

of thought flows from her judging ideas by their sound: "It was the hymns that made the theology, not the preaching" (p. 28). As her psychologist observes, "the reason why music goes with religion . . . is that it is also anti-rational" (p. 10). The reader may very well doze off while reflecting on the thoughts of this woman who invariably falls asleep when reading Pascal, who had declared "philosophy not worth an hour of trouble" (*Pensée* 174). As rendered by the protagonist of *The Glassy Sea*, philosophy does not merit half that much study. Marguerite Heber indulges in "marvellous discussions of metaphysics" (p. 53), but the author never chooses to have her character articulate these for our intelligence and entertainment.

*The Glassy Sea*, a volume of "clouds of unknowing" (p. 157), in which sexual orgasm and mystical experiences are treated as "syntheses" (p. 19), mirrors a "lazy" (p. 59) "cluttered mind" (p. 153) reflecting on itself in a manner much inferior to Rilke's. For Rilke, who provides the epigraph of the novel, as for Engel's protagonist, God becomes a "tendency of the heart"; and, as in Rilke's *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, which mirrors the progress of a soul from debasement to the possibility of unspeakable bliss, the integration of unknowing owes more to Jung than to theology. As Erich Fromm writes in *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, "Needless to say, in the logic of Jung's thinking insanity would have to be called an eminently religious phenomenon" (New Haven, 1959, p. 18). The author, perhaps, like her character, hankers after a discipline which eludes her. If, in the words of *The Glassy Sea*, "the essence of philosophy is logic" (p. 49), she "should never even have tried philosophy" (p. 154). Marguerite is much more at home in a world that makes few demands on intelligence: "There's apparently a greed for sex that comes and goes" (p. 141), she offers for our meditation.

Camille R. La Bossière

LARS HARTVEIT  
*The Art of Persuasion:  
 A Study of Six Novels*  
 Bergen: Universitetsforlaget,  
 1977. Pp. 152.

In his conclusion the author concedes or warns, "It is easy to over-elaborate the art of persuasion." (Easy for the critic, he means, though the sentence is ambiguous.) "All verbal communication is in the last resort a matter of persuasion" (p. 133). By then he has conducted the reader through *Pamela I*, *Silas Marner*, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *A Passage to India*, *Brighton Rock*, *A Clockwork Orange*, revealing in them different "aspects" of the art. The choice of novels is "partly arbitrary, partly personal"; some are "old friends" (p. 7). A Forsterian conception, post-Leavis in analytic detail, and a Boothian interest in point of view.

Richardson is shown to have sought, unsuccessfully, how to fuse overt didactic purpose with convincing characterization ("Pamela as an exemplary character and Pamela as a character in her own right" [p. 16]). In *Silas Marner* the author's didactic impulse is woven into the patterns of imagery, principally of the open/closed door. The art of persuasion depends largely on authorial control of point of view. Hardy's dilemma to reconcile "his dogmatic need for inarticulate characters, who illustrate the view that man is a tiny creature that blindly collides with an inscrutable fate, with his need for a character who can perceive and articulate this bleak vision" (p. 50) is overcome by a sharing of narrative point of view with a central character—an interested spectator-victim, Elizabeth-Jane Newsom/Henchard/Farfrae. Forster varies the nature and degree of authorial involvement: he persuades through "accent"—modulating two "tones," symbolic-poetic and matter-of-fact ironic, to show that cultural differences put harmony between colonial and native always just out of reach—and by "design"—the evocation of India and human existence is with all the effects of elusiveness a conscious achievement of form. Greene, in contrast, is continuously present in his narrative, directing the reader to see tawdry Brighton as a battleground of Good and Evil: the novelist has taken over as persuader. Moral considerations are inapplicable in *A Clockwork Orange*; we are

to take the nightmare violence on a purely aesthetic level. The eloquent first-person narrator is supposed to tame us from our concern with his morality to an admiration of his mesmeric power with language. "We are invited to surrender to the orchestral magic of his language, the secret of his devilish charm" (p. 129), says Hartveit in a Conradian flight. We have reached "the limits of persuasion."

The readings are sound and provide useful introductions to works which might well figure in an introduction to prose fiction in the English tradition (with due exercise of critical discrimination: we do not have here the best of Richardson or Hardy, and the latest two works are, for all the art of persuasion in them, inferior fictions comparatively). Key, and notoriously slippery, critical terms are deployed—form, design, pattern, accent, tone, emphasis—and the reader will need to be alert to distinguish among them and keep Hartveit's thread, despite and even because of his pains to be lucid ("It is easy to over-elaborate the art of persuasion"). Also, Hartveit tends to over-quote and in quotation is faithful to his *MLA Style Sheet*, or equivalent, to the point of fastidiousness: there are too many words suffering dismemberment by square brackets. Then, Conrad's masterpiece is not *The Heart of Darkness*; and one wonders by what

criterion Hartveit can call the hero of *A Clockwork Orange* "intelligent" especially when he has just emphasized his "limited understanding."

These are momentary disturbances in a meticulous and fluent if rather dry and earnestly delivered study. More importantly, Hartveit opens, but lets slip, rich possibilities of comparison among his chosen texts and of reference outside them: in fact, he does not do either of these things nearly enough. The general reader (to whom this book has been addressed along with the specialist) would welcome pointers: how is it that the art of persuasion is of unequal success in these novels? Looking at Richardson and Burgess, what can one generalize about first-person narrators as persuaders (especially if they are like Pamela and Alex clothes-conscious)? Who else persuades through pattern both like and unlike George Eliot? Is Hardy's use of character in this novel typical of his practice in his other novels? Who else with Greene among modern writers works with allegory? Such questions point to the limitations of Hartveit's arbitrary/personal choice; positively, however, his study shows, even in its omissions, what may be done by examining a variety of fictions.

P. J. M. Robertson