical space closed to the reader's eyes. "Quand le mari est là,…quand il a étendu sur elle le linceul, tout autre se serait arrêté, et c'est le moment où M. Flaubert donna le dernier coup de pinceau: 'la drap se creusait depuis ses seins jusqu'à ses genoux, se relevant ensuite à la pointe des orteils'" (when the husband is there,…when he has spread the shroud over her, any one else would have stopped short, and this is the moment where M. Flaubert delivers the final stroke of the brush: 'the sheet sagged hollowly from her breasts to her knees, rising again at the points of her toes') (477; quoting 441). This description of the shroud veiling the naked body, like the naked hand of the *fiacre* passage, epitomizes "la littérature réaliste" for Pinard. It is the "art sans règle [qui] n'est plus l'art ; c'est comme une femme qui quitterait tout vêtement" (art without rules [which] is no longer art; it is like a woman who would take off all her clothes) (481).

But Pinard misreads: "Charles entra, et, s'avançant vers le lit, il tira lentement les rideaux. Emma avait la tête penchée sur l'épaule droite.…Le drap se creusait depuis ses seins…" (Charles entered, and, advancing towards the bid, he drew the curtains slowly. Emma's head was leaning on her right shoulder.…The sheet sagged hollowly from her breasts…) (477). Charles does not drape Emma's body in a shroud, but rather draws back the curtains of the bed to find her already draped in a shroud. In his final indirect recounting of the novel's language, Pinard travesties the real travesties performed: here again, the passage he cites is not itself a passage in *style indirect libre*, but rather a scenic or tableau description, ultimately not dissimilar to the scenic description in the *fiacre* passage. It too generates the effect of an interior by refusing to "penetrate" it (473)—suggesting that if it were opened, we only find it to be empty, as happens with Charles's body in his autopsy. The persistence of the veil is that "quelque chose de subtil épandu sur sa personne" that "la transfigurait" in the "j'ai un amant" scene (293), the "luxure presque immatérielle" that neither Léon nor the narrator could locate (395), and the potential effect of the extreme unction that even Emma herself has to look for in a mirror (436-37). (There is nothing behind the veil, or in this instance what is behind the veil is another veil: we could as easily say that what is behind the veil is the other side of the veil.) It is not exactly that the narrator refuses to "penetrate" and judge, or on the other hand that he simply "glorifies" immorality "in all its nudity." He is only an effect of passing over, of the "something somehow subtle" that paraliptically allows the jurist to believe that there is some thing somewhere to be located and quantified.

Pinard's attempt to locate such a thing elsewhere in the novel finally culminates in the claim that Emma should not be absolved but is (represented as) absolved ("Messaline a raison contre Juvenal" [Messalina wins out over Juvenal]), that there is no vantage from which to judge her (either intradiegetically or from the perspective of the author). Therefore, he claims, judgment can come only from an external ground: "il faut donc chercher ailleurs que dans le livre…dans cette morale chrétienne qui est le fond des civilisations modernes. Par cette morale, tout s'explique" (it is thus necessary to look elsewhere than in the book…in that christian morality that is the foundation of

modern civilizations. By this morality, all is explained) (480). Such a "fond" is very different from the "fond" I have tried to show that Flaubert calls the novel as ensemble—and equally the ensemble of the novel, its serialization process, and the trial. The "fond" to which Pinard and Senard both appeal could be guaranteed only by a stable, transcendent perspective that Flaubert's *style indirect libre* refuses.

"A woman who would take off all her clothes" (481). …If what, if she could? Pinard's simile is in the conditional because he registers (if unknowingly) that this sexualized, misogynistic phrase figures the realism he takes *Madame Bovary* to perform—and figures it in an impossible modality. But Flaubert's novel proceeds exactly by such methods of conjuring the impossible by omission, of insinuating the unlocalizable within a lacuna in the banally quotidian reality. In other words, the prosecutor's assumption is equally the paradox of things passed over, circulating in *Madame Bovary*, the serial suppressions, and the trial, but localizable within no one of the three. I said earlier that the *fiacre* passage is epitomizes Flaubertian style, in virtue of its being passed over and then recirculated in its effects through the trial. Turning to the series of passages in *style indirect libre* and then to the scene of Emma's last rites reveals how the trial seeks to fill out the lacuna, to lend precision to the vagueness, of the *fiacre* passage's paralipsis. Across this trajectory, the trial itself shows us how the detail (whether a deleted passage, a morally unrepresentable adulterous act, a character's interiority, the external narrator, the efficacy of a ritual or conventional form) appears as a detail, both as cause and effect of another heterogeneous order inhering elsewhere—but those empirical textual elsewhere that Pinard seeks out tend to disperse further and further, revealing something unlocalizable within themselves. This vitiates a notion of "all of the novel" as a sum total. Just as Emma's body (or her passion) is not one. "Lire tout le roman? C'est impossible"—Pinard's words are strangely prescient, even though he thought he did not need to read all of the novel. Flaubert's ensemble is effective in paralipsis: the mélange of the sacred and the profane turns out to be the interpolation of a lacuna. The opposition Pinard wants to make between faithful reproduction and sacrilegious performance recirculates in the trial in the form of his own "recounting" of the novel, a kind of conventional or normative *style indirect libre* in which narratorial judgment is the whole point. Correlatively, Senard's insistence upon "pure copying" and the restoration of the whole novel reveals that Flaubert did more and less than merely copy and that his mélange of citation and indirect discourse—a incomplete performance of a conventional form—is essential to *Madame Bovary*.

If the scene of extreme unction and the scenes in *style indirect libre* help flesh out issues of narrative perspective and judgment, as well as a relation to conventional forms, that are more latent in the *fiacre* passage, then reciprocally that passage and its suppression concretize a logic of omission and scandal that is more dispersed in those later moments, since Flaubert's note disavowing the serial publication falls at the beginning of the final installment and refers vaguely to multiple suppressions. In other words, (the trial's reading of the suppression of) the *fiacre* passage lends precision to a logic of omission and scandalous vagueness insofar as it exists as a discretely delimited omission. But the obverse is also true. If the *fiacre* passage epitomizes Flaubertian style, then it is necessary to read the death scene (and its auxiliaries) in order to show that even when we have positive textual facts available, paralipsis is still the operative condition: the actual is always the corpse of the counterfactual, the result or even the act is always the corpse of a "luxure" always only "presque immatérielle." Together, the oddities of referential alibi and the paradoxes of narrative perspective, and the trial's readings recirculations of both, show that *Madame Bovary* as ensemble cannot simply be the text we (think we) know. It must also include the editorial suppressions and the trial's misrecognitions—as the necessary consequences, the embodied rhetorical effects, of Flaubert's paraliptical style. In other words, to claim either that the trial alone created or determined the dilemmas it addresses (that it misread the novel), or that the novel necessitated the trial by virtue

of its immoral content would be to avoid the very nature of the new problem that Flaubert presents to literary modernity. His formal innovations are inextricable from the history of the Second Empire, but in a relationship that is neither mimetic nor causal in any simple sense of those words. The ensemble that the novel forges by way of passing over can only show up in the details with which the trial fills in its at once bibliographical and aesthetic lacunae.

Chapter II
Out of the Picture. Wilde and Sins of Omission

> The distinction between literature and journalism is quite futile.
> — T.S. Eliot
>
> But change is a monster and changing is hard
> — Marc Bolan

I. *Fin-de-siècle* Aesthetics and the Literary Marketplace

Near the end of his 1930 essay "Arnold and Pater," T.S. Eliot asserts that Pater "propagated some confusion between life and art which is not wholly irresponsible for some untidy lives"—by this euphemism referring most pointedly to Oscar Wilde. He intimates that Pater's 1873 *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* had a morally poisonous effect on Wilde and others of his "generation."[1] In 1895, of course, Wilde became the most famous and most spectacularly sacrificial of late-Victorian morality's victims, but his former teacher had been, to a lesser degree, another casualty—as witness the outrage both within the walls of Oxford and in the wider public at *Studies*, with its paean to impressionist notions of criticism and experience that to many looked too much like decadent hedonism. In the wake of this, Pater's later career was marked by a concern to avoid precisely the accusation that Eliot would make. In the second 1877 edition of his first major work the "Conclusion" was omitted because, as Pater later wrote, "I conceived it might possibly mislead some young men into whose hands it might fall." He reinstated a revised text in subsequent editions, having meanwhile "dealt more fully in *Marius the Epicurean* with the thoughts expressed by it."[2] That 1885 novel revises Cyrenaic hedonism—modeled on Aristippus's "*monochronos hedone*," which Pater translates as "the pleasure of the ideal present, the mystic *now*"[3]—into a more spiritualized, moral Epicureanism intended to be commensurable with Christianity. Eliot's essay would take particular exception to this point. Although his own moral values are not far below the surface, Eliot's major criticism is that Pater confused moral and aesthetic spheres.

Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*—both the 1890 and 1891 texts, the newspaper review controversy that the first version occasioned, and Wilde's rebuttal in the form of the preface to the second version—meditates in complex fashion on precisely these questions of "life and art" or the aesthetic and the moral, on the conflict between the "ideal present" of the aestheticist artwork and the temporality of the literary marketplace and newspaper world it abjures. These issues are obviously central to the most important and notorious scandal we associate with Wilde, the 1895 trials, which led in short order to incarceration, ignominy, and death. However, I wish to take a step back from this better known and more often studied scandal. I shall turn to the earlier moment of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and particularly three newspaper reviews, alongside Wilde's responses to them, in order to grasp Wilde's revisionary transformation of (a Paterian) aestheticism and its relationship to the prose of the newspaper world. This transformation is able, in Wilde's words, to "realize the 19th century" by virtue of a modernist "mythical method" that precedes Eliot's attribution of such techniques to Joyce and Yeats by a quarter-century.[4] And it works by paraliptically incorporating the ephemerality of newspaper time into the supposedly atemporal

---

[1] *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1932), 392.
[2] See *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, ed. Matthew Beaumont (New York: Oxford World's Classics, 2010), 177n.
[3] *Marius the Epicurean: His Sensations and Ideas*, ed. Gerald Monsman (Kansas City: Valancourt, 2008), 103.
[4] T.S. Eliot, "'Ulysses,' Order and Myth," in *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), 175-178.

perfection of the aesthetic. This earlier confrontation, I would suggest, is an essential, determining moment in the story of Wilde's career, the broader *fin-de-siècle* literary and social world, and the place his aesthetics holds in the history of the modernist novel. And while I shall leave this aspect mostly in the background, it likewise has an important bearing on the more catastrophic 1895 scandal, since Wilde's novel, the differences between its two texts, and the reviews and Wilde's responding letters became crucial in jurist Edward Carson's courtroom attack on Wilde's character.[5]

In this chapter I shall argue that the minor controversy of *The Picture*'s 1890 reviews (and Wilde's epistolary disputes with the journal reviewers and editors) work much as did Flaubert's obscenity trial in the first chapter. It is a social instantiation or epiphenomenon of the deeper stumbling block into which Wilde transforms his novelistic work of art. The Wildean analogue to Flaubert's ensemble is built out of a novel (about the incommensurable relation between a man and a picture that might be his soul) that exists in two incommensurable forms (the 1890 journal edition and the 1891 volume edition), and a press dispute that Wilde disavows but reincorporates into that novel by way of a preface of aestheticist epigrams drawn often verbatim from it. (Moreover, the preface was first published in a journal before migrating into the 1891 text.) But this is not all. Wilde revises both the novel and his sense of aestheticism across the disputes and the revisions they subtly inform, finally making *The Picture* into something more than a novel. Building on Flaubert's transformation of the novel, Wilde turns the question from a matter of generic form into a matter of the work of art as such. In order to address this question, *The Picture* also enfolds a whole career of aestheticist art criticism itself concerned with the Renaissance question of the *paragone* (the relations amongst the different arts) as well as the relation of art and journalism. In other words, Wilde's one novel manages to include (by omission) not only its reception and revisions, but also the entire antagonism between his aestheticism and the journalistic world, as a revisionary realization of his larger project of "the Critic as Artist." This is realization in an active, dynamic sense. It is, as we shall see, what Wilde means when he criticizes Paterian aestheticism for not fully living up to the task of "realiz[ing] the nineteenth century" by including and retroactively transforming "the dreams and ideas and feelings of myriad generations," but also refusing to recoil from the ephemerality of the journalistic literary marketplace into some ostensibly timeless realm of pure art.[6]

Wilde's most intelligent interlocutor in the review debacle mocks Wilde by calling *The Picture* an "unhappy apotheosis"[7] and I was tempted to adopt the (unqualified) term to name the new novelistic work that Wilde forges. But my argument will be that across the newspaper controversy Wilde revises the static aestheticism implicit in the word "apotheosis." For his aestheticism is but the visible effulgence of his deeper transformation of the nature of the artwork in the *fin-de-siècle* world. Consequently, I shall term Wilde's stumbling block—his analogue to the Flaubertian ensemble—quite (deceptively) simply, a "picture." I do this in part to capitalize on the oddity in Wilde's use of the word rather than, say, "portrait." While a portrait unequivocally suggests an integral and complete representation of one human subject, "picture" is more ambiguous: a picture could be a landscape or a still life or even a photograph. As Daniel Novak has shown, Wilde drew on a discourse about photography, exemplified by Charles Baudelaire and A.H. Walls, which contrasts "portrait" (associated with "a form of mechanical realism") to "picture" (associated with "language and narrative"). "If a 'portrait' is an unimaginative, photographic copy, a fictional 'picture' or a 'novel' portrait promises more than meets the eye."[8] As opposed to a portrait, a picture "exceeds its

---

[5] See Merlin Holland, *The Real Trial of Oscar Wilde* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), especially 77-79.

[6] "Mr Pater's Last Volume" (*The Speaker*, 22 March 1890), rpt. in *The Soul of Man under Socialism and Selected Critical Prose*, ed. Linda Dowling (New York: Penguin, 2001), 25-26.

[7] *Scots Observer*, July 19, 1890, 226-227.

[8] *Realism, Photography and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 136-37.

subject."[9] In short, in order to become a picture, a painting should cease to be a portrait, "should look less like the sitter and more like the artist and his secret," although this "looking like" is thereby brought into question. Moreover, while one paints or sits for a portrait, one buys or collects a picture, implying that the latter includes elements extrinsic to the "pure" work itself, such as the materiality of the object (canvas) and its frame. In both of these registers, then, "picture" acknowledges the sort of scandalous lacuna and excess that I shall be concerned with in this chapter.

Wilde constructs his picture by two main modes of paralipsis, and each hinges on an essential heterogeneity—perhaps even an ekphrastic duplicity—related to that of the novel's titular picture. The first mode is to be found in the newspaper debates over whether or not the journal edition of the novel was immoral: there Wilde's posture of contempt for reviewers passes over how his own counter-interpretations of the 1890 text subtly revise that text in advance. Review as (paraliptical) revision. But moreover, the aestheticist novelist enlists compositional help from the plebian critics he utterly rejects. While that relationship of mirroring between the realm of art and the realm of journalism is not exactly ekphrastic, I would suggest that something like ekphrasis is at stake here, especially if we consider the analogous relationship between the timeless work of art that is Dorian's body and the finite temporality registered by his portrait.

This broad notion of ekphrastic mirroring gains in concretion, I think, in light of the second mode of paralipsis I shall uncover: the revised 1891 volume draws on the dynamic of revision nascent in the newspaper controversy, in order to "realize" the novel through a kind of allusion-by-omission that explicitly concerns the relations between the arts. The volume's preface responded to the quarrel by ostentatiously rejecting both the language of morality and the journalistic marketplace as beneath art's notice. But it did so in epigrams drawn verbatim from the earlier newspaper clashes, quietly transforming the relation between aestheticist text and marketplace context. This shift, I shall argue, also stands at the heart of the novel's revisions. Wilde's changes make a virtue of incompletion, regrounding the novel in an interpolated allusion to the Ovidian myth of Cephalus and Procris. The allusion itself, however, only becomes legible in light of Wilde's reference to the myth elsewhere, in a contemporary journalistic piece he wrote on 1820s newspaper art critic T.G. Wainewright and an unfinished painting of Cephalus and Procris by Giulio Romano. The allusion itself thus encodes—by paraliptically revising—the relation between art and journalism. And it does so in terms of the Renaissance *paragone* (the relations amongst the arts) that Romano exemplified. In order to grasp *The Picture*'s surprising anticipation of a modernist "mythical method," I shall claim, the novel must be read through the newspaper journalism it disavows. Later techniques of allusion thus emerge as successors to a Wildean social sin of omission, which revises aestheticism by mirroring a classicist eternity in the inconstant waters of newspaper ephemera.

Because the Wildean version of paralipsis I shall elaborate emerges from an antagonism with the journalistic press, and because it functions by revision—and revision importantly of his Paterian inheritance—it will be helpful to outline Pater's own relationship to the same journalistic sphere. Pater's project of self-recuperation was an important facet in his later work borne out in the essays collected in *Appreciations: With an Essay on Style* (1889) and in lectures gathered in the 1893 volume *Plato and Platonism*. *Appreciations* develops the *Renaissance*'s impressionistic criticism, but emphasizes temperance against the fervid self-indulgence that readers found in that "ecstasy" of the "hard gem-like flame" that the 1873 "Conclusion" praised.[10] In particular, the sub-titular "Style" essay stresses the ethics of the Horatian or Neoplatonic labour of the file, as a form of self-restraint and askesis in prose but also in life: "the true artist may be best recognised by his tact of omission.…The ornamental word, the figure, the accessory form or colour or reference, is rarely content to die to

[9] Novak, *Realism, Photography and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 138.
[10] *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* 120.

thought precisely at the right moment, but will inevitably linger awhile, stirring a long 'brain-wave' behind it of perhaps quite alien associations."[11] Scholarly attention to the constraints of the medium chastens any tendency towards self-indulgence.[12] It is matched, as in the exemplary literary "martyr" Flaubert (24),[13] by a monastic separation from the vulgar dissolution of the "modern world"—the public and the press—which Pater construes as intruding on, diverting from, the essential Spartan purity of art (7). Flaubert's increasing withdrawal from the public world cannot be reduced to a reaction to the 1857 obscenity trial, but Pater certainly thinks of Flaubert as a brother in his literary martyrdom at the hands of a vulgar public. Hence the ground note of social askesis vibrates through the descriptions of stylistic literary askesis:

> as the very word ornament indicates what is in itself non-essential, so the 'one beauty' of all literary style is of [the] very essence [of this scholarly attentiveness], and independent…of all removable decoration; that it may exist in its fullest lustre, as in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, for instance.…Parallel, allusion, the allusive way generally, the flowers in the garden: —he knows the narcotic force of these upon the negligent intelligence to which any *diversion*, literally, is welcome, any vagrant intruder, because one can go wandering away with it from the immediate object.…Surplusage! he will dread that, as the runner on his muscles. For in truth all art does but consist in the removal of surplusage. (15-16)

Linda Dowling calls this passage "an obvious paradox," observing that it is emblematic of Pater's prose, which "seldom fulfills his strictures."[14] And she persuasively argues that a substantial part of Pater's undertaking, here as elsewhere, is to establish a basis on which language could regain its lost status as guarantor of socio-historical and national stability in the late days of empire. This means not just knowing "one's own impression as it really is," but also "know[ing] one's medium,"[15] knowing the "the science of the instrument [the writer] plays on" (Pater, *Appreciations* 10).

As Dowling rightly notes, behind Pater's "science of the instrument" that is language stand the broad debates on the origin and status of language sparked in Victorian England by the wide-ranging influence of Darwinian thought, of comparative linguistics, and of the comparative philology and mythology of figures like Max Müller (Dowling 117). To ground an authority that could dispel any threat of linguistic and thus national instability or decadence, Pater assumes that "the literary artist is of necessity a scholar" (*Appreciations* 8), who grants the "living authority language needs" by "purifying its very elements, which must needs change along with the changing thoughts of living people" (11-12). But he also presumes that a scholar writes for other scholarly, "disinterested lovers of books," an elect who take "aesthetic satisfaction in that frugal closeness of style which makes the most of a word." These elect will find in art's ascetic impersonality "a refuge, a sort of cloistral refuge, from a certain vulgarity in the actual world" (14). In this connection, Gerald Monsman underscores the connection between Pater's worry that he would be "blame[d]" for Wilde's transgressive writings and public persona. Monsman points out that his concern about the practical effects or popular interpretations of "a style mixing the sensual with the spiritual comes

---

[11] Walter Pater, *Appreciations, With an Essay on Style* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889), 15.
[12] Pater, *Appreciations* 9-10.
[13] "Style" grew out of the short review "The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert," published in the *Pall Mall Gazette* on August 25, 1888. Expanded and revised from this review, "Style" was published in the December 1888 edition of the *Fortnightly Review* before being collected in *Appreciations* (published November 1889).
[14] *Language and Decadence in the Victorian Fin de Siècle* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 129. See also Gerald Monsman, *Walter Pater's Art of Autobiography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 37.
[15] Dowling, *Language and Decadence* 113.

close to the worries of conventional Neoplatonists."[16] In other words, if style is a project of re-establishing a "living authority" for a language in decay, it nonetheless risks disavowing the embodied or the expressed in its anxiety to avoid misappropriation in the chaotic realm of public discourse (as may have happened, Pater and Eliot suggest, with "young men" like Wilde). Pater's writings thus tend increasingly towards a disavowal of the sensual (be it the body as such, the "Conclusion's" "as many pulsations as possible into the given time" or the popular reception of Wilde's novel in connection with Pater's earlier writings [*Studies* 120]). His notion of style as restraint and "scholarly attentiveness" involves a logic of self-correction and self-renunciation; not just a "reserve" but a reserved temperament *vis-à-vis* the press and the literary marketplace.

Plato and Platonism only further reinscribes aestheticism within this ascetic "temperance," now a virtually Christianized, Neoplatonic Greek Republicanism. Here Plato's idealism offers a "centripetal" force to guard against the "centrifugal" Heraclitean individualism or liberalism prefiguring the more Latinate decadence perceived to threaten *fin-de-siècle* Britain.[17] While the former is "the moral or practical equivalent of the Parmenidean doctrine of the One," the latter is negatively associated with Heraclitean motion and its practical equivalent, "the Cyrenaic μονόχρονος ήδονή [*monochronos hedone*]—the pleasure of the ideal now" which *Marius the Epicurean* had attempted to rescue from just such an association (*Plato and Platonism* 48). With a clear aim of separating Pater's idea of the Dorian life from the familiar Victorian notion of a transgressive Hellenism (which Dorian Gray had meanwhile come to embody), *Plato and Platonism* insists on devotion to the unalloyed expression of the substantial idea, more explicitly expanding this from a question of literary style to a style of life. The text stands in tense equipoise between praise of omission, reserve, and concealment of the "connecting thought" on the one hand, and the condemnation of allusion, the contingent, or the heterogeneous on the other. In it Pater translates Plato's term "paralipomena" from Book 3 of the *Republic* (where Socrates refers to defects, "when something has been omitted from a thing and when it has not been finely crafted or finely made by nature")[18] as "negligences" (281). If paralipomena, like the "surplusage" of "Style," are ornamental self-indulgences, then they are also the force of "perhaps quite alien [or hidden] associations." Paradoxically, *Marius the Epicurean*'s "hiddenness of perfect things" (*Marius* 61) has become "Style's" cloistral refuge from the "negligences" and "alien associations" of the chaotic "modern world" (*Appreciations* 7), or *Plato and Platonism*'s hiddenness of "self-den[ial]" (*Plato and Platonism* 271, 274). And the latter's historical stereoscopy, overlaying ancient Greece with 1890s Britain, further brings out the degree to which self-correction and renunciation are a corrective to the "centrifugal tendency" Pater saw in the mass print culture of the *fin de siècle*.

In this respect it is hardly surprising that when Oscar Wilde published *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in 1890, Pater was anxious to avoid being associated with his former student in the ensuing press scandal. The appearance of the novel in the July 1890 issue of *Lippincott's Magazine* (on sale beginning June 20) occasioned a series of energetically negative reviews in which Wilde himself was as much the target of vituperation as his novel. Wilde was offended enough to respond directly to three of these reviews—appearing on June 24 in the *St. James's Gazette*, June 30 in the *Daily Chronicle*, and July 5 in the *Scots Observer*—with open letters written to the editors of the respective journals. The reviewers, their editors, and the journals' readers responded in turn, prompting yet further letters from Wilde, in what became a sprawling debate on "Art and Morality" that eventually lost its

[16] Gerald Monsman, "The Platonic Eros of Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde: 'Love's Reflected Image' in the 1890s," *English Literature in Transition* 45.1 (2002): 40.

[17] See *Plato and Platonism: A Series of Lectures* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1893, 1907), 23-24; 102-105.

[18] *Republic* III 401e; Plato, *Complete Works*, ed. John M. Cooper (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), 1038.

initial focus on the novel altogether.[19] Pater wanted no part in any of this, especially since his reputation was perhaps only at this moment fully recovered from his own scandals. As Laurel Brake notes, despite *Fortnightly Review* editor and mutual friend Frank Harris's request, "Pater did not review the novel when it first appeared, when his favourable view might have been of value to Wilde. Nor did Pater review it promptly when it appeared in volume form."[20] When he finally did do so—in November 1891, seven months after the revised volume appeared—he took pains to stress the distance between his own "true Cyrenaic or Epicurean doctrine of life," which "aims at a complete though harmonious development of man's entire organism," and Dorian's or Lord Henry Wotton's immoral, purely sensuous hedonism. For Pater, the latter "lose[s] the moral sense" and consequently "so much in the way of impressions, of pleasant memories, and subsequent hopes."[21]

Throughout Wilde's quarrel with the press over the 1890 *Picture of Dorian Gray*, his detractors equate this loose moral attitude (which they attribute to the author) with an artistry that they allege to be similarly loose or lacking "finish" (a term Brake associates with the translation of a text "from the ephemeral of the periodical essay into the permanence of the book [which obscures its] ephemeral characteristics and…origins" in the journalistic sphere).[22] In reaction, Wilde assumes the expected posture of the aesthete, denying the validity of moral assessments of art and asserting his work's perfection. The product of this dispute is "A Preface to 'Dorian Gray'"—perhaps Wilde's most famous aestheticist manifesto—which appeared at the head of the 1891 text of *The Picture*. In fact, this short text was first published in the *Fortnightly Review* in March, a month prior to the revised novel, essentially as a final rejection of the review controversy and an advertisement for the forthcoming volume. Wilde's "Preface" to the volume edition all but names its Paterian heritage. It declares that "beautiful things mean only Beauty," that "the morality of art consists in the perfect use of an imperfect medium."[23] These remarks are central to the short text's manifesto of *l'art pour l'art*—which, the reader is given to understand, the novel itself embodies.

However, this apparently straightforward aestheticism—a snobbish rejection of the newspaper press and literary marketplace peppering many of the preface's epigrams—immediately raises difficult questions. If the novel is perfect and for the "elect" (III: 167) who are capable of the Paterian "temperament" (*Studies* 4) necessary to sense in it the Neoplatonic Form of "Beauty" (III: 167), then why is there an apparent need for a preface to make all this explicit? The preface seems to be both a summa of the novel and a reader's manual, but neither of these should be necessary if the novel is in fact perfect—that is, "new, complex, and vital," thriving from "diversity of opinion" about it. If we take seriously the conception of art that Wilde and his novel everywhere espouse, then we are confronted with the problematic fact that by its very existence the preface fractures the integrity, self-sufficiency, and unity of the work of art from within. Of course, the relationship of doubling between the preface and the novel has a corollary in the substance of the text, with what Pater was perhaps first to notice was the central "Döppelgänger" [*sic*] theme of "the man and his portrait."[24] And both of these troublingly double relationships, each in its own way ekphrastic,

---

[19] See *Scots Observer*, July 19, 26; August 2, 9, 16, 23, 1890.

[20] "The Discourses of Journalism: 'Arnold and Pater' Again—and Wilde," *Pater in the 1990s*, ed. Laurel Brake and Ian Small (Greensboro, NC: ELT Press, 1991), 60.

[21] Walter Pater, "A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde," *The Bookman* (November 1891); qtd. in Karl Beckson, *Oscar Wilde: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 84-85.

[22] Brake, "Discourses of Journalism" 46. It is perhaps notable that Pater uses the term to describe Michelangelo's "puzzling sort of incompleteness, which suggests rather than realises actual form": "it was in reality perfect finish" (*Studies* 38-39).

[23] *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde, Volume III*: *The Picture of Dorian Gray, the 1890 and 1891 Texts*, ed. Joseph Bristow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 167-168. Further references to the novel will be cited "III."

[24] Beckson, *Critical Heritage* 85-6.

reflect yet another. There are two incommensurable texts of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*: an 1890 periodical text and a revised 1891 volume edition.[25] The preface, in other words, might seem to suture the novel together by guaranteeing that Wilde's "final authorial intentions" are embodied in a definitive volume text, but in truth it marks a profound rift within the substance of the work. The preface masks Wildean aestheticism's disavowal of the literary marketplace as rejection, but also incorporates the marketplace into the work, often quite literally. For without acknowledgement the preface cites, revises, and alludes to Wilde's letters to the editors—and in one crucial case, a criticism by one of the reviewers—enfolding the press debacle into the novel while demonstratively passing over it. And this allusion-by-omission, I shall argue, is an index to the way Wilde's evolving novel manages to transform, to enact a revision, a realization, of aestheticism and its relationship to its opposite number, the *fin-de-siècle* literary marketplace.

As is demonstrated by the renewed attention some recent criticism has devoted to the topic, Eliot and other high modernists distinguish themselves from certain of their *fin-de-siècle* forebears with a fervor that can also be the (sometimes moralizing) mark of an anxiety of influence.[26] In this light—the light of a *longue durée* modernism's concern with the literary marketplace, the newspaper press, and the prose of the world—I shall read the apparently timeless and self-enclosed aestheticism of Wilde's preface and novel through the "imperfect medium" that they demonstratively pass over and retrospectively incorporate, the ephemeral, prosaic newspaper world. The review scandal over *The Picture of Dorian Gray* plays a more intimate and complicated role in Wilde's novel as well as his broader career and aesthetics than has been recognized. In Wilde's letters to the editor, in the Doppelgänger preface (a periodical article/advertisement and a genuine preface to the volume text) and in the equally Doppelgänger novel (existing in two texts), Wilde's aestheticism manages to transform itself in a uniquely paraliptical mode that is both precursor and alternative to the "mythical method" Eliot famously described in Yeats and Joyce. Ronald Bush and others have uncovered the deep affinities that Eliot in particular had to Wilde, for instance in his conceptions of impersonality, the historical sense, and the use of allusion or quotation.[27] Part of this chapter's aim is to outline a different approach to these categories—key not just to Eliot, but to high modernism more broadly, in both self-conception and critical reception—in the light of a better understanding of what Wilde's work accomplished. The bewilderingly paradoxical "new theory of art" that Wilde expounds in contemporaneous essays ("The Critic as Artist," "The Decay of Lying," "Pen, Pencil, and Poison") continues to flummox scholarship, despite Wilde's successors having grasped it in a more sophisticated manner, but my contribution will be to insist that Wilde did not merely promulgate notions to be realized by modernism. His own mythical method has gone unrecognized partly because of how subtle and paraliptical it is, and it is this quality that should allow for an understanding of later related techniques that can go beyond the superficial thought that myth provides order to a chaotic present.

---

[25] On the two editions, see Bristow's introduction to the *Complete Works* variorum edition; Josephine M. Guy and Ian Small, *The Textual Condition of Nineteenth-Century Literature* (London: Routledge, 2012), especially 32-58; Nicholas Frankel, "Preface" and "Introduction," *The Picture of Dorian Gray: An Annotated, Uncensored Edition*, ed. Nicholas Frankel (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); Donald Lawler, *An Inquiry into Oscar Wilde's Revisions of* The Picture of Dorian Gray (New York: Garland Publishing, 1988).

[26] See for example Ann Ardis, *Modernism and Cultural Conflict, 1880-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), especially 45-77; Patrick Collier, *Modernism on Fleet Street* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006); Vincent Sherry, *Modernism and the Reinvention of Decadence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); and John Paul Riquelme, "T.S. Eliot's Ambivalences: Oscar Wilde as Masked Precursor," *The Hopkins Review* 5.3 (Summer 2012): 353-379.

[27] Ronald Bush, "In Pursuit of Wilde Possum: Reflections on Eliot, Modernism, and the Nineties," *Modernism/modernity* 11.3 (2004): 469-485; "'Intensity by association': T.S. Eliot's Passionate Allusions," *Modernism/modernity* 20.4 (2014): 709-727. See also Richard Shusterman, "Wilde and Eliot," *T.S. Eliot Annual I* (London: Macmillan, 1988), 117-144.

Through these paraliptical moves, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* harnesses the ephemeral temporality of the newspaper press, and the sensationalized self-contradictions it harbors, in order to dynamize—"realize"—the static and potentially empty form of Dorian's aestheticist *monochronos hedone*. According to Benedict Anderson and others, the "essential literary convention of the newspaper" involves an arbitrary juxtaposition and inclusion of otherwise unrelated events or narrated elements. This formal convention creates an "imagined linkage" derived from the calendrical simultaneity of the events and from the fact that the newspaper itself is an "'extreme form' of the book" as a "distinct, self-contained object"—a form the extremity of which lies in its limited market, in the fact that its marketability has a nearly immediate date of expiry.[28] And in *fin-de-siècle* Britain, there was a good deal of concern about the relationship between a putatively autonomous world of literature and the world subtended by this "extreme form" of the literary object. As Dowling notes, Wilde "found himself enmeshed in the machinery of the emergent culture industry that George Gissing described in *New Grub Street*."[29] Exemplary here are the reversals Gissing typifies by having Mr. Fadge's journal favorably review a novel just after running a review that "tremendously abused" it.[30] And if Gissing's documentary inspiration is the contemporary British literary marketplace, his literary inspiration is Lucien de Rubempré's three contradictory reviews of Raoul Nathan's book in *Illusions perdues*. There Balzac contrasts the stability and profundity of "une grande et belle œuvre, un livre enfin" with "des articles lus aujourd'hui, oubliés demain" but also plays with the idea that "en littérature, chaque idée a son envers et son endroit.…Janus est le mythe de la critique et le symbole du genie" (A great and beautiful work, a book [with] articles read today, forgotten tomorrow [but also with the idea that] in literature, there are two sides to every idea.…Janus is criticism's myth and genius's symbol).[31] With his preface, Wilde disavows his own version of these controversies, but also eternalizes it within the revised novel.

The more important point is that Wilde thereby confronts aesthetic consequences that neither Balzac nor Gissing are willing to admit: his engagement with this newspaper machinery is turned to advantage when it transforms his novel's performance of aestheticism into a meditation on its own relationship to its antitype. By repeatedly reinterpreting the novel in his letters to the press; by refashioning this antagonism into an apparent manifesto on the purity of his art in the preface; and by revising the novel in ways that incorporate the scandal by way of allusive omission, Wilde refigures the aestheticist artwork's "perfect[ion]" as a uniquely dynamic relation between genres, discourses, art forms, and spheres. This is a picture that, like Dorian's, is not static but dynamic. It is a kind of revisionary realization that works by active incompletion: it not only includes what it apparently must reject, the ephemeral, contingent, and vulgar prose of the world; it also formalizes its perfection as its essential incompleteness.

---

[28] *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006), 33-35.

[29] Linda Dowling, *The Vulgarization of Art: The Victorians and Aesthetic Democracy* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1996), 91.

[30] George Gissing, *New Grub Street* [1891] (New York: Modern Library, 2002), 19.

[31] Balzac, *La Comédie humaine*, Tome V, ed. Pierre-Georges Castex, et. al. (Paris: Gallimard, 1977), 457-8.

II. Dandy in the Underworld of Prose. The 1890 Press Controversy

> There is something to me repugnant, at any time, in written hand. The text never seems determinate. Print settles it.
>
> — Charles Lamb

> Être critique, c'est un emploi, une profession facile à apprendre, qui laisse l'esprit tranquille.
>
> — Champfleury

In his epistolary responses to the reviewers' charges of decadence (construed as a blend of effete immorality and spurious or at least overstated erudition) Wilde begins by defiantly embracing the accusations, dismissing the possibility of morality or even definite content. In this section I shall show that, irrespective of Wilde's personal motives and intentions, irrespective even of the tenor of his arguments in letters to editors, this engagement with the press begins to elaborate a transformative revision of Wildean aesthetics that the preface will help fold into the 1891 novel. It is true that throughout his eight letters, Wilde consistently rejects journalism's vulgarity and defends *l'art pour l'art*, as the critical consensus holds.[32] However, I shall argue that his intervention into "that monstrous and ignorant thing called Public Opinion" is more than a typically high-handed dismissal of the prose of the world: it is a determining moment in the realization of Wilde's proto-modernist aesthetics.[33] Because the newspaper scandal beats Wilde at his own game (particularly in his exchanges with the *Scots Observer*), forcing the paradox implicit in the aestheticism he espouses, he is moved to transform it. Beyond or hidden within Wilde's *hauteur* towards his interlocutors, a complex process of revision unfolds.

When the *St. James's Gazette*'s June 24 review, "A Study in Puppydom," offended Wilde, he wrote to the editor to complain. The editor printed the letter but appended a mocking reply. This began a back-and-forth lasting until June 30th, when Wilde's fourth letter was printed. On the same day, the *Daily Chronicle* ran its review.[34] Wilde rightly sensed that the piece was a review as much of his letters to the *Gazette* as it was of his novel, and wrote a letter that the *Chronicle* duly printed on July 2. Three days after, the *Scots Observer* ran a review that in turn aimed itself as much at Wilde's letters as at the novel. Wilde found this review in particular to be "grossly unjust [to him] as an artist," and began an exchange that would involve three letters from his pen.[35] Following his first letter to the *Observer* the quarrel changes character, as the *Observer*, under the editorship of Wilde's erstwhile friend W.E. Henley, capitalizes on the opportunity to sensationalize Wilde's dispute as part of a wider debate: it began a seven-week column of letters called "Art and Morality" (in the July 19, 26, August 2, 9, 16, 23, 30 editions).[36] Many of the letters were written by Henley's friends or his paper's employees; there is reason to suspect that Henley may even have directed the *Observer* review's attack on Wilde.[37]

---

[32] See for instance Lawler, *Inquiry* 15-16.

[33] *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde*, Volume IV: *Criticism: Historical Criticism, Intentions, The Soul of Man*, ed. Josephine M. Guy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 254. Subsequent references to the *Intentions* essays will be cited "IV."

[34] The letters are dated June 25, 26, 27, and 28; the *Gazette* printed them on June 26, 27, 28, and 30 (CL 428-434).

[35] These letters are dated July 9, 23, and August 13; they were printed July 12, August 2, and August 16 (CL 438-449; which erroneously has the date of the last latter's publication as August 15).

[36] This wider debate includes the "Candour in English Fiction" articles in the *New Review* earlier that year, in which Thomas Hardy figured prominently. On this issue, see Ardis, *Modernism and Cultural Conflict*.

[37] See Henley's letters to *Observer* reviewer Charles Whibley from July and August 1890 in *The Letters of William Ernest Henley to Charles Whibley, 1888-1903*, vol. I, ed. Damian Atkinson (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2013), 141-158.

From the outset, in the *Gazette* review, the paper is at pains to assert that its quarrel with the novel is not that it is "dangerous and corrupt" but rather that it is "a very lame story…very lamely…told."[38] "Not being curious in ordure…we do not propose to analyse 'The Picture of Dorian Gray': that would be to advertise the developments of an esoteric prurience" (Beckson 68). This moralizing repudiation is, unsurprisingly, feigned; and it is followed in due course by a fairly involved discussion of the novel. In the course of this analysis the reviewer decries the way in which Wilde "airs his cheap research among the garbage of the French *Décadents* like any drivelling pedant. The review concludes by insisting that the work should be "chucked into the fire"—not because it is dangerous ("it is corrupt but not dangerous") but because it is a "mere catchpenny revelatio[n] of the non-existent," in other words the "singularly unpleasant" mind of its author (71).

Although the review's simulated refusal to delve into the "ordure" of the novel clearly intends to profit by the controversial figure of Wilde as "good copy" (in the sense of publicity) while dismissing the novel as "bad copy" (in the sense of an artwork as representation), the gesture also tries to conceal a real moral objection to the novel. Encoded in its own air of flippancy is the review's worry about the social, sexual, and moral danger of a decadence in late Imperial Britain that seemed all too clearly foreshadowed by the decadence that Suetonius documented in Imperial Rome. In this light, surely the reviewer noticed and took umbrage at the fact that in the novel, the journal announcing Sibyl Vane's death (the journal Lord Henry leaves for Dorian along with the infamous "yellow book") is none other than the *St. James's Gazette* (in which this review appears) (III: 101-103/273-274). In any event, the moral condemnation comes in the mode of paralipsis—its fake refusal to discuss the novel in detail.

In one breath, Wilde takes on the *Gazette*'s rhetorical refusal to discuss novelistic "ordure" it nevertheless catalogues, along with the moralizing prurience it disguises. The review did not announce its moral condemnation—it did all it could to insist that the novel did not even merit one—but Wilde's letter responds directly to the disavowed judgment. In it he states that, although he will not discuss the "merits or demerits" of the review, since "ordinary English criticism is perfectly free," nonetheless he is in fact "quite incapable of understanding how any work of art can be criticised from a moral standpoint."[39] Even so, as his next letter stresses, "the poor public, hearing from an authority so high as your own, that this is a wicked book that should be coerced and suppressed by a Tory Government, will, no doubt, rush to it and read it. But, alas! They will find that it is a story with a moral. And the moral is this: All excess, as well as all renunciation, brings its own punishment" (CL 430). This statement is too-simply glossed as referring only to an Epicureanism learned from Pater. It needs to be understood more specifically, in the context of the *Gazette* review's paraliptical or self-renouncing moralizing argument and Wilde's immediately subsequent claim that this very moral is itself excessively present in the novel.[40]

Wilde pursues this idea with the caveat that it likewise reflects the reader's own perspicacity and aesthetic development. "The prurient will not be able to find" either the moral or the aesthetic pleasure the novel offers, but the moral at least "will be revealed to all whose minds are healthy. Is this an artistic error? I fear it is. It is the only error in the book" (CL 431). Erudition certainly was

---

Henley makes reference in these letters to William Whyte, William Archer, J. Maclaren Cobban, and Vernon Blackburn, all of whom were connected to Henley and the *Observer*, and all of whom wrote letters to the "Art and Morality" column.

[38] Beckson, *Critical Heritage* 70.

[39] *The Complete Letters of Oscar Wilde*, ed. Merlin Holland and Rupert Hart-Davis (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2000), 428. Further citations of Wilde's letters will be to this edition (CL), unless the newspaper printings are specified.

[40] Wilde's use of the word "renunciation" is subtle: the *Oxford English Dictionary* connects it etymologically to "classical Latin *renuntiāre* (in post-classical Latin also *renunciare*) to take or send back a message, report, to announce, to proclaim, to declare, to call off, to withdraw (from), forsake, give up, in post-classical Latin spec. in spiritual context to withdraw (from), forsake, give up (late 2nd cent. in Tertullian)."

not one. "I myself frankly admit I cannot imagine how a casual reference to Suetonius and Petronius Arbiter can be construed into evidence of a desire to impress an unoffending and ill-educated public by an assumption of superior knowledge. I should fancy that the most ordinary of scholars is perfectly well acquainted with the *Lives of the Caesars* and with the *Satyricon*…though I suppose [passmen] are obliged to read it in translations."[41] In sum, Wilde's first two letters intend to give a peremptory corrective to an insolent and inept critic. But in so doing, they cannot help claiming that the moral is not just a disappointment for prurient readers (who will be unable to perceive it), it is a real aesthetic failure.

Of course, in casually assuming that everyone is intimately familiar with Suetonius and Petronius (whose vivid descriptions of the decadence of the Roman Empire enjoyed renewed popularity in both England and France in the second half of the 19th century) Wilde embraces the accusations of decadence. And he seizes the opportunity to let the reader know that he, for one, reads them in the original, a gesture hardly likely to dispel the impression that he is parading superior knowledge of morally dubious objects. And this effrontery is of a piece with Wilde's riposte to the review's claim that the novel is a "mere catchpenny revelatio[n] of the non-existent"—that "the supreme pleasure in literature is to realise the non-existent" (CL 430). Thus, Wilde's response to the reviewer's (and, published underneath his first letter of response, the editor's) attacks on an elitist aestheticism is to heighten the sense of the novel's—his own—rarefaction. Perhaps he lost sight of a proper sense of his work in his enthusiasm for contextual opposition, in his acceptance of the role of the intellectual so at home in his superiority that he imagines that everyone knows firsthand "what an advantage it is to have received a classical education" (to put it in the bitterly sarcastic phrase with which the reviewer evokes the recent Paterian scandals about that education) (Beckson 70). Or perhaps the review truly revealed to him a flaw that he had not earlier perceived. Regardless, nothing in Wilde's first few letters seems very much out of keeping with the customary image of him as mere *agent provocateur* and advertisement for the "Aesthetic Movement," a role with which the public had been familiar since the early 1880s and which his novel seemed partly meant to overcome. But beyond these letters' provocations, the important point is that what the *Gazette* does not quite name as the defect of the novel, what has been left out—the moral—is in Wilde's estimation overbearingly present.[42] For him the *Gazette* review could not be more wrong: the defect of the novel is not a graceless style that "hints" at "disgusting sins and abominable crimes" (and, with equal indelicacy, at the author's privilege and erudition),[43] too simply revealing a foundation of immorality so blithely defiant as to be "non-existent." The reviewer is right, Wilde insinuates, to complain that the novel did not work "obscurely" enough—not however with respect to Dorian's "sins" or the author's decadent scholarship, but rather with respect to a moral the reviewer himself was too busy being prurient to recognize. Wilde suggests that the reviewer is as familiar with Petronius and Suetonius as he is, but cannot see beyond the smut he seeks in them, perhaps for lack of classical languages.

In short, the first letters to the *Gazette* seem at first glance to give the performance that the public had come to expect from Wilde and to keep faith with a straightforward conception of authorial commentary. They posit Wilde's unique authority, and although he also insists on his

---

[41] CL 430. A "passman" is an Oxbridge student who either studies for an honours degree but passes without attaining honours, or studies only for a pass degree. See William Shuter, "Pater, Wilde, Douglas, and the Impact of 'Greats'," *ELT* 46.3 (2003): 250-278.

[42] A fairly commonplace reading in scholarship, up to this day, is to read the novel as essentially a cautionary tale; that tendency finds one of its primary impetuses, I suspect, in the uncritical adoption of this line of thinking. For a recent example, see Sean Latham's *Am I A Snob?: Modernism and the Novel* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 33ff.

[43] These are the editor's words, appended in a note to Wilde's second letter, quoted in Stuart Mason, *Oscar Wilde: Art and Morality* (London: Frank Palmer, 1912), 46.

expertise as regards criticism ("a critic should be taught to criticize a work without making any reference to the personality of the author. This, in fact, is the beginning of criticism"), he maintains an absolute barrier between journalism and art ("the essential difference between art and life") (CL 432). But there are several important points to be grasped here. First, as I have said, the *Gazette* review's bid for a morally unflappable, aesthetically minded criticism is a fraud. Its nominal unwillingness to dignify "ordure" with its attention and its overstated insistence that this ordure is not "dangerous" but worthless ("non-existent") amount to a rhetorical move that disavows its essentially moralizing condemnation. Second, Wilde grasps this paltry device for what it is and asserts the essential difference between moral and aesthetic criticism—but he does so in a manner that adopts the review's rhetorical mode, insisting both that the novel had a moral and that literature "realise[s] the non-existent." Hereafter, things passed over will be inseparable from the disputes and from Wilde's novel, and it is crucial to note the possible equivocation: if Wilde's novel realized the non-existent, then perhaps his letter redoubles this gesture by "realizing" a moral that was "non-existent" in the novel itself (CL 430). Finally, Wilde's letters to the *Gazette* involve him in a related self-contradiction, the simultaneous claim of perfection and admission of an aesthetic defect.

Two days after Wilde's last letter to the *Gazette*, the second review destined to provoke a Wildean rejoinder appeared in the *Chronicle*. The piece takes a different tack than the *Gazette*, calling the novel "a poisonous book" while conceding Wilde the dubious compliment of writing prose that is dangerously powerful and "fluent [in its] impudence." This second review nevertheless repeats central motifs from the earlier *Gazette* review, among them that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is derivative of "the leprous literature of the French *Décadents*," that an "effeminate frivolity" prevents the work from becoming "fascinating" (if "horrible"), and that it betrays an "elaborate Wardour Street aestheticism and obtrusively cheap scholarship." In other words the *Chronicle*, like the *Gazette*, reads Wilde's novel as marked and marred by a decadent erudition and a flamboyant morbidity that are obviously second-hand or off-brand imitation.[44] However, the *Chronicle* significantly develops the principal accusation: Wilde's "desperate effort to vamp up a 'moral' for the book at the end is, artistically speaking, coarse and crude, because the whole incident of Dorian Gray's death is, as they say on the stage, 'out of the picture'" (Beckson, *Critical Heritage* 72-3). In the judgment of this reviewer, to say that the story has a moral amounts to a kind of virtually criminal duplicity, an attempt to counterfeit rather than "realise the non-existent" (CL 430). "This is a sham moral, as indeed everything in the book is a sham, except the one element in the book which will taint every young mind that comes in contact with it. That element is shockingly real, and it is the plausibly insinuated defence of the creed that appeals to the senses 'to cure the soul' whenever the spiritual nature of man suffers from too much purity and self-denial." Such is the real moral, that nothing "'can cure the soul but the senses, just as nothing can cure the senses but the soul.'"[45] This is a gloss not only of the novel but equally of Wilde's summary of "the moral" to the *Gazette*. It amounts to another allegation that even Wilde's aestheticism, the one "shockingly real" thing about the novel, is not the genuine article but rather a bad copy. So, what the *Chronicle* calls the real moral creed of the novel is what Lord Henry calls, in his best Pater voice (which is not all that good), the New Hedonism. That is of course a doctrine which, after the negative publicity of the first edition of *The Renaissance*, Pater increasingly sought to subordinate to an idea of temperance (Beckson 72-73).

---

[44] At this time, Wardour Street, located in Soho, was known for second-hand furniture stores. The epithet thus implies both obsolescence and affected grandiloquence of style—that is, what Pater theorized as the threat of excess to which Euphuism is heir. There also seems to be an undertone here that would suggest that, beyond being out of date and second-hand, Wilde's aestheticism and scholarship are inferior copies of the Paterian original.

[45] See III: 185, 324. As Philip Cohen notes, Lord Henry's epigram is something condemned by Wilde's immediate source, the third chapter of *Marius* (*The Moral Vision of Oscar Wilde* [Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1978], 150-1).

The *Chronicle*'s substantive claims aside, I want to underscore the fact that the review reads the novel filtered through Wilde's arguments with the *Gazette*. It is only once "Mr Wilde [has said that] his book has 'a moral'" that the review can go looking for one and call it a "sham" fabricated "out of the picture." This reference to Wilde's letters to the *Gazette* is emblematic of the *Chronicle* review's reliance on that earlier dispute for its broader arguments: the denunciation of the novel's conclusion as "inconsistent with Dorian Gray's…conscienceless character" (72) follows on Wilde's second letter to the *Gazette*, which claims that the moral of the story was the self-punishing nature of both excess and renunciation, that when Dorian "tries to kill conscience [he] kills himself" (CL 436). In this light, and reading the review only slightly against the grain, an ambiguity or equivocation is visible in its critique of the "sham moral," marking more explicitly than the previous review an entanglement between the novel and its reception. Is the claim that the "sham moral" to be found in the novel's end (the so to speak moral *deus ex machina* of Dorian's death) is out of key with the overall immoral tone of the work? Or is it rather that "the moral" is the decadent, immoral creed that Wilde has "vamped up" in his letters to the *Gazette*, since in the novel "the whole incident of Dorian's death is…out of the picture?" Is this a suggestion that, *qua* author, Wilde ought not to have responded to the *Gazette* review's allegation that he was a second-rate artist? Or instead that, *qua* literary critic, Wilde is equally second-rate? A case might be made for each of these, but the venom of the review suggests that the last makes for a worse offense—but this paratextual sin, one is left to infer, is somehow a failure of but also in the novel, despite taking place "out of the picture."

Really, though, the *Chronicle* is uninterested in making such distinctions. In the eyes of this second review, if Wilde's earlier letters to the *Gazette* offend, they do so as a figure or an aspect of what offends about the novel—the insouciant immorality that Wilde, Dorian, et al. represent. Both the novel and its author are cheap provocations to propriety (although if this is all there is to it, then why expend the energy denouncing, and advertising, the novel?). Wilde's predictable defense is to insist all the more on both the Paterian ethic of restraint in the novel's composition and his own transcendent position relative to the press, while embracing even more dramatically the posture attributed to him. He certainly did not "vamp up" a moral:

> I must candidly confess that I do not know what 'vamping' is. I see, from time to time, mysterious advertisements in the newspapers about 'How to Vamp,' but what vamping really means remains a mystery to me.…However, I do not propose to discuss the absurd terms used by modern journalism. What I want to say is that, so far from wishing to emphasize any moral in my story, the real trouble I experienced in writing the story was that of keeping the extremely obvious moral subordinate to the artistic and dramatic effect (CL 435).

Hence, the story's moral was no sham appended to the novel (either as the *deus ex machina* of its conclusion, or retroactively in Wilde's letters to the *Gazette*). Rather, it was a surplus all too left in, and this obtrusiveness is the work's actual defect: "when the book is published in a volume I hope to correct this defect" (ibid.). In correcting the reviewer on this matter of literary style, Wilde asserts his authorial control of both self and interpretive possibilities while fundamentally rejecting the validity of the criticism. Moreover, he offers a different way of reading the moral (about the punishments that follow both excess and renunciation, and about Dorian's attempt to kill conscience) where the stress falls on a dialectics of defect as excess and as excision.

But what is crucial here is the deeper, more obscure response that Wilde's letter makes to the growing entanglement between ostensibly autonomous novel and journalistic discourse on it. He concludes this letter with three interlocked assertions of the novel's unrecognized artistic success and the artist's superiority to newspaper critics; three assertions which do not address the actual

editor or reviewer but rather quietly meditate on what is becoming the antagonistic interpenetration of art and journalism, while loudly denying the very possibility of interpenetration. First, in response to the *Chronicle* claim that Dorian had no conscience, Wilde rejoins that "it is finally to get rid of the conscience that had dogged his steps from year to year that he destroys the picture; and thus in his attempt to kill conscience Dorian Gray kills himself."[46] The next sentence objects to the indictment of the novel's "obtrusively cheap scholarship" (Beckson 72) by asserting that "the only literary books that [the novel] alludes to are books that any fairly educated reader may be supposed to be acquainted with." Finally, Wilde claims that the novel essentially "reacts against the crude brutality of plain realism. It is poisonous if you like, but you cannot deny that it is also perfect, and perfection is what we artists aim at" (CL 436).

Wilde is here in open self-contradiction, since he claims perfection to the *Chronicle* despite having already argued to the *Gazette* that the novel contains the defect or "artistic error" (CL 431) of an excessive moral. However, the subtler and more powerful work of the letter is buried within this contradiction, in the way these three argumentative points interconnect to "express more than they seem to say," (as Pater puts it in *Plato and Platonism* [281]). The general idea is not new, since the *Chronicle* really only further develops the *Gazette*'s allegations of a "non-existent" moral and a second-rate, affected scholarship. Likewise, the idea that in attempting to kill conscience Dorian kills himself is a familiar one: subsequent scholarship has often enough noted that the conclusion to *The Picture of Dorian Gray* recalls Edgar Allan Poe's "William Wilson," wherein the debauched narrator stabs his double, only to discover in a mirror that he has thereby killed himself, his double thus being revealed as a personification of his own conscience. It is a commonplace that this and other Poe tales are among the precursor texts to Wilde's novel.[47] For instance, Rodney Shewan writes that in this letter's reference to killing conscience "Wilde was *quoting* from Poe's 'William Wilson.'"[48] Now, that is not perfectly accurate, for if it is "obtrusively" clear in Poe's tale that the other William Wilson is the narrator's conscience incarnate, such a revelation does not appear as such and in those words. But Shewan and those who follow him on this point are absolutely correct to see an allusion to "William Wilson" in this letter, as there is in the scene of Dorian's death. The unobserved connection between this allusion and the immediately subsequent denial of "obtrusively cheap scholarship" in the novel is a key part of the logic of revisionary incorporation that unfolds across the controversy.

The connection is this: Wilde obliquely ridicules the reviewers for being so imperceptive (or, as his earlier letter to the *Gazette* puts it, so "prurient") in their search for the details of Dorian's sin that they miss the "real" moral lying in plain sight; simultaneously, he demonstrates that his alleged literary pedantry (*décadence française réchauffée*) cannot have been all that obtrusive since a central instance of it, both morally and aesthetically, went unperceived by those who accuse him of such failures. His letter forges a mode of almost silent emphasis—a repetition underscoring the point that the allusion went unnoticed, both as a moral and as scholarship—in alluding again, this time in the discursive register of critical commentary. Wilde draws attention to the moral as explicitly but also as unremarkably as possible by embodying it anew. But this renewed allusion also revises its

---

[46] Wilde would offer an interesting iteration of this claim in the first of his 1895 trials. After his solicitor Sir Edward Clarke summarizes the book (Holland, *The Real Trial of Oscar Wilde* 41-43), he asks Wilde if his summary "substantially represent[s] the current of the story of the book." Wilde answers "I say, *with one slight addition*, I thought it a perfect description of what I meant by the book. There is just one *omission*." Clarke interposes: "then, I must ask you to supply it, if you think it *material* in this case," to which Wilde replies with a summary of the final scene of the novel: "that the picture…had become—the change was meant to symbolise, of course, the ruin that he brought on his own soul—that the picture became to him conscience…and by trying to kill his own soul the man directly dies. That is *the only small addition I wish to make*" (63; emphases added).

[47] Pater was likely the first to observe a connection to Poe, in his review of the volume edition (Beckson 86).

[48] *Oscar Wilde: Art and Egotism* (London: Macmillan, 1977), 212n3; emphasis added.

predecessor by fusing it to the question of scholarship and aesthetic elitism. Simple and odd, maybe, but the letter's allusion is not cheap, and he seems to know his interlocutors will pass it by unknowing.[49] We might call this gesture of alluding to, rather than explicating, an unnoticed allusion a kind of paralipsis of allusion. It is not simply, as in the traditional rhetorical device, drawing attention to something in the act of passing over it; rather, Wilde's letter works by obscuring (and revising) the aesthetic stakes of a "moral" he insists was there all along, in the act of drawing attention to it as a "moral." Here allusion works not to advertise the textual gesture's legitimacy on the ground of another text to which it alludes, but rather to transform the other text while working to hide rather than advertise the allusive relation. This is the Wildean version of things passed over—an allusion-by-omission that involves a sort of active incompletion. The important thing is less the rhetorical shape of the figure than the fact that a private allusion still functions as an allusion. The question thus becomes: How do we understand a kind of reference that relies on a public mode in order not to convey its sense?

This letter's disdain for journalism and the self-contradiction between its admission of a fault and its assertion of perfection might lead us to view it as another predictable act of aestheticist insolence, not unlike letters Whistler wrote in similar situations. I want to insist however on reading it not as merely a bit of narcissistically provocative self-promotion (it may be that), but as principally a way of reincorporating error or "defect" in revised form as (realization or evidence of) perfection. Wilde does not here insist, as he might, that he had already answered the question of the moral fully and completely in his letters to the *Gazette* (and in the novel!), and that moreover the accusation of cheap scholarship only betrays the envy and ignorance of an accuser who is not legally obliged to read "perfect" works that are above him. Rather, by recurring to—and silently revising—arguments from his letters to the *Gazette* in those to the *Chronicle*, he links the issues of morality and aesthetic perfection. Further, the connection is made in the form of an allusion that obscures the more profound mode of revision it helps inaugurate. This is a formal device with at least three registers: at first glance, Wilde seems merely to insist that the novel has a moral. Beneath that register, as Shewan observes, is an allusion to Poe. But beneath this, and within the context of the review's allegations of immorality and pedantry, the allusion functions in yet another register: it has both the rhetorical force of a subtle rejoinder and the critical force of revising the novel's own allusive mode and moral horizon. The paraliptical allusion to the text's own Poe allusion is not simply an allusion (as, one might argue, the 1890 death scene is) because in its act of revisionary realization it binds the question of aesthetic value to the question of the relations between art and the literary marketplace. In the register of commentary or personal defense, this paraliptical allusion ties the novel's "moral" to the objection of cheap scholarship. But in a more profound aesthetic register, the intertwining of the moral and the scholarly is also a revision of the novel it claims merely to explicate. As we shall see it is part of the larger revisionary realization of the novel, and of what it could mean for a work of art to be both "poisonous" and "perfect" in the *fin-de-siècle* literary marketplace. Part of the reason this revision denies itself is that otherwise it would openly concede that the reviews are to a degree correct. The more consequential point is that Wilde's revisions of the novel have already begun to operate, precisely here in the world of newspaper journalism, far "out of the picture" *of Dorian Gray*. Moreover, this suggests a kind of revision also of the conflict with the press—not just of its fruits (his insistences and his concessions), but also of the controversy itself (the structure of the antagonism and its conceptual terms).

[49] In fact, he had been equally explicit in his second letter to the *Gazette*: "Dorian…tries to kill conscience, and at that moment kills himself" (CL 430). This remark is put forward is in the elaboration of the abovementioned claim that the moral's obtrusiveness is the only artistic error in the novel.

Where the *Chronicle* debased the novel by treating it as no different in essence from Wilde's defensive press commentary, or the earlier *Gazette* review to which it responded, Wilde's *Chronicle* letter implicitly but definitively asserts its own nearly Platonic participation in the form of the novel, by its self-reflexive insistence on the discursive register it occupies: this is the voice of the "artist" speaking. The phrase "*you* cannot deny that [the novel is] perfect, and perfection is what *we artists* aim at," with its simultaneously inclusive and exclusive first person plural pronoun, absorbs the *Chronicle*'s antagonistic conflation of the novel and Wilde's previous letters as its reparté to the *Chronicle* (CL 436; emphases added). In other words, the review blends the voice of the work and the voice of the author to the detriment of both; Wilde too identifies the novel with his letters to the editors, but he elevates the latter to that autonomous aesthetic realm from which the journalist is ontologically separated.[50] This assertion of art's transcendent position relative to newspaper prose is predicated on the paralipsis of the Poe allusion. But it nevertheless coils the prose of the newspaper world and the realm of art still more tightly together, with a studied casualness that ensures that it will be passed by unobserved.[51]

With this one letter Wilde evidently silenced the *Chronicle*. But on July 5, three days after it was printed, there appeared the third and last review to which Wilde directly responded, this time in *The Scots Observer*. It picks up where the *Chronicle* left off. Or rather, the anonymous reviewer reiterates that second review's attacks in starker terms: "Mr Oscar Wilde has again been writing stuff that were better unwritten; and while 'The Picture of Dorian Gray'…is ingenious,…it is false art…The story—which deals with matters only fitted for the Criminal Investigation Department or for a hearing *in camera*—is discreditable alike to author and editor.…[If Wilde] can write for none but outlawed noblemen and perverted telegraph-boys, the sooner [he stops writing] the better."[52] While according to the *Chronicle* review the death scene and its false moral were fabricated "out of the picture," the *Observer* condemns the work as false art (that is, crime) that should be but is not out of the picture (that is, "in camera," in a judicial chamber from which public and press are excluded). Wilde immediately writes to Henley, the editor of the *Observer*, to attack this latest conflation of art and morality as an error analogous to the *Chronicle*'s equation of the novel with its commentary. Each of these amounts to the "absolutely unpardonable crime of trying to confuse the artist with his

---

[50] It is worth emphasizing that "perfection" is stated as an "aim," even if Wilde assumes that his own aim is true, that he has hit the mark. Another review, appearing in *Punch* on July 19 but passing without response from Wilde, pays as much attention to Wilde's remarks to the *Chronicle* as to the book itself, quoting the above-cited statement that "perfection is what we artists aim at" and rejoining "Perhaps; but 'we artists' do not always hit what we aim at, and despite his confident claim to unerring artistic marksmanship, one must hazard the opinion, that in this case Mr Wilde has 'shot wide'" (Beckson 77). The *Punch* reviewer is not attuned to the subtler rhetoric of Wilde's letter, but seizing on the ballistic imagery is apt, and I will return to it below in order to suggest that the artist certainly shot wild, but hazard has a way of being unerring, and this is part of the point in the Wildean aesthetics I am recovering.

[51] This gesture is perhaps related to the tactics of plagiarism that Wilde deploys vis-à-vis Whistler around the same time, as analyzed by Nicholas Frankel ("Wilde's *Intentions* and the Simulation of Meaning," *Victorian Literature and Culture* 24 [1996]: 155-137). Frankel shows how Wilde, in response to Whistler's letter to a periodical claiming that Wilde had plagiarized him in "The Decay of Lying," added passages of explicit plagiarism to the revised version of that text (in *Intentions*): "Wilde's answer to the charge of plagiarism…was to plagiarize the charge, and thereby to so transform it that it no longer remained a charge to [*sic*] plagiarism as such" (122). "Unlike plagiarism as we traditionally thing of it, 'plagiarism' in Wilde calls…attention to itself…[by citing] ideas and phrases…[to evacuate them] of their sense…even as they seem to convey clearly communicable ideas" (124-5).

[52] *Scots Observer* July 5, 1890, 181. This phrase refers to the Cleveland Street Affair. See Ed Cohen, *Talk on the Wilde Side: Towards a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 121ff. These lines seem strangely to transmute the initial claim that the novel "were better unwritten" since here the reviewer implies that it ought to be subject to a criminal investigation, but remain hidden from the public. As the *Gazette* went to great lengths to demonstrate, publication is what renders a work of art an 'action' liable to prosecution under the law (see Mason, *Art and Morality* 54).

subject-matter," the illegitimate journalistic and moralistic demand that the author make it clear whether he prefers "virtue to wickedness" or the reverse.

Accused by the critics of exactly what the Imperial Prosecutor Ernest Pinard argued was the worst sin of *Madame Bovary* (as we saw in chapter one, its refusal to pass judgment on Emma Bovary's transgressions), Wilde publicly announces an aesthetic principle which Flaubert held so strongly that he refused to appear in his own person to articulate it: "an artist, sir, has no ethical sympathies at all."[53]

> It was necessary, Sir, for the dramatic development of this story, to surround Dorian Gray with an atmosphere of moral corruption. Otherwise the story would have had no meaning and the plot no issue. To keep this atmosphere vague and indeterminate and wonderful was the aim of the artist who wrote the story. I claim, Sir, that he has succeeded. Each man sees his own sin in Dorian Gray. What Dorian Gray's sins are no one knows. He who finds them has brought them. (CL 439)

The "aim" of the novel, its "perfection," consists necessarily in leaving Dorian's sins unwritten, in the innuendo that passes over details. On first blush, the argument seems at variance with the fact of arguing it in a letter, as well as with Wilde's earlier admissions of the defect in the moral's obtrusiveness. But Wilde is here refining the self-contradiction into something aesthetically generative, not merely dismissing morality *pour épater les bourgeois*. As we have seen, the June 30 letter's paraliptical allusion transparently invoked the earlier allusion to Poe as a way of suturing the question of immorality to the question of decadent erudition: it revised the moral's aesthetic mode of allusion as a way of revising its obtrusiveness, while asserting the ontological separation of "you" journalists from the sphere that "we" artists inhabit. Here the letter to the *Observer* modulates that process by a repetition in reverse, embracing obscurity rather than obtrusiveness; and rather than insisting on the moral, endorsing the proposition that Dorian's sins, like his death, are left "out of the picture."

Wilde's *Observer* letter, then, turns the tactic from his *Chronicle* letter (claiming perfection in the voice of the autonomous artist) inside out, defending the novel's aesthetic merit in a voice that now identifies itself by its differentiation from the artist: "to keep this atmosphere vague…was the aim of *the artist who wrote the story*. *I* claim, Sir, that *he* has succeeded" (emphases added). The first person who speaks of the success of the novel is as separated from the third person of the artist as the *Chronicle* reviewer was from the realm of art, but since in this instance both pronouns refer to Oscar Wilde, there is a kind of Doppelgänger effect. Here we find a revision of the previous letter's insistence on artistic control, and while it even more emphatically insists on the perfection of the artwork, its rhetorical success hinges on this revisionary relation. It reverses, as in a mirror, the previous letter's paralipsis of the allusion to Poe. With the formally explicit if rhetorically subtle distinction between the voice of the critic ("I") and the voice of the artist ("he"), this letter dramatizes its own participation in the discourse of journalistic criticism. But it does so in order to create the same effect that the previous letter had created through denial of its participation in the newspaper discourse: the separation of that sphere from the sphere of art, where the novel remains in its perfection. In other words, whereas the Poe allusion incorporated the previous letter's own critical or extra-literary commentary into the artist's discourse while excluding Wilde's reviewers, this letter, speaking in the voice of Wilde as critic, separates artist and critic. Wilde likely suspected that Henley, editor of the *Observer*, had written the review himself; he surely has Henley in mind with this shift of tactic. And Henley indeed senses the canniness of Wilde's gesture, as is clear from a note to

[53] Wilde uses "ethics" and "morality" interchangeably, but he clearly means morality.

the author of the anonymous review, Charles Whibley,[54] written a few days after Wilde's letter was published: "I haven't yet read Oscar his story. I wish I had; for if he keeps us to our first utterance [i.e. the review] he has us in a tight place. Our second [i.e. the editorial note appended to Wilde's first letter to the *Observer*] has *him*, I think; but he's a dexterous & slippery bitch. As for your letter, write it & d—n the founders. You had better sign."[55]

Whibley indeed wrote a letter of response to the *Observer* and signed it, and though it is addressed ostensibly to the anonymous reviewer, it takes aim at Wilde. Printed July 19, as the first letter in what would be a seven-issue column "Art and Morality," Whibley's signed riposte marks a shift. The quarrel gradually expands into a wider-ranging public debate on morality and art, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* itself falls out of the picture. Wilde replies to only a few other editorial rejoinders and a couple of the new voices writing of this wider debate, and so I shall conclude my discussion of the controversy with Whibley's letter and Wilde's response, which together bring it into its greatest focus. As it takes what had been an argument exclusively with and about Wilde and turns it into a broader discussion, Whibley's letter also brings into acute focus a (hitherto more implicit) aesthetic and metaphysical question of the literary artwork as realization (or in his own sarcastic word, "apotheosis") of the Form of Beauty. Whibley writes as though in total disagreement with his own *Observer* review, proposing that if the review found "art and no morals" in the novel, he "detect[s] in its pages lots of morality and no art."[56] Apparently parodying an aesthete's point of view and contending on behalf of a purely formal or stylistic criticism, Whibley draws on a Paterian notion of style: "what your reviewer is disposed to regard as immorality seems to me to be nothing but a lack of proportion. [Guy de Maupassant, for example,] is dealing with certain facts and types which are not wholly pleasant; yet he might have woven them into a work of art had he set a watch over his style and suppressed his own idiosyncrasy."[57]

When he turns to Wilde's novel, his pose becomes more specific—that of Wilde's aesthetic character Lord Henry Wotton.

> Mr Wilde has permitted his love of paradox to obscure his sense of proportion. If I may parody the conversational style of Lord Henry Wotton—surely one of the dullest characters in fiction—there is nothing in life so tedious as an epigram. And a novel which is made up of inverted commonplaces and idle phrases developed παρά προσδοκίαν[58] has no more claim to be called artistic than has a picture composed entirely of dazzling spots.[59] Does an artist break the march of his story with tedious dissertations upon jewels and wearisome catalogues of furniture? And does he not, when dealing with an avowedly delicate topic, refrain…from superfluous detail and

---

[54] In a footnote to Wilde's letter of July 9, Rupert Hart-Davis remarks that "although [the *Observer*'s review] was for long thought to have been written by W.E. Henley, the paper's editor, the author was in fact his henchman Charles Whibley" (CL 438n2).

[55] *The Letters of William Ernest Henley to Charles Whibley, 1888-1903*, vol. I, 145. Henley's editorial note to Wilde's letter reads: "It was not to be expected that Mr. Wilde would agree with his reviewer as to the artistic merits of his booklet. Let it be conceded to him that he has succeeded in surrounding his hero with such an atmosphere as he describes. That is his reward. It is none the less legitimate for a critic to hold and to express the opinion that no treatment, however skilful, can make the atmosphere tolerable to his readers. That is his punishment. No doubt, it is the artist's privilege to be nasty; but he must exercise that privilege at his peril" (July 12, 1890; 202).

[56] July 19, 1890, 227. See Henley's above-quoted letter to Whibley, which suggests that Whibley's reversal of approach may stem from Henley's concern that if Wilde "keeps [the paper] to [its] first utterance he has [it] in a tight place."

[57] See *Appreciations* 34-35.

[58] *Para prosdokian* translates as "counter to expectation" or, perhaps, "against the grain" or "against nature."

[59] Surely we are meant to hear in this phrase a subjacent attack on James Abbott McNeill Whistler's painting, and hence a dismissal of Wilde's letters as the same sort of egotistical scene-making in which Whistler was known to indulge.

> exotic sentimentality? Mr Wilde has proved that he lacks the tact and restraint to give us an artistic representation [of a character such as Dorian].…He himself claims an artistic triumph, and he has been hailed by at least one religious print as a moral reformer. Was there ever so unhappy an apotheosis? (July 19, 1890, 226-227)

In one sense, this reads like a doctrinaire application of Pater's recently published canon of aestheticist style, "Style." For Whibley, Wilde's excrescences—whether in the form of monotonous litanies that in fact are often self-plagiarized passages from Wilde's own journalism, or Lord Henry's provocations, or Wilde's present defenses of his novel—are what Pater would term "paralipomena" in the sense of "negligences," "forgetfulness of one's self," "accidental or removable ornaments."[60] More strongly still, Whibley argues that the juxtapositions and caprices of Wildean wit merely paper over self-contradictions with empty virtuosity. The novel's disjointed texture (e.g. non-narrative digressions such as the chapter detailing Dorian's variegated obsessions) is but a patchwork of that same precious cloth from which Lord Henry's epigrams are cut. Although Whibley's major claim is that the "treatment" and not the "subject matter" should be faulted, he also implies that this is improper material for a novel. Whibley takes the moral approbation of the novel that organs like *The Christian Leader* and *The Christian World* had voiced to evince a self-contradiction in Wilde's absolute separation of the ethical and the aesthetic. Such an apotheosis is "unhappy" since it consists of what should count as error within Wilde's avowed doctrine. In other words, Wilde might proclaim an aesthetic perfection in which journalism and its morality are denied participation, but praise from religious journal reviews demonstrates that the power of a novel "made up of inverted commonplaces" (July 19, 1890, 227) is in reality but the "crude power" of a journalistic discourse that Wilde himself had recently denounced as a "style so gorgeous that it conceals the subject" in his essay "Pen, Pencil and Poison." Because it has no subject at all, anyone can read one in.[61]

We should pause here to note the precision with which Whibley's parodic Paterian aestheticist analysis grasps the contradictions in Wilde's epistolary defense. And his parody of Lord Henry aptly captures the way in which the character's litany of epigrams does indeed reproduce *tedium vitæ* in the very act of trying to escape it. Furthermore, Whibley's gambit—writing in his own name but under the aegis of Paterian aestheticism, in order ostensibly to disagree with a review he himself wrote—is a move inherited from an earlier moment of newspaper prose that, by this time, had been afforded at least some potential literary legitimacy. One thinks immediately of Charles Lamb and Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, who wrote for the *London Magazine* in the 1820s; the authors wrote in their own names as well as pseudonymously (Lamb as Elia; Wainewright as Cornelius Van Vinkbooms, Egomet Bonmot, and Janus Weathercock). Moreover, we should recall here Pater's laudatory essay on Lamb in the October 1878 *Fortnightly Review*, which reappeared alongside "Style" in *Appreciations* only eight months before Whibley's letter. In it Pater praises Lamb for writing journalistic prose about quotidian matters, in such a way that he achieved "a certain exceptional enduringness" that, Pater finds, "Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley even…surrender to the mere course of time" because they "sharing so largely in the unrest of their own age."[62] Pater claims Lamb as his precursor, a man whose prose "realises the principle of art for its own sake," and above all exemplifies the "value of reserve in literature" (IV: 112, 124). Hence Whibley, enacting

---

[60] *Plato and Platonism* 281; *Appreciations* 16.

[61] "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" (IV: 112, 114). This criticism will have an afterlife in Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). Sedgwick argues that the novel's incipient modernism lies in its "imperfect transformation" of an "open secret" of male love into an "empty secret" of a "modernist self-reflexive abstraction" in no small part determined by its own panic about male love (163-167). There is much to be said for this reading, but it tends to propose a concept of modernist abstraction that is itself rather empty.

[62] "Charles Lamb," in *Appreciations* 111.

precisely Lamb's mode of journalistic criticism, denounces Wilde for falsely claiming the qualities that Pater attributes pre-eminently to Lamb. (That Lamb "realise[d]" them within the journalistic sphere that Wilde disavows is not lost on Whibley.)

How does Wilde respond to this deft journalistic attack? He accepts much of Whibley's letter, responding in his letter of July 23 by calling its "insistence on the right of the artist to select his own subject-matter" "admirable," and claiming that "if a work of art is rich and vital and complete, those who have artistic instincts will see its beauty, and those to whom ethics appeal more strongly than aesthetics will see its moral lesson. It will fill the cowardly with terror, and the unclean will see in it their own shame. It will be to each man what he is himself. It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors" (CL 441).[63] This appears to concede Whibley's argument, which would make of Wilde's letter only a somewhat flat attempt to insist that the novel was artfully done: "your Mr. Charles Whibley genially says that he discovers in it 'lots of morality.' It is quite true that he goes on to say that he detects no art in it. But I do not think that it is fair to expect a critic to be able to see a work of art from every point of view." But the rather mild retort shades into a more convincing representation of Lord Henry's conversational mode than Whibley's paler echo. Wilde absorbs Whibley's accusation and embraces that heterodox, or paradoxical, version of apotheosis as the very ground of the novel (much as when, to the *Gazette*'s assertion that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* was a revelation of the "non-existent," he replied that it is the essence of literary art "to realise the non-existent" [CL 430]). Or rather, he builds his picture out of what is always missing in an apotheosis. For the work of art is not simply the sum of the views taken of it. However contradictory that sum would be, adding the purely aesthetic to the moral, nonetheless divergent "points of view" attest to its unity and perfection. This, then, is the Wildean picture, the analogue to Flaubert's ensemble. The moral considerations of religious reviews are thus a "tribute" to the work, amounting not to an "unhappy apotheosis" but, rather, bodying forth moral evidence of aesthetic perfection—precisely what *The Picture* passes over. The divergence of opinions amongst critics apparently means that Wilde as artist is "in accord with himself" (III: 167). Wilde again posits the work of art and the artist as Platonic Forms of which newspaper and journalist are at least reflections, reiterating once more his ostensibly aestheticist argument in the controversy.

And he does so in a glib tone calculated to infuriate a man who had been annoyed with Lord Henry's less weighty paradoxes. It is altogether true, as Whibley alleges, that Wilde's "love of paradox…obscure[s] his sense of proportion," but the obscure is not necessarily the factitious. And it is part of my argument that Wilde's aesthetic works most effectively in the shadows of its own lustrous paradox, that this is the deeper "sense of proportion" of his style. It is a proportion defined by the equilibrium of aestheticism and journalism. Read purely in the context of the newspaper debates, the witticism—that the novel "will be to each man what he is himself," that "it is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors"—certainly might seem what another letter-writer subsequently called only "an impudent paradox."[64] The epigram might be taken for just the sort of "inverted commonplace" or "idle phrase" that Lord Henry would utter—or a (by this point tiresome) recapitulation of an aestheticist doctrine derived from *Phaedrus*.[65] And its most pointed response to Whibley would be that if Whibley found no art in the novel, this is because it only mirrored to him his own insensibility to art.

---

[63] In addition to the twenty-first epigram of the "Preface" (given verbatim in its last sentence), one can detect in this passage several of the "Preface" epigrams lurking, among which the twenty-second ("Diversity of opinion about a work of art shows that the work is new, complex, and vital") and twenty-third ("When critics disagree the artist is in accord with himself").

[64] J. MacLaren Cobban; August 9, 1890, 304.

[65] 255d-e, where the beloved "does not realize he is seeing himself in the lover as in a mirror" (Plato, *Complete Works* 532). See Monsman, "Platonic Eros."

But read as a response to Whibley's claim that the unexpected critical judgments on the novel imply the novel's botched composition (or the emptiness of Wilde's aestheticist posturing), in the wider context and full rhetorical complexity of the whole quarrel with the press, and as part of what the spectacularly rarefied preface crystallizes and passes over, this epigram does something else. It shows how Wilde's letter appears to rebuff Whibley the better to enfold the substance of his critique, as a "modest contribution" hereafter integral to it as a genuine work of art. Here, Wilde's dynamics of revision are learning from the press controversy, most importantly that the new aesthetic Wilde seeks to enact necessarily involves what ostensibly looks like "error" (in this case, the moral praise from Christian reviews). "Error" is part of the temporal dynamic of Wilde's shifting understanding of aesthetic embodiment, and the point is that the artist's absolute separation of morality from aesthetics is homologous to the separation of aestheticism and the literary marketplace. Once Wilde takes moral appreciation as a "tribute," his aesthetics must also incorporate the prosaic newspaper world as such, and likewise include the incompleteness its "contribution" adds as a positive fact to the artwork. As we shall see, Wilde's revisions—irrespective of his intentions—work to forge his analogue to the Flaubertian ensemble.

But how, concretely, does this work? The answer is attested in certain ambiguities haunting the concluding lines of Wilde's response, where he insults Whibley by consoling him about his limited perspective: "I do not think that it is fair to expect a critic to be able to see a work of art from every point of view. Even Gautier had his limitations just as much as Diderot had, and in modern England Goethes are rare. I can only assure Mr. Charles Whibley that no moral apotheosis to which he has added the most modest contribution could be a source of unhappiness to an artist" (CL 441-2). The rhetorical subtlety here, what I called the deeper sense of proportion, trades on the apparent feebleness of the rejoinder. It looks as though Wilde has nothing of substance to say to Whibley's accusation of self-contradiction, and indeed his remark about Gautier might even imply a renunciation of *l'art pour l'art*. But this passage introduces a third instance wherein Wilde's use of pronouns works an understated sorcery. The syntax of the last sentence admits of a confusion: the pronoun "he" precedes its most semantically logical antecedent ("the artist"), but follows the syntactically possible (and, in the temporality of reading, the initially more likely) antecedent "Mr. Charles Whibley." In other words, we first read the phrase as signifying "no moral apotheosis to which you, Mr. Whibley, have contributed could make me, the artist, unhappy." This yields little immediate sense, however, and by the end of the sentence we recognize that Wilde must mean "no moral apotheosis to which the artist has contributed could make him unhappy." But that retroactive revision does not erase the momentary error—it in fact preserves it as a potential reversal, an incompleteness lodged in the completed thought. This underscores again the Wildean paradox of the agon of art and journalism with another bit of pronominal play: if "he" is taken to refer to Whibley, then the artwork as a dynamic picture include what it leaves out: Whibley's odd (but hardly "modest") journalistic "contribution." While the immediate semantic purport of the sentence would foreclose on this possibility, foreclosure occurs only at the conclusion and, as Pater says, such a stylistic ornament "is rarely content to die to thought at precisely the right moment, but will inevitably linger awhile, stirring a long 'brain-wave' behind it of perhaps quite alien associations" (*Appreciations* 15).

In this context, Wilde's letter of July 23 fuses the question of criticism's limitations to a different question—that of an incompleteness in the work of art that journalistic criticism is capable of revealing, and a picture irreducible to the sum of these partial views. Whibley sees no art in the "mirror" that is *The Picture* because he belongs to a journalism that does not sublate its opposition to art (as does the aesthetic critic, the "critic as artist"). But this does not foreclose the possibility that Whibley is partly (and partially) right, that the work of art itself is incomplete unless and until it incorporates the prose of the world as an extra-aesthetic defect that is also, paradoxically, a necessary

"contribution" to its (revised) realization. And if Whibley's signed letter marks the point where Wilde removes himself from the fray, then it also marks a point of convergence, where Wilde's emergent practice of revision-as-realization finds its closest Doppelgänger. This is the point where the process that I am articulating most subtly theorizes itself. Wilde suggests that "all the arts [are] one" by revising his novel's relation to its own defects and indeed to the sphere against which, but also in which, it defines itself as art (IV: 113). In other words, the relatively minor controversy of the 1890 reviews of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* as I have read it embodies Wilde's recognition that in the *fin de siècle* the artwork must confront and indeed include the literary marketplace. Moreover, this (cognitive) realization allows, indeed requires, him to revise his sense and practice of art as the (practical) realization of timeless beauty. Perfection now materially hinges, not on its atemporal separation or withdrawal from an extra-aesthetic vulgarity (as Wilde felt Pater believed), but rather on the work becoming a processual meditation on its own relation to the extra-aesthetic. For Wilde, this means incorporating the iterative, ephemeral dynamics of the newspaper world into the artwork. But how? As we shall see, the procedure works by way of active incompletion.

Wilde's engagement in the 1890 press controversy, then, looks to all appearances like a public relations campaign foundering on its own narcissism. But as we have seen, it elaborates and occults a process of revision that transforms the very notions of aesthetic autonomy that his letters ostensibly promulgate. The series of letters shows Wilde's recursive, iterative transformation of the idea of aesthetic perfection from a static postulate of *l'art pour l'art* into a processual relation energized by the antagonism between art and public morality, between literature and the marketplace. In his later letters, and particularly the exchange with his canniest of opponents, Whibley, it is as though Wilde has accepted the way the reviews blend criticism of the novel with commentary on the controversy itself and turned it into his own technique for revising the text. For his responses increasingly amalgamate the novel and the controversy as well, but in order to transform both. The temporality of this process, at once quotidian, ephemeral, and recursive, suggests that we see the review debacle not simply as an encounter between aestheticist or decadent art and an outraged literary market and periodical discourse, but also as a deeper scandal (stumbling block) of *fin-de-siècle* literary art. In other words, Wilde's letters begin to theorize (or criticize, or revise) *The Picture of Dorian Gray* as an artwork perfect and poisonous precisely because it is incomplete, and because that incompletion occasions denunciations from the newspaper press. The stagnant hedonism that pushes Dorian to endlessly repetitive and interchangeable sensuous experiences (his Paterian "pulsations" being as apparently infinite as his "given time" [*Studies* 120]) in fact mirrors the endless ephemerality of the journalistic press that cannot seem to countenance such experiences. Wilde gleans this from the encounter, and consequently begins to install a recursive structure of artistic revision that proceeds by way of (journalistic) critical interpretation. It at once realizes what was not in his novel, as in his paraliptical allusion to Poe, and establishes an ekphrastic dialectic between art and journalism, aesthetics and morality.

As each review follows on the last, successively injecting more of its own discourse into its object, so do Wilde's letters revisit and revise themselves—moving from relatively straightforward argumentation to the rhetorical assertion of their participation in a sphere ("we artists") from which the newspapers (where those letters appear) are excluded, and then revising that very gesture by separating Wilde the letter correspondent from Wilde the artist ("I claim, Sir, that he has succeeded"). But Wilde's revisions are also recursive embraces of unrealized potential within the past, not unlike the impressionist ethos of Pater's sense of historical criticism, but reconceived through the ephemeral temporality of the newspaper press. The process of this self-revision itself shows a more intricate and radical meditation on the relations between art and the marketplace than either separation or participation can capture—an antagonism the ekphrastic and paraliptical dynamics of which dialectically forge what Wilde calls the artwork as a "realization." Here Wilde's

Paterian "capacity for correction" broaches a level of complexity and historical self-reflection implicit within but left undeveloped within Pater's aesthetics of style (*Plato and Platonism* 283). In this light, Wilde's letters work beyond the confines of the more pedantic or self-promoting ways he might be understood to reply to his critics. The notion of leaving things "out of the picture" takes on new resonance that cannot be fully elaborated either in the reviewer's moral and commercial terms or in Paterian aesthetic terms alone, but only through the antagonism of the irrepressible force that is Wilde and the immoveable object (stumbling block?) that is the journalistic prose of the world.

That antagonism will be dealt with twice—first by the preface, which enfolds the debacle into the text as a generative index of incompleteness; secondly and more profoundly in a larger and more complex structure of paraliptical allusion, proceeding from the press disputes, that defines the revisions of the 1891 volume. In the newspaper controversy itself, Wilde's defenses exceed their mere argumentative insistence with a silent reserve. They mutely elaborate a revisionary process that, because it obscures the fact that it is a process, works to transform aestheticist perfection by incorporating the prosaically defective and temporally incomplete. And the "final" gesture of this process is the most dramatically marked by an active sense of incompletion: the closing argument in, and would-be judgment on, the scandal is, as I have said, the short text called "A Preface to 'Dorian Gray'," which appears in the March 1891 issue of the *Fortnightly Review* and then reappears a month later at the head of the novel's volume edition. It consists of twenty-three epigrammatic dicta that present themselves as both the rules of interpretive engagement with the text and the Wildean aestheticist manifesto *par excellence*. But when it first appeared, "A Preface" is disingenuously silent about its provenance, status, and rhetorical force. It appears most obviously as an advertisement for the revised volume edition; but it also stands as a final judgment on the novel, a rejection of the authority of the periodical press, and a disavowal of the "contribution" the press made to its construction (revision).

For "A Preface" is culled largely from the newspaper disputes, sometimes verbatim. For instance, the central issue of morality, appearing in Wilde's first letter, is adjudicated in the eighth epigram: "there is no such thing as a moral or an immoral book. Books are well written, or badly written. That is all." Similarly, Wilde's assertion in his second letter, to the *Gazette*—that it is "the prurient" who, like the reviewer, "will not be able to find [the moral]" of the novel—is polished into the fifth: "those who find ugly meaning in beautiful things are corrupt without being charming. This is a fault." And there is Wilde's contention—destined to become infamous during the 1895 trials—in his July 9 *Observer* letter that "each man sees his own sin in Dorian Gray. What Dorian Gray's sins are no one knows. He who finds them has brought them."[66] There, he also calls the *Gazette* reviewer "Caliban" from which derives one of the preface's most famous epigrams: "the nineteenth-century dislike of Realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass. The nineteenth-century dislike of Romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass." Likewise, a close paraphrase of letter six is visible in the epigram "no artist has ethical sympathies. An ethical sympathy in an artist is an unpardonable mannerism of style." Finally, the Whibley exchange contributes, either verbatim or nearly, at least three epigrams from the preface: "Diversity of opinion about a work of art shows that the work is new, complex, and vital;" "When critics disagree the artist is in accord with himself;" and finally, "It is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors." Hence, in 1891, Wilde's preface would inevitably be legible as at once part of the earlier press

[66] Carson quoted this portion of the letter during his interrogation of Wilde during the 1895 trials, arguing that Wilde "left it open to be inferred…that the sins of Dorian Gray, some of them, may have been sodomy" (Holland, *The Real Trial* 78).

debacle and a disavowal of it; at once a high-handed aesthetic manifesto and a crass advertisement for the volume edition.

"Writing to newspapers" may have "a deteriorating influence on style," as Wilde wrote in his final letter to the *Observer* (CL 448), but some of the most famous of his highly stylized sentences nevertheless were written to newspapers before they appeared in the preface. This is not simply a self-contradiction, but rather the embodiment of a deep paradox defining the Wildean artwork as a dynamic picture, a revisionary realization that includes what it leaves out. To put it another way: if Whibley is right, if Lord Henry's paradoxes and the novel's composition as such are aesthetic defects, then the same judgment applies to the preface, even if it seeks to aesthetically redeem Wilde's idle extra-literary epigrams. Beyond his superficial criticism, however, Whibley's letter helps to crystallize the scandal of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in all its complexity. It gives, albeit in a pejorative tone, a name to the paradox that haunts Wilde's novel and is the motivating contradiction of his letters, the preface, the revisions, and therefore, I argue, the artwork as a picture in Wilde's sense. Whibley's insightful if malicious critique beats Wilde at his own game. But this is less a judgment on the novel than it is a "modest contribution" to it, because it yields Wilde's revisionary process a further twist: the novel can enfold what should be error within its "apotheosis" by leaving it out of the picture and thereby forging a genuinely dynamic literary entity. And when the preface incorporates the successive stages of Wilde's defense and the substance of the reviews' criticisms by further refinement and collection into a series of epigrammatic dicta, it retrojects the commentary as something prior to the novel itself—a preface—further complicating the temporality of *The Picture*'s bid for aesthetic perfection. The moral here does indeed concern, as Wilde said, "excess" and "renunciation:" his letters to the editors are an excess vis-à-vis the novel, but the preface embodies them also as a renunciation of the world of newspaper prose within the novel.

This is what we might call, playing on Pater's famous phrase, incorporation of the fruits of the scandal, insofar as it embeds within the novel the antagonism between Wilde and the newspapers, art and journalism.[67] It does this by establishing itself as the very field of tension between the aesthetic and the extra-aesthetic, refining the laborious tedium of those weeks of prosaic epistolary quarrel down to a golden chain of epigrams. Hence, the preface is not simply the doctrinaire manifesto of a decadent aestheticism it is often taken to be. If it is a kind of key to Wilde's aesthetics, it is so only in a sense antithetical to that commonplace assumption. When the text was first published in the *Fortnightly Review*, it stood as a conventionally authorial, aesthetic text, in contradistinction to his letters (which, as we have seen, often traversed discursive registers and even altered the relations between them). When it reappeared at the head of the revised volume, it shifted from extra-literary advertisement and/or commentary to the interior of the text, becoming an (only apparently) standard instance of what Gérard Genette calls a paratext. In fact Genette reads it as singing "exactement la même chanson" (Exactly the same song) as Gautier's famous preface to *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, categorizing each preface as a "préface-manifeste" that levels "une charge…contre la presse, et une profession de foi en faveur de l'« art pour l'art »" (A preface-manifesto [that levels] a charge against the press and a profession of faith in favor of art for art's sake).[68] There is of course no denying this. But if it is such a charge and profession of faith, then it is also something more: Wilde admitted to Whibley that "even Gautier had his limitations," and there "Gautier" does not signify Théophile Gautier the writer, so much as it signifies, in the parlance of the English press, *l'art pour l'art*. The discussion of the preface's genesis within the prose of the world has shown, I hope, that the implications—literary historical, aesthetic, and hermeneutic—of both it and the controversy it folds into the novel are more extensive than Genette's account would allow.

---

[67] "Not the fruit of experience, but experience itself is the end" (*Studies* 119).

[68] Gérard Genette, *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), 212.

If Wilde essentially passes over the explanatory part of this *explication de texte*, leaving the gnomic, epigrammatic dicta to "conceal its subject" (IV: 114)—Wilde's antagonism with the press—and proscribe further debate, then the preface nevertheless also (and thereby) introjects that antagonism within the novel.

III. Et in Selby Ego. Interpolated Death in the 1891 Revisions

> that inextricable error,
> Which makes a thrilling vapour of the air
> Become a [ ] and ever-shifting mirror
> Of all the beauty and the terror there—
> — P.B. Shelley

The preface—perhaps most clearly in the epigram "it is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors"—combines the effects of Wilde's earlier paraliptical allusion (to the concluding mirror scene in "William Wilson" as his own novel's unseen moral) with a specular erotics and aesthetics schooled in Plato's *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*,[69] and with a terse commentary on the opposition between art and journalism. I have argued that the preface is both an emblem of and a key to Wilde's strange use of revision, despite or rather because of the fact that the revisions seem to contradict the seeming Neoplatonic aestheticism that the preface irradiates. If this is plausible, then it will be necessary to think this specular logic in and through the substantive changes made in the 1891 text of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. The revisions deepen the process of which the preface is both product and erasure—a process of recursive transformation that proceeds by incorporating the work's error-ridden incomplete prehistory. This dynamic indexes not only Wilde's changing views on the questions of art, morality, scholarship, and decadent obtrusiveness at issue in the press quarrel, but also his aesthetic transformation of the *fin-de-siècle* antagonism of art and journalism into a dynamic, ekphrastic picture. The adoption of the ephemeral, quotidian temporality of the newspapers as dialectical counterpart to the aestheticism of a timeless artistic perfection gives real substance to the task that, Wilde's Rimbaudian phrase (from his review of *Appreciations*) suggests, Pater has not fully lived up to: the task of being "absolutely modern," of "realiz[ing] the nineteenth century" by including and retroactively transforming "the dreams and ideas and feelings of myriad generations."[70] In the 1891 revisions I shall demonstrate this last turn in the transformation of Wilde's aesthetics. It is an "absolutely modern" revision of the temporality of the press into the aesthetic temporality of a grander kind of paraliptical allusion than we saw in the letter to the *Chronicle*.

To grasp this transformation, it will be necessary to consider how the revisions deal with the problem of "the moral." In the newspaper controversy, as we have seen, these questions found an important focus in the conclusion, the scene of Dorian's death. The 1891 revision of this scene importantly modifies Dorian's relation to the picture as "mirror of his soul." It also stands in an intimate relation to what I shall subsequently suggest is the paradigmatic revision of the 1891 text—the added Chapter XVIII, wherein Sibyl Vane's brother James follows Dorian to his estate at Selby seeking revenge, only to be slain by mere contingency. Before turning to that more complicated revision, it will be useful to consider the revised final scene, wherein Dorian becomes alarmed that

---

[69] See Monsman, "Platonic Eros," 39: "Wilde and Pater both knew a picture does not corrupt a healthy soul. Since art is the mirror of the beholder, the presence or lack of a transcendental vision determines art's influence for good or ill."

[70] "Mr Pater's Last Volume" (*The Speaker*, 22 March 1890), rpt. in *The Soul of Man under Socialism and Selected Critical Prose*, ed. Linda Dowling (New York: Penguin, 2001), 25-26.

his picture does not seem to mirror the effects of his recent (attempted) good deed of sparing Hetty Merton, the peasant girl who succeeds the Duchess of Monmouth as Dorian's plaything. Wilde's additions bring the problem of Dorian's conscience—so central to the newspaper controversy—to the fore in a passage of free indirect discourse. The 1890 journal text reads

> His sin? He shrugged his shoulders. The death of Basil Hallward seemed very little to him. He was thinking of Hetty Merton.
>
> It was an unjust mirror, this mirror of his soul that he was looking at. Vanity? Curiosity? Hypocrisy? Had there been nothing more in his renunciation than that? There had been something more. At least he thought so. But who could tell?
>
> And this murder,—was it to dog him all his life? Was he never to get rid of the past? Was he really to confess? No. There was only one bit of evidence left against him. The picture itself,—that was evidence. (III: 162)

The 1891 text annexes the second of the above-quoted paragraphs to the first: "He was thinking of Hetty Merton. For it was an unjust mirror…". It then continues unchanged through the end of the paragraph (with the question "but who could tell?"), where several new sentences are appended: "…No. There had been nothing more. Through vanity he had spared [Hetty]. In hypocrisy he had worn the mask of goodness. For curiosity's sake he had tried the denial of self. He recognized that now" (III: 356).

A few lines later, the 1891 text intensifies the self-evidence of the Poe-esque "killing conscience" trope that Wilde had called the all-too-obvious moral of the 1890 version. In that text the death scene (which the *Chronicle* complained was fabricated "out of the picture") came to a climax with a description of Dorian ripping the canvas apart.

> [The picture] had been like a conscience to him. Yes, it had been conscience. He would destroy it.
>
> He looked round, and saw the knife that had stabbed Basil Hallward. He had cleaned it many times, till there was no stain left upon it. It was bright, and glistened. As it had killed the painter, so it would kill the painter's work, and all that meant. It would kill the past, and when that was dead he would be free. He seized it, and stabbed the canvas with it, ripping *the thing* right up from top to bottom.
>
> There was a cry heard, and a crash… (III: 163; emphasis added)

In the revised edition, Wilde revises the last few sentences: "…and when that was dead he would be free. *It would kill this monstrous soul-life, and without its hideous warnings, he would be at peace. He seized the thing, and stabbed the picture with it.* There was a cry heard, and a crash…" (III: 357; emendations emphasized). Donald Lawler, in perhaps the most exhaustive scholarship on the novel's revisions, reads these and related passages as correcting a defect in the work, as a "fulfill[ment of] his promise [to the *Gazette* and *Chronicle*] to eclipse the 'too evident' moral of the story" (Lawler, *Inquiry* 41). This assessment of the relation between the two texts is somewhat incoherent, appealing at moments to Wilde's final intentions in the 1891 text, and at others to the discrete integrity of the 1890 text. Nevertheless, Lawler is right to say that the revised version puts the question of conscience and self-recognition more explicitly in the foreground, as becomes clear when we compare the two sets of added lines cited above.

Of much more moment is the fact that they also put the scene of Dorian's death even further "out of the picture" (Beckson 73). In other words, the added lines seem both to concede and to contest the *Chronicle*'s judgment: conceding in that the revisions make it all the more obvious that

Dorian attempts to kill conscience in order to live completely amorally; contesting in that by putting the actual death further out of the frame of narrative description, they amplify the 1890 text's refusal to provide a narratorial guarantor of moral justice. Dorian's epiphany—that his one attempt at self-corrective renunciation, when he broke off his relations with Hetty Merton, was in reality hedonistic sensation-hunting—is an act of conscience, if only a negative one. This negative revelation redoubles when Dorian considers that he has kept the picture not because it is his conscience, but because "it had [formerly] given him pleasure to watch it changing and growing old" while he remained apparently unchanged by time (III: 356). Since he has surfeited on the pleasure of watching it decay, he now deems it simply a piece of "evidence" against him. He thereby denies the efficacy, or perhaps possibility, of conscience. The first of the above-cited additions, then, makes it textually indisputable that Dorian experiences a veritable crisis of conscience, that he realizes the enormity of what he has done and what it has made him. But it also works to intensify the crisis, since that recognition remains purely negative or unrealized.

As to the second change, Dorian's attack on the painting, Lawler and others have taken it to heighten the sense that Dorian commits suicide. This seems to me utterly wrong: if it resolves ambiguity at all, the added sentence ("it would kill this monstrous soul-life, and without its hideous warnings, he would be free") implies not suicide but that Dorian intends to live henceforth purely in that Cyrenaic "*monochronos hedone*" that Pater had expended such effort in *Marius the Epicurean* to separate from crude hedonism, and of which "The Critic as Artist" makes a mockery.[71] For Dorian, however, such a "mystic *now*" is very serious business, something he at this point believes possible only where there truly is no conscience, a "high indifference of joy" stripped of relation to futurity, the past, or self-reflection (III: 340). And we might argue that by "ripping the thing right up," Dorian merely completes the murder of Basil. For in Chapter II, just after Dorian's Faustian wish, Basil tries to "rip up the canvas" with a palette-knife, only to be stopped by Dorian's cry that "it would be murder" (III: 31/191). That is to say, the painting is the mirror in which Dorian's murder of Basil reflects (what Dorian took to be) Basil's attempted murder of Dorian. The attack on the picture here is first and foremost an act of self-preservation—or if the word 'self' is problematic, then an act meant to ensure the continuance of Dorian's experiences, not end them.

In both texts Dorian thinks of the knife with which he stabbed Basil and will stab the picture as a timeless, changeless agent whose deeds cannot stain it: it can be cleaned of bloody evidence and so, by a paralogism, Dorian can live on free of his soul-picture. He objectifies it as exactly the kind of unconscious, selfless force that he hopes to become, impervious to the menaces of conscience and consequence. And in both texts, there is a connected reference to the eclipse of that more damning piece of evidence, Basil's body: the last time Dorian was in this room, he noted that "*the thing* that had been sitting at the table was gone" (III: 153/313; emphasis added). The revision of Dorian's attempt to murder the painting, though, makes a slight but significant change in the mode of this echo: where the 1890 text reads "he seized *it*, and stabbed the canvas with it, ripping *the thing* right up from top to bottom," the 1891 gives "he seized *the thing*, and stabbed the picture with it" (163, 357; emphases added). The revised passage omits the earlier description of the picture's physical destruction—that earlier emphasis on its medial materiality perhaps having implied that Dorian does successfully destroy this "thing" that is his conscience or soul, reducing it back to a mere piece of canvas. At this level, Wilde's revision does seem to follow the letter of his response to the *Chronicle*'s criticism that the end occurred "out of the picture."

---

[71] On "the pleasure of the ideal present, the mystic *now*," see Pater, *Marius* 103ff and 173ff. In Wilde's dialogue, Gilbert quips "I am tired of my expedition into the dim, dull abyss of facts. There is nothing left for me now but the divine μονόχρονος ήδονή of another cigarette. Cigarettes have at least the charm of leaving one unsatisfied" (IV: 142).

More telling is the fact that in 1891 the knife becomes "the thing." In the 1890 journal edition, "the thing" referred to the picture, the external embodiment of his defects (whether construed as his soul, his conscience, the psychological or supernatural spell haunting him, or the mere aesthetic materiality of the picture canvas itself). But in the revised volume the knife is now "the thing," and that thing is transformed into the unswerving agent or instrument of the irony of fate, if not necessarily of justice. Considered as a revision caught up in the process begun with the press debacle, it is as if Dorian's decision to destroy his conscience works the same sort of spell his original Faustian wish had worked. But this time the irony is instantaneous rather than cumulative, transforming the magical aesthetic object from product or work (the picture as testimonial mirror) into instrument or agent (the palette knife as judge and executioner). For Dorian there is not much difference, since both realize his desire only in the mode of tragic irony. But at another remove—where, just as the initiating and final acts of the plot stand outside their narrative temporality for the reader, so do both texts of the novel stand in relation to one another—the transformation of picture-thing into knife-thing does make a significant difference. In each text, the echo of Basil's removed body serves to underscore that "the thing" is always "evidence," but this particular emendation forges a mode of visibility for the revisionary process itself, and its transformative meditation on the relation between "aesthetic effect" and the moral (CL 435). The 1890 description of the ripped canvas may well carry an association with Jack the Ripper and in this light the 1891 passage might be taken as self-censorship under duress, as Frankel claims.[72] But removing that detail hardly would satisfy anyone who suspected the novel itself of immorality. The decisive point is that the revision, in making more explicit the "moral" that "in his attempt to kill conscience Dorian Gray killed himself," makes equally explicit that, as the *Chronicle* review complained, Dorian's death is decidedly not the product of a genuine and complete remorse. Rather it is born of a desire to live a bestial life free of conscience, "out of the picture" in a different sense. Therefore, despite Wilde's claim that he would make the moral less obvious in the volume edition, he makes it all the more apparent; and although he insists that it is a moral in his accusers' sense of the word, his revisions only intensify what to the reviewers had looked like the absence or travesty of a moral.

In short, the revision of picture-thing to knife-thing marks a kind of moral judgment that we saw Flaubert's novel refuse (the absence of which Pinard rightly intuited) in chapter one. The 1890 metonymy between Basil's body and the picture, both called "the thing" in the sense of evidence, is transformed when that metonymy includes the instrument of death, the knife which itself is bound up with the agent of death.[73] By making the knife "the thing" in the 1891 text, Wilde's revision inscribes a moral (but also theoretical or aesthetic)[74] judgment against Dorian's naïve conception of experience—Dorian's is not a true *monochronos hedone*, but a monochrome one, and for that reason untenable.[75] The intertwining of evidence, instrument, and agent revokes any possibility of escaping

---

[72] *The Picture of Dorian Gray: An Annotated, Uncensored Version* 252n21.

[73] Moreover, it intensifies the metonymy between Dorian's knife and the palette-knife with which Basil attempted to destroy the painting in Chapter II. This link of instruments of crime and instruments of art recalls "Pen, Pencil and Poison" and the passage from Swinburne's *William Blake* from which it derives its name. Of Wainewright, Swinburne wrote that "with pen, with palette, or with poison, his hand was never a mere craftsman's" (*William Blake: A Critical Essay*, rev. ed. [London: Chatto & Windus, 1906], 74).

[74] I do not mean this in Kant's sense, of course, but only in the sense that it is a judgment against the aesthetic presumptions that underlie Dorian's behavior.

[75] In this respect, critics like John Paul Riquelme are as right to see *The Picture* as a critique of Paterian aestheticism as critics like Gerald Monsman are to see Dorian as a failure of Paterian Neoplatonist Eros. Wilde's novel is, I think, in agreement with Pater about Dorian's particularly naïve version of hedonism, but Wilde differs greatly from Pater as to the remedy. Pater's response to his own scandal was partly to recoil from the sensuous; for Wilde the remedy to this ephemeral pleasure necessarily involves the quite different ephemeral temporality of the newspaper. See Monsman,

conscience or consequence. This is also a narrative judgment, although it is not inscribed in the narrator's stance towards the character because, as in Flaubert's novel, the free indirect style of this passage makes that sort of distinction untenable. It is not a judgment that occurs either diegetically (at the level of character) or extradiegetically (at a narratorial level). Rather, it is a narrative judgment that obtains only at the level where each of the two texts stands in relation to the other and in relation to the series of the press controversy, as I said above. It is a judgment only evident as a revision, and as a revision understood in the terms that the press controversy established. It is a judgment occurring at a textual level including the press and its temporality along with the artwork that disavows them. If the press debacle looks to all appearances like it is Wilde's "thing" the same way the picture is Dorian's—the evidence against his aesthetics and his morals and not some ephemeral threat that time will dissipate—then Wilde revises this fact along with the final scene of the novel, turning the antagonism between art and newspaper prose into an instrument of a much more delicate operation than Dorian's attack on the canvas.

This intimation will find substantiation and nuance in the added Chapter XVIII, the conclusion of the subplots added to the 1891 text. As many critics have noted, the bulk of the added material concerns two elements, corresponding to the two other "only defects" (in addition to the overly apparent moral) that Wilde admitted in his letters, namely an overabundance of "paradoxical…dialogue" and "sensational incident."[76] With respect to the first, Wilde added several scenes of social comedy starring Lord Henry Wotton and a new sparring partner, Gladys, the Duchess of Monmouth. Surely this only adds to what Wilde lamented as the "too paradoxical" dialogue of the 1890 journal edition. In the same way, the 1891 text interpolates an entire subplot featuring Sibyl Vane's mother and more particularly her brother James, the melodrama of whose story certainly only compounds the second fault, that of the novel being "too crowded with sensational incident." Critics have often commented on the odd effect of the added subplot of James Vane's almost incestuously jealous attempt to avenge his sister's death by "kill[ing] Dorian like a dog" (IV: 230).

What goes unnoticed is the more occult manner in which this material responds to (and meditates on the structure of) the reviewers' complaints about "the moral." Chapter XVIII pointedly flirts with the possibility of Dorian's moral salvation, while drawing together the two added subplots, with their antagonism of generic and class sensibilities: the potential social comedy, embodied by the Duchess as Wotton's only peer for "paradoxical dialogue" (CL 432), confronts the potboiler melodrama, with all the "sensational incident" James Vane promises. It draws them together, though, only to dispense with them both in the same breath. When Vane, hiding in the bushes at Dorian's estate during a hunting party, is accidentally shot by a guest, any further witty reparté or romantic intrigue amongst Dorian's aristocrat acquaintances is foreclosed along with revenge for Sibyl's death. The man who shoots Vane is Sir Geoffrey Clouston, brother to the Duchess, the woman currently under Dorian's spell. In several respects these siblings mirror James and Sibyl Vane, in a doubling that complements the triangulated mirroring of desire and jealousy amongst James, Dorian, and Sibyl. First, James's death is the efficient cause of Dorian's decision (if it is one) not to ruin the Duchess as he had Sibyl and other women. Also, Sir Geoffrey stands as a potential double of James, in the characterological function of fraternal protector and rival. In this respect, Sir Geoffrey shooting Vane can be seen as a figural and narrative displacement of the plausible scenario

---

"Platonic Eros" and John Paul Riquelme, "Oscar Wilde's Aesthetic Gothic: Walter Pater, Dark Enlightenment, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*," *MFS* 46.3 (Fall 2000): 609-31.

[76] In his third letter, to the *Gazette*, Wilde wrote that "if I were criticizing my book, which I have some thoughts of doing, I think I would consider it my duty to point out that it is far too crowded with sensational incident, and far too paradoxical in style, as far, at any rate, as the dialogue goes. I feel that from a standpoint of art these are two defects in the book. But tedious and dull the book is not" (CL 432).

in which Clouston would shoot Dorian in a duel for ruining his own sister. More generally, Vane's death is also the point of convergence between the socio-economic and generic rivals. By cancelling the two plots out, the scene suggests that its own function is principally to lead with a more coherent narrative consequence to the pastoral Hetty Merton episode, with its tantalizing possibility of redemption for Dorian.

Chapter XVIII, then, performs the convergence and foreclosure of the opposed generic modes of the aristocratic social comedy, nearing its apparent telos of the seduction of the Duchess Gladys, and the melodramatic potboiler plotline of the Vane family. This mélange of styles is quite out of key with the ostensibly pure artistic aims Wilde ascribes to his revisions. Likewise, the dispatch of the threat to Dorian (along with the ancillary plots) looks like a *deus ex machina* both from Dorian's point of view (he is now safe from any retribution for Sibyl's death and offered a way out of his association with the Duchess) and from the compositional perspective (these two accessory additions having been disposed in one stroke, the volume can conclude without a substantial revision of the ending). Considering that this *deus ex machina* paradoxically is also a moment of godlessness, or of the inefficacy of the gods (after all, Vane is a would-be Nemesis, but he is thwarted by diegetic contingency), it threatens to prove the entire revised novel guilty of the charge reviewers made to the first version—a "sham," or at least a "lame story…lamely…told" (Beckson 72, 70).

However, just as Wilde's pose in the press controversy concealed a subtler dynamic, the seeming indelicacy of this sudden termination of the two added narrative threads is the very sign of that deeper "sense of proportion" I noted in Wilde's rejoinder to Whibley. Vane's death scene proceeds by a mechanism wherein utterly prosaic contingency and *deus ex machina* coincide. I suggest that it also deepens the profundity of the scholarship that reviewers found obtrusive and the complexity of a moral they called a sham, though it does so once again by feigning to refuse morality. Reading this feint in terms of the aesthetics of revision initiated in the newspaper controversy, we see more clearly how the scene occults its more sophisticated revisions of the relation between the moral and the aesthetic—between the prosaically moral and the decadently aesthetic, as they are parodied by the two added plotlines. Chapter XVIII works much like the June 30 letter to the *Chronicle*, which brought together, under the aegis of what I called the paralipsis of the 1890 text's allusion to Poe's "William Wilson," the questions of the moral, an obtrusiveness of style, and the autonomous realm of artistic perfection (CL 435-6). In fact, the scene of James Vane's death can be read as a kind of mirror image reversal of the concluding scene's "moral": if at the end, as in Poe's tale, Dorian attempts to kill his conscience only to kill himself, then in Chapter XVIII he tries to preserve (or revisit and restore) a narcissistic image of edenic innocence only to confirm self-consciousness, only to witness the dramatized knowledge of his own corruption and imperfection.

I suggested above, though, that the 1891 text dallies with a presumptive moment of salvation. It comes just before Geoffrey shoots at a rabbit, inadvertently killing Vane: "there was something in the animal's grace of movement that strangely charmed Dorian Gray, and he cried out at once, 'Don't shoot it, Geoffrey. Let it live" (III: 340). Geoffrey does not do so, of course, but Dorian sees the hare's exuberance and lack of self-consciousness as the beauty and innocence—just the light in which he had once viewed Sibyl Vane in her quasi-Kleistian *Marionnettentheater*, before that "touch of cruelty" had appeared in Dorian and in his picture, inaugurating his own fall into self-consciousness (III: 245). What "strangely charm[s]" Dorian in the hare's "grace of movement" is, quite simply, grace—of the sort that charmed Basil enough to paint Dorian, and of the sort that charmed Dorian into thinking he loved Sibyl. Like the boy's attempt, in Kleist's text, to replicate his inadvertent mirroring of the *Fedele* statue, Dorian's sight of the pure, natural innocence—the incompleteness—of the animal literalizes the specularity and downfall of self-consciousness. This spectacle literalizes that fall by re-envisioning it with a difference. It is almost as though, in some

Paterian "ideal present" or "mystical *now*" outside of narrative and historical time (*Marius* 103), Dorian finally sees himself in the state of perfect innocence (but also incompleteness); sees himself as he had been before the frame had been put on Basil's painting, before he had been "quite finished" by the picture's revelation of his own mortality in Chapter II (III: 28/188).

In other words, this moment revisits and revises the Narcissus moment of Chapter II, its sequel in Sibyl's fall from ideality, and its conclusion in Dorian's death. As Christopher Craft argues, the picture had turned "Dorian inside out so his eyes may witness what, by definition, they cannot see at all—the legible condition of his inner being." This complicates the Ovidian theme of desiring not the self but "the visual image that discloses the self to itself as the alienated object of its own desire," through the prosthetic medium of its production.[77] Craft persuasively shows the way in which the Wildean mirror stage in Chapter II is essentially ekphrastic, with language mediating visuality in a way that the Lacan of the "mirror stage" essay would deny.[78] I would add that on this stage, the spectacle—of the hare's innocence destroyed simultaneously with Vane's quest for justice—intensifies that specular dynamic. It refracts the Nemesis that attends narcissism through the lens of the equally Ovidian Nemesis that attends jealousy (here we should recall how Echo's voice mediates Narcissus's solipsism in advance). For Chapter XVIII brings together the two mirror-image plotlines about jealousy, only to kill them off in a scene of the specular destruction of innocence.[79]

Immediately before spotting the hare Dorian, seemingly reborn into innocence, is "dominated by the carelessness of happiness, the high indifference of joy." But the spectacle of the hare's death (and more so the man's), becomes to Dorian "a bad omen." "The dreadful death of the unlucky beater [whom he assumed Vane to have been], shot in the thicket like a wild animal, had seemed to prefigure death for himself also." This attitude results partly from Lord Henry's dismissal of the event as being without "psychological value": "this accident…can't be helped. It was the man's own fault.…Besides, it is nothing to us. It is rather awkward for Geoffrey of course. It does not do to pepper beaters. It makes people think that one is a wild shot. And Geoffrey is not; he shoots very straight." In fact, Wotton wishes it had been a murder; he would "like to know some one who had committed a real murder." Dorian, aware now of himself as a real murderer, but also with a presentiment of the ineluctability of fate's irony, feels "as if something horrible were going to happen to some of us. To myself, perhaps." Lord Henry quips that "there is no such thing as an omen," and insists that nothing could befall Dorian, who has "everything in the world that a man

---

[77] "Come See About Me: Enchantment of the Double in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*," *Representations* 91 (Summer 2005): 109-136, at 115 and 113.

[78] "L'assomption jubilatoire de son image spéculaire…nous paraîtra dès lors manifester en une situation exemplaire la matrice symbolique où le *je* se précipite en une forme primordiale, *avant qu'il ne s'objective dans la dialectique de l'identification à l'autre et que le langage ne lui restitue dans l'universel sa fonction de sujet*" (The jubilant assumption of his specular image…will henceforth appear to us to manifest, in an exemplary situation, the symbolic matrix wherein the *I* is precipitated in a primordial form, *before it is objectivated in the dialectic of identification to the other and language restores, within the universal, its function as subject*) (*Écrits*, new ed., vol. 1 [Paris: Seuil, 1999], 93; second emphases added). However, Lacan's 1964 seminar would rework the mirror stage in ways that do, I think, attend to some of what Craft finds missing. For instance: "c'est dans l'Autre que le sujet se constitue comme idéal, qu'il a…à se constituer dans sa réalité imaginaire.…[Mais] là où le sujet se voit, à savoir où se forge cette image réelle et inversée de son propre corps…ce n'est pas là d'où il se regarde" (it is in the Other that the subject constitutes himself as ideal, that he has…to constitute himself in his imaginary reality.…[But] there where the subject sees himself, namely where that real and inverted image of his own body forges itself…is not from where he regards himself) (*Le Séminaire, Livre XI: Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse 1964* [Paris: Seuil, 1973], 132).

[79] Another way of making this same point about the triangulation of narcissism through jealousy is found in the *Phaedrus*, a key text for Wilde: "he loves; but what? He is at a loss. He does not know what he has experienced nor can he tell; but just as someone who has caught ophthalmia from another is not able to state the cause, so it escaped his notice that he is seeing himself in the lover as in a mirror" (*Phaedrus* 255d-e; Plato, *Complete Works* 532).

can want. There is no one who would not be delighted to change places with you." Dorian's response is revealing: "there is no one with whom I would not change places.…The wretched peasant who has just died is better off than I am. I have no terror of Death. It is the coming of Death that terrifies me. Its monstrous wings seem to wheel in the leaden air around me. Good heavens! don't you see a man moving behind the trees there, watching me, waiting for me?". It is revealing in that Dorian in fact did momentarily change places with the figure in the spectacle that mirrored his own fall; even now he projects conscience onto an external agency (III: 341-44).

But the man moving in the trees, watching and waiting, is merely the gardener with a question about floral arrangements for the dinner table, as though to contrast the disarrangement that mars the narrative surface of the previous scene. The fact that Dorian now sees a lurking threat of death where before he saw animal grace and innocence is of greater importance than the deflation of that threat. The two (death and the grace of innocence) were there simultaneously, but not until the gunshot does Dorian become aware of their disjunctive coincidence. This fearful realization condenses the parallels between Sibyl's and Basil's deaths into a single image. And the convergence of Vane as Nemesis with the unconscious grace of the hare offers him the chance to become aware, for a moment out of narrative time, of one effect of his narcissistic self-reflection: "I wish I could love…but I seem to have lost the passion, and forgotten the desire. I am too much concentrated on myself. My own personality has become a burden to me. I want to escape, to go away, to forget" (III: 342). And although the Duchess looks lovely, "like Artemis in a tailor-made gown" as she approaches, the charm is broken for Dorian.

Vane's death scene, I am suggesting, mirrors Dorian's revised death scene, because it provides a more elaborate figuration of, and reckoning with, the specular figuration of his conscience. And this is a deeper engagement with the implications of the 1890 text's reviews than has been grasped. It is the mark, at once declamatory and understated, of a profound enfolding of the antagonistic structure between aestheticist art and the *fin-de-siècle* marketplace. Where the 1890 text has Dorian attempting renunciation (sparing Hetty Merton) basically unprovoked, at some unspecified moment after Basil's murder, the 1891 version causally links Dorian's horror at that death to his encounter with Vane (via his distress after disposing of the evidence of Basil's murder, his desire for more opium, and his chance encounter there with an anonymous woman he corrupted) in a direct train of consequence that leads to Chapter XVIII's death scene. The episode gives greater substance to the moral dilemma that Dorian faces, underscoring that it is a genuine dilemma. By making more explicit the veracity of the moral quandary, it retroactively introjects the reviewers' criticism that Wilde had contested. For Dorian's wish that he could be anyone else (such as Basil, for whom death's advent is no threat) is a mark, too, of the moral ramifications of his self-spectatorship. Even once he knows that the body is Vane's and that he is "safe," he remains intent on changing, and in the next chapter he recounts to Lord Henry how he "spared" Hetty Merton from his corruptive influence (III: 346).

As the next chapter opens he continues his efforts to redeem himself, as though still caught in the thrall of the bad omen he read in the spectacle of that double death. This might be read, along with Vane's abrupt execution, as further evidence of Wilde's less-than-seamless artistry in revision. Against this interpretation, the very discontinuity of the 1891 text can be read as a more involved meditation on the relationship between the moral and the aesthetic effect: it is immaterial that the body is Vane's because ironically his death cannot make Dorian any safer from the recursive arrows that time's weird winds bend back onto him. Vane was an instrument of prosaic, melodramatic consequence dressed up in the borrowed robes of fate, but he was also a mirror of Dorian's conscience. He, like Dorian, was haunted by Sibyl's death, his life in a sense corrupted by it. Hence, his non-identical coincidence with an image of grace and innocence at the moment of his death redoubles, as a spectacle, Dorian's own non-identical coincidence with the real "mirror of his soul."

In this added scene, then, more than anywhere else—more, indeed, than when he stands before the picture of himself—Dorian is allowed to witness the realization of the fact that "it is the spectator…that art really mirrors."[80] That famous epigram is, in substance, Whibley's "modest contribution," and I shall demonstrate below how Chapter XVIII, by having Dorian witness its dramatic realization, takes Whibley's half-serious gesture to the heart of the novel's revised meditation on the relation of aestheticism to the morality and temporality of the literary marketplace.

The revision is therefore not as self-defeating, in terms of its moral and aesthetic effect, as might initially appear. But this fact is available only from the perspective of the relation between the texts—that is, in terms of the artwork as a dynamic, ekphrastic picture—not diegetically. It is lost on Dorian: his attempt to leave Hetty Merton "as flower-like as when [he] had found her" is self-defeating, as Lord Henry points out. He has awakened her to self-consciousness, so that she will never be "contented" within "her own rank" (III: 155/347), much as he had awoken Sibyl from her dream-world of acting to the (fatal) reality of "love" (III: 63/242). To Dorian's naïve thought that Hetty "can live, like Perdita, in her garden of mint and marigold," Lord Henry rejoins "how do you know that Hetty isn't floating at the present moment in some star-lit mill-pond…like Ophelia?" (III: 155/347). The implication is unavoidable. Just as it is too late to undo the damage done to Hetty in bringing her to a state of self-consciousness that will make her "wretched," it is too late to repent of Dorian's own self-consciousness (and too late to avoid the concomitant irony of fate attending jealousy's epistemological self-destruction, a topos signaled by both the reference to *The Winter's Tale* and the entire James Vane subplot). Dorian can no more hope to become good by such reforms—if becoming good means recovering the innocence that precedes the narcissistic jealousy of self-consciousness—than he could hope to bring the hare, James Vane, Sibyl Vane, or Basil Hallward back to life. Temporal existence's ephemeral syntax is settled by the prosaic and contingent punctuation of death.

In the 1891 text these implications are underscored by connections between Hetty and the Vanes that are rendered explicit in at least two ways. The last lines of Chapter XVII—the sight of Vane's face "pressed against the window of the conservatory, like a white handkerchief," on the night before his death—find parallel in the opening of Chapter XIX, where Dorian tells Lord Henry of seeing Hetty's "white face at the window, like a spray of jasmine" as he left her (III: 338, 347). These pale specular visions, aestheticized and dehumanized by the similes attached to them, bookend the death scene with the hare. They not only underscore the complexity of the doubling and conscience topos at play; they also suggest a counterfactual solution, a ghost of a different conclusion to the novel possible only in foreclosed retrospect. Were this a different novel, James Vane and Hetty Merton might have been married off to each other, resolving both Vane's loss and Dorian's sin at once—like a Florizel and a Perdita who would remain forever in their pastoral fantasy world. But, let us be thankful for small miracles, marriage will never be a satisfactory *deus ex machina* in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, no matter how many times it is reincarnated and revised. Secondly, Dorian tells Lord Henry that Hetty was "wonderfully like Sibyl Vane" and, like Sibyl, Dorian purports "really [to have] loved [Hetty]. I am quite sure I loved her" (III: 346). With this, the references to *The Winter's Tale* and *Hamlet* frame Hetty as a botched double or revision of Sibyl. Botched, because Lord Henry points out that what Dorian believes to be a capacity for self-correction and self-renunciation is in fact self-absorption. This insistence on love is but a mask for the truth Dorian spoke a few pages previously when he said he had become "too concentrated" on himself to love (III: 342). Hetty, like the hare, figures as a revisitation of Sibyl Vane—a victim of his attempted renunciation as Sibyl was of his excess, and another mirror in which Dorian attempts to see himself.

---

[80] *Scots Observer*, August 2, 1890, 279; CL 441.

I have argued that the death scene of which Dorian is the spectator in Chapter XVIII refracts the "moral" that Wilde claimed was not sufficiently subordinate to the aesthetic effect in the 1890 text—and refracts that "moral" particularly as it appears in the final scene of Dorian's own death. It is, however, not something that Dorian can fully realize, although its ekphrastic dramatic figuration offers him a presentiment of it. But, again, it is the spectator that art mirrors, and if the spectator lacks the discernment necessary to see the truth, then there is nothing for it. In this sense, Chapter XVIII might be a deeper rejoinder to the critics on the question of the moral. This line of reasoning would see the conclusion of the novel as refracted in several ways, perhaps making it less of a "sham" or a *deus ex machina*. The fact that it would be made possible by what I have called the *deus ex machina* of the scene in Chapter XVIII might be yet another occulted reparté to Wilde's critics, this time about the nature of artistic perfection. This would be in keeping with the view that critics like Lawler uphold when they read the conclusion of the 1891 text as at once less morally ambiguous and more psychologically nuanced in its treatment of moral questions—in Robert Mighall's words, that with the 1891 text the novel is "indisputably improved."[81]

But, might it not as easily be construed as an admission that the 1890 novel was not perfect, and, what is even worse, that these afterthoughts are only the evening edition's reprint of the morning's old news? This assessment would agree with other critics like Frankel who see the 1891 text as an aesthetic (and ethical) failure, a bowdlerization, a concession to the sort of oppressive morality that would later imprison Wilde himself. On the first view, the specular death scene allows the revised edition to converge again with the original, leaving the conclusion unchanged (at least *de jure*) and thus offering a kind of aesthetic closure at both the narrative level and the level of the relation between the two versions. On the latter view, Chapter XVIII would be taken to mark the exposed seams of the revisions' aesthetic incoherence and origins in moral duress, making it inferior to the 1890 novel (or, in Frankel's case, an *avant-texte* prior to editorial censorship).

Contrary to both of these views, I submit that the interpolation of the specular death scene in Chapter XVIII opens a gulf in the substance of the novel, a rift between its two versions wherein lurks, like a more dangerous Nemesis than James Vane, the extra-aesthetic discourse of newspaper morality and the literary marketplace, which the preface itself passes over as inextricably bound up in the novel's "aim" of "perfection" (CL 436). In other words, rather than try to adjudicate the question of which of the two texts is a purer embodiment of the "ideal text" of Dorian Gray[82]—a question rendered impossible within the novel itself by the ekphrastic relation of the man to his picture—I would like to read the novel as perfect not atemporally but as a temporally dynamic, revisionary realization of the antagonism between art and morality, and between the novel and the marketplace. The 1891 text paraliptically incorporates the press controversy via the preface, and in a more complex way via the revisions I have been discussing. In its mirroring of the revised conclusion, the scene of Vane's death in Chapter XVIII tantalizes the reader with a potential moral resolution kept in abeyance—its more elaborate reckoning with the specular figuration of Dorian's conscience is a way to incorporate something of the reviewers' complaints that a moral was lacking, but it also withholds that resolution. Moreover, the spectacular and apparently artless gesture of killing off the two interpolated subplots with their genre and class antagonism suggests the scene as an ekphrastic conversion of the larger threat to the text's perfection: the antagonism of the Wildean aesthete and the vulgar press mirrored in that of the Selby Royal hunting party and James Vane. Chapter XVIII does not merely kill off that opposing story of the novel where it had crept into the

---

[81] *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, ed. Robert Mighall (New York: Penguin, 2003), xliii.

[82] As Guy and Small persuasively show, this question not only is an important instance of a wider concern in the late-19th-century literary world, it also had an important if subterranean impact on the 1895 trials (*The Textual Condition of Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 34-40).

text via the preface and the felt need for revisions. More profoundly, it enfolds them into its substance, as part of the formal texture of its essential incompleteness. However, this only becomes evidence when we look at both texts. And the preface. And the review disputes.

In other words, it is finally fruitless to speculate about which is the 'definitive' text of the novel; about the state of Wilde's original (or final, or pure) intentions as grounding textual legitimacy; or about which revisions, if any, are legitimate because founded on purely aesthetic motivations. For though Wilde espoused that all the arts are one, his novel is not one: as Gilbert remarks in "The Critic as Artist," "it is through its very incompleteness that Art becomes complete in beauty," and the critic as artist actualizes this truth ekphrastically, "by transforming each art into literature, solv[ing] once for all the problem of Art's unity." [83] The Wildean picture as revisionary realization—the analogue to Flaubert's ensemble—exists as an ekphrastic, paraliptical relation of specularity: just as Dorian and his picture, so too the 1891 novel and its preface, the 1890 *Lippincott's* text and the 1891 volume, the novel and its newspaper controversy, art and journalism, the moral and the aesthetic. And this last claim can only be borne out fully on the basis of a final paraliptical allusion that Wilde's revisions enact. Appropriately, it is the paralipsis of an allusion, and bears essentially on ekphrasis and the relations amongst the arts and between art and journalism.

IV. Pen, Pencil, and Paralipsis. The Wildean Mythical Method

We're aberrations
Defects in a defect's mirror
And we've been here all the time
Real fixations
Hidden deep in the furor
— Darby Crash

I shall conclude by showing that Chapter XVIII—beyond its function as a reaction to Wilde's critics, and beyond proleptically mirroring Dorian's death scene to him—interpolates a new element. It folds the newspaper controversy into *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in a fashion more sophisticated and less contrarian than the preface did. We have seen this already, but there is a deeper and even more allusive way to read Chapter XVIII in terms of the paraliptical logic that informs Wilde's picture. It is not only a revision of the novel in response to bad press—it is also a revision of, a transformative meditation on, the 19th-century aesthetic problem that is the antagonism of art and journalism. The scene of Vane's death works like another paraliptical allusion. Here the revision alludes, by omission, to a mythic structure that offers a figural parallel, a kind of ekphrastic mirror, in which to understand *The Picture*'s relationship to the literary marketplace. Of course, it is not only in the preface and the letters I discussed that Wilde denounces journalism. He also does so in a series of essays, reviews, and dialogues written in the same period, several of which are collected in the 1891 volume *Intentions*—including "The Decay of Lying" (appearing first in January 1889 in the *Nineteenth Century*), "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" (published the same month in the *Fortnightly Review*), and "The Critic as Artist" (appearing first in the July and September 1890 issues of the *Nineteenth Century*. Prior to examining this last paraliptical allusion, it is necessary to provide a context for it within the broader Wildean project of the "critic as artist," for the omitted allusion turns on a moment from one of those essays, and inscribes the novel within that project.

[83] See Wilde's critique of Whistler in the 1885 text "Mr Whistler's Ten O'Clock" (*Soul Of Man* 5); also "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" (IV: 113) and "The Critic as Artist" (IV: 152).

Laurel Brake usefully contrasts the rhetorical strategies of authorial identity construction marking Wilde's volume to those marking Arnold's *Essays in Criticism* (particularly the posthumous second series of 1888) and Pater's *Appreciations* (1889), all of which collect essays published initially in periodicals. She argues that, for all three, "the production process whereby writing is translated from the ephemeral of the periodical essay into the permanence of the book [obscures] the ephemeral characteristics and…origins, even to the original readers of the book."[84] Such collections are really "selected work, and what is deselected, left to the limbo of ephemera, is…as important." Moreover, characteristic to the process of constructing authorial identity is "the systematic revision of the ephemeral writing to provide it with a 'finish' allegedly not required by periodical publication.…'Finish' comes to be exclusively associated with another form of production, leisured and gentlemanly, which [results] in art which by implication is defined as 'not journalism.' Finish often involved the careful suppressions of topical allusions in order to enhance the illusion of timelessness of the new 'art' text." Arnold and Pater both gave "finish" to essays originally published in "relatively staid periodical[s] aimed at a family audience," e.g. *Macmillan's Magazine*, whereas Wilde's *Intentions* selected texts from *Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review*—"the two journals at the apex of the high culture which offered the widest moral parameters in the British press" (46-8).

As Brake notes, the "distinctive and unexpected dialogue form" of "The Decay of Lying" and "The Critic as Artist" allows Wilde to displace "Arnold's pulpit and Pater's academy with the Aesthetic drawing-room, and the setting of the public occasion and audience favored by Arnold and Pater with the private. These qualities together make Arnold's and Pater's contemporary work appear rarefied and even constrained compared with Wilde's, and suggest Wilde's work is part of a different periodicals discourse" (45). Though Wilde's essays in *Intentions* uniformly disparage the literary marketplace in the name of the same cause for which Pater urges a scholarly monasticism in "Style," that shared dislike of the prose of the world is virtually the only similarity. Moreover, the fact that "The Critic as Artist" was being written in the late spring and summer of 1890 (at the exact moment of the press debacle over *The Picture of Dorian Gray*) suggests a very specific "periodicals discourse" as an importantly determining context for Wilde's most famous dialogic essays. Though "The Decay of Lying" makes several admiring references to Pater, this essay and (more overtly still) "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" put distance between Wilde and his erstwhile teacher.[85]

Both of these essays share in the critiques that Wilde would soon make in his 1887 review of Pater's *Imaginary Portraits* and his March 1890 review of *Appreciations*. The former offers the backhanded compliment that "though it may be admitted that the best style is that which seems an unconscious result rather than a conscious aim, still in these latter days when violent rhetoric does duty for eloquence and vulgarity usurps the name of nature, we should be grateful for a style that deliberately aims at perfection of form" (*Soul of Man* 14). And the latter calls "Style" the "most interesting" essay of *Appreciations* (because it speaks with the "authority that comes from the noble realization of things nobly conceived") but also the "least successful" (because, it is insinuated, the essay does not realize the concept of style that it nobly conceives).[86] Although there is ambiguity in

---

[84] Brake, "Discourses of Journalism" 46.

[85] Josephine Guy attributes the ambivalence in these essays to the "strong sales" and "generally favourable reception" of *Appreciations*, which "may have persuaded Wilde that Pater's self-evident cultural authority now made him a more useful ally than rival" (IV: xliv).

[86] This is clearest in a passage of the review where Wilde circles around Pater's essay, in a parody of Paterian afterthought and qualification, to finally laud it: "What a high ideal is contained in these few pages! How good it is for us, in these days of popular education and facile journalism, to be reminded of the real scholarship that is essential to the perfect writer, who, 'being a true lover of words for their own sake, a minute and constant observer of their physiognomy', will avoid what is mere rhetoric, or ostentatious ornament, or negligent misuse of terms, or ineffective

the attitude these essays may be espousing toward Pater, it is clear, as Brake suggests, that their formal, generic, and rhetorical stance separates Wilde's "periodicals discourse" from Pater's or Arnold's.

Brake's argument could be easily extended to the other *Intentions* essays, "The Truth of Masks" and "Pen, Pencil and Poison," which make related, if less obvious, formal modifications to the Arnoldian "site of criticism" (Brake 45). The former was initially written in 1885 and lacked "finish" in the extreme, given how determined it was by markers of the ephemeral quotidian occasion. Despite Wilde's revisions for its volume version, it remained a very journalistic essay in Brake's sense but also T.S. Eliot's, which is developed importantly in his 1930 homage to Whibley.[87] "Pen, Pencil and Poison"—an essay often taken as a less than serious piece of provocation, or as a "foil" for Wilde's other, presumably more substantial essays of the same vintage (IV: xxxv)—also makes generic choices that generate complex rhetorical effects. This text gives a Wildean twist to both the Paterian genre of the "imaginary portrait" and the decidedly vulgar and outmoded genre of criminal biography and "gallows literature" broadsheets.[88] Generically, it blends a Paterian mode at its seemingly most anti-journalistic with modes so vulgar that they become outmoded.

This gesture echoes that same blend embodied in the aesthete characters of Wilde's two dialogic essays—especially if we take into consideration Guy's suggestion that Wilde's use of the dialogue form might be attributable less to Platonic dialogues than "an equally likely (if more prosaic) influence," namely, "the popularity of the dialogue form in contemporary periodicals" (IV: xliii). The *dramatis personae* of the dialogic essays find historical precedent in T.G. Wainewright—who, along with Lamb, wrote pseudonymous art criticism for the *London Magazine*, and thus prefigures Whibley's review and letters in the *Observer*. And if Lamb was a central figure of *l'art pour l'art* in Pater's *Appreciations*, Wainewright is the counterproposal *Intentions* makes. Wainewright's art criticism shares, for example, Vivian's disdain in "The Decay of Lying" for a petty archeological accuracy: Wilde claims that Wainewright prefigures Pater as "one of the first to recognize what is, indeed, the very keynote of aesthetic eclecticism, I mean the true harmony of all really beautiful things irrespective of age of place, of school or manner" (IV: 108). To its contemporary readership, the essay on Wainewright might appear to be the same sort of decadent posturing that Wilde's newspaper interlocutors would take his letters to be a few months later, because by the time of the essay public interest in Wainewright had, well, decreased. As critics have noted, he had been written about in fictionalized treatments both while still living (in Bulwer-Lytton's *Lucretia* [1846]) and after his death (in De Quincey's essay on Charles Lamb [1848] and Dickens's "Hunted Down"

---

surplusage, and will be known by his tact of omission, by his skillful economy of means, by his selection and self-restraint, and perhaps above all by that conscious artistic structure which is the expression of mind in style. I think I have been wrong in saying that the subject is too abstract. In Mr Pater's hands it becomes very real to us indeed, and he shows us how, behind the perfection of a man's style, must lie the passion of a man's soul" (*Soul of Man* 25-26).

[87] Eliot there seeks to redefine journalism's relation to literature (though all but "the *best* journalism" is categorically excluded). The difference is only that a journalist writes "under the pressure of an immediate occasion.…It is not so much that the journalist works on different material from that of other writers, as that he works from a different, no less and often more honourable, motive" (*Selected Essays* 440).

[88] See Regenia Gagnier, *Idylls of the Marketplace: Oscar Wilde and the Victorian Public* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), 34-39, which reads the essay as a satire on both criminal broadsheets and criminal biographies. She implies that the former are analogous to what Wilde calls "modern journalism" and the latter to "critical appreciations of criminals"—e.g. Pater's own 'imaginary portraits.' The implication would seem to be that Pater's aestheticism is fundamentally indistinguishable from the New Journalism's sensationalism. The connection between the two forms is supported but complicated by more recent work by Jonathan Grossman, who persuasively shows how the Victorian novel (and by implication a 'literary' discourse putatively distinct from journalism) incorporated aspects from criminal biography, thereby supplanting it, while newspaper journalism did likewise for the broadsheet tradition (*The Art of Alibi: English Law Courts and the Novel* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002], 7-36; especially 26-36). Ultimately, Gagnier's simple equation cannot be upheld, and Wilde's critiques of Pater move in precisely the opposite direction.

[1859/1860]). Likewise, Swinburne's 1868 critical essay *William Blake* included several pages devoted to Blake's friendly relationship with Wainewright in the 1820s, and in 1880 Carew W. Hazlitt published Wainewright's *Essays and Criticisms* (to which he appended a biographical essay of his father's friend). But, as Guy rightly points out, Wainewright "was somewhat 'old news' by the end of the decade.…Moreover attempts to justify his crimes [of forgery, fraud, and poisoning] by appealing to his aesthetic sensibility had already been made some years earlier by figures such as Thomas De Quincey and Algernon Swinburne—the latter indeed had coined the expression which Wilde used as the title of his own essay" (IV: xxxi-xxxii).[89]

As part of an argument to date the composition of "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" after "The Decay of Lying" rather than the reverse, as Richard Ellmann's canonical dating has it,[90] Guy claims that its "pointed analogy between Wainewright and the more contemporary figure of Walter Pater" helps to explain why Wilde might choose to write (and why Frank Harris, then editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, might accept an essay written) on Wainewright (IV: xxxii). Publishing the essay a month after Pater's "Style" appeared in the same publication, Guy suggests, may have been meant to enable "Wilde to establish the originality of his critical voice by ridiculing the authority of his nearest rival" (IV: xxxv). For in 1888, Pater was perhaps finally rebounding from the damage that controversies surrounding his 1873 *The Renaissance* had done to his reputation. Additionally, the appearance of "Style" just a few months after Matthew Arnold's death "must have been a reminder for Wilde that Pater, far from having retreated, was about to place himself as precisely [the heir to] that critical authority" to which Wilde was now also attempting to accede (IV: xxxiii).

What I wish to draw from Guy's remarks is that Wilde's essay (as part of a larger aesthetic and critical project) embeds, within its ostensible apologia for a dandy of days gone by, an immanent critique of the aestheticism and philosophy of history he had inherited most directly from Pater. Rodney Shewan and others have noted that Wilde's interest in Wainewright is more from "the psychological than from the aesthetic viewpoint,"[91] pointing out that his study on Wainewright ends with the proposition that "to be suggestive for fiction is to be of more importance than a fact" (IV: 122). I want to make a bid for Wainewright's aesthetic interest. It lies, like the figure of Pater at whom many of the essay's barbs are truly launched, in the relation of art to the literary marketplace and journalism, in questions of the "modernity" and temporality of art as opposed to that of the New Journalism and the literary press, and finally in questions of stylistic execution, realization, and incompleteness. For Wilde, Wainewright embodies the coincidence of each term of the agon that has defined my analysis of the press controversy occasioned by *The Picture of Dorian Gray*:

---

[89] As I noted earlier, Wilde alters Swinburne's "palette" to "pencil"—why? Surely it reduces Wainewright's arts from three to two? Until the 18th century, "pencil" meant "painter's brush." I take Wilde to be playing on that sense while also gesturing to multiple intermedial relations. As we shall see below, Wainewright's incompleteness is essential to Wilde, and he seizes it in Wainewright's discussion of Giulio Romano's pencil sketch of the myth of Cephalus and Procris. Wainewright's ekphrastic description of the sketch yields Wilde the "conception of making a prose-poem out of paint" (IV: 113), a conception easily applied to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. If the 1891 revisions trade the picture as "thing" for Basil's palette knife as "thing," then they also trade the "finished" picture (both novel and "palette") for the essentially incomplete sketch (both Wainewright and "pen"). Wilde's title has the first two terms from the same medium ("pen" and "pencil") obscure Swinburne's triumvirate of "arts" while simultaneously entertaining the possibility that "palette"—the occluded term—could mean "palette knife" as murder weapon, thus making the last two terms refer to the "fine art medium" of murder.

[90] This is the sequence Ellmann claims in his biography *Oscar Wilde* (New York: Vintage, 1987), 300. Guy seems to take this, along with Ellmann's comparison of "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" to his 1886 lecture on Chatterton, as meaning that Ellmann dates the essay's composition to "the mid-1880s" (IV: xxxi), and it is this idea that she disputes in the passages quoted. Ellmann, however, never makes such a proposition—his comparisons are strictly thematic.

[91] Shewan, *Art and Egotism* 74. Gagnier on the other hand reduces the essay to an oppositional critique of Wainewright and Pater (*Idylls* 37-39).

Wainewright prefigures not only Wilde's confrontations with the literary marketplace and Mrs. Grundy (and later the Marquess of Queensberry and the law), but also Pater's earlier confrontation with the prose of the world—from which Pater recoiled into what Wilde took to be propitiatory defenses of temperance in *Marius the Epicurean* and, more overtly, *Plato and Platonism*.

For, while lauding Wainewright as an aesthete, Wilde laments the coming of modern journalism that Wainewright's magazine writing portends.[92] "Modern journalism may be said to owe almost as much to him as to any man of the early part of this century. He was the pioneer of Asiatic prose.…To have a style so gorgeous that it conceals the subject is one of the highest achievements of an important and much admired school of Fleet Street leader-writers, and this school *Janus Weathercock* [one of Wainewright's pseudonyms] may be said to have invented" (IV: 114). Or again: "There is much in his published works that is too familiar, too common, too journalistic, in the bad sense of that bad word. Here and there he is distinctly vulgar in expression, and he is always lacking in the self-restraint of the true artist" (IV: 121). Imagine Wilde's embarrassment six months later when Whibley deployed Wainewrightian journalistic techniques to catch Wilde out for the faux-Paterian vulgarity of his earlier letters in the dispute.

In this respect, "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" bears an important rhetorical relation to the newspaper controversy of June–August 1890. That scandal, as we have seen, shows a Wilde demonstratively inhabiting the postures of the stereotyped aesthete, while silently revising the figure, the novel itself, and the relation it bears to journalism and the literary marketplace. Correlatively, the January 1889 essay allows Wilde to make what looks like an exaggerated apologia for Wainewright, an already cliché figure of the dandy and proto-aesthete, into a subtle critique of both Paterian aestheticism and the New Journalism, retroactively posing that outmoded and incomplete figure as their common prefiguration. Wilde would write in his March 1890 review of Pater's *Appreciations* that "the true critic is he who bears within himself the dreams and ideas and feelings of myriad generations," that "to realize the nineteenth century, one must realize every century that has preceded it, and that has contributed to its making. To know anything about oneself, one must know all about others" (*Soul of Man* 25). Though voiced as praise for Pater, this claim is really reserved for Wilde himself, and, not, I suggest, in the sense that the Des Esseintes figure in Dorian's "yellow book" tries to "realize *in* the nineteenth century all the passions and modes of thought that belonged to every century *except his own*" (III: 103/274; emphases added). Here the work of art already includes its reception and the present moment which Pater too had to exclude from his impressionism (in order for the work to become an object, an impression). Wilde finds in his all-too-present antagonism of art and the marketplace a potential waiting to be revised and realized through an encounter with an icon of its prehistory—through an encounter with a mythic hermeneutic structure. In this way Whibley's "modest contribution" marks a transformation in Wilde's aestheticism that we might name, somewhat reductively, by pointing to a shift from a Romantic notion of realization as organic totality (including Pater's Neoplatonist version of this idea) to a modernist notion of realization that embraces the incompleteness of any *monochronos hedone*, any ideologically mystical "now." This larger question gets folded into *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in its revisions' most complicated paraliptical "realization" of their potential.

At a key moment in the 1889 essay, Wilde gives Wainewright "the highest praise we can give him" (that "he tried," just as Pater would do, "to revive style as a conscious tradition"), and characterizes his art criticism as aimed at "deal[ing] with his impressions of the work as an artistic whole" and "translat[ing] those impressions into words, to give, as it were, the literary equivalent for the imaginative and mental effect." (This last might as well be a quotation of *Studies in the History of*

[92] See David Stewart, "T.G. Wainewright's Art Criticism and Metropolitan Magazine Style," *Romantic Textualities* 17 (Summer 2007): 7-23.

the Renaissance.) He then quotes and discusses two specimens of Wainewright's style. The first Wainewright passage comes from an April 1820 *London Magazine* article, which describes a sketch of the crucifixion of Christ by Rembrandt, praising Rembrandt for leaving the sketch unpainted.[93] Wilde remarks that Wainewright's prose here has "much that is terrible, and very much that is quite horrible, but it is not without a certain crude form of power, or at any rate, a certain crude violence of words, a quality which this age should highly appreciate, as it is its chief defect" (IV: 112). With this criticism of Wainewright's prose, made in terms that recall the venom he frequently aspersed on journalism, Wilde turns to another of Wainewright's ekphrastic art-critical descriptions, this one of a sketch from an October 1821 article in the same paper: "it is pleasanter, however, to pass to this description of Giulio Romano's 'Cephalus and Procris.'"[94] The passage that Wilde quotes begins with Wainewright's advice to read (Leigh Hunt's translation of) Moschus's lament for Bion "before looking at this picture, or study the picture as a preparation for the lament. We have nearly the same images in both" (qtd. in IV: 112). This odd gesture of intermedial identification or mirroring is amplified by Wainewright's interpolation of lines of poetry into the ensuing description of the picture—Hunt's translations of Moschus, apparent allusions to George Chapman and Shelley, and some lines almost certainly of Wainewright's own composition (IV: 433-435n). After quoting the passage at some length, Wilde concludes: "were this description carefully re-written, it would be quite admirable. The conception of making a prose poem out of paint is excellent. Much of the best modern literature springs from the same aim. In a very ugly and sensible age, the arts borrow, not from life, but from each other" (IV: 113).

More than anything else in "Pen, Pencil, and Poison," these lines—insisting as they do on a non-natural, ekphrastic, intermedial mirroring between art forms—justify Paul Sheehan's claim that the essay "is, of course, a thumbnail sketch of [*The Picture of*] *Dorian Gray*."[95] And, I hasten to add, the thought expressed here partakes of the larger project of the "critic as artist." Not only does it get at the ekphrastic dynamic at the core of the novel (and suggest ways that this might be rethought as something more substantial than a metaphor), it also sheds this odd light on the idea of a revisionary realization that incorporates what it leaves out of the picture: the ekphrastic relation between the arts is also, Wilde suggests, a relation between the modern and its mythologized precursors. This passage performs on Wainewright the sort of frenetic, discontinuous leaps and juxtapositions of silently edited or revised quotations I have shown to be at work in the controversy over *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. And if the passage can be understood as folded into the aesthetic transformations I am uncovering in that controversy, then this would be an explicit mode of enacting the logic of the temporality and aesthetic history that it articulates.

At this point I shall want to suggest a way of thinking through *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in terms of a kind of modern version of Romano's Renaissance unification of all the disparate arts (Vasari's *Lives* quotes Romano's epitaph to this effect).[96] But as we shall see in a moment, Wilde's assessment of Wainewright's ekphrastic exegesis also threads in variations on the themes of inheritance, influence, and revision. Just as, in an "ugly modern age, the arts borrow" from, allude to, revise and transformatively realize one another, so too do the modern age's structures of mediation (here the *fin-de-siècle* newspaper press and literary marketplace) facilitate and necessitate a

---

[93] Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, *Essays and Criticisms*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt (London: Reeves and Turner, 1880), 54.

[94] The mythical subject of the picture Wainewright describes is originally Greek but was most enduringly limned in the Latin verses of Ovid, both in *Ars Amatoria* (Book III) and in the *Metamorphoses* (Book VII).

[95] *Modernism and the Aesthetics of Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 72. Sheehan does not cite this passage, and discusses the essay simply to establish Wilde as someone who aestheticizes criminality in a fairly obvious manner—a reading that my own interpretation has as one of its secondary aims to complicate significantly.

[96] See Leonard Barkan, "'Living Sculptures': Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter's Tale*," *ELH* 48.4 (Winter 1981): 639-667; particularly 656-657.

different kind of historical relationship across epochs. This is not just des Esseintes warmed over, "realiz[ing] in the nineteenth century" everything except that present moment (III: 103/274). It is rather "realiz[ing] the nineteenth century" (*Soul of Man* 25). And I suggest that the scandal of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* can be read as a revision of the claim that "in a very ugly and sensible age, the arts borrow, not from life, but from each other," into an enactment of the necessity that art borrow from the prose of the world. In short, a revision of the very sort of dismissal (of that "life") which we saw Pater's later work increasingly approximating. In the 1890 newspaper controversy Wilde transforms his own relation to journalism not merely by insisting on his newly authenticated status as an artist, but more profoundly by changing what Wainewright could mean as an omen of the relation between Paterian aestheticism and its opposite number. And the revisions of the scandal that the 1891 novel embeds within it also revise and incorporate the agon of art and journalism of which Wainewright retroactively becomes a sketch—the specific and very qualified sense in which he may be for Wilde a figure of the multitudinous, complete man of art for whom Goethe stands as representative at the outset of the essay.[97]

What then is the relation of this project of the "critic as artist"—plotted out in the aesthetic writings of the 1890s and represented in the present argument by "Pen, Pencil, and Poison"—to the 1891 revised text of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*? Since what I shall have to say in conclusion will again address a structure of allusion, I suggest that it touches the core of Wilde's own gesture of claiming the absolute presence of a moral truth in the 1890 text by grounding it in an allusion he knew would not be noticed. In that moment of the newspaper controversy, I read Wilde's letter to the *Gazette* (CL 436) as responding to the charge of "obtrusively cheap scholarship" and the charge of a "sham moral" in a strangely interlocked gesture that I called a paralipsis of an allusion to Poe. I submit that the scene of James's death too functions like an allusion, though nothing allows us to say that—intentionally, or in any empirically verifiable way—it is one. The revision alludes by omission, and this is, I think, essential to a revised sense of Wilde and of the relation between art and the marketplace in this distinctly prosaic moment. This is another sort of paraliptical allusion, on a grander scale.

Let us set the scene once more, in somewhat greater detail. At the end of Chapter XVII, Dorian faints after seeing the face of James Vane looking in the window of his Selby Royal estate. He stays inside for days, mostly locked in his room, a prey to "the consciousness of being hunted, snared, tracked down" (III: 339). Two days pass in an internal debate over whether the face of Vane had been real or imagined: "it was the imagination that set remorse to dog the feet of sin. It was the imagination that made each crime bear its misshapen brood. In the common world of fact the wicked were not punished, nor the good rewarded." However, even if Vane's appearance was only Dorian's imagination, "how terrible it was to think that conscience could raise such fearful phantoms, and give them visible form!". It is unsurprising that Dorian's distress bears on the recent murder of Basil Hallward (the effect of which was to trigger an opium binge that brought him to the den where he encountered James Vane), but one might expect that this apparition of a figure of vengeance would also call up a specific remorse for having driven that figure's sister to suicide. Dorian thinks, however, only of the murder he committed with his own hands: "Oh! in what a wild hour of madness he had killed his friend! How ghastly the mere memory of the scene! He saw it all again. Each hideous detail came back to him with added horror. Out of the black cave of Time, terrible and swathed in scarlet, rose the image of his sin" (ibid.). Then, on "the third day," Dorian emerges from his own cave of time, seemingly reborn.

---

[97] And to whom Wilde likewise contrasts Whibley in the letter where he claims that "it is the spectator, and not life, that art really mirrors" (*Scots Observer* August 2, 1890, 279).

> There was something in the clear, pine-scented air of that winter morning that seemed to bring him back his joyousness and his ardour for life. But it was not merely the physical conditions of environment that had caused the change. His own nature had revolted against the excess of anguish that had sought to maim and mar the perfection of its calm.…After breakfast he walked with the Duchess for an hour in the garden, and then drove across the park to join the shooting-party. The crisp frost lay like salt upon the grass. The sky was an inverted cup of blue metal. A thin film of ice bordered the flat reed-grown lake.
>
> At the corner of the pine-wood he caught sight of Sir Geoffrey Clouston, the Duchess's brother, jerking two spent cartridges out of his gun. He jumped from the cart and…made his way towards his guest through the withered bracken and rough undergrowth.
>
> "Have you had good sport, Geoffrey?" he asked.
>
> "Not very good, Dorian. I think most of the birds have gone to the open. I dare say it will be better after lunch, when we get to new ground."
>
> Dorian strolled along by his side. The keen aromatic air, the brown and red lights that glimmered in the wood, the hoarse cries of the beaters ringing out from time to time, and the sharp snaps of the guns that followed, fascinated him, and filled him with a sense of delightful freedom. He was dominated by the carelessness of happiness, by the high indifference of joy.
>
> Suddenly from a lumpy tussock of old grass, some twenty yards in front of them, with black-tipped ears erect, and long hinder limbs throwing it forward, started a hare. It bolted for a thicket of alders, Sir Geoffrey put his gun to his shoulder, but there was something in the animal's grace of movement that strangely charmed Dorian Gray, and he cried out at once, "Don't shoot it, Geoffrey. Let it live."
>
> "What nonsense, Dorian!" laughed his companion, and as the hare bounded into the thicket he fired. There were two cries heard, the cry of a hare in pain, which is dreadful, the cry of a man in agony, which is worse.…
>
> Dorian watched them as they plunged into the alder-clump, brushing the lithe, swinging branches aside. In a few moments they emerged, dragging a body after them into the sunlight. He turned away in horror. It seemed to him that misfortune followed wherever he went. He heard Sir Geoffrey ask if the man was really dead, and the affirmative answer of the keeper. The wood seemed to him to have become suddenly alive with faces. There was the trampling of myriad feet, and the low buzz of voices. A great copper-breasted pheasant came beating through the boughs overhead. (III: 339-41)

Dorian's attempt to assure himself that he lives in a world of prosaic contingency ("the common world of fact") where, void of tragic fate, "the wicked were not punished, nor the good rewarded" seems almost absurdly confirmed by Vane's death (III: 339). As Neil Hultgren has recently claimed, the 1891 text's added "melodramatic" potboiler subplot starring James Vane certainly "initiates events, making sure that more happens in [the 1891 text], but ultimately [Vane's] actions rebound against him," and the interpolated material "hardly seems to alter the conclusion of the novel."[98] As so often with Wilde, however, not everything is as it seems.

[98] "Oscar Wilde's Poetic Injustice in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*," in *Wilde Discoveries: Traditions, Histories, Archives*, ed. Joseph Bristow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 217. Hultgren argues that Wilde adds this plot in the 1891 text in order to invoke and then in turn revoke the generic moral and causal structure of melodrama. According to Hultgren, it

I am claiming, as I said, that this scene enfolds within it something like an allusion. Were it one, the paraliptical allusion here would be multivalent, or at least multi-layered: that death scene of Dorian's personal Nemesis invoke, or can be interpreted to signify across, the myth of Cephalus and Procris. In other words, I want to suggest that this scene is worth being carefully re-read as a revisionary realization ("carefully re-written") of Wainewright's impressionistic description of Giulio Romano's ekphrastic treatment of Ovid's proto-decadent Latin revision of his own earlier adaptation of a Greek myth whose earliest known sources are Hyginus and Antoninus Liberalis. Wilde's choice of Wainewright's description of Romano's "Cephalus and Procris" as the key specimen of his prose is not, I think, adventitious. Like Wainewright, Romano is a figure whose fame dwindled posthumously, although he was once acknowledged as Raphael's greatest student and heir, and was given lavish praise in Vasari's foundational *Lives* (1550), as embodying the unity of all the arts, the *paragone*. But even if Romano is adventitious as the subject matter of Wilde's choice of Wainewrightian stylistic excerpts, that fact is immaterial, particularly since in the essay it is precisely Wainewright's capricious and fundamentally incomplete writing that supplies Wilde with a counterbalance or corrective to what he elsewhere calls the "asceticism…of Mr Pater's prose." If the "almost too severe" quality of "self-control" in Pater's *Imaginary Portraits* made Wilde "long for a little more freedom," then his own imaginary portrait of Pater in Wainewright would be the counterbalance.[99]

And the paraliptical, allusive gesture would enact a temporality of aesthetics and a theory of history all the more complex, given Wilde's familiarity with the comparative mythology of his former Oxford professor Max Müller, and the references to Müller's "solar theory" that run across Wilde's entire career—from his 1878 prize essay "Historical Criticism," to the May 1885 article "Shakespeare and Stage Costume" (to become "The Truth of Masks" in *Intentions*), to "The Critic as Artist."[100] For while Müller's controversial work on comparative mythology (published in as essay in 1856 and republished in a collection in 1880) addresses many myths, it most centrally connects those of Endymion, Tithonos, and Cephalus (or Kephalos). While Tithonos is an obvious inverse image of Dorian Gray (immortal but always aging, like Swift's Struldbrugs), Endymion was of course importantly a focal point of Keats's Hellenism. One of Wilde's references to Müller, in fact, compares his use of comparative mythology to Keats's own poetic method: "I have no desire to underrate the services of laborious scholars, but I feel that the use Keats made of Lemprière's Dictionary is of far more value to us than Professor Max Müller's treatment of the same mythology as a disease of language. Better *Endymion* than any theory, however sound, or in the present instance, unsound, of an epidemic among adjectives."[101] This point of view is clearly in line with John Addington Symonds's qualifying remarks about Müller's blending of mythology and philology.[102]

---

allows Wilde to refute (and punish) his critics by punishing a diegetic emblem of them (James Vane). Hultgren rightly sees some of the key hermeneutic, aesthetic, and moral aporias at issue here. However, he imposes too constricted a sense of generic oppositions and conflates morality with narrative causality. More problematically, his argument has to take Wilde's letters to his reviewers at face value, which as we have seen is not a tenable approach.

[99] One of Wainewright's epigrams to his article on Romano is apt in this connection. It is a quotation from John Selden's *Table-Talk*: "A wise man should never resolve upon anything ***** / A man must do according to accidents and emergencies" (*Essays and Criticisms* 189). The asterisks mark a passage Wainewright excises, which reads "…at least never let the world know his resolution, for if he cannot arrive at it he is ashamed. How many things did the king resolve, in his declaration concerning Scotland, never to do, and yet did them all!" (*Table-Talk, Being the Discourses of John Selden* [1689], ed. Israel Gollancz [London: J.M. Dent, 1898], 151).

[100] See Iain Ross, *Oscar Wilde and Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 54-80 and 180-2.

[101] "The Truth of Masks," IV: 217. By the time of the *Intentions* text, Wilde's view on Müller evidently changed, for the 1885 text did not contain the phrase "or, as in the present instance, unsound."

[102] "It is enough to bear in mind that, however important the sun was to the ancient Aryans, he could not have been everything: he was, after all, but one among many objects of interest; and what requires to be still more remembered, is

Wilde's careful reading of Symonds's *Studies of the Greek Poets* and its influence on his thinking is clear from the notes in his *Oxford Notebooks* and has been given substantial scholarly attention.[103] And in this respect, Symonds's thinking about modernity in his *Studies* suggests the pregnancy of the myth and Wainewright as a theorist and practitioner of Romanticism (and Hellenism).[104] Like Endymion for Keats, Wainewright (but also Romano, the myth, and the ekphrastic, intermedial, recursive relation that obtains amongst them) is more important as a "suggesti[on]" than as a "fact" (IV: 122), and Müller's comparative mythology is twisted into Wilde's mythical method.

The myth of Cephalus and Procris thus has an odd place within 19th-century debates on language and culture, and within the more circumscribed discourses of the period's Hellenism and Romanticism, in which Wilde is an important culminating figure. Romano's picture of the dying Procris has an analogously curious position, as is suggested by the appreciation shown it by none other than Goethe. I cite a short note describing the appearance of Helios (the sun) and the odd tricks of lighting as its chief accomplishment:

> Wir aber ja nicht zweifeln daß das alles mit Tagesanbruch sich zutrug, eilt Helios auf seinem Wagen aus dem Meere hervor. Sein hinschauen, seine Gebärde bezeugen, daß er das Unheil vernommen, es nun erblicke und mitempfinde. Uns aber darf es bey aufmerksamer Betrachtung nicht irren, daß die Sonne gerade im Hintergrunde aufgeht und das ganze, oben beschriebene Personal, wie vom Mittag her beleuchtet ist. Ohne diese Fiction wäre das Bild nicht was es ist, und wir müssen eine hohe Kunst verehren, die sich, gegen alle Wirklichkeit, ihrer angestammten Rechte zu bedienen weiß.[105]
>
> We certainly do not doubt that all this occurred at daybreak, [as] Helios speeds forth in his chariot out of the sea. His gaze, his gesture bear witness that he heard the calamity, now catches sight of it and compassionately feels it also.
>
> Upon close reflection, however, there can be no mistake that the sun is just rising in the background and the whole group of figures described above are lit as though by the light of midday. Without this fiction the picture would not be what it is, and we must venerate a high art that, in opposition to all reality, knows how to minister its ancestral rights.

Goethe—who Wilde uses at the outset of his essay to ironize Wainewright's essentially incomplete, if multi-faceted nature—was, like Romano, what is called a "Renaissance man," one who incorporates diverse and even antagonistic talents and artistic capabilities into a synthetically whole nature. This Romantic notion inherits the Renaissance debates about art, the arts, and nature, debates in which Romano's work played a substantial part. As Leonard Barkan puts it in a

---

that the Greeks themselves, in dealing with the tales of Achilles, or of Kephalos and Prokris, did not know that they were handling solar stories. It is, therefore, misleading to base handbooks which serve as introductions to Greek literature and art, upon speculation about the solar groundwork of the myths." John Addington Symonds, *Studies of the Greek Poets*, second series (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1879), 17-28, at 26.

[103] See *Oscar Wilde's Oxford Notebooks: A Portrait of Mind in the Making*, ed. Philip E. Smith II and Michael S. Helfand (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[104] It may also suggest a mature Wilde reflecting back on his own less than fully successful apprenticeship to Keats in poems from his first book, the 1881 *Poems*, such as "Charmides" or his own "Endymion." See Iain Ross, *Oscar Wilde and Ancient Greece* 67-80.

[105] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, "Cephalus und Prokris, nach Julius Roman," *Ästhetische Schriften V: 1824-1832*, ed. Anne Bohnenkamp (Frankfurt a.M.: Deutsche Klassiker, 1999), 915.

Shakespearian context, "the name Giulio Romano means…the multiplicity of the arts, the rivalry among them, and the *paragone* of art and nature."[106] Shakespeare memorably used the name to invoke this ultimate question about art in his late play *The Winter's Tale*—by way of a *deus ex machina* no less fantastic than, and in many ways analogous to, the so-called supernatural element in Wilde's novel. Shakespeare's dramatically realized living statue of Hermione, which fantastically resolves the play's dilemmas by fusing art and nature, is "a piece many years in doing and now newly performed by that rare Italian master Julio Romano, who, had he himself eternity and could put breath into his work, would beguile Nature of her custom, so perfectly he is her ape."[107]

But all this by the way, since "the piece many years in doing and now newly performed" that is currently in question now is the myth of Cephalus and Procris. Ovid's version (first and more briefly in *Ars Amatoria*, and then revised and expanded in *Metamorphoses*) tells of how Cephalus, newly married to Procris, goes hunting early one morning and is abducted by Aurora, the Goddess of the Dawn, who is smitten with him. So persuasive and impassioned is his account of his love for Procris that Aurora frees him—after, however, sowing doubt in his mind about Procris's fidelity. He returns disguised as a stranger and attempts to seduce his own wife in order to test her love. She first rebuffs him but eventually is persuaded, at which point he reveals himself as her lost husband. In shame she flees to the forest and becomes a devotée of Diana, Goddess of the Hunt. Diana arms her with a spear that always hits its mark—it is not subject to chance—and the hound Laelaps, divinely guaranteed always to catch its prey. But Procris still loves Cephalus and eventually returns to him. Disguised as a man, she tempts Cephalus with her two hunting gifts from Diana.[108]

Here we come to a bit that Ovid passes over, in a complicated but classical gesture of paralipsis. Cephalus agrees to sleep with the unknown man in return for the gifts, and it is in bed that Procris in turn reveals herself. Ovid omits detailed description of this part of the myth. At the moment in *Metamorphoses* where (years later, after Procris's death) Cephalus is asked to tell how he came into possession of the spear and the dog, we read "But indeed (it is shameful to tell) / He is silent about what he paid for the reward; and touched with sadness / For his wife lost to death he spoke with streaming tears flowing" (VII.685ff).[109] Ovid's parenthetical revision-by-omission passes an ironized moral judgment on a salacious detail from the earlier Greek myth, with which his audience was familiar. Indeed without such familiarity, the complex joke his paralipsis makes about mores, censorship, and the relations between diegetic levels in frame narratives would be meaningless.

The detail in the Greek myth was not unknown in Wilde's day either. The August 1881 *Fraser's Magazine* review of his former professor Müller's *Selected Essays* makes this familiarity (if not the reviewer's sensitivity to Ovidian irony) clear in a discussion of Müller's comparative mythology and his "solar theory": "Mr. Max Müller adopts the purified poetic form [of the myth from Ovid], and carefully avoids touching the extraordinary and most odious features of the earlier Greek legend."[110] But Ovid's version is not totally purified: Cephalus's story seems to want to recur to this

---

[106] "Living Sculptures" 657. Though it is often contested that Romano was not a sculptor, Barkan argues that the full epitaph that ends Vasari's chapter on Romano in 1550, cut from later editions of the *Lives*, "leave[s] no doubt that he was indeed a sculptor" (656).

[107] *The Winter's Tale* V.ii.93-97.

[108] As Irving Lavin remarks, the earliest known source of the myth is by the Greek writer Antoninus Liberalis, whose account "contains one of the most essential elements that reappears [*sic*] in the [popular fables that disseminated the myth], the temptation to homosexuality by which the couple is reconciled." See "Cephalus and Procris: Underground Transformations," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17.3-4 (1954): 366-372; at 367.

[109] The translation is due to R.D. Perry. I am grateful to him for helping me work through the Latin syntax and semantics. On this passage, a crux in Ovid textual scholarship, see R.J. Tarrant, "The Silence of Cephalus: Text and Narrative Technique in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.685ff," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 125 (1995): 99-111.

[110] *Fraser's Magazine*, Volume XXIV (July-December, 1881), 183.

omitted scene, and to avoid it, he offers a short frame narrative of the hound Laelaps at Thebes. Ovid plays on the *double entente* of lines 748-750 ("[I] owned that I had sinned, / that I too might have yielded to such gifts / Had I been offered gifts so wonderful"), where "gifts" could refer to Cephalus's first disguised seduction of his wife or to the hound and the spear themselves. Cephalus's "shame" rears up at this new coincidence of words and tells the story of the plague at Thebes to avoid a subject that he unintentionally all but reintroduced—"Of the other gift, which would be a fortune, you ask? / Accept the wonder: you will be moved by the novelty of the deed."[111] These paralipses will not be without their effects.

In any case, it would seem that with the paraliptical and queered *quid pro quo* of disguised seduction between Cephalus and Procris, the couple is restored to equilibrium, and indeed they live in happiness for a time. But one day "some fool"—having overheard Cephalus praising the dawn breeze ("aura") that caresses him as he hunts with the fateful, chanceless spear—tells Procris that her husband is meeting someone in secret. Procris follows him one morning, and hearing his ritual invocation to the breezes, she is deceived into thinking that he is in love with Aurora. She groans, but Cephalus thinks it is the coming of the winds, which he invokes again. Then, "a falling leaf" makes "a slight rustle" which Cephalus mistakes for a beast in the bushes. He hurls the spear and it unerringly hits its aim—Procris's breast. The arbitrary sonic coincidence of words ("aura" and "Aurora") causes a doubt in Procris that mirrors the doubt which Aurora willfully caused in Cephalus. And her doubt in turn causes the throw of the spear whose flight is never arbitrary, although its aim is only the chance movement of an animal in the bushes, only the arbitrary sound of a falling leaf (blown from the tree by either the breath of the wind or Procris's groans).

The myth, then, is a story of queer mirroring, of contagious and self-fulfilling jealousy, of the paradoxes that attend the notion of certainty, and of contingency enforcing fate. One can see how easily it finds echoes in both *The Winter's Tale* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*: for Dorian's jealousy of his own picture seems to fold the jealousies of Cephalus and Leontes back onto themselves, while the Ovidian and Shakespearian tropes of jealousy open inroads into *The Picture*'s more obviously Narcissistic structure, with Vane's jealousy triangulating Dorian's self-obsession.[112] Likewise, Procris overhearing, but mishearing, the name "Aurora" in the chance word "aura" prefigures the encounter in the opium den where Vane correctly overhears Dorian identified by a "chance word" as "Prince Charming" (the misnomer which is all Vane knows of his sister's seducer) (III: 332). His jealousy is even more fully his undoing than was Cephalus's. Even the goddess who provided the fatal instrument is on the scene in Chapter XVIII, though designated by her older Greek name: just after Vane dies, Dorian and Lord Henry see the Duchess approach, "looking like Artemis in a tailor-made gown" (III: 342).[113] The goddess's divine spear is both the counterevidence against, and the instrument enforcing the destitution suspected by, Cephalus's jealousy. And as Procris lies dying, he sees himself in that death, since her jealousy is the avatar and precipitate of his own. He is a bit like a reverse Narcissus—when he looks at the inaccessible beloved other he finds himself, whereas Narcissus looks at the inaccessible self and there finds a beloved other.

But beyond these connections, it is important to note that the myth is also, if obliquely, concerned with the relations among the arts, and of art's relation to knowledge and action—like

---

[111] "Muneris alterius quae sit fortuna, requiris? / Accipe mirandum: novitate movebere facti" (VII.757-8). Again, I am indebted to R.D. Perry for helping me with this translation.

[112] For a brief but insightful reading of this, see Sherry, *Modernism and the Reinvention of Decadence* 10.

[113] In Antoninus's version, of course, the Goddess is Artemis rather than her Latin equivalent Diana. Moreover, in light of the cross-dressing and queered seduction motifs of the myth, we should note the peculiar way that topoi of cross-dressing, gender-bending, disguise, and homoeroticism get reshuffled at this moment when Dorian, like Cephalus, dismisses a (woman dressed up as a) goddess in the light of a more intense and preexistent bond with James Vane (who, it will be recalled, does not recognize Dorian, since he is in disguise as himself twenty years prior).

Romano the architect, painter, and if Shakespeare is to be believed, sculptor. But also like Wainewright, if Wilde is to be believed. I am not saying that, with James Vane's death scene, Wilde makes any explicit allusion to the scene of Procris's death. In principle, and given Wilde's familiarity with Ovid, with Müller's interpretation of the myth and Symonds's qualification, and with Romano's sketch via Wainewright (and, perhaps, Goethe's interest?), the allusion was available to Wilde. But he omitted to make it. Nonetheless, this very omission—or the retrospective, revisionary gaze that sees the possibility of this "carefu[l] re-writ[ing]" as prepared for by Wilde's complex engagements with his reviewers—articulates the structure of Wilde's aesthetics of revisionary realization in its most powerful form. This would sound a note in harmony with Eliot's 1933 remark about poetic obscurity: "the difficulty caused by the author's having left out something which the reader is used to finding; so that the reader, bewildered, gropes about for what is absent, and puzzles his head for a kind of 'meaning' which is not there, and is not meant to be there."[114] Or rather, Wilde's paralipsis goes to the more radical length, not of giving fullness in the difficult shape of apparent incompleteness, but rather of forging a perfection out of an incompleteness there to be overlooked. In the epistolary disputes, Wilde claimed a poisonous perfection for his novel, both as aim and as achievement. One review (to which he did not respond) pointed out that "'we artists' do not always hit what we aim at," but we are now in a position to say that the "opinion" the review "hazard[s]" is wrong. Mr. Wilde has not "'shot wide'" (Beckson 77). I doubt that Wilde intended to give a hidden rejoinder to this remark in Chapter XVIII of the 1891 text, but it is worth recalling that Lord Henry says of Vane's death that "it does not do to pepper beaters. It makes people think that one is a wild shot. And Geoffrey is not; he shoots very straight" (III: 341). Wilde did perhaps "pepper beaters" with his letters to the press, which certainly never shot straight but were rather full of nimble tricks and rhetorical parabola, as we saw. He is, then, something of a wild shot. But this is partly the point of an aesthetics that corrects purist aestheticist "asceticism" with a leavening of "a little more freedom" from the caprice of Wainewrightian newspaper prose, and does so precisely by omitting to bring it too narrowly into the "severe…self-control" of the artist (*Soul of Man* 14). The aesthetics of revisionary realization that get elaborated across this long trajectory depend essentially on "hazard."

Moreover, the myth demonstrates profoundly that one's intentions and one's aims are not always the same thing. But—and this is the vulgar truth of the *fin-de-siècle* literary marketplace—contingency and necessity are the same thing, occurring as irony or fate when the arrow finds its aim, unless and until their opposition is sublated.[115] In other words, the punishment Dorian feared but tried to dismiss as pure contingency (dramatized in Vane's death) is equally the necessary fate of his own death once conscience is destroyed. Or in yet other words, and in the register of Wilde's antagonism with the press, the newspaper prose of the world is indifferently the pure and vulgar contingency Wilde denounced it to be and the blind material necessity of the marketplace from which he could not escape. This is what Fredric Jameson describes when he notes "an unquestionable causal relationship between the admittedly extrinsic fact of the crisis in late nineteenth-century publishing…and the modification of the 'inner form' of the novel itself." For Jameson, this instance of mechanical or external causality is not an emblem of causal relations as such, but rather of a real but partial and subordinate law of capitalist society: "the scandal of the extrinsic [should be] a salutary reminder [to the cultural critic] of the ultimately material base of cultural production."[116] That three-volume novels suffered a kind of technological unemployment alters the form of a work by, say, Gissing (Jameson's case in point). Although Jameson's conception of material determination might arguably presuppose the mechanical causality that he claims is only

[114] *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933), 144.
[115] Also see Lacan, *Séminaire XI* 159-169.
[116] *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981), 25-26.

partial, his astute point is that this kind of relation seems contingent because it is uncomprehended, just as the blind necessity of fate is uncomprehended. This is a deadlock that, I claim, Wilde—or rather the picture his revisions forged out of his work and its marketplace antagonist—learned to sublate. A true aestheticism must of necessity confront and indeed include that contingent prosaic world from which it would recoil into the pure pleasure of art.

And thus, reading the revisions in this wayward fashion, as passing over an allusion to Wainewright, to Romano, to the myth (along with the allusion's bearing on the moral that "in trying to kill conscience Dorian kills himself"), gives a final turn of the screw to the Wildean procedure of paralipsis. I showed how that procedure was inaugurated in his letter to the *Chronicle* (by repeating, and simultaneously passing over, an allusion to Poe from the initial version's death scene). Like that letter, the incomplete allusion in Wilde's paraliptical mythical method answers the charge of "obtrusively cheap scholarship" (and the decadence it implies) in the same misapprehended breath with which it answers the charges of immorality and imperfection. It does so by enfolding Whibley's critique—accepting into the work of art the "modest contribution" of the journalistic marketplace it disavows. This is a deeper and more complicated kind of paraliptical allusion. It realizes—transforms, revises—not only the novel's aesthetic moral that "all excess, as well as all renunciation, brings its own punishment" in a narrative register expanded to include the two different texts of the novel as well as all the epistolary and prefatory paratexts (CL 430); it also realizes Wildean aestheticism as "absolutely modern." A picture that is realized by active incompletion, including both art and journalism. Wilde's paraliptical allusion-by-omission to the myth of Cephalus and Procris in Chapter XVIII achieves all this by embracing the incompleteness and the ephemeral temporality that are the conditions of the prose of the world as the formal condition of that very paralipsis. This sublation is not exactly what Jameson calls, echoing Lévi-Strauss, a "symbolic resolutio[n] of [a] real political and social contradictio[n]."[117] Wilde's is, I claim, a (textually) material act, "at once surface and symbol," and it is a proper sublation, not a resolution ("Preface," IV: 168). It is a proper sublation, but a paradoxical one, since it maintains distinctions in the form of ekphrastic specular tension and incomplete Paterian "translation," and since its recursive temporal dynamic of mirroring redoubles that intermedial tension with an ekphrastic tension between historical moments.[118]

But, fittingly for an argument so hell-bent on shifting attention to what is passed over—in the present idiom, what is realized as incomplete—I too have left something out, one last thing. Just as in the revised *Picture* there is an embedded subplot with a drastic *deus ex machina*, Ovid's own revised version of the myth (in *Metamorphoses* VII) embeds an additional subplot: along with the spear that never misses, Artemis also gave Procris a dog divinely fated always to catch its prey. Prior to Procris's death, the couple had lent the dog Laelaps out to the Thebans, who were suffering a second plague (the first being the sphinx whose secret Oedipus unveiled). This time the plague is the Teumessian Fox, a beast destined never to be caught. And what is the answer to this secret without a sphinx? The dog that always catches its prey chasing the fox that is never caught is a figure for the confrontation between the irresistible force and the immoveable object. In this paradoxical agon the only possible solution is a literal *deus ex machina*. Jupiter descends and—in that "mystic *now*" constitutive of aesthetic experience (*Marius* 103), or what Lessing would call art's *prägnenter Moment*, or Shakespeare "beguiling Nature of her custom"—crystallizes hound and fox in a marble statue.

---

[117] *Political Unconscious* 80.

[118] The distance between Jameson's Marxism and my heterodox Hegelianism should be clear here. I am thinking more along the lines of Jean Hyppolite, who remarks of the Absolute that it is "nécessairement plus que lui-même" (necessarily more than itself) (*Logique et existence: Essai sur le logique de Hegel* [Paris: Presses Universitaires d France, 1961], 92).

Like Wilde, he realizes the paradoxical agon as a work of art, aesthetically eternalizing its temporal struggle.

But all this occurred, as I said, within a subplot preceding Procris's death scene as sketched by Romano. Wainewright describes, and Wilde quotes: "'Laelaps' lies beneath, and shows by his panting the rapid pace of death" (III: 113). Wilde does not quote Wainewright's footnote: "Ovid says that he was transformed into a stone before the present event; but I don't chuse to believe him."[119] Wainewright mentions the Laelaps subplot only to deny it—perhaps as a gesture of vindication for Romano's artistry. Wilde no more mentions this error, if it is one, than he mentions the myth at all in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. He omits Wainewright's allusion to Ovid, or should we call it Wainewright's criticism of Ovid's revision? (We should recall that Cephalus tells the story of Laelaps at Thebes as a way of avoiding discussion of Procris's queered repetition of his seduction of her.) Wilde's omission, by redoubling Wainewright's and Ovid's own paralipses, stresses the incompleteness of every element in this dynamic picture that unfolds across registers, media, and spheres—in "Pen, Pencil, and Poison," in his disputes with the press, and in his 1891 text. What I want to suggest is that across the 1890 press controversy and 1891 revisions of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde takes seriously his own suggestion that Wainewright's description should be "carefully re-written," so as to realize "the conception of making a prose-poem out of paint" (IV: 113). Moreover, he takes Whibley's claim about the aestheticist artwork as an "unhappy [or incomplete] apotheosis" and transforms it into the novel's strength. The myth offers a hermeneutic and figural complex in terms of which *The Picture*'s "moral" is refracted, revised, and newly realized; it allows us to delineate concretely how Wilde's revisions work in relation to the reviewers' complaints. But it also enacts a kind of aesthetics of revisionary realization, entailing an ekphrastic specular relation across media, across historical moments, and across the antagonism of art and journalism. The omitted allusion generates a figural medium in which Wilde's novel transformatively realizes its relationship to the morality and temporality of the *fin-de-siècle* literary marketplace as such—by way of retroactively reinscribing incompletion and journalistic lack of "finish" within it.

It does so, of course, by traversing Wainewright. Wainewright as a historical and aesthetic (not, as is often assumed, merely psychological) figure offers an incomplete sketch of *The Picture*'s aesthetic moral. He affords Wilde an opportunity to rewrite his novel and its relation to the scandal it occasioned. The novel—where this word refers to the interplay of the two texts, the preface, and the press debacle—can be read, not just in the light of the aesthetic/critical theory elaborated in "Pen, Pencil, and Poison" and elsewhere, but also as folding itself into that project thematically, formally, and materially. This intertextual nexus is drawn into the 1891 volume as it paradoxically incarnates the revision of Wilde's aesthetics—by way of omitted allusion to, and incomplete but "careful re-writ[ing]" of, the potential Wainewright affords as anachronistic counterbalance to Paterian aestheticism. The preface folds the 1890 newspaper controversy into the 1891 novel; the revisions enfold the novel itself, along with the scandalous agon of 19th-century art and its literary marketplace, into the project of the "critic as artist." The main plot of Cephalus and Procris is a kind of mythical mirror to the moral quandaries of *The Picture* and only gives greater profundity to the initial allusive moral gloss Wilde offered to his reviewers (that "in his attempt to kill conscience Dorian kills himself"). But this motif is the other side of Dorian's jealous need to be certain of his pleasure at the expense of self-consciousness—that is, his retreat into a naïve hedonism, which is but a version of the tragedy of uncomprehended fate. And just as Wilde omits Wainewright's disavowal of Ovid's subplot and the difference between the poem and Romano's picture, so do his revisions of the novel allude by omission—obliquely traversing the statue of Laelaps and the Fox in the myth, Romano and Wainewright to his own agon with journalism, wherein Wilde is the

[119] *Essays and Criticisms* 205.

irresistible force and the press the immoveable object. Or vice versa. With *Doppelgänger* it is often hard to tell the difference. (Which is what makes them scandalous in René Girard's sense.)[120] Wilde dynamizes, by omitting, the incompleteness of every term of the simultaneously critical and artistic dialectic that he conjures across the myth of Cephalus and Procris—explicitly and intentionally in "Pen, Pencil and Poison," allusively and by omission in the 1891 text of *The Picture*. The *deus ex machina* of Wilde's incorporation of defects into his picture is no "sham," though it may occur, as the *Gazette* review put it, "out of the picture." "The Sphinx" may be Wilde as decadent aesthete, but *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is the paraliptical, revisionary realization of a second paradoxical riddle, that of the *fin-de-siècle paragone* of art and journalism. That is what it would mean, in Wilde's sense, "to realize the nineteenth century."

[120] See *Des choses cachées depuis la fondation du monde* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1978) and *Le bouc émissaire* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1982).

Chapter III
Time to Play Possum. Barnes and the Style of Censorship

> All art is at once surface and symbol.
> — Oscar Wilde

> Und es zeigt sich dabei zwar nicht die Wahrheit—niemals wird man soweit kommen—aber doch etwas von der tiefen Verwurzelung der Lüge. Alle unsinnigen Erscheinungen unseres Lebens und die unsinnigsten ganz besonders lassen sich nämlich begründen. Nicht vollständig natürlich—das ist der teuflische Witz—aber um sich gegen peinliche Fragen zu schützen, reichts hin.
> — Franz Kafka

I. "This Book, Owing to Censorship"

Who wrote the asterisks that litter Djuna Barnes's 1928 novel *Ryder*? And what are they meant to express? Now, my questions might seem naïve, for the very good reason that all this is explained in the author's foreword to the book, which tells of the editorial censorship imposed before publication: "This book, owing to censorship…has been expurgated. Where such measures have been thought necessary, asterisks have been employed, thus making it matter for no speculation where sense, continuity, and beauty have been damaged."[1] Publishers Boni and Liveright demanded the excision of certain passages as obscene, and when Barnes agreed to remove five illustrations and twelve passages, she replaced the offending lines with asterisks.[2]

The asterisks would seem in that case not to have been written at all: censorship appears as an institutional privation, not an authorial production. Moreover, when confronting so difficult and obscure a novel, it could seem a fool's errand to manufacture unnecessary hermeneutic problems. Interpretive dilemmas everywhere confront the reader, particularly in its nearly endless catalogue of opaque stylizations. The book moves across a range of expressive manners from the biblical to the picaresque, deploying epistolary and sentimental novelistic conventions alongside psychoanalytic dream-texts and parables, as it narrates something like the chronicle of the autobiographically-informed Ryder family. In the effort to grasp the story of Wendell Ryder's polygamous pursuits and the consequent damage (direct and collateral) on the women and children around him, such mannered heterogeneity stands in the way. As with, say, Joyce's *Ulysses*—to which *Ryder* is almost always compared—one could almost feel that the whole labour has been to conceal story (*fabula*) behind discourse (*sjužet*) in ever more extravagantly impenetrable ways.

In such a situation, this heady mixture of sex, secrecy, and style would seem to relegate the issue of editorial censorship to a secondary question, to little more than a footnote in some sociology of the literary marketplace. So why make a meal out of the asterisks? Precisely because, I shall claim, they restage the very principle of disguise or occultation according to which the novel

---

[1] Djuna Barnes, *Ryder* [1928, 1979] (Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive, 1990), vii. Further references will be cited R in the body of the text.

[2] On questions of censorship, self-censorship, women's writing, and feminism, see for instance Brenda R. Silver, "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice: Or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf Part II," in *Representing Modernist Texts*, ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 193-222; and Kate Flint, "'The pools, the depths, the dark places: Women, Censorship and the Body 1894-1931," *Essays and Studies* 46 (1993): 118-130. On these issues with particular regard for Barnes, see Monika Faltejskova, *Djuna Barnes, T.S. Eliot and the Gender Dynamics of Modernism: Tracing Nightwood* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

itself seems to be formulated—and in so doing, they allow us to understand how Barnes puts that principle to work. They allow us to know what we are doing when we are reading *Ryder*. Language blocked out by asterisks puts the novel's thematic and stylistic investment in hidden secrets, inaccessible depths, and unknown causes and origins on the surface, so to speak. Although, unlike the book's mannered stylizations, the censorship was imposed externally and retrospectively, nonetheless Barnes insists on "showing plainly where the war, so blindly waged on the written word, has left its mark" (R vii). And, in rendering censorship typographically rather than emending the text or using ellipses, she goes still further. Emendation would have hidden deletions cosmetically, while ellipses would have shown plainly the sites of textual lacunae. Ellipses are punctuation, that is, a more or less legible part of a larger code. But the asterisks are made to order: they are material marks with differently positive force, crying out for interpretation or decryption, especially since they frequently seem tailored to the length of the words they obliterate. And the book's foreword frames them with an interpretive demand, stipulating that they are loci of meanings that have been occulted, but might be restored.

Barnes's foreword not only frames such a demand; it also situates the book within a Wildean lineage, with respect both to its declamatory espousal of aestheticist notions about the work of art and to its antagonistic relationship to moralistic print culture. In effect, I shall suggest that Barnes inherits and radicalizes several aspects of the Wildean revision of aestheticism discussed in the last chapter. First, the foreword positions *Ryder* in the same broadly aestheticist terms of formal and conceptual autonomy, invoking for instance "the war…so blindly waged on the written word," but also in the same breath the recent actual war connected to it (ibid.). Of course, the Great War led to increased legal surveillance of printing: the Defence of the Realm Act of 1914 in the United Kingdom and the Espionage Act of 1917 in the United States introduced new and severe restrictions on the circulation of printed matter, arming juridico-moral entities like the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and Britain's National Vigilance Society with the means to prosecute literary works under an indefinite conception of obscenity derived from the 1868 "Hicklin rule."[3] More broadly, Samuel Hynes has shown how wartime brought a renewal of "hatred and fear of sexual deviance, and a felt need to suppress the art and ideas about art that were associated with it. Henceforth the higher morality of war would be invoked as justification for the persecution of homosexuality and the censorship of art" such as had "surrounded the Wilde case in the Nineties."[4]

Yoking the War to the moral war on literature, then, Barnes's foreword inscribes *Ryder* in advance within a tense zone of interpenetration between a literary sphere for which she herself claims autonomy and a complex of political and commercial institutions and discourses. All this is not merely to say that Barnes is at least partly aware of (and surreptitiously points to) the broader shaping forces and longer history that impinge on her freedom of aesthetic expression. More than this, as with Flaubert and even more so Wilde, the occasion of external intervention yields a uniquely distinct instance of *Ryder*'s own figural economy: as we shall see, just where it most aggressively proclaims formal autonomy as the criterion of the literary artwork, the foreword registers its internalization of censorship as its own expressive act. The asterisks do not simply denote an extra-

---

[3] Lord Chief Justice Alexander Cockburn's decision in *Regina v. Hicklin* interpreted the Obscene Publications Act of 1857 in such a way as to lend precision to its vague notion of indictable obscenity: "I think the test of obscenity is this, whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall" (*Regina v. Hicklin* <www.en.wikisource.org/wiki/Regina_v._Hicklin> [accessed May 10, 2017]). See Adam Parkes, *Modernism and the Theater of Censorship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Rachel Potter, *Obscene Modernism: Literary Censorship and Experiment, 1900-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); M.J.D. Roberts, "Morals, Art, and the Law: The Passing of the Obscene Publications Act, 1857," *Victorian Studies* 28.4 (Summer 1985): 609-629.

[4] *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York: Atheneum, 1991), 16-17.

literary veil laid on the surface of expression, or as the disfiguring price of the work's processional departure from its realm of form ideality and incarnation as a material text. They paradoxically instantiate the defining movements of that form as it is borne out in the text itself.

In short, Barnes not only adopts a Wildean stance *vis-à-vis* the literary marketplace, she also uses the foreword to mark her own particular version of things passed over. In a sense, she intensifies the dynamic of revision and incorporation-by-omission we saw with *The Picture of Dorian Gray*: she localizes what is passed over, making it a matter of particular moments in the text, but also making it a textually material issue with the asterisks. Furthermore, this act of localization gains in clarity if we compare it to the situation with Flaubert's suppressed passages. Flaubert's authorial note disavowing the serial text on the basis of editorial deletions invested the missing passages with intense, particular significance and seemed to necessitate the trial's attempts to fill in the lacunae. Here, although a similar dynamic seems at first blush to be at work, I shall argue that Barnes's foreword and asterisks actually reveal the censorship to be without particular significance. Rather, it is simply another materialization of the deeper fact of Barnes's notoriously difficult style.

In this light, although I ask who wrote the asterisks—with the thought that there is a meaningful distinction to be made between intentional opacity and imposed censorship—the answer is plain. Barnes wrote them. Rather than being the form the novel's editorial censorship took, as it might seem, they are the form in which Barnes resolved to reckon with it. But what would it mean to submit to censorship in this way? Why represent the censorship within the text itself? And why did she refuse, half a century later, to restore the deleted passages for the St. Martin's Press republication she had been persuaded to authorize?[5] Because Barnes intended her novel, and while she certainly did not intend its censorship, I want to suggest that she did intend the asterisks—she intended that the reader confront that unintended censorship as a problem. A problem of meaning and a problem of style. The reader must, as a component of reading her novel, interpret the asterisks.

This is because they express something other than they seem to indicate. The predicament, then, remains an interpretive one: the asterisks become part of the texture of the novel, part of its manner of expression. Where Flaubert's ensemble enfolded the text of his novel along with the editorial suppressions (as positive facts) and the trial itself; where Wilde's revisionary realization the aestheticist work of art as a dynamic, ekphrastic picture constructed of not only two irreconcilable material texts, but also a series of reviews, newspaper debates, journalistic art criticism (and thereby Renaissance painting and even myth); Barnes offers yet another version of the novel as a literary work constructed paraliptically. Like Wilde but even more deliberately, she enfolds an antagonistic external reception back within the novel itself; but she also intensifies this dynamic. Not merely an invitation to read *Ryder* in terms of its censorship, her gesture is to make it impossible to do anything else. The issue is no longer only a question of defining the novel as a generic stumbling block (Flaubert), or the work of art as a conceptual stumbling block (Wilde); now all of this has been internalized as the very substance of the text. The Wildean question of style becomes a first-order problem of the actual words on the page. Therefore, to understand what the asterisks are doing is to see that they are integral to what *Ryder* is doing. And this is also the way to understand what *Ryder* is doing. The editorial censorship, the decision to represent it typographically in the text, and the rhetorical framing of the foreword together restage the same interpretive dilemma involved in the

[5] The later Dalkey Archive edition's apparatus notes that "the original manuscript was destroyed during the Second World War, and Barnes declined the opportunity to restore the censored passages for St. Martin's 1979 reprint" (R viii). Hank O'Neal writes that "She would not even consider restoring the censored 1928 text. Her concern over the text had nothing to do with the words; she felt it would take too much time to restore all the excised expletives" (*"Life is painful, nasty, and short… in my case it has been only painful and nasty." Djuna Barnes, 1978-1981: An Informal Memoir* [New York: Paragon House, 1990], 79).

novel's omnipresent gesture of adverting to hidden depths the excavation of which turns out to be distinctly non-revelatory. In other words, the asterisks are to be read as an index to the problem of *Ryder*'s mannered or even mannerist style. They seem to ratify the basic premise of censorship, entailing a series of homologous binary logics common to our customary approaches to aesthetic significance—censorship and veiled obscenity, manner of expression and expressed matter, extrinsic and intrinsic, story and discourse, latent and manifest, symbol and symbolized, intention and expression. But in fact they reject the logic underpinning all those dyads in favor of a different conception of style and aesthetic significance.

We can think of this actionable alternative to such a depth model as a kind of mannerism, understood in a more and less technical sense. Now, when I suggest thinking of Barnes's style as something like mannerist, I mean this in a fairly broad way: not necessarily that she has taken things directly from Cellini or El Greco (although her novel does betray an abiding scholar's interest in out-of-date and extreme aesthetic modes), but that her novel shares with mannerism writ large a privileging of style over its putative substance, a decision to place manner on equal footing with or on the same plane as the matter it "treats." The 16th-century cluster of artistic techniques called mannerist, then, helps delineate what is at stake with the Barnes's novelistic style. The distended limbs in Parmigianino's *Madonna of the Long Neck*, for example, bother viewers because they are indisputably intentional gestures, meant to do something, but they refuse our normal modes of interpreting their significance. They resist interpretations that would unearth their meaning as if it were something symbolic or symptomatic. Likewise, faced with Bronzino's *Portrait of a Young Man with a Book*, to "read" the wooden mascarons on the table and chair as simply allegorical images of, say, vice—particularly given the face-like patterns in the youth's clothing between the two mascarons—would be untenably reductive. These stylized features are not "meaningful" in that sense, although they are intensely, disconcertingly legible. This is, I shall argue, how the asterisks help us see Barnes's style working in *Ryder*: neither form nor content, legible but not exactly meaningful, the asterisks are the textual "long neck" of Barnes's novelistic style.

But if the asterisks will enable us to understand how *Ryder*'s novelistic mannerism eludes a latent/manifest paradigm, it will be necessary to understand how Barnes navigates the question of censorship, which seems to enforce just that paradigm. In the next section of this chapter, I shall show that the censorial model of surface and depth, of veil and obscenity, which the asterisks apparently endorse by denouncing is, in fact, a red herring. The asterisks, it turns out, reveal that censorship conceals nothing. Censorship in its conventional sense is certainly something that happened to the novel, but in no way does its concept entirely explain what is at stake. Like a mannerist painting, the asterisks show us how Barnes's style as such works: her mannerist techniques are significant, but they are significant precisely because they disturb our ability to interpret them in conventional way, as symbolizing or encoding or representing some latent content. They disturb us in the same way that, for Sigmund Freud, what he calls "the navel of the dream" disturbs both dreamer and interpreter.[6]

And so in order to account for the nature of this red herring that I am calling a censorial model of significance, and to help isolate what it is that Barnes finds productive in something like a mannerist style, I shall also reconsider the role of the censor in Freudian dream-work. Freud offers an inevitable model, but one surprising in its implications, given Barnes's writings' frequent attention to psychic distress generally, and *Ryder*'s repeated use of psychoanalytic dream-narratives. In light of

[6] *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*, 24 vols., gen. ed. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974), 4: 111n and 5: 525. Subsequent references will be cited SE in the body of the text.

the often-overlooked fourth term of the dream-work, "secondary working-over"[7]—which functions to smooth over places where the dream seems incoherent or troubling, offering a sort of pre-interpretation within the dream that is perhaps attributable to waking thought—Freud's powerful insight turns out to be that it is not censorship in itself that matters, but how desire puts censorship to work within its own expressive syntax. And this insight will help us reorient ourselves in the task of reading *Ryder*.

Secondary working-over shows us that there is, finally, no assignable limit between the work and its reception or interpretation. This provides a framework for reading Barnes's asterisks and *Ryder* as such. What does one get when one refuses to give into binaries like latent/manifest, discourse/story, or censorship/censored? One gets a mannerist sort of style or, perhaps, the realization that style in itself is always mannerist. For if secondary working-over splits the difference between inside and outside the dream, between latent and manifest content, and between censor and desire, then mannerism splits the difference between a fundamentally impressionistic, subjectivist, or naturalist view of aesthetic significance, on the one hand, and a fundamentally expressionistic, objectivist, or allegorical one, on the other. In short, secondary working-over is the mannerism of the dream-work.

Lastly, Freud is helpful here because his discourse happens to be one of the manners Barnes takes up. The novel's central chapter concerns a dream that the apparent Barnes-surrogate Julie Ryder has—seemingly a distorted expression of (biographical) sexual trauma. This chapter's dream-narrative not only crosses the border between sleep and waking, it also is comprised of multiple, mutually refractory stylistic manners. If, as I shall argue, the asterisks align with Freud's insistence on the primacy of the dream-work over a reified latent/manifest depth model—if the asterisks flatten out intention and expression, censorship and censored content—then *Ryder*'s proliferation of styles enacts secondary working-over's syntactical, or even paratactical, structure. In other words, as with censorship, interpretation in the conventional sense is out of place. In the case of Barnes, interpretation is not the labor of decoding the latent content in the novel as a work. It is, rather, the labor of grasping the novel's work, its syntax of working-over. The analogue to Flaubert's novel-as-ensemble and Wilde's artwork-as-realization here is best understood as something like the dream-work: rather than producing a work, Barnes's mannerist parataxis generates work that traverses lateral boundaries while flattening the vertical dimension of surface and depth. And that work is constitutively "reconstruction" (R vii).

If Barnes's stumbling block is something we can call, again using her own term, a "reconstruction," then the primary techniques of paralipsis by which it is (re)constructed are construable in terms of secondary working-over: a mannerism of style that conjures up the effects of depths, secrets, latent contents paraliptically, while displacing that sort of semantic or symbolic fulfillment onto the syntax amongst given manners. This is most immediately available in the way she recuperates the style of censorship via the asterisks. In short, the asterisks are written by Barnes, but more than that, they are an index of style—they are the thing that reveals to us what style is in Barnes.

[7] "Die sekündare Bearbeitung" is somewhere between "secondary revision" and "secondary elaboration," the common translations of Freud's term. The root is *arbeiten* (to work).

II. Censorship Conceals Nothing

I could not stir
But like a comet I was wondered at
— Shakespeare

A look at a few representative moments where asterisks replace text dispels the impression that they are a veil to be removed. The first place where this occurs is in chapter 10, a mock-Chaucerian "Ryder's Tale" outlining Wendell's sexual exploits. The opening stanza describes his efforts to father as many children as possible (R 53-55), while the next concerns how, when his "game" of procreation "on coldë hours fell," he "worked his other wits as well," attempting to give pleasure to his mistress Kate by fashioning a cock ring from ox bone (having "read that savages y-bare / A crown of thornës on their here-and-there") (R 55-56). The result is painful rather than pleasurable for Kate, who understandably flees what she views as an act of violence. The stanza ends here with four centered lines of six asterisks. While the two deleted couplets may have expressed something still more explicit than the remainder of the stanza (hard to imagine, given the "penis as Christ" image), it cannot be said that there is much left to the imagination, or that the censorship hinders the reader's grasp of the situation or its purport (in terms of character development, plot, or imagery). The asterisks, really, do not preserve the reader from exposure to indecency; they underscore the salacious (and disturbing) aspect of the scene. This is the more pronounced, given the subsequent description of Wendell piercing the ears of both his cattle and "his" women. No decoding is necessary here, and the asterisks are, to say the least, ineffectual in hiding obscenity.

Of *Ryder*'s twelve sets of asterisks, four work this way: multiple blocked-out lines obscure the specific content, but specificity is a matter of indifference given the clarity of the context. In the remaining cases, the deletions are much smaller (with the number of asterisks approximating the length of the deleted word or phrase), and what has been deleted is basically inferable. For instance, chapter 14 gives the grandmother Sophia's meticulous instructions for her burial in one coffin with her husband. Three small phrases are excised: "My left hand…to be placed palm in and about that part of him which **********, as the evening star rests upon the finger of the dawn;" her husband's "right hand…to be placed upon the half of the side that sees not, the index finger…touching *** as the evening star rests upon the finger of the dawn, his left hand to be placed, palm in **********" (R 79). While the specific distribution of body parts is unclear, one can hazard a guess, and the consequences are not very great. Something similar occurs in a later chapter, where Wendell extols polygamy: his capacious, self-productive personality is ratified, he believes, by the equivalence between indiscriminate procreation and indiscriminate self-naming: "I name myself as I find myself.…[But] what need have I of such a cognomen as 'Cock o' the Walk' when the evidence of it sits at my table?". However, he proposes that name for his evidently less self-assured son: "Cock o' the Walk or ***." The excised appositive could be little else than "Dick" (R 164-65).

As this sample indicates, reparation of deleted text would not amount to much. One already knows all one needs to know: asterisks replace some of the more explicit elaborations of a pervasive concern with the body, sexual violence, (pro)creative authority, and so on. The latent thought is, really, and despite censorial distortion, patent. Consequently one impulse would be to refer the asterisks back to historiographical analyses of modernist moral transgression. Such a sociological description, however, would be about as explanatory as the asterisks are censorial: filling in a few negligible details without touching the censorship's significance. It would offer no more than what a 1928 review already said: "there are only a few asterisks, and, as they invariably occur after passages that are certain to be considered particularly obnoxious by the smut-researchers, it may be assumed

that Miss Barnes is merely thumbing an uptilted nose at censorial obtuseness."[8] Instead of straightforwardly indicating "where sense, continuity, and beauty have been damaged" (R vii), the asterisks demand a different sort of interpretation, concerned with what work the asterisks do rather than what content they censor. In other words, the answer that historical information could supply does not answer the question of the asterisks *qua* intentional act: the asterisks are, or become, integral to the novel. But they are significant not because they show the "here-and-there" (the various unmentionable heres and theres) where censorship wounded the textual body, but because they express the novel's lack of interest in fetishizing what is latent or secret. In short, the asterisks show us that nothing is censored. So censorship in its usual acceptation is not the right concept here. What is?

III. The Wounded Textual Body Has No Borders

Je suis la plaie et le couteau !
— Baudelaire

In order to measure this difference, we should consider the censorship not merely empirically but as an element in a structure of intention. Psychic censorship provides an obvious and useful model, and we know that Freud makes censorship one of the cornerstones of his thinking on the unconscious: *The Interpretation of Dreams* avers that "the phenomenon of censorship and that of dream distortion correspond down to their smallest details" (SE 4: 143, trans. mod.).[9] However routinely this and cognate ideas have been marshaled to underwrite prying open literary works to extract their autobiographical cores, and however much such a practice could seem the obvious interpretive move with a novel so undeniably informed by the author's own life, to take this path would be to miss the point entirely. There is no curing either *Ryder* or Barnes,[10] and Freud offers a better, more fundamental insight in the sheer fact that censorship implies a double enunciation, one that in principle means something other than itself.[11]

Moreover, if censorship and distortion are equivalent, the fact that *Ryder*'s editorial censorship censored nothing casts doubt on the more general idea of something hidden behind distortion's figurations. It is salutary, then, to recall the often-neglected difference between "dream-thoughts" or "latent content" and the dream-work proper. Manifest content transcribes "dream-thoughts into another mode of expression, whose characters and syntactic laws it is our business to discover" (SE 4: 277). But as that last clause makes clear, the real labor of dream interpretation is not recovering distorted dream-thoughts. Freud explicitly denounces the "confusion" of seeking "the essence of dreams in their latent content and in so doing…overlook[ing] the distinction between the latent dream-thoughts and the dream-work. At bottom, dreams are nothing other than a particular

---

[8] L. Calhoun, "A Woman's Hero," *The Argonaut*, vol. CIV, no. 2683 (1 September 1928): 12.

[9] See *Gesammelte Werke*, 18 vols., ed. Anna Freud, et al. (Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 1991-1998), 2/3: 149. Subsequent citations of Freud in which the translation is modified will appear in the body of the text with GW references.

[10] See Julie Taylor, *Djuna Barnes and Affective Modernism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012); Susan Edmunds, *Grotesque Relations: Modernist Domestic Fiction and the U.S. Welfare State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 39-63; and Daniela Caselli, *Improper Modernism: Djuna Barnes's Bewildering Corpus* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), especially 191-215. These three scholars rightly charge critics like Anne B. Dalton ("Escaping from Eden: Djuna Barnes' Revision of Psychoanalytic Theory and Her Treatment of Father-Daughter Incest in *Ryder*," *Women's Studies* 22 (1993): 163-169) and Louise DeSalvo (*Conceived with Malice* [New York: Dutton, 1994]) (as well as Barnes's biographers, who tend to fill in gaps in biographical knowledge with material from *Ryder* and *The Antiphon*) with precisely this gesture.

[11] See Paul Ricœur, *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, trans. Denis Savage (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), e.g. 7ff.

form of thinking…It is the dream-work that creates that form, and it alone is the essence of dreaming" (SE 5: 506-7; emphases removed). As with dreams, we saw that the asterisks' "latent content" is more or less inferable, but devoid of serious interest. This shifts the interpretive dilemma onto the form, the work itself. Let me be clear: I am saying that the latent content of a dream is of secondary importance, at best, in the interpretation of dreams. Fine—then what is the main thing? We are dealing with a structure of expression irreducible to the surface/depth or manifest/latent model, one that is closer to lateral—syntactical or paratactical. This, in turn, offers a better way of grasping the asterisks. They are not what we are reading, but this is not because we are trying to read what is supposed to be behind them. Rather, we are not reading them because we are looking around them, at the syntax of which they are a part.

Consequently the boundaries, the punctuation, of such a syntax come into question—that is, where the dream-work ends. Freud never managed to fix this limit between dream-work and waking thought: alongside the dream-work's better-known components (condensation [*Verdichtung*], displacement [*Verschiebung*], regard for figurability [*Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit*]) is secondary working-over [*Sekundäre Bearbeitung*]. It functions to paper over "the gaps in the dream-structure with shreds and patches" so that "the dream loses its appearance of absurdity and disconnectedness." It is triggered when something troubling emerges in the dream, threatening to wake the sleeper by its incoherence or unintelligibility. "It is more convenient…to sleep on and tolerate the dream, 'since, after all, it is only a dream'" (SE 5: 489-490). This last phrase being its paradigmatic gesture, secondary working-over seems to be the only part of the dream-work attributable to waking thought, although it still remains within, or on the border of, the dream. It "approaches the content of dreams with a demand that it must be intelligible, which subjects it to a first interpretation"—but such pre-interpretation invariably "produces a complete misunderstanding" (SE 5: 500). This is partly because despite appearing to proceed from the censoring agency, secondary working-over frequently draws the shreds with which it builds "a façade for the dream" from material that is only apparently intelligible and non-controversial: phantasies, "the immediate precursors of hysterical symptoms" (SE 5: 491; GW 2/3: 495). In short, if secondary working-over is part of the censorship (part of waking thought), its efforts are self-defeating both because they fulfill the dream-function of prolonging sleep and because they reintroduce the questionable, symptomatic elements it wants to mask (SE 5: 489-493).[12]

Furthermore, Freud vacillates over whether secondary working-over continues beyond the threshold of wakening; at least in some cases "one has no means of assuring oneself…that one is really remembering something one has dreamt" and not retrojecting a phantasy only present in the dream as a telegraphic allusion (SE 5: 501-2, 497). Secondary working-over is thus a preliminary act of interpretation that is somehow at once within and outside the expression it interprets, establishing the dream as something formally coherent and self-contained at the cost of rupturing that coherence and self-containment by its presence. By the same token, it is also an expressive act, one that cannot be definitively situated either as part of the dream or as totally distinct from it. And while Freud calls this threshold concept the fourth element of the dream-work, it is more truly a name for the nebulous relations between the force of desire and the force of censorship, and between unconscious dream-work and conscious thought. In other words, secondary working-over becomes

[12] On these last two points, Jean-François Lyotard insightfully remarks that "what should be situated at the level of dream-thoughts is not a discourse, but rather phantasies.…The dream's wrapping is also sometimes its core.…The phantasy is not only of both day *and* night, it is of both the façade *and* the foundation" (*Discourse, Figure*, trans. Anthony Hudek and Mary Lydon [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 258, translation modified (see *Discours, figure* [Paris: Klincksieck, 1971], 262). Because its interpolations are made out of phantasy material, the legibility or intelligibility that secondary working-over seeks to lend to the dream "is more simulated, imitated, than truly satisfied" (266; 269 in the original).

necessary exactly because the censorship at issue is not censorship as we would normally think of it—or even as Freud himself often thinks of it. This borderline concept shows that censorship can become part of, can become one of the expressive manners of, the very force of desire which it intends to inhibit or proscribe.

Hence, again, to the realization that interpretation concerns dream-work's mediations rather than recovering a banal "dream-thought" must be added this: the question of the dream-work is also a question of its boundaries, the punctuation of its syntax. Where does the work end and its reception begin? Can the intentional valences of censorship and desire be fully distinguished? If the asterisks are like a catalyst for secondary working-over, then we shall see Barnes's foreword doing precisely its labor; it offers what looks like a rational pre-interpretation at that border between work (dreaming) and reception (waking). Neither secondary working-over nor *Ryder*'s asterisks provide punctuation's full-stop. So, then, although my first naïve question is answered (who wrote the asterisks? Barnes did), I am pressed to another, equally naïve: what do they express? Or, in Freud's terms, how does secondary working-over (produced by the asterisks and foreword) bend censorship to the intentions of the dream-work? Answering this question will finally yield an approach to the mannered stylizations in the novel itself.

Of course, *Ryder*'s foreword offers a preemptive answer. And it appears to give just the outraged defense of literary autonomy that we would expect from a modernist author whose work has been censored:

> This book, owing to censorship, which has a vogue in America as indiscriminate as all such enforcements of law must be, has been expurgated. Where such measures have been thought necessary, asterisks have been employed, thus making it matter for no speculation where sense, continuity, and beauty have been damaged.
>
> That the public may, in our time, see at least a part of the face of creation (which it is not allowed to view as a whole) it has been thought the better part of valour, by both author and publisher, to make this departure, showing plainly where the war, so blindly waged on the written word, has left its mark.
>
> Hithertofore the public has been offered literature only after it was no longer literature. Or so murdered and so discreetly bound in linens that those regarding it have seldom, if ever, been aware, or discovered, that that which they took for an original was indeed a reconstruction.
>
> In the case of Ryder they are permitted to see the havoc of this nicety, and what its effects are on the work of imagination. (R vii)

This paratext (quoted in full) explicitly embraces the informing presupposition of censorship—that there is something latent behind the distortion. But closer inspection finds its rhetoric making of the authorial original novel something irrecoverable in itself: the asterisks are not an imposed veil because they unveil the damage already done to the textual body. Consequently, to go behind the veil they seem to constitute would be to find "hidden" there only the other side of the veil. In other words, the importance of the asterisks, for Barnes, is that, rather than marking sites of specific content occulted, they are something like warnings: danger, interpretation needed ahead. (Or, as with secondary working-over's pre-interpretation, they duplicitously produce a "complete misunderstanding" [SE 5: 500]). In the first sentence, "censorship" irrupts as an ambiguous subordinate clause ("owing to censorship, which…"), modeling the effect on the book itself: is the clause adverbial (the book is expurgated "owing to," because of, censorship) or adjectival (the book, "owing to," which owes its existence to, censorship)? The former is the more obviously intended, but the sentence opens up the latter possibility without ever foreclosing it. (This is of a piece with

the adjectival clause that modifies "war" in the second paragraph. By the end of the larger phrase—"showing plainly where the war, so blindly waged on the written word, has left its mark"—the reader comes to understand that war as a metaphorical entity, but in the temporality of reading an evocation of the Great War is unlikely to misfire, as I suggested earlier.)

This paradoxical thought—that the secret, the authorial original, is born simultaneously with its censorial corruption—is concretized in Barnes's duplicitous use of the conventional trope of the censored work as an organic unity fragmented, as a traumatized body. She professes that *Ryder*, in the form in which it can be read, is but "a part of the face of creation (which [the public] is not allowed to view as a whole)." However, she refuses to bowdlerize and have done, to let her novel's body be "so murdered and so discreetly bound in linens" that its wounds are invisible. On the other hand, she also differs (or learned?) from, say, Joyce, whose bloody-minded refusal to sanitize *Dubliners* so delayed its publication. Through the foreword, *Ryder* puts to work its own mutilation, turning the obscenity of the deleted passages themselves into the obscenity of violating the authorial original's purity. But more: this transformation occurs on the same plane as, is part of, the "textual body." The editorial injunction to withhold some signs from the whole, once sardonically expressed as asterisks, becomes the blankly ("plainly") reiterated sign of nothing more—and nothing less—than that whole's corruption.

Hence, the foreword's argument for her work's (violated) unity and coherence takes pains to coopt the governing assumption of the shadowy agency it denounces: equating the logic of obscenity and its censorship with the logic of literary figuration, defined as encryption. In keeping the novel's wounds open, Barnes draws on the conventional organicist topos while shifting censorship's locus and status within that figure. No longer a veil placed over the textual body, censorship is a trauma that becomes part of it. But when Barnes, subtly travestying the authorial voice of aestheticism, claims that "literature" has never been received in its "original" purity, she is not arguing that *Ryder* could recover that state if it were published in unexpurgated form. If that were her view, it would not make such perfect sense that she refuses to restore the text for its 1979 republication. Rather, she is propounding an aesthetic for which the literary work is constitutively a "reconstruction"—a partial expression that retroactively generates some idealized phantasm of an untainted original.[13] "Reconstruction" understood, then, as a kind of synonym for Freud's "secondary working-over."[14] The foreword reckons with censorship, as a violation of the work's intentional unity, not by seeking reparation but by submitting duplicitously, proliferating violence to expression as expression. Violence to some original, unitary intention is not just the price of publication; it is what "creation" is.

The duplicitous work of the asterisks and foreword is to "show plainly" that her novel, *qua* body, is inherently wounded, not as the result of an external act of violence. And that "creat[ing]" is wounding. The asterisks, in reproducing the violence to meaning that trauma is understood to be, reproduce at another level the novel's main theme and manner. Hence the paradox that censorship

[13] Here an apt psychoanalytic analogue would be Jean Laplanche's reformulation of the Freudian theory of seduction in terms of the "translation" of enigmatic signifiers, rather than the return of repressed primal scenes. See for instance *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*, trans. David Macey (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989) and "Interpretation Between Determinism and Hermeneutics," in *Essays on Otherness*, ed. John Fletcher (London: Routledge, 1999), 138-165.

[14] Although this is beyond the purview of my present argument, the echo of post-bellum social and racial issues here should be noted. A further inquiry into this connection would necessarily confront novel's other major dream-narrative, the chapter entitled "Amelia Dreams of the Ox of a Black Beauty," in which Amelia's dream is a fraught, racially-charged guilt response to her husband's suspicion that her newborn child was fathered not by himself but by a black man. Edmunds's *Grotesque Relations* touches on this moment from a related angle. On race in Barnes more generally, see for instance Jane Marcus, "Laughing at Leviticus: *Nightwood* as Woman's Circus Epic" in *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes*, ed. Mary Lynn Broe (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991); and Robin Bly, *The Freak-Garde: Extraordinary Bodies and Revolutionary Art in America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

is tricked into being one of *Ryder*'s expressive manners when it seeks to efface expression in *Ryder*. This means that there is no authorial "original" of *Ryder* to recover, with the implication that there is likewise no originary fact to be decoded or exhumed from wordplay, stylistic obscurantism, or literary allusiveness. For once, a dictum from Slavoj Žižek applies perfectly: "if we see the 'secret of the dream' in the latent content hidden by the manifest text, we are doomed to disappointment." That "secret" is irreducible "to a 'normal train of thought'…because it has no 'original' in the 'normal' language of everyday communication.…[It] intercalates itself…between the latent thought and the manifest text; it is therefore not 'more concealed, deeper' in relation to the latent thought, it is decidedly more 'on the surface'."[15]

In short, Barnes duplicitously colludes with, radicalizes, the logic of censorship—defined by the error of fetishizing latent intentions and pure content—in order to divide this model of intention against itself. Dressing the text up in borrowed wounds, submitting to an external violence in order that the resultant blankness seems to confirm the implication of something buried. We could call this "playing possum" to censorship. The asterisks appear only as the appearance of censorship, and they implicate it in the question of style and content in general. They add to *Ryder* more than they take away. For, contrary to Barnes's overt claim that the editorial violence corrupts an integral textual body, the unintelligibility of some twelve passages in no way renders *Ryder* meaningless. No more than its own mannered figural practices do, anyway. But what they add is not, certainly, a quantifiable content. I am not maintaining that the book does not differ in specific (if not exhaustively determinable) ways from some uncensored *Ryder* retrojected by Barnes's stratagem. But as we saw, such "losses" are at this level immaterial. In any case, there is no authorial original to be recovered in its pure state—Barnes would not compromise on that point when *Ryder* was republished. This fact sheds the light in which we should read the novel. The asterisks paradoxically help us see that—with the editorial censorship and in general—we should focus not on any latent content but on the mediating relations, the "characters and syntactic laws" whereby autobiographical data, mannered style, even deletion become expressively generative (SE 4:277). Just as secondary working-over is part of the dream-work and requires interpretation, so too are the paratextual censorship and foreword part of the novel's work (if not of the novel as a work): they are a paradigmatic instance of *Ryder*'s use of mannered styles.

IV. Mannerist Style Sunders Intention

The asterisks and the foreword, I am claiming, accomplish materially something that pervades *Ryder* as both theme and manner: the novel is fashioned in such a way as to advert to putatively inaccessible depths, but in the same breath it makes those depths meaningless in and of themselves. The depth, it turns out, is all on the surface, and so the important thing will be the syntax or manner that pretends to encrypt some secret, not at all the pretext of a secret. While the novel's dream-sequences give the most involved version of this, another good case is the end of the chapter of mock-Chaucerian verse discussed earlier. There, the patriarch tries to fix an error in creation, the fact that animals cannot speak. Since "nothing so the very soul outflares / And brings to speech, as flattery of breed," Wendell praises his livestock's lineages, concluding with a recommendation that they pray that God endow them with speech, that they might assume their rightful equality with humanity (R 66-68). In the closing lines, the animals turn toward Wendell,

> And Hisodalgus [his horse] lifted up his feet

[15] *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (New York: Verso, 1989), 12-13.

And placed them on his shoulders light and strong
And looked into his eyen deep and long.
And this be nonë false nor read me wry,
He lookëd long into that mortal eye,
But what he meant, or if he understood
I would not tell ye children if I could,
For it is best such matters to leave plain.
Or capel be afright to do again
That miracle. So now I will make close
By saying, on mine honour he arose! (R 68)

Wendell's thought that animals are of equal dignity as man hinges on filiation, on stable procreative agency and authority, just as his indiscriminate procreation hinges on the stability of patrilineal derivation.[16]

Be that as it may, the scene's climax is Wendell's effort to communicate across the abyss that separates human from animal consciousness—or alternatively, to project human consciousness behind the animal's blank visage. The narrator produces a kind of counterfeit secret in the act of withholding its elucidation: what the horse intended by its gesture, whether or not it understood Wendell. But of course there is no secret hidden in the depths of the horse's eyes or mind, since language is the condition of the kind of thought Wendell here envisions, not the reverse. By redeploying toward the audience ("children") the horse's own act toward its owner—a demonstrative refrain that, by refusing to communicate fully, both conjures a spectre of latent intentional meaning and delegitimates it—the narrator engenders at least two important effects. Not only does this device remobilize the spurious mystery of an animal consciousness potentially identical to human consciousness; it also insists that were revelation of the intention underneath its expression possible, this would annihilate both intention and expression.

Likewise, there is more than a quibble involved in the phrase "it is best such matters to leave plain," despite the fact that it certainly means "to leave the matter blank, illegible, unknown," as the context makes clear—I almost wrote, makes plain. That would seem to be the difference: between making something plain or clear (intelligible) and leaving something plain or blank (incomprehensible). This distinction between autonomous intentional act and submission to externally imposed fact is just the difference between writing a text and submitting to editorial censorship. But as her foreword announced, Barnes's submission to the fact of censorship's plain blanks is something she chose to perform by way of making it clear, of "showing plainly where the war, so blindly waged on the written word, has left its mark" (R vii). The asterisks thus reproduce, materially and at the limit where text meets context and paratext, this chapter's narratorial gesture of generating meaning by refusing to speculate (or to allow the reader room for meaningful speculation) on whether or not the horse understood Wendell or what intention grounded its expressive act.

Something related but more complex unfolds in the novel's central chapter 24, which narrates Julie Ryder's dream and emblematically hinges on the interactions amongst narrative dynamics and stylistic manners. As Julie Taylor notes, most critics tend to mine this chapter for biographical incest trauma but fail to consider its title, "Julie Becomes What She Had Read."[17] Against prevalent interpretations relying on "Freudian psychosexual interpretation as *the* way to read

[16] In addition to Caselli, see Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 121-136.
[17] Taylor, *Affective Modernism* 96.

dreams," Taylor argues that the chapter redeploys "the logic of belated understanding that characterizes the trauma response, the way in which trauma is experienced only through repetition"—not because it narrates a dream, but because it reworks the "outmoded" sentimental novel form (Taylor 84, 96). For Taylor, stylistic mannerism provides a way to work through an otherwise unspeakable trauma that, like sentimental literature, involves "affective ambivalence" and polyvalent relations of valuing and identification (Taylor 102). Despite a polemic against "hermeneutics" and reading defined as "a search for certainty and clarity" (85, 108), which somewhat hampers her approach, Taylor manages to follow the proper cue here. This book, and especially this chapter—which critics generally treat as the novel's kernel—must be approached in terms of style, rather than as a biographical secret distorted into fiction and censored into symbolic form.

This suggestion points us toward an implication that Freud helps to flesh out. For just as the title signals the chapter's engagement with sentimental literature's mixture of identificatory sympathy and voyeuristic pleasure at scenes of an innocent child's death, it also signals that—like all dream-texts—the chapter is a mediated narration of Julie's dream, not the dream as immediate experience. (Or rather, that the text of the dream, complete with omissions and interpolations, is all the dream we shall ever get.) Moreover, the chapter fixes no limit between dreaming and waking, between dream and dream-recounting. Far from a straightforward dream-narrative, it is comprised of two different (albeit intertwined) parts. The first part, sentimental in manner, recounts the death of one Arabella Lynn. Before bed she confesses having denied God's existence—were he really looking down on her, he would not have been able to resist "my red and yellow ball amid the leafy splendour of my garden." Her erotic guilt is projected as a "horde" of stars indicting her from the same heavens, their accusations giving birth to "a thousand thousand" Arabellas. Sleepwalking, she shepherds this "flock of likeness" outside, where she dies of exposure ("corruption…set[s] in" when "death's unpeopled army" grips her). The chapter's transition to Julie's dream occurs by way a "hundred little girls" in funereal march, one of whom is Julie (R 105-109). Julie's sequence then reworks the tripartite structure of Arabella's. Confession; self-recriminatory sky-gazing; herding a multiplicity of sinful selves to death by exposure; these find their corollaries in the sequence of Julie's identification with a martyred Christ; her "voluptuous" yet "innocent" gaze out her window at a fecund spring garden; and her incarnation as the "total" of an ever-multiplying number of little girls giving birth to other little girls. The transition of Arabella's interment parallels the moment at the chapter's close when these girls gradually decline into sleep/death and Julie wakes to her father disowning her (R 109-110).

Arabella's sequence is organized around sentimental addresses to the reader, of which the centerpiece and archetype is the apostrophe at her death: "But pause to think, dear reader. Is this, perhaps, not best? What might have weakened that structure had it reared into full womanhood?…It is better, ah, far better, surely a thousand times better, that Arabella Lynn died while yet in bud!". Sentimental novelistic affectations occur here in the form of an absurd rhetoric of narratorial authority.[18] Where Barnes's foreword took the mannered pose of—that is, travestied—a broadly aestheticist defense of the novel's self-contained unity, in order coopt editorial censorship as another of the novel's own expressive manners, chapter 24 does something similar to the authority of sentimental fiction's narrative voice and its idealization of the child's pure body (R 106-8). The narrator's rhetorical questions pressure the reader to fetishize the innocent child. But when the passage is read not for the content underneath the manner but for the content of the manner, it is as plain as day that Arabella can die "before she had known the stain of a baser world" only because her unconscious plays out a drama of guilt. She dies of exposure, and the process is described as a

[18] See Taylor, *Affective Modernism* 95-108.

"corruption" setting in. So, her death literalizes the (sexual) "corruption" implicit in her dream, both as a confirmation that even the sentimental novel's idea of the pure child is not exactly innocent, and as a redemption of impurity through her narrative "exposure" to the sentimental reader. To unearth—to expose—this so-called latent content, easy as it is, tells us nothing. Moreover, decoding is superfluous since the dream and her last waking hours stand in a relation of mutual explication. This is a proliferation of seeming layers of depth that, in fact, puts everything on the same plane: purity is born simultaneously with its corruption, just as dreams show that "repression and desire are born simultaneously."[19]

The apostrophe gives sentimental narratorial authority a working-over, turning what it seems to assert (the purity of the child) into a self-delegitimating, spurious mystery: that innocence is a postlapsarian retrojection or fetish. This is undergirded by the dream-work's syntax and its implications for any cognition of unconscious drives or bedrock data: as Freud notes elsewhere, it is "only as something conscious that we know [the unconscious]." "Unconscious processes only become cognizable" in expressions such as "dream[s] and neurosis.…In themselves they cannot be cognized, indeed are not capable of existing" before being attached to preconscious/conscious ideas and emotions (SE 14: 166, 187; GW 10: 286). There is, in fact, no way to hold the unalloyed substance of the dream (desire, intention) in our hands without distorting it—it will always be split in itself. That is what Arabella's dream means. That is why the sentimental manner is a sort of readymade phantasy, and must be understood as something only apparently legible.

To search for censored matter, for the repressed truth or the hidden secret, is therefore to ask the wrong question of Barnes's novel. We should not be asking what we are reading when we are reading *Ryder*, but rather, what we are doing when we read *Ryder*. The answer is not that we are looking for the buried secrets and concealed truths (they are right there, even when they are there as asterisks), but rather that we are reading the syntax of the manners, how that syntax expresses and divides the intentions lodged in this or that manner, irrespective of the content putatively hidden by manner. It is manner, not matter, that is at issue in *Ryder*'s censored moments, and in its style as such.

The problematic of boundaries elaborated by Freud's concept of secondary working-over is crucial here. As I noted, one side of its function is to prolong sleep by smoothing over what disturbs the dreamer (like, for instance, the threat of death) (SE 5: 488ff). This is exactly what happens with the transition from Arabella to Julie's own dream, which deepens a natural suspicion that the chapter begins not *in medium somnium* but in the middle of a bedtime story straddling Julie's waking and sleeping states. (A suspicion confirmed a dozen pages later when we learn that Sophia reads to her grandchildren at bedtime, frequently from sentimental novels containing death scenes that Wendell asks her to censor, as they make him cry.) At some unlocalizable moment, then, chapter 24 crosses from "What [Julie] Had Read [to her at bedtime]" to the text of her dream. This latter sequence is marked not only by her coming on the scene but also by the fact that the sentimental manner is displaced by the style of the King James Bible (although secondary styles also emerge: one paragraph features chivalric romance imagery and Shakespearean discourse, another draws on John Donne). The primary force here is signaled most pointedly not so much in syntax as in an opening allusion: "It is Julie now lying on her bed, it is Julie snatched up and flung down into the market place, where they are selling Jesus for a price" (R 109). Julie's advent, of course, alludes to Christ's final arrival in Jerusalem, where he finds sacrificial animals are being bought and sold within the Temple.[20]

Now an allusion, as much as a dream, would seem the bearer of a latent content that, once exposed, exhausts its significance, and I am tempted to follow this readymade imagery back to the

[19] Lyotard, *Discourse, Figure* 236.
[20] See Matthew 21:12ff, Mark 11:11ff, and John 2:13ff.

dream-thoughts. But although the gospel is always a temptation, there is no point in retreading that ground. For the fact that Julie stands as a Christ-like child (bought and sold, martyred) within the corrupted Temple (that is, the house of the Father) is hardly a secret. Arabella's death by exposure already made that manifest. The allusion's real work lies in a different register; and the redoubling of an allegorical child in another literary manner could be called either a decoding or another encoding with equal plausibility. The significant point is that the sentimental and biblical manners (as well as the other secondary elements) refer to, mediate, and revise one another, without one becoming the latent truth of the other. They exist on the same plane: like Arabella's waking and dreaming states in the first part of the chapter, they stand in a relationship of reciprocal working-over. In other words, exhuming the secret, putting the depth on the surface will not resolve anything, for it is the surface itself that is deep, and neither Barnes nor her novel need or want to be cured—that is not the task of interpretation here.

So chapter 24 is certainly about dreams, but only insofar as a dream is an expression that sunders intention rather than encoding it. That is, intention does not have an autonomous existence preceding its expression. And expression is already mannerist, already a secondary-working over: the dream as expression does not so much bear the content of some isolable wish as it does create that wish by working over it, making it one element amongst others in a greater syntax. The "readymade" aspect of any given manner means that its legibility, or rather intelligibility, is a put-on: the coherence it seems to offer (that the biblical allusion yields the truth of the sentimental sequence) is only a "façade" of coherence, of this being the self-contained expression of a unitary underlying matter (SE 5:493). In other words, if it is true that the asterisks reveal the indifference of this or that obscenity, the same is true of the work of mannered styles: they do not matter because they are adequated to some secret they encode, but because they reveal the banality of the secret, reveal that the secret is a mere occasion. Moreover, manner is not about surface and depth at all, but about lateral displacement, a syntax that puts everything on the same plane: intention and expression, content (secret) and form (style), desire and censorship. Finally, this syntax refuses the punctual boundary between self-enclosed work and its reception or interpretation. Barnes's mannered style does not produce a work; it generates work.

V. The Havoc of this Nicety

There is perhaps more to be said concerning allusion, especially given the previous chapter's elaboration of a Wildean "mythical method" preceding but also offering an alternative to Eliot's high modernist model. If in chapter 24 the biblical manner involves an allusion, but ends up putting the allusive content on the same plane as the sentimental style that reworks it, then another prominent allusion in *Ryder* renders explicit the implications with respect to the relationship between text and paratext. For Barnes, allusion uses intertextual "content" as part of a stylistic relay of reciprocal reference and working-over, rather than pointing to that content as to a dilemma's solution. And this particular allusion will return us to our point of departure at the indistinct boundaries amongst text, paratext, and context. Fittingly, it occurs in a chapter the title of which ("Tears, Idle Tears!") pointedly invokes the manner of sentimental literature so important to chapter 24.[21] In chapter 9, Amelia prepares to sail with her then-fiancé Wendell for America while her sister Ann discourages her from leaving London: "how know you but that Wendell will have his way of you on the stormy sea, for no one can be sure of anything on board a ship, it pitches and plunges to

[21] As Taylor notes, the likely readymade source here is not (or not only) Tennyson's poem, but also the sentimental novel satirized under this title in William Dean Howells's *Silas Lapham* (*Affective Modernism* 97).

that extent…and what chance has a woman to keep what belongs to her, when everything else is where it shouldn't be? I would that you would marry this side of the sea.…Marriage, my dear, is the better part of valour" (R 44). Her quip, of course, alludes to Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV*. In that play's penultimate scene, after Hal leaves the battlefield, the seemingly dead Falstaff reveals to the audience that he was not killed but had been playing dead while Hal killed Hotspur and soliloquized over the bodies of his rival and companion. Alone onstage save for Hotspur's corpse, Falstaff remarks that to avoid death, he "counterfeit[ed]" it—that is, he played possum. But he immediately quibbles with his own word: "Counterfeit? I lie; I am no counterfeit, for he is but the counterfeit of a man who hath not the life of a man. But to counterfeit dying when a man thereby liveth is to be no counterfeit but the true and perfect image of life indeed. The better part of valour is discretion, in the which better part I have saved my life" (V.iv.112-119).

In the first place, this allusion's content "means" no more and no less than that content is indifferent and meaningless, that what matters is occasion and context—the work that one does with any particular performance. For Falstaff, discretion amounts to readiness to contradict the valour of which it is allegedly an element—readiness to be a coward. For this readiness to abandon any conviction or intention, Hal, that propagandist of univocal texts and pure intentions, rejects him: in contrast to an expressive mode that would impose organic unity, Falstaff's capaciousness is a duplicity indifferent, or positively disposed, to a manner of expression that will not be resolved back into unitary intentions and to the need for interpretation such a manner generates. But if he offers an alternative model for containing "all the world" (II.iv.462), it is because he underscores that "the world" is a synonym for "the globe" and that the vertical part-whole relation of discretion and valour is also a horizontal (or paratactical) relation of parts or roles. Falstaff is a sort of mannerist performer: he saves his life by acting, by playing the role of slain soldier, without privileging that role any more or less than any other. Indeed, he insists on the duplicity that makes the counterfeit the condition of expressive force. Staging discretion in this indiscreet form is, simultaneously, a way of "breaking the fourth wall" or refusing the boundary between the stage and dramatic reception: the speech is in a sense less soliloquy than direct address, akin to the one concluding the subsequent play, where the actor playing Falstaff speaks to the audience (humbling himself before, and refusing to be suppressed by, both monarchical authority and the power of the state censors).[22] We might say that Falstaff exemplifies *Ryder*'s mannerism in both its privilege of mediating syntax over motivating intention and its traversal of boundaries.

Be that as it may, the essential thing is once again less in the thematic content of the allusion than in the fact that Barnes makes it cross the divide between text and paratext. For she reworks the Falstaff allusion in the foreword when she explains the intention of *Ryder*'s unconventional typographical device. In order to show "plainly where the war, so blindly waged on the written word, has left its mark…it has been thought the better part of valour, by both publisher and author, to make this departure" (R vii). This secondary working-over of Falstaff's sally cleaves the allusion across the boundaries that separate the text from the foreword, materially linking the thematic freight of Ann's version of the phrase (engagement and the Atlantic as two related kinds of no-man's-land; the punctuation and legitimation that is marriage; but also a duplicitous revision of what marriage can mean) to the question of publication, censorship, and the asterisks. In other words, the foreword's revision of Ann's allusion yields a relation of mutual reworking like the one I showed

[22] *2 Henry IV*, Epilogue. For a good account of the question of censorship in the tetralogy with respect to Falstaff and his model Sir John Oldcastle, see Kristen Poole, "Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.1 (Spring 1995): 47-75; especially the discussion of whether or not modern editions should change the character's name from Falstaff to Oldcastle in order to "save [the] writer from the censor" (52 and note). I thank David Landreth for this reference.

obtaining between styles in chapter 24. In chapter 9 Ann advises Amelia to escape Wendell's sexual violence only in the sense of legitimating it. To paraphrase her thought: it may be brave of Amelia to sail to America on the strength of her love, but she ought to make assurance double sure and sanctify Wendell's inevitable possession in advance. The punctuation of marriage turns the no-man's-land of the sea voyage into a honeymoon. But of course a merely formal legitimation of sexual violence such as this is open to the charge of "produc[ing] a complete misunderstanding" (SE 5: 500).

In the foreword's liminal working-over of this allusion, things are altered somewhat, although the same issues (liminal states and spaces; playing possum to the violence of external authority) are of concern. The only place in the foreword where discretion appears in its own name is in the scenario that Barnes's gesture forecloses: the scenario in which the corpse of literature would be offered to the public "so murdered and so discreetly bound in linens that those regarding it have seldom…discovered that that which they took for an original was indeed a reconstruction." The mediating work here—traversing the content of the allusion and Ann's transformation of it, crossing the divide between text and paratext—is to reconfigure the duplicitously readymade adage in two stages. First, the "departure" of the asterisks displaces Falstaff's "discretion" in the formula, leaving in question whether this "better part" is the author's intention or the publisher's inhibition of authorial expression. But secondly the dead, linen-bound textual body (here "murde[r]" faintly echoes Ann's "marriage") insinuates a different figure of discretion, one antithetical to the asterisks as "departure." In other words, the foreword conflates the murdered textual body with the seemingly lifeless asterisks that are there to be the "discretion" preventing such a murder. But as we have seen, the asterisks are just playing possum. If discretion is the better part of valour, then there is likewise a "havoc of this nicety" concerning intentional integrity. That havoc, both devastation and spoils, is Barnes's revision of censorship's conventional discretion as the more productively duplicitous discretion of playing possum (R vii).

Thus the Falstaff allusion, riven and reworked, confirms the asterisks' involvement, as an intentional authorial strategy, in the novel's broadest thematic concern with violence, procreation, and legitimacy. More importantly, it also establishes the primacy of the syntax of manners over latent matters. Barnes puts it right on the surface in the foreword: the secret, the repressed origin, the latent content, the buried autobiography—in short, what we "took for an original"—is "indeed a reconstruction" (R vii). By playing possum to the logic of censorship, the asterisks offer a paradigm for how the novel disqualifies the assumption, shared by censorial agencies and reading protocols of decryption alike (but also implied in a certain modernist aestheticism's conception of autonomy), that intentions and texts are univocal, and expressions nothing but a husk to be removed. Just as, according to one observer, Falstaff "unloaded all the gibbets and pressed the dead bodies" into service as "food for powder"—Barnes presses the dead, censored letter into service as food for the novel's expressive fireworks. In negating a censorial model of significance, she turns its own negations into a new positivity: another manner. She "misused the King's [the editorial and public superego's, the sovereign author's] press damnably."[23] By means of the distortions, displacements and condensations that censorship would enforce upon the novel (but which are themselves subjected to secondary working-over in the process), *Ryder*'s foreword manages to conscript censorship as the forward-guard of the mannerist style it was meant to suppress.

[23] *1 Henry IV*, IV.ii.35-6; IV.ii.62; IV.ii.12.

VI. There Is No Difference between Story and Discourse

And what is the consequence of all this hair-splitting? What is the "havoc of this nicety" (*R* vii)? I have suggested that Barnes undoes the obvious distinction between authorial intention and extra-textual censorship: with the asterisks and the foreword, she bends censorial intention to the caprices of authorial intention. But this in turn requires us to revise that latter notion. With *Ryder*—from composition to the acceptance of censorship and the foreword's duplicitous denunciation—Barnes was always performing a secondary working-over. Just as she picked up the readymade manners of censorship (the asterisks) and its antagonistic complement of outraged aestheticism (the foreword), the novel itself performs its primary labor by playing readymade styles off of one another. Likewise, I have tried to show that Barnes's cooption of censorship not only fundamentally undoes the surface/depth model that it usually shares with crude dream psychologism (manifest content/latent content); it also requires us to drop our habitual protocols of reading, which prevail with nervous insistence especially in Barnes's case (mannered style/autobiographical secret). In other words, if we need to jettison some familiar dualistic notions of censorship and interpretation and learn to read in terms of secondary working-over, we also need to reconsider some fairly basic notions of what the novel as a literary form is, when we read Barnes.

The final consequence, I submit, is that with *Ryder* no dualism of content/form or story/discourse can meaningfully obtain. This is because here, form simply is style, and if form has turned into style then content meanwhile has been flattened out and put on the stylistic surface. Everything is there; or put otherwise, there is a content of style but no divide between style and some other thing it stylizes or masks. Secondary working-over offers a façade of legibility or internal coherence that turns out to be specious because it is forged out of phantasies—as Jean-François Lyotard puts it, the façade of the dream can also be its deepest, most fundamental element.[24] This also means that in the case of *Ryder* another basic presupposition about novelistic form, that it is a consistent and teleologically linear narrative unity, is a put-on. While there is of course a series of narrated events in the novel, and these have a chronology, that chronology is of no importance whatsoever. Nor does it bear on the sequencing of chapters or their stylistic construction (which possesses nothing of linearity or narrative cohesion).

Both of these presuppositions merely confuse matters when we read Barnes's novels, something that Joseph Frank saw clearly when, in his once-influential "Spatial Form in Modern Literature," he opposed her to Proust and Joyce in terms of a "naturalistic principle." For Frank, the latter two authors depict "their characters in terms of those commonplace…descriptions of circumstance and environment [which we] regard as verisimilar."[25] Joyce may fragment his narrative into a spatial form, but he still "present[s] the elements of his narrative" in a "factual background" that can be "reconstructed from fragments…scattered through the book" (I: 234). That is to say, there is a story behind the discourse, however elaborately it is convoluted. Frank rightly observes that Barnes does not share this naturalist impulse. What he says of *Nightwood* is even truer of *Ryder*: because it "lacks a narrative structure in the ordinary sense, it cannot be reduced to any sequence of action for purposes of explanation.…One can, with some difficulty, follow Leopold Bloom's epic journey through Dublin; but no such reduction is possible" with Barnes (II:438). In *Ulysses*, it

---

[24] "La peau du rêve peut être ce qu'il a de plus profonde…[parce que] le phantasme n'est pas seulement de jour *et* de nuit, il est de façade *et* de fondation" (*Discourse, Figure* 258; 262 in the original).

[25] "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts," *The Sewanee Review* 53.2-4 (Spring, Summer, and Autumn 1945): 221-240, 433-456, and 643-653; at 435. Further references will be cited in the body of the text with a roman numeral denoting the proper Part. On this aspect of Joyce, see Leo Bersani's intensely polemical but insightful *The Culture of Redemption* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 155-178.

matters what happens when, and Joyce notoriously schematized the relationship between style and content in each episode: neither of these is the case with *Ryder*. Here, manner has displaced matter.

Of course, Frank's actual analyses of modernist novels nonetheless piece together all of the spatially-formed units into coherent narratives (and one might also object to his conception of space). But the main point is that Barnes's novel is indifferent to narrativity as a principle of its formal structure or of its meaning, insofar as what justifies the inclusion of an episode or a stylistic manner has nothing to do with its motivation within the narrative. (And insofar as it rejects any final punctuation mark between it and its censorious reception.) The bedrock is not a story to be adequately presented in discourse—there is in fact no bedrock, nothing behind the mannered discourse. There is no one episode, detail, or stylistic manner that is essential or necessary to *Ryder*: it is only necessary that there be episodes, details, and manners. Hence anything could be censored from the novel without any loss of meaning whatsoever. But this in turn means that the censorship itself becomes yet another manner, and the novel's reception becomes part of the novel. In that specific sense, there is no end to the story the novel tells, nor any to the novel's work of proliferating expressive manners. So, then, the reader's task is not to unearth the obscenity behind the censorship, the intention behind the expression, the latent content behind the manifest manner, or the story behind the discourse. Or not primarily, anyway. That may happen as a collateral effect, but the place where meaning resides is in the syntax mediating different manners, in the concrete effects by which the suspicion of a secret is conjured, in the feints by which some apparently hidden content is displaced laterally to reappear as the visible form of an adjacent manner.

That is what I call playing possum: finally, the meaning of all of Barnes's mannerisms in *Ryder*, of *Ryder* as "reconstruction," is not grasped by digging up some "full speech" that we might imagine to be concealed behind a "wall of language."[26] There never was such a thing. This is one of the lessons that the asterisks teach: we can now understand why Barnes's style must be what it is. More broadly, the asterisks suggest that one important site where modernism's *fin-de-siècle* heritage gets worked over (or through) is the liminal space where style confronts censorious morality. In this light, the foreword to *Ryder*, with its aestheticist obduracy, is worth considering alongside the apotheosis of that obduracy—Wilde's 1891 preface to the revised volume edition of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. In both paratexts the uncompromising aestheticism is less than straightforwardly candid, but more than simply a pose. Wilde's notorious declaration of art's timeless perfection—most of all, that of his novel—hinges on rejecting the sphere of journalism that had condemned the 1890 serial version of *The Picture*. The preface's duplicity is most patent in a handful of related facts: first, that it disavows the extensive revisions of a novel it decrees to be perfect; second, that it advertises the novel in the most literal of senses, having first appeared in *The Fortnightly Review* to announce the volume's publication before being included in the text; and third, that its own substance is drawn, frequently verbatim, from Wilde's newspaper letters to reviewers of the 1890 version of the novel. But this duplicity is itself a kind of open secret, all on the surface from the moment Wilde published an aestheticist manifesto built out of pieces of an irredeemably journalistic quarrel. The Wildean manifesto is no mere pose because it is the textual mark of a more profound revision of aestheticism's relation to newspaper controversy, a revision enfolded and encoded within a novel that is "perfect" precisely because split into two incommensurable material expressions.

Barnes's foreword, we are now in a position to say, does more than affect some outworn decadent scorn when it confronts a moral censorship partly shaped by Wilde's own fortunes. Together with the asterisks, it takes up the ramifications of *fin-de-siècle* aestheticism's dialectic with its opposite number, and gives that dialectic another working-over, while reabsorbing this as a part of

[26] Jacques Lacan, "Fonction et champ de la parole et du langage en psychanalyse," *Écrits*, new ed., vol. 1 (Paris: Seuil, 1999), 254, 280.

Ryder's paratactical structure. Where Wilde's preface hid his extensive revisions in broad daylight, Barnes's foreword announces her refusal to revise *Ryder*. This is not simply the familiar defense of the literary work's autonomy, for it hides—in the twilight of surface and symbol that the asterisks are—the evidence that *Ryder*'s stylistic mannerisms are no obstruction, as first seemed to be the case, but rather the novel's core. That is to say, understanding *Ryder* means understanding the asterisks, but this in turn yields a way of approaching a *fin-de-siècle* heritage that modernism gets as much from Freud as from Wilde. It is to be found neither within the hermetic space of "the work," in its secret or its latent content; nor on the outside, in ideological disavowals of the marketplace. Rather, it unfolds in an interspace of reconstruction, where primacy belongs to mediating syntax or work.

Chapter IV
Work of Unabandonment. Beckett and the Series

We must have scapegoats
— Éamon de Valera

I. Fowl Papers

In 1933, at the request of publishers Chatto and Windus, Samuel Beckett wrote an additional story for his forthcoming collection *More Pricks than Kicks*, "Echo's Bones." But the editor, Charles Prentice, thought the story "a nightmare"—it gave him "the jim-jams" and so was kept out of the volume.[1] In 2014, an instance of what Beckett might have called "unnatural selection"[2] occurred: "Echo's Bones" was exhumed from the archives of the author's manuscripts and published. This posthumous publication oddly reproduces the story's own gesture: it resurrects the protagonist of *More Pricks than Kicks*, Belacqua, who had died in the volume's penultimate story. "Echo's Bones" is thus an oddly vestigial text—extraneous to the collection it was written to lengthen, and accordingly not self-sufficient on its own. It is also a deeply personal work, legibly marked by the recent deaths of Beckett's father and his cousin and former lover Peggy Sinclair. These losses furnish a dark backdrop to its depiction of an infernal, cartoonish suburban Ireland of the 1930s, where nationalist discourses of natalism and are on the ascendant, and proto-Nazi tourists roam the suburbs.[3] At a pivotal moment, the impotent Lord Gall takes Belacqua to his castle so that he may produce an (illegitimate) heir with the syphilitic Lady Gall in order to save the entailed estate of Wormwood. They ride there on Lord Gall's pet ostrich Strauss—on the ground, of course, since in spite of their wings ostriches are flightless birds. Like Belacqua himself, who persists in his post-mortem uselessness as a kind of textual atavism, the ostrich (whose name is German for "ostrich") poses a curious problem at the intersection of textual and genetic studies, on the one hand, and Beckett's own developing aesthetics, on the other. Namely, the problem of something that outlives its loss of function, its referential coordinates. This uncanniness shared by things like the ostrich or Belacqua as a figure may have been part of what gave Prentice the "jim-jams."

But why an ostrich? Aside from the fact that its flightless wings have made it a traditional figure for hypocrisy (here indexing the Anglo-Irish landlord's intended fraud), the ostrich signals Beckett's obsession, from this point on, in the residua that live on despite or because of their obsolescence. And I suspect that he would have been delighted to see the way that it has now come to emblematize that nearly meaningless persistence at a different level (despite the fact that, subsequent to Prentice's rejection of the 1933 story, Beckett never again authorized its publication). For if the ostrich was perhaps an insignificant detail in 1933, and if "Echo's Bones" was an

---

[1] Qtd. in *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*, 3 vols., eds. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009-), I: 172n3.

[2] *Watt* typescript, 133 (Harry Ransom Center, TXRC00-A1, box 7, folders 5-6). The typescript and six manuscript notebooks (TXRC00-A1, box 6, folders 5-6; box 7, folders 1-4) will be cited TS and NB#, respectively. Triangular brackets signal an addition; text crossed out indicates a deletion. The best account of these documents is C.J. Ackerley's book of annotations *Obscure Locks, Simple Keys: The Annotated* Watt (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 14-27; 232-260. Ackerley's work is indispensable, and the subsequent argument was developed with significant recourse to its meticulous research of sources, allusions, and compositional history.

[3] See Seán Kennedy, "*First Love*: Abortion and Infanticide in Beckett and Yeats," *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui* 22 (2010): 79-91; Kennedy, "'Bid Us Sigh on from Day to Day': Beckett and the Irish Big House," *Edinburgh Companion to Samuel Beckett and the Arts*, ed. S.E. Gontarski (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), 222-234; James McNaughton, "Samuel Beckett's "Echo's Bones": Politics and Entailment in the Irish Free-State," *Modern Fiction Studies* 60.2 (Summer 2014): 320-344.

insignificant textual document in 1933, then since the story's 2014 publication both have gained a new significance, persisting in Beckett's writing in odd ways and generating unexpected connections. A hint of the ostrich's presence and aesthetic importance already recurs in Beckett's next published fictional work, *Murphy* (1938). Lord Gall is mentioned there briefly by a very minor character, Rosie Dew (whose name, more obviously than the ostrich's, points to her status as a "residue"). A spiritualist who helps Lord Gall seek "testamentary pentimenti from the *au-delà*" concerning his "Big House" estate, she has Duck's disease and looks like "a duck, or a stunted penguin." Accordingly, the narrator refers to her as "the Duck."[4] No doubt, this "pentimento," or visible trace of an earlier composition within the work, is slight. Gall is mentioned only twice in *Murphy* and never appears; further, the avian connection is even more tenuous, since an ostrich is not a duck—even if that duck is a medium able to channel what is dead and gone.

A more consequential, albeit fainter, pentimento appears in Beckett's next work, the "Big House" novel *Watt* (1941-45; 1953), when the eponymous protagonist first reflects upon the many distressingly meaningless phenomena he encounters in his capacity as servant to the mysterious Mr. Knott. In this moment, he rues the fact that he did not listen to his predecessor Arsene's advice, which might have resolved some of the aporias which are the main focus of the novel: "Watt thought sometimes of Arsene. *He wondered what had become of the duck*.…He wondered also what Arsene had meant, nay, he wondered what Arsene had said, on the evening of his departure."[5] Nothing suggests, at first blush, that there is any connection to "Echo's Bones," of which contemporaneous readers could have had no awareness. At most, it would seem, this is a private, innocent little game of intertextuality. Moreover, the bird in evidence is again a duck, not an ostrich. But Watt's query, it turns out, marks a larger and more significant problem. If one goes looking for Watt's remembered duck, or even the above-quoted question, neither is certain to be found, since they are absent from British editions. The duck itself appeared only in the first edition (published in Paris in 1953 by Olympia Press), whereas Watt's question also appears in Grove editions (published in America in 1959). The question on its own, in Grove editions from 1959 to 2006, is thus an erratum: Beckett marked the phrase (along with the antecedent scene that it recalls) for deletion when preparing the novel's second edition (Grove) from the text of the first edition (Olympia). Somehow the question, alone and newly erroneous, made it into the published text.

Nevertheless, I will answer Watt's question "what bec[ame] of the duck": in 2014, when "Echo's Bones" was published, the duck became an ostrich. There is a subterranean genetic and referential link between, on the one hand, the duck that persists in *Watt* only as an erratum and, on the other, the ostrich that was rejected in 1933 only to be exhumed from the archive and published in 2014. In this chapter, I will show that these odd textual objects, the erratum and the posthumously published "Echo's Bones" (which Beckett would have called an "unabandoned work")[6] both embed themselves within *Watt* as unavoidable problems of reading. *Watt*, and thereby Beckett's œuvre, I will claim, demands a genetic inquiry not only to account for its compositional history, but to come to grips with its mode of figuration. Hence, I shall proceed seek what answers textual genetics can give, beginning with Watt's question about the duck. As it appears in Grove

---

[4] Samuel Beckett, *Murphy* (New York: Grove, 1957), 97-99.

[5] Beckett, *Watt* (New York: Grove, 1959), 80; emphases added. Further references to this edition—the first Grove edition and the second edition overall—will be cited GW in the body of the text.

[6] In 1960 Beckett published a segment of *How It Is* under the title "From an Unabandoned Work." I apply the term to "Echo's Bones," therefore, partly to highlight a broader aspect of recycling in Beckett's compositional practice. It is also meant to suggest some of the aesthetic implications that arise from the publication practices that arose in the wake of his mercurial success in the 1950s. Since his death in 1989 this has only continued—from the publication of *Dream of Fair to Middling Women* to the ongoing project to digitize Beckett's existing manuscripts, from the multi-volume publication of Beckett's correspondence to this early short story.

editions, this erratum poses an apparently impossible question, at once referential and genetic—a question with no empirical answer. But precisely because Watt's question admits of no empirical (or diegetic) answer, it sheds—as an erratum—a different light on *Watt*'s textual history, on its relation to the now-published "Echo's Bones," and on a peculiar Beckettian logic of referential/genetic signification that we have yet to grasp, or to situate within our increasingly archivally and genetically oriented critical approaches to modernism.

Prima facie, it might seem that the duck erratum is simply another instance of issues that *Watt* already entails: the novel, it is true, makes incompletion a central problem, linking its theme (the protagonist's encounter with a crisis of linguistic and ontological meaning) to questions of genetics, including that of *Watt*'s "place in the series" of his works.[7] This link is made most explicit in the novel's "Addenda," a final section of thirty-seven manuscript fragments, but it also appears in the many seemingly editorial footnotes and markers of transmission, such as " ? " and "(Hiatus in MS)."[8] Such devices present readers with phenomena as apparently meaningless as those assailing the protagonist—"things which, if they consented to be named, did so as it were with reluctance," such as Mr. Knott's meal pot. "It was in vain that Watt said, Pot, pot. Well, perhaps not quite in vain, but very nearly.…It resembled a pot, it was almost a pot, but…it was not a pot. And it was just this hairbreadth departure from the true nature of a pot that so excruciated Watt" (GW 81). At first blush, then, the duck erratum seems something like this pot, the lacunae, or the "Addenda." As C.J. Ackerley, one of *Watt*'s best commentators, puts it, "the question that every reader…must surely ask is, what *duck*?"[9]

Answering this question—answering it empirically, referentially, diegetically—will not neutralize Watt's question "what had become of the duck," because, as I will demonstrate, the erratum makes what is within *Watt* a thematic epistemological crisis into a material, historical issue of reference and genetics that traverses Beckett's writings. As I said, it emerges with the 1959 Grove Press edition when, although Beckett excised Arsene's discussion of his pet duck from the text of the first edition, Watt's later question about that duck inadvertently remained. Beckett would succeed in having Watt's question removed for Calder Press's British edition in 1963 (and the 1968 French translation based on Calder's text likewise omits it), but despite noting the Grove erratum, the author never had it corrected. He knowingly let it stand in Grove editions, without errata sheet or editorial acknowledgment, where it remained until the posthumous Centenary edition of 2006 expunged it. This is crucial. Unlike typographical errors, then, Watt's question becomes an erratum only with the second edition, once it has no literal referent in the book, making the initially referential question also textual or genetic. The duck thus becomes essential to the novel because it appears as something partly present but unsubstantiated, a rumour or hoax. We might even call it a "canard." As etymology underscores (*vendre un canard à moitie*, to half-sell a duck), "the duck" exists in the novel only as something half-there. Moreover, when chased down, the duck's origins do not resolve the canard lodged in the novel's structure. Rather, they unfold a model of reference that is essentially genetic, but at considerable variance with conventional textual genetics' progressivist biological metaphor and presuppositions about a work's authorial intentionality and textual teleology.

---

[7] In May 1947 Beckett wrote that *Watt* was "an unsatisfactory work, written in dribs and drabs, first on the run, then of an evening after the clod-hopping, during the occupation, but it has its place in the series, as will perhaps appear in time" (*Letters* II: 55). This letter was written twelve days after he had begun composing *Molloy*, and so "the series" at first could refer really only to *Murphy*, *Watt*, *Mercier et Camier*, and *Molloy*.

[8] *Watt* (New York: Grove, 2006), 205, 23, 196; this edition hereafter abbreviated W.

[9] C.J. Ackerley, "Fatigue and Disgust: The Addenda to *Watt*," *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui* 2 (1993): 186. Also see *Obscure Locks* 67-68, 98.

This is not to dispute the relevance of genetic and archivally oriented scholarship, which is increasingly central to modernist studies, particularly where Beckett is concerned.[10] But in taking up an eminently textual question, I shall show that it forces us to conclusions beyond the horizons of textual methodologies. In order to answer either Watt's question ("what had become of the duck") or the reader's question ("what duck"), we will have to account for a series of genetic variations, indeed propagations, reducible to no particular bird and no particular text, whether actual or "ideal."[11] In this respect, S.E. Gontarski rightly worries that "the idea of 'correct' texts suggests a linear, evolutionary model of literary history where later versions are by definition improvements of or progress beyond the former…[but with Beckett's multiple texts,] such assumptions are dubious. The problems of textual validity and stability are further complicated [by Beckett's] fundamental authorial and so textual ambivalence."[12] This gets to the heart of Beckett's aesthetic project. Gontarski here adduces Beckett's divergent productions of his plays; but I would suggest that in his work more generally, textual ambivalence rather than personal authorial ambivalence is primary. This is one of the aesthetic lessons that the arduous composition of *Watt* taught Beckett, and it inflects the rest of his career.[13]

---

[10] For instance, Dirk van Hulle writes that "Beckett radicalized [Joyce's] crisis of modernity by indicating (for instance in *Watt*, with its lacunae and addenda) that the published text is not quite a finished product," (*Manuscript Genetics, Joyce's Know-How, Beckett's Nohow* [Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008], 192. I shall argue that this is more than an "indicat[ion]."

[11] For a characteristic account of genetic criticism as it is deployed by Beckett scholarship, see Dirk van Hulle, *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing from Darwin to Beckett and Beyond* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), especially 6-13. Van Hulle's scholarship, while generally quite good, nonetheless shows how textual genetics' attempts to disentangle the *avant-textes* from the published text can result in incoherent or uncritical conceptions of "the work." Metaphorizing "epigenesis" for literary criticism as "the continuation of the genesis after the first publication" (97), Van Hulle writes that, once the border between *avant-texte* and published text is compromised by variants, "what remains more or less stable is not the 'text,' but the 'work,' defined by Peter Shillingsburg as the 'message or experience implied by the authoritative versions of a literary writing.' This 'work' remains the 'work' even when the textual versions by which it is implied keep changing" (217; see Peter Shillingsburg, *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*, 3rd ed. [Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006], 176). Here, the unity subtending a writer's manuscripts remains an idealized abstraction, such as Gabler's edition of *Ulysses* so controversially attempted to realize. Van Hulle's work is attentive to the ways that Beckett's writings can transform questions of textuality, but his notion of epigenesis does not eliminate the presupposition of an ideal "work," whether construed as a unity partially instantiated by various texts, or as an idea of (some sort of image of) the author's "mind" or intentional creative activity (he discusses this alternative as "a cognitive process which can partially be reconstructed by means of…successive editions, serving as snapshots of this thought process 'at this time'" [103]). Here, the duck erratum is important because it signifies across variants, but does so partially, making the notion of a definitive edition of *Watt* entirely problematic. Moreover, its entailment of other texts confronts textual genetics with a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* of its interest in "the movement of writing."

[12] "Editing Beckett," *Twentieth-Century Literature* 41.2 (Summer 1995): 196.

[13] If we wish for archival confirmation of this thought, we need look no further than the opening pages of *Watt* manuscript notebook 3 (NB3: 1-3), where Beckett formulates some decisive aesthetic and compositional principles under the rubric of "the creative consciousness." John Bolin has discussed the importance of this passage for Beckett's aesthetic development, but his transcription is incomplete and erroneous (*Beckett and the Modern Novel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013], 75-81). Beckett's conception is of a consciousness wherein "acting is a receiving [and] receiving an acting.…When it acts it receives its own act. It accepts & suffers it. It accepts & suffers itself. It is its own ~~acceptation~~ accepting & its own suffering. In the act is the accepting, in its ~~continuation~~ <its continuance> ~~to act~~ the suffering. In the [creation?] is the [cross?]. Vincit qui patitur. With a pyrrhic victory. ~~& an idle passion.~~" A few days later, he adds: "Accepted as soon as done ~~(written)~~ <(written down)>, not accepted & then done, not done & then accepted, but accepted in the doing, done in the accepting. Written in the reading. Then suffered to stand, suffered to engender." This philosophy of composition revises authorial intention as occasionalist passivity (and indeed passion, since the meditation ends with "~~Jesus of Nazareth the king of the Jews. not: Jesus of Nazareth "the king of the Jews."~~ Suffer the King of the Jews without inverted commas. Prefer one's Pilate to one's high priests"). And it turns error, misgiving, and decay into a generative principle: it is about as definitive a warrant as could be imagined for accepting the duck erratum.

It is essential here that Beckett deliberately allowed the erratum to remain in Grove editions during his life. Allowing this decayed textual vestige to survive alongside corrected editions is a peculiarly pseudo- or quasi-intentional intervention into *Watt*'s genetic and publication history. This makes *Watt*'s genetic history a problem not only for models that privilege final intentions and some necessarily ideal authorial text (whether published or publishable),[14] but also for more recent genetic studies that privilege an equally ideal "movement," "process," or even "fire" or "dance" of prepublication compositional "genesis."[15] The duck erratum is a paradigm of the way in which the novel plays these temporalities of arche and telos off of one another, and makes what should be extrinsic to the composition something intrinsic to the work—but only partly present in any one text of it.[16]

I shall claim that, whatever the textual model, the genetic metaphor tends to naturalize something Beckett is invested in disarticulating.[17] Whereas the "Addenda" arguably amount to an authorially intended representation of referential error and deterioration, the erratum is both more and less than that. It lodges within *Watt* a referential structure that degenerates the novel into a series of variants whose relationships are irreducible to the perfective linear temporality we attribute to a work's evolution. Moreover, by following the erratic path from Watt's question about the duck through the *Watt* drafts to the ostrich in "Echo's Bones," I shall show that the duck erratum is not simply an index to *Watt*'s compositional trajectory, or a turning point in Beckett's conception of figuration and reference, but also the material emblem of a larger formal gambit. For, in forcing reference to unfold across genetic series, Beckett dethrones the notion of a self-sufficient artwork—to which textual and editorial practice necessarily appeals, and of which genetic criticism to its detriment often imagines it has no need.

---

[14] I am drawing, of course, on Jerome McGann's longstanding critique of textual criticism's reliance on authorial intention, its lack of consideration of what he calls the "social text," and its indifference to matters of interpretation, theory, and criticism. See in particular *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, *Social Values and Poetic Acts: The Historical Judgment of Literary Work* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), and *Black Riders: The Visible Language of Modernism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993). As I remarked in the introduction, forceful as McGann's critiques are, and suggestive as his excurses into the relevance of social determinants of publication on the nature and meaning of texts are, I have yet to read a book of his on this subject (they are many) that fully overcomes the idealism he attributes to final-intentionalist textual critics, or that fully and persuasively demonstrates how "bibliographical code" does more than redouble a meaning that is already available in the "linguistic code" to which criticism has always attended (see e.g. *The Textual Condition* 56ff).

[15] All of these terms (common to the majority of genetic critics' parlance) come from Daniel Ferrer's "Production, Invention, and Reproduction" (*Reimagining Textuality: Textual Studies in the Late Age of Print*, eds. Elizabeth Bergmann Loizeaux and Neil Fraistat [Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002], 48-59, at 49 and 56). Indeed, the very term "genesis" as it is regularly employed—to substitute for something more concrete like, say, "composition"—already attests to the problematic, theologically weighted idealization to which scholarship becomes susceptible when it when replaces an avowedly ideal conception of the "work" (to be instantiated by a published or publishable text) with the (disavowed) ideal abstraction of "a movement, the process of writing, that can only be approximately reconstituted from existing documents and only imperfectly represented" (49).

[16] In a forceful critique, Laurent Jenny writes that genetic criticism's fetishism of the *avant-texte* "presents serious methodological problems.…The formation of a 'pre-text' [as part of a corpus but not part of the published work] amounts to textualizing that which rightfully should survive as an eternal pre-textuality, fundamentally heterogeneous to the fixed nature of the text.…A pre-text cannot be read and still remain a pre-text. It is not only materially difficult to assemble an exhauxtive pre-text, it is also logically impossible to close it without betraying its essence" ("Genetic Criticism and its Myths" *Yale French Studies* 89 [1996]: 9-25, at 14-15). In this light, the erratum and its referent occur as something at once part of the text and part of an *avant-texte*, further intensifying the methodological aporia Jenny isolates.

[17] As Hannah Sullivan rightly remarks, "Both traditional final-intentionalist editing and genetic criticism are prone to making teleological claims about works' improvement toward a final goal, or their degeneration from a point of origin" (*The Work of Revision* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013], 57).

In other words, the textual critic's aim is to establish the best text or incarnation of the ideal work, of the notional term "the novel *Watt*"; the genetic argument's shift of focus hinges on the thought that "it is impossible fully to understand the present state of an utterance [i.e. the novel] without knowing the previous states it has gone through."[18] But in the case of *Watt*, this requires not only crossing the divide between "final" text and *avant-textes* (compositional stages), between the published text and the archive, but also the divide amongst putatively discrete works. Hence, one last new novelistic work along the lines of Flaubert's novel-as-ensemble, Wilde's artwork-as-revisionary-realization, and Barnes's work-as-reconstruction. And once again I shall borrow the author's own word to name it: "the series." As I noted, Beckett used the phrase to refer to the sequence of novels he had written (which at that point extended no further than the barely-begun *Molloy*), but Beckett's abiding interest in seriality emerges in the first instance as a local fascination within *Watt*. Ultimately, I shall claim that Beckett's "series" (which critics not infrequently use as a term for Beckett's œuvre as such) is something that *Watt* forges paraliptically, and it entails not only published and unpublished works that succeed *Watt*'s composition (like *Mercier et Camier*, where Watt reappears, or the trilogy, in which he is mentioned several times), and not only the preserved genetic archive of *Watt*'s composition, but also intertexts like "Echo's Bones" which are, in a manner I shall describe in detail below, somehow members of both of the preceding categories.

But seriality is also a mode of figuration for Beckett, and one that *Watt* initiates. It does not simply amount to things like Molloy's famous permutations with sucking-stones, and consequently a thorough grasp of it will require a long inquiry into *Watt*'s genetic prehistory. By way of anticipation, however, we can say that the paraliptical mode whereby *Watt* constructs what I call "the series" is a mode of figuration that plays merry hell with reference. For *Watt*, and for Beckett's writing from *Watt* onward, figuration is a matter of reference. But as the duck erratum will show, as a question at once hermeneutic and textual, in *Watt* even first-order reference is problematic, because nothing signifies fully in one register and nothing signifies only in one register. Beckett makes referential relations also genetic relations, and he further denatures the idea of genetics, making what would normally be a linear, teleological progression into a polyvalent, non-progressive proliferation. Beckett's paraliptical mode, which I shall call (following the narrator in the draft manuscripts, who uses it to refer to an indefinitely extending displacement of motives or intentions) "surrogative," generates a non-sequential dynamic of relations that keep propagating meaningful relations across registers precisely because they never achieve closure or fulfillment in one register. That is both the truth of *Watt* from a genetic critical perspective, and a definition of his analogue to the Flaubertian ensemble, "the series" (admittedly an abstract definition, for the moment).

Implicit in what I have said thus far is that Beckett anticipates textual genetics' shift to the presence of a genetic past within the work, but he also folds editorial history within it, forcing the issue that textual genetics tends to imagine it can avoid—that of the status of "the work" as such,

[18] Ferrer's remark here is somewhat misleading in its seeming emphasis on the final published text. In the same passage, he insists that genetic criticism "is concerned with the entire range of documents as evidence of the multiple decisions that were taken along the way, not because they throw light on the proper tenor of the text and help in making new (editorial) decisions, but because the object of genetic criticism is inseparable from the decision-making process itself." It is "a more and a less material pursuit than textual criticism. It is more abstract because its final object is not a printable text but a movement, the process of writing, that can only be approximately reconstituted from existing documents and only imperfectly represented, be it by a narrative, a 'genetic' edition, or a hypertextual presentation. It is also more concrete, insofar as it does not go beyond the existing documents toward an ideal text that never existed anywhere, but instead strives to reconstruct, from all the evidence it can muster, a historically attested chain of events" ("Production, Invention, and Reproduction," 49). The larger theoretical problem is palpable in the contradiction between these last two quoted sentences.

and the relationship these various other textual phenomena bear to it.[19] *Watt*'s composition and publication marks a period across which Beckett redefines that category: the "work" is displaced by what he calls "the series," a series of referential/genetic relations that does not fully close off into a circuit, thereby enfolding—partly and partially—other works, texts, and residua by way of incomplete or paraliptical reference.

By recovering this referential/genetic link as it is established between *Watt* and "Echo's Bones," I shall demonstrate that the "place" of each of these texts within what "the series" of his writings is homologous to the erratum's self-displacing presence within *Watt*: neither simply present as a part of the final work's unified whole, nor simply a superseded genetic stage on the way to that final whole. That is to say, in Beckett's series, so-called foul papers, compositional drafts, turn out to be "fowl papers"—neither fish nor flesh. In the genetic prehistory, so to speak, of his "mature career," Beckett establishes at a material (textual, bibliographical) level what will become the overriding topics of concern in his most famous works. Moran's report (and the confusion about Molloy's name) in *Molloy*, the more pervasive metatextuality of Malone's notebook in *Malone meurt*, the aporias of naming and references to published and unpublished figures (Mercier and Camier, Murphy, Watt…) in *L'innommable*: these all thematize, and derive from, the way that *Watt* seizes on textual degeneration and error in order to fuse reference with genetics, and to predicate both on things passed over, of which the duck erratum is here the instance. Hence, the thematics and tropes that define Beckett's novels from the trilogy on find their formal and textual paradigm in *Watt*. In other words, when Beckett wrote *Watt*, "the series" was a local fascination within that text—in order to understand it as a matrix for his entire œuvre, as we all do, we have to return to this initial elaboration.

In the chapter's first section, I shall track down the erratum's origin in the *Watt* manuscripts. That path will move through three stages: first, I shall locate the Grove erratum's absent referent in the first (Olympia) edition, where we shall find the duck; but this will not exorcize the canard (and "to explain had always been to exorcize, for Watt" [W 62]). For the first edition does not simply tell us "what duck." Rather, in giving us the duck as referent, it reveals that duck to be a figure for exactly the sort of referential/genetic quandary that the erratum will come to instantiate materially. Because we find that the answer to the textual question of the erratum (to what does "the duck" refer?) is that it refers to a figure that functions as emblem for dilemmas of reference and genetics, we learn that the quandary is not merely bibliographical or editorial. It necessarily entails deeper formal and aesthetic concerns, making an inquiry into the *Watt* manuscripts.

At this second stage, I shall address a central scene from the *Watt* drafts that prefigures the long passage in the published novel containing Arsene's monologue about his mystical "change." Here I shall uncover themes of "unnatural selection" (TS 133) perversely drawing on Max Nordau's

[19] On the concept of the work in genetic criticism, and more specifically the relation between the published text and the compositional "avant-textes," see Almuth Grésillon, *Éléments de critique génétique: lire les manuscrits modernes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), especially 8-12, 15-21, 136-140, 205-210. While Grésillon is admirably lucid in recognizing that "l'illusion téléologique" [teleological illusion], which equates temporal succession with progression toward a perfect state, "est sournoisement présente dans la recherche génétique, et la tentation d'y céder malgré soi est permanente" [is there surreptitiously in genetic research, and the temptation to give into it despite oneself is constant] (137), his attempt to theorize the way to avoid it, and to establish on firmer ground a genetic conception of the published text in relation to the *avant-textes*, leaves much to be desired. At this point he, like many other genetic critics, shifts into a rather vague and 'poetic' register that does not resolve the dilemma: after establishing the compositional documents' chronology, "on lira le dossier dans tous les sens, et on découvrira alors tous ces « sentiers qui bifurquent » de Borges" [one reads the dossier in every direction, and one then discovers all of those "forking paths" of Borges's] (140). Unless otherwise noted, all translations of texts other than Beckett's are my own.

notion of "degeneration,"[20] but which are more than mere thematic oppositions to contemporary discourses of social Darwinism, nationalism, and eugenics. Because Beckett grasped the aesthetic logic underpinning these discourses, the trope of "unnatural selection" refers us to a formal procedure that collapses revision with composition, with figuration as such. This procedure works by equating reference or naming with biological and cultural degeneration. And the Grove erratum embodies this procedure materially, at the limit of authorial control where the text enters the world. By letting that erratum stand, Beckett "unnaturally selected" the less genetically "fit" text to survive alongside the "fittest" (during Beckett's life this "ideal text" would be the 1963 Calder text; now it is C.J. Ackerley's admirable 2009 Faber and Faber edition).[21] This formal mode of using degeneration to make reference genetic, and of making degeneration generative, is given a name just where the drafts' version of Watt's encounter with Arsene reaches its climax: the scene stages a search for referential, biological, and psychological origins that recovers nothing but a series of endlessly "surrogative" relations (TS 153). The manuscripts' neologism "surrogative" evokes something substitutive, delegative, or as one draft had it, "subsidiary" (NB2: 81). But as a revision process and a logic of reference, I shall show, "surrogative" names a process of decay and generative displacement, wherein the proxy neither fully replaces, nor stably refers to, what it supersedes. Likewise, the substitute cannot be fully authorized by reference to its predecessor, which it usurps and transforms. Beckett's "surrogative" is thus a final variant of the scandals of revision addressed in this dissertation: a passing through rather than passing over, since it implies authorized substitution or representation-by-proxy. However, it necessarily also entails the possibility of fraudulent displacement or usurpation, an aspect that Becket learns to exploit across *Watt*'s composition.

Finally, I shall demonstrate how surrogative relations transform the question of *Watt*'s relation to the "whole" Beckettian œuvre, its "place in the series." By a final(?) caprice of textual history, the surrogative revision of reference is given a new incarnation with "Echo's Bones"—once published, the story becomes both genetic forebear and descendant of *Watt*. As we shall see, the *Watt* drafts' central scene is surrogative of (revises, displaces, refers back to) the 1933 story: the ostrich of that manuscript becomes the duck of the *Watt* manuscripts, and the very concept of the "surrogative" transforms a notion of Belacqua's own existence as "derogation" in "Echo's Bones."[22] But "Echo's Bones" is likewise surrogative of the *Watt* drafts and the duck erratum: its 2014 publication is an even less authorial, and even more genetically erratic, material emblem of what I claim is Beckett's signature literary gesture. That is, the posthumous publication of the 1933 story embodies Beckettian style's non-sequential, self-degenerating structure of reference, and illuminates the relation between *Watt* and its genetic history, pre- and post-.

There is a final implication here: by seizing on the erratum and following its erratic referential and genetic trajectory, the literary object of inquiry (insofar as it can be called an object) turns out to be, not a novel or an œuvre, but a series of relations embedded within seemingly discrete works, but only partly present there, which demand a shift to other works and compositional dead-ends to complete them. *Watt*—and in this, I want to claim that it is the key to Beckett's aesthetics as such—demands a genetic approach. But it does so by reincorporating into the finalized work the genetic process it passed through; not as a simple referent, but as a canard, an apparently empirical question for which no empirical answer exists. In answering the question "what had become of the duck," I shall uncover a series of referential/genetic relations lodged within Beckett's works, but lodged there as things only partly present in any one version of any one text.

---

[20] See Ackerley, "Samuel Beckett and Max Nordau" in *Beckett after Beckett*, ed. S.E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006), 167-176.

[21] The 2006 Grove Press edition of *Watt* (but not only *Watt*) contains several somewhat glaring errors.

[22] *Echo's Bones*, ed. Mark Nixon (London: Faber and Faber, 2014), 41; hereafter abbreviated EB.

II. The Duck Erratum and the Surrogative Relation

> A minute knowledge of the individual peculiarities of every duck used must be kept in writing in every instance. It is useless to depend on memory.
> — J.A. Coutts
>
> Non altrimenti l'anitra di botto giù s'attuffa
> — Dante Alighieri

In the first instance, Watt's question and ours might be answered by consulting the first edition (Olympia Press, 1953) to find the subsequently expurgated referent of what will become the erratum. There, the duck appears at the midpoint of Arsene's "short statement"—a long monologue anticipating the style of the trilogy—when he abruptly concludes his reflections on his "change" (W 31-52). This "change" (when Arsene fell out of his mystical unity with Knott's estate) is central to the novel and is frequently read as the index to Beckett's negative version of Joycean epiphany or Proustian revelation. Discussing it, Arsene enumerates a series of epistemological and metaphysical questions, but declines to answer them: "unfortunately I have information of a practical nature to impart…so I shall merely state…that it was not an illusion,…that presence of what did not exist, that presence without, that presence within, that presence between, though I'll be buggered if I can understand how it could have been anything else."[23]

At this point in the Olympia text, a passage deleted in all subsequent editions appears—the moment to which Watt will refer in the Grove editions with his question about the duck. Arsene interrupts his monologue to recite:

> But what is this so high, so white,
> And what that so black and low,
> Burning burning burning bright,
> Quenched long ago, cold long ago?
> It is a duck, a duck, a duck,
> A young East India Runner duck,
> On a mat, a mat, a mat,
> A hairy mat, a hairy mat.
> O ancient mat, O hairy mat,
> O high white brightly burning duck,
> Cush's stones are crying yet
> Forth from the wall to Habbakuk [*sic*],
> And from the wood the answering beam
> Cries yet of the appointed time
> Still tarrying, and of old resolves,
> Of wind, and sand, and evening wolves.

> Impatient to be off, the little rascal, she has crept in and sat down on the mat. See how she opens and shuts, in imitation of her master, her orange bill. How against the fawn the black eyes flash. But Not Heard, she is saying, in her duck language, it is time we were gone. Like the Jerusalem Artichoke, she was born in Newtown-Mount-Kennedy, and can hardly walk, but she is a true Indian Runner for all that. Her

[23] *Watt* (Paris: Olympia Press, 1953), 45; this edition hereafter abbreviated OW.

> breeding is so high that she can eat nothing but pork scrap, pea meal.…The lines were to her grandmother, I think. I was living in World's End then, I believe. For I have never been without my India Runner. Where I go, she goes too, and every time I leave she leaves with me. So we all bring something with us. You bring your bags, and I bring my duck. In this way we are sure not to go emptyhanded away. Pretty Nuala! They are the best wives a man ever had. And every Sunday she lays an egg for my breakfast. I wake up in the morning and find it in the bed. A long green egg. Which I gob. But I am worse than Mr Ash… (OW 45-46)

Why this odd digression? Because Arsene has noticed what will be the absent referent of the Grove erratum: his pet duck Nuala, who he believes will never leave him. But when that dream is revoked by the deletion of these lines, the duck is transformed into something akin to the "change," that experience Arsene can name only in retrospect—"that presence of what did not exist, that presence without, that presence within, that presence between."

One might be tempted to stop here, explaining away the hermeneutic difficulty as a non-authorial and thus meaningless caprice of publication history: what happened to the duck is that Beckett excised it after the first edition, and when the typesetters accidentally overlooked this Beckett did not think it worthwhile to demand a subsequent correction. Or one might go further, hazarding the speculation that "Nuala" refers to Nuala Costello, an Irishwoman Beckett met in Paris through the Joyces a few months prior to writing "Echo's Bones," and with whom he was for a time infatuated.[24] A woman to whom, moreover, he wrote some fairly overwrought letters, including one that hinges on ducks: on his daily walks through London, he writes to Costello, he goes "across the string of Parks…past the celebrated pelicans [in St. James's Park, where he eats] the most expensive egg that money can buy, though it is surely a strange thing that a rich man would be in and out of heaven twenty times over while you would be looking for a duck's egg in Old Chelsea…".[25] That Costello's mother was an Irish Free State senator would perhaps add cultural-political valences to the reference. But, "like the Jerusalem Artichoke," whose name belies its origin as well as its species (it is an American sunflower), Arsene's Nuala hails from "Newtown-Mount-Kennedy," not the "East Indies." Already, questions of name and origin refer us elsewhere than to their answers. In other words, even with the most immediate answer to the textual quandary of the duck erratum, we already find the very terms of the question drawn into a larger meditation on reference and genetics.

As I said, all post-Olympia editions pass over this digression, moving directly from Arsene's discussion of his change to his story about a man named Ash telling him, unbidden, the (incorrect) time—an illustration of the vanity of "all information whatsoever" (W 37). However, in the first edition, when Arsene goes on to say that he is "worse than Mr. Ash," he means that mentioning Nuala to Watt is worse-than-useless "information." *Qua* variant, Arsene's discussion of the duck is perhaps equally meaningless. But its context in the Olympia edition intimates a different order of signification. Aside from the issues of reference, nomination, and origin I noted above, this variant also oddly refracts, or refers us to, Watt's later regret at not having heard Arsene's monologue. Here in the Olympia text, Arsene notes Nuala's mouth movements and translates her silent duck speech. "But Not Heard," her nickname for Arsene ("are seen"), therefore refers also to her, to the fact that Watt will have heard neither of them, and after 1959 to the erratum itself. Here, with help from the Old French root of *canard* (*caner*, to quack), we can say that if it looks like a duck but does not quack like a duck, it must be a canard.

---

[24] See Beckett, *Letters* I: 184-189; I: 207-209; James Knowlson, *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett* (London: Bloomsbury, 1997), 186-7; 745n85.

[25] Beckett, *Letters* I: 188-9.

But the soon-to-be-expurgated Olympia variant also changes Arsene's change. Nuala tarries on the threshold of Mr. Knott's world, on an "ancient" mat. Burning brightly like Blake's Tyger, she also echoes the near-Proustian light with which Arsene sat in communion before his change; the wall recalls the one on which that light shone. Nuala still luminous on a mat "quenched long ago" juxtaposes temporalities (suggesting she has outstayed her welcome?). This is staged again in Arsene's allusive degradation of the prophet Habakkuk's visions (here no longer answered by God but dissolving into a continual "tarrying" of the "appointed time" of fulfillment). This fractured temporal structure of meaning is itself displaced into another register: Arsene wrote the poem for Nuala's grandmother while living in Chelsea's threshold "World's End" neighborhood.[26] These deleted interplays reveal a deeper complexity to the temporality of Arsene's change itself, a complexity occulted within all editions by way of the partial presence of the duck erratum. Arsene's change, moreover, is itself an event that cannot be strictly situated: when Arsene finds his replacement Watt in the house, he cries out "haw! how it all comes back to me.…How I feel it all again, after so long.…Or did I never feel it till now?" (W 31-2). Such a self-displacing temporality applies equally to the erratum itself—it "tarr[ies]" in the Grove text as something lost but present, anterior but unlocalizable.

In short, "Nuala" is the apparent referent of the Grove erratum, a possible answer to Watt's question about the duck. And the excised passage casts a slightly different light on a central moment of *Watt*. But the Olympia edition's "Nuala" does both more and less than this. Most importantly, it actively generates referential decay, generates further need for referential fulfillment—occasioning for instance the possibility that perhaps the name means Nuala Costello, although the psycho-biographical freight of this particular possible referent of "Nuala" would stand condemned as "information" by the monologue in which the reference is made. Hence, genetic/referential explications ("the duck" referring to "Nuala;" "Nuala" referring to Nuala Costello) are subjected to the same erratic temporality of "change" we find at work in the Olympia edition poem, in Arsene's statement, and in Watt's failure to recall them (despite having recounted them to *Watt*'s belatedly-appearing narrator Sam). Each term is half-present, or problematic in the logical sense, because its necessary referential fulfillment (whether arche or telos) is routed through a simultaneously retrospective and prospective relay that continually displaces the circuit's closure. This is more complicated and consequential than mere self-referentiality. The erratum shows that in *Watt* even first-order reference is problematic, because nothing signifies fully in one register and nothing signifies only in one register. Furthermore, both vestigial "tarrying" and decay are always involved in reference. The duck is meaningful not only as a kind of figure for the novel's narrative tempo and its theme of epistemological and linguistic crisis; it also materializes these concerns at the level of the novel's material text, of the relation to genetic and publication history. Although we now know, in a sense, "what had become of the duck," there is more to this piece of what Arsene disparagingly calls "information." The point, then, is not exactly to make the "reference explicable."[27] Although I shall attempt to do that, the more important task is to articulate how it materializes Beckett's peculiar deployment of reference as a genetic structure, and how that formal experiment makes the

[26] Given the breed's lifespan this would put Arsene in World's End about 1919, suggesting a connection to Eliot substantiated by the first draft of these lines, written in 1944: "the lines were written to her grandmother twenty five years ago, ~~in World's End,~~ while I was still toying with the influence of Mr Eliot, in World's End" (NB4.273). Eliot indeed lived near World's End, and *The Waste Land* is invoked by that neighborhood's name (and by "burning burning burning" in Arsene's poem). In this respect, Arsene's poem might be put in fruitful dialogue with Eliot's 1919 quatrain poems, particularly in light of Vincent Sherry's discussion of those poems' relationship to decadence in *Modernism and the Reinvention of Decadence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[27] Ackerley, "Fatigue and Disgust" 186.

erroneous, the non-authorial, and the excluded into an integral, if partly disintegrated, part of the published work.

But even the more limited aim of making the reference explicable requires its genetic history, would send us back to the drafts. I turn, then, to the draft of the encounter with Arsene, where the duck first appears. For the rest of this section I shall focus on the first two of three moments in the drafts when the duck obtrudes—at the beginning of a conversation with Arsene, and then towards the end. The conversation is arguably the place where the novel begins to take a shape that bears some resemblance its "final" form. A hitherto omniscient third-person narrator gradually mutates into a diegetic figure who refers to himself in the first person plural.[28] He will later become Johnny Watt, and finally lose both his first name and the first-person, becoming the Watt of the published text. Early on in this process, while exploring the house of James Quin (a figure who will lose almost all of his attributes to become Mr. Knott), the draft-narrator encounters Quin's servant Arsene and has a long conversation with him (TS 131-245 / NB2.53-81 and NB3.3-65). Partway through the draft-narrator's tour of Quin's house, a door suddenly opens and into the stairwell walks "a large bird…followed at a respectful distance by a small man"[29] (the duck and Arsene, Beckett's first real pseudocouple).[30] The narrator describes the bird in detail and speculates that "a longer, taller, straighter, bird…it is pretty safe to say never laid or fertilised an egg" and that "who knows even as we gaze…it feels in the viscous turmoil of its secret parts a large fresh egg descending…toward the light of day, the light of evening,…supposing the bird to be a hen, and not a cock" (TS 129).

This suggests to the narrator a taxonomical question. "Now if all these things be true, that have been said of this bird, of what bird may they be said,…of what species of…bird may they be said, with truth?" The response:

> Looking back now at the lovely creature across the waste of years, peering back now through the feeble light of an experience dearly bought and of doubtful viability, recollecting in tranquillity (tranquillity!) such scraps of testimony as have not faded from a memory enervated by tobacco, alcohol, Edward Hartmann, sacred songs and private ejaculations, and bringing to bear on the data thus recovered the decayed resources of a judgment at no time remarkable for its penetration, we are regretfully obliged to confess that we do not know, and cannot tell, what for a bird it was exactly that then appeared to us in the slowly darkening glory of that summer evening so long ago, when life lay gravely smiling before us in endless prospects of mysterious joy, and perhaps also before it, so high, so white, and tranquil with a tranquillity astonishing in so large a bird, on poor old Quin's hairy stairy mat.… We may be mistaken but we fancy that it may have been, an
>
> Indian
> RUNNER
> DUCK

[28] On this transformation, see David Hayman's interesting, if speculative and occasionally erroneous "How Two Love Letters Elicited a Singular Third Person: Generating a Watt," *Beckett after Beckett*, ed. S.E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2006), 202-211.

[29] TS 127 / NB2.53. For expediency, I pay most consistent heed to the typescript, which in these instances does not significantly depart from the notebook drafts.

[30] "Pseudocouple" is what the narrator of *L'innommable* calls the duo of Mercier and Camier, who are a bit like the duck in that they exist as names without referents from the time of that novel's publication (1953) to 1970, when Beckett finally gave in to pressure to publish his 1946 novel named after the pair (*L'innommable* [Paris: Minuit, 1953], 19; *Three Novels* 291).

> Of the very finest <possible> strain obtainable by long years of inbreeding and unnatural selection. (TS 129-133 / NB2.53-59)

Here questions of nomination and reference intersect with language of degeneration, as the draft-narrator's identification of the bird's breeding becomes a question of physical vision understood as degraded recollection. Since the moment of visual perception fuses with its doubtful recollection, the force of physical detail is undermined: looking at the bird is the same as "looking back across the waste of years." The moment of narration enfolds the narrated moment. This is a single, degenerate vision: the original physical sight is infected in advance, by a memory "enervated," a temporality defined as "waste," a judgment whose "resources" are "decayed." In a word, this draft passage (the so-called original genetic referent of the Olympia edition's "Nuala") proleptically seizes what will be *Watt*'s governing concern with epistemological and linguistic skepticism, and collapses its material and temporal orders—the sensuous with the intellectual, sensation with recollection. The temporally past (but narratologically present) sensory experience was decayed from the beginning, and so "we do not know, and cannot tell, what for a bird it was."

"Cannot tell" means both "cannot discern (or recall)" and "cannot relate (to another)"—the collapse of physical sight and recollective memory is also a conflation of cognition and narration. The situation will be precisely Watt's own in relation to the duck in the Grove erratum, indeed in relation to the whole of his narrated experience. This begins to suggest that Watt's question in the Grove text, though erratic, was not erroneous. In recalling something that had effectively decayed out of the text—and recalling it as a question not amenable to empirical answers—Watt articulates less a mere erratum than an emblem, a "paradigm…a term in a series, like the series of Mr. Knott's dogs, or the series of Mr. Knott's men, or like the centuries that fall, from the pod of eternity" (W 106). In short, it appears that *Watt*'s canard demands genetic criticism, while exceeding its methodological horizons, especially as they concern the temporality and status of pre-textual documents in relation to the published work.

The draft-narrator's conflation of (narrative and cognitive) recollection on the one hand and sensory experience on the other places them under the aegis of cultural and biological degeneration. It does so largely by way that odd mode of reference so dear to modernism, allusion. Crucially, this allusive work itself embodies, in the same decayed mode, the narrator's question of reference. Central here are the echoes of Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads*: the preface's definition of poetic recollection; several poems, such as the boy Edward's answer to his father in "Anecdote for Fathers" ("I cannot tell, I do not know") or "The Thorn's" refrain ("I cannot tell") and its contrast between the "old and grey" Thorn and the moss hill with "all [its] lovely colours."[31] Other references intensify the interplay of poetic recollection and ignorance—like "Edward Hartmann" (a crossbreed between Wordsworth's Edward and Eduard von Hartmann, the post-Schopenhauerian theorist of the unconscious) and the degradation of Darwinian evolution into "unnatural selection." All this routes what is for Beckett a triumphalist Wordsworthian recollection through Yeats's bleaker version: "darkening glory" evokes the "feathered glory" of "Leda and the Swan," concretizing a dispersed tone of Celtic Twilight via a thematic discourse on genetic decline. Here "unnatural selection" might imply the reversal of biological or social evolution, a narrative of degeneration rather than adaptive development.

In a more formal register, the prosaic allusions in this manuscript passage refract Arsene's allusive revision of prophecy in the Olympia edition's "But what is this, so high, so white" poem quoted earlier. The referential/genetic relay is made all the more explicit by the fact that, in the drafts, the narrator's taxonomical speculation is followed directly by that poem (here recited by the

[31] I am grateful to Kevis Goodman for pointing out these last two allusions.

draft-narrator rather than Arsene). Hence, what occurs in the Olympia edition as a digression from Arsene's statement occurs in the drafts as the draft-narrator's poetic revision of his prosaic concern with taxonomy and recollection. This juxtaposition of the narrative and the poetic helps to sift out the buried formal gestures at issue in the drafts here. In the prose, what is thematically genetic is narratologically degenerate: collapsing the narrative instance with the narrated moment installs the decayed state as primordial. Correlatively, in the verse what is thematically recollective is poetically degenerate: the work of allusion is precisely to void the authority of the original source, or indeed to void the linear temporality that would afford that source its creative authority. In the manuscripts, even as the poem lends belated conviction to the prose's tentative taxonomy, it twists the Habakkuk allusion against its own visionary certitude—a certitude that would ground prophecy in God's word and allusion in the authority of its source. In short, the prophetic temporal involutions of the poem and the taxonomical temporal involutions of the prose elaborate two generic modalities of the same degenerate vision.

But what of the duck? What is the status of all this pre-publication "information?" The drafts figure the duck with a specificity that devalues certitude by parading its pointlessness: what could it matter what species of duck the narrator saw in the stairwell? In any case, we may as well note in passing that the Indian Runner Duck (a bird whose wings, like the ostrich's, are basically non-functional vestiges) was introduced into Europe through imperial trade in the Indonesian archipelago. By the late 1800s duck breeding enthusiasts sought to ameliorate the "rapid degeneration" the species had undergone in Europe, but their attempts to find the "'original' Runner" were frustrated by near-extinction in its native archipelago.[32] Given that Coole Park was founded on money that Major Robert Gregory's namesake made in the Honourable East India Company, this backstory makes the gesture at Yeats more explicit. If the poet at Coole found one wild swan missing, the draft-narrator finds a supernumerary duck unnaturally flourishing in a foreign environment.[33] But more important than the potential critique of Yeatsian mythopoetics, the Anglo-Irish "Big House," and social Darwinism through one another is the figural/referential logic elaborating it. In the narratological structure of the prose and the allusive structure formalized by the verse, the narrator's findings imply a kind of genetic reference that undermines its taxonomical and prophetic epistemology. In other words, the drafts show Beckett working out an aesthetic that hinges on reference (taxonomy, allusion, naming generally) but which predicates reference itself on a temporality of decadence. This fact alone would offer compelling confirmation of the position Beckett takes (alongside Barnes) at the conclusion of Vincent Sherry's account of modernism's reinventions of decadence.[34] But there is more: precisely because reference hinges on a temporality defined by genetic deterioration across registers (different editions, different compositional states, and even, as we shall see, different works), degeneration itself becomes a motor of textual and referential generativity by entailing more and more text.

The same is true for our genetic inquiry. In moving from the Grove erratum, through the Olympia edition to the drafts, we have uncovered a series of referential/genetic relations that proliferate in multiple directions. The Olympia edition's answer to the question of the duck erratum raises further questions, and the drafts enmesh referential and genetic relations in a logic of signification thematized here by the language of "unnatural selection"—narrative's teleological temporality is upended by the primary decadence of narration, and the poetic authority of a source is

---

[32] J.A. Coutts, *The Indian Runner Duck: Its Origin, History, Breeding and Management* (London: Feathered World, 1926), 18-30. See also Darwin's discussion of the duck (there called a "Penguin Duck," perhaps suggesting the comparison to a penguin in *Murphy*'s description of Rosie Dew) in *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication,* vol. 1 (1868) (New York: Appleton, 1898), 276ff.

[33] See Yeats's "The Wild Swans at Coole."

[34] See *Modernism and the Reinvention of Decadence* 280-87.

evacuated by the primary unfulfillment of prophecy. The draft-narrator's prose attempt to name the duck gives a pseudo-eugenicist taxonomic model, and his verse gives a prophetic allusive one, for the perpetual temporal gap between naming the duck and the closure of the referential/genetic circuit to which that act of naming appeals. But this is more than a theme: it is precisely the gap that the erratum inserts into the novel materially, at the level of the social text. This means, as I suggested above, that Watt's erratic question becomes a material paradigm of the way that *Watt* revises reference into a genetic problem. Just as the draft-narrator recounts the Indian Runner Duck as a half-known, problematic "fancy," so will Watt "wonde[r] what had become of the duck." This is neither recollection, nor tranquillity. But *pace* T.S. Eliot's famous locution, at issue is less a "distortion of meaning" than a generation of "a new thing" (if not exactly "meaning") by way of a degeneration of meaning's referential structure.[35]

In other words, the belated emergence of the duck as an erratum, along with Beckett's halfway-intentional sanction of its persistence, at once degenerates the novelistic structure and tempo of signification and preserves an otherwise absent motor of textual generation. Beckett is formulating a revised model of genetics, where precisely what does not work is what persists in the work. It is also a different narrative form, where each new piece of information recounted is generative, not of a resolution to the quandary that occasions it, but of further links in a network of partial referential/genetic relations. Like Arsene's "change," what the erratum does (tarries like the poem's "old resolve," constitutively decayed and propagating its degeneration) cannot be explained away by any empirical answer about what it is. As with the published novel and the inexplicable "incidents of note" that occasion Watt's wondering about the duck (W 63), the drafts' "Indian Runner Duck" recollection insinuates a logic and a temporality of reference as genetic "tarrying." Hence, this "unnatural selection" means more than evolutionary temporality in reverse: rather, it signifies the unnatural, or quasi-authorially intended, process by which what is unfit is allowed to propagate. In this tarrying, references, allusions, and information are not gone when they are gone, but instead continue "to unfold…according to the irrevocable caprice of [their] taking place" (W 57). And thus the drafts' themes of degeneration refer us to a material writing practice, an aesthetics. What we are uncovering, then, is that for Beckett figuration is reference, but reference is revision-by-decomposition.

The significant finding so far in the drafts is that the duck is a paradigm for a form of figuration that Beckett articulates across the composition of *Watt*. By installing error, decay, and the extraneous at its core, he forges the style by which his later works will be known: his narrative form hinges on reference, on naming, as a self-degenerating genetic process. Unlike those later works, where referential decay and cultural and biological degeneration are partly a formal issue and partly a thematic one, *Watt* constructs this principle as equally a textual or bibliographical—that is to say material—issue. In other words, the duck erratum installs the novel's genetic prehistory within the published novel at a material level, retroactively, and as part of what Jerome McGann calls the "social text."[36]

And fittingly, it turns out that the drafts offer a name for, and a formal substantiation of, this strange logic. We find it further along in the drafts of the encounter with Arsene, where, as in the

---

[35] In "Tradition and the Individual Talent," Eliot's conception of poetry's work of "concentration," its "continual extinction of personality," leads him to revise Wordsworth's famous dictum: "'emotion recollected in tranquillity' is an inexact formula [for poetry]. For it is neither emotion, nor recollection, nor without distortion of meaning, tranquillity. It is a concentration, and a new thing resulting from the concentration" (*Selected Essays* [London: Faber & Faber, 1932], 17-21). Beckett's draft-narrator is, I think, playing on Eliot's essay, and finding a new way to generate "a new thing," not so much by extinction as by the persistence of what—from the perspective of biological, social, or what we might call textual Darwinism—should not be still (or "already") living.

[36] *The Textual Condition* 21 et passim.

Olympia text, the duck intervenes when a meandering conversation abruptly returns to its main topic—departure (in this case not Arsene's but the narrator's). After speculating about the duck's breed and conversing with Arsene, the narrator expresses a need to leave and immediately falls into a trance. Arsene prods him to explain himself and the two discuss the vanity of all information, including that concerning the narrator's departure (TS 133-141). Unprovoked, Arsene falls to his knees, bemoaning that life yields neither knowledge nor experience: even if he lived one hundred lives, they would all be equally null (TS 143-5). After this complaint he asks where the narrator intends to go and is informed, vaguely, "to some other place." At Arsene's rejoinder "nothing more definite than that?" the narrator hesitates: "perhaps deep down in our unconscious mind…in those palaeozoic [*sic*] profounds, midst mammoth Old Red Sandstone phalli and carboniferous pudenda, lurked the timid wish to leave you." Arsene replies "Further! Deeper! The Upper Silurian! The Lower Silurian! The truth! The truth!…Dig! Delve! Deeper! Deeper! The Cambrian! The uterine! The pre-uterine!…Never mind what it reminds you of…stick your snout into <her> and know the worst" (TS 149).

A scene of introspective self-excavation ensues—a precursor to Arsene's incomplete inquiry into his change in the published novel (including his mention of Nuala in the Olympia edition). The draft-narrator, in search of the answer to Arsene's demand for the "truth" of his desire, excavates his mind's geological strata. Hitting bedrock, he finds a cellular "boundless, timeless" jelly inhabited by homuncular or spermazoidal figures of himself (TS 153). I shall return to this moment later, for it warrants fuller attention, especially since it is less a Proustian introspection than a willful embrace of what Max Nordau calls "cœnaesthesis"—a generalized cellular sensibility that "healthy" individuals have overcome, but which dominates self-consciousness in "degenerate" types.[37] But for now what is essential is not what is discovered, but rather the logic of which it partakes: namely, that the draft-narrator's "timid wish to leave [Arsene]…was perhaps merely how shall I say…surrogative, shall we say, dare we say, surrogative?" (TS 155). Instead of the "truth" Arsene demanded, the primordial origin or primal scene is comprised of an endless series of virtual surrogates.

The surrogative is not repression or sublimation. To unfurl its deeper logic, we must follow the digressions. (This is, as we saw in chapter 3 with Djuna Barnes, the real power of Freudian interpretation, which is not to be confused with content-oriented hermeneutics or with some dream of total recuperation of the present's past determinants.) Arsene is rightly unsatisfied with the draft-narrator's answer to his simple question, and demands to know "of what" the narrator's desire is surrogative (TS 155). "Of another," the narrator replies.

> 'What other?' said Arsene. 'Oh!' we cried, starting back in surprise and raising in amaze an astonished hand to a thunderstruck mouth, 'well now just fancy that!' At these words the bird rose and began to move towards the door. 'Come back here at once, sir!' said Arsene…and the bird came back at once, with the smartness of ~~a bird~~ <one> used to be commanded…Thus this vulgar little nonentity whose entire ~~laugh~~ <life> had been nothing…could say to this king of ducks, Go! And the duck went, and Come! And the duck came…So extraordinary is the effect of God's image. 'Even Eamon has had more than he can stand' said Arsene, 'and Eamon can stand a great deal.' 'Oh' we cried again and started back again, as though we had not started back already and cried already 'oh', 'no, it cannot be.' 'My Greek is forgotten' said Arsene, 'my Latin lost and I never had a gasp of the Gaelic.' (TS 157-159)

[37] Max Nordau, *Degeneration* [1891] (Lincoln, NE: University Press of Nebraska, 1999) 248-249. For Beckett's co-option, see *Beckett's Dream Notebook*, ed. John Pilling (Reading, UK: University of Reading, 1999), 95-97.

Of all the surprises here, the most immediately striking is that, rather than Nuala as in the Olympia edition, we find here a "king of ducks" named Eamon. In this guise (genetically earlier than the Olympia text's "Nuala") the duck only calls up post-Independence Irish cultural politics the more pointedly, doubtless referring to then-Taoiseach Éamon de Valera. But another kind of representation, that of "God's image," gets laid over political and cultural ones (just as had occurred in the Irish cultural politics of the 1930s and 40s, in Beckett's eyes). Arsene intensifies the apparent satire implied in the name Eamon by alluding to the intertwinement of Catholicism and Gaelic in the independence movements and de Valera's roots in the Gaelic League (or perhaps instead lampooning the Irish Literary Revival's claim for Gaelic's properly classical status). The "effect of God's image" might also hint that de Valera is an ineffectual puppet as a political representative, the rubber duck plaything of cultural-historical forces beyond his ken. But underpinning this scene's thematic engagement with an aesthetics of epiphany, and the potential critique of Irish 1930s and 1940s cultural politics, is the unfolding of a "surrogative" mode of reference that *Watt*'s duck erratum will later render materially, at the border where authorial text and the social text of publication history meet.

The draft-narrator's own surprise suggests a way of elaborating all this. His gasped reaction stutters in diminuendo, first upon Arsene's insistent question (what original does the narrator's desire to leave surrogate?), then again upon mention of the duck's name and the "effect of God's image." The narrator's repetitive gesture plays two different shocks off of each other. First, it is not just that his desire to leave is surrogative of another desire. Rather, the truth of his desire is a constitutively surrogative relation, self-displacing and serial. Hence his cry of surprise when Arsene demands the name of the "other" of which his desire to leave is surrogative: his real epiphany is that he unearthed no empirical answer to Arsene's question, but rather a relational logic. No name would fully answer that question. Secondly, the revelation that the duck is named Eamon *and* that Arsene usurps "God's image" involves a more complicated shock about structures of reference, representation, delegation, and authority. It is not for nothing that the draft-narrator's cry at Arsene's naming of the duck ("just fancy that!") reiterates an element of his own attempt, in the drafts passage discussed earlier, to name it as an Indian Runner Duck ("we may be mistaken but we fancy that it may have been…").[38] As I said earlier, the most basic first-order reference, such as a name, is problematic in *Watt* because nothing signifies fully in one register and nothing signifies only in one register. Part of the shock here is the narrator confronting this fact as it is partly incarnated by "Eamon." Hence, this second aspect involves a question of the same complexity as "what had become of the duck?" and which likewise fuses the character's hermeneutic quandary with our textual one: of what other is Eamon surrogative?

In 1942, when this passage was composed, the question "of what, or whom, is de Valera representative?" would have been a very real one, and the drafts certainly raise it. But the way they do so entails another: what is the duck doing as a surrogate of, an allusive reference to, de Valera? Clearly the name alludes to de Valera, but what sort of reference is it? How does it surrogate (refer or allude to, substitute for) a critique of Irish politics? Especially since we know that "Eamon" will be displaced in turn by "Nuala" once we get to the first edition? To answer these questions it would be necessary to sever "Eamon" the name (or allusion or referent) from Eamon the duck, both from "Nuala," and all from the duck *qua* textual canard. But separating all those terms into discrete registers and putting them in a stable referential and/or genetic sequence is precisely what Beckett works to make impossible. Thus, in this passage, where the duck's desire to leave redoubles the surrogative logic of the narrator's own desire to leave, the structure of allusion we saw in the "Indian

[38] Here again, reference to notebook 3's notion of the "creative consciousness"—which Coleridge would have taken to be "fancy," rather than true poetic "imagination"—is relevant. See footnote 13 above.

Runner Duck" recollection is given a substantial form. The scene revises the literary allusions in the narrative recollection the duck's taxonomy and the prophetic poem about the duck on the mat by way of a political one—but more importantly by way of a concept of surrogative relation that, I suggest, defines Beckett's formal practice. What exactly is this concept?

To elaborate it, it is necessary to follow one more genetic twist in the cry of surprise. The draft-narrator's stuttering, self-displacing exclamation ("'Oh!' we cried, starting back in surprise and raising in amaze an astonished hand to a thunderstruck mouth") recurs again in the published text. Near the novel's end, a man named Micks arrives to replace Watt as Mr. Knott's servant and Watt realizes that it is time to leave. The scene thus restages the moment of Watt's arrival and Arsene's monologue (the recollection of which includes the duck erratum, in the Grove text). Watt stands ready to depart, bags in hand on the duck's mat. There seems to be something terribly disconcerting here, or rather there is something that is disconcerting precisely because it is not entirely present: "The expression on his face became gradually of such vacancy that Micks, raising in amaze an astonished hand to a thunderstruck mouth, recoiled to the wall" (W 181). But the passage goes on to doubt whether the cause is really that Watt is, so to speak, not all there: "it may have been something else that caused Micks to recoil in this way.…Was it not perhaps something that was not Watt, nor of Watt, but behind Watt, or beside Watt, or before Watt, or beneath Watt, or above Watt, or about Watt, a shade uncast, a light unshed, or the grey air aswirl with vain entelechies?" (W 181). Watt is standing on the mat (though hardly "burning bright" as Nuala did); was Micks's cry not, then, caused by the absent duck itself (which was and was not on the mat in *Watt*, and for which "vain entelechy" seems peculiarly apt)? Arsene's question about the surrogative, his usurpation of "God's image," and the revelation of the duck's name—all these tend toward the surprising thought that even God's is an image of the "vacancy" of expression," of the thought that referential authority is inevitably surrogated, propagating degraded images with no final appeal to a ground.

The drafts scene wherein the narrator prefigures Micks's surprise concerns the desire to be gone, is about a surrogative logic. But more importantly it is a surrogate for leaving. Arsene is fraudulent but effective as "God's image" (he usurps God's authority over Eamon, having been made in God's image). Arsene has force, like the narrator's timid wish to leave Arsene, and by association Eamon as a figure, only in the name of "another," and this scandalizes the narrator. If his cry will be surrogated in *Watt* by Micks's analogous wonder at Watt in "God's image,"[39] then the narrator's awe implies that he is also surrogated in the drafts by Eamon, who stands in awe of Arsene, that "vulgar little nonentity" who is the drafts' illegitimate surrogate of "God's image."

Evidently, then, this stuttering, self-displacing dynamic—irrupting into a discussion of surrogative relations of representation—satirizes Irish cultural politics, as though using de Valera's name in vain were libel, if not a still more grievous sin (the censorship board that would eventually ban *Watt* in Ireland likely would have considered it so).[40] But the surrogative relation subtending this satire is the essential thing. It deprives referential and representational structures of their foundation by a stuttering displacement of temporality and a *mise en abyme* of referential/genetic grounds. And the presumable thrust of naming the duck Eamon (or perhaps even Nuala) would be to mock the mode of representation (at once political, cultural, and aesthetic) that Beckett saw in the Irish Literary Revival, the Free State, and the Republic.[41] Hence, if we wish to see a critique in the de

[39] See Michael Robinson, *Long Sonata of the Dead: A Study of Samuel Beckett* (New York: Grove, 1969), 109-115.

[40] See Beckett's unpublished 1934 "Censorship in the Saorstat," which criticizes the 1929 Censorship of Publications Act, linking it to issues of nationalism and procreation in the Free State (*Disjecta*, ed. Ruby Cohn [New York: Grove, 1984], 86-87); and Kennedy, "*First Love*."

[41] In addition to Kennedy and McNaughton, see Patrick Bixby, *Samuel Beckett and the Postcolonial Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 135-145.

Valera reference, it would have to be one that also attacked the very possibility of legitimately postulating that "Eamon" represents de Valera in the text. If the duck might work partly to intimate that de Valera's political/cultural representational status is fraudulent, then the referential status of that intimation is equally at stake. Thus the force of "Eamon" is that it is a canard, not a name but an empirical problem with no merely empirical answer. "Eamon" could function as a critique of the natalist tendencies Beckett saw in a putatively stable, progressivist structure of cultural-political representation only by practicing the referential/genetic degradation of the surrogative logic that it preaches.

In other words, with "Eamon" and "God's image," problems of nomination and representation (whether literary, cultural-political, or theological), like the narratological and allusive problems in the "Runner Duck" scene, are subject to the process of propagation-by-decay they articulate. The erratum introduces a canard into *Watt*, pointing us to this deeper surrogative process. It stipulates that in Beckett's writing, reference generates meaning by deterioration and displacement, in a genetic temporality that is multivalent and non-sequential. In the late drafts and the 1953 Olympia edition, "Nuala" is surrogative of the earlier drafts' "Eamon," while from 1959 to 2006 the Grove "duck" erratum is surrogative of both. The self-displacing referent of "the duck" and the equally self-displacing cry of surprise refer back not to a ground or origin, but rather to a non-sequential dynamic of relations that keep propagating meaningful relations across registers precisely because they never achieve closure or fulfillment in one register.

These relations delegitimate progressivist conceptions of intention (referential or otherwise) and of the artwork as the telos of a discrete creative act. And they do so, in a sense, *post festum*, since it is the duck erratum that belatedly opens up this epiphany (if it is one). Without the erratum, all this would be an exercise in genetic criticism pure and simple, but because the duck halfway persists as a material presence in published, authorized texts, it exceeds the horizons of genetic study to become another of what I have called "things passed over"—a textual detail that manages to embed the social precisely through its paraliptical formal presence. The erratum thus displaces the empirical referential concerns to which genetic or textual criticism would normally constrain it, subjecting those questions to the structure of signification that obtains across different registers amongst editions, manuscripts, and revisions. Here we have the logic of surrogative relation. It articulates the peculiar modality in which the duck erratum signifies in *Watt*—but also the modality of reference in *Watt* generally, the signifying modality imposed on things like reference and allusion in published editions and in superseded drafts. In other words, the question about a particular erratum led us inexorably on to the novel's process of generating signification by the surrogative. Watt's question about "what had become of the duck" is another way of putting Arsene's question to the draft-narrator: surrogative "of what?"

In this section we have seen that *Watt* incorporates its genetic record within its public, social form—but only in the problematic referential mode of the canard. And it anticipates criticism with a model of genetics as degeneration or "unnatural selection." If the duck erratum is a limit-case of the presumptive logic of textual genetics—that is to say, wherein the partial preservation or recuperation of a fragment of a teleological composition prehistory appears as a synecdochal index to that prehistory, calling for an empirical explication of its genealogy—then it also degenerates the structure of reference on which that logic depends. In *Watt*, reference surrogates its object with a series, an interpenetration of different registers that render one another problematic. "The duck," or rather the erratum's textual canard, embodies this because it refers at once to the diegetic bird(s), the different stages of composition whence a duck surfaces, the partial socio-political critique which may potentially be entailed at various points, and an expanding network of other related fragments. There is no stable, apodictic referent to "the duck"—the duck erratum shows us how *Watt* displaces referential unity or closure onto a serial, genetic process of surrogation. Reformulated in its broader

implications, the duck erratum delegitimates our conventional presuppositions about reference and intentional content: those that organize the kind of reference that Watt seeks to restore to his experience in general and those that organize the archival epistemology that would deem "the duck" merely a typographical error, a genetic compositional fossil, or an allusive critique of post-Independence Irish cultural politics.

At the same time, the search for a lost duck, the genetic attempt to recover or recollect it, has become a different kind of interpretive demand: a need to account for a complex set of referential/genetic (that is to say, surrogative) relations as something at once part of and passed over in *Watt*. Searching in *Watt*'s genetic prehistory for the resolution to the erratum's canard yielded a Beckettian trope of "unnatural selection," but it also began to suggest how the erratum materializes that trope in another register: while the Indian Runner Duck survives in Europe, where it is an artificial, displaced species, through breeding (or "unnatural selection"), the erratum survives in a similarly hostile, unnatural environment, despite the eugenic assumptions of bad Darwinism and progressivist textual genetics alike. Beckett's willful embrace of degeneration is thus not only a critique of a socio-political environment he saw in post-Independence Ireland and in the rising tide of fascist ideologies on the Continent. It is also a critique or rather displacement of the logic of representation it implies. This makes it necessary to trace the further connections that the series of canards invoked by "the duck" propagate, in order to transform *Watt* (along with its errata, its genetic archival record, and the heretofore unrecognized intertext "Echo's Bones"). As we shall see, Beckett's 1947 remark that *Watt* is "an unsatisfactory work…but it has its place in the series, as will perhaps appear in time" (*Letters* II: 55), has a significance that is no more authorially intended than is the erratum. Namely, *Watt* is the moment when Beckett's writing disintegrates the very category of the self-sufficient "work" by displacing it with a "series" that manages to lodge, within any given text of any published work, a genetic reference that will entail things it passed over in order to become a discrete published work.

III. The Unabandoned Work of "Echo's Bones"

> For the wonder and the wormwood of the whole
> — Thomas Hardy
>
> It's a derogatory way to be, right enough, ma'am.
> — Sean O'Casey

If this is at all plausible, then it should allow for a consideration of the relationship *Watt* bears to the rest of Beckett's corpus—that is, the question of *Watt*'s "place in the series."[42] Is it like the picture or the "lamentable tale of error, folly, waste, and ruin," that is, an indifferent term in a succession progressively characterized by a uniform minimalism? Or is it a "paradigm" of a different type? If the series (of pictures, for instance) in *Watt* is not a fact, then the series of Beckett's literary works is, surely? Here, a corollary to the duck erratum foists into *Watt*'s genetic history what initially appears as an intertext. But because this intertext—or rather, what I will term the "unabandoned work"—adds another dimension to the surrogative relations constituting *Watt*, this latter ceases to name a discrete work with a place in a sequence of discrete works, and comes to refer to the genetic nexus that articulates Beckett's aesthetics as such. According to this relation, there are no longer any discrete, self-sufficient works, no aesthetic wholes, no apotheoses. The unabandoned work puts

[42] *The Letters of Samuel Beckett* II: 55.

added emphasis on the fractured temporality of Beckett's degenerative model of genetics: the series not as a linear progression, a literary career, but rather as a process that undermines teleology.[43]

The link between the unabandoned work "Echo's Bones" to *Watt* hinges precisely on the duck. The genetic origin of the duck in the *Watt* drafts is the narrator's conversation with Arsene, with its scene of excavatory research into the "unconscious mind," which prefigures Arsene's change by unearthing not epiphanic truth but endless surrogative relations (TS 149 / NB2.81). It turns out that those relations ramify beyond the single discrete work, since the drafts' conversation in turn revises moments of "Echo's Bones." This last twist of the surrogative will underscore the larger stakes for genetically informed criticism of modernism in a way already implicit in the idea of "unnatural selection." Here, the surrogative logic of textual "selection" involves a non-evaluative unnaturalness—a generative non-sequential usurpation of linear genetic relations among texts. In Edward Said's terms, we might say that here an affiliative relation usurps the filiative logic of textual genetic history, installing an unnatural tempo of repetition as decay and propagation. We will find this in the way that the Watt drafts revise aspects of "Echo's Bones," in Belacqua's conversations with Lord Gall and, later, the gravedigger Doyle (when the two dig up Belacqua's grave, in a more literal precursor to the drafts' excavation).

In the first conversation Belacqua makes the unmotivated decision that "it is time I was getting on," but does not act on it (EB 23). This provides the template and phraseology for the *Watt* draft-narrator's desire to leave Arsene and the duck (TS 175). As I noted in the previous section, the answer to Arsene's question about that desire is drawn from the excavatory research into the "pre-uterine" geological stratum of the narrator's "unconscious mind:" it is the very logic of the surrogative (TS 149 / NB2.81). In "Echo's Bones," rather than a degenerate vision of "high modernist" self-excavatory descent, there is an oddly degenerate sort of premodern descent—a journey on ostrich-back to a castle where the hero's honour and fidelity will be tested, a descent into the infernal stratum or Bolgia of panderers (Lord Gall) and seducers (Lady Gall).[44] And it is quite likely that the issue of the encounter would be prone to cœnaesthesis, since according to Nordau syphilis would be a cause of degeneration broadly, and of disordered cellular processes in particular.[45] Insofar as Belacqua is meant to save an entailed "Big House" estate (by fraudulently interposing himself into the Gall family genetic pool and thereby redeeming the nobility of that name from its unproductive degeneracy), the critics' exhumation of "Echo's Bones" might further substantiate a postcolonial reading of *Watt*. An interpretation of *Watt* as a critique of the "Big House" literary tradition and its socio-political presuppositions, becomes all the more plausible if it metabolizes part of "Echo's Bones," wherein Belacqua is called upon to preserve a much more obvious, much more clearly parodic "Big House."[46] But what is essential is the way the surrogative relation obtains in this expanded genetic series: just as the conversation between Arsene and the narrator in the *Watt* drafts reworks "Echo's Bones," the duck (Eamon or Nuala) recycles Lord Gall's

---

[43] Gillian Beer offers a useful descriptor for such a conception of process: she describes the nature of Darwinian thought as involving a "dysteleological" principle, one that "eschew[s] fore-ordained design [and allows] chance to figure as the only sure determinant," wherein a "superfecundity of instance serv[es] an argument which can reveal itself only *through* instance and relations" (*Darwin's Plots*, 2nd ed. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 2000], 6). See also 178.

[44] See *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri*, 3 vols., ed. and trans. Robert M. Durling (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996-2011), I: 260-273 (*Inferno*, Canto XVII).

[45] See Nordau, *Degeneration* 34, 248-254, 353. As it turns out, the child is a girl, and therefore Lord Gall's ruse will not save Wormwood from reversion. Perhaps the "obscure family and professional relation" of "the Galls, father and son" in *Watt* ought to be considered in light of this (W 58, 54).

[46] Recent work of note on this topic includes Bixby's *Samuel Beckett and the Postcolonial Novel*. James McNaughton's recent essay interprets "Echo's Bones" as a critique of a Protestant Ascendancy in decline (and Yeats's ideological relationship to it) that is equally suspicious of what McNaughton calls the "Free State's growing censoriousness and legislative Catholic morality" ("Politics and Entailment in the Irish Free-State" 334).

ostrich Strauss.[47] In "Echo's Bones"—a more explicitly Dantean text than usual, even for Beckett—Strauss is a kind of "postwar degenerate" (EB 26) heir to Geryon, "that filthy image of fraud" from Dante's *Inferno*.[48] Geryon approaches at the end of *Inferno* XVI and carries the pilgrim and Virgil into Malebolge in Canto XVII, depositing them in the Bolgia of panderers and seducers (Lord and Lady Gall being the "post-war degenerate," or decaying Protestant Ascendant, editions of Dante's Venedico and Ghisolabella?).[49]

In fact, the allusion to Geryon in the ostrich is particularly illuminating with respect to the fraudulent aspect of all the surrogative figures and instances that arise in *Watt*'s series. With respect to Geryon's representational status, Robert Hollander has argued that Geryon "both exist[s] and do[es] not exist in the order of the actual world with its actual history."[50] Geryon has no literal referent grounding the allegorical senses of fourfold exegesis: he "seems to have been made by the poet, and not by God; yet he performs actions which are exactly of the same order as those performed by those who were made by God."[51] In this respect, Strauss (whose name only taxonomizes him as an ostrich, referring us nowhere) becomes a half-paradigm, a rumour like the duck or Nackybal, of how the unabandoned work further complicates Beckett's surrogative logic. Strauss is a referent generated only across a longer genetic series of unanswerable questions, making the ostrich a surrogative descendant of the duck erratum. Like Geryon in *Inferno* or the duck erratum in *Watt*, Strauss has no literal referent within *Watt*'s genetic prehistory—but it is thereby all the more significant—as a canard.

More broadly, this relay of the referential, the genetic, and the intertextual suggests that not only is "the series" not teleological, it is likewise not comprised of internally coherent, integral works. For if the ostrich is the figural forebear of the duck (if the ostrich of 1933 becomes the duck by 1953), then nevertheless the fact that they are neither exactly in *Watt* nor part of its genetic prehistory troubles the teleology and logic of signification presupposed by the critical apparatus responsible for its publication. More to the point, though, is the fact that, with the publication of "Echo's Bones" there is finally(?) an answer to Watt's question ("what [became] of the duck"). In 2014, the duck became—reverted to, degenerated into—an ostrich. This reversion is legitimated not by the author, but rather by a surrogate representative, a literary estate. The "intertextual" genetic link between *Watt* and "Echo's Bones" might have been proposed prior or without appeal to the 2014 publication of the story, that is to say, given the typescript's existence. But the point is to show how Beckett's surrogative aesthetics demands genetic criticism not only to deal with its genetic history, but more importantly to comprehend its logic of signification. But it fractures the temporality and causality of criticism's genetic metaphor. It disentails the linearity of "the series," and with it the integrity of the literary work as unit or integer. Thus, the publication of "Echo's Bones" is the complement and the fraudulent (unauthorized) non-linear surrogation of the unnaturally selected series of ducks. This means that Beckett's surrogative aesthetics demands that

---

[47] As Nixon's annotations point out, "Strauss" is German for "ostrich," but as the bird "simply waltzes along, never hesitates," Lord Gall's pet's name also alludes to the German composers Strauss, father and son (like the Galls in *Watt*).

[48] "Quella sozza imagine di froda" (Durling and Martinez I: 260-1 [*Inferno* XVII.7]). Nixon's annotation points this out, though he places Geryon in the *Purgatorio*, and calls him a "griffin." There is a gryphon in the *Purgatorio* (Cantos XXIX-XXXII), but it is the figure (or form of appearance appropriate to the pilgrim's spiritual capacity for comprehension) of Christ!

[49] It is perhaps worth noting in passing that, though it does not appear in Dante's Latin sources, Geryon is often depicted with a two-headed dog, Orthos. This beast was born of Echidna—making it the sibling of the Teumessian Fox, who made an appearance in the discussion of Wilde's revisions of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in chapter two. See Hesiod's *Theogony* 304; also the *Bibliotheca* of Pseudo-Apollodorus, II.v.10.

[50] Robert Hollander, *Allegory in Dante's* Commedia (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 249.

[51] Hollander, *Allegory in Dante* 294.

archival or genetic criticism become degenerative criticism—a criticism capable of coming to grips with terms that are unnatural or irrational, that refuse to be quantified.

The connection between the *Watt* drafts and "Echo's Bones" goes further, to the heart of the surrogative logic emblematized by the drafts' erratic duck. To unearth that logic in his excavatory introspection, the draft-narrator had to plunge past the "pre-uterine" stratum of his mind, which reminded him of the "rocks at Greystones" (TS 149). This is a reference to the titular bones-turned-stones of Echo, which Doyle the gravedigger and Belacqua will find in the latter's coffin, buried at Greystones. During the conversation leading up to the disinterment, Belacqua laments his reanimation, stressing that "my life was a derogation and an impudence…which it was my duty…to nip in the wombbud. But—" and here Doyle, like Arsene in the *Watt* drafts, interrupts: "you say derogation. From what?" (EB 21).

Belacqua supplies a kind of answer. "Who but an imbecile can care from what? *Isn't derogation in the dear old abstract good enough?…There you glump like a fluke in a tup and want to know from what*. Can you think of any thing existing, God or Gonococcus, lower than the creature, his three score years and ten of…réchauffé cockles[?]" (EB 41-42; emphases added). Thus, in response to Doyle's evident disagreement with his Arsene-like view of life as a "lamentable tale of error, folly, waste, ruin" (TS 143), Belacqua spits out a demotic version of Hamlet's "how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar."[52] Belacqua's retort ("there you glump like a fluke in a tup and want to know what") is perhaps an attempt to overcome his inability, in life, to communicate with and in the (Wordsworthian?) language of "real men."[53] More importantly, it reroutes the story's purgatorial themes, and Belacqua's individuated existence as the sin in need of expurgation, more explicitly through Hamlet's metabolic image of a "continual purgatorial process" of transubstantiation.

As Stephen Greenblatt argues in *Hamlet in Purgatory*, the Shakespearian scene from which Belacqua recycles his quip (in a feeble attempt to turn it into an idealizing tool of the Protestant Ascendancy) amounts to "a grotesquely materialist reimagining of the Eucharist." It works as a "skeptical, secular [or Reformation] protest" against "the ghostly transmission of patriarchal memory" and "the crude materialism of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation," *and simultaneously* as an attempt "to fulfill precisely the task that the Ghost has set [Hamlet]." For Greenblatt, "a skeptical, secular insistence on irreducible corporeality paradoxically originates in an attempt to save the Eucharist from the taint of the body." "The spirit can be healed only by refusing all compromise.…Such a conviction led the Reformers to dwell on the progress of the Host through the guts of a mouse, and a comparable conviction…leads Hamlet to the clay pit and the decayed

---

[52] Nixon's annotation rightly claims that "glump like a fluke in a tup" is equivalent to "sulk like worm in a gut" (EB 103). However, there does not seem to be anything particularly Irish about the slang. (I am grateful to Catherine Flynn for helping me to sort this out.) See *Hamlet* IV.iii.19-30, where Claudius asks Hamlet where Polonius (whom Hamlet has killed) is: "At supper.…Not where he eats, but where he is eaten; a certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots: your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service; two dishes, but to one table: that's the end.…A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm." Asked what he means, he replies "Nothing, but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar."

[53] In "Walking Out," when Belacqua comes upon a "complete down-and-out" in a shelter made of a cart (who makes him "[feel], the wretched bourgeois, a paroxysm of shame for his capon belly") his dog urinates on the man, violating the makeshift privacy. Belacqua, in extreme embarrassment, can only wish the vagabond "good evening," to which he replies only "game ball" (with "a smile proof against all adversity"). "After that further comment was impossible. The question of apology or compensation simply did not arise. The instinctive nobility of this splendid creature for whom private life, his joys and chagrins at evening under the cart, was not acquired, as Belacqua one day if he were lucky might acquire his, but antecedent, disarmed all the pot-hooks and hangers of civility. Belacqua made an inarticulate flourish with his stick and passed down the road out of the life of this tinker, this real man at last" (*More Pricks than Kicks* [London: Faber and Faber, 2010], 97-98).

leftovers that the gravediggers bring to light."[54] Throughout "Echo's Bones," Belacqua's position is at once that of the Ghost and that of Hamlet, but displaced into a three-act "fiasco, in which he is installed for each dose of expiation of great strength, from which he is caught up each time a trifle better, dryer, less of a natural snob" (EB 4). And, at the end of the third episode of the story he is, like Hamlet, in the clay pit staring at the leftovers a gravedigger has exhumed. But Belacqua's insistence on the abstract ineffability of that which his existence derogates is not equivalent to Hamlet's remark about Polonius's corpse, and Doyle is not the usurper of the crown (though he is another "natural man," a partial recycling of the "beggar" of "Walking Out").[55]

Belacqua's purgation-as-dematerialization certainly could be read as registering the scandal of a skeptical Protestantism faithful to the Spirit only by way of obsession with the endless cycles of corrupt matter that can never incarnate the divine. In that light, "Echo's Bones" would seem to imply a nuanced engagement with the figure of Joyce that reinforces the complexities of Arsene's "change" and the draft-narrator's trance and self-excavation. Beckett indeed construed Joyce's aesthetics as an aesthetics of transubstantiation and his own as moving in a different direction. And interpreting *Watt* as a critique of Irish religious and cultural politics, and "Echo's Bones" as a precursor to precisely this aspect, would complement a reading of the two works' intertextual connections in terms of Beckett's relation to Joyce. However, the point here is that surrogative aesthetics is so radically other to a notion of apotheosis and aesthetic finality, that it does not need to oppose it with a properly Beckettian "absolute absence of the Absolute."[56] The essential thing is the surrogative relation, not the theme of a materialist theology in "Echo's Bones."

Belacqua's answer to Doyle's "of what?" is "derogation in the dear old abstract." The "surrogative" that appears in the corresponding exchange in the *Watt* drafts is more concrete. It surrogates rather than merely recycles "derogation" in "Echo's Bones": the answer to Arsene's analogous question (surrogative "of what?") is that the surrogative is always surrogative "of another" (EB 22; TS 153). The very concept of the surrogative is a revision of Belacqua's notion of life—and the story's resurrection—as "derogation." By the same token, the empirical genetic relation ("Echo's Bones" as a genetic *avant-texte* of *Watt*) is itself usurped by the non-linear publication history, making the story a genetic successor to *Watt* and its duck erratum. Once "Echo's Bones" is disinterred for publication it no longer exists purely as prehistory, though likewise it is not simply an intertext, another discrete work in the legitimate Beckettian œuvre. Surrogative relations degenerate the aesthetic logic whereby a literary œuvre could be called legitimate. Hence, the distinction between derogation and the surrogative is a better model for Beckett's aesthetics than the tired opposition of subtraction and apotheosis. Whereas the cliché modernist aesthetics of apotheosis entails an idea of signification of which derogation "in the dear old abstract" would be the negation, Beckett's surrogative aesthetics deposes the antinomy itself. This entails a fractured, occulted temporality—the semantic line from reference to referent is decayed in advance, transforming the linear temporality of referential fulfillment into a polyvalent diminuendo marked by degeneration and non-sequential tarrying. But that decadence of semantic reference is the effect of the way *Watt* makes hermeneutic questions immediately genetic ones. The dilemma of the duck and the ostrich show us that *Watt* demands that criticism not only deal with its textual history, but more importantly comprehend its logic of signification.

---

[54] *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 240-1, 243-4.

[55] See EB 42. In fact, just a few pages later, when Doyle says to Belacqua "game ball," the narrator points out that this is a repetition of the vagrant's words in "Walking Out" (*More Pricks than Kicks* 97): "The vagabond again! Dear oh dear oh dear! The good old pastoral days, prior to Thanatos" (EB 46).

[56] "Dante…Bruno.Vico..Joyce," *Disjecta* 33.

Although this logic of signification enfolds "Echo's Bones," it is not something that defined Beckett's work from the outset. The Belacqua of "Echo's Bones" may be partially purged, and may partially propagate, but he is not exactly a figure for *Watt*'s surrogative aesthetics. He is ultimately another "seedy solipsist" like Murphy will be (*Murphy* 82). *Watt*'s serial logic of signification actualizes what is ultimately only a theme or a character's worldview in *More Pricks than Kicks*, "Echo's Bones," and *Murphy*. Belacqua's derogation is a narcissistic fantasy (as is Murphy's quietism). *Watt*'s "surrogative" is the supersession of those fantasies and thereby the satisfaction of their impulse. This is because the surrogative is not really a theme or a worldview, it is a material process so thoroughgoing that it sacrifices the aesthetic finality and integrity of the work that lends its name to the procedure: "'surrogative of what?' What a question!" Surrogative of *Watt* (TS 155). Though this process is a ceaseless metabolism of materiality (and genetic material), it is not Hamlet's indifferent equivalence of a king and a beggar as "but variable service—two dishes, but to one table," partly because, *pace* the young literary man, that is not the end.[57] Nevertheless Belacqua, like Murphy (and, perhaps, the works of which they are the protagonists),[58] takes it as the end: dissolution, death, successful purgation, nothingness, or at most a kind of permanent cœnaesthesis.

It is only with *Watt* that death becomes truly not the end: this is not only because Watt does not die at the end of *Watt*, but also because the novel formally and materially prevents the consummation devoutly wished. In *Watt*, the fantasy of cœnaesthesis either as image of nothingness and quietus, or as narcissistic apotheosis (of which the narrative is a temporary derogation) is surrogated by endless purgation and endless persistence of the purgatorial matter. Not merely is there no death any longer, since all is infinitely recyclable and no protagonist will ever finish dying again, but also *Watt* names the moment where these cease to be mere themes and become a procedure. *Watt* is the moment where "the series" comes into being materially and as an aesthetic principle.[59] But as I have suggested, *Watt*'s "place in the series" is problematic, as self-displacing as the canard that the duck erratum foists into *Watt*, or "Echo's Bones's" specular place as both stage in *Watt*'s genetic history and "final" published version of material ultimately passed over by *Watt*. The surrogative aesthetics elaborated across *Watt*'s nonteleological history proposes a model of genetics as degeneration and of the relation of terms and works in multiple series—referential, genetic, and publication. The unabandoned work is transformed—it refers not to "Echo's Bones" or any particular text that is recycled or published belatedly in the series. It refers to the series itself as

---

[57] *Hamlet* IV.iii.24.

[58] At the beginning of Belacqua's revival, he considers "that perhaps if he had been cremated rather than inhumed directly he would have been less liable to revisit the vomit. But happily for all of us this thought was too egregious to detain him long. He tried all he knew, without shifting from his position however, to conceive of his exuviae as preserved in an urn or other receptacle in some kind person's sanctum or as drifting about like a cloud of randy pollen, but somehow he could not quite bring it off, this simple little flight. Was it possible that his imagination had perished?" (EB 3-4). Though he was not cremated, his confrontation with the stones in his coffin dissolves (or absolves) him. Moreover, Murphy will be cremated—his unfulfilled final wish was for his ashes to be flushed down the toilet of the Abbey Theatre in Dublin (like so much excrement of the Irish literary revival), but his remains only make it as far as a London bar, dusting its floor and being conclusively "swept away" (*Murphy* 275). The *Grove Companion*'s assessment of Murphy's end is canonical: it is "a huge Democritean joke, with its insistence upon the soul's dissolution, a would-be Occasionalist universe blown apart by the guffaw of the Abderite, for whom *Nothing is more real than nothing*" (*The Grove Companion to Samuel Beckett*, ed. C.J. Ackerley and S.E. Gontarski [New York: Grove, 2004], 388).

[59] Murphy's notable permutation—the assortment of cookies—certainly foreshadows the series in *Watt*, *Molloy*, and later texts (*Murphy* 96-97). However, Murphy's "prejudice against the anonymous" cookie and his "infatuation with the ginger" cookie respectively limit the possibilities and demonstrate that the underlying principle at work in the later serial gestures is not yet possible. It is not so much that Murphy is too Irish, with too much of a taste for what Jack B. Yeats called the ginger of life, but that the permutation is incorporated into, and limited by Murphy's self-involvement. It is peculiarly appropriate that the (reduced) permutative possibilities are taken from him by "the Duck's" dog, and thus connected to the surrogative logic obtaining between "Echo's Bones" and *Watt*.

that work of unabandonment which denatures the integrity of its units. This invalidates any conception of apotheosis—whether in terms of representation or signification in a work, or in terms of the aesthetic corpus—since these are metaphysical and theological presuppositions of genetic criticism and of aesthetic finality.[60]

As I argued in the first section, the duck erratum inaugurates a rumour, imperiously demands the genetic archive: the Olympia edition with Nuala and the Habakkuk poem, the long conversation with Arsene, the mythopoetics of unnatural selection and degenerate vision, "God's image" and the revelation of the name Eamon—all this shifts the structure of reference and recollection into the oddly self-displacing ambit of the processual relation I term "surrogative." I then articulated the logic of the surrogative relation as it enfolds more and more series of relations (and relations between series of relations), through an extended analysis of the draft conversation with Arsene and several entailed parts of the published novel.

In this section, the unabandoned work revealed itself as the corollary and exponentiation of the duck erratum's canard: if the erratum points beyond individual textual units towards a referential and genetic relation that is properly serial, then the unabandoned work redoubles this relation, in its fractured temporality and causality, beyond the limits of one individual novel's genetic history to "the series" itself. Not only does the unabandoned work transform the object of inquiry from individual works (*Watt* or "Echo's Bones") to a process that disintegrates them as units; it also reveals that Beckett's degenerate vision of genetics thwarts the linearity and teleology presupposed by genetic criticism and a normal notion of seriality alike. The duck erratum and "Echo's Bones" are something like the obverse of paralipomena. Rather than being something left out or passed over, they are retrojected (into *Watt* and into Beckett's series, respectively). With "Echo's Bones" the surrogative relation enacts itself on the very novel which gave rise to it: just as Beckett let the "unfit" genetic variant of the duck erratum flourish, so to does the unabandoned work propagate the "unnatural" relays that erratum emblematized. However, the two formulas of derogation and the surrogative are not equivalent expressions. *Watt*'s surrogate relation to "Echo's Bones" is not a "progress through the guts of a beggar" but rather an instance in a nonlinear process, a metabolism of thematic material that also transmutes it into a material principle: Beckett's aesthetics of things passed over, or rather through.

If this is plausible, then the questions with which I began—Watt's erratic question "what had become of the duck" and the critic's empirical question "what duck"—have become even more unnatural than the erratum suggested on its own. As I have argued, answering the second in no way answers the first. But to grasp the unabandoned work we have to abandon the already minimal teleology or at least linearity that seriality (like genetic history at the level of an individual work) implies as a model for Beckett's writing. This is because of the way that "Echo's Bones" in turn surrogates *Watt*. "What had become of the duck?" It turns out that, even more unnatural and illegitimate than having an ostrich in its gene pool, in 2014 it reverted to that same ostrich. The duck

[60] This theological aspect—the Shakespearian paradox of a sardonically materialist Eucharist, turned into a kind of second-order Irish bull in "Echo's Bones"—is of course "represented" in *Watt*, for example in the figure of "Dum" Spiro, editor of the "popular catholic monthly" who shares a train ride with Watt. Their conversation (of which Watt heard nothing, as he was in a trance, hearing other voices) consists of Mr. Spiro reading a letter to the editor and answering its questions—does "a rat, or other small animal, [that] eats of a consecrated wafer…ingest the Real Body, or does he not? If he does not, what has become of it? If he does, what is to be done with him?" (W 21-22). The drafts go further and, according to Spiro's predecessor Matthew David McGilligan, the necessity of adoring the portion of host eaten by the rat leads to the question of what is to be done if the rat is not caught until after the host passes through him (NB2.15ff / TS 97ff). There would be much of interest to say about this passage (and it should be connected to the scene where Watt and Sam, feeding rats to other rats, feel nearest "to God" [W 127]), but it is sufficient to note how *Watt*'s surrogative process metabolizes these theological dimensions.

erratum's "place" in *Watt* is erratic, and the series Strauss – Eamon – Nuala – "the duck" – Strauss (or "Echo's Bones" – *Watt* drafts – *Watt* – "Echo's Bones"; or derogation – surrogative – derogation) is unnatural to the extent that it shows that the surrogative lies at the heart of "the series" of which Beckett spoke. This series cannot be conceived in terms of a linear sequence of individuated texts, whether or not they were composed or published as autonomous works. Again, no apotheosis, no œuvre or corpus, no telos or finality of genetic and publication history. Only an unnatural, non-linear series that renders its own terms incomplete—the work of unabandonment generates a set that is neither finite nor infinite, but rather indefinite.

IV. The Series as Indefinite Set

But again, since before referring to Beckett's work as such, "the series" was a local fascination in and of *Watt*. The mode of reading I have sought to elaborate in all of the foregoing—elaborated with recourse to an erratum, a genetic archive, and a posthumous intertext—is something that is equally demanded by *Watt* considered as an unproblematic text, as a novel on its own. A full grasp of its nuances and ramifications necessitate the genetic inquiry, as I have shown. This in turn allows us to understand the most seemingly self-evident things about the novel *Watt*: its odd games with narrative perspective and temporality and its curious "Addenda" section of thirty-seven fragments from various compositional stages, with its apparently editorial injunction "The following precious and illuminating material should be carefully studied. Only fatigue and disgust prevented its incorporation" (W 205). The addenda make for a peculiar version of things passed over: they are essentially themselves passed over, but they also inject into *Watt* much of its genetic past, by way of the context they paraliptically entail. In other words, if they mean anything, they do so only partially, and by way of the connections they make between relevant passages in the published novel and relevant moments in its composition. They are in that sense only partly and partially present within *Watt*.

Although after untold hours in the archives I could offer here an exhaustive (and exhausting) account of the entirety of the addenda and the surrogative relations they develops, there is no need. Moreover, one of the consequences of my argument is that the entailed notion of totality is out of order here. Nonetheless, the addenda need to be incorporated into the account of Beckett's things passed over, and no quarter given for "fatigue and disgust." And doing so will elaborate in its most robust form the analogue to Flaubert's novel-as-ensemble, Wilde's artwork-as-picture, and Barnes's work-as-reconstruction: Beckett's series-as-indefinite-set. Little needs to be said about addenda like "change all the names" (which was a manuscript note Beckett made to himself to regularize character names that had changed in the course of composition, but also manages to refer to the basic surrogative gesture that Beckett performs on the genetic/referential force of names) (W 213), but there is more to be gleaned from the tenth ("Note that Arsene's declaration gradually came back to Watt"), the sixth ("limits to part's equality with whole") and the final ("no symbols where none intended") (W 206, 214). In this section I shall trace the first two of these, in order to relate the logic of the duck erratum and the surrogative as seen in the *Watt* manuscripts and "Echo's Bones" to the seemingly more flat-footed thematic representations of similar notions given in the published text of *Watt* itself. Moreover, I want to show how the seriality of compositional and publication history as I have considered elaborated it so far, also affects the basic temporality of narrative in the novel. Finally, this will allow for a conceptualization of not just the temporality of Beckett's "series" of writings, but also of those writings considered as something like an œuvre or a corpus. In other words, if my analysis has the effect of undoing the linear chronology of Beckett's published works,

then we need a new category for the "whole" of those works. It will turn out to be the series construed as neither a finite nor an infinite, but rather an indefinite set. Finally, I shall conclude with a brief consideration of *Watt*'s last word, the final addendum, "no symbols where none intended," in order to draw a few conclusions about the nature of things like contingency and error and material textual transmission in relation to authorial intention and literary meaning—that is, the odd "things passed over" that have gotten me so worked up over the course of this dissertation.

The sixth addendum, "Note that Arsene's declaration gradually came back to Watt," came from a series of notes at the end of NB5, made when Beckett was revising in order to give a coherent shape to a novel that had changed drastically in the course of its composition. Here, as Ackerley remarks, Beckett is reminding himself to reconcile the earlier text with a narratorial revision late in the work's development—the decision to have the novel be told from the perspective of a belatedly-acknowledged intradiegetic narrator named Sam, to whom Watt must have told his story. If he did so, then he must have remembered that story. In the end, Beckett did not fully square this with the fact that in Part II of the novel, Watt "wondered what Arsene meant, nay, he wondered what Arsene had said.…For his declaration had entered Watt's ears only by fits, and his understanding, like all that enters the ears only by fits, hardly at all" (W 64). In a sense, then, this addendum refers to the duck erratum, since Part II's moment of wondering is where Watt's erratic question occurs in the Olympia and Grove texts. The addendum suggests that Beckett was thinking about the problem of things that are "not ended, when [they are] past" (W 57) well before the happy accident of the duck erratum, and that surrogative relations also affect the actual narrativity of the novel, both in terms of perspective and in terms of narrative time. For in every version of the published text, Sam's emergence (in the course of an account of how Watt managed to break into the bedroom of Mr. Knott's other servant Erskine, where he finds the painting I shall discuss in a moment, the reader is told that "if Watt had not known…that Erskine's key was not a simple key, then I should never have known it either, nor the world, for all that I know on the subject of Mr. Knott,…and on the subject of Watt,…came from Watt, and from Watt alone" [W 101]) is a development that fundamentally alters the narrative form of the novel, not the revelation of a fact in place all along. In other words, the narrative form of *Watt* is incoherent, it changes. The opening section focalized through Mr. Hackett, for instance, could not possibly be narrated by Sam, even if Sam is Mr. Hackett.

These intimations about narrative time and perspective are substantiated if we take a look into what is paraliptically entailed by the sixth addendum, "limit's to part's equality with whole." The line comes again from the drafts' long conversation with Arsene, just before Arsene asks the question that prompts the draft-narrator's excavation of "the surrogative" from his "unconscious mind." The narrator has just decried the vanity of all information whatsoever (a passage that will become Arsene's explanation of the pointlessness of his digression about Nuala in the Olympia text), and Arsene responds with the announcement that "personally of course I regret everything," and the outline of a worldview according to which everything is a "lamentable tale of error, folly, waste, ruin" which would remain the same even if at the end of his life he could begin life again with the knowledge and experience accrued. Indeed if he could live a hundred lives, each marked by the knowledge and experience accrued in all the previous lives, the result would be the same. Or, as the narrator formulates it mathematically, "$L=L + 2E=L + 3E=\dots L + (n - 1)E=(n[2L + (n - 1)E]) / 2$ or, perhaps better, $ltefwr=L=LE=LE^2=LE^3=\dots LE^{(n - 1)}=(L[E^n - 1]) / (E - 1)$" (NB2.73, ellipses in original).[61] "Surely," the narrator asks, "you don[']t mean to suggest that.…That would be too

[61] In other words, the first formula would mean that "the lamentable tale of error, folly, waste and ruin equals life equals life plus experience equals life plus twice experience equals life plus thrice experience equals…any number of lives less one times experience equals any number of lives less nothing times the sum total of two lives and any old number of

appalling to contemplate.…There are limits to the part's equality with the whole.…Overstep them and chaos is bound to ensue" (TS 145).

Hence, restored to its original context, the sixth addendum is part of a complicated meditation entailing Galileo's paradox, which Galileo formulated under house arrest after an insufficiently earnest recantation of his post-Copernican astronomical work. It states that since not every natural number is also a square, the set of all natural numbers is larger than the set of squares; yet since every natural number can be squared, the set of squares is equal to the set of natural numbers. This violates the fundamental Euclidian axiom that the whole is greater than the part. Aside from explaining the joke behind the sixth addendum, the drafts' entailment of Galileo's paradox has important ramifications: if the part can be equal to the whole (under limited conditions), then it would follow that an addendum, a variant, or an erratum might be equal to the whole whose absence it marks; that is, the totality of the genetic pre-history as the truth of the published novel. Or, perhaps it implies that the novel equals the novel plus the Addenda equals the novel plus the addenda plus the duck erratum equals the novel plus the Addenda plus the duck erratum plus the totality of pre-textual genetic history…

This begins to sound like Arsene's lament, but such self-referentiality or synecdochal figuration would simplify to the novel = "a cat's flux" (as Arsene puts it in *Watt*). Just as, in Arsene's appraisal, life figures both as the result (the "ltefwr," identified with life as a single "L" even where there are "a hundred lives") and as a part of the formula that yields it, a normal genetic inquiry would presume some idealized plenitude called *Watt* that is the whole of which the published novel *Watt* is a part. However, the point is precisely that there are "limits" to such an equality. Because the mathematical expressions both equate the lamentable tale with life, and life with a formula that includes life as a component, the formulas progress infinitely and postulate the equality of the part and the whole—bad infinity. Moreover, it seems that the two formulas (based on linear and exponential rates of growth of experience, respectively) are themselves meant to be equivalent. NB2.73 introduces the second with the phrase "or perhaps better," whereas TS 145 replaces this with "or worse still," but in each case they are both attempts to express, mathematically, what it is that Arsene's lament has "suggest[ed]." The relation between the formulas, however, is not equivalence.[62]

What is more, their variables are related as the natural number to the square, just as in Galileo's paradox. If there are limits to the equality of these two formulas—a set of values for which the two formulas coincide—this set is limited to the value 1. For every other value, the linear formula generates an increasingly negative (but rational number) value for experience (-E, -3/2E, -2E, -5/2E…), whereas the exponential formula generates irrational numbers. Neither set of results contains nor is equal to the other, except for the value n=1. Further, this value is the only equation for which the part (x number of lives) is equal to the whole (life). In a sense, then, the limit is not the finite (which Euclid's part-whole axiom requires), but rather the infinite, which is implicit in Beckett's writing as soon as there is more than one.[63] Whereas Galileo's paradox might be

---

lives less one times experience all divided by two." The second would be "worse still": the lamentable tale "equals life equals life times experience equals ~~life times experience equals~~ life times experience squared equals life times experienced cubed equals life times experience to the ninetyninth equals life times experience raised to the power of any number of lives less one equals life times the difference of experience raised to ~~any n~~ the power of any number of li~~f~~<v>es and unity all divided by the difference of experience and unity all divided by one" (TS 145).

[62] I am indebted to Samia Rahimtoola here: it was only with the aid of her mathematical expertise that I could wrap my head around this passage and give the account that follows.

[63] See *Comment c'est* (Paris: Minuit, 1961), 65: "puisqu'on voilà deux on le fut des billions" (the moment there are two there were yes billions) (*How It Is* [New York: Grove, 1964, 1970], 65)]. One would imagine that Badiou's set-theory-based metaphysics and keen interest in Beckett would make him the authority here. In this (but not only this) respect, his

formulated "there are limits to the inequality of the part and the whole," what we could call Arsene's paradox turns this inside out, and takes infinite sets as the point of departure. But what would it mean to "overstep" the "limits" of the infinite set? What chaos is "bound to ensue?"

The narrator in the drafts is obviously not saying that the important thing is the relation between the two equations. However, *Watt*'s surrogative structure of figuration (but also the referential/genetic force of the Addenda themselves) entails these issues as the condition of the drafts' formulas or the "part-whole" addendum having any value: they tell us nothing of substance taken as textual units, stages of composition merely. Their significance is in how they complicate the very set of relations (or relations between relations) that they establish across referential registers and genetic stages. What this addendum in particular, but also the Addenda more broadly suggest, then, is the concern is less with any given term, reference, or variant, than with the indefinite but concrete set of serial relations that elaborates it along with other terms. This relationship is the paradigm for the relationship of the novel and its genetic prehistory. Though it is undoubtedly interesting (at least to Beckett scholars) to compare the drafts with the published text, or to discover the provenance of an addendum like "limits to part's equality with whole," the essential lies not with the particular facts recovered about any single term, but rather with the concrete relations between sets or series of terms (i.e. the relations between the duck in the Olympia edition and the duck in drafts, and so on). This relation between sets yields neither a finite nor an infinite set: the object of inquiry is an indefinite set of which the various editions of the novel and the genetic archive are units that communicate in a series of surrogative relations. Particular passages, variants, errata, or addenda are like explicit values for different variables, which allow us to determine the relations between the different formulas of their value (the notebooks, the typescript, the Olympia edition, the Grove edition, subsequent editions). But from that moment, we realize that these units are not real, natural numbers, but rather irrational numbers or "surds," as Beckett liked to say.

The sixth addendum ("limits to part's equality with whole") thus partially signals a moment in the drafts where Beckett's surrogative logic of figuration further complicates the genetics of reference and the mythopoetics of recollection I discussed earlier in this chapter, recasting them in terms of a language of mathematical symbolization and a part-whole paradox. Here a structure of logical entailment refracts the allusive and taxonomical models of reference in those earlier discussions. The fact that the "lamentable tale" yields a relation to Galileo's paradox (entailing the oddities of an actual logic of the part-whole relation, rather than alluding to an idea of recollection as fulfillment) might seem to contradict the thrust of the "part-whole" addendum by positing the addendum itself as a part equal to the whole. But the point I am attempting to make here is that the concrete functions of a surrogative relation denature the static integrity of the terms of that relation.

Galileo's paradox, the indefinite relation of two sets, becomes even more illuminating in this respect: it is surrogated in turn. For the implicit question of the relations between sets partially persists, surviving the mathematical joke's expurgation, elsewhere than in the sixth addendum. The passage that envelops Galileo's paradox has no direct genetic or diegetic link to the "lamentable tale," but it too concerns an apparently infinite series of terms. Midway through the published novel, Watt steals into Erskine's seemingly impenetrable bedroom and wonders whether or not a picture he finds there is "part and parcel of Mr. Knott's establishment" (W 105). By this point in the narrative the reader has been trained to expect an exhaustingly exhaustive series of permutations involving the logically possible hypotheses about such a question. Instead—and in keeping with the unexplained "ruse" whereby Watt overcomes the apparent logical impossibility of getting into the room—the

writings on Beckett are disappointing. See "L'écriture du générique: Samuel Beckett," in *Conditions* (Paris: Seuil, 1992), 329-366, which offers only a very schematic (and naïvely gendered) Lacanian suggestion that (the lack of) sexual relation between two figures opens up, in some obscure way, onto an equally obscure notion of infinity.

published text elides some of the more involved considerations, which invest Watt with a considerable amount of knowledge about art history, and simply states that "prolonged and irksome meditations forced Watt to the conclusion that the picture was part and parcel of Mr. Knott's establishment" (W 105).[64]

The phrase "part and parcel" twists the problem of the equality of part and whole, and of the finitude or infinitude of a set, into a question opposing (unique) participation in a discrete autonomous whole to generic symbolic formulation: Watt wonders whether the picture was "a fixed and stable member of the edifice [or] simply a manner of paradigm,…a term in a series, like the series of Mr. Knott's dogs, or the series of Mr. Knott's men, or like the centuries that fall, from the pod of eternity" (W 106). This second question, derived from the answer to the first, occasions a different form of the comic elision of prolonged meditations: "a moment's reflexion satisfied Watt that the picture…was one of a series. There were times when Watt could reason rapidly, almost as rapidly as Mr. Nackybal. And there were other times when his thought moved with such extreme slowness that it seemed not to move at all, but to be at a standstill. And yet it moved, like Galileo's cradle. Watt was greatly worried by this disparity. And indeed it contained cause for worry" (W 106).

Bearing in mind that this passage is the first time where the presence of Sam as narrator is fully registered (as I remarked above), there are two points I want to make about this passage and what it implies about the "part-whole" addendum to which it is connected. First, "Eppur si muove" (yet it moves) is what Galileo is alleged to have said to himself, in reference to the earth, immediately after his Inquisitional hearing in 1633. The implication is thoroughly realist: whether or not it is a scandal for religious belief, whether or not it is credited, it is a fact that the earth moves. However, Galileo referred to the earth, while the (narratively fraudulent) movement of Watt's thought (and body, into Erskine's room) is compared to a cradle. The cradle is drawn from a privileged source of imagery and philosophical problematics for Beckett, the Belgian post-Cartesian philosopher Arnold Geulincx.[65] His treatise on ethics presents several images of the separation of mind and the physical, the absence of human causality in the physical realm (including the movement of one's own body). One figure he repeatedly uses to illustrate this idea is the image of a cradle rocked in non-causal coincidence with the baby's desire for it to be rocked (where causality pertains to an order unrelated

---

[64] In fact, one of the most "prolonged and irksome" of the novel's meditations concerns how Watt might be able to get into Erskine's room. The conclusion reads "what with one thing and another,…it seemed that Watt, as he was then, could never get into Erskine's room…as it was then, and that *for Watt to get into Erskine's room, as they were then, Watt would have to be another man, or Erskine's room another room*. And yet, without Watt's ceasing to be what he was, and without the room's ceasing to be what it was, Watt did get into the room, and there learned what he wished to know. Ruse a by, he said" (W 103-104; emphasis added). J.M. Coetzee has analyzed the development of the emphasized part of this passage, arguing that the drafts (which have "would have had to be…") imply a "hypothetical condition (in fact the condition is impossible of fulfillment)" whereas the published text implies a necessary "condition (the condition is impossible of fulfillment, but the verb does not allow this)" (*The English Fiction of Samuel Beckett: An Essay in Stylistic Analysis* [PhD Diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1969], 107, 165; "The Manuscript Revisions of *Watt*," *JML* 2.4 [1972]: 478-479). But Coetzee presumes an anterior first-person present tense direct discourse model of which the actual sentences of the texts are modulations. In other words, he reads this as a kind of *style indirect libre* such as I discussed in chapter one. This leads him astray: the distinction is not between a present tense subjunctive, hypothetical (but practically impossible) imperative and an present tense indicative, concrete (impossible but still legislated) imperative. It is between a past tense subjunctive counterfactual and a tense-ambiguous but (or rather because) subjunctive (hypothetical) imperative. The distinction is not negligible: Watt's solution to the problem is ruse or fraud. The impossible hypothetical imperative subtly undermines the stability of Watt's tale's anteriority to Sam's narration of it, and when we learn that Watt did get into the room while remaining what he was, Watt's actual direct discourse syntactically registers the problematics of temporality by changing itself: "ruse a by." This obviously intensifies the complex interconnections between these moments and Beckett's own compositional "ruses," as we shall see below.

[65] See Ackerley, *Obscure Locks* 132.

and incomprehensible to that desire, i.e. the mother's will).[66] Hence, in this moment where Beckett's revisions of the novel are emphasizing their own incongruity, the phrase "like Galileo's cradle" links the entire indefinite set meditation from the drafts to the question of narrative seriality and paradigmatic figuration (the series of Knott's servants, the picture as paradigm). The link is a kind of non-causal synchrony borrowed from Geulincx.

Moreover, this link is strengthened even further by the fact that Sam compares Watt's reasoning not only to "Galileo's cradle" but also to the rapid thinking of one "Mr. Nackybal." This is the second point I want to make about the passage entailed by the "part-whole" addendum. Watt's swift decision (that the picture is not a fixed part of the finite whole that is Mr. Knott's establishment, but rather a term in a series) involves a strange narrative prolepsis in conjuring the heretofore unmentioned figure of Mr. Nackybal. For a reader encountering the text for the first time, the effect would be indistinguishable from the effect of the duck erratum—namely, utter confusion.[67]

Of course, this confusion will be partly alleviated some forty pages later by Mr. Nackybal's formal introduction into the narrative. He appears as part of a story that Arthur, who replaced Erskine, tells in a confusing attempt to "better illustrate" a nebulous critique of the embargo on contraceptives in the Republic of Ireland.[68] During this strange anecdote, Mr. Nackybal is brought before a university committee by a Mr. Louit to substantiate some of the research for his dissertation, "The Mathematical Intuitions of the Visicelts." Nackybal's supposedly untutored and visionary intuitions consist of the ability to derive the cube roots of numbers with as many as six digits, rapidly and without pen or paper. The figure of Nackybal (a phonetic anagram of Caliban)[69] takes a fairly obvious swipe at the Irish literary revival's idealization of the rustic Irish peasant—a natural man, a "real man at last" like the vagabond whom Belacqua's dog mistakes for a tree in *More*

---

[66] *Ethics, with Samuel Beckett's Notes*, trans. Martin Wilson (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 39. In the annotations, Geulincx writes "Not because I prevail on God with my will to impart the motion that I desire (as the infant moves his mother to rock the cradle), but because God in His ineffable wisdom knew how to enact such laws of motion that, independently of my will and power, a certain motion corresponds exactly with my free will: see the Annotation I made earlier to the analogy of the two clocks. Therefore, the analogy of the baby and his mother on the one hand, and of God and me on the other hand, is a lame one…(God makes motion, the mother does not make it; the baby moves his mother to move, I do not move God). But the whole force and energy of the analogy turn on this, that just as the motion or rocking of the cradle is made with the baby willing it, though the motion is not made by the baby, so equally, motion is often made with me willing it, though I never make it" (249-250, annot).

[67] Coetzee remarks that "a complex but relatively straightforward argument carried on in Watt's mind [although the novel would put it less confidently, as "in his mind, presumably in his mind, whatever that might mean" (W 61)] and reported, in oratio recta and obliqua, in a self-effacing way has been replaced by a summary composed by an editor who makes disparaging remarks about his subject and mystifies his readers by referring to a character who will not be introduced for another forty-three pages" (*The English Fiction of Samuel Beckett* 104). It is an untenable assumption that Watt's "mouthpiece" (W 55) is an "editor," but more importantly, there is nothing "self-effacing" here—if that is meant to refer to Beckett. The revision in fact draws attention to its incoherence by referring to an unknown character.

[68] The embargo was part of an attempt to gain political support for the Free State amongst the clerisy. As some critics have noted, this interlude recalls a short satire that Beckett wrote in 1929 for the university journal *Trinity College Dublin: A Miscellany*, critiquing the ban on contraceptives. It was entitled "Che Sciagura" and signed "D.E.S.C." (for "d'essere senza coglioni"). "O che sciagura d'essere senza coglioni" (O what a misfortune to be without balls) comes from the end of chapter eleven of Voltaire's *Candide*, wherein Cunégonde's servant tells of a eunuch's lament at his vain attempt to rape her. Cunégonde's servant is "étonnée et ravie [!] d'entendre la langue de ma patrie" (shocked and enraptured to hear the language of my fatherland), being the illegitimate child of the pope (Voltaire, *Romans et contes*, ed. Henri Bénac [Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1960], 160-161). The reference surely bears on the figure of "Mother Ireland" as Beckett follows Yeats and Joyce in critiquing it. The connection (already in Voltaire) between the theme of generativity and the mother tongue cannot be incidental, as Ann Banfield has so powerfully shown about Beckett's work more broadly ("Beckett's Tattered Syntax," *Representations* 84 [2004]: 6-29).

[69] The spelling in the drafts is at first "Nacibal," where it replaces the initial "Conan" (NB4.47).

Pricks than Kicks.[70] But Nackybal's visionary mental talents are later revealed to be just as much a ruse as is (at the level of revision) Watt's entry into Erskine's room: he has memorized a formula for arriving at the solutions without actually performing the exponential calculations. It is not his Visiceltic "intuition" but rather "method," as one committee member suspects when he realizes the limits placed on the test sheet provided by Louit.[71] If Louit means for Nackybal to represent the Irish peasant's (pure and perhaps occult) virtues, he is an illegitimate surrogate, a fraud. He is not a "natural man." As a figuration, he is an unnatural man, an irrational number. Louit's deception is not simply an analogue to the racist positivism of a 19th century anthropologist like A.C. Haddon (who attempted to study the racial makeup of Ireland using techniques modeled on Francis Galton's social Darwinist anthropometry).[72] It is also a further development of the aspect of illegitimacy and fraud in Beckett's surrogative figural economy, an aspect first suggested with by political theology of the equally "unnatural" duck's two names.

Thus, this second order surrogation of Galileo—the movement of Watt's mind, the comparison to Nackybal's intuitions, and the disparity between Watt's normal mentation and this nearly visionary rapidity—does indeed "contai[n] cause for worry," though of a different sort than the reader might first surmise. The "disparity" between Watt's faculties is a sign of fraud. Watt's entry into Erskine's room ("ruse a by" as Watt puts it, anticipating his later aphasic reversals of syntax) and his rapid conclusions about the picture are as fraudulent as Nackybal's mathematical intuitions. This is because Beckett has short-circuited the incoherence that resulted from deleting a draft passage that endowed Watt with too much art-historical knowledge—a genetic/referential "ruse" like the one by which Watt gained entry into Erskine's room. The point is that the genetic record reveals how Beckett's text inscribes different orders of fraudulence in a non-causal, occasional series: Nackybal's cultural and mathematical fraud, Watt's epistemological (and burglarious) fraud, *Watt*'s diegetic incoherence and its compositional, genetic fraud (W 106).

In this way, this passage (or rather this series) further surrogates Galileo from the drafts' mathematical formulae. Those formulations of the "lamentable tale" had abstracted from the contents of experience in an attempt to show its infinitely regressive nullity, and the published text's expurgation of those equations (along with their partial reinstatement 'n the part-whole addendum) elided much of the elaboration of Galileo's paradox of the part and the whole. Correlatively, the published text's description of Watt's mental rapidity elides a draft solution of the dilemma posed by the picture, which gave Watt an inconsistent degree of sophistication and knowledge about art. But it does so in a way that inscribes its own caprice: the expurgated passage and its incoherence are surrogated and signaled by what seems to be an erratum (the proleptic reference to Mr. Nackybal). If this is intended to appear as an error—perhaps a representation of scribal error akin to "(MS illegible)" (W 198)—it is a fraudulent one, as much as Nackybal's performance is (as representative

---

[70] *More Pricks than Kicks* 98. See Seán Kennedy, "Irish Literature," (*Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013]): "Beckett takes aim here at the entire discourse of the 'imaginary Irish peasant' that provided much of the stock-in-trade imagery for the early writings of the Irish literary revival. He quietly contrasts this 'real man' with W.B. Yeats's fisherman, the man who was 'but a dream,' and situates him beyond the stifling effects of bourgeois civilisation.…In this passage Belacqua Shuah is rendered complicit with revivalist ideology.…Beckett encodes an entire disposition towards the Irish peasant and implicates our 'dirty low-church Protestant,' however obliquely, in the politics of Protestant ascendancy" (206-207). Here we might have a sort of complement to Eamon as surrogate (representative) of Irish cultural politics.

[71] W 140-163. It is also revealed that his name is not Nackybal but "Tisler" (W 163). Given that Nackybal is an anagram of Caliban, and given Beckett's frequent anagrammatic jokes, then perhaps it is not tendentious to read Lister as an anagram of Elstir, Proust's prototypical visionary painter. That Elstir (though a composite drawing on multiple sources) is a partial (figural rather than literal) anagram of Whistler is curious, especially as it reinforces at one and the same moment the Wildean echo in the figure of Caliban and the problematic of allegorical or symbolic readings.

[72] See Bixby, *Samuel Beckett and the Postcolonial Novel* 135-145.

of the Irish rustic, as capable of such mathematical feats). The allusion to Galileo's cradle that displaces the deleted art-historical "meditations" makes the connection to Mr. Nackybal's fraud (concerned as it is with the relation between natural numbers and their exponentiation) crucially important to the surrogative aesthetics that *Watt* enacts. But it makes that connection only partially legible without reference back to the addendum on the equality of part and the whole, where Galileo's paradox and the draft's mathematical sequence are entailed (without allusion). All this creates a multivalent sort of occasionalist short-circuit amongst (1) the empirical genetic history of the text; (2) the allusive visionary mythopoetics and the facets of political and theological representation and reference at stake with the duck erratum; (3) and the logic of sets, mathematical formulation, and narrative time and seriality at stake here. "Ruse a by," Galileo, in the treetops…

In sum, "the series," Beckett's novelistic stumbling block, which I have discussed in terms of referential/genetic relations understood primarily temporally, can be understood also as a set—not a whole that is the sum of its constituent parts (the quantitative whole of all of Beckett's published individual works), but an indefinite set comprised of irrational or unnatural terms, terms that cannot be quantified. The "series" is not a fact, and neither is there a fact of *Watt* as a whole or a teleological product—and no ideal *Watt* adduced from the sum of the various editions and pre-texts.[73] No apotheosis and no telos to the series. *Watt*'s surrogative relation to literary genetics revises that method's usual logic of excavation and salvage, and gives a further twist to the notion of paralipsis I have deployed throughout this dissertation: each term qualitatively transforms the nature of the series of which it ostensibly is (or was) a part, and there is no term which, once exhumed, would finalize its significance or the novel's. Rather, each of the "units" that seem to require archival elucidation alters the logic of a slew of other elements to which it is related—without the authorization on which a normal concept of substitution depends. And as this section has shown, each term inscribes the fraudulence of its place in the specific surrogative relations amongst the novel and its genetic precursors, in a perfectly determinable but nonetheless problematic way. *Watt* and its manuscripts and intertexts therefore constitute neither a finite set of textual elements in a progressive linear series, nor the paradigm of an infinite, and infinitely equivalent, set of potential substitutes. Rather, they are "part and parcel" of an indefinite serial set: not discrete or empirically exhaustible, not infinite or indifferently identical, but concretely fraudulent and always partial.

V. No Intention where None Surrogated

I began this chapter with the obtrusion of the duck, and in the first section I discussed its series of appearances in the published editions and in the drafts. In the second, I discussed its atavistic or reversionary surrogation by the ostrich in "Echo's Bones." The duck—or at least the erratum—might be the perfect symbol of *Watt*'s surrogative aesthetics. But this would be possible only if, for "symbol," a substitute could be given that bears in its structure the force of its partiality and fraudulence. In the previous section I attended to this question, as well as the related questions of

[73] Not even the "'ideal' (or at least better) edition of *Watt*, derived from an awareness of its evolutionary history" that Ackerley's annotations propose (232). Of course, as even the current Grove editions feature typographical errors of the lowest order (simple misspellings, etc.), the 2011 Faber and Faber edition that Ackerley edited is undeniably the best edition feasible. The trouble, as Gilles Deleuze saw so well, is that the feasible will never be the measure of Beckett's aesthetics (see "L'Épuisé," in Samuel Beckett, *Quad et autres pièces pour la télévision* [Paris: Minuit, 1992], 57-106). My point is simply that *Watt* cannot be gathered into one place or instantiated in one embodiment. This is not because it is ineffable or some kind of *corpus absconditus* susceptible only to a negative theology, but rather because *Watt* is the indefinite set—perfectly concrete—of relations amongst its aesthetic or figural principles, its genetic history, and its publication history.

narrative temporality and the Addenda, with my discussion of Beckett's series of series as an indefinite set. The erratum, the unabandoned work, and the indefinite set have elaborated an aesthetic mode capable of surrogating the language of symbol in this way. Thus, I shall conclude with the last line of *Watt* (the last of the "Addenda's" lapidary genetic vestiges: "no symbols where none intended" [W 214]) and the duck's last real obtrusion in the drafts, which it echoes. I turn to it also to turn away from the duck, in a sense; call it a last twist of the surrogative screw, for the phrase evidently concerns the figural status of Eamon, among other things. It is yet another quandary that yields no empirical solution, and brings the concept of the surrogative to its most robustly scandalous form.

Not too long after the revelation of the duck's name in the drafts' conversation, the draft-narrator tries to engage a glum and silent Arsene, noting that night has fallen and that "we are in the dark, Arsene…each in his different way, all are in the dark." He strikes a match, which soon extinguishes.

> In its little light, we had seen, dimly: Eamon sitting on his mat as good as gold, and Arsene lying in a heap where he had fallen, and the passage and the stairs and the newell and the bells, all as we had left them, and the dark in which we all were, each in his or her own way, and Eamon and Arsene and the passage and the stairs and the bells and the newell and we.
> No symbols where none intended.
> "Arsene" we said.
> "Yes" said Arsene.
> "You are not angry with us?"
> "No." (NB3.11; TS 183)

Why this odd phrase here, with its concern about symbols and intention? In considering its force, perhaps we should say, with Beckett, that a question about symbol and intention is "entièrement une question de voix" (entirely a matter of voices).[74] Or, what amounts to the same thing, a question of manuscripts, handwritings—since we should remember that like Arsene's change, Watt's tale is a "revelation, to [Sam]," his "mouthpiece."[75] Hence, with respect to this line, which will become the published novel's last word, Maurice Blanchot's famous query about Beckett is ineluctable: "qui parle ici?" (who speaks here?).[76]

For the statement "no symbols where none intended" is not direct dialogue, which is signaled consistently by quotation marks in both the manuscript and the typescript (if not in the published text). It seems not to be the judgment of a narrator so firmly diegetically embedded; that is, too intensely metaleptic to be any normal sort of metalepsis. The phrase is so out of joint with the surrounding context that it is more than a simple step back from the narrated moment into the moment of narration. Rather, it seems to irrupt into the silence and twilight of the scene like a voice from elsewhere, or like a more profound darkness whose source is not to be intuited. Irrespective of any possible attribution to a speaker (if that is the right word), the phrase gains nothing in clarity or

---

[74] *L'innommable* 77-78; *Three Novels* 319.

[75] In NB5.9, "~~his amanuensis~~ <his mouthpiece>."

[76] *Le livre à venir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959, 1986), 289. This particular instance shows the problem with Van Hulle's remark (in rejoinder to Foucault's use of the Beckett line "qu'importe qui parle?" [what matter who speaks?]) that, with Beckett, "it is paradoxically necessary to find out who is speaking in order to be able to examine whether it matters or not" (*Manuscript Genetics* 152). It may be necessary but it is impossible—an apparently empirical question for which no empirical answer suffices.

purport by looking at it in its genetically original context. Any questions about this final line of the published novel that might have been answered by genetic research are only deepened by it.

As an addendum, it is about as Wildean an epigram as Beckett ever wrote. The 1968 French translation, prepared in collaboration with Ludovic and Agnès Janvier, gives "honni soit qui symboles y voit."[77] This French version (of which the literal sense would be "shamed be who sees symbols in it"), of course, invokes the motto of the British chivalric Order of the Garter ("honi soit qui mal y pense") credited to King Edward III—in some accounts, at the crucial Battle of Crécy.[78] And this is the sort of authority conferred on the addendum: following much the same hermeneutic tendency one finds with Wilde's preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, critics nearly always take "no symbols where none intended" as a ban on unauthorized interpretation, rather than an imperative to confront its implications.[79] In short, they read it as a condemnation of those who would read symbolically or, in Wilde's words, "those who go beneath the surface."[80] But what, one asks—and with the best of intentions—is the force of this phrase? What is one doing when one reads it? In fact, it seems to have been so effective in its presupposed authorial legislative capacity, that everyone has passed over one of the most obvious things about it.[81]

The phrase is self-evidently about, but also a material engagement with, surface and symbol, effect and intention. It not only invokes the motto of the Order of the Garter but also thereby recalls a singularly knotty manuscript crux in English literary history, that of the 14th-century romance *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. A densely symbolical work, it is preserved in only one manuscript, at the end of which is written "hony soyt qui mal pence." Scholarship continues to puzzle over the phrase's presence—was it written by the same scribe at a later date, or by another hand? And to what end?—and more broadly about the relationship of the poem to the Order.[82] For

---

[77] Samuel Beckett, *Watt*, trans. Ludovic and Agnès Janvier with Samuel Beckett (Paris: Minuit, 1968), 268.

[78] The origins of the motto, as of the Order itself, are debated. For a recent and persuasive account, see Stephanie Trigg, *Shame and Honor: A Vulgar History of the Order of the Garter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), especially chapter 2. Elias Ashmole, in his 1672 work on the Order, claimed that Edward III said these words and gave his garter as the signal to attack at the Battle of Crécy in 1346. Another more complicated origin story is discussed at length in Trigg's book (it concerns a lady's wardrobe malfunction at a ball, redeemed by Edward's offer of his garter and the motto as a rebuke to the onlookers).

[79] For instance, Deirdre Bair cites Jack MacGowran's account of Beckett's advice about various interpretive possibilities in a dramatic reading: "He kept repeating that line from *Watt*—'no symbols where none intended.' At that time he was very annoyed with the symbol-hunting scholars who seemed to be breathing down his neck all the time" (*Samuel Beckett: A Biography* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978, 1990], 556). What is not explicitly stated here but is to my mind rather obvious is that the issue is less the possibility of unintentional symbolism (Beckett was not an imbecile) than Beckett's frustration at being sought out as the arbiter of the legitimacy of symbolic meaning(s).

[80] The following, from the almost unbelievably appropriately named Jeremy Parrott, is representative: "'no symbols where none intended' [is] seemingly a warning to would-be symbol hunters to leave well alone. However, this double negation [*sic*] can also be read as an invitation to look more closely, since we may also understand that all the symbols which can be discerned are the product of authorial intention. I certainly adopt the latter position" ("'Riley's Puckaun Again,' or, What Became of Watt: A Millennial Reading of the Ending to Samuel Beckett's *Watt*," *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 9.2 [Fall 2003]: 181).

[81] Or almost everyone: I recently found one critic who noticed it. Mary Lydon, in an essay devoted not to Beckett but to Mallarmé and Proust, briefly but eloquently discusses the echo. (One imagines further discussion would have appeared in the book she was writing on Beckett at the time of her death.) See Mary Lydon, "Skirting the Issue: Mallarmé, Proust, and Symbolism," *Yale French Studies* 74 (1988): 157-181.

[82] Canonical accounts of the manuscript include Israel Gollancz's introduction to his manuscript facsimile edition *Pearl, Cleanness, Patience* and *Sir Gawain* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1923) and A.S.G. Edwards, "The Manuscript: British Library MS Cotton Nero A.x," *A Companion to the* Gawain-*Poet*, ed. Derek Brewer and Jonathan Gibson (Cambridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1997), 197-219. Francis Ingledew, in support of a controversial attempt to date the manuscript roughly half a century earlier than the generally accepted dating (in 1346 rather than in the last part of the 14th century), cites personal correspondence from the eminent paleographer Malcolm Parkes to the effect that it was the same scribal hand (Sir Gawain and the Green Knight *and the Order of the Garter* [Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre

Stephanie Trigg, the poem "exemplifies the problems of untangling knots and allusions" in historical research on the Order. Moreover, it is "closely concerned with the life of signs: their transmutation and their interpretation," and the appearance of the Garter motto is "concrete evidence…that at least one reader thought the romance referred directly to the Order of the Garter, and wanted to assert or underline that connection." Beyond such potentially direct reference, the motto stands as a complex figure or the poem's symbolism, which also "positively celebrates its own ambivalence." Analyzing the enigmatic style of many such mottos and signs in the period, Trigg concludes that

> The occulted quality of the Garter motto may even be its primary meaning, rather than an oblique reference to an original event of which we have lost all trace.…Either way, this provocative motto—*Honi soit qui mal y pense*—becomes a kind of small but powerful textual machine for generating explanations and etiological narratives. Its long history is as complex as that of the garter itself, as that most ephemeral of garments becomes a richly symbolic sign, capable of endless transformation across a series of embodied, sartorial, and heraldic contexts.[83]

Thus the Garter motto, as an addendum to the *Gawain* manuscript, both sends us in quest of historical answers and duplicitously symbolizes the poem's figural economy, its interpretive inaccessibility condemning those who would stand in judgment, reflecting judgment back onto the judge. In other words, the poem's hermeneutic questions converge with textual and historical ones.

The poem concerns Gawain, an Arthurian knight whose blazon is the pentangle, and whose quest is a test of his fidelity and self-evidently truthful perfection (or "trowth"), of which the pentangle is the "fixed sign."[84] Bound by the terms of a game of reciprocity to seek out the Green Knight and submit to beheading, he finds temporary shelter and hospitality in the home of a strangely friendly lord (not unlike Belacqua in "Echo's Bones," or Watt himself). After refusing the advances of the lady of the hall, he accepts from her a love-token—a green girdle imbued with a supernatural protective power that protects him from harm. It saves him from beheading by the Green Knight (the strangely friendly lord in disguise), but thereby becomes or is revealed to be, in Gawain's eyes, the symbol of his infidelity to his quest (breaking his covenant with the lord, breaking the terms of the beheading game with the Green Knight).

The Green Knight, however, disputes this symbolic interpretation, calling it a "pure token" of Gawain's adventure. Upon his return to Arthur's court, Gawain confesses the failure of his quest and swears to wear the girdle forever as a sign of his shame. The court mocks him and Arthur instead canonizes the garment as the heraldic emblem of the court,[85] masking Gawain's shame in plain sight while allowing him to satisfy his demonstrative shame—or surrogating its symbolic value with the symbolic value of symbolic value.[86] As Ralph Hanna has argued, the poem thus unfolds "the persistent intractability of experience…and the often self-willed limitation of human efforts to comprehend [it]. The multitude of interpretations to which characters subject a green silk belt…suggests both the difficulty of knowing a simple physical object and the potential caprice

---

Dame Press, 2006], 224n10). Other scholars see the handwriting of the motto inscription as a more open question. See for example Edwards, "The Manuscript;" Stephanie Trigg, *Shame and Honor*, 58ff; A.C. Spearing, *Readings in Medieval Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 205.

[83] Trigg 60-61; 71; 72-73.

[84] Ralph Hanna, "Unlocking What's Locked: Gawain's Green Girdle," *Viator* 14 (1983): 289-302, at 290.

[85] See Hanna, "Unlocking What's Locked," especially 290-298.

[86] In a peculiar way, this sort of open secret puts one in mind of what Eve Sedgwick called the "empty secret" in Wilde—in this instance, that of the green carnation that Wilde had friends wear at the premiere of *Lady Windermere's Fan* on February 20, 1892 (*Epistemology of the Closet* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990], 164-165).

involved in all human claims to knowledge."[87] Hence, Gawain's personal blazon, the Solomonic "pentangle, the emblem of a world where meaning is clear and exemplary (if not locked to the point of rigidity)," is surrogated by an essentially polysemous or problematic symbol. "Although it stands to the pentangle as failure to perfection, [the girdle's] significance remains slippery and equivocal. And that…is just the point of the poem: Gawain in his failure…finds himself inhabiting a world where the promise of perfection is distant indeed" (Hanna 290).

Nevertheless, of course, the garter does still have meaning—whether as a token of solidarity with Gawain, a private mark of shame, an emblem of the ineffable authority of chivalric codes, or an unstable relation amongst these and other partial and partly present meanings. Likewise, the Garter motto itself is not simply indeterminate. For Edward III, it was an expression of authority and legitimacy through signifying power. In this, the Garter motto—but not just the motto, nor just the poem, but also their indefinite and yet concrete relation to one another—offers a strange emblem or blazon of the relation of *Watt* to its genetic record, a blazon or emblem of Beckett's surrogative aesthetics (of which the final "no symbols where none intended" is so frequently taken as the motto). Finally, whether Beckett knew of the *Gawain* manuscript and its addendum when he appended the Addenda to the English text of *Watt* in 1945,[88] or only later with the French translation—or whether he never knew of it—is ultimately irrelevant. Although it may never have occurred to Beckett to make this connection—to surrogate the complex symbolic economy that the Garter motto inscribes in relation to the poem—it nevertheless occurred. "No harm [or offense] where none intended," the addendum's model,i does not intend the annihilation of negative effects; it only severs the causal relation between such effects and a discrete authorial act answerable to judgment, and disbars nominating those effects as "harm." "No harm where none intended" does not prevent or fully erase real harmful effects; nether does "no symbols where none intended" revoke or fully delete symbolic effects (by way of some autocratic intentional power of the author). No, the surrogative persists, partially, irrespective of authorial intention, be it in the modality of a later hand (the typesetter's, the Janviers') inscribing the motto of the Order of the Garter into *Watt*, just as happened in the transmission history of the *Gawain* manuscript. This is a kind of "symbol" or "paradigm" for what the erratum and the unabandoned work do to *Watt*—its genetic history, signifying logic, and "place in the series."

The surrogative relation, I claim, generates its own explanatory and justificatory power, since it registers a problem implicit in the Addenda and irreducible to empirical resolution. But it also figures its own partiality or fraudulence. The "no symbols" addendum thus problematizes the status of its own significance—even as it unfolds as a properly unintended symbol like the canard that opened this inquiry. That is, irrespective of the symbolic value in the draft version of what has become the "no symbols" addendum, and irrespective of whatever intentional content Beckett invested in the phrase, the addendum surrogates itself into a "textual machine for generating explanations" (Trigg 72-73), for surrogating them, for problematizing the ostensive difference between textual and hermeneutic questions, for interposing the possibility of fraud or polyvalent illegitimate textual displacement into any apparently static symbol. No symbols where none intended: No intentions where none surrogated.

A final device of the surrogative machine: contingent though it may be, there is no expurgating the relation between the Garter motto's "autosymbolism"[89] and Arsene's mystical

---

[87] "Unlocking What's Locked" 302.

[88] They were added, evidently, only on the final typescript, of which no copy survives. Ackerley rightly infers, on the basis of Beckett's handwritten corrections of the galley proofs (and the absence of the collected Addenda in the late notebooks), that they must have been appended at this stage.

[89] Beckett, *Proust* [1931] (New York: Grove Press, 1957), 60.

"change," around which almost all of this chapter has danced. In his monologue, Arsene describes that change most explicitly in physical terms. His chest, "on which I could almost feel the feathers stirring,…relapsed into the void and bony concavity which my dear tutor used to say reminded him of Crécy." Crécy, then, names the unlocalizable moment of Arsene's change (names it in the way that "Nuala" or "Eamon" names the duck). Of what is Crécy symbolic, that is to say, surrogative? Perhaps we are meant to think of Proust's Odette de Crécy, who married Swann. If so, it is worth noting that in the drafts (and the addenda), Quin's mother was "Leda, née Swann."[90] Arsene's concave bird-chest—which (almost) "had pretty plumage once"[91]—would then be a kind of Proustian-Yeatsian joke.[92] But, the most compelling significance, I would suggest, is also the most non-empirical, since it is impossible to read it as authorially "intended." Crécy was the site of a decisive battle for Edward III's England during the Hundred Years War and, as I mentioned above, some accounts place his inaugural use of the Garter motto on the battlefield. The possible explanations for this strange association occurring just at the fault line of Arsene's "change"—and for the compositional change from "Agincourt" to "Crécy" (NB4.267)—"bristle with alternatives," as Beckett wrote of Proust's proliferating explanations.[93]

It is in that sense that I have sought to "explain" genetic changes and textual-hermeneutic quandaries in *Watt*: as Beckett put it of Proust's metastasizing explanatory accounts, I have "explained them in order that they may appear as they are—inexplicable" (*Proust* 67). They are inexplicable in an almost literal way. We cannot unfold and finally separate the entangled pieces: there is no difference between *Watt* and its genetic prehistory, between its hermeneutic questions and its textual questions, between the series of Watt's crises, the genetic series of *Watt*'s composition, and the series of Beckett's works. They constitute a concrete but indefinite set, and so cannot be explicated by empirical answers that would disentangle the textual and genetic from the hermeneutic and aesthetic. Beckett's canard—the thing he half-sells criticism—is a quandary of an apparently empirical sort that yields no empirical answer. In the 1930s Beckett wrote the phrase "all his imperatives were hypothetical" in a commonplace notebook. Here all the rare birds are hypothetical and imperative: the series of genetic *avant-textes* exists in a problematic mode, as does *Watt*, finally. In order to confront the novelistic stumbling block that Beckett gives us with *Watt*, a critical method different than we are disposed to conceive is required. The logic for that method is what this dissertation has sought to elaborate—the aesthetics of things passed over.

---

[90] *Watt*'s first addendum ("her married life one long drawsheet" [W 205]) refers to the drafts' mention of Quin's (Knott's) mother, "Leda, née Swan, demi-mondaine, of Enniskillen" (TS 41).

[91] Yeats, "Among School Children," l.30.

[92] Proust's Odette de Crécy marries Swann.

[93] *Proust* 61. Or perhaps—I cannot stop myself from making one last gratuitous association—he was preparing a place for the potential surrogative relation between Crécy and its bastard anglicized form, Creasy?

Bibliography

Ackerley, C.J. "Fatigue and Disgust: The Addenda to *Watt*." *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui* 2 (1993): 175-188.

_____. *Obscure Locks, Simple Keys: The Annotated* Watt. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

_____. "Samuel Beckett and Max Nordau." In *Beckett after Beckett*. S.E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann, eds. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006. 167-176.

_____, and S.E. Gontarski, eds. *The Grove Companion to Samuel Beckett*. New York: Grove Press, 2004.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie. Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 7. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1970, 1996.

_____. *Aesthetic Theory*. Trans. and ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

_____. *Hegel: Three Studies*. Trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.

_____. *Lectures on Negative Dialectics*. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Trans. Rodney Livinsgstone. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.

_____. *Negative Dialektik. Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 6. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann et al. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1970, 2003.

Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri*. 3 vols. Trans. and ed. Robert M. Durling. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996-2011.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New ed. New York: Verso, 2006.

Anon., *Pearl, Cleanness, Patience* and *Sir Gawain*. Ed. Israel Gollancz. London: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Ardis, Ann. *Modernism and Cultural Conflict, 1880-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Badiou, Alain. *Conditions*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.

Bair, Deirdre. *Samuel Beckett: A Biography*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978, 1990.

Bal, Mieke. "Fonction de la description Romanesque: La description de Rouen dans *Madame Bovary*." *Revue des Langues Vivants/Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen* 40.2 (1974): 132-149.

Balzac, Honoré de. *Illusions perdues* [1837-1843]. *La Comédie humaine*. Vol. 5. Ed. Pierre-Georges Castex, et. al. Paris: Gallimard, 1977.

Banfield, Ann. "Beckett's Tattered Syntax." *Representations* 84 (2004): 6-29.

Barkan, Leonard. "'Living Sculptures': Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter's Tale*." *ELH* 48.4 (Winter 1981): 639-667.

Barnes, Djuna. *Ryder* [1928, 1979]. Champaign, IL: Dalkey Archive, 1990.

Barthes, Roland. *Le bruissement de la langue*. Paris: Seuil, 1984.

Beckett, Samuel. *Beckett's Dream Notebook*. Ed. John Pilling. Reading, UK: University of Reading, 1999.

_____. *Comment c'est*. Paris: Minuit, 1961.

_____. *Disjecta*. Ed. Ruby Cohn. New York: Grove, 1984.

_____. *Echo's Bones*. Ed. Mark Nixon. London: Faber and Faber, 2014.

_____. *How It Is*. New York: Grove, 1964, 1970.

_____. *L'innommable*. Paris: Minuit, 1953.

_____. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*. 3 vols. Ed. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009-.

_____. *Molloy* (Paris: Minuit, 1982.

_____. *More Pricks than Kicks*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010.
_____. *Murphy*. New York: Grove, 1957.
_____. *Proust* [1931]. New York: Grove Press, 1957.
_____. *Three Novels: Molloy, Malone Dies, The Unnamable*. New York: Groves Press, 2013.
_____. *Watt* Manuscripts. 6 Notebooks. Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin. TXRC00-A1, box 6, folders 5-6; box 7, folders 1-4.
_____. *Watt* Typescript. Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin. TXRC00-A1, box 7, folders 5-6.
_____. *Watt*. Paris: Olympia Press, 1953.
_____. *Watt*. New York: Grove, 1959.
_____. *Watt*. Trans. Ludovic and Agnès Janvier with Samuel Beckett. Paris: Minuit, 1968.
_____. *Watt*. New York: Grove, 2006.
Beckson, Karl. *Oscar Wilde: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 2000.
Bellemin-Noël, Jean. *Le texte et l'avant-texte: Les brouillons d'un poème de Milosz*. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1972.
Bénard, Charles, trans. *Cours d'esthétique, par W.-Fr. Hegel*. Vol. 1. Paris: André, 1840.
Bersani, Leo. *The Culture of Redemption*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
de Biasi, Pierre-Marc. "Secrets d'écriture, écritures du secret: Les procédures de cryptage dans *Madame Bovary*." *Modern Language Notes* 122.4 (2007): 779-796.
_____, ed. Gustave Flaubert, *Carnets de travail*. Paris: Balland, 1988.
Bixby, Patrick. *Samuel Beckett and the Postcolonial Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Blanchot, Maurice. *Le livre à venir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1959, 1986.
Blanton. C.D. *Epic Negation: The Dialectical Poetics of Late Modernism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
Bly, Robin. *The Freak-Garde: Extraordinary Bodies and Revolutionary Art in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
Bolin, John. *Beckett and the Modern Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
Bornstein, George, ed. *Representing Modernist Texts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
Bourdieu, Pierre. *Les règles de l'art: Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.
_____. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
Brake, Laurel. "The Discourses of Journalism: 'Arnold and Pater' Again—and Wilde." In *Pater in the 1990s*. Laurel Brake and Ian Small, eds. Greensboro, NC: ELT Press, 1991.
Broe, Mary Lynn, ed. *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.
Bush, Ronald. "In Pursuit of Wilde Possum: Reflections on Eliot, Modernism, and the Nineties," *Modernism/modernity* 11.3 (2004): 469-485.
_____. "'Intensity by association': T.S. Eliot's Passionate Allusions," *Modernism/modernity* 20.4 (2014): 709-727.
Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
Calhoun, L. "A Woman's Hero." *The Argonaut*, vol. CIV, no. 2683 (1 September 1928): 12.
Caselli, Daniela. *Improper Modernism: Djuna Barnes's Bewildering Corpus*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
Clark, T.J. *Farewell to an Idea: Episodes from a History of Modernism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
Coetzee, J.M. *The English Fiction of Samuel Beckett: An Essay in Stylistic Analysis*. PhD Diss. University of Texas, Austin, 1969.
_____. "The Manuscript Revisions of *Watt*." *JML* 2.4 (1972): 478-479.

Cohen, Ed. *Talk on the Wilde Side: Towards a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
Cohen, Philip. *The Moral Vision of Oscar Wilde*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1978.
Collier, Patrick. *Modernism on Fleet Street*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006.
Coutts, J.A. *The Indian Runner Duck: Its Origin, History, Breeding and Management*. London: Feathered World, 1926.
Craft, Christopher. "Come See About Me: Enchantment of the Double in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Representations* 91 (Summer 2005): 109-136.
Dalton, Anne B. "Escaping from Eden: Djuna Barnes' Revision of Psychoanalytic Theory and Her Treatment of Father-Daughter Incest in *Ryder*." *Women's Studies* 22 (1993): 163-179.
Darwin, Charles. *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*. Vol. 1 [1868]. New York: Appleton, 1898.
Deleuze, Gilles. "L'Épuisé." In Samuel Beckett, *Quad et autres pièces pour la télévision*. Paris: Minuit, 1992.
Deppmann, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden. "Introduction: A Genesis of French Genetic Criticism." In *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*. Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, eds. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
DeSalvo, Louise. *Conceived with Malice*. New York: Dutton, 1994.
Dord-Crouslé, Stéphanie. "Les deux bibliothèques religieuses de *Madame Bovary,*" in Madame Bovary *et les savoirs*. Gisèle Séginger and Pierre-Louis Rey, eds. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009.
Dowling, Linda. *Language and Decadence in the Victorian Fin de Siècle*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
_____. *The Vulgarization of Art: The Victorians and Aesthetic Democracy*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1996.
Edmunds, Susan. *Grotesque Relations: Modernist Domestic Fiction and the U.S. Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Edwards, A.S.G. "The Manuscript: British Library MS Cotton Nero A.x." *A Companion to the* Gawain-*Poet*. Derek Brewer and Jonathan Gibson, eds. Cambridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1997.
Eliot, T.S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1932.
_____. *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.
Ellmann, Richard. *Oscar Wilde*. New York: Vintage, 1987.
Faltejskova, Monika. *Djuna Barnes, T.S. Eliot and the Gender Dynamics of Modernism: Tracing Nightwood.* New York: Routledge, 2010.
Ferguson, Frances. *Pornography, the Theory: What Utilitarianism Did to Action*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
Ferrer, Daniel. "Production, Invention, and Reproduction." In *Reimagining Textuality: Textual Studies in the Late Age of Print*. Elizabeth Bergmann Loizeaux and Neil Fraistat, eds. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.
Flaubert, Gustave. *Correspondance*. Vol. 2. Ed. Jean Bruneau. Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 1980.
_____. *Madame Bovary (Mœurs de Province)* [October-December 1856]. *Revue de Paris*. Vol. 40. Geneva: Slatkine, 1972.
_____. *Œuvres complètes, Tome III: 1851-1862*. Ed. Claudine Gothot-Mersch et al. Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 2013.
Flint, Kate. ""The pools, the depths, the dark places: Women, Censorship and the Body 1894-1931." *Essays and Studies* 46 (1993): 118-130.

Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.2-4 (Spring, Summer, and Autumn 1945): 221-240, 433-456, and 643-653.
Frankel, Nicholas. "Preface" and "Introduction." In Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray: An Annotated, Uncensored Edition*. Ed. Nicholas Frankel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
_____. "Wilde's *Intentions* and the Simulation of Meaning." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 24 (1996): 155-137.
Freud, Sigmund. *Gesammelte Werke*. 18 vols. Ed. Anna Freud et al. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 1991-1998.
_____. *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. 24 vols. Gen. ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974.
Gagnier, Regenia. *Idylls of the Marketplace: Oscar Wilde and the Victorian Public*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.
Genette, Gérard. *Figures I*. Paris: Seuil, 1966.
_____. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.
Geulincx, Arnold. *Ethics, with Samuel Beckett's Notes* [1675]. Trans. Martin Wilson. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.
Girard, René. *Le bouc émissaire*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1982.
_____. *Des choses cachées depuis la fondation du monde*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1978.
Gissing, George. *New Grub Street* [1891]. New York: Modern Library, 2002.
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "Cephalus und Prokris, nach Julius Roman." In *Ästhetische Schriften V: 1824-1832*. Ed. Anne Bohnenkamp. Frankfurt a.M.: Deutsche Klassiker, 1999.
Gontarski, S.E. "Editing Beckett," *Twentieth-Century Literature* 41.2 (Summer 1995): 190-207.
Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Grésillon, Almuth. *Éléments de critique génétique: Lire les manuscrits modernes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.
Grossman, Jonathan. *The Art of Alibi: English Law Courts and the Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
Groupe d'Histoire et d'Études de Bihorel. "Origine du nom des 'trois pipes.'" <gheb.pagesperso-orange.fr/trois_pipes.htm> Accessed 4 June 2015.
Guillois, Ambroise. *Explication historique, dogmatique, morale, liturgique et canonique du catéchisme, avec la réponse aux principales objections tires des sciences contre la religion*. 4 vols. Le Mans: Lanier et Monnoyer, 1849.
Guy, Josephine M., and Ian Small. *The Textual Condition of Nineteenth-Century Literature*. London: Routledge, 2012.
Hanna, Ralph. "Unlocking What's Locked: Gawain's Green Girdle." *Viator* 14 (1983): 289-302.
Hayman, David. "How Two Love Letters Elicited a Singular Third Person: Generating a Watt." In *Beckett after Beckett*. S.E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann, eds. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2006.
Haynes, Christine. "The Politics of Publishing during the Second Empire: The Trial of *Madame Bovary* Revisited." *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 23.2 (2005): 1-27.
Hay, Louis. "Critiques de la critique génétique." *The Romanic Review* 86.3 (May 1995): 403-417.
Hegel, G.W.F. *The Encyclopædia Logic*. Trans. T.F. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H.S. Harris. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991.
_____. *Faith and Knowledge*. Trans. and ed. Walter Cerf and H.S. Harris. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1977.
_____. *Hegel's Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. 2 vols. Trans. T.M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975, 1988.

_____. *The Science of Logic*. Trans. and ed. George di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
_____. *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*. New rev. ed. Eva Moldenhauer und Karl Markus Michel, eds. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1969-79.
Henley, William Ernest. *The Letters of William Ernest Henley to Charles Whibley, 1888-1903*. Vol. 1. Ed. Damian Atkinson. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2013.
Hesiod. *Works and Days and Theogony*. Trans. Stanley Lombardo. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993.
Holland, Merlin. *The Real Trial of Oscar Wilde*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.
Hollander, Robert. *Allegory in Dante's* Commedia. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
Van Hulle, Dirk. *Manuscript Genetics, Joyce's Know-How, Beckett's Nohow*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008.
_____. *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing from Darwin to Beckett and Beyond*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
Hultgren, Neil. "Oscar Wilde's Poetic Injustice in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." In *Wilde Discoveries: Traditions, Histories, Archives*. Ed. Joseph Bristow. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
Hynes, Samuel. *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*. New York: Atheneum, 1991.
Hyppolite, Jean. *Logique et existence: Essai sur la logique de Hegel*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961.
Ingledew, Francis. Sir Gawain and the Green Knight *and the Order of the Garter*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981.
Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
Jay, Martin. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
Jenny, Laurent. "Genetic Criticism and its Myths." *Yale French Studies* 89 (1996): 9-25.
Joyce, James. *The James Joyce Archive*. Vol. 30. Ed. Michael Groden et al. New York: Garland, 1977-79.
Justice, Steven. "Chaucer's History-Effect." In *Answerable Style: The Idea of the Literary in Medieval England*. Andrew Galloway and Frank Grady, eds. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2013.
Kennedy, Seán. "'Bid Us Sigh on from Day to Day': Beckett and the Irish Big House." In *Edinburgh Companion to Samuel Beckett and the Arts*. Ed. S.E. Gontarski. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
_____. "*First Love*: Abortion and Infanticide in Beckett and Yeats." *Samuel Beckett Today/Aujourd'hui* 22 (2010): 79-91.
_____. "Irish Literature." In *Samuel Beckett in Context*. Ed. Anthony Uhlmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury, 1997.
Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits*. New ed. Vol. 1. Paris: Seuil, 1999.
_____. *Le Séminaire, Livre XI: Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse 1964*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.
LaCapra, Dominick. Madame Bovary *on Trial*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.
Laplanche, Jean. *Essays on Otherness*. Ed. John Fletcher. London: Routledge, 1999.
_____. *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*. Trans. David Macey. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
Latham, Sean. *Am I A Snob?: Modernism and the Novel*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.
Lavin, Irving. "Cephalus and Procris: Underground Transformations." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17.3-4 (1954): 366-372.

Lawler, Donald. *An Inquiry into Oscar Wilde's Revisions of* The Picture of Dorian Gray. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988.
Leclerc, Yvan. *Crimes écrits: La littérature en procès au 19e siècle*. Paris: Plon, 1991.
Lewis, Wyndham, ed. *BLAST 1* [June 20, 1914]. Santa Rosa, CA: Black Sparrow Press, 2002.
Lydon, Mary. "Skirting the Issue: Mallarmé, Proust, and Symbolism." *Yale French Studies* 74 (1988): 157-181.
Lyotard, Jean-François. *Discours, figure*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1971.
_____. *Discourse, Figure*. Trans. Anthony Hudek and Mary Lydon. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
Marcus, Jane. "Laughing at Leviticus: *Nightwood* as Woman's Circus Epic." In *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes*. Ed. Mary Lynn Broe. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.
Mason, Stuart. *Oscar Wilde: Art and Morality*. London: Frank Palmer, 1912.
McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1983, 1992.
_____. *Black Riders: The Visible Language of Modernism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
_____. *Social Values and Poetic Acts: The Historical Judgment of Literary Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
_____. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
McNaughton, James. "Samuel Beckett's "Echo's Bones": Politics and Entailment in the Irish Free-State." *Modern Fiction Studies* 60.2 (Summer 2014): 320-344.
Mighall, Robert, ed. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. New York: Penguin, 2003.
Miller, Tyrus. *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
Monsman, Gerald. "The Platonic Eros of Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde: 'Love's Reflected Image' in the 1890s," *English Literature in Transition* 45.1 (2002): 26-45.
_____. *Walter Pater's Art of Autobiography*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
Naddaff, Ramona. "Confronting the Frugal Editors: The *Revue de Paris*' *Madame Bovary*." *Law, Culture, and the Humanities* 3 (2007): 266-292.
Neefs, Jacques. "'Du réel écrit…'." *MLN* 122:4 (2007): 697-712.
Nordau, Max. *Degeneration* [1891]. Lincoln, NE: University Press of Nebraska, 1999.
Novak, Daniel A. *Realism, Photography and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
O'Neal, Hank. *"Life is painful, nasty, and short… in my case it has been only painful and nasty." Djuna Barnes, 1978-1981: An Informal Memoir*. New York: Paragon House, 1990.
Olmsted, William. "Improper Appearances: Censorship and the Carriage Scene in *Madame Bovary*." In *Efficacité/Efficacy: How to Do Things with Words and Images?* Véronique Plesch and Catriona MacLeod, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011.
Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. A.D. Melville. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 1986.
_____. *Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. With trans. by Frank Justus Miller. Rev. G.P. Goold. London: Heinemann, 1984.
Parkes, Adam. *Modernism and the Theater of Censorship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Pater, Walter. *Appreciations, With an Essay on Style*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1889.
_____. *Marius the Epicurean: His Sensations and Ideas* [1885]. Ed. Gerald Monsman. Kansas City: Valancourt, 2008.
_____. *Plato and Platonism: A Series of Lectures*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893, 1907.

_____. *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* [1873]. Ed. Matthew Beaumont. New York: Oxford World's Classics, 2010.
Parrott, Jeremy. "'Riley's Puckaun Again,' or, What Became of Watt: A Millennial Reading of the Ending to Samuel Beckett's *Watt*." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 9.2 [Fall 2003]: 181-188.
Plato. *Complete Works*. Ed. John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.
Poole, Kristen. "Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.1 (Spring 1995): 47-75.
Potter, Rachel. *Obscene Modernism: Literary Censorship and Experiment, 1900-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Pseudo-Apollodorus. *Bibliotheca*. Ed. Sir James George Frazer. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Apollod> Accessed May 10, 2017.
Puckett, Kent. *Bad Form: Social Mistakes and the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Pound, Joyce and Eco: Modernism and the 'Ideal Genetic Reader'." *Romanic Review* 86.3 (May 1995): 485-501.
Raitt, Alain. "'Nous étions à l'étude'." In "Flaubert 5: Mythes et religions." *Revue des lettres modernes* 777. Paris-Caen: Lettres modernes minard, 1986.
Ramazani, Vaheed. *The Free Indirect Mode: Flaubert and the Poetics of Irony*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1988.
Rancière, Jacques. *La chair des mots*. Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1998.
_____. *La parole muette: Essai sur les contradictions de la littérature*. Paris: Hachette Littératures, 1998.
_____. *Politique de la littérature*. Paris: Galilée, 2007.
Ricœur, Paul. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. Trans. Denis Savage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
Riffaterre, Michael. "Flaubert's Presuppositions." *Diacritics* 11.4 (1981): 2-11.
Riquelme, John Paul. "Oscar Wilde's Aesthetic Gothic: Walter Pater, Dark Enlightenment, and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *MFS* 46.3 (Fall 2000): 609-31.
_____. "T.S. Eliot's Ambivalences: Oscar Wilde as Masked Precursor." *The Hopkins Review* 5.3 (Summer 2012): 353-379.
Roberts, M.J.D. "Morals, Art, and the Law: The Passing of the Obscene Publications Act, 1857." *Victorian Studies* 28.4 (Summer 1985): 609-629.
Robinson, Michael. *Long Sonata of the Dead: A Study of Samuel Beckett*. New York: Grove, 1969.
Ross, Iain. *Oscar Wilde and Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'idiot de la famille*. Vol. 2. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.
Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
Séginger, Gisèle, ed. "Gustave Flaubert 5, Dix ans de critique: Notes inédites de Flaubert sur l'*Esthétique* de Hegel." *La Revue des lettres modernes* 816-824. Paris-Caen: Lettres modernes minard, 2005.
Selden, John. *Table-Talk, Being the Discourses of John Selden* [1689]. Ed. Israel Gollancz (London: J.M. Dent, 1898).
Sheehan, Paul. *Modernism and the Aesthetics of Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
Sherry, Vincent. *Modernism and the Reinvention of Decadence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Shewan, Rodney. *Oscar Wilde: Art and Egotism*. London: Macmillan, 1977.
Shillingsburg, Peter. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006.
Shusterman, Richard. "Wilde and Eliot." In *T.S. Eliot Annual I*. London: Macmillan, 1988.

Shuter, William. "Pater, Wilde, Douglas, and the Impact of 'Greats'." *ELT* 46.3 (2003): 250-278.
Silver, Brenda R. "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice: Or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf Part II." In *Representing Modernist Texts*. Ed. George Bornstein. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
Spearing, A.C. *Readings in Medieval Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Spinoza, Baruch. *Complete Works*. Trans. Samuel Shirley. Ed. Michael L. Morgan. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002.
Stählin, Gustav "σκάνδαλον." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Volume 7. Ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1964.
Stewart, David. "T.G. Wainewright's Art Criticism and Metropolitan Magazine Style." *Romantic Textualities* 17 (Summer 2007): 7-23.
Sullivan, Hannah. *The Work of Revision*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *William Blake: A Critical Essay* [1868]. Rev. ed. London: Chatto & Windus, 1906.
Symonds, John Addington. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. Second series. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1879.
Tarrant, R.J. "The Silence of Cephalus: Text and Narrative Technique in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.685ff." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 125 (1995): 99-111.
Taylor, Julie. *Djuna Barnes and Affective Modernism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.
Trigg, Stephanie. *Shame and Honor: A Vulgar History of the Order of the Garter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
Vinken, Barbara. "Loving, Reading, Eating: The Passion of Madame Bovary." *MLN* 122.4 (2007): 759-788.
Voltaire. *Romans et contes*. Ed. Henri Bénac. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1960.
Wainewright, Thomas Griffiths. *Essays and Criticisms*. Ed. W. Carew Hazlitt. London: Reeves and Turner, 1880.
Wilde, Oscar. *The Complete Letters of Oscar Wilde*. Ed. Merlin Holland and Rupert Hart-Davis. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2000.
_____. *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde, Volume III*: *The Picture of Dorian Gray, the 1890 and 1891 Texts*. Ed. Joseph Bristow. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
_____. *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde, Volume IV: Criticism: Historical Criticism, Intentions, The Soul of Man*. Ed. Josephine M. Guy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
_____. "Mr Pater's Last Volume." In *The Soul of Man under Socialism and Selected Critical Prose*, ed. Linda Dowling (New York: Penguin, 2001.
_____. *Oscar Wilde's Oxford Notebooks: A Portrait of Mind in the Making*, ed. Philip E. Smith II and Michael S. Helfand. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
Yeats, W.B. *The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. New York: Scribner, 1996.
Zeller, Hans. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts." *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231-264.
Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. New York: Verso, 1989.