

Agnes, Pointing at Predestined Coincidence:
The Long-Range Polyrhythm in *David Copperfield*
1. Pseudo-polyphonic Novel

必然たる偶然を指さすアグネス：
『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』における遠投のポリリズム
1. 疑似ポリフォニー小説

麻生 雅樹[※]
Masaki Aso[※]

要旨

この論文では、ディケンズの小説がミハイル・バフチンのポリフォニー小説とは違って、モノロジックな疑似ポリフォニー小説であり、しかも、19世紀の古典的リアリズム小説とは異なるポリリズム小説であることを論じる。この論文は2部に分かれており、今回はその前半部分にあたる。第1部では、まず、ジョージ・ギッシングの古典的なディケンズ小説の批評、E. M. フォスターやエドウィン・ミュアの小説の構造・小説タイプ・人物造形などの理論を基礎としながら、F. K. スタンツェルの物語の構造と一人称小説の語りの理論、ウェイン・ブースの語り手論、デイヴィッド・ロッジのミメーシスとディエゲーシスの分析、ウラジーミル・ナボコフのテーマや作中人物における対位法理論、E. アウエルバッハのモダニズムと比較した古典的リアリズムのミメーシス論などを援用して、とくに『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』を中心としたディケンズ小説の物語構造について理論的に分析する。そして、ディケンズ小説のプロットの本質的役割（偶然性の意味と機能）、個性的な作中人物に与えられた人物造形のシステムと働き（マーカー論）、物語言説におけるミメーシスとディエゲーシスの関係（ディエゲーシスの浸透理論）、自由間接話法の処理方法（疑似ポリフォニー論）を詳述し、『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』とその他のディケンズ小説がモノロジック小説として成立していることを論じる。その上で、ディケンズの疑似ポリフォニー小説における物語構造のリズムについて考察し、第2部のポリリズム小説論へつなげる基礎を準備している。
キーワード：ディケンズ、リアリズム、ポリフォニー、物語構造、文体論

“No doubt the generality of readers are wise, and it is pedantry to object to the logical extremes of convention in an art which, without convention, would not exist.” ---George Gissing

Introduction

Charles John Hoffman Dickens (1812-70), whose novels threw the British and American people of the nineteenth century into laughing and crying in a frenzied fashion, made an epoch in the history of English literature. The literary value of Dickens's works, all of which were published more than 150 years ago, seems to have been established, experiencing both a favored position and an unfavored one repeatedly along the

※日本経済大学経営学部グローバルビジネス学科

waves of realism, modernism, and post-modernism in the history of literary criticism: “Dickens captured the popular imagination as no other novelist had done and, despite some murmurs against his sensationalism and sentimentality and his inability to portray women other than as innocents or grotesques, he was also held in high critical esteem, admired by contemporaries as varied as Queen Victoria and Dostoevsky (Birch, 294). This probably implies that Dickens was most skillful in catching hold of the emotions of the nineteenth-century readers with his creation of certain types of characters casting some light on the truth in their real lives.

On the other hand, many critics pointed out Dickens’s inaptitude for conceiving proper plot. Gissing, one of the earliest critics who wrote a comprehensive study of Dickens’s works, examined *Oliver Twist* and provided a simple benchmark against which Dickens’s plot can be measured: “not in this book alone did Dickens give proof of an astonishing lack of skill when it came to inventing plausible circumstances. Later, by sheer force of resolve, he exhibited ingenuity enough, often too much for his purpose; but the art of adapting simple probabilities to the ends of a narrative he never mastered” (Gissing, 47). According to Gissing, Dickens’s “fondness for the theatre” determined his preference for “some far-fetched eccentricity, some piece of knavishness, some unlikely occurrence, about which to weave his tale” and he “planned a narrative as though plotting for the stage” (Gissing, 48). In other words, Dickens prioritized creating remarkable characters, whether they are humorous or grotesque, and made plot serve them accordingly.

Dickens, as shown in his earliest success of *Sketches by Boz* or *The Pickwick Papers*, started his literary career by primarily compiling sketches and episodes into a volume of book. His talent and skills of sketching people and their lives in the city or country might have hindered the growth of plot, particularly through the first half of his career. As if he himself decided, however, to conceive plot more carefully, Dickens started to prepare his number plans, “consisting of a single 7×9 inch loose sheet of blue foolscap paper for each serialized number folded in half horizontally, for each of his novels from 1846’s *Dombey and Son* onward” (Manuscripts Lab). Each set of the number plans consists of Dickens’s notes and memoranda for planning the serial of the novel respectively. In the number plans, Dickens “often was debating with himself as to what he should include or omit (‘Yes,’ ‘No’) or inventing proper names for new character, or giving himself advice about timing and matters of emphasis.” And Dickens outlined the numbers as he had decided to develop them, including “the precise division into chapters with appropriate titles; they serve to remind him of the structure of each scene and the interrelationship of episodes; and they often supplied key phrases and even snatches of dialogue expected to advance the plot and its themes” (*Copperfield* Norton, 741). Dickens planned his novel more carefully in advance than the predecessors. The number plans “show that Dickens had many particulars in mind early; in *David Copperfield*, Agnes Wickfield is identified as “the real heroine” in the plan for the fifth number, where she is introduced, and the admonition to himself to ‘carry the thread of Agnes through it all’ appears during David’s headlong infatuation with Dora in XII, as well as later” (Nelson, 75).

Gissing provided his impression on the plot of *Dombey and Son*: “...we feel that the book is built up with great pains, with infinite endeavour to make a unity. The advance is undeniable (of course we have lost something, for all that), but one cannot help noticing that with the death of Paul ends a novel which is complete

in itself... As usual, we have loud melodrama side by side with comedy unsurpassed for its delicate touches of truth and fancy” (Gissing, 57-58). The number plans of *Dombey and Son* had contributed a little to the advance in making a unity of the plot but had caused a loss to the novel at the same time. The novel might have been still regarded a little better than a compiled sketches and episodes. Gissing, however, added an interesting observation: “His melodrama serves an end which is new in *Dombey*, though afterwards of frequent occurrence: that of bringing together, in strangely intimate relations, figures to delight in this. His best use of the motive representing social extremes” (Gissing, 58). Gissing seemed to imply that the number plans were not so useful for conceiving a deeper plot as expected, but very useful for arranging his characters in “strangely intimate relations,” which achieved an effect of a counterpoint. This is one of the literary devices employed by Dickens that almost his contemporary critics ignored.

In fact, Dickens’s novels were not so popular with critics as with the English public in the nineteenth century: “His popularity and fame proved durable, but it was not until the 20th century that he began to attract serious academic attention; ... Later criticism has tended to praise the complexity of the sombre late works at the expense of the high-spirited humour and genius for caricature traditionally labelled ‘Dickensian’” (Birch, 294). *Bleak House*, “as most critics now tend to agree, is his central work” (Bloom, 289). Vladimir Nabokov also praised and loved “the complexity of the sombre late works” such as *Bleak House* or *Great Expectations*, and serious academics seem to remain the same preferences today. It was probably by the influence of Willkie Collins that Dickens came to show more of his concern about the complexity of his works. Dickens was indeed improving his plotting skill all the time. However, Dickens sacrificed “the high-spirited humour and genius for caricature” when he tried to conceive good plot. Dickens’s characters can be the most impressive and powerful when they have humor.

Then, what is the perfect Dickens novel in which his structurization and characterization coexist most happily? We should ask Dickens himself about it. He loved *David Copperfield* the best. This must be partly because it is his autobiographical novel. Dickens tried, as his friend and biographer John Forster advised him to do, to write a first-person narrative inspired by Dickens’s own experience of his childhood such as his father’s imprisonment and his work in a blacking warehouse (Birch, 293). In the 1850 Preface to the First Edition of *David Copperfield*, he wrote that “all that I could say of the Story, to any purpose, I have endeavoured to say in it” and “[I]t would concern the reader little, perhaps, to know, ...how an Author feels as if he were dismissing some portion of himself into the shadowy world, ...I have nothing else to tell; ...no one can ever believe this Narrative, in the reading, more than I have believed it in the writing. (*Copperfield* Penguin, 11). He added in the 1867 Preface to the Charles Dickens Edition, “Of all my books, I like this the best” (*Copperfield* Oxford, 870). Here we can feel his enthusiasm and special affection for *David Copperfield*.

Another reason why *David Copperfield* was Dicken’s favorite is probably an artistic one. Dickens named his son Henry Fielding Dickens, as “a kind of homage to the style of the novel he was about to write,” which is *David Copperfield*. “It is not a robust comedy of social and sexual hypocrisy like *Tom Jones*, but odder, more precise and more painful” (Tomalin, 217). The full title of *David Copperfield* is *The Personal History*,

Adventures, Experience and Observation of David Copperfield the Younger of Blunderstone Rookery (Which He Never Meant to Publish on Any Account). It reminds us of the eighteenth-century classical novels like *Tom Jones* by Henry Fielding, which Dickens loved and admired, and it is “a title whose multifariousness implies the proliferation of the early novels” (*Copperfield* Penguin, xii). Dickens seemed to intend to use the “multifariousness” and “proliferation” of the early personal-history novels as a basic concept and weave truth and fiction into a complicated literary fabric of *David Copperfield*. The autobiographical novel apparently has a better-designed and more realistic plot than that of the previous one, and still keeps “the high-spirited humour and genius for caricature.”

David Copperfield, nevertheless, contains some forced coincidences and irrelevant episodes in some places, which are sometimes so elaborated that they seem to disrupt the flow of the plot, even though Dickens used the number plans in writing *David Copperfield*. Dickens actually commits in his abuse of coincidence in his works. “It seems never to have occurred to him, thus far in his career, that novels and fairy tales (or his favourite *Arabian Nights*) should obey different laws in the matter of incident” (Gissing, 62), but we can appreciate “his abuse of coincidence” more positively. Is it possible that Dickens would have tried to put a romance and realism together? The failure of *David Copperfield*’s realism gave Dickens a new appreciation of fancy’s charms, and led to the aesthetic of fancy articulated by Dickens for the first time in ‘A Preliminary Word’ [of the first issue of *Household Words*] and defended by him throughout the rest of his career, most notably in *Hard Times*” (McGowan, 67). *David Copperfield* might be actually intended to be a mixture of a novel and a romance. John Forster, a close friend and biographer of Dickens, wrote in the biography of Dickens about Dickens’s “favorite theory as to the smallness of the world” (Forster *Life*, Chapter III). Dickens thought that coincidences happen frequently in the real life, and exercised his theory of the small world in his novels. In writing *David Copperfield*, Dickens probably took advantage of coincidences to make the characters play their roles at their best. As a result of it, the sketches of the characters and the world must have contributed to the realism side and the plot the romance side.

Dickens’s characters can usually be summarized easily in one sentence. E. M. Forster named such a character “the flat character.” Even though it is apparent that Forster considered the flat character to be inferior to its counterpart, “the round character,” he highly appreciated Dickens’s characters as “a conjuring-trick” (Forster, 49). Why did he appreciate Dickens’s characters so much? Have they already assumed some of the characteristics of the round? Forster kind of admitted it. According to Forster, “Pip and David Copperfield attempt roundness, but so diffidently that they seem more like bubbles than solids,”... and yet there is this wonderful feeling of human depth” (Forster, 49). This is probably because Dickens knew how to make his characters vividly alive in his stories. And Forster regarded all the Dostoevsky characters “the round characters proper” (Forster, 53). This comparison implies as if *David Copperfield* is an early version of the polyphonic novel, which is said to be established by Dostoevsky.

In fact, some critics say that Dickens did write polyphonic novels. Rick Allen is one of them: “In our postmodernist age, which has seen a dismantling of traditional cultural hierarchies and a mixing of high and

popular art forms, the tonal and stylistic discontinuities characterizing Dickens's 'polyphonic' novels seem less problematic than they once did" (*Continuum*, 261). Dickens's novels might seem polyphonic from the postmodern point of view, but it is not from the Bakhtinian point of view. Compared to Bakhtin's theory of the polyphonic novel, Dickens's novels are obviously monologic. The "tonal and stylistic discontinuities" of Dickens's novels are derived from his character- and episode-centered tendencies. "Plot in Dickens might better be considered the shaping and ordering of story material to furnish a coherent succession of scenes than the arrangement of it to provide E. M. Forster's train of causally related events" (Nelson, 119). Dickens's novels obey a different kind of narrative structure from that of the polyphonic novel.

So now let us remember the supposition that the number plans worked primarily for Dickens to organize the arrangement of the characters, not to conceive plot. The supposition leads us to a small conclusion: Dickens's novels are monologic. In his novels, Dickens is orchestrating the characters and they are singing the same song which Dickens wrote about himself. Every part of the song was detailed by Dickens, who instructed the characters how to sing it. Dickens is singing through all the characters. This means that *David Copperfield* is not exactly a polyphony novel as Mikhail Bakhtin advocated. It sounds a little strange because Dostoevsky was significantly influenced by Dickens. So what is the difference between Dickens and Dostoevsky? Dickens's novels might be able to be called the pseudo-polyphonic novel. But more importantly, they are also a different type of the monologic novel, just as Foster pointed out, they "attempt roundness, but so diffidently that they seem more like bubbles than solids."

It would be the best for us to examine the narrative structure of *David Copperfield* to know where exactly it is between the polyphonic novel and the classical monologic novel. By doing it, we will first find out that *David Copperfield* is a monologic narrative. And then, we will examine Dickens's technique of organizing the deployment of the characters in the "C-plot," which is an abbreviation of "character-centered plot" meaning "a plot with weak causality in places and enduringly strong motivation to develop fueled by characters' energy and synergy," and we will be able to find the answer to the question about Dickens's narrative structure. The answer is in the rhythm of the novel which is generated from the plot structure that consists of forced coincidences and the deployment of the characters. *David Copperfield* can be called "polyrhythmic," in contrast to Bakhtin's polyphonic novel. It has several different rhythms performed by characters simultaneously. It can be called "the polyrhythmic novel." This should be the key to the narrative structure of Dickens's novels.

The purpose of this paper is to argue that *David Copperfield*, along with Dickens's other novels, is a polyrhythmic novel in contrast to Bakhtin's polyphonic novel, and verify the theory of polyrhythmic novel in *David Copperfield*. For that purpose, we will first discuss the plot, the characterization, and the narrative speech of Dickens's novels by referencing some preceding studies, and demonstrate that *David Copperfield* is a monologic novel. We will primarily examine the studies of Dickens by George Gissing, E. M. Forster, and Edwin Muir and also employ additionally the analyses and the theories of F. K. Stanzel, Wayne C. Booth, Vladimir Nabokov, and David Lodge when needed. This is because the paper is initially a fundamental study

of Dickens's techniques of the narrative structure of his novels, which might not be so relevant to recent studies, and the subject was already discussed enough in the first half of the twentieth century, that is, prior to the post-modernism, although it does not mean that this kind of study is unimportant. Particularly, Gissing's criticism, which is one of the earliest ones, is based on a direct impact of Dickens's novels and the nineteenth-century literary tradition, can be very important our first agenda, so we will examine his criticism extensively. Early criticism on the nineteenth-century novels is more important to us than later one in that it can provide more direct analyses about Dickens's writing techniques, although recent criticism tends to use more complicated theories of novels. In this paper, we need to analyze the analyses of Dickens by the critics mentioned above and make their points clear and examine the structural and stylistic characteristics of Dickens's novels.

Secondly, we will discuss Dickens's monologic novels in comparison with Bakhtin's polyphonic novels. We will use *David Copperfield* as an example for discussion to argue that the characters of the novel are not dialogic and polyphonic but monologic and polyrhythmic who have their own narrative profiles (or markers) and speak independently and appear repeatedly in their unique rhythms through the long plot. And we will conclude that Dickens's technique of the polyrhythmic novel is the "long-range polyrhythm," because Dickens's novels develop in "space," not in "time" as we will examine closely later, so the characters live in a spatial world without time. In this stage of the paper, we will employ Bakhtin's theory of the polyphonic novel. Bakhtin will cast a literary light retroactively on Dickens's novels and reveal the clear characteristics of them. This paper will include the nineteenth-century realism and the polyphonic novel comprehensively and give Dickens a position in the modern literary history that is linking the monologic novel to the polyphonic novel to post-modernism. Considering Dickens in the history of Western Literature, he seems to have absorbed the classical realism from Daniel Defoe to George Eliot and pass the essence of it with a new addition of his narrative technique to the new type of realism like Dostoevsky's polyphonic novels. It might be possible to say that in that position Dickens wrote his novels in which romanticism and realism are put together, added a new narrative element to the classical monologic novel, and prepared a new style of novel: the dialogic or polyphonic novel. We will be able to locate Dickens's position in the literary history in solving his narrative magic of *David Copperfield*.

Thirdly, we will apply the theory of polyrhythm to the text of *David Copperfield* to verify the theory. And finally, we will conclude that the polyrhythm novel propelled the advent of the polyphonic novel with the help of the repulsion to the nineteenth-century classical realism, and the polyrhythm novel was the form that had a huge impact on Dostoevsky and caused him to create a new type of novel. This will indicate that the polyrhythmic novel was a burgeoning style of the polyphonic novel.

(This publication is the first half of the whole paper, in which we will examine Dickens's plot, characterization, and narrative speech to argue that his novels are monologic. The second half will be published in another occasion, in which we will examine Dickens's novels in comparison with Bakhtin's theory of the polyphonic novel to argue that Dickens's novels are the polyrhythmic novels and apply the theory of polyrhythmic novel to the text of *David Copperfield* to draw our conclusion.)

1. Pseudo-polyphonic Novel

We will examine Dickens's plot, characterization, and narrative speech to describe his novels as monologic ones. After that, we will be able to take a next step to compare Dickens's novels and the polyphonic novel to reveal Dickens's novels to be the polyrhythmic novel. The main subject of our examination will be *David Copperfield*.

So now let us examine Dickens's plot first. A plot is the "plan, design, scheme or pattern of events in a play, poem or work of fiction; and, further, the organization of incident and character in such a way as to induce curiosity and suspense in the spectator or reader" (Cuddon, 719). According to E. M. Forster's famous definition, a story is "a narrative of events arranged in their time-sequence" and a plot is "a narrative of events, the emphasis falling on causality." For example, "The kind died and then queen died is a story. The kind died, and then the queen died of grief is a plot. The time-sequence is preserved, but the sense of causality overshadows it" (Forster, 60). Even these simple definition are useful for us to make the features of Dickens's plot clear.

A well-known fact about Dickens's plot is that he used number plans from *Dombey and Son* onward but even *David Copperfield* has some parts that finds no clear causality in the plot. Besides, sometimes the scene does not have any certain purposes for the plot and just introduces and describes characters to add humor to it. *David Copperfield* seems to be a novel in which characterization is more important than the plot. Edwin Muir called such a novel "the novel of character." Muir divided the novel into a few "rough and ready but easily recognizable classes" and tried to discover "the laws which operate in each, and find an aesthetic justification for those laws" (Muir, 7). Some of those classes are "the novel of action," "the novel of character," and "the dramatic novel" and the differences are mainly in plot and character. The novel of action is "the most simple form of prose fiction" (Muir, 17) called the romance, whose object is to "arouse our curiosity" (Muir, 19), in which the plot is the most important element. It can be called "A-plot" (action-centered plot). On the other hand, the novel of character is a novel in which "the characters are not conceived as parts of the plot" (Muir, 23) and "it has been a convention that the plot of a novel of character, which can be called "C-plot" (character-centered plot), should be loose and easy" (Muir, 27).

Muir's dramatic novel is a novel in which "the hiatus between the characters and the plot disappears. The characters are not part of the machinery of the plot; nor is the plot, which can be called "S-plot" (situation-centered plot), merely a rough framework round the characters. On the contrary, both are inseparably knit together. The given qualities of the characters determine the action, and the action in turn progressively changes the characters, and thus everything is borne forward to an end" (Muir, 41). And Muir presented a significant difference between the novel of character and the dramatic novel: the treatment of time and space in each type of novel. The imaginative world of the dramatic novel is in "Time," and the imaginative world of the character novel in "Space." In the world of the character novel, "Time is assumed, and the action is a static pattern, continuously redistributed and reshuffled, in Space" (Muir, 62-63). We should keep this in mind. In the C-plot, the redistribution and reshuffle of the actions of characters (or the deployment of characters) are the

main motivation to develop its narrative. In Dickens, as we will discuss later, the deployment of characters is the skeleton key to his novels. As a matter of fact, it is beautifully used in *David Copperfield*.

In his discussion of the dramatic novel, Muir mentioned Dostoevsky's novels: "No one, perhaps, has understood better than Dostoevsky this naked manifestation of Time at the moment when it is slipping away; and a passage in *The Idiot* describing the feelings of a man condemned to death explains it with great force, and gives at the same time the reason why those scenes in the dramatic novel should have such extraordinary power" (Muir, 73). Muir's dramatic novel can help us examine Dickens's novels as the monologic novel because we can see *David Copperfield* as the monologic novel in comparison with *The Idiot* as the dialogic novel.

In the novel of character, "the situations are typical or general, and designed primarily to tell us more about the characters, or to introduce new characters." All it needs to do is "to bring out their various attributes, which were there at the beginning; for these characters are almost always static" (Muir, 24). Dickens's plot gives the reader the impression that it is a patchwork of episodes or sketches of the characters. This must have something to do with the fact that Dickens's first work of fiction was *Sketches by Boz*, which is a collection of short pieces. His skills and preference to sketch people seem to affect even later novels. In *David Copperfield*, the situation is almost the same. Dickens seemed to try to put some sketches into a plot. So, we should pay attention to the arrangement of sketches of people, not to the causality in the plot, although it develops chronologically as an autobiography. This will reveal the structural features of Dickens's novels.

David Copperfield, according to Gissing, "combined with lavish wealth of description, character, pathos, humour, we meet with poverty of invention, abuse of drama" (Gissing, 59). Gissing thought that the characters can cover the weaknesses of the plot enough to attract and immerse the reader into the story. He tried to explain the captivating power that Dickens's novels have, taking *Bleak House* for an example: "What fate pursued him that he could not, in all the resources of his brain, hit upon a device for such a simple end more convincing than this? Still, with an end not worth attaining, the author here wrought successfully. The story is child's play compared with many invented, for instance, by Wilkie Collins; but in combination with Dickens's genuine powers, it produces its designed effect; we move in a world of choking fog and squalid pitfalls, amid plot and counterplot, cold self-interest and passion over-wrought, and can never refuse attention to the magician who shows it all" (Gissing, 61-62). *David Copperfield* and *Bleak House* were regarded to be successful in terms of Dickens's "genuine powers" of sketching people and capturing "the sense of place" (Lodge *Art*, 57). To Gissing, it was like a magic for Dickens to write a powerful novel based on a feeble plot, which is a C-plot, to be precise. It is necessary for us to examine Dickens's sketching skills and their relationship with the C-plot more closely.

Dickens had improved his sketching skills to a considerable degree by the time of *The Pickwick Papers* and he took advantage of the skills in *David Copperfield* as well. Gissing appreciated Dickens's exactness of his sketches: "You will come across no such instances as these in any other novelist, of observation, memory, and imaginative force, all evinced in a touch of detail so indescribably trivial" (Gissing, 232). David Lodge agrees the excellence of Dickens's sketching skill. London in Defoe's or Fielding's novels "lacks the vivid visual

detail of Dickens's London" (Lodge *Art*, 57). And he compared the two versions of descriptions of London in *Tom Jones* (1749) and *Oliver Twist* (1838): "What intervened was the Romantic movement, which pondered the effect of milieu on man, opened people's eyes to the sublime beauty of landscape and, in due course, to the grim symbolism of cityscapes in the Industrial Age" (Lodge *Art*, 58). As Gissing and Lodge indicate, Dickens's sketching skills were so powerful that characters and episodes could control plot, making it a C-plot. In his novels, Dickens apparently used the method of compiling some "episodic stories" into one plot with setting links between them. One perspective of testing his method seems to be Dickens's treatment of coincidences.

Gissing, as mentioned above, pointed out Dickens's abuse of coincidences in his works. In *David Copperfield*, for example, in chapter fifty-five, Steerforth returns to England from his travels on his ship and it is accidentally wrecked at Yarmouth in a storm. He is thrown off the sinking ship and Ham dives into the sea to save him. Both of them drown and their dead bodies are washed up on the beach one after another. David watches all of that from the beach, who happens to be in Yarmouth to see his friends. Three---or two and a half, because Ham's rescue has a cause but no need to die---things coincide in this scene. Gissing commented that it is "the worthlessness of the plot" and if "anything may happen just where or when the interest of the story demands it, and a neat drama may pretty easily be constructed. The very boldness of the thing prevents readers from considering it; indeed most readers take the author's own view, and imagine every artificiality to be permitted in the world of fiction" (Gissing, 62-63). Dickens, as Gissing pointed out, "was content to have aroused interest, wonder, and many other emotions. The conception of the book is striking; the atmosphere could hardly be better; even the melodrama (as in Krook's death by spontaneous combustion) justifies itself by magnificent workmanship" (Gissing, 63). Gissing seems to mean Dickens's sketching skills by "magnificent workmanship" here and he is right about it. The scene is depicted so vividly and powerfully that the reader can deny the reality of their death in the accident. The exactness of Dickens's sketches has a strong effect on fairly-like plot and the C-plot functions to push the story forward.

Nabokov also mentioned Dickens's treatment of coincidences and regarded them as if a necessary evil. In *Bleak House*, the young surgeon Woodcourt appears and reappears in front of Esther "to link things up nicely," and later Esther runs into him again, who has come back from India, although she has renounced her love for him. The coincidental meeting is "preceded by a delightful description of the sea," and the piece of artistic imagery "makes one condone the terrific coincidence" (Nabokov, 105). After adding another Woodcourt's coincidental meeting (with Jo in this case) to his analysis of Dickens's use of "terrific coincidences," Nabokov pointed out a "curious trick": the impossibility of the narrative which Esther reports in detail in chapter 51. She writes about something that is impossible for her to know. Nabokov suggested that she could know because she must have been told about it by Woodcourt, and this makes the good reader expect her future marriage to Woodcourt on reading the chapter (Nabokov, 105-106).

Gissing and Nabokov seem to understand Dickens's plot with forced coincidences to be something tolerable or that "makes one condone." However, is it possible that we think that Dickens aimed intentionally to add something to the plot by coincidences? It is probably to merge a novel and a romance into one plot. If not,

we could not regard Jip's death as just a coincidence and tolerate it in *David Copperfield*. It must be the matter of how to perceive the coincidences: they are just tolerable twists or positive literary devices. We need to analyze the effect of the coincidences on plot to determine which. Coincidences in Dickens's novels function as the strong motivation to propel the C-plot regardless of a question whether we can tolerate or not. They do not interfere the characters' actions but actually prepare for them to do what they should, have to, or want to do. Each episode and character, including coincidences, is placed carefully where they are in order to fulfill themselves for each particular purposes, which gives the character some attribute and is presented on each appearance of them. At least, as Gissing and Nabokov suggested, we cannot ignore Dickens's coincidences as a white elephant as long as they are related to Dickens's sketching skills. On the contrary, coincidences can be part of important plot elements. If we look at the episode of Martha in this respect, we can accept his coincidences as his part of strategy to perform his coincidental magic.

The main driving force of Dickens's novels as the novel of character is, as Muir explains, the characters, not the design of plot, and in writing his novels, Dickens paid his careful attention to characterization and the deployment (or redistributing and reshuffling) of characters in space (or the C-plot). It is most important for us to examine how Dickens design and frame each character and where he redistributes and reshuffles them in the C-plot. The characters should be deployed to work in a counterpoint. In the counterpoint, Dickens is careful about the rhythm of each character, not about the melodies or harmony which they play or sing, which means the timing of appearance of the character. The key to Dickens's narrative structure is in the rhythms of the characters' appearance.

Rhythm, as E. M. Forster explains, "hardens into a symbol," and "trips us up." It can be "achieved by the writers who plan their books beforehand," and "it has to depend on a local impulse when the right interval is reached." It may be "defined as repetition plus variation, and which can be illustrated by examples" (Forster, 115). The profile of the writer matches that of Dickens, particularly in the first half of his career. Coincidence is one of Dickens's favorite literary devices and it significantly helps him control the rhythms of characters, because each of them has a different rhythm. And Forster defined rhythm as "repetition and variation," which include not only the deployment of characters but the certain features of the characters, such as the favorite phrase, the habit, or the way of thinking. The features of the characters that repeat and varies should be called "markers." The most familiar lexical contribution to characterization (combined with a graphological marker) is Uriah Heep's harping on the adjective 'umble in *David Copperfield*---a good example of how even a single word may encapsulate idiolectal expression of character" (Leech and Short, 134).

Let us now examine Dickens's characterization. Critics usually say that Dickens cannot describe the psychology of the characters very well. In *Nicholas Nickleby*, for example, Dickens describes the details of "inner man" of Ralph Nickleby, which "cannot interest" and they show "much crudity and conventionality of thought." It is so clumsy that people "may surmise that the author felt something of this, and went out of his wonted way in an endeavour to give the image more life" (Gissing, 109). His "wonted way" of sketching character is not the analysis of character, which probably means that Dickens's method of characterization

is completely different from that of Henry James. Gissing criticized about the realism of Dickens's characterization but we should consider Dickens's true intention of his characterization. His characters do not represent the complexity of modern psychology but the multiplicity of human existence.

[H]owever little their speech or conduct may smack of earth, their worldly surroundings are shown with marvellous fidelity. Tom Pinch worshipping at the shrine of Pecksniff may not hold our attention; but Tom Pinch walking towards Salisbury on the frosty road, or going to market in London with his sister, is unforgettable. This is what makes the difference between an impossible person in Dickens and the same kind of vision in the work of smaller writers. One cannot repeat too often that, in our literary slang, he "visualized" every character---Little Nell no less than Mr. Jagers. Seeing them, he saw the house in which they lived, the table at which they ate, and all the little habits of their day-to-day life. Here is an invaluable method of illusion, if an author can adopt it. Thus fortified, Dickens's least substantial imaginings have a durability not to be hoped for the laborious accuracies of an artist uninspired"

(Gissing, 121-122).

Dickens sketched primarily the outside world such as surroundings, appearances, behavior, habits, that is something visible and audible. He was not so interested in sketching the inside world, that is something invisible and inaudible:

Dickens's characters are "caught briefly in some action, the significance of which is conveyed by their attitudes, their gestures, and the setting as a whole. Two important elements in Dickens's art are his visual imagination and his use of stage techniques to express feelings and relationships. Of course the characters have voices as well---in the voices lies a major part of Dickens's genius---although the dialogue chiefly serves to define the characters and their attitudes rather than to prepare and advance the action. When a character can be presented mainly through speech and gesture, the English writer is unrivalled; Dostoevsky did not really know how to use Mrs Skewton in *The Uncle's Dream*

...

(Lary, 151)

Dickens's characterization is based on the thought that the outside features could reflect the attributes of characters. Dickens's sketching skills can "visualize" the reflective (or indicative) character of characters.

The indicative character of Dickens's characters does not mean they are types or symbols that embody "hypocrisy, selfishness, pride, and so on, masking as everyday mortals." Dickens's characters are "not

abstractions, but men and women of such loud peculiarities, so aggressively individual in mind and form, in voice and habit, that they for ever proclaim themselves the children of a certain country, of a certain time, of a certain rank” (Gissing, 12-13). Dickens’s characters, however, are “men and women of such loud peculiarities” not only because they are “so aggressively individual in mind and form, in voice and habit,” but because they can reflect several things (not types or symbols). Therefore, the indicative character of Dickens’s characters works centrifugally, not centripetally. It is a semantic entity, not a semiotic one. Something that a character indicates is called a “marker.”

Then, how can we identify the markers of a character? Gissing pointed out how Dickens used the characters in his novels:

His art, especially as satirist, lies in the judicious use of emphasis and iteration. Emphasis alone would not have answered his purpose; the striking thing must be said over and over again till the most stupid hearer has it by heart. ...it is quite true that Mr. Micawber, Mr. Pecksniff, Uriah Heep, and all Dickens's prominent creations say the same thing in the same way, over and over again.

(Gissing, 146-147)

Dickens’s characters make a periodical appearance in his novels for twenty months. Dickens’s used the technique of emphasis and repetition for his characters, but another aspect of the characters concerning emphasis and repetition should be noticed, which is the fact that the reader actually forgets about them soon after they leave the scene, although the reader easily recognizes them when they appear in the story again. This is because every character is so exaggerated and has so strong an impact on the reader that the reader has no choice but focus on only the characters in the on-going scene.

To discuss the topic of emphasis and repetition further, let us consider the characters of women and children. Betsy Trotwood “[w]asted in her time, or nearly so; no scope for her beyond the care of Mr. Dick, varied by assaults upon seaside donkeys (the quadrupeds). To be sure, she is the making of David, but that came accidentally” (Gissing, 179-180). Betsy Trotwood’s help for David is yet another Dickens’s coincidences? David had his own reason. David decided to go to Canterbury to ask Miss Betsy for help because he remembered that his mother told to him about Miss Betsy touching her hair “with no ungentle hand.” So, David took a chance. His only hope was Miss Betsy’s “no ungentle hand,” which is one of her markers. It appears two times: once in Chapter I and the other in Chapter XII. The accidental contribution to David’s success is not a coincidence but a predestined coincidence.

Emily, according to Gissing “is shown to us as acting with something like cold-blooded deliberation, the simplest form of true immorality? We have no hint of her temptation, and it really looks very much as if she had calculated the probable advantages of flight with Steerforth” (Gissing, 187). Gissing seemed to fail to grasp her. Emily wanted to be a lady, but not for herself. It was for the Peggotty family. She always aspired

to help other people. Figuratively speaking, she wanted to be a boat that can save the lives of sailors like her father on the sea. Steerforth actually gave her a boat named after her. The marker of Emily is the “boat.” Emily’s boat repeatedly appears through the plot.

Dora is “Dolly Varden volatilized; every fault is there, prevented from becoming vice only by utter lack of purpose” (Gissing, 188-189). Dora’s ignorance and childish attitude can actually become vice in other situations, but she is prevented from becoming vice by David’s love and tolerance, not by “utter lack of purpose.” We need to notice that Dora and David’s mother have something in common. Both are short with curly hair and fond of dancing. David loves Dora as he loved his mother. The women whom David loved except Agnes have a similar profile, which is short with curly hair and fond of dancing. The marker of David’s mother and Dora is a short-height female with curly hair and the fondness for dancing. Dickens emphasized and repeated the marker of David’s mother and Dora along with other variants.

To find the markers of a character, we should also ask E. M. Forster. As mentioned above, Forster admitted that Dickens’s characters are nearly all flat but exceptionally powerful. The secret of the “conjuring-trick” is “the immense vitality of Dickens to vibrate his characters.” (Forster, 49). Probably it has something to do with the characters’ speech and actions or behavior, which are sometimes emphasized and repeated. In doing a conjuring-trick, it is the rhythms of the characters that matter. In fact, Forster also attached much importance to variations and repetition in some novels.

Let us now go on to Nabokov’s criticism. “Every character,” in *Bleak House*, “has his attribute, a kind of colored shadow that appears whenever the person appears” (Nabokov, 68). Nabokov calls what Gissing called emphasis “attribute” or “a kind of colored shadow” (our “marker”) here. However, in Nabokov, the characters seem to represent kind of types. Nabokov penetrated “the dualism permeating the whole work” (Nabokov, 68) and found a counterpoint performed by the two types of characters in the dualism: the evil and the good. And in the battle between the two sides there is a third type of the tempted and redeemed. Nabokov said that “Lady of Dedlock is redeemed by suffering,...Even the smallest act of goodness may bring salvation. ...All these forces and people in conflict (often wrapped up in the Chancery theme) are symbols of greater, more universal forces, even to the death of Krook by fire (self-generate), the devil’s natural medium. Such conflicts are the “skeleton” of the book, but Dickens was too much of an artist to make all this obtrusive or obvious. His people are alive, not merely clothed ideas or symbols” (Nabokov, 69). Nabokov’s explanation of the characters is a little hard to understand because it includes a contradiction that they are symbols or not, but he had a good point in “Even the smallest act of goodness may bring salvation.” Applying this to *David Copperfield*, we will find an interesting fact. As mentioned above, the memory of Miss Betsy’s hand (possibly) touching the hair of David’s mother brought salvation to David. Miss Betsy’s small act of goodness might not have brought salvation to his mother directly but did to David. This fact will become an important point for discussion about the theory of the polyrhythmic novel in the second chapter of this paper.

We also need to pay attention to the counterpoint in the dualism. Dickens seems to arrange his characters so that they can play a counterpoint. “In the counterpoint arrangement of our book, as Nabokov explains,

Mr. Skimpole is shown first as a gay, lighthearted, childish person, a delightful infant, a candid and innocent child. Good John Jarndyce, being in some ways the real child of the book, is completely taken in and taken up with the pseudochild Skimpole” (Nabokov, 90-91). Skimpole plays as a poor parody of a child in contrast to the real child John. Here Nabokov implies that the characters reveal their true identities once in a counterpoint arrangement. The difference from the others is the meaning of the character, whether we call it “marker” or not. Skimpole, as Nabokov also pointed out, play a role of the “parody” of Miss Flite’s caged birds like a “fugue,” in which a musical theme is parodied and repeated by another theme (Nabokov, 89). In their relationships or conflicts, the characters appear to play parodied themes repeatedly. This will be another important point for discussion in the next chapter.

Summarising our discussion about Dickens’s plots and characterization, we have two conclusions:

1. Coincidences are built in Dickens’s plots intentionally.
2. Dickens’s characters have certain markers of Personality.

Now let us discuss narrative speech in Dickens’s novels. The first thing that we should focus on when we examine *David Copperfield* is the fact that it is an autobiographical novel. It must have been very important for Dickens to write a first-person narrative because it should have given some reality to the plot and the characters in some places of the novel. In fact, “we have the author's vision of his own childhood, and he makes it abundantly convincing” and it “suggests very faithfully an artist's early years, his susceptibility, his abnormal faculty of observation, the vivid workings of his mind and heart” (Gissing, 194-195). This concerns the problem of Dickens’s realism or of his treatment of mimesis and diegesis. Employing some theories of narrative structures of the nineteenth-century realism, we will find out the characteristics of Dickens’s narrative structures.

First, we are going to examine David Lodge’s explanation of the classical realism. He points out the lack of homogeneity in the classic realism:

The mode of classic realism, with its concern for coherence and causality in narrative structure, for the autonomy of the individual self in the presentation of character, for a readable homogeneity and urbanity of style, is equated with liberal humanism, with empiricism, common sense and the presentation of bourgeois culture as a kind of nature. ... There is a certain truth in this picture, but it is a half-truth, and therefore a misleading one. The classic realist text was never as homogeneous, as consistent as the model requires.

(Lodge *Bakhtin*, 26)

There were many types of the classical realism in terms of the relationship between mimesis and diegesis, or

between the author's voice and the characters' voices.

Lodge discusses mimesis and diegesis in relation to Volosinov and Bakhtin's theories. He mentions Plato's theory first and explains it. According to Plato, the purest diegesis is in poetry and the purest mimesis is in drama and epic is in between. Homer's works consist of the authors reports, descriptions, summaries, interpretations and quotations directly from the characters' voices but the characters' personalities can never be lost unless the author gives too much organized summaries. In the competition between mimesis and diegesis like Homer's works, discourse has been developed:

Plato conceived of the epic as a mixed form in the sense that it simply alternated two distinct kinds of discourse---the poet's speech and the characters' speech---and this is in fact true of Homer; but his own example shows the potential within narrative for a much more complex mixing, more like a fusing, of the two modes, in reported speech. This potential was to be elaborately exploited by the novel, which uses reported speech extensively---not only to represent speech, but to represent thoughts and feelings which are not actually uttered aloud.

(Lodge *Bakhtin*, 29)

The development of reported speech realized the classical realism: "they focus on the way the novelistic treatment of reported speech tends towards an intermingling of authorial speech and characters' speech, of diegesis and mimesis" (Lodge *Bakhtin*, 29). The authorial speech appears in the main clause and the characters' speech appears in the noun clause following the conjunction "that" and they are mingled in reported speech. Volosinov divided the reported speech into two styles: the linear style and the pictorial style. The linear style "preserves a clear boundary between the reported speech and the reporting context (that is, the author's speech) in terms of information or reference, while suppressing the textual individuality of the reported speech by imposing its own linguistic register, or attributing to the characters exactly the same register as the author's" (Lodge *Bakhtin*, 29). In the linear style, the author's voice permeates through all the characters. According to Volosinov, the linear style used to be employed in pre-novel narratives, which can be related to the authoritarianism in Medieval ages and the Enlightenment age. Lodge suggests Samuel Johnson's *Rasselas* as a later example of the linear style.

For Volosinov, naturally influenced by Russian literary history, the rise of the novel virtually coincides with the development of the *pictorial* style of reported speech, in which author's speech and character's speech, diegesis and mimesis interpenetrate. The evolution of the English novel was more gradual." and "The rise of the English novel in the eighteenth century began with the discovery of new possibilities of mimesis in prose narrative, through the use of characters as narrators---the pseudo-autobiographers of Defoe,

the pseudo-correspondents of Richardson---thus making the narrative discourse a mimesis of an act of diegesis, diegesis at a second remove. These devices brought about a quantum leap in realistic illusion and immediacy.

(Lodge *Bakhtin*, 30)

The narrative discourse as a mimesis of an act of diegesis or diegesis at a second remove is the most powerful in first-person narrative. In *David Copperfield*, the intentions of Dickens were “highminded” and “the author’s speech and values are not quite clearly distinguished from the character’s speech and values.” (Lodge *Bakhtin*, 31). On the contrary, the development of the reported speech usually made diegesis and mimesis more interpenetrate. The classic nineteenth-century novel “followed the example of Fielding and Scott in maintaining a fairly even balance between mimesis and diegesis, showing and telling, scene and summary; but it also broke down the clear distinction between diegesis and mimesis in the representation of thought and feeling, through what Volosinov called the ‘pictorial style’ of reported speech” (Lodge *Bakhtin*, 31). George Eliot’s *Middlemarch* is a good example of the pictorial style. In *Middlemarch*, unlike *David Copperfield*, mimesis is clearly independent of author’s speech because the development of the reported speech “broke down the clear distinction between diegesis and mimesis in the representation of thought and feeling.” *Middlemarch* and *David Copperfield* are two good examples of completely different types of the classical realism. In the next stage of the novel’s development, “the reported speech is not merely allowed to retain a certain measure of autonomous life within the authorial context, but actually itself comes to dominate authorial speech in the discourse as a whole” (Lodge *Bakhtin*, 33). This is the second stage of the pictorial style and Dostoevsky is the representative author. Lodge suggests Henry James and Joseph Conrad as the counterparts in English novels. In this stage, according to Volosinov, the author’s speech loses its objectivity and begins to be perceived as if it were subjective. In other words, the author’s speech is like one of the characters’ speech. This is the polyphonic novel.

Dickens’s novels did not develop in the same direction as Eliot’s but seem to achieve the same goal taking a different path. Dickens trusted in his own diegesis and his speech and value permeate his mimesis. His narrative style is monologic. Every character echoes Dickens’s speech. In *David Copperfield*, “there is little need to distinguish the values of the first-person character (David as child and young man), the narrator (David as adult), the implied author (‘Dickens’) and the real author (Dickens): they all take the same attitude” (Leech and Short, 221). The reason why Dickens took the path may be to deploy the characters in each designated position to function the markers of the characters organically in the plot where predestined coincidences are planted from place to place. In *David Copperfield*, coincidences and markers are beautifully arranged because it is a monologic novel and a result of a mixture of realism and *Arabian Nights*.

We will still discuss the narrating self and experiencing self in *David Copperfield* to examine diegesis and mimesis in Dickens’s first-person narrative.

Typical of the first-person novels of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as the authorial novels, is the constant alternation of passages in which report prevails and passages consisting of scenic presentation and dialogue. The recurrent narrowing of the perspective of the narrating self to the point of view of the perceptual horizon of the experiencing self is a specific characteristic of the first-person narrative situation. The transition is almost always gradual and thus usually not apparent to the reader. Yet it is precisely this change which is very important for the dynamics of the narrative in the first-person novel. Through it the tension between the two phases of the self in confrontation in a quasi-autobiographical first-person novel becomes part of the narrative structure. The dynamics of the modulations of this scheme diminish as the presentation is increasingly restricted to the point of view and the perceptual horizon of the experiencing self. Accordingly, they are greater in *David Copperfield* than in Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*, and they diminish further in a novel which approaches the form of interior monologue, as, for example, Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*"

(Stanzel, 71-72).

In *David Copperfield*, the dynamics of the narrating David and the experiencing David are greater, so it means that diegesis and mimesis are quite clearly distinguished in the novel. It matches Lodge's explanation of the classical realism, which is an example of the linear style. In reverse, it does not match *Middlemarch*, which is an example of the pictorial style without the clear distinction between diegesis and mimesis.

In *David Copperfield*, mimesis becomes predominant over diegesis and "this diminution of narrative dynamics is probably also related to the altered objective of the author in the second half of the novel. Here Dickens no longer concentrates his energies on David's life story but offers a kind of tour through a gallery of characters. In addition to the nature of the quasi-autobiographical first-person narrative situation, the gradual approach in time of the narrating self to the experiencing self seems to reinforce this effect" (Stanzel, 75). In the second half of the novel, Dickens concentrated on introducing characters like "a kind of tour through a gallery of characters," gradually shifting the narrative profile from the narrating self to the experiencing self. His objective here is to decrease the number of using the reported speech and lessen the narrative friction of diegesis and mimesis to focus on the characters' speech. In other words, the narrating self hides as long as possible behind the characters including the experiencing self and speaks through the characters' mouths. In *David Copperfield*, the characters' speech can never achieve independence from the author. It is as if they are singing in monophony or "uniphony," which is another of my coinage.

In *David Copperfield*, for example, the first-person reference is almost never abandoned, but the first-person narrator often presents his recollection of certain episodes and scenes from his earlier life in the present tense instead of in the usual narrative tense,

the past. For this the designation ‘historical present’ is not quite appropriate, for only rarely in this novel is the present tense used to animate the development of a recollection by presenting it as if it were taking place at the moment. This present tense frequently produces a kind of tableau-effect: the recollected scene is imagined as if it were a picture at some distance presented for quiet and reserved observation. This, too, results in an increase in distance: The ‘I’ on the tableau is nearly a ‘he.’ The most revealing passage from *David Copperfield* in this connection is the beginning of the forty-third chapter.

(Stanzel, 99-100)

David recalls his happy days of engagement with Dora. He hides himself, in this case, behind the past self and speaks about himself. The voice of the past self rather objectively distinguished from the first-person narrator can be identified with the author’s voice. The experiencing self can be independent of the narrating self but not of the author. The author’s speech permeates all the characters’ speech in a monologic novel.

And there is a place in Chapter 37 where the narrating self uses free indirect speech to tell Dora that he is poor now. Dora upsets at the news and David tries to calm her down:

But I looked so serious, that Dora left off shaking her curls, and laid her trembling little hand upon my shoulder, and first looked scared and anxious, then began to cry. That was dreadful. I fell upon my knees before the sofa, caressing her, and imploring her not to rend my heart; but, for some time, poor little Dora did nothing but exclaim Oh dear! Oh dear! And oh, she was so frightened! And where was Julia Mills! And oh, take her to Julia Mills, and go away, please! until I was almost beside myself.

(*Copperfield* Norton, 456)

In this passage, reported speech, free direct speech, and free indirect speech are used and Dora’s exclamation plays “a very special sound in the ears of the reader. Free indirect style makes the hysteria of the reaction of the immature and spoiled Dora more clearly audible than would direct speech, because the voice of the narrating self, David can also be heard through it as he remembers this scene years later with a certain bemusement, perhaps, but surely no longer with the astonishment he experienced at the time” (Stanzel, 221-222). It is probably an example of pseudo-dialogic, meaning that the author is playing a double role: the narrating self and the experiencing self. Free indirect speech, or *Erlebte Rede* was, as Auerbach pointed out, “used in literature much earlier too, but not for the same aesthetic purpose.” (Auerbach, 535). In a first-person narrative in particular, it can be used for the first-person narrator to objectify the experiencing self. From the viewpoint of today’s reader, who knows the polyphonic novels, Dora’s words seem to contain multiple voices but we should hear in her words double voices of the narrating self and the experiencing self, which are one and the same voice as if two persons are singing the same song. Not multiple but double, not dialogic but monologic, not

polyphony but monophony or uniphony.

In a monologic novel, the author's speech is presented as both diegesis and mimesis. In *David Copperfield*, diegesis is powerful, particularly in the first half. Even in the second half, diegesis plays an important role, which means that the author's speech permeates the characters' speech. Homer usually uses mimesis as much as possible so that the author can hide himself behind the characters but even Homer "writes scarcely a page without some kind of direct clarification of motives, of expectations, and of the relative importance of events" (Booth, 4). In any novel, diegesis, or telling, is indispensable as is mimesis, or showing, although mimesis tends to be more and more dominant over diegesis in the modern narrative discourse. And diegesis is not one of endangered species and a primitive literary device used only in the old narratives. We can even find that "Boccaccio's artistry lies not in adherence to any one supreme manner of narration but rather in his ability to order various forms of telling in the service of various forms of showing" (Booth, 16). Diegesis has not only one form but various forms, which have been developed for a long time. The author's presence in several forms of diegesis will be "obvious on every occasion when he moves into or out of a character's mind---when he 'shifts his point of view,'" or provides "inside views" in fiction. The author's voice is "as passionately revealed in the decision to write the *Odyssey*, 'The Falcon,' or *Madame Bovary* as it is in the most obtrusive direct comment of the kind employed by Feilding, Dickens, or George Eliot. Everything he shows will serve to tell; the line between showing and telling is always to some degree an arbitrary one" (Booth, 17-20). Dickens's voice is revealed in the most obtrusive direct comment but his voice will also be revealed even only when he decides to write a novel. As Wayne C. Booth pointed out, "we must never forget that though the author can to some extent choose his disguises, he can never choose to disappear. The triumph of diegesis is inevitable.

Let us now examine Dickens's diegesis permeated in his rhetoric of the character's voice taking another novel of Dickens an example. In *Hard Times*, when Stephen Blackpool confronts the employers, he expresses himself negatively. In his words, we can hear Dickens's voice and "what the speech amounts to in positive terms is a plea for generosity, charity, imaginative understanding of the spiritual and emotional needs of humanity" (Lodge *Language*, 155). Dickens uses some rhetorical devices to express his ideas through the characters' speech. A novelist uses rhetoric "to persuade us of the validity of his vision of experience,... There is another reason why rhetoric seems a particularly useful term in discussing Dickens's work. Not only is the 'author's voice' always insistent in his novels, but it is characteristically a public-speaking voice, an oratorical or histrionic voice; and it is not difficult to see a connection between this feature of his prose and his fondness for speech-making and public reading of his works" (Lodge *Language*, 156). As we have learned from Gissing, Dickens's fondness for theatre affected his narrative style. We can spot his voice in not only the author's speech, but also the characters' speech. Dickens enthusiasm for diegesis is shown in even mimesis. His novels are destined to be monologic.

In the same way, Nabokov pointed out Dickens's voice in the characters' speech in chapter 3 of *Bleak House*. Esther appears as the narrator for the first time and begins her story in "a kind of would-be girlish

style, in bubbling baby talk,” but Dickens “will see very soon that it is an impossible medium for telling a robust story and we shall very soon his own vigorous and colorful style breaking through artificial baby talk” (Nabokov, 100). Here Nabokov found a problem of narrative style, and it is another example of diegesis through mimesis.

On the other hand, Lodge drew our attention to Dickens’s use of repetition to describe the death of Jo in *Bleak House* and make us find an emotional example of diegesis: “Repetition is also a favourite device of orators and preachers, roles that Charles Dickens often adopted in his authorial persona” (Lodge Art, 92). Dickens also uses repetition arranged by variations in *David Copperfield*: “Lovers had loved before, and lovers would love again; but no lover had ever loved, might, could, would, or should ever love, as I loved Dora” (*Copperfield* Norton, 413). Repetition of the word “love” and variations of auxiliary verbs are used in the sentence. The effect of deliberate repetition of a single item of words or its variants is “even more striking when repetition takes place in a longer syntagmatic sequence” and “each successive item is likely to narrow the possible choices for what is to follow, and the writer can work on our expectation by his skill in taking what paths are open to him” (Chapman, 52). It is seen in a passage from *Hard Times* in which Dickens uses the device to heighten his attack on the callousness of the Coketown millowners. Let us not, however, forget that Dickens uses not only repetition of words and phrases but repetition of motifs. For example, Agnes as the angel of the stained glass in *David Copperfield*. Repetition makes a rhythm. Repetition of words and phrases like Uriah Heep’s use of “umble” in his words can be called a short-range repetition or a short-range rhythm. Repetition of motifs like Agnes’s angel pointing upward can be called a long-range repetition or a long-range rhythm. And the short-range repetition or rhythm is related to the stylistic dimension and the long-range repetition or rhythm is related to the structural dimension. The style and the structure is, as Nabokov said, the form. The Form of *David Copperfield* is essentially constructed by the short-range rhythm and the long-range rhythm.

It seems safe to say that *David Copperfield* is a monologic novel. Now we are ready to discuss the next topic: Dickens’s novels and the polyphonic novel. So, let us take a look at a brief picture of the comparison between the monologic novel and the polyphonic novel.

Virginia Woolf, one of the “principal exponents of modernism,” implemented her experimental techniques in her novels, such as “free indirect discourse and interior monologue” (Birch, 1084). We will be able to grasp the main differences between the monologic novels of realism and the polyphonic novels of modernism when we compare Dickens’s novels and Woolf’s novels as Auerbach did.

...the author [Virginia Woolf] at times achieves the intended effect by representing herself to be someone who doubts, wonders, hesitates, as though the truth about her characters were not better known to her than it is to them or to the reader. It is all, then, a matter of the author’s attitude toward the reality of the world he represents. And this attitude differs entirely from that of authors who interpret the actions, situations, and characters of their personages with objective assurance, as was the general practice in earlier times. Goethe or Keller, Dickens or Meredith, Balzac or Zola told us out of their

certain knowledge what their characters did, what they felt and thought while doing it, and how their actions and thoughts were to be interpreted. They knew everything about their characters.

(Auerbach, 535)

Unlike Woolf, Dickens was one of the authors of earlier times who “interpret the actions, situations, and characters of their personages with objective assurance.” He knew “everything” about his characters. Auerbach continues:

And what is still more important: the author, with his knowledge of an objective truth, never abdicated his position as the final and governing authority.

(Auerbach, 535-536)

Dickens fully controls the characters’ speech as well as the narrating self and the experiencing self in *David Copperfield*. He also fully controls the dynamics between the selves to keep his position as “the final and governing authority” with his knowledge of an objective truth.

...The design of a close approach to objective reality by means of numerous subjective impressions received by various individuals (and at various times) is important in the modern technique... It basically differentiates it from the unipersonal subjectivism which allows only a single and generally a very unusual person to make himself heard and admits only that one person’s way of looking at reality. In terms of literary history, to be sure, there are close connections between the two methods of representing consciousness--- the unipersonal subjective method and the multipersonal method with synthesis as its aim. The latter developed from the former, and there are works in which the two overlap, so that we can watch the development”

(Auerbach, 536).

Dickens seemed to practice “the unipersonal subjectivism” in most of his novels. He had certain way of looking at reality and tried to communicate it through his characters, as Lodge pointed out in his study on *Hard Times*. The monologic novel is based on the unipersonal subjective method and the dialogic novel is based on the multipersonal subjective method. Dickens’s novels employ the unipersonal subjective method and they are monologic and Woolf’s novels employ the multipersonal subjective method and they are polyphonic. According to Auerbach, Dickens’s novels and Woolf’s novels are closely related in terms of presenting consciousness and the latter developed from the former. The only difference between them is whether the author abdicated his or her position as the final and governing authority or not. When Woolf or

Dostoevsky decided to abdicate their position, the polyphonic novel started to be formed.

Our next objectives it to find the link between the monologic novel like Dickens's novels and the dialogic novels like Woolf's novels and Dostoevsky's ones. The answer should be the polyrhythmic method which Dickens developed through his novels. In the next chapter of this paper, we will be examine it in *David Copperfield*.

References

- Auerbach, Erich (1953). *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, Fiftieth-Anniversary Edition, Trans. by Willard R. Trask, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1963). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Ed. and Trans. by Caryl Emerson, Theory and History of Literature, Volume 8, 1984, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Bloom, Harold (1994). *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*, New York: Riverhead Books.
- Booth, Wayne C. (1983). *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Second Ed., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Birch, Dinah (2009). *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, Seventh Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chapman, Raymond (1973). *Linguistics and Literature: An Introduction to Literary Stylistics*, London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Cuddon, J. A. (1991). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, Third Ed., Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dickens, Charles (1990). *David Copperfield*, Norton Critical Edition, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- (2004). *David Copperfield*, Penguin Classics Revised Ed., London: Penguin Books.
- (1999). *David Copperfield*, Oxford World's Classics, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forster, E. M. (1927). *Aspects of the Novel and related writings*, Ed. by Oliver Stallybrass, Abinger Edition, Volume 12, 1974, London: Edward Arnold.
- Gissing, George (pref. 1902). *Charles Dickens: A Critical Study*, Imperial Ed., London: Gresham.
- Lary, N. M. (1973). *Dostoevsky and Dickens: A Study of Literary Influence*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Mick Short (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, 2 ed., 2007.
- Lodge, David (1990). *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*, London: Routledge.
- (1992). *The Art of Fiction*, Vintage Ed., 2011, London: Vintage.
- McGowan, John P. (1979). David Copperfield: The Trial of Realism, In Harold Bloom (Ed.), *Charles Dickens's David Copperfield: Modern Critical Interpretations*, New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987, pp. 67-82.
- The Manuscripts Lab (2017). *Memoranda and Mutual Friends: Dickens and his practices of note-taking in the Book of Memoranda*, The English Faculty at the University of Cambridge. <https://www.english.cam.ac.uk/manuscriptslab/memoranda-and-mutual-friends-dickens-and-his-practices-of-note-taking-in-the-book-of-memoranda/>
- Muir, Edwin (1928). *The Structure of the Novel*, New Edition, London: Hogarth Press.
- Nabokov, Vladimir (1980). *Lectures on Literature*, Ed. by Fredson Bowers, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Nelson, Harland S. (1981). *Charles Dickens*, Ed. Herbert Sussman, Twayne's English Authors Series, 314, Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Serafin, Steven R. and Valerie Grosvenor Myer, eds. (2003). *The Continuum Encyclopedia of British Literature*, New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Stanzel, F. K. (1979). *A Theory of Narrative*, Trans. by Charlotte Goedsche (1984), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomalin, Claire (2011). *Charles Dickens: A Life*, London: Penguin Books.