SILENCING THE PROVINCIAL OTHER: FOCALISATION, IDENTIFICATION AND POWER IN FRANZ INNERHOFER'S *SCHÖNE TAGE*

CATRIONA FIRTH

The emancipatory and socially critical role of anti-Heimat literature constitutes one of the grand narratives that shape and define Austria's post-war literary history. The 'neuer Heimatroman' of the 1970s and 1980s made use of the generic constants of its predecessor[1] to assign new values to the once exalted rural idyll, which now appeared as a 'Bauern KZ' in Innerhofer[2] or as Hans Lebert's 'parteibraune Landschaft'.[3] Connecting the sub-genre to an increased mobility between Austria's rural and urban populations in the 1960s and 1970s, Walter Weiss is eager to emphasise 'der positive Aspekt der Befreiung von dämonischen Zwängen und der Befreiung zu einer von der Zukunft geforderten größeren Mobilität'.[4] With the negative transformation of the rural *locus amoenus* of the Heimatroman,[5] anti-Heimat literature is considered to have exposed the archaic social conditions prevalent in provincial Austria and conferred power on the rural other.

Critical consensus on the philanthropic impetus behind the literary movement reveals itself again and again in claims that 'in dem Anti-Heimatroman der siebziger Jahre […] wird für die sprachlose, unterdrückte unterste soziale Schicht Partei ergriffen',[6] which assign to the anti-Heimat novel a social function that transcends the conventional limits of literary representation. Through close textual analysis of Franz Innerhofer's *Schöne Tage*, this article seeks to examine precisely what is at stake in the assertion that the anti-Heimat novel speaks for Austria's disenfranchised rural other. A comparative narratological approach, combining insights from literary and film studies, will illuminate the connection between the novel's structures of focalisation, its

narrating voice(s) and the linguistic power structures that cement the patriarchal subjugation of the rural populace.

Within accounts of rural emancipation, the shift in narrative perspective to a view 'von unten' occupies a central position in the devalued subject's self-liberation.[7] A previously silent rural underclass thus ousts the omniscient (and omnipotent) authorial narrator to make its own voice heard, toppling the perspectival hegemony of the 'Bauer' as the revered protagonist of the traditional Heimatroman.[8] The reception of Franz Innerhofer's first novel, *Schöne Tage*, subscribes fully to this equation of narrative point-of-view and socio-linguistic liberation. Seen through the eyes of Holl, the illegitimate son of a powerful farmer, this brutal, semi-autobiographical account of 1950s rural Austria is frequently held up as the prototype for the anti-Heimat novel, which unites the inward-facing focus of New Subjectivity with a disturbingly honest account of provincial power structures.

Previous analyses of *Schöne Tage* insist on the novel's ability to 'give a voice' to the disenfranchised provincial other, primarily through the reader's sympathy for, and identification with, Holl. W. Martin Lüdke's claim that '[s]prachloses Leiden hat er zur Sprache gebracht'[9] exemplifies this interpretative discourse, within which Innerhofer features as the spokesman for the misery of an oppressed underclass, charged with the formidable task 'einer Bevölkerungsgruppe, die jahrhundertelang sprachlos gehalten wurde, den Knechten und Mägden, den Kindern und Behinderten, eine Sprache [zu geben]'.[10] Yet despite this insistence on linguistic liberation, the novel's dominant narrative voice, an unidentified third-person narrator, forms a conspicuous blind-spot in analyses of the text. Ulrich Greiner follows this discourse to its (il)logical extreme in his audacious claim that 'das Erstaunliche ist, dass ein Erzähler gar nicht in Erscheinung tritt: die Geschichte erzählt sich selber'.[11]

An explanation for this analytical omission may be sought in the widespread failure of critical literature to differentiate clearly between the work's narrator and its main protagonist, Holl. In this sense, the novel's reception falls into the trap identified by Mieke Bal:

> They do not make a distinction between, on the one hand, the vision through which the elements are presented and, on the other, the identity of the voice that is verbalizing that vision. To put it more simply: they do not make a distinction between those who see and those who speak.[12]

Bal's insistence on the non-identity of narrator and focaliser, a term borrowed from Gérard Genette to designate the consciousness through which the narrative is filtered,[13] finds particular resonance in Innerhofer's novel, in which an informed and eloquent narrator conveys a child's experience of rural hardship. Matters are further complicated by the text's semi-autobiographical element, which introduces a third term into the equation: the (implied) author. Rainer Fribolin's account of Innerhofer's work as autobiography, for example, is particularly persistent in its confusion of author and protagonist, resulting in a repeated amalgamation of fiction and reality: '[h]at Holl vielleicht mit der Mutter doch vergleichsweise Positives erlebt, aber der Autor erinnert sich daran nicht?'[14] Such rhetoric finds its more subtle counterpart in a pervasive personification of language as '[die] Stimme der Sprachlosen'[15] and in passive constructions, such as Kunne's comment that '[es] wird in *Schöne Tage* der historische und gesellschaftliche Kontext immer wieder betont', which repeatedly efface the narratorial agent.[16]

This article seeks to identify the foundation of the considerable critical praise received by the novel in a skewed narratological understanding of *Schöne Tage* and proposes an alternative methodological route. Employing psychoanalytic conceptions of

identification developed in the field of film studies, this article will shed light upon the relationship between the novel's narrator and its central protagonist and reflect critically upon the reader's identificatory relationships with both. The filmic split between the invisible cinematic apparatus and the cast of on-screen characters, it will be argued, finds its counterpart in the division between the unidentified narrator at the novel's helm and the protagonists as narrative objects. Through close textual study akin to the detailed shot-by-shot analyses of film studies, this article seeks to draw a clear distinction between narrator, focaliser and author. In this way a complex matrix of identifications and power relations emerges, which calls into question the basis of the novel's hitherto positive reception.

TOWARDS A COMPARATIVE NARRATOLOGY

Film theory has long imported concepts from literary theory, from Frank Manchel's argument for the appropriateness of applying literary concepts to analyses of filmic narratives[17] to Seymour Chatman's narratological approach to cinema.[18] Traffic in the other direction, however, has been remarkably sparse. François Jost has nevertheless begun to pave the way with his concept of comparative narratology: 'a kind of shuttle between cinema and novel in order to better comprehend a narrative category which functions equally well for the analysis of written as well as filmic narrative'.[19] Focusing in particular on narrative perspective, Jost argues for a more informed adoption of cinematic terms in literary analysis, which goes beyond an over-simplified equation of camera and gaze.[20] By taking a detour through cinema, Jost argues, literary scholars may arrive at a more nuanced understanding of narrative point-of-view, one which distinguishes between knowing and seeing and, one might add, speaking.[21]

In the context of the specific problems posed by Innerhofer's text, the potential benefits of a cinematic approach are threefold. The first advantage resides in the implicit connection of the concept of narrative perspective to the visual; scholars frequently talk about 'seeing' the text through a figure's eyes or adopting his 'point-of-view'. Bal explicitly connects visuality and narrative perspective in her definition of focalisation as 'the relation between the vision and that which is "seen", perceived',[22] yet simultaneously problematises her optical terminology by placing inverted commas around 'seeing'. This uneasiness is mirrored in Jost's insistence that one must distinguish between 'ocularisation', the filtering of (visual) perception, and 'focalisation', which pertains to the figure's inner life, his emotions and thoughts.[23] This argument is echoed in Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan's distinction between the perceptual, cognitive and emotional facets of focalisation, which enable the reader to determine the consciousness through which the narrative is filtered at any given point.[24] Film theory, when following the careful taxonomy proposed by Jost, may thus offer itself as a productive alternative to conventional discussions of focalisation, supplying new terminology and theoretical frameworks.

Second, a psychoanalytic approach to cinema's identificatory structures may shed light on the pervasive claims that the novel's emotional (and socially critical) power lies in its ability to inspire sympathy for, and identification with, Holl. Until now, these contentions have been based on subjective speculation, such as Joachim Hoßfeld's admission that 'Innerhofers Roman ist mir besonders nahegegangen, weil die unmittelbare Betroffenheit [...] ganz zu spüren ist',[25] or empirical analyses of the work's reception,[26] which focus on the effects of identification rather than its genesis. Consistent with Paula Murphy's assertion that '[t]he emphasis on the occasion of consumption [...] is one of the most important differentiating factors between film

theory and literary criticism',[27] this study exploits the recipient-based analysis offered by film studies to illuminate the identificatory paths forged between reader, protagonist and narrator.

From the outset, psychoanalytic film theory has concerned itself with the complex network of identifications activated within the spectator in order to interpellate her into the film's narrative. Christian Metz proposes a dual alignment at the heart of cinematic signification, whereby the viewer's identification with the on-screen protagonists is secondary to, and dependent upon, a foundational identification with the camera-apparatus.[28] This primary identification appears to occur within the subject itself, as 'the spectator *identifies with himself*, with himself as a pure act of perception' and thus 'can do no other than identify with the camera too'.[29] Accordingly the viewer believes herself to be the 'all-seeing capacity' that controls the filmic images. By mapping the identifications activated in *Schöne Tage* onto the Metzian model, a more complex network of primary and secondary alignments may present itself as a challenge to the reader's ostensibly liberating identification with Holl.

The third advantage of a cinematic approach derives from the focus in Lacanian-based film theory on the power structures intrinsically linked to these identificatory relationships. Commenting on Metz's work, Kaja Silverman notes that 'primary identification also implies a vision which is exterior to time and body, and which yields an immediate epistemological mastery'.[30] Spectatorial pleasure thus appears to derive chiefly from the viewer's belief in this imagined mastery, to which she lays claim through identification with the true instrument of 'the gaze', the camera. Yet the invisibility of the apparatus renders impossible an absolute alignment, compelling the viewer to seek an alternative identificatory object within the fiction, who 'offers himself as a crossing point [between gazes] for the spectator'.[31] This secondary identification

sutures the spectator into the fiction, ensuring that her pleasure remains undisturbed by an awareness of the omnipotent camera 'whose transcendent and castrating gaze can never be returned'.[32] Psychoanalytic film theory may thus facilitate a reassessment of the view 'von unten' as a potential challenge to provincial patriarchal hierarchy by connecting the matrices of perspective and identification to latent power relations lurking below the novel's diegetic surface.

FOCALISATION AND IDENTIFICATION

Holl's presence throughout the narrative, whether as an active protagonist physically present at events or as the agent through whose perspective they are retrospectively narrated, clearly marks him as the dominant 'character-focaliser'. Following Rimmon-Kenan's typology, this focalising agent is located within the story, in contrast to the 'narrator-focaliser' who remains external to narrative events.[33] Addressing first the question of ocularisation and perceptual focalisation in *Schöne Tage,* it is evident that the bulk of sensory information offered to the reader emanates from Holl's perspective, encouraging her — through imaginative empathy — to see, hear and smell the environment through the child, to taste the rustic cuisine with the same disgust and to feel the physical pain inflicted upon him by others. Thus, Holl's first journey to his father's farm is presented as a list of sights and sounds, which follow each other in rapid succession, mirroring Holl's progress towards his new 'home':

> Durch den Markt.
>
> In den Zug.
>
> Das Tal wurde weiter.
>
> [...]

> Sie gingen durch ein Dorf, über eine Brücke, fremde Gesichter schauten her und sofort wieder weg, Kühe brüllten, Scheunentore flogen auf, knarrten, ein Fuhrwerk da, ein Fuhrwerk dort, dann allmählich hohes Gras und Zäune. (*ST*, p. 10. Original line breaks preserved.)

The syntactical structure of this passage with its fragmented, verbless sentences and long list of images, recreates the immediate sensory impressions of the main protagonist as he moves through the landscape. Furthermore, the spatial indication offered by 'fremde Gesichter schauten her' locates the centre of consciousness as the object of the strangers' gaze and thus identify Holl as focaliser or, to be more accurate, as oculariser. Demonstrating the creation of subjectivity through speech, Emile Benveniste notes the significance of linguistic markers such as the deictic adverb 'her' (used in this instance as a separable prefix), which assume meaning only in relation to the speaker and identifies him as a subject within discourse.[34] The 'her' of 'herschauen' thus necessitates the reader's full alignment with the remembered Holl in order to ensure her own subjectivity within the novel's discourse.

This interpellation of the reader bears a striking structural resemblance to the filmic shot/reverse-shot sequence, which has assumed an exemplary position within theoretical discussions of cinematic identification and suture.[35] In this common formation, the initial shot of a actor or object is followed by a second shot from the 'reverse' angle, revealing a second character in such a manner as to suggest that the first image was 'seen' from his point of view. In this way, cinematic convention locates the source of the gaze within the fiction, deflecting the viewer's attention from the invisible and potent camera, frequently referred to in ominous terms as the 'Absent One'.[36] Daniel Dayan elaborates:

> The absent-one's glance is that of a nobody which becomes (with the reverse shot) the glance of a somebody (a character present on the screen). Being on screen he can no longer compete with the spectator for the screen's possession. The spectator can resume his previous relationship with the film. The reverse shot has 'sutured' the hole opened in the spectator's imaginary relationship with the filmic field by his perception of the absent-one.[37]

By placing herself in Holl's position and identifying herself with his gaze, then, the reader is similarly sutured into the fabric of the fiction and inserted into the signifying chain of the narrative. Persistent focalisation/ocularisation through, and subsequent identification with one fictional character, therefore, form a mechanism of literary suture, whereby the means of production (i.e. the writing process and the implied author behind it) are concealed.[38] Structurally analogous to the cinema of suture, then, the novel's perceptual facet offers a pleasurable sense of narrative mastery through identification with an intradiegetic figure as the source of the gaze.

Study of the cognitive component of focalisation equally attests to Holl's position as character-focaliser. Already in the novel's opening passages, the reader is struck by the inapprehension of the focaliser when confronted with a noticeable lack of concrete detail:

> Zwei Hände packten ihn und setzten ihn auf die Bank zurück, wo er weinte, weg wollte und wieder hinunterfiel, so daß es den Frauen, die seinetwegen von der Arbeit weg mußten, oft zuviel wurde, sie ihn packten und schlugen. (*ST*, p. 5)

The vague references to 'zwei Hände' and 'den Frauen' deny the reader an introductory overview of the characters, which may usually be expected in the opening sections of traditional novels, leading to a sense of confusion and alienation. The explanation a few lines later that 'eine mußte er Mutter nennen und eine Großmutter' (*ST*, p. 5), in itself a

bizarre statement, exposes the restriction of the reader's knowledge to that of the small child, as Holl's gradual understanding of the situation provokes an analogous cognitive development in the reader. Through these frustratingly vague descriptions, which abound in the opening section, the reader shares Holl's sense of confusion, and is alienated in her reading of the novel from the traditional narrative model.

Thus the reader is compelled to align herself with a doubly devalued subject, dislocated from the sites of social and narrative power. This identification compromises the reader's own sense of perceptual and cognitive mastery. As such it would appear incompatible with a cinematic conception of identification that places a sense of visual and epistemological control at the heart of spectatorial pleasure. However, the novel's structures of focalisation contain their own defence mechanism, comparable to a Freudian process of projection, where the subject protects herself from her own threatening lack by displacing it onto others.[39] Following this model, narrative structures within *Schöne Tage* repeatedly project significant aspects of Holl's lack onto other, peripheral protagonists in order to establish Holl as the most 'privileged' figure within the work's moral structures.

Throughout the novel the reader is presented with numerous descriptions of acts of cruelty and violence carried out around Holl and very often directed towards him. These include, but are by no means limited to, the constant taunting of the 'Fürsorgefall' Moritz (*ST*, p. 56), violence towards Church dissenters (*ST*, p. 28), institutional brutality in schools (*ST*, pp. 84, 129-30) and the Bauer's notion of 'discipline' (*ST*, pp. 12, 15, 27, 43, 60). Holl himself is not blameless within this environment of 'Roheit, Haß und Sadismus',[40] and is in fact depicted as capable of violence and cruelty on several occasions. Yet narrative perspective works to absolve Holl of any personal blame, displacing responsibility and guilt onto other characters or

society at large. Affective focalisation offers the reader access to Holl's thoughts and emotions during these episodes of brutality and consequently preserves an otherwise unsustainable identification with a potentially undesirable character. Thus, his cruelty towards his half brothers, whom he leads into the woods at dusk in order to frighten them (*ST*, pp. 64-5), is at least partially extenuated in the reader's mind by insight into Holl's inner life. The paragraph preceding this episode informs the reader that Holl feels excluded from his family and bullied by his brothers, since 'die Brüder wußten, daß Holl ihnen ausgeliefert war, daß er nie bei ihren Eltern Gehör suchen würde' (*ST*, p. 63). By granting the reader access to Holl's emotions, the focus is shifted onto his ongoing suffering at the hands of his family, projecting onto them the burden of guilt and marking them as representatives of moral lack.

The projective element of this concentration of identification around Holl becomes evident when the representation of Holl's cruel acts is compared with those of others. Konrad's violence towards a fellow servant, Maria, for example, is depicted with no explanation as to why the labourer feels compelled to abuse her: 'Ein paar Schritte vor der Toreinfahrt, wo Moritz vor einem Jahr unter den Wagen gekommen ist, ging Konrad auf Maria los und schlug sie blutig' (*ST*, p. 77). His emotions and motivations remain entirely obscure to the reader, preventing her from aligning herself with Konrad and ultimately encouraging a more judgemental stance. By contrast, Holl's cruelty towards his loyal friend, Leo, whom he refuses to name as a friend in a game conceived by their teacher, is accompanied not by an insight into Leo's reaction to this callous act but rather into Holl's emotional response. His action is described in the passive form: 'da passierte Holl etwas Dummes. Er gab seine Stimme einem Dorfschreihals' (*ST*, p. 155), exteriorising his guilt as something that happened to him. Regret and remorse come to dominate this passage, underlined by the final sentence 'zusammen gingen sie

nach Hause, und Holl machte ständig einen weiten Bogen um sich' (*ST*, p. 155). His vague awareness of guilt serves paradoxically to free him from blame, as it is implied that some other force than Holl's consciousness is at work here. Thus this episode, which clearly testifies to undesirable qualities within Holl, in fact strengthens the reader's identification with him through the exteriorisation of his guilt and the constriction of access to Leo's inner life.

This valorisation of Holl at the expense of others conforms to Murray Smith's concept of 'relative desirability', which explains the reader/viewer's identification with a morally dubious character, such as a gangster or drug dealer, through the position of this figure in the work's moral hierarchy.[41] Whilst Smith is at pains to distance himself from psychoanalytic theories of identification, the concept of 'relative desirability' emanates essentially from the process of projection, since the reader/viewer is encouraged to exteriorise the lack of the central identificatory object onto less desirable characters. Whilst focalisation through Holl does indeed facilitate alignment with the rural protagonist, then, the novel cannot be seen to encourage a positive process of 'cross-identification'.[42] A re-valorisation of socially impotent subjects clearly does not occur, since this exclusive identification with Holl occurs only at the expense of the remaining characters.

PRIMARY IDENTIFICATION AND THE NARRATOR-FOCALISER

Thus far we have explored the various facets of secondary identification activated within the novel through perceptual, affective and cognitive focalisation. Turning to the figure of the narrator-focaliser, it is evident that his field of influence is limited to the latter component. Remaining unidentified throughout the text, Innerhofer's narrator falls into Chatman's category of the 'covert narrator', informing us of events, characters etc.

whilst 'its owner remains hidden in the discoursive shadows'.[43] The narrator's implicit mediating presence and lack of discernible identity recall the qualities of cinema's Absent One. Further analogous to the omnipotent camera, Innerhofer's narrator holds knowledge far superior to that of any intra-diegetic figure, as the narration's retrospective nature bestows on him the power to condense and summarise substantial lengths of time and draw discrete events into relation with one another. Thus the outer manifestations of Holl's despair are condensed into one paragraph, where unrelated events are juxtaposed in a manner that encourages the reader to interpret his individual actions as indications of a deeper psychological disturbance:

> Er ging zu einer tiefen Schlucht, wie in einen Selbstbedienungsladen. Er bekam Lust, giftige Schlangen am Schwanz zu halten, und sie dann in unmittelbarer Nähe wieder fallen zu lassen. Er kletterte auf Hochspannungsmaste [...] Er besuchte die Gräber der Selbstmörder. Da wurde plötzlich alles zum Spiel. (*ST*, p. 52)

This summarising passage clearly testifies to the narrator's command over the narrative, discreetly signalling to the reader his ability to shape and order narrative events and thus to direct the reader's interpretation of the text.

The narrator is further endowed with a knowledge which extends beyond the parameters of the main diegesis. Throughout the novel, the reader is provided with short snippets of historical information, which enable her to locate narrative events within a broader socio-historical landscape, a power explicitly denied to the intra-diegetic figures. Thus, the narrator places the Church processions in which the workers are obliged to participate within a wider historical context, commenting that 'lange vor dem Bauernaufstand und der von einem Erzbischof veranstalteten gewaltsamen Vertreibung der protestantischen Bauern aus den Salzburger Gebirgstälern sind von den

Fahnenspitzen schon Menschen verletzt worden' (*ST*, p. 117). The narrator's evocation of peasant uprisings and the Reformation in the banal context of minor injuries suffered during these processions suggests a more sophisticated grasp of narrative events which far exceeds that of the protagonists involved.

Whilst the narrator appears to offer an alternative history that focuses on those figures typically overlooked by grand cultural narratives, his access to this information clearly places him on the side of authority, since only those aligned with dominant values are shown in the novel to be in a position to question them. This rather Foucauldian knowledge/power nexus is underlined by the general ignorance of the farm workers:

> [d]ie meisten Dienstboten wußten voneinander nicht einmal wieviel beziehungsweise wie wenig sie verdienten, obwohl sie gemeinsam aßen, arbeiteten und in Gemeinschaftsräumen schliefen, an Sonn- und Feiertagen gemeinsam den Kirchengang zurücklegten, nicht wie die größeren Bauern in der Kirche einen Stuhl hatten, nicht wie die Bauern sich auf dem Kirchenplatz versammeln durften, nicht wie die Bauern auf dem Kirchenplatz ihre Interessen vertreten durften. (*ST*, p. 67)

The relationship between knowledge and power further determines the workers' economic situation, as their ignorance leads to the financial inferiority that denies them the social and political privileges afforded to the farmers.

Paralleling the initial stage in primary cinematic identification, when 'suddenly, [the spectator] senses the space he cannot see, hidden by the camera' and recognises the presence of an invisible gaze controlling the on-screen images,[44] the reader's awareness of a mediating narrative agent could conceivably engender a sense of epistemological impotence. In these instances, the reader is unable to locate the source of knowledge

within the narrative, which previous examples have shown to be essential to both identification and pleasure. Unable to engage in the compensatory secondary identification with Holl, then, the reader must seek out an alternative identificatory figure in the form of the invisible source of narrative power. Identification with the omnipotent literary gaze, however, clearly follows a different identificatory path than that with Holl, since his opacity and anonymity preclude identification along emotional and perceptual lines. Unlike the sensory alignment with Holl identified above, where 'the appearance of a lack perceived as a Some One (the Absent One) is followed by its abolition by someone (or something) placed within the same field',[45] the reader remains aware of an invisible figure directing her access to the narrative and, recognising the narrator's epistemological mastery, desires to possess this control also.

Within the cinema of suture, the camera's total control over the narrative, its ability to determine and limit what the viewer may see, stands at the centre of filmic signification, motivating narrative progression and sustaining spectatorial pleasure. This narrative potency, Silverman argues, provides the film's 'castrating coherence', since 'we must be shown only enough to know that there is more, and to want that "more" to be disclosed'.[46] To a significant extent, then, the spectator's pleasure is dependent upon her confidence in the ultimate omniscience (and omnipotence) of the camera and in the belief that she may herself possess this potency through identification.

The Absent One's 'omnipotent and coercive gaze'[47] finds its literary equivalent in the unidentified third-person narrator, whom narrative conventions endow with the power of omniscience. Noting that 'covert narrators must know How Things Will Turn Out', Chatman highlights the pleasure the reader derives from the narrator's all-knowing stance as a re-assuring point of stability in the narrative.[48] Through his mode of address, his use of Hochdeutsch and his incorporation of historical information, the

narrator establishes himself as an ideal identificatory object. Reception of the novel in elevated literary circles, alongside the numerous accolades and official awards which it garnered,[49] suggests that the novel was aimed at, and found resonance with, an educated, probably urban, readership.[50] On the one hand, then, the culturally literate reader of *Schöne Tage* may identify with the narrator on the basis of 'self-sameness',[51] recognising qualities in the narrator that she believes herself to possess. Once again, however, this alignment occurs at the expense of the protagonists. Silverman notes that this particular identificatory form is founded on 'the refusal on the part of the normative subject to form an imaginary alignment with images which remain manifestly detached from his or her sensational body, and his or her stubborn clinging to those images which can be most easily incorporated'.[52] The reader's attempts to align herself with the source of narrative authority may thus be seen to mark the provincial figures as irreconcilably other with little hope of achieving the status of equal subjects.

The less-educated reader, experientially closer to the novel's protagonists than to its narrator, on the other hand, may enter into an idealising identification, whereby the narrator comes to represent those attributes that the reader wishes to possess. Held up against the sets of narrative ideals that constitute the cultural screen of Western literature, the narrator's omniscience and linguistic competence mark him as the text's 'ego ideal'. Comparable to the potent father, whom Freud regards as the object of a 'vorbildliche Identifizierung' during the Oedipal process,[53] this figure possesses those attributes valorised within a particular cultural context, which the subject aspires to annex through identification. Mirroring the Metzian model, then, the reader identifies primarily with the perceived 'source' of the narrative, the narrator, and only subsequently, and provisionally, with the intra-diegetic protagonist(s). Metz's designation of 'primary' and 'secondary' identification to describe these processes

clearly points to an identificatory hierarchy, within which the camera/narrator occupies the privileged position. The significance of this hierarchy becomes apparent upon examination of a further narratological dichotomy, that between narrating voice and focaliser.

LINGUISTIC INCORPORATION AND CANNIBALISTIC IDENTIFICATION

Whilst the majority of the novel is clearly filtered through Holl's consciousness, narrative structures see the child's inner life consistently reformulated by the unidentifiable, linguistically and epistemologically superior narrator. Throughout the novel, insight is offered into Holl's inner life through 'psycho-narration',[54] whereby the protagonist's thoughts and emotions are conveyed through the narrator's discourse, introduced by verbs of perception or thought. This method simultaneously shifts the reader's attention onto the narrating agent, whilst offering the greatest insight into the inner lives of the characters. Indeed Cohn asserts that 'psycho-narration may be regarded as the most direct, indeed the unique, path that leads to the sub-verbal depth of the mind',[55] given that the narrator's knowledge of the characters' inner lives far exceeds their self-awareness.[56]

The dominance of this mode of representing consciousness has significant consequences for the work's identificatory structures. Insights into Holl's emotions, such as 'in diesen ganz und gar verzweifelten Zuständen der Selbstbezichtigung dachte er oft an seine Leidensgenossen' (*ST*, p. 39), evidently mark Holl as the main focaliser and encourage sympathy for his suffering. However, Holl's self-disgust and attempted solidarity with others are described in a language in no way assimilable to the idiom of a six-year old child. The terms 'Leidensgenossen' and 'Selbstbezichtigung', although clearly reflecting Holl's emotional perspective, are unlikely to belong to his juvenile

lexicon, pointing instead to the narrator's linguistic intervention. Whilst Holl embodies the privileged source of consciousness, then, he is a silent, or indeed silenced focaliser, stripped of the capacity to tell his own story in his own words.

Further reflection also reveals the use of 'erlebte Rede', which would appear to enable Holl to speak in his own words, to be complicit in this process of linguistic disempowerment. Within literary portrayal of consciousness, the degree to which the narrator distances himself from the intra-diegetic protagonists may differ greatly, from the dissonant narrator, who maintains his own syntax and vocabulary,[57] to the consonant narrative voice whose language is tinged to varying degrees by the characters' idioms.[58] Considered alongside the cinematic model of primary and secondary identification, Cohn's narratological taxonomy points to linguistic power structures as the basis for an identification with *Schöne Tage*'s narrator. This is clearly the case in the exposition of Holl as a bed-wetter, described as 'eine große Gemeinheit. Es war ja schon eine Gemeinheit, daß Holl sein Gewand nicht in der Stube haben durfte' (*ST*, p. 38). The repetition of 'Gemeinheit' indicates a childish response in language that would appear to belong to Holl, an impression strengthened by the use of the Austrianism 'Gewand' to refer to clothes. However, this outburst is both preceded and followed by language clearly to be attributed to the narrator, such as the metaphoric description of his situation: 'obwohl er die Stiege hinunterging, kam es ihm vor, als würde er mit einer schweren Last einen immer steiler ansteigenden Berg hinaufgetrieben' (*ST*, p. 38). This framing of 'Holl's' speech suggests that the reader is confronted, not with 'erlebte Rede', but rather with a case of consonant narration, whereby the narrator incorporates elements of Holl's language into his own speech.[59]

Holl's story is consequently 'swallowed up' by the narrator's discourse, with the result that the reader's relationship to Holl closely corresponds to the incorporative,

almost cannibalistic model of identification described by Diana Fuss. Referencing Freud's 'Totem und Tabu', Fuss contends that 'all active identifications, including positive ones, are monstrous assassinations: The Other is murdered and orally incorporated'.[60] Unlike Silverman's 'identity-at-a-distance', which recognises and accepts difference, the incorporative nature of *Schöne Tage*'s identificatory structures denies Holl his own subjectivity, involving 'a degree of symbolic violence, a measure of temporary mastery and possession'.[61] Thus the narrator effects a form of incorporative identification, devouring and digesting Holl's experiences and regurgitating them in his own terms. The narrator hereby assumes a certain possession of Holl, whose status as a speaking subject is negated by this linguistic incorporation. Thus Holl is presented to the reader only as an object of the narrator's discourse, precluding any possibility of inter-subjective identification with the provincial other. Through the novel's narrative perspectives and the identificatory structures they engender, then, the reader is compelled to identify paradoxically with both the oppressed character and his linguistic oppressor. Far from providing Holl and his social contemporaries with a voice, the novel's narrative in fact repeats the power structures enacted at the diegetic level, separating the oppressed labourers from the site of cultural privilege.

LINGUISTIC OPPRESSION

The workers' lack of access to language is highlighted throughout the novel, as their misery is seen to stem from the fact that 'sie hatten keine Worte, keine Sprache, um [ihr Elend] auszudrücken' (*ST*, p. 22). The involuntary nature of this silence finds its roots in an unspoken prohibition imposed by the Bauer, who himself claims linguistic hegemony 'weil er ihnen durch seine bloße Anwesenheit einfach die Sprache verschlug' (*ST*, p. 138).[62] The servants must content themselves with impotent gestures and

outbursts of violence, whilst the farmer freely avails himself of language to give orders, admonish the workers and spread vicious gossip about his adversaries. The violent nature of this linguistic power is stressed as a further means of oppression against which the workers have no weapon: 'obwohl sie jetzt zu fünft dem Bauern gegenüberstanden, schlug sie der Bauer mit bloßen Worten auseinander' (*ST*, p. 18).

This hierarchy of linguistic power is reinforced by the presentation of speech in the novel. Direct speech, which is relatively rare in *Schöne Tage*, is reserved almost exclusively for the farmer and his wife, where it usually takes the form of orders or contributes to Holl's humiliation and linguistic subjugation:

> 'Gell. Was hat die Lehrerin in der zweiten Klasse in dein Zeugnis geschrieben?'
>
> Darauf die Antwort zu verweigern hätte Handgreiflichkeiten zur Folge gehabt, also sagte er lieber, was die Lehrerin in sein Zeugnis geschrieben hat. (*ST*, p. 62)

The shift from his stepmother's direct speech to Holl's reported reply underlines his lack of linguistic power, as his language is controlled and regulated by those in positions of authority as a means of maintaining his subordinate status. The narrator's linguistic hegemony, then, re-enacts at a narratological level the protagonists' linguistic subjugation, revealing the illusory nature of their purported enfranchisement.

CONCLUSIONS

The delusional belief, supported by cinematographic convention, that one may 'see' through the eyes of filmic characters thus finds its equivalent in the widespread conviction that one 'hears' the voice of the rural other in *Schöne Tage*. Just as Metz asserts that (as a spectator) 'I have the impression that [...] I am "casting" my eyes on things',[63] so critical reception of Innerhofer's novel insists that his work makes heard the 'Stimme der Sprachlosen',[64] thus ignoring the narrator as the true speaking subject.

The relationship between literary focalisation and cinematic perspective, it would appear, is indeed more complex than a simple equation of gazes, supporting Jost's condemnation of literary criticism's 'shockingly imprecise' employment of the camera metaphor.[65] Dialogue between film and literary studies, or comparative narratology, thus promises to make a genuinely useful contribution to critical understanding of the structures of focalisation, identification and power at work in literature (and film).

Several critics have drawn attention to public fascination with Innerhofer and his semi-autobiographical protagonist, locating its foundation in the allure of the 'foreign', almost exotic element of the rural experience.[66] The reader's pleasure appears to be dependent on a simultaneous activation of (experiential) distance and (identificatory) proximity. Innerhofer's third-person narrator fulfils both functions admirably, at once providing intimate access to the world of the rural underclass, whilst offering himself up as an alternative, superior identificatory object. In aligning herself with the narrator, the reader assures herself of her own social worth, guaranteed by the access to cultural power that the narrator embodies. Any challenge to the existing value system is thus negated by the reader's ultimate identification with the narrator, marking Holl, and by extension a whole class of rural worker, as irreconcilably 'other'.

We are compelled, then, to reassess the numerous claims that Innerhofer's novel succeeds in its ostensible endeavour 'einer Bevölkerungsgruppe, die jahrhundertelang sprachlos gehalten wurde, den Knechten und Mägden, den Kindern und Behinderten, eine Sprache [zu geben]'.[67] Language emerges here not as key to emancipation but as weapon of further oppression. Innerhofer's 'allerpersönlichste[s] Hochdeutsch', praised by Karin Struck as a means of politicising the novel's social critique,[68] in fact perpetuates the widespread (linguistic) disenfranchisement within the province, denying rather than according a voice to its underclasses. Whilst the novel clearly sheds light on

the shocking living conditions experienced by countless generations of agricultural labourers, it is doubtful whether this 'Dokument einer individuellen Befreiung vielleicht auch einen Anstoss für eine kollektive zu geben vermag'.[69] Closer analysis of focalisation and identification in Innerhofer's work exposes the anti-Heimat novel as a problematic peg on which to hang provincial equality, forcing the reader to question the basis of his interaction with the texts. Placed under the interdisciplinary light of comparative narratology, the impulse within literary history to accord to Innerhofer's work a positive performative function thus appears at best idealistic, at worst condescending.

---

1 Karlheinz Rossbacher provides a comprehensive analysis of the Heimatroman's defining characteristics in his study *Heimatkunstbewegung und Heimatroman: zu einer Literatursoziologie der Jahrhundertwende*, Stuttgart 1975.

2 Franz Innerhofer, *Schöne Tage*, Munich 1993 [Salzburg 1974], p. 208. Further references appear in the text.

3 Lebert's work is considered to be one of the earliest examples of anti-Heimat literature and provides a searing critique of continuing fascism in rural Austria: Hans Lebert, *Die Wolfshaut*, Hamburg 1960.

4 Walter Weiss, 'Literatur', in *Das neue Österreich: Geschichte der Zweiten Republik*, ed. Erika Weinzierl and Kurt Skalnik, Graz and Vienna 1975, pp. 277-311 (p. 302).

5 Andrea Kunne, *Heimat im Roman: Last oder Lust? Transformationen eines Genres in der österreichischen Nachkriegsliteratur*, Amsterdam and Atlanta 1991, p. 108.

6 Klaus Zeyringer, *Innerlichkeit und Öffentlichkeit: Österreichische Literatur der achtziger Jahre*, Tübingen 1992, p. 230.

7 Peter R. Frank, 'Heimatroman von unten: einige Gedanken zum Werk Franz Innerhofers', *Modern Austrian Literature*, 13 (1980), 163-75.

8 Kunne, *Heimat im Roman*, p. 150.

9 W. Martin Lüdke, 'Franz Innerhofer', in *Kritisches Lexikon zur deutschsprachigen Gegenwartsliteratur*, Munich 2002, p. 2.

10 Frank Tichy, *Franz Innerhofer: auf der Suche nach dem Menschen*, Salzburg 2004, p. 146.

11 Ulrich Greiner, *Der Tod des Nachsommers: Aufsätze, Kritiken, Porträts zur österreichischen Gegenwartsliteratur*, Munich 1979, p. 114.

12 Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, 3rd edn, Toronto 2009, p. 143.

13 Gérard Genette, *Figures III*, Paris 1972.

14 Rainer Fribolin, *Franz Innerhofer und Joseph Winkler: die moderne bäuerliche Kindheitsautobiographik vor dem Hintergrund ihrer Tradition vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Bern 1989, p. 135.

15 Hans Esderts, 'Stimme der Sprachlosen', *Bremer Nachrichten*, 25 January 1975.

16 Kunne, *Heimat im Roman*, p. 139.

17 Frank Manchel, *Film Study: An Analytical Bibliography*, 2nd edn, 4 vols, Cranbury, NJ, London and Mississauga, ON 1990, I, p. 109.

18 Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca and London 1978.

19 François Jost, 'The Look: From Film to Novel: An Essay in Comparative Narratology', in *Companion to Film and Literature*, ed. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo, Oxford 2004, pp. 71-80 (p. 71).

20 Jost, 'The Look', p. 72.

21 *Ibid*, p. 79.

22 Bal, *Narratology*, p. 142.

23

23 Jost, ‘The Look’, p. 74.

24 Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, London and New York 1996, p. 77.

25 Joachim Hoßfeld, ‘Franz Innerhofer: *Schöne Tage*’, *Literatur und Kritik*, 94 (1975), 251-2 (251).

26 Kunne refers to Hans-Werner Ludwig and Werner Faulstich, *Erzählperspektive empirisch: Untersuchungen zur Rezeptionsrelvanz narrativer Strukturen*, Tübingen 1985, in which they warn against an ‘Überschätzung der Bedeutung der Erzählperspektive’ (Kunne, *Heimat im Roman*, p. 156).

27 Paula Murphy, ‘Psychoanalysis and Film Theory Part I: “A New Kind of Mirror”’, *Kritikos*, 2 (2005), no pagination.

28 Christian Metz, *The Imaginary Signifier: Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, tr. Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, Ben Brewster and Alfred Guzzetti, Bloomington 1974, p. 45.

29 Metz, *The Imaginary Signifier*, p. 49.

30 Kaja Silverman, *The Threshold of the Visible World*, London and New York 1996, p. 126.

31 Metz, *The Imaginary Signifier*, p. 56.

32 Kaja Silverman, *The Subject of Semiotics*, Oxford and New York 1983, p. 210.

33 Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 74.

34 Silverman, *Subject of Semiotics*, p. 44.

35 See Jean-Pierre Oudart, ‘Cinema and Suture’, *Screen*, 18 (1977-78), 35-47 (41).

36 Oudart, ‘Cinema and Suture’, p. 36.

37 Daniel Dayan, ‘The Tutor-Code of Classical Cinema’, *Film Quarterly*, 27 (1974), 22-31 (30).

38 Silverman, *Subject of Semiotics*, p. 244.

39 Sigmund Freud, 'Psychoanalytische Bemerkungen über einen autobiographisch geschriebenen Fall von Paranoia', in Freud, *Studienausgabe*, ed. Alexander Mitscherlich, Angela Richards and James Strachey, 10 vols, Frankfurt a. M. 1975, VII: *Zwang, Paranoia und Perversion*, pp. 133-203 (pp. 186-9).

40 Esderts, 'Stimme der Sprachlosen'.

41 Murray Smith, *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion and the Cinema*, Oxford 1995, p. 194.

42 This term is borrowed from Diana Fuss, *Identification Papers*, London and New York 1995, p. 8. Further references appear in the text.

43 Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 197

44 Oudart, 'Cinema and Suture', p. 41.

45 *Ibid*, p. 37.

46 Silverman, *Subject of Semiotics*, p. 205.

47 *Ibid*, p. 232.

48 Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 212.

49 Innerhofer was awarded a number of literary prizes, including the 'Staatsstipendium des Bundesministeriums für Unterricht und Kunst' (1973), the 'Rauriser Literaturpreis' (1974) and the'Literaturpreis der Stadt Bremen' (1975).

50 Interestingly, this discrepancy between implied reader and the novel's protagonists is characteristic of the Heimat genre, whose accounts of rural life were primarily read by the city-dwelling petty bourgeoisie eager to hear about an idyllic rural life (see Rossbacher, p. 98).

51 Silverman, *Threshold*, p. 10.

52 *Ibid*, p. 24.

53 Freud, 'Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse', in Freud, *Studienausgabe*, IX: *Fragen der Gesellschaft. Ursprünge der Religion*, pp. 61-134 (p. 98).

54 Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, Princeton, 1978.

55 Cohn, *Transparent Minds*, p. 57.

56 *Ibid*, p. 29.

57 *Ibid*, p. 29.

58 *Ibid*, p. 33.

59 Cohn notes the difficulty in distinguishing between these two narrative modes. Cohn, *Transparent Minds*, p. 33.

60 Fuss, *Identification Papers*, p. 34.

61 *Ibid*, p. 9.

62 The violent undertones of 'verschlagen' are unmistakable.

63 Metz, *The Imaginary Signifier*, p. 50.

64 Esderts, 'Stimme der Sprachlosen'.

65 Jost, 'The Look', p. 72.

66 Frank, 'Heimatroman von unten', p. 171; Greiner, *Der Tod des Nachsommers*, p. 113 and Tichy, *Franz Innerhofer*, p. 154.

67 Tichy, *Franz Innerhofer*, p. 146.

68 Karin Struck, 'Für die Arbeit gezeugt', *Der Spiegel*, 9 December 1974, 136-39 (136).

69 M.K., 'Befreiung von der Sprachlosigkeit', *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 5 May 1975.