

Agnes, Pointing at Predestined Coincidences:  
The Long-Range Polyrhythm in *David Copperfield*  
2. Polyrhythmic Novel<sup>1)</sup>

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  
2. ポリリズム小説

麻生 雅樹<sup>※</sup>  
Masaki Aso<sup>※</sup>

要旨

本稿では、ディケンズの小説が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、今回はその後半部分にあたる。この第2部では、まず、ミハイル・バフチンのポリフォニー論とディケンズの小説を比較しながら、『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』を中心とするディケンズの小説が、登場人物たちが主体的な声を持つというポリフォニー小説ではないことを明らかにする。次に、E. M. フォースターやエドウィン・ミュアによる小説の構造・小説タイプ・人物造形などの理論を再考しながら、『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』のようなディケンズ小説の人物造形に関する特徴をマーカー論として展開し、さらに、ディケンズ小説の物語構造について、そのリズムとパターンを理論的に分析する。その上で、ディケンズ小説が人物造形とプロットにおいて対位的な物語展開を持ちつつ、登場人物同士が様々なリズムをもって長い小説の中で「遠投のポリリズム」を継続しながら構造化されていることを明らかにし、最終的に『デイヴィッド・コパフィールド』などのディケンズ小説が「ポリリズム小説」であることを結論づけている。

キーワード：ディケンズ、ポリフォニー、ポリリズム、物語構造、文体論

## 2. Polyphonic novels and polyrhythmic novels

The narrative mode of Dickens's novel *David Copperfield*, as examined closely in the previous paper (Aso, 2022), is basically 19th-century classic and it has clearly been testified that Dickens's novels are written in a monologic mode. The monologic mode, however, is not exactly the same as that of other 19th-century classical monologic novels. The close analysis in the previous paper on Dickens's talent that can create a lot of impressive characters showed us that the tentative conclusion that his novels are simply monologic is insufficient for our goal to investigate and figure out the causes and sources of the "polyphonic-ish" elements of his novels. In other words, his novels cause a conflict that they are monologic but it seems that they are akin to polyphonic

---

※日本経済大学経営学部グローバルビジネス学科

or dialogic novels at the same time. Therefore, we named Dickens's novels "Pseudo-polyphonic novels" in the previous paper.

So, we will now focus on the differences between monologic novels and dialogic novels, employing Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the polyphonic novel, to examine the narrative mode of Dickens's novels as a first task in this paper.

In the polyphonic novel, according to Bakhtin, characters' voices are curiously independent from the author in the structure of the novel and they seem to be the very author of their own stories respectively and they live and interact subjectively and objectively to each other as a single entity that has unique voice and consciousness in the story, and they even claim their independent existence from the author. As Bakhtin explains, a "plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels" (Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 6). Compared to the polyphonic novel of Bakhtin, Dickens's novels do not have characters that have "independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses." In fact, the reader does not discuss with the characters directly in Dickens's novels unlike in Dostoevsky's novels. Dickens's characters' voices do not reach the reader subconsciously when they are not on stage and tend to be forgotten. Nevertheless, as E. M. Foster pointed out, Dickens's characters have some special and specific influence on the reader when they appear in their stories. Why? On one hand, that surely indicates Dickens's creativeness of characterization, but it must not be a sufficient explanation for it.

The most important elements about the special and specific influence of the characters on the reader in Dickens's novels are symbolized core images of the characters and the calculated repetition of their appearances into their stories. In this paper, we named the symbolized core image a "marker," which functions as a symbol, metaphor, or allegory, and knowing how the markers work as those functions in Dickens's novels, we will know the cause of the special and specific influence of the characters on the reader.

Each of the markers are unique and unforgettable, but more importantly each of them has a different rhythm in appearing in a story. Figuratively, they are thrown into their stories by Dickens at a calculated timing. Which is one of the important factors to make Dickens's novels look like polyphonic novels and Dickens's calculated manipulation of throwing markers into their stories in different rhythms causes a "polyrhythmic phenomenon" in his novels. That is why we can regard Dickens's novels as polyrhythmic novels, not polyphonic ones. The word "polyrhythm" or "polyrhythmic" is a musical term and it is applied to Dickens's literary works here as "polyphonic" that Bakhtin did to Dostoevsky's novels. As a musical term, polyrhythm is defined as "Simultaneous use of different rhythms in separate parts of the musical texture. It is a characteristic feature of some 14th-century music, and also of some 20th-century pieces." (Oxford, 2004: 142)

Let us examine Dickens's novels from another angle and confirm that they are polyrhythmic novels, not polyphonic ones. Firstly, Dickens's novels are not polyphonic simply because Dostoevsky invented the polyphonic novel. In literary history, it is not until Dostoevsky that we can see the advent of the polyphonic novel. As Bakhtin confirms, "Dostoevsky is the creator of the polyphonic novel. He created a fundamentally new novelistic genre. Therefore his work does not fit any of the preconceived frameworks or historico-

literary schemes that we usually apply to various species of the European novel. In his works a hero appears whose voice is constructed exactly like the voice of the author himself in a novel of the usual type” (Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 7). Taking into account the fact that Dostoevsky learned a lot about narrative methods from Dickens, Dostoevsky must have gotten some hints of the polyphonic novel from Dickens’s novels. This could lead someone to the assumption that Dickens created some kind of “the pre-polyphonic novel,” which could deductively be nominated as the polyrhythmic novel. As we confirmed above, Dickens’s novels are monologic, which means that the characters do not have their independent voices of dialogism, but they have individual and unique characteristics and they are deployed strategically and utilized effectively in Dickens’s novels. What Dostoevsky particularly learned from Dickens might have been Dickens’s characterization and the method of taking advantage of the effect of the pseudo-polyphonic novel. “Pecksniff” [*in Martin Chuzzlewit*], as C. P. Snow pointed out, “the supreme example of Dickens’s savage humour (just as Jonas Chuzzlewit is the supreme example of Dickens’s Gothic vision, and some of the criminal psychology there anticipates Dostoevsky)” (Snow, 1978: 68).

In Dickens’s novels, the author created unique characters and arranged them well in the way that they can interact with each other like a counterpoint, which is the same technique employed in many 19th-century novels. However, in the polyphonic novel, as Bakhtin explained, a plot based on that kind of characterization and arrangement of characters cannot be realized:

[O]rdinary pragmatic links at the level of the plot (whether of an objective or psychological order) are insufficient in Dostoevsky’s world: such links presuppose, after all, that characters have become objects, fixed elements in the author’s design; such links bind and combine finalized images of people in the unity of a monologically perceived and understood world; there is no presumption of a plurality of equally-valid consciousnesses, each with its own world.

(Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 7)

In the dimension of the polyphonic novel, there is something special that Dickens’s characterization and arrangement of characters cannot reach. This “something” is the sub-main difference between monologic novels and dialogic novels rather than the difference between “plurality of independent voices and consciousnesses.” It must differentiate Dickens’s novels further from Dostoevsky’s novels, in other words, the monologic novel from the dialogic novel. Let us examine Bakhtin’s opinion further. He explained the polyphonic novel by taking Vyacheslav Ivanov’s definition of Dostoevsky’s realism for example. Ivanov “defined Dostoevsky’s realism as a realism based not on cognition (objectified cognition), but on “penetration.” To affirm someone else’s “I” not as an object but as another subject—this is the principle governing Dostoevsky’s worldview” (Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 10). Bakhtin pointed out that Ivanov’s definition was wrong because Dostoevsky’s realism is not a realism based on penetration, and to affirm someone else’s “I” as another subject is not the principle governing

Dostoevsky's worldview. Analyzing Dickens's novels from this point of view, all his characters are established as an object and all the voices and consciousnesses of his characters are those of the objects, of the subjects, and of Dickens's. It means that Dickens's realism is a realism based on penetration. In that sense, it should seem to Ivanov that Dickens's novels might have the potentiality of polyphonic novels. Bakhtin, however, definitely rejected Ivanov's definition for the reason it cannot be the decisive difference between the monologic novel and the dialogic novel, and continued:

Ivanov subsequently shows how this principle is refracted, solely and entirely on the thematic plane, in the content of the novel—a refraction which is, it turns out, predominantly negative: the heroes suffer destruction because they cannot wholeheartedly affirm the other, “thou art.” Affirmation (and nonaffirmation) of someone else's “I” by the hero—this is the theme of Dostoevsky's work.

But this theme is altogether possible in a novel of the purely monologic type as well, and is in fact often found in that sort of novel. As the ethico-religious postulate of an author or as an important theme in a work, the affirmation of someone else's consciousness does not in itself create a new form or a new type of novelistic construction.

(Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 10-11)

Bakhtin's explanation of the difference between the monologic novel and dialogic novel can confirm that Dickens's novels are of “the purely monologic type.” Taking *David Copperfield* for example, David regarded Agnes as his sister until Dora died. That kind of episode leads to the theme of the subjective unacceptability to affirm someone else's as another subject. At the end of the story, Agnes confessed that she had loved David all her life and the confession enabled him to affirm her as another subject. The happy end shows us that David was able to affirm the other, “thou art” finally, but his affirmation is limited to the theme of penetration and it is only a matter of monologicality. The novel needs Agnes's independent voice in order to be regarded as an ultimate dialogical novel. As explained later, Agnes's marker is an angel pointing upward related to the stained-glass in Spenlow's house and Agnes's marker not only symbolizes “good,” but also indicates the immature embodiment of Agnes's independent voice as a subject. Agnes's marker begins to have its own voice here. As a result, it seems as if *David Copperfield* shows us the sign of an ultimate dialogicality but in reality, the sign is caused by the markers that were thrown into the story by Dickens. That will be more clearly understandable when you think about the narrative mode of *David Copperfield*. You can hear Dickens's voice through all the characters in the novel. They appear to have “dialogues” in the story, but in fact, they are not dialogues. They are nothing but Dickens's accumulating monologues. As Bakhtin explained the polyphonic novel further, in “Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel we are dealing with not with ordinary dialogic form, that is, with an unfolding of material within the framework of its own monologic understanding and against the firm background of a unified world of objects. No, here we are dealing with an ultimate dialogicality, that is a dialogicality of the ultimate whole”

(Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 18). Unlike Dostoevsky’s polyphonic novels, Dickens gives ordinary dialogic form to his novels within the framework of its own monologic understanding. In Dickens’s polyrhythm novel we are dealing with a seemingly ultimate dialogicality, that is, unordinary monologicality. Dickens’s characters’ voices are energetic, lively, expressive, and sometimes comical, and all the voices, as explained above, come to the reader as echoes of the author’s voice. It cannot be called “an ultimate dialogicality.” To identify the monologic characteristic of Dickens’s characters’ voices, let us examine how Bakhtin related about the voices that are specific to Dostoevsky’s characters:

Dostoevsky does not labor over objectified images of people, he seeks no objectified speech for *personages* (characteristic and typical), he does not seek expressive, graphic, finalizing authorial words—what he seeks above all are words *for the hero*, maximally full of meaning and seemingly independent of the author, words that express not the hero’s character (or his typicality) and not his position under given real-life circumstances, but rather his ultimate semantic (ideological) position in the world, his point of view on the world;...

(Bakhtin, 1963/1984: 39)

I think that the opposite of Bakhtin’s definition of Dostoevsky’s polyphonic novels is true to Dickens’s monologic novels, that is, Dickens seeks “objectified speech for personages” and “expressive, graphic, finalizing authorial words.” Seeing Dickens’s novels from this angle, we can conclude that they are neither dialogic nor polyphonic.

Next, let us refer to David Lodge’s explanation of the difference between the monologic novel and the dialogic or polyphonic novel in order to differentiate the narrative mode of Dickens’s novels and that of polyphonic novels. According to Lodge, the difference depends on how to use diegesis and mimesis. To know the difference between the monologic narrative and the dialogic narrative more clearly, Lodge explains them respectively in two sections juxtaposed in his *The Art of Fiction*. First, he explains in the section of “Showing and Telling,” as follows:

Fictional discourse constantly alternates between *showing* us what happened and *telling* us what happened. The purest form of showing is the quoted speech of characters, in which language exactly mirrors the event (because the event is linguistic). The purest form of telling is authorial summary, in which the conciseness and abstraction of the narrator’s language effaces the particularity and individuality of the characters and their actions. ...he [Henry Fielding] was writing before the technique of free indirect style, in which authorial speech and characters’ speech are fused together, had been discovered. In his novels the boundary between these two kinds of discourse is clear and unambiguous.

(Lodge *Art*, 1992/2011: 122)

Ultimately, the dialogic narrative mode is determined by the author's use of "the technique of free indirect style, in which authorial speech and characters' speech are fused together." Dickens's novels, like Fielding, basically wrote "before the technique of free indirect style." Lodge demonstrates the difference between the classical monologic novel and the dialogic novel after Dostoevsky, explaining Bakhtin's theory of the polyphonic novel:

Bakhtin characterized the novel as 'polyphonic' and maintained that, 'One of the essential peculiarities of prose fiction is the possibility it allows of using different types of discourse, with their distinct expressiveness intact, on the plane of a single work, without reduction to a single common denominator.' Different types of discourse can be represented in fiction, of course, as the direct speech of characters, without serious disturbance to the authority of the narrator, as in the novels of Fielding or Scott.

(Lodge *Bakhtin*, 1990: 49-50)

Lodge's explanation makes us aware of the affinity of Dickens's novels with classical realism novels like Henry Fielding's or Tobias Smollett's. Fielding's narrative technique should be an accurate benchmark for Dickens's narrative mode and it represents Dickens's monologic novels.

Lodge in turn explains polyphonic narrative mode analyzing Fay Weldon's novels in the next chapter of his book: "In fact what we have here is not a single uniform style, like Fielding's authorial voice in the passage from *Joseph Andrews*, but a polyphonic medley of styles, or voices, through which the serio-comic skirmishing of Grace and Christie's courtship is vividly but concisely evoked." (Lodge *Art*, 1992/2011: 127) As Lodge demonstrates here, Fay Weldon's novels, which are narrated in "a polyphonic medley of styles, or voices," are the opposite type of Fielding's or even Dickens's monologic novels, which are narrated in a single voice, and Lodge's implies the possibility of achieving the complete monologic narration using diegesis and mimesis like Dickens's novels.

Now the differences between the monologic novel and the dialogic novel have become crystal clear and it is proven that Dickens's novels are definitely categorized as the monologic novel and his novels are not categorized as the polyphonic novel. Nevertheless, Dickens's novels have the potential of the polyphonic novel, which is caused by Dickens's technique of throwing unique markers of characters into their stories calculatedly. Taking all the evidence into account, we suggested that Dickens's novels are polyrhythmic, not polyphonic. To discuss Dickens's polyrhythmic narrative technique further, let us go back to Dickens's characterization here and examine our theory of characters' markers.

### 3. The Polyrhythm

In pursuing our current goal, which is to discuss Dickens's narrative technique further and to explain how the markers of characters work in his novels, and to find out the polyrhythmic characteristic in Dickens's novels, let

us now examine E. M. Forster's "flat characters" again.

Dickens's characters, which are the descendants of the simple characters of the 17th-century classical novels, are called "flat characters" by E. M. Forster. According Forster, "Flat characters were called 'humours' in the seventeenth century, and are sometimes called types, and sometimes caricatures. In their purest form, they are constructed round a single idea or quality; when there is more than one factor in them, we get the beginning of the curve towards the round. The really flat character can be expressed in one sentence such as 'I never will desert Mr Micawber'" (Forster, 1927/1974: 46-47). And one great advantage of flat characters is that "they are easily recognized whenever they come in--recognized by the reader's emotional eye, not by the visual eye which merely notes the recurrence of a proper name" (Forster, 1927/1974: 46-47), and a second advantage is that "they are easily remembered by the reader afterwards. They remain in his mind as unalterable for the reason that they were not changed by circumstances; they moved through circumstances, which gives them in retrospect a comforting quality, and preserves them when the book that produced them may decay" (Forster, 1927/1974: 47-48). In *David Copperfield*, as Foster pointed out, almost all the characters are flat characters, but David himself is some kind of exception:

Dickens's people are nearly all flat (Pip and David Copperfield attempt roundness, but so differently that they seem more like bubbles than solids). Nearly every one can be summed up in a sentence, and yet there is this wonderful feeling of human depth. Probably the immense vitality of Dickens causes his characters to vibrate a little, so that they borrow his life and appear to lead one of their own. It is a conjuring-trick;...

(Forster, 1927/1974: 49-50)

Forster highly appreciated Dickens's characterization and called it a "conjuring-trick." According to Forster, Dickens's flat characters have a "wonderful feeling of human depth." Dickens's characters are flat but Dickens makes them seem to "vibrate" or to be round-ish like Pip and David. In fact, David's characterization is good partly because it was based on Dickens's own experience, but of course there is more than that. Dickens created more complicated characters in his later career. Such characters have two or more attributes in their personalities. So, how is the "conjuring-trick" of giving human depth to Dickens's flat characters conjured up?

Forster pointed out that "The part of their novel that is alive galvanizes the part that is not, and causes the characters to jump about and speak in a convincing way" and this means not only Dickens's characterization, but also Dickens's deployment of characters in the plot. Dickens was excellent at characterizing and deploying his characters appropriately and effectively in the plot in order to "cause them seem to vibrate" and "jump out." In other words, it has nothing to do with "human depth," but, it has something to do with the situations, that is, the gaps between the characterization and their behavior in the plot.

Dickens's characters are, as Forster pointed out, characterized based on one attribute per person, so that they can easily recognized and remembered by the reader when they appear in their stories. I suggested in the

previous paper (Aso, 2022: 28) that we call the attribute that is unique in each character a “marker.” A marker is a sole, never-changing attribute that each character has, and also his or her true nature recognized by their words and behavior. The gaps between markers and behavior are created when the characters get in some unexpected situations. Moreover, the gaps create some comical and surprising scenes in the plot. Those scenes contribute the characters to have some kind of roundness in their flat personalities. The conjuring-trick works in this way.

As a result, the flat characters’ vibration is caused from the effect of the combination of markers and situations. Dickens’s characters are surely all flat and they have only one attribute in each person, which functions as a marker. When they appear in their stories, the reader can easily recognize the characters and remember their past behavior. And the characters sometimes act unexpectedly in different situations. That is when they begin to seem round. It is a matter of timing and rhythm if markers can function properly or not. Markers have their own rhythms and characters play their roles accordingly.

On the other hand, Edwin Muir also appreciated Dickens’s characterization highly: “Dickens’ plots, of course, were primarily intended to keep up the reader’s interest from instalment to instalment of a serial. They had no literary function at all. To bring in his characters and set them going Dickens did not need such artifices; he had an exceptional talent in that direction.” (Muir, 1928/1967: 37). But he criticized Forster’s flat characters saying that Dickens’s characters are not monotonous and unreal: “The question is why ‘I’ll plough up that bit of gorse’ should bore us by its consistency, and ‘I will never desert Mr Micawber’ should not. And it is obviously because Mrs Micawber’s formula comes out of her fictitious social image, and that this, though a cliché, reveals the real woman to us; whereas the Sussex farmer is intended to show us his heart, and shows us his social image instead, without the author’s being aware of it. His formula is therefore false in its place, as Mrs Micawber’s is true” (Muir, 1928/1967: 136-137). The key word here must be the “social image.” This means, of course, that Mrs Micawber is a realistic character, but at the same time, it means that she acts properly or realistically in a situation. If so, Mrs Micawber is a realistic person and not so flat. Muir explains the reason why the social images of Dickens’s characters are realistic.

The flat character, being flat, has two sides. All pure characters, formally, are in a sense artificial. They continue to repeat things as if they were true. Perhaps these things were once true; but they have long since ceased to have their first fresh conviction and have become habitual. Everybody reiterates certain sentiments half mechanically in this way, just as everybody repeats certain gestures, once spontaneous and passionate. It is this accumulation of habits, dictated by their natures or imposed by convention, that makes every human being the potential object of humour. The flat character is pre-eminently this incarnation of habit.

(Muir, 1928/1967: 142)

The word “two sides” of the flat character mentioned by Muir here indicates the “accumulation of habits” and



the “natures” of the flat character. Those are equally the two sides of markers.

Habitual behavior has the other side: the true nature. Taking Mrs Micawber for example, her slogan, “I never will desert Mr Micawber” shows her true nature: trust and determination, which is her marker. Like her marker, conceptualized markers provide the roundness of the characters in each situation. So, Forster and Muir ultimately mean the same thing. A marker is an attribute or a concept of a character and it is flat in that sense, but it reflects differently according to situations. As a result, a marker has two sides. The marker shows the duality in a situation and it depends on what kind of situation it is put in, that is, it depends on the timing and rhythm of deployment of the marker.

F. K. Stanzel analyzed the problem of rhythm in *David Copperfield*: “In *David Copperfield* 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, 1979/1984: 75). In Stanzel’s analysis, he dealt with the same problem that David Lodge examined: showing and telling or diegesis and mimesis. According to Stanzel, in the later part of *David Copperfield* Dickens employs more showing and less telling. That is why the story becomes rather uneventful and monotonous.

Considering Dickens’s markers and rhythms that are deployed in the long plot, however, the problem of diegesis and mimesis is not important. In addition, the later part of the novel seems to be uneventful and monotonous because it is focused on Dora’s death and Emily’s retrieval and it is the result of foregrounding both situations. In layman’s terms, it has less comical and more serious atmosphere. Dickens surely employs more showing in later chapters to try to give the reader the feeling that the story comes to an end with a dramatic effect. Nevertheless, if you examine the novel more closely, markers are deployed constantly and they are developed in several complicated rhythms. To measure the effect of the complicated rhythms, we should examine Forster’s idea of “rhythm” in a novel like Marcel Proust’s *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu*.

Forster analyzed the rhythm in a novel: “[The work of Marcel Proust] is chaotic, ill-constructed, it has and will have no external shape; and yet it hangs together because it is stitched internally, because it contains rhythms” (Forster, 1927/1974: 113). About the rhythm that stitches the chaotic work internally, Forster continues: “There are several examples (the photographing of the grandmother is one of them), but the most important, from the binding point of view, is the ‘little phrase’ in the music of Vinteuil” (Forster, 1927/1974: 113). The same thing could be applied to *David Copperfield*. A variety of characters are introduced and interact and become more uncontrollable in the long plot, but just as Proust’s long novel, the story “is stitched internally, because it contains rhythms.” What we need to notice is that *David Copperfield* contains multiple different “rhythms.” This is the point that we would really like to insist on: the story is stitched by a variety of characters, or markers, in multiple different rhythms. In reverse, multiple different rhythms support the ultimate unity of the novel. The assertion that *David Copperfield* is a polyrhythmic novel is confirmed in the very sense. Another important point here is the repetition of the markers. It is, of course, expected in our discussion, a marker is

applied to each character and the markers are recognized every time they appear in the plot. The markers have their own original rhythms and each marker keeps its rhythm and repeats itself, which is another essential element of a polyrhythmic novel like *David Copperfield*.

Forster mentioned the difference between the rhythm and the banner or symbol. “A banner can only reappear, rhythm can develop,” and rhythm has “a life of its own.” Its power can stitch a story together from the inside, and contribute to “the establishment of beauty and the ravishing of the reader’s memory.” It sometimes mean “nothing and is forgotten, and this seems to me [Forster] the function of rhythm in fiction: not to be there all the time like a pattern, but by its lovely waxing and waning to fill us with surprise and freshness and hope” (Forster, 1927/1974: 114-115). In this paper, the polyrhythmic novel is defined as a combination of stress and repetition of markers. If a marker is regarded as a symbol, a metaphor, or an allegory, Forster’s banner and developing rhythm become applicable to the polyrhythmic novel. Markers are repeated and stressed in a plot in multiple different rhythms, so the rhythms of the markers develop in each situation in the plot. The repetition and stress of the markers create different rhythms, as Foster insisted: “Done badly, rhythm is most boring, it hardens into a symbol, and instead of carrying us on it trips us up... I doubt that it can be achieved by the writers who plan their books beforehand, it has to depend on a local impulse when the right interval is reached. But the effect can be exquisite, it can be obtained without mutilating the characters, and it lessens our need of an external form” (Forster, 1927/1974: 115). The development of the markers indicates the different rhythms and they are defined by Forster as “repetition plus variation” (Forster, 1927/1974: 115). The “variation” means the markers repeated, stressed, and developed in each situation. As Forster pointed out, by the way, Dickens is a good writer at dealing with rhythms because he tended to rely on “a local impulse” so that the right interval is reached.

Let us now examine another issue apart from Forster’s idea of rhythm, which is Forster’s idea of “pattern.” I think we can get a new insight into the polyrhythmic novel by this examination. Forster categorized the pattern of novels into two: the shape of an hour-glass and the shape of a grand chain. And he explains the two as follows: “Thais, by Anatole France, is the shape of an hour-glass... In the central scene of the book they [the two chief characters] approach, he succeeds; she goes into a monastery and gains salvation, because she has met him, but he, because he has met her, is damned. The two characters converge, cross and recede with mathematical precision, and part of the pleasure we get from the book is due to this” (Forster, 1927/1974: 102). Following Forster’s idea of pattern of novels, *David Copperfield* can be the shape of an hour-glass. In the story, Steerforth, Emily, Ham, Uriah Heep, and Littimer are “damned” people, on the contrary, David, Mr Micawber, Dr Strong and Tommy Traddles “gain salvation.” In addition to this, if focused on the relationship between David and Agnes only, the novel can be categorized in the shape of a grand chain. David finds the ultimate partner at last in the end of the story. If so, *David Copperfield* is a novel that has a combined shape of an hour-glass and a grand chain. More importantly, however, all the characters “converge, cross and recede” to form some patterns of counterpoint. It is as if some musical notes are arranged in counterpoint and positioned against each other in a musical bar, and those notes develop after several bars accidentally so that they have a fresh, different harmonic effect. Like this, the characters make a new situation with a fresh counterpoint effect. Those

arrangements of counterpoint in *David Copperfield* might be that of social classes like the upper class and the lower class, or might be that of good characters and evil characters. Either way, they can work as a counterpoint in each situation. Forster's idea of pattern makes us realize that an important factor of the polyrhythmic novel is the counterpoint that can create the shape of an hour-glass or the shape of a grand chain. And in *David Copperfield*, the characters have different timing to act so that they sometimes meet and do not in the plot. There are also two types of counterpoint: the counterpoint of accidentally synchronized -timing and the (non-) counterpoint of different-timing.

Originally in musical sense, a counterpoint is “the combination of two or more related but independent melodies into a single harmonic texture in which each retains its linear or horizontal character” (*Webster's*, 1986: 520). When it comes to Dickens's counterpoint, the “two or more related but independent melodies” are equal to characters' independent markers, and they sound certain melodies according to situations in their stories. In other words, Dickens's counterpoint does not deal with melodies but with rhythms and each marker is accentuated by particular stress. Dickens's counterpoint can be defined as two or more related but independent “rhythms” into a single harmonic texture in which each retains its linear or horizontal character. This must be called the polyrhythmic novel. Dickens's counterpoint is deeply intertwined with the forms of his novels. Let us now examine Vladimir Nabokov's idea of form of a story to discuss further our idea of the form of the polyrhythmic novel. Nabokov gives the formula of the form of a story is (Nabokov, 1980: 113):

Form (structure and style) = Subject Matter: the why and the how = the what.

According to Nabokov's idea of the form of a story, Dickens's novels would be constructed on stress (structure) and repetition (style). Structure (the why) is throwing markers into the plot (stress) and style (the how) is characters' behavior in a situation (repetition). This formula creates a wide variety of rhythms and keeps them in long plots. Form (structure and style) supports the long-ranged rhythms, which are not spaced, as Nabokov pointed out: “The bursts of vivid imagery are spaced—they do not occur for stretches—and then there is again an accumulation of fine descriptive details. When Dickens has some information to impart to his reader through conversation or meditation, the imagery is generally not conspicuous. But there are magnificent passages” (Nabokov, 1980: 114). Markers are spaced and keep their different rhythms in their long stories.

It takes many pages for a long story to be narrated in a book. A story is written in letters and the written story has time within the story. A story written in letters has time and the letters occupy some space. Therefore, a long story can be regarded as a long distance. As a life is usually regarded as a journey, Dickens's characters are thrown into the the long-distant journey, as well as into the time spent in their stories. So, his characters are deployed in space accordingly. This can be paraphrased that Dickens deploys his character according to their “spatial rhythms.” The rhythms of Dickens's characters are not kept for a long time in the story, but kept for a long distance in the story, which can be rephrased as a “long-ranged story.”

Muir concluded about the long-ranged rhythms:

It will be an image of life, not a mere record of experience; but being an image it will inevitably observe the conditions which alone make the image complete and universal, and those, I have tried to show, reduce themselves to a representation of action predominantly in time or predominantly in space. Seeing life in time, or seeing it in space, the writer can work out the relations, the dynamic values, of his plot satisfactorily and to an end, and transform his vague and contingent sense of life into a positive image, an imaginative judgment.

(Muir, 1928/1967: 149-150)

In Dickens's novels, characters' markers are repeated and keep their rhythms in the plot. Through the plot, the same markers work in "accidentally designated situations." This is the same as Forster's idea of the developed rhythms. Markers are thrown into the plot and keep their rhythms, and the different rhythms synchronizes accidentally in the end like  $4 \times 3 = 12$  and  $3 \times 4 = 12$ .

Now let us examine the long-ranged polyrhythms of the characters in *David Copperfield*. The table below shows the main characters' markers and chapters in which they appear in the story.

Table 1

CHARACTERS	MOTHER	DORA	BETSY	EMILY	STEERFORTH	MICAWBER	URIAH	DARTLE	AGNES	TRADDLES
MARKERS	Curl Dance	Curl Dance	No ungentle hands	Ship Lady	Knife	Difficulties Anything turned up	'Umbles	Scar	Angle point- ing upward	Skeletons
CHAPTERS										
1	●		●							
2	●									
3				●						
4	●									
5										
6					●					●
7					●					●
8	●		(●)							
9	●									●
10				●	(●)					
11						●				
12			(●)			●				
13	(●)		●		(●)					(●)
14			●							
15			●				●		●	
16							●		●	
17	●			(●)		●	●			
18									●	
19			●		●				●	
20					●			●		
21				●	●			(●)		
22				●	●					

	MOTHER	DORA	BETTSY	EMILY	STEERFORTH	MICAWBER	URIAH	DARTLE	AGNES	TRADDLES
23			●		●				(●)	
24					●			●	●	
25							●		●	●
26		●					●		●	
27						●				●
28					●	●				●
29					●			●		
30		●		●						
31				(●)						
32								●		
33										
34			●			(●)			(●)	●
35			●				●		●	
36						●		●		●
37		●	●							
38		●	●							●
39						●	●		●	
40			●							
41		●								●
42		●				(●)	●		●	
43			●						●	●
44		●	●							●
45			●							
46				(●)	(●)			●		
47			●							
48		●	●							
49			●			●				●
50		●		●				●		
51			●							
52		●	●			●	●		●	●
53		●							●	
54			●			●			●	●
55					●					
56								●		
57				●		●			●	●
58									(●)	
59			●							●
60			●						●	
61							●			●
62			●						●	●
63				(●)		(●)			●	
64			●					●	●	●

(●): Mentioned as an important topic in the story

The table shows us the markers’ “accidental designated rhythms” and the polyrythm consists of those rhythms. Please note the counterpoint that the characters’ markers form in the story. Every marker is polyrythmically structured in the group of similarity and the group of contrast. Among the markers, the most impressive one is Agnes’s. Agnes’s marker is an angel of the stained-glass pointing upward. When you check the chapters in which Agnes appears against David and Steerforth, you can recognize the polyrythm of Agnes’s marker. It is situated in the last scene all the way through the long-ranged rhythm of her marker. It is a predestined coincidence.

## Conclusion

In this paper, it is clarified that Dickens's novels are monologic and the author's voice echoes through all the characters' voices. However, as Foster pointed out, Dickens uses a specific technique to make his characters "vibrate" as if a conjuring-trick. Dickens creates unique characters that have their own markers and uses the technique of stress, repetition, and counterpoint to deploy them intentionally and coincidentally through his novels in different rhythms. This is called the polyrhythmic novel in this paper.

The polyrhythmic novel like *David Copperfield* is a novel before Dostoevsky's polyphonic novels, in the polyrhythmic novel, coincidence is predestined and characters are made work as markers between coincidences and planned situations keeping the long-ranged rhythms. However, the markers keep their own rhythms in counterpoint between coincidence and planned situations and they sound to each other in "spatial rhythms." In other words, the polyrhythmic novel consists of coincidental destiny and predestined coincidences.

## Note

<sup>1)</sup>This is the continuation of the paper below.

Aso, Masaki (2022). Agnes, Pointing at Predestined Coincidence: The Long-Range Polyrhythm in *David Copperfield* 1. Pseudo-polyphonic Novel. *The Economic Review of Japan University of Economics*, 52 (1), 19-40.

## References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. In Caryl Emerson (Ed. and Trans.), *Theory and History of Literature* (Vol. 8). Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1963)
- Dickens, Charles (1990). *David Copperfield* (Norton critical ed.). New York, NY: 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, Edward Morgan. (1974). *Aspects of the Novel and related writings* (Abinger ed., Vol. 12). (Oliver Stallybrass, Ed.). London: Edward Arnold. (Original work published 1927)
- Gove, Philip Babcock (Ed.). (1986). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Lary, N. M. (1973). *Dostoevsky and Dickens: A Study of Literary Influence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Latham, Alison (Ed.). (2004). *Oxford Dictionary of Musical Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lodge, David (1990). *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge.
- (2011). *The Art of Fiction* (Vintage ed.). London: Vintage. (Original work published 1992)
- Muir, Edwin (1967). *The Structure of the Novel* (new ed.). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1928)
- Nabokov, Vladimir (1980). *Lectures on Literature*. (F. Bowers, Ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Snow, Charles. Percy. (1978). *The Realists: Portraits of Eight Novelists*. London: Macmillan London.
- Stanzel, Franz. Karl. (1984). *A Theory of Narrative* (Charlotte Goedsche, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1979)