

José Antonio Alvarez Amorós
University of Coruña

It is an acknowledged fact that the study of the different methods whereby the speech and thought of the fictional character can be represented in narrative texts had its heyday in the seventies and eighties, following the development of a brand of narrative theory deeply rooted in structuralism and textual linguistics. Names such as Norman Page, Dorrit Cohn, Roy Pascal, Brian McHale, Meir Sternberg, and Ann Banfield are closely associated with the poetics of literary quotation, although their positions *vis-à-vis* concrete issues in this field are, more often than not, widely divergent. This interest in the verbal presence of character on the surface of narrative texts began to dwindle in the nineties with the gradual demise of formalistic criticism under the pressure of a view of literary discourse which proved to be less schematic and restricted than that adhered to by classical structuralism. If evidence were called for to document this change of emphasis, a cursory scan through the substantial bibliography appended to Vladimir Tumanov's *Mind Reading* will suffice, for only five of the over two hundred entries collected there were published in the nineties and, of these five, only two —those by L. A. Radzikhovskii and S. Rimmon-Kenan— are expressly devoted to the reproduction of the verbal activity of character on the textual microstructure. For this reason, Tumanov's contribution can be looked upon as a welcome reactivation of a central issue of narratology, and one which is inseparably connected to questions of narrative voice and point of view. In addition, *Mind Reading* continues the critical tradition originated in the fifties by Robert Humphrey's *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel* (1954), Melvin Friedman's *Stream of Consciousness: A Study in Literary Method* (1955), and Erwin R. Steinberg's *The Stream of Consciousness and Beyond in Ulysses* (1958), even though Tumanov's theoretical bases draw heavily on discourse linguistics and empirical data about the psychological nature of inner speech in human beings.

The focus of *Mind Reading* is what its author calls *unframed direct interior monologue* (henceforth UDIM), a variety of interior monologue characterized by being *direct*, which means that the thinking subject is designated by the first-person pronoun «I,» and *unframed* or, in other words, not embedded in a third-person or heterodiegetic frame text such as that surrounding the thoughts of Stephen Dedalus or Leopold Bloom in *Ulysses*, or even those of Molly Bloom in «Penelope,» if we consider the novel as a whole. Methodologically, Tumanov pursues his ends within a purely mimetic theory of the novel, his book being a brilliant and successful attempt at naturalizing UDIM, a genre whose greatest set-back and greatest paradox lies in verisimilitude: on the one hand, UDIM can be seen as the most mimetic vehicle for the reproduction of fictional thought; on the other, it involves a direct eavesdropping on a consciousness and the marshalling of words to denote what goes on in the mind, both of which are activities placed well beyond credibility. In order to lay the theoretical foundations for his method, Tumanov resorts to discourse linguistics, as well as to the conventions of first-person or homodiegetic narrative, the experimental discoveries concerning the nature of real-life inner speech, and the linguistic study of oral, spontaneous discourse. From discourse linguistics and homodiegetic narration, he draws his conviction that mimesis in UDIM is just a contrastive and relational notion devoid of absolute value in itself. By this he means that the reader will only experiment the illusion of mental mimesis inasmuch as the features of the resulting discourse contradict the conventions of realistic, first-person narrative texts. The yardstick against which to measure the departures from these conventions is Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality as presented in their influential 1981 book *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Of these seven standards, Tumanov addresses only three, cohesion, coherence, and intentionality, respectively defined as syntactic well-formedness, semantic continuity, and the pragmatic will of the addresser to facilitate the addressee's decoding process. Non-standard grammatical constructions, non-sequitur

conceptual links like the chaotic association of ideas, and the so-called «unwanted reader» effect, tend to violate cohesion, coherence, and intentionality, removing UDIM far from traditional homodiegetic narration and increasing the illusion of private self-communication. From the very outset, Tumanov insists that the definition of UDIM as a literary genre is based on the constant tension between its quasi-mimetic abhorrence of conventional first-person narrative and its inescapable informative goal, which inhibits the generation of absolutely self-communicative and, therefore, absolutely meaningless texts.

Mind Reading, however, also draws on the study of psycholinguistic phenomena such as children's egocentric speech, real-life inner speech, and spontaneous oral discourse. In fact, the UDIM features that infringe Beaugrande and Dressler's standards of textuality can also be attested in samples of these three phenomena, thus suggesting that «fictional UDIM does indeed have a counterpart in reality» (22) or, in other words, that there is a naturalistic connection between UDIM and real-life inner speech. To investigate the nature of inner speech on an objective basis, A. N. Sokolov devised an experiment whereby he could measure the micromovements of speech musculature during verbal thought, and discovered that, although abstract thinking is accompanied by bursts of muscle activity far stronger than visual thinking, both of these proceed by verbal means. Additionally, he proved that inner speech is characterized—like egocentric speech and spontaneous oral discourse—by a tendency towards omitting the Theme, or old information, and retaining the Rheme, or new information. But if a minimum of intelligibility is to be retained, Theme deletion must not be final, and the omitted elements should be somehow recoverable, especially through the recursive reading of the UDIM text and the collateral information provided by the linguistic context. It should be borne in mind, however, that the impression of realism given by UDIM is largely conventional and not based on a *verbatim* reproduction of inner speech. Tumanov draws this rather paradoxical conclusion by confronting the low mimetic illusion created in readers by the UDIM verbalization of non-verbal thought—generally provoked by sensorimotor experience—with the scientific fact that its occurrence actually induces bursts of inner speech activity. Apparently, in the case of UDIM, «[s]cientific evidence . . . takes second place to communicative conventions» (30).

After his methodological and theoretical discussion, Tumanov devotes the remaining chapters of *Mind Reading* to the analysis of four UDIM works: Vsevolod Garshin's «Four Days» (1877), Edouard Dujardin's *Les lauriers sont coupés* (1887), Arthur Schnitzler's *Leutnant Gustl* (1900), and Valéry Larbaud's *Amants, heureux amants . . .* (1921). Those by Garshin, Dujardin, and Schnitzler are clearly pre-Joycean texts, whereas Larbaud's was written after the serialization of the early episodes of *Ulysses* in the *Little Review*. All four, however, are successive steps towards a more perfected UDIM technique capable of provoking in the reader the illusion of private self-communication. Garshin's «Four Days»—written originally in Russian—is a very rudimentary UDIM text. Tumanov describes it as being poised between the conventions of traditional homodiegetic narrative and those of true interior monologue. The impression of direct eavesdropping on a consciousness is achieved by trying to synchronize experience and its mental verbalization, though lapses into retrospective narration are frequent. These lapses are not, however, the only faults that turn «Four Days» into a somewhat unconvincing UDIM text. Summary, for example, at times intrudes upon scene; there are instances of narratorial framing in the form of subordinating expressions such as «I see,» «I feel,» or «I smell»; and explanatory comments cancelling out the illusion of private self-communication are by no means uncommon. In spite of these and other imperfections, Tumanov considers Garshin's «Four Days» the forerunner of a whole tradition of UDIM works and «the first to explore the potential» (31) of this innovatory technique. Dujardin's *Les lauriers sont coupés* entails a significant leap forward in the development of UDIM. First, it eliminates the lapses into retrospective narration so typical of «Four Days»; second, it creates the impression of self-communication by imitating the features of spontaneous oral discourse and not only by trying to synchronize experience and mental verbalization as in «Four Days.» This leads, of course, to a consistent violation of Beaugrande and Dressler's standards of textuality mentioned above. Discourse in *Les lauriers* is fragmentary, abbreviated, apparently unpolished and unplanned. Reliance on the linguistic context becomes indispensable if a suitable decoding is to be achieved. Ref + Prop constructions—omission of the syntactic links within sentences—and Theme deletion are rife in this text, the awkwardness of the so-called

«copy» —or co-referential— pronouns being intensified by all manners of purposeless repetitions and ruptures in the semantic continuity. The greatest problem of *Les Lauriers* is, however, its lifeless presentation of sensorimotor experience. The protagonist's inner speech must verbalize his external circumstances and physical actions, and this makes discourse stylistically stiff, though not, as we have seen, remote from the actual workings of the human mind. In «Four Days,» sensorimotor experience was conveyed via narratorial framing («I see something dark and big . . .»), but Dujardin improves on Garshin's method and presents this experience impressionistically, i.e. by means of loose nominal phrases which create a more effective illusion of private communication. Three decades later, Joyce solved the stylistic problem of presenting Leopold Bloom's physical environment in *Ulysses* simply by placing his monologue in a heterodiegetic narratorial frame. But this solution removed him drastically from the UDIM genre.

In Tumanov's opinion, Schnitzler's *Leutnant Gustl* is an even better sample of UDIM than *Les Lauriers*. The features bespeaking the violation of cohesion, coherence, and intentionality in Dujardin's text are also present here, but are reinforced by frequent instances of syntactic topicalisation, by the transgression of the usual word order of the German sentence, and even by morphological omissions (especially of vowels), a type of discourse abbreviation that Tumanov also finds in real spontaneous German speech and in children's writing patterns (89). Apart from these morphosyntactic features, Schnitzler's text manages to enhance the illusion of self-communication by means of a consistent use of interior dialogue. Gustl's personality is split into two interlocutors —one pessimistic and one optimistic— and his final decision to commit suicide is thus made dialectically through a succession of questions and answers. Contrary to what happens in *Les Lauriers*, references to the external world in *Leutnant Gustl* are very sparse and the method employed to communicate them is not at all stilted. Instead of presenting these references by means of narratorial language (Garshin) or by an accumulation of loose nominal phrases (Dujardin), Schnitzler conveys sensorimotor experience dramatically, i.e. by displaying Gustl's reaction to his environment and not the environment itself. This internalization of sensorimotor experience leads Schnitzler to avoid declarative or narrative sentences and replace them with exclamative and interrogative ones, better suited to the expression of subjectivity. But the most impressive of the UDIM texts analyzed by Tumanov is, beyond doubt, Larbaud's *Amants, heureux amants* ... not only because it contains all the syntactic features so far associated with private self-communication, but also because it is the *locus classicus* of the so-called «unwanted reader» effect, namely the systematic violation of Beaugrande and Dressler's standard of intentionality. In *Amants*, there is an absolute disregard for the addressee's decoding efforts, and this is manifest in the omission of fundamental linking elements, in the absence of key contextual information, in the substitution of enigmatic expressions such as «celle à qui je pense» for proper names, in the non-explicit reference of pronouns, and in the countless cultural allusions that make discourse even more arcane. Eventually, the reader is left «with a disjointed stream of private association» (117) and the uneasy feeling that he has truly trespassed into the privacy of the protagonist's consciousness. Needless to say, the Ulysean influence can be perceived throughout.

Although the most striking feature of *Mind Reading* is the parallel hypothesized between literary inner speech, or UDIM, and real-life inner speech, it seems that Tumanov's analysis of UDIM discourse as a consistent breach of the standards of cohesion, coherence, and intentionality is of more important and far-reaching effects. In *Mind Reading*, UDIM is characterized as constituting an essentially contradictory genre: purportedly, it is the most mimetic mode for the reproduction of fictional thought, but, at the same time, it relies on grossly artificial procedures that demand «the reader's willing and active suspension of disbelief» (130); it also labours between the quasi-mimetic goal of creating the illusion of self-communication and the informative goal of allowing the reader to make sense of it; finally, it combines anti-narratorial techniques, conversational tendencies, and the need to attain some kind of external macrocommunication. Few genres, if any, can reach this level of complexity, and the value of *Mind Reading* lies precisely in its attempt to account for this complexity in a clear and convincing way.