

The Prospects of Reading in J. Hillis Miller

P. Prayer Elmo Raj

Assistant Professor

PG and Research Department of English
Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30

Abstract

Text is a narration that demonstrates a correspondence between mind and its objects. The writer creates a harmony displayed through an imaginary relationship between meaning and narration. Text, for Miller, is an open-ended category which is not a mere tool for the production of meaning but adjudicates and reflects the historical conditions in order to transform and fashion meanings with the audience. Correspondingly, reading becomes the extension of the otherness of the text guised into the incongruity of language. Miller finds the foundation for double reading in radical polylogism, which is an analogous effect of cognitive and linguistic potential. Narrative, therefore, envisions plurality of narratives enshrined in an intricate relationship. The interlink between theory and reading is accomplished through perpetuity of differences that augment the unpredictability of meaning and examination that reassures hermeneutic conclusiveness. This paper is an attempt to map the Miller's assumptions prospects of reading, the interconnection between theory and reading and cognitive/critical consciousness evolved in and through the making of meaning/narration.

Key Words: Reading, Text, Narration, Parabasis, Polylogism, Theory, Catechresis, Parabolic, Ethics

The assumption that each word in a text is a narration exemplifies a relationship between "mind and its objects." The writer fashions a unity that emanates various paths from the same center. At the centre of the text is revealed an image or event that is imaginary, configuring its form through the choice of words. Form revealed by the writer is a cue for the writer's autobiographical details and his relation to the world, paving way for an objective narrative that is to be understood from outside. A text is not a peripheral pattern of meaning but a specific expression of the personality and spirit of the author. Words express the experience of the world. A text is "translated," that is, displaced, transported, carried across, even when it is read in its original language by someone who belongs to another country and another culture or to another discipline" (Miller, *Topographies* 317). The text, however, is open ended. The unknown in the text is made explicit by the production of meaning, a characteristic signature of the text. Text is

not a mirror of historical conditions but transforms those conditions. It arbitrates history when it is read. Therefore, a text is productive and performative making things happen.

Creative texts are intervened by theoretical works with a glimpse of the wholly other and constant attention to the language of the text. The change from consciousness to language allows a critic to move closer to the exchange between reader and the word from which meaning materializes. This exchange includes a referent. Therefore, the critic has to focus on specific events of reading without invariable reference to theory. Reading, in this sense, refers to the incongruity of the text, its otherness. Miller's notion of otherness is that of "an alterity that cannot be logically understood by being turned to some version of the same. That is to say, it's not a same other" (Miller, "Humanistic Discourse" 8). Reading veils the oddness of language by "naturalizing" and "neutralizing" it to appropriate the other or "each hetero-otherness" (Miller, *On Literature* 33).

A text is an expression of single consciousness of the author. It appropriates the author's world in a unique manner to explicate his/her consciousness. The narrator and the reader are related within an open horizon of interaction. Innate form of a text is observed as combination of direction to the imagination of discourse and attention to the demonstration of consciousness in a conventional work of art. Time is foundational to fictional form because it entangles the finality of novel bringing together experience spatially and structurally. A miniature world within a world, the form and meaning of a novel faces interpretive questions. Reading fiction prevents rupturing the interrogation that mutually shun out self-sustaining formalities. While the foundational experiential aspect of fiction is temporal, novels can also be counterintuitive in terms of "1) an unmediated expression of an omniscient mind; 2) a linguistically overdetermined accumulation of signs referring only allegorically to the ultimate failure of representation; or 3) as an overarching spatial design containing within its frame a fixed pattern wherein we might find the same characters or images unchanged each time we open the same novel" (Dunne 49). Faithful experience of reading determines temporality of fiction altering it into "open form." Interaction with discourse of different consciousness is significant in the way intersubjectivity and consciousness are brought together. Consequently, writing about it becomes dislocation and

dissemble. It neither removes nor adds anything in the text but presents an exact replica of what the experiences teach.

Philosophically represented, double reading is a “permanent parabasis.” A line repeats an idea, redoubles it not only by repeating its idea but also ironically collapsing it to make a “double double” to generate a parabasis. However, the narrative line cannot contain permanent doubling. The term Miller employs to denote double reading is “radical polylogism.” Radical polylogism happens “as an effect of the human imaginative power to be, or to think of itself as being, someone other than itself and to speak for that other. ‘Radical polylogism’ would mean the presence of an indefinite number of incompatible logoi in a text” (Miller, *Reading* 121). Doubling of narrative involves a superimposition of mind over mind or voice over voice in a circuitous manner dealing with plurality of central narratives. Each narrative obscures the other in the process of reading. Narratives distribute a convoluted relationship between central logos and permanent parabasis of the same logos. While the task appears impossible to bring the irony objectively, the narrative becomes a fatality. “Even the attempt to master dialogical doubling through theoretical reasoning seems to become dialogical, that is, no longer, strictly speaking, reasonable, just as rational discourse about irony seems infallibly to become itself ironical” (Miller, *Reading* 122). Dialogism is evocative of rational narrative classification formulating circuitous discourse. Fictional characters constantly alter the purity of present. Such purity depends on the possibility of truth that is explicated by literature. Derridean “being-two-to-speak” is a mysterious way of being together in defining the feature of fiction and the possibility of altering the experiences of otherness of other in expressing plurality of voices. Within a significant plurivocal ambience, polylogism enables fiction through a rigorous hermeneutical impulse. “If the wholly other does not come except in multiple voices, each work is unique and irreplaceable opening that allows the others to come or rather to come in their not coming” (Miller, “Derrida” 74).

Reading is an unanticipated obligation. It is a self-reliant act evoking specific response from the reader. A veiled text demands exploration of an unfamiliar territory to fashion fresh responses with hope and chance. “All acts of reading are a manner of doing without knowing in the ways in which (or by which) reading can be seen as a mode of conduct. Reading is doing, an

act or series of acts causing something else, something other, to happen in turn” (Dunne 20). It is not an incomplete activity but perverse. It is perverse because it anticipates a formidable task where humans are compelled to perform. Reading should be directed by anticipation of surprises, the assumption that what we recognize when we read a work is different from what we expected or the previous readers have led us to anticipate. “Perversion is therefore not subversion. It does not simply undermine in a counteractive or countervailing sense. Perversion is neither an inversion at the level of polarity, neither is it subversion at the level of reduction or ruination” (Dunne 74). There is no center in perversion, no logos or termination. A text allows either corroborating or contradicting the method of reading. It reflexively puts up with our reading and misreading through an unforeseen potential over the readers. The text cannot differentiate the right reading from wrong reading but demands of us the way we read.

Reading is a “performative catachresis,” a fine middle path between literature and interpretation enforcing meaning that cannot be encountered face to face. Conversely, theory is “performative praxis” that directs the process of reading but is devoid of epistemological value in itself and “help us get on with the serious business of reading” (Miller, *Ariadne's* vii). Theory is embedded into the text and exists in the act of reading. Reading is guided by theory yet both are antithetical. Theory is an epistemological supposition and reading is an ontological endeavour. Theory is “constative” and reading is “performative.” Theory is a generalization, that which do not fit as it veils the foundational uniqueness of literature. Catechresis is a discordant trope; a trope is compiled of distressed protocols. Our incapability to locate names for unadministered event relates to dissonance: “All the common names for the Internet and its programs are catechreses”: “the web,” “the net,” “the information superhighway,” “the galaxy,” “cyberspace” are instances of an unchangeable human endeavor for offering a systematic account of the new or the different (Miller, *Black* 117). Miller’s perspective on reading includes specifications of pre-involved rejoinders or possibility of belief. What we seek is a limitless accountability to the other envisaging a differential structure, alogicality veiled within ideal sovereignty but with a promise for future.

Theory and reading are lop-sided: “Though there is not theory without reading, theory and reading are asymmetrical” (Miller, *Topographies* 323). Translating theory discards reading

and misreading as it collocates specific time and place overlooking broader topography. This interchange, with its dislocations, divulges the fleeting formulation of theory that is structurally diminutive and generalized. James Joyce explains it through Stephen's inner consciousness: "The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words home, Christ, ale, master, on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be for me an acquired speech. I have not made or accepted his words. My voice holds them at bay. My soul frets in the shadow of his language" (Joyce 194). The "apodictic equation" generalizes translations forwarding unlimited tasks in the inevitability of translation. However, there is also the impossibility of re-locating the original.

Prosopopoeia is key to literature, "Without prosopopoeia no poetry, no narrative, no literature" (Miller, *Topographies* 72). It is the foundational trope of literature that explains the "virtual spectrality," "what we do when we ascribe a voice, a face, or a name to what is absent" (Dunne 83). When we read, we are responsible for what we arrive at. Exploitation of the trope is indispensably central to all "good, responsible, responsive" reading. "All readers are necromancers. Reading is the art and practice of a dark magic called necromancy, and dare I say it, Miller is an arch-virtual-necrophiliac" (Dunne 83). Reading is akin to the act of spectralization. It is a responsibility; the living has towards the dead. Responsibility, here, is not a choice. We cannot choose how and when to respond to what we read. It is with this response the ethics of reading collectively organize a response to the demand of each text be read.

Reading what the author's mind has constructed is the responsibility of the reader. The reader cuts a deplorable irresponsibility if he/she is not able to derive the mind's construction. Moreover, reading a narrative culminates in the dual proposal the narrative is revealing as possibility of the impossibility of unveiling. The linguistic is puzzled with material reality to cause a nonphenomenal textual reading of "I." The relocated text, thus, causes the reading "I," a coalition with material reality in the act of reading. Therefore, the "I" becomes a linguistic act in a self-accrued procedure and is approved by no sovereign witnessing "I". "It is not an 'I' who speaks or writes, in any of these effectively working historical actions. It is an impersonal possibility of thinking, speaking, writing, there already within language, that takes possession of

the 'I' to think itself, speak itself, or write itself and thereby enters history. When it enters history, it makes things happen as they happen" (Miller, *Hawthorne* 126).

Parabolic reading will not assign the other a designation as in critical archaeology but endeavors to depict the matter of truth. Parables do not guide by indirection or bring explicit knowledge to the reader. They employ words to make meaning relationally to the other echoing in the narrative. Parabolic reading is a performative act that is irreducible to cognition, that which surpasses the acts of disclosure and reason. Parables are embedded with sequence of performatives untied during reading. When a narrative is superimposed, the reader fails to read. Supplementary narrative that alternatively imposes form not only makes a linguistic error but also changes the text ambiguous. Therefore, when one can read and interpret, it seems to absorb a different than actual reading, the text becomes a "perpetual fugacity." The text demands respect in the act of reading. The author's ability to view narration as an allegorical deviant structure that does not offer ethical rules but fashions a code in the instant of reading becomes a possibility. Therefore, reading is prior to theory and has the ability to alter the critical discourse subversively to those who teach literature.

Close reading responds to systems of language with an explicit aim to teach the veiled meaning. Reading gratifies philological drive to make literary sense on oneself. Ethics of reading is respect to the text and the obligation to read the text, "to read carefully, patiently, scrupulously, under the elementary assumption that the text being read may say something different from what one wants or expects it to say or from what received opinion says it says" (Miller, *Theory* 315). It depends on the ability to locate the necessity of a "double gesture," a response and responsibility, to a process of seeking, passive and active responses. Ethics of reading is an overwhelming demand and responsible freedom for a response that is interpersonal, socio-political, institutional and historical. "What happens when I read must happen, but I must acknowledge as my act of reading, though just what the "I" is or becomes in this transaction is another question" (Miller, *Ethics* 43). Uncertain paragrammatical organization is an issue of prosopopoeia that allegorically proposes the reader's responsibility in recognizing their identity. This strange organization communicates to the reader, the idea of an unjustified responsibility to a code that is unknown to an instant that is rebuilt retrospectively. The narrative "I" alters

according to the context with changing temporalities, distributed, segregated and diffused. Consequently “consciousness, intentionality, meaning, and intention unequivocally identifiable by the hearers, or promises, are effects of iterability, rather than the other way around.” (Miller, *Speech* 84).

Reading is the “consciousness of the consciousness of another.” “Through the act of reading the reader tries to identify himself with another mind and to reexperience from the inside the feelings and thoughts of that mind. Reading novel is a form of intersubjectivity” (Miller, *Form 2*). Reading is an endeavor that accomplishes a concurrence of subject with another subject necessitating provisional centers and correlating the manner in which the reader moves from one passage to another. There are texts that are “self-interpretive” which wheedles the reader to share within the eternal self-preserving interpretation. The text fashions interpretive elements which only readers can “share” during interpretation. They become associated in a process that commences with them. Reader’s interpretation and interpretation of the text are closely knit together. Here, the readers strategize their own interpretation/s by closely assessing the text. The reader assumes a form of the work that is essential for textual exposition rather than forcing in or out interpretations. The text fashions meanings out of concurrence and interplay of sameness and difference of ‘objective’ facts and ‘subjective’ interpretation. Thus, readers fashion various patterns of meaning from the text by “active intervention.”

Fashioning a reading is also about “mapping one’s worldview, abilities toward world-making” (Ghosh and Miller 6). Reading is accomplished through continual differences. However, “Theory is resistance to reading, apparently because theory pretends to foresee clearly the results of reading (demystification of aberrational acts of taking metaphors literally), whereas reading itself is unpredictable” (Ghosh and Miller 97). Reading is a commitment where the reader puts his/her heart and soul without stipulations. It re-creates the characters, action, geography and feelings within our “internal cinema.” Followed by this is the interrogative reading to examine how the “magic” is executed.

Reading is guided by expectation of revelation that opens to a specific event of the new. Good reading is manifested by hospitality to the impassable entrance of the wholly other, a “heterogeneity and polyvocality” that surpasses the reassurance of “hermeneutical finality.” It

involves positive mental, emotional and physical effort that enables the reader to re-create the creator's imaginary world with a possible clarity. A good reader does not lose anything in the text. He/She pays close attention to the linguistic devices that formulates the meaning in a text. We read literary texts because it offers us imaginary worlds with which we can bring together various aspects of the Real. Reading is an act of connecting elements and configurative patterns that disperse materials in writing. As a reader works through the sequence of words in a text, he/she impresses certain mastery in deriving meaning. The reader is free to add to the narrative, a meaning that is undecidable. Meaning materializes from a mutual act through which the interpreter and the text that is interpreted contribute to configure a pattern.

A critic as a conductor is a means and a performer engraving the self onto their performance which is not completely theirs, winding and doubting performance existing in the interstitial space of creation and translation. Performance creates and awaits, positions and de-locates, and determines at once. The “illustrations are always falsifying abstractions from the ungraspable idea they never adequately bring into the open” (Miller, *Illustration* 150). The critic's attempt to interweave elements present in the text he interprets piles up to twist again in a new form leaving unraveled murkiness. Moreover, “criticism or the teaching of a given text is always the displaced expression of what happens when the work is read” (Miller, *Versions* 24). Reading, consequently, is a matter of perpetual “peripatetic translation” augmenting the hermeneutic understanding of meaning that lay outside the text. “The specificity and strangeness of literature, the capacity of each work to surprise the reader, if he can remain prepared to be surprised, means that literature continually exceeds any formulas or any theory with which the critic is prepared to encompass it” (Miller, *Fiction* 5).

“Criticism as re-writing is truly ethical and affirmative, life-giving, productive, inaugural. It is a response to a categorical imperative, a demand which perforates new channels, more adequate channels, in my writing, for the latent and gathered force to which I respond by the way of the work I read. My writing as re-writing in its turn is performative, productive. If it has value at all it opens access for my readers and students not the meaning of the text as such, the information it conveys, but to the ‘matter,’ ‘thing,’ or ‘force’ latent in the work (Miller, *Ethics* 120). Criticism can be considered as a “form of literature. It is a form which takes as its theme

not the experience of natural objects, other people, or supernatural realities about which the poet and novelist write, but those entities after they have been assimilated into the work of some author. Literary criticism is literature at a second degree” (Miller, *Theory* 14).

Criticism of consciousness is a briefly thriving approach for enclosing rhetorical interruptions of narrative logic through dialectics. Criticism is strategized in a way to refer back to the stability of authorial consciousness as source of literature. Understanding literature occurs through a tapering and extension of the author and that which contradicts and dilates the motion of interpretation. The “living motion” of interpretation is inert yet moves concurrently with the context of the creation of a text. Identifying the text as telos, it extends the outward expression of inner consciousness, a mimetic depiction of critic’s representation of the text. The text is a place where “the world of sense perception has been transformed, through its verbalization, into the very substance of thought” (Miller, *Reader* 121). Metaphor encloses substance of meaning in words reflecting inner consciousness through “verbalization” process. Hence, a text becomes a mystical substitution, it becomes the author. In the process of signification, alienation is not recognized; however, language allows the authorial consciousness to reflect in the text, a critical language demonstrated by critic. Therefore, the narratives become “not symbolic, but perfectly literal embodiments of his inner life. They are the very form his consciousness takes when it has any form at all, when it ceases to be a hollow shell filled with indeterminate energies careening in the void” (Miller, *Tropes* 25).

Interpretation that stays simple is vulnerable to deconstruction through an indirectly antithetical logocentric and epistemological aspirations. The ideas of derivation and continuity are restored by the categories of difference and openness that challenges human potential which is connected to interpretation and misinterpretation of the whole. “All interpretation is misinterpretation” (Leitch 601). Within an infinitive heterogeneity, the text asserts within its limits what a critic possibly can imagine, paving way for interpretive possibilities. Reading happens best when it accounts “for the heterogeneity of the text, its presentation of a definite group of possible meanings which are systematically interconnected, determined by the text, but logically incompatible. The clear and rational expression of such a system of meanings is difficult, perhaps impossible” (Miller, *Fiction* 51). To assess a text with particularities of

author's imagination within the totality of works identify on what the author persists throughout the brimming multiplicity of his texts and a creative world that is unique and altered. Implications of investigations and logically translucent ideas on which the author's endeavor is based always on the effort based on equivocation. "Whenever the interpreter thinks he has reached back to something original, behind which it is impossible to go, he finds himself face to face with something which is already an interpretation, that is, something which refers to another sign still further back, and so on forever" (Miller, "Interpretation of Lord Jim" 213).

Does reading and interpretation involve morality? How is this ethics formulated? What is the responsibility of the reader towards the text? "To live is to read, or rather to commit again and again the failure to read which is the human lot" (Miller, *Ethics* 59). Reading is innately perpetual and can therefore be ceased arbitrarily. Reading is a continual wander or dislocation that can only be restrained by sign. Reading offers "new insights into what is going on in particular works, even where that has been insight into the necessary blindness of the work to its own incoherence or heterogeneity and insight into the consequent inability of the critic to 'read' the work in any determinate or monological way" (Miller, "Theory and Practice" 610). The moment of ethical reading is "neither cognitive, nor political, nor social, nor interpersonal, but properly and independently ethical" (Miller, *Ethics* 1). Metaphysical implications of reading are influenced by infinite referential language. In his *Ethics of Reading*, Miller discusses the material effects of reading, how reading as performative effects the physical world. Metaphysics of reading is received in and through reading. Examining the association between a narrative imperative and ethical moment, Miller distinguishes between the disagreement of "language and action, constatives and performatives, metaphysics and material world and epistemology and ontology" (Lynde 32). Ethical moment is a reaction to the moral imperative ("I must") and ethical performance that retort to slimy class of ethics. Miller distinguishes ethics from politics and knowledge, explaining it to be a resource rather than a subsidiary (Miller, *Ethics* 4-5).

Ethics is not an orientation to an antecedent moral imperative delineating right/wrong, good/bad. It is similar to semiotic systems, fluid, referential, relative and performative. The link between the act of reading and ethical moment is a connection between imperative and

performative. Ethical moment in reading is not a correlative of transcendent moral code but an obligated choice that is referential. Reading and re-reading fashion a fluent sequence of ethical moments continually rescheduled from closeness in its contemplative narrative veil. Moral imperative is neither ethical nor linguistic but a “categorical imperative” obtained from the text. Within the act of signification, it can be identical to the signifier that relates to other signifiers, delayed, referential, relative and fluid. Responsible response to a text is to go against the grain with our “better judgments.” “Responsibility is inhabited by the irresponsible. Both are inextricably enmeshed, tied, bonded each to each in every religious speech act” (Dunne 8). The event of reading has to disturb the actuality anticipated to happen with a counter reading. It takes accountability for the choice of vocabulary we use, which are not our own. The question then is, do we “re-speak” the words already employed by someone else?

Ethics of reading is not an affirmative response to thematic substance but a performative response to categorical imperative. Ethical performative is metaphysically opaque because it acts as a catachresis for the other that manifests itself in the socio-political world. When expressed as a narrative, it becomes a “subversive accomplice.” Narratives act as a “bridge between the law as such and any particular law applied in a specific familial, social, and historical situation” (Miller, *Ethics* 38). The deferral presents the unreadable detection that the text might error. Unreadability is not just a linguistic occurrence but an ethical responsibility that inclines on the moral imperative. “All performatives are unpredictable and unmeasurable. A performative can never be controlled, defined, or have a decisive line put around its effects. The link between knowledge and power goes by way of language, and that link is both a barrier and a break, a gulf. Language used performatively makes something happen all right, but the link between knowing and doing can never be predicted exactly or understood perspicuously after the fact” (Miller, *Ethics* 76). Responsibility is bound by inevitability challenging the freedom of the text. Ethical act should be free, “free to do it or not to do it” responsibly (*Ethics* 15). When we fashion a responsible ethical movement, it becomes productive. Ethics is a symbolic disarticulation from the nearness of reading. The imperative to read is a response to an antecedent idea of reading because reading is a responsibly free act that re-initiates reading itself.

Miller offers a fine reading of De Quincey's writing. What Miller formulates as theoretical suppositions on reading are explicated through his literary readings. Reading a single work of an author is aimed at interpretation but reading the entire corpus of works by an author becomes the "evidence of the workings of a mind" (Loesberg 104). It not only involves an investigation of a single but also an original structure of permeating minds, the mind of the narrator as he regards itself to be or penetrates into the characters. De Quincey's universe is gloomy and haunted. Here "life bleeds into death and death is always returning and bleeding back into life" (Dunne 32-3). Leaving the reader engrossed in multiple methods, he creates "impressionistic dreamscapes." The creator's consciousness transpires out of life that ends in death negating the immanence of divine. Mystery of time and space realized out of consciousness is differentiated from the other. This attentiveness separates life from death to separate the paradise. Hence, the sole meeting point is encircled by endless accomplishments of time and space. "An existence without center, be that center God, Truth, or a belief in a unified self, presupposes an existence without teleological goals. The immediacy of the lived-world has retreated to the extent that the subject is forced to look within himself for an adequate understanding of his own existence" (Dunne 33). Knowledge of the self is segregated from the objective world. Without the immanence of divine, the world of subject lacks direction by remaining inestimable.

De Quincey's works offer an essence that could not be translated in vacuum. They are specious and momentary but uncertain at various points. On substantial subjects, he fashions various themes that are contradictory but aspiring for a configuration that continues with writing. "For De Quincey there is no subject with just limits, a finite goal which may be seen from the beginning, and pursued through a logical train of thought. The realm of his essays is like London a space of infinite wandering. Just as it is impossible to say of the astronomical space whether we 'look down, or look up,' into it, so there is a consistent ambiguity in De Quincey's descriptions of his mental space" (Miller, *Disappearance* 29). Unlike Baudelaire's reading of De Quincey, Miller's reading of the symbolic allows the spatial metaphors to restrain sequential style of dissipated wandering. Attempting to mimic the images of De Quincey, Miller turns them into a reticent catalog. Alternative images envisaged by Miller challenges the fundamental rationale

because subjectivation of the poet is devoid of centering. Moreover, the universe is fluid and unpredictable yet deferred by juxtapositions. De Quincey's universe lacks the immanent presence of the prime mover resulting in emptiness, holding things together through "pregnant tension": "The motif of opposites in tense equilibrium is more than merely a psychological or epistemological principle for De Quincey. Space and time stretch interminably in all directions, with no strong magnetic field to orient things and hold them in position. If this is the case, a man, a system of thought, or a nation must hold itself up in the void by "a steady, rope-dancer's equilibrium of posture" (Miller, *Disappearance* 44). This is the only method through which the infinite space is packed, a harmonious system which will acquire innate principles of self-perpetuation. De Quincey, however, compiles a law that recompenses nature and history to keep up balanced motion.

Dunne recognizes in Miller's reading of De Quincey a fugue, a strong image of impossibility. Fugue is a complex musical phenomenon. Fugue "is a species of counterpoint (contrappunto) in which a number of voices—usually three—react with one another in a composition" (Dunne 39). Fugue remains discernible from other voices. The subject expresses itself in whole and reacts in a contrapuntal fashion through a reply. Counter-subject is overlaid by another counter-subject because the next counter-subject repeats the original voice. The general momentum of fugue is attained by repetition and imitation. Therefore, fugue is a "chase or hunt. The imitative measure of the fugue, expressed in a series of "episodes" (where the subject appears metonymically in each voice) and expositions (where the subject is state and restated), essentially operates on a series of dialectical tensions between degrees of thematic expansion and modification" (Dunne 39). Various musical nuances augment and decorate the proper structure to thoroughly fracture. Overlapping fashions a delirium encompassing proper persuasiveness of structure with perplexity. The composition undergoes a prescribed surplus where various strands of individual and reciprocally exclusive elements are misplaced in an incessant "disseminative play." In his reading of De Quincey's "Dream Fugue," he exhibits "apotheosis." De Quincey terms his style of writing "tumultuous," pointing to the thematic point and explain how the ruptured and imaginative signs intersect one another to redirect reader's consciousness into a mounting and twisting of parenthesis and bewilderment. "Dream Fugue" is

an instance of how the skill and shimmering disorder in his writings display figures into mayhem. With his deft exhibition of repeated tone and rhythm, De Quincey follows the theme of his dream visions articulating fugual forms. Rather than expressing his ideas within this canvas, he instills obstinately outlandish allusive thoughts.

Miller's reading of De Quincey fails not because of creative meandering he undertakes but he was unable to "exhaust the infinite which lurks in the finite" (Miller, *Disappearance* 56). Ambiguity is a bunged phenomenon challenging univocality, promoting mutually exclusive readings and restricting uncertainty to an insoluble oscillation between the opposed members of a logical contradiction ('a' and 'not a') (Rimmon-Kenan 186). De Quincey implies a prototypical impracticality of the unilinear reading event. Miller's examination of De Quincey's textuality has developed a metatheoretical problem of reading. Presence of a subject matter and absence of a central principle have altered reading as enigma within "literature as an alterity absolutely other" (Asensi 90). The issue of interpreting subjectivity or consciousness of an author can be expressed through his/her writing. However, the problem is if interpretation of a text is devoid of a center, then the process of reading nullifies integrated reading. The question of truth and consciousness does not cohere within the paradigms of formal experiences. The loss of center as a unifying presence contradicts the method of criticism attempting to find an accord within the loss of conscious expressions of experience. The intricacies of De Quincey arise out of the palimpsestic nature of his works. Possibilities of mind and myriad intersections punctuate a blanket between present awareness and covert inscriptions on psyche. Inscriptions cannot be erased as it remains forever. Therefore, it becomes an opportunity to revive the past in the present. This process becomes straightforward when it cannot survive as a holistic representation because it is an image of persistent dislocation.

Works Cited

- Dunne, Eammon. J. *Hillis Miller and the Possibilities of Reading: Literature After Deconstruction*. Continuum, 2010.
- Fosso, Kurt and Jerry Harp. "J. Hillis Miller's Virtual Reality of Reading." *College English*, vol. 75, no. 1, September 2012, pp. 79-94.

- Ghosh, Ranjan and J. Hillis Miller. *Thinking Literature Across Continents*. Duke UP, 2016.
- Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Flamingo, 1994.
- Leitch, Vincent B. "The Lateral Dance: The Deconstructive Criticism of J. Hillis Miller." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 6, no. 4, Summer 1980, pp. 593-607.
- Loesberg, Jonathan. "From Victorian Consciousness to an Ethics of Reading: The Criticism of J. Hillis Miller." Review of J. Hillis Miller's *Theory Now and Then; Victorian Subjects; Tropes, Parables, Performatives: Essays on Twentieth-Century Literature*. *Victorian Studies*, by Hillis Miller, vol. 37, no.1, Autumn 1993, pp. 99-121.
- Olson, Gary A. and J. Hillis Miller. "Rhetoric, Cultural Studies, and the Future of Critical Theory: A Conversation with J. Hillis Miller." *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 14.2, Fall 1994, pp. 317-45.
- Miller, Hillis J. *The Disappearance of God: Five Nineteenth-Century Writers*. Harvard UP, 1963.
- . *The Form of Victorian Fiction*. Notre Dame UP, 1968.
- . "The Interpretation of Lord Jim." *The Interpretation of Narrative: Theory and Practice*, edited by Morton W. Bloomfield. Harvard UP, 1970, pp. 211-28.
- . "Theory and Practice: Response to Vincent Leitch." *Critical Inquiry*, 6 Summer 1980, pp. 609-14.
- . *Fiction and Repetition: Seven English Novels*. Harvard UP, 1982.
- . *The Ethics of Reading*. Columbia University Press, 1987.
- . *Versions of Pygmalion*. Harvard UP, 1990.
- . *Hawthorne and History: Defacing It*. Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- . *Tropes, Parables, Performatives: Essays on Twentieth-Century Literature*. Duke UP, 1991.
- . *Theory Now and Then*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- . *Ariadne's Thread: Story Lines*. Yale University, 1992.
- . *Illustration*. Harvard UP, 1992.
- . "Humanistic Discourses and the Others." *Surfaces*, 4 1994, pp. 1-18.
- . *Topographies*. Stanford UP, 1995.
- . *Black Holes*. Stanford UP, 1999.
- . *Speech Acts in Literature*. Stanford UP, 2001.
- . "Derrida and Literature." *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities: A Critical Reader*, edited by Tom Cohen. CUP, 2001.
- . *On Literature*. Routledge, 2002.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. "Deconstructive Reflections on Deconstruction: In Reply to Hillis Miller." *Poetics Today*, vol. 2, no. 1b, Winter 1980-1, pp. 185-8.
- Wolfe, Julian, editor. *The J. Hillis Miller Reader*. Stanford UP, 2005.