

## ***Born in Exile, Bakhtin, and the Double-Voiced Discourse of the Epistolary Form***

REBECCA HUTCHEON  
University of Bristol

“You know that I constantly use irony & this is never under[stood]; it is all taken in the most stupid literal sense.”<sup>1</sup>

In Bakhtinian terms, irony, along with sarcasm and cynicism, is understood as what emerges when carnivalesque humour collides with oppression and suffering. It can also be seen as a leitmotif of Gissing’s writing. It has produced, in the critical reception, a persistent search for some sympathetic shelter from the inevitable bathos of *ressentiment*. A clear indication of this is the manner in which Gissing’s correspondence has been seized upon as capitulating the myth of the author as noble victim. It is just this motif that Gissing sought to keep out of his fiction itself, and the novels make us uncomfortable to the precise degree that they disallow any such melioristic modes of escape.

Similarly, the impulse to discover the author in the books has been particularly forceful in Gissing criticism. Yet, because of the heteroglossic and dialogic nature of Gissing’s writing, this has had the effect of creating a mythic figure of an author invested in such a vast array of seemingly autobiographical characters and, consequently, one wrought with paradox, contradiction, and inconsistency. Perhaps, then, the clue to the man, so obfuscated by the novels, lies in his supposedly monologic correspondence and as a result the publication of the nine volumes of Gissing’s *Collected Letters* has proselytised the highly influential strand of biographical criticism in which, most worryingly, his correspondence is valued almost as much as his novels.

The critical engrossment in the letters as the key to the novels is misleading due to their fundamental difference in form. Gissing’s novels display what Constance Harsh has defined as the “looseness of Gissing’s artistic control” in relation to his use of free indirect speech.<sup>2</sup> The letters, by contrast, maintain a much tighter discourse or, in Bakhtin’s terms, are “monologic form” uttered “outside the artistic context” of work and thus

are merely prototypes for several of the idea-images in [...] novels. For this reason it is absolutely impermissible to substitute a critique of these monologic idea-prototypes for genuine analysis of [...] polyphonic artistic thought. It is important to investigate the *function* of ideas in [the novels’] polyphonic world, and not only their *monologic substance*.<sup>3</sup>

Where Bakhtin warns against using letters and articles as an explicative tool for understanding novels by proxy, Gissing identifies the problems of this confusion of forms but in reverse. In 1894, for instance, he writes to the *National Observer* complaining that “the novelist is often represented as holding an opinion which he has simply attributed to one of his characters,” amounting to a form of negligence with “all the effect of deliberate misrepresentation.”<sup>4</sup> Although approaching the issue from different angles, both Gissing and Bakhtin point out the disingenuous and misleading effect of confusing the ideas of characters with those of the novel’s author.

Yet despite Gissing’s exhortation against “deliberate misrepresentation,” such forms of criticism have prevailed and, as the title of Gillian Tindall’s eloquently written biographical reading *The Born Exile* implies, *Born in Exile* (1892) has been a prime victim for the minimalising character-author interpretations of Gissing’s works.<sup>5</sup> However, if we turn to the letters – the biographer’s favoured elucidatory tool – these understandings are far from straightforwardly substantiated: “Peak is,” Gissing writes to Bertz,

in a great degree, sympathetic to the author. But you will not find that Peak’s tone is to be henceforth [mine...] it seems to me that the tone of the whole book is by no means identical [with] Peak’s personality, certainly I did not mean it to be so. Peak is myself – one phase of myself. I described him with gusto, but surely I did not, in depicting the other characters, take *his* point of view?

There is a pronounced reservation in the equation of the already strangely detached “author” with character, and there is, moreover, a marked distinction – an implicit opposition even – between protagonist and, through “tone,” the stance or attitude of the piece. Arguably, nowhere is Gissing’s irony so sharp, language so slippery, the *ressentiment* so forceful than in *Born in Exile*.<sup>6</sup> The author’s

and protagonist's voices may seem deeply interlocked but unpacking them reveals an irony which separates the two. Furthermore, as Gissing draws attention to the "other characters" and their contrasting attitudes, nowhere is the "dialogic communication *between* consciousnesses," the confrontation of the "ideas of *others*," so qualified.<sup>7</sup>

The affinity between Gissing and Dostoevsky has already been convincingly established by Jacob Korg, John Sloan and Simon J James.<sup>8</sup> While, as James points out, "Gissing's narrative voice is certainly more heavily ideologically inflected than Mikhail Bakhtin seems to find Dostoevsky's," his "work shares many of the qualities of the Dostoevsky novel lauded by Bakhtin in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*."<sup>9</sup> Gissing, for example, like Dostoevsky, "thought not in thoughts but in points of view, consciousnesses, voices" and thus views of ideologies of his novels contradict the performatively monologic ones stated in his correspondence.<sup>10</sup> So, with this in mind, this article will turn the matter on its head and ask: what happens when letters appear in Gissing's novels?

Like many of Gissing's works, *Born in Exile* contains numerous examples of what Bakhtin defines as "inserted genres" such as letters, articles, reported dialogues, parodically reinterpreted citations.<sup>11</sup> To Bakhtin, letters in novels are "images of ideas" – the refracting word – in which the author's conceptions and aspirations are refracted through characters. They are a form or variety of *Ich-Erzählung* [first person narration]. Discourse here, as in the epistolary style, allows for double-oriented speech, and in most cases is unidirectional. In other words, the discourse of letters does not express ideas in a straightforward and direct fashion, but is adjusted to take their recipient's views and concerns into account. In *Born in Exile*, a novel so concerned with the irony of double standards, with self-presentation and preservation, and – perversely – the innate and often almost irresistible impulse to expose such hypocrisy (in others, society, and oneself), letters take on a particularly performative quality, expressing a guardedness, seeking the avoidance of confrontation and detection yet fraught with an undertone of scepticism. The sense of the double-voice in *Born in Exile* is thus not just a literary technique but a sign of the double-consciousness that permeates the narrative.

The clearest instance of double-consciousness is seen in Godwin Peak – the lower middle-class exile with a misplaced "aristocratic temperament" who, in order to penetrate the class to which he believes he naturally belongs, suppresses his deep-seated atheistic cynicism under a guise of liberal Anglicanism. But even prior to this, the narrative is wrought with the irony of Godwin's double-consciousness or, in the Bakhtinian understanding of consciousness as always a language, the dialogism or doubleness innate in the associated processes of perception of and interaction with the world. Like Bakhtin, the narrative of *Born in Exile* recognises the commonality of multiplicity in language by presenting Godwin as an example of an "intelligent young man" in a "society strange" to him:

Only the cultivation of a double consciousness puts them finally at ease. Impossible to converse with suavity, and to heed the forms of ordinary good-breeding, when the brain is absorbed in all manner of new problems: one must learn to act a part, to control the facial mechanism, to observe and anticipate. [...] The perfectly graceful man will always be he who has no strong apprehension either of his own personality or of that of others, who lives on the surface of things, who can be interested without emotion, and surprised without contemplative impulse. [...] Peak] was beginning to understand the various reasons of his seeming clownishness.<sup>12</sup>

The references to "suavity," "play a part," "control", "observe and anticipate" exhibit the innate dialogism of speech by emphasising the tension between the language of the protagonist and other characters. Godwin's speech is orientated towards the discourse of another, rendered double-voiced, then, through the forms of internal polemic and stylisation. The idea of having "no strong apprehension of [...] personality" and living "on the surface of things" contains an implicit reference to Negative Capability and the suppression of personality, perhaps standing as an ideological and retrospective poetic justification for Godwin's debilitating class insecurity. There is a wonderful duality implicit in "seeming clownishness" – alongside a resistance to the carnivalesque which Bakhtin views as an essential truth. And for Godwin, of course, the motivation for the internalisation of the one in favour of the cultivation of another is social status, the showcasing of the "aristocratic temperament" at the expense of the needy beneficiary. At Whitelaw Godwin is preoccupied with achieving the façade of "self-possession" whilst simultaneously tormented by the silenced but known thoughts of others.

## The letters of Godwin

The form in which both Godwin's socially paranoid dialogism, and the interpenetration of narratorial and protagonistic language, is most revealed in the various letters in the novel. After deciding to leave Whitelaw following the arrival of his working-class uncle and the approaching establishment of "Peak's Dinin' and Refreshment Rooms," Godwin writes to Lady Whitehall requesting permission to complete his funded studies in London. The passage begins in the third person, which intimates the double-voice in the epistle: "all possible respect yet firm," a narrative "without confession" in which "he could not hint" at the real reason, and moves on to quote monologically from the letter.<sup>13</sup> So far, so direct. Yet, immediately after this, the narrative continues "the lady must interpret that the best she might" in a tone suggestive of Godwin's perfunctory stance.<sup>14</sup> Then we get an echo of the letter Godwin wished he were writing: "dignified without effort," displaying "disinterestedness."<sup>15</sup> Thus the letter is multi-tonal, a surface idea hiding both the real motivation and natural discourse. The performativity of the epistolary form is highlighted at the close: "several portions of the letter struck him as well composed, and he felt that they must heighten the reader's interest in him. With an author's pleasure (though at the same time with much uneasiness) he perused the appeal again and again".<sup>16</sup> The letter is "double-voiced" since Godwin has written with his audience in mind and in a consciously stylised fashion. The "uneasiness," in strange conjunction with the "author's pleasure" in creative pride, anticipates the fine line between performance and pretence along which the novel pursues and reiterates the sense of doubleness from the beginning.

Following his subsequent meeting with Lady Whitelaw Godwin is described hurtling home in "feverish excitement."<sup>17</sup> In the report of his reflection on the exchange there is a strange part-focalisation: "That would have been to act with dignity; that would have been the very best form of gratitude [...] But no, his accursed lack of self-possession had ruined all"; followed by rhetorical questions and exclamations.<sup>18</sup> The prose, through its anaphoric repetition and contrast, reflects Peak's thought process from regret, through resentment to the perverseness which at once motivates and undermines his affected "self-possession." Thus, by the opening of the next paragraph, with "composed already," we are already in Godwin's interior monologue and yet approaching it via narrational irony.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the jolty prose – enacting the state of mind which we are privy to – further contradicts the attitude Godwin aims to portray, accentuating its performativity. The letter is reported not monologically but dialogically:

He begged Lady Whitelaw would forgive this thoughtless impropriety; she had made him understand the full extent of his error. Of course he could not accept anything more from her. [...] – "instead of going into the world to make a place for myself among the scientific investigators of our time."<sup>20</sup>

The hyperbolically phrased "thoughtless impropriety" is melodramatic and appears spurious. The concluding quote from the letter is "double-voiced" due to its echoes of the discourse of Whitelaw College's philanthropic aims and the benevolence of Sir Job, without which its lower-middle-class student would have "set forth into the world with no better equipment of knowledge than was supplied by some 'academy' of the old type."<sup>21</sup> However, the ironic tone causes it to appear cynical and parodic through repetition, taking on the quality of a hidden, antagonistic polemic.<sup>22</sup> Consequently, the letter is a "microdialogue" and provides an example of dialogic interchange.

Following this, the free indirect discourse continues, indicated by a narrative interjected with various colloquialisms which impede the aspired decisiveness:

One's claims to respectful treatment must be put forward unmistakably, especially in dealing with such people as Lady Whitelaw. Now, perhaps, she would understand what his reserve concealed. [...] He read his letter several times aloud. This was the great style; he could imagine this incident forming a landmark in the biography of a notable man. Now for a fair copy, and in a hand, mind you, that gave no hint of his care for caligraphic seemliness: bold, forthright.<sup>23</sup>

"Such people" is Godwin's opinion as he reads Lady Whitelaw as a straightforward prototype of someone with the "superiority of mere brute wealth,"<sup>24</sup> and yet his bombast is undermined by his nescience of both the complexities of character the narrative reveals and the adverse way in which he comes across. Godwin does not really want Lady Whitelaw to understand what his reserve conceals, but rather to present her with a character of his own invention. This sense of playing a part is

amplified as he, reading the letter aloud as though in performance, perceives it as the “great style.” The pronouncement evokes both the “grand style” of rhetoric and the “grand manner” in painting, two modes characterised by their use of idealisation and figuration. Thus the narrative, focalised through Godwin, recognises the “doubly-oriented” speech in the stylisation, or the borrowing of another’s discourse.<sup>25</sup> The reference to emblematic forms emphasises the letter’s status as “an image of an idea,” not presented in a single voice, but via a combination of battling heterogeneous voices. In constructing an alternative narrative of the self, Godwin, grandiose and self-dramatising, envisages his story as “a landmark in the biography of a notable man” in a way which underlines the textualisation of life. It is almost as though, like Dostoevsky’s heroes, Godwin is consciously self-aware, but unlike in Bakhtin’s definition, he is also cripplingly cognisant of his fictionality.<sup>26</sup> So self-conscious, in fact, that he imagines even his handwriting could expose him and its subsequent falsification suggests the fundamental dissimulation of the written word.

However, when it comes to narrating his composed self through real, external dialogue with his mother “Godwin found his tongue falter” as he wonders how to “convey to another the intangible sense of wounded dignity which had impelled his pen”,<sup>27</sup> his consciousness is implicitly questioned and tested by the ideas of other “life-positions” in the book.<sup>28</sup> The written self, the inserted genre, remains hidden, unposted, until a letter arrives from Lady Whitelaw, granting his request:

[F]orthwith he sat down to write quite a different letter from that which still lay in his private drawer,— a letter which he strove to make the justification (to his own mind) of this descent to humility. At considerable length he dwelt upon the change of tastes of which he had been conscious lately, and did not fail to make obvious the superiority of his ambition to all thought of material advancement. [...] a letter in which the discerning would have read much sincerity, and some pathos; after all, not a letter to be ashamed of. Lady Whitelaw would not understand it; but then, how many people are capable of even faintly apprehending the phenomena of mental growth? <sup>29</sup>

The location of the letter, in Godwin’s “private drawer,” microcosmically perpetuates and enacts the “intimacy of one’s own room” which Bakhtin defines as the “zone of the letter.”<sup>30</sup> Elsewhere, Bakhtin asserts that Ivan in *The Brothers Karamazov* is “not disputing with Alyosha but above all with himself,” and here the fact that Godwin is in dialogue with “his own mind” is noted via narratorial comment.<sup>31</sup> At the close it appears that we have slipped into free indirect discourse as Godwin considers his tonal achievements and yet, through the reference to “the discerning” and “sincerity,” it is overtly self-ironising, and the sentiment is further undercut by the presence of rhetorically-charged “pathos.” The “pathos,” perhaps, represents an immediately undermined desire for a monologic discourse. The litotes, “not a letter to be ashamed of” has an obscuring quality which accentuates the dialogism between narrator and character. By this point, Godwin appears almost convinced by his own misplaced superciliousness – an ironically rendered egotism which undercuts his ability to gain self-knowledge. Godwin, then, estranged from rather than conjoined with the narrator is constructed of surface qualities which are nonetheless hidden from explicit view – obtained indirectly via negation. Reading the novel from a Bakhtinian point of view completely counters persistent biographical readings, such as Halperin’s suggestion that “All [Peak’s] ‘aristocratic instincts’, as Gissing calls them, are his own.”<sup>32</sup> In fact, Godwin has no fixed position, no monologic consciousness, for it is his only defining feature, the persistent “idea function” of the “savagely aristocratic temperament,” which is tested throughout.

### **The letters of others**

Unlike the dialogically reported letter, in which the subtle switches between third-person narration and free indirect discourse are sometimes hard to determine, through the I-narrators of the monologically quoted epistolary forms the reader is made doubly aware that the author is not addressing them directly but through the represented discourse of some persona or character. *Born in Exile* is a novel of ideas in which debates, discussions, and arguments about radicalism, theology, and science are foregrounded. Characters in the novel are, superficially at least, figurations of various ideological standpoints – a feature attested by their quasi allegorical names.<sup>33</sup> Thus characters’ discourse, be it spoken or written, generates and sustains the continuous struggle and interchange of competing interests and ideas. This is evident in a written exchange between Sylvia Moorhouse and Sidwell Warricombe which begins with a strangely-phrased apology for not writing sooner: “I have

written to you mentally at least once a day, and I hope you have mentally received the results,”<sup>34</sup> as though to think is to communicate or, in Bakhtinian terms, “to be is to *communicate*.”<sup>35</sup> At this point, the letter is interrupted by the narrative discourse as Sidwell notices that “Sylvia had carefully obliterated two lines, blackening the page into unsightliness. In vain Sidwell pored over the effaced passage, led to do so by a fancy that she could discern a capital P, which looked like the first letter of a name.”<sup>36</sup> The description is fraught with tensions: between Sylvia’s acting “carefully” and the resulting “unsightliness.” Also, where Sidwell’s “fancy” suggests something whimsical and capricious, “pored” implies something much more assiduous. And Godwin – disguised, implied, half-present, imagined – is introduced only to be effaced from the discourse. Obliterate, with its Latin roots implying to literally unwrite, anticipates the way in which, later, Godwin will be written out of the novel. In a text in which names carry a part of, or stand as an emblem for, identity, it is particularly telling that Godwin’s presence, reduced to a “P,” is blackened and effaced: designations which connote something hidden or shifted, like Godwin himself. And yet, his trace remains and perhaps influences the direction of the discourse:

Don't trouble yourself so much about insoluble questions. Try to be more positive – I don't say become a Positivist. Keep a receptive mind, and wait for time to shape your views of things. I see that London has agitated and confused you; you have lost your bearings amid the maze of contradictory finger-posts.<sup>37</sup>

This, presumably, is in response to an earlier, unquoted letter from Sidwell. Yet the way that Sylvia’s reference to Positivism is placed directly succeeding the present absence of Godwin, reminding the reader of the “peculiar recklessness of mood” during his recent visit to the Moorhouses in which “ironic temptation was terribly strong,” requiring, in a way reminiscent of Poe’s “Imp of the Perverse” (1845), “an incessant effort to refrain from self-betrayal”, suggests that the abrupt change of subject is an oblique response to a hidden polemic of deep-rooted cynicism.<sup>38</sup> Bakhtin suggests that in Dostoevsky’s novels the authorial discourse is loosened, allowing other discourses in the text to dialogically interact in more complicated ways. In these terms, Sylvia’s advice to Sidwell, to be “more positive” can be understood as a direct antithesis to Godwin, earlier depicted as devoid of “[a]bsolute faith [...] essentially a negativist, guided by the mere relations of phenomena”, and his Schopenhauerian impulses.<sup>39</sup> The struggle of competing ideas – “the maze of contradictory finger-posts” – embodied in Sidwell stands in contrast to Godwin’s innate recognition of the connectedness between abstracts.

Sidwell’s reply realises the anticipated answer of Sylvia’s letter:

By way of being more “positive”, I have read much in the newspapers, supplementing from them my own experience of London society. [...] The decay of religious belief is undermining morality, and the progress of Radicalism in politics is working to the same end by overthrowing social distinctions. Evidence stares one in the face from every column of the papers. Of course you have read more or less about the recent “scandal” – I mean the *most* recent.– It isn’t the kind of thing one cares to discuss, but we can’t help knowing about it, and does it not strongly support what I say? Here is materialism sinking into brutal immorality, and high social rank degrading itself by intimacy with the corrupt vulgar. There are newspapers that make political capital out of these “revelations.” I have read some of them, and they make me so *fiercely* aristocratic [...] You will tell me, I know, that this is quite the wrong way of looking at it. [...]

Reading this, Sylvia had the sense of listening to an echo. Some of the phrases recalled to her quite a different voice from Sidwell’s. She smiled and mused.<sup>40</sup>

In both “Problem of Speech Genres” and *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, Bakhtin notes that an author can use quotation marks to signal a voice shift or to “lend expressivity” to another, as though “the *change of speech subjects* has been internalised.”<sup>41</sup> Sidwell uses speech marks throughout her letter. Firstly, the reiteration of Sylvia’s “positive” in a way which accentuates the dialogic method, the speech marks give it a vaguely ironic edge and this anticipates the following description. Secondly, in quoting newspapers, the letter becomes metatextual, with Sidwell foregrounding the issues and debates of declining religious belief, growing Radicalism and the immorality of the press via a dialogue with a second inserted discourse through dialogue. The single word citations – “scandal,” “revelations” – contain a subversive mockery of the certain type of newspaper from which they are sourced. Furthermore, the personified “evidence stares one in the face” vivifying the image-idea and lending it a life of its own. This personification is pursued as the letter progresses, with “high

social rank degrading itself.” The use of italics – *most*; *fiercely* – give the words a visually iconic status. The sense of the hidden polemic, the antagonism between the proprietous evasion of polite society and the candid bavardage of metropolitan journalism, emphasised through the shifting register as Sidwell moves, in one sentence, from the indefinite “one” to first person plural “we” and finally to the first-person singular “I”, reveals a double-oriented discourse which incorporates various speech-acts. Through the direct address to Sylvia: “you will tell me,” the letter appears to confirm the theory that “[i]f the word is territory *shared* by both addresser and addressee, by the speaker and the interlocutor, then language is not one’s own.”<sup>42</sup> This sense of a shared language is furthered, at the close, through the interpretation, focalised through Sylvia, of reading giving “the sense of listening to an echo” of “quite a different voice” – most pertinent in Sidwell’s phrase “*fiercely* aristocratic.” Thus the communication between consciousnesses is further multiplied – the idea-image being polyphonic or multi-voiced through Sylvia’s recognition of Godwin’s register disguised and refracted in Sidwell’s. Sidwell’s language, much like Godwin’s, is not her own.

The end of the novel provides a final example of how Godwin is disguised and discussed through the written word:

[I]n a hand there was no recognising:

“Ill again, and alone. If I die, act for me. Write to Mrs Peak, Twybridge.”

[...]

He turned hurriedly to the foreign writing [...] beyond *Geehrter Herr*, scarcely a word yielded sense to his anxious eyes. Ha! One he had made out – *gestorben*.

[...]

“Dead, too, in exile!” was his thought. “Poor old fellow!”<sup>43</sup>

This stands in painful contrast to the letter Earwaker received ten days earlier, where Godwin confidently writes that in Vienna he “shall get [his] health back again”, and which is ironically placed directly preceding the news of his death.<sup>44</sup> Like Bakhtin’s understanding of Dostoevsky’s heroes, Godwin cannot achieve “absolute death (non-being)” or “the state of being unheard, unrecognised, unremembered.”<sup>45</sup> Godwin’s final message, reduced to a “hand there was no recognising,” is symbolic of his ultimate inability to author the self in death just as he failed to in life.

In Dostoevsky, Bakhtin suggests, “final agony and death are observed by others. Death cannot be a fact of consciousnesses itself,” because death belongs to the person but not consciousness.<sup>46</sup> Death, in fact, “doesn’t exist at all.”<sup>47</sup> It is an “objective fact for other consciousnesses” and “finalises nothing.”<sup>48</sup> And in *Born in Exile*, Godwin’s death is not reported directly, but via a letter written in “excrebabl[e...] German manuscript.” The one word Earwaker can discern – “*gestorben*” – is visually and linguistically emblematic of how Godwin has, through his sentient cultivation of double-consciousness weighted too much on the surrounding otherness and too little on his core self. The news is given dialogically once Earwaker and his acquaintance have “extracted the essence” of the letter.<sup>49</sup> The pseudo-scientific register, along with the respective definitions of Godwin as “the English gentleman,” “the stranger,” and finally “the body” and the particularly bathetic ending query: “[t]o whom should *bills* be sent?” have a distancing and ignobling effect.<sup>50</sup> This highlights how Godwin’s death, like those in Dostoevsky’s novels, is an objective fact for other consciousnesses. A character is given the last word, and it encapsulates the idea-image which rings out throughout the novel, incorporating Godwin’s initially repressed though increasingly recognised self, and – through its echo of the title – the narrative view. It is a word which disallows the conclusion and completion since, although “unheard” and “unrecognised,” Godwin is, through “exile,” defined and remembered.

In the end, Godwin is deprived entirely of his ideological content and is written out of the novel, remaining only as an image of an idea once removed. This is uncomfortable for the reader through contrast – the narrative departs unsensationally and indirectly from identification to comment and reportage – underlining the irony innate in the image of the self as “aristocratic temperament” finally exposed as “poor” “exile.”

- 
- <sup>1</sup> *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, 9 vols, eds. by Coustillas, Matheison, Young (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1990-97), Vol. 7 (1995), p. 318.
- <sup>2</sup> Constance Harsh, "Gissing's *In the Year of Jubilee* and the Epistemology of Resistance," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 34:4 (1994), p. 855.
- <sup>3</sup> Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and translated by Caryl Emerson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 92.
- <sup>4</sup> *George Gissing on Fiction*, ed. by Jacob and Cynthia Korg (London: Enitharmon Press, 1978), p. 76.
- <sup>5</sup> John Halperin, *Gissing: A Life in Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1982) suggests: "At times he seems to forget he is writing a novel, so directly does he speak to us of himself and his own disappointments," p. 163, see also pp. 160-63; John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice Among the Literary Intelligensia, 1880-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), writes "much of what Godwin believes in, Gissing himself never outgrew," p. 113.
- <sup>6</sup> The innate ambiguity of the novel's narrative is astutely expressed by Ralph Pite, who explains: "Godwin's success is disturbing and sometimes funny because it shows how much escapes detection in social interaction and how little there is of mutual understanding or genuine exchange," in "Place, Identity and *Born in Exile*," *Rereading Victorian Fiction*, eds. by Alice Jenkins and Juliet John (London: Macmillan, 2000), p. 138.
- <sup>7</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 88.
- <sup>8</sup> Jacob Korg, *George Gissing: A Critical Biography* (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 173; John Sloan, "The Literary Affinity of Gissing and Dostoevsky: Revising Dickens," *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*, 32:4 (1989), pp. 441-453; Simon J. James, *Unsettled Accounts: Money and Narrative in the Works of George Gissing* (London: Anthem Press, 2003), p. 44.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>10</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 93.
- <sup>11</sup> Godwin's initial fabrication is based around a report of a sermon interpreted ironically, but understood unambiguously by his audience; the growing friendship between Godwin and Mr Warricombe is reliant, in part at least, on a translation of a German disquisition, and Godwin's eventual carnivalesque "unmask[ing]" or uncrowning centres around the discovery of his authorship of the article "The New Sophistry" by Buckland, to name but one example". See George Gissing, *Born in Exile* (1892; London: Everyman, 1993), p. 309.
- <sup>12</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, pp. 55-56
- <sup>13</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 72
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>22</sup> Bakhtin explains: "analogous to parodistic discourse is ironic, or any other double-voiced, use of someone else's words; in those instances too another's discourse is used for conveying aspirations that are hostile to it," *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 194. Jameson also notes that "the normal form of the dialogical is essentially an antagonistic one," *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 84.
- <sup>23</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 77.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>25</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 189.
- <sup>26</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, pp. 48-49.
- <sup>27</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 78.
- <sup>28</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 88.
- <sup>29</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 79.
- <sup>30</sup> Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 397.
- <sup>31</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 279.
- <sup>32</sup> Halperin, *Life in Books*, p. 163.
- <sup>33</sup> As Christine Huguet, "Written too, in exile!": A Metatextual Approach to *Born in Exile*," *A Garland for Gissing*, ed by. Bouwe Postmus (Amsterdam: Rodolphi, 2001), explains that "naming is performative" in the novel, p. 167.
- <sup>34</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 266.
- <sup>35</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 287.
- <sup>36</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 266.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 252.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.
- <sup>41</sup> Bakhtin, "Problem of Speech Genres," *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, eds. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist and translated by V. W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), p. 92.
- <sup>42</sup> V. N. Volonšinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), p. 86.
- <sup>43</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, pp. 415-16.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 416.

---

<sup>45</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 288.

<sup>46</sup> Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Poetics*, p. 290.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Gissing, *Born in Exile*, p. 416.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*