

4-17-2008

# Clarice Lispector's an Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights: The Role of Silence in the Cultivation of Intimacy"

Susan Katherine Dulaney  
sdulaney1@student.gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/english\\_theses](http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/english_theses)

---

## Recommended Citation

Dulaney, Susan Katherine, "Clarice Lispector's an Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights: The Role of Silence in the Cultivation of Intimacy"" (2008). *English Theses*. Paper 34.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact [digitalarchive@gsu.edu](mailto:digitalarchive@gsu.edu).

CLARICE LISPECTOR'S *AN APPRENTICESHIP OR THE BOOK OF DELIGHTS*: THE ROLE  
OF SILENCE IN THE CULTIVATION OF INTIMACY

by

SUSAN DULANEY

Under the Direction of Dr. Calvin Thomas

ABSTRACT

This thesis undertakes to explore silence as it functions in relation to intimacy in Clarice Lispector's last narrative. It asks how silence, when perceived as a generative force, may cultivate intimacy between men and women, opening up a horizon of equality and exchange between the sexes. Using Lispector's work as a symbolic location for asking larger questions about the role of Eros in contemporary literature, the first chapter is dedicated to introducing her work as it relates to the critical canon. After examining silence and intimacy as each have been conceptualized by thinkers from various philosophical traditions, I incorporate the recent work of Luce Irigaray, which has integrated Western discourse and Eastern mystical concepts of the intimate to articulate a new kind of male/female reciprocity. I apply Irigarayan theory to Lispector's text as a way of enriching the academic scholarship regarding Lispector.

INDEX WORDS: Clarice Lispector, silence, intimacy, the divine, *To Be Two*, Luce Irigaray, mutual reciprocity, George Kalamaras, The Way of Love, Eros, Anna Khasnabish

CLARICE LISPECTOR'S *AN APPRENTICESHIP OR THE BOOK OF DELIGHTS*: THE ROLE  
OF SILENCE IN THE CULTIVATION OF INTIMACY

by

SUSAN DULANEY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2008

Copyright by  
Susan Dulaney  
2008

CLARICE LISPECTOR'S *AN APPRENTICESHIP OR THE BOOK OF DELIGHTS*: THE ROLE  
OF SILENCE IN THE CULTIVATION OF INTIMACY

by

SUSAN DULANEY

Committee Chair: Matthew Roudane

Committee: Calvin Thomas  
Michael Galchinsky  
Louis Ruprecht

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Georgia State University  
May 2008

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	CLARICE LISPECTOR: AN AUTHOR LITTLE KNOWN AND WELL-RESPECTED	6
3	THE ROLE OF SILENCE, THE VALUE OF INTIMACY	14
	The Role of Silence	14
	The Value of Intimacy	23
	Integration: Luce Irigaray, Intimacy Grounded in Silence	33
4	LUCE IRIGARAY'S ETHICS OF THE COUPLE	38
	Anna Khasnabish and Luce Irigaray	38
	Sexual Difference: Recognizing the Other	42
	Becoming	46
	Ulysses' Becoming	53
	Mutual Reciprocity: Love Grounded In Silence	57
5	CONCLUSION	62
	WORK CITED	65

CLARICE LISPECTOR'S *AN APPRENTICESHIP OR THE BOOK OF DELIGHTS*: THE  
ROLE OF SILENCE IN THE CULTIVATION OF INTIMACY

INTRODUCTION

In the midst of committing the impossible act of writing what is most difficult to write, that is, the interiority of the self and the silence of intimacy, I begin. I begin in hamlets of thought, ringing deeply inside, containing no concrete form, yet existing just the same. Without a preface, without the attempt at words, the inner world of an individual may be experienced and never expressed. Here is my preface to a text that resonates intensely with the soul's pursuit of courage to stand by conviction and discover more fully what meaning can be found in silence and what openness, transformation and intimacy results from a cultivation of such silence.

In Clarice Lispector's text, *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* (1969), silence functions within the narrative as a vehicle for creating mutual exchange and transformation. Underlying the female protagonists' search for self resides a desire to join and find the fulfillment of love. Beginning with the interiority of the self represented, silence acts as the middle ground between the self and the other while love acts as a mediator of desire. In *An Apprenticeship*, silence serves as a productive force, beginning with Lori's inward transformation and leading her into a new connection with God, and her relationship to Ulysses, her lover. My analysis will trace Lispector's use of silence as a philosophical and literary tool that is crucial to the structure and plot of her last narrative. I suggest that through tracing silence as it operates within Lispector's work- to cultivate intimacy - one can better begin to understand a larger philosophical question about intimacy. In what way does silence cultivate intimacy? Lispector's ambivalent use

of silence in *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights* offers a location from which to explore a current “ethics of the intimate” as Irigaray calls it.

I will first locate Lispector’s work in relationship to various schools of philosophical thought as a means of illustrating the recognition I believe her works deserve within the critical literary canon. I will lay a foundation of philosophical scholarship and situate this novel within counter- philosophical bodies, Tantric Buddhism and the Phallogocentric tradition, which includes recent philosophical work on Eros. In looking at *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* through the lens of theorists who occupy social positions outside of the dominant philosophical line, I hope to define silence within a context of Buddhist philosophy, where emptiness acts as the ground for all fecundity, and in the case of Lispector’s work, intimacy. I will offer background that supports Lispector’s work as a crucial literary and cultural artifact that demonstrates an ambivalent and complex view of silence that resonates with current marginal voices of postmodern literature.

Since I am talking of silence’s role in intimacy, I will first lay a foundation for understanding silence as explained by Dainin Katagiri, Ramana Maharshi, Maurice Blanchot, and George Kalamaras. I will follow this with an explanation of intimacy, again referring to George Kalamaras’s work, and following with Thich Nhat Hanh, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Osho. Though it is difficult to nail down a simple definition of silence and the intimate, several interconnected themes exist between the thinkers I have chosen. Vulnerability, surrender, loss of control, and connection to the divine through exchange with the other, each are addressed in all eight writers’ work. In each thinker’s conceptual descriptions, for each of the aforementioned elements to foster intimacy, a

spatial location beyond the linguistic realm, must precede an intimate encounter. Every thinker, though writing from various backgrounds, speaks to the search for a profound intimacy which is driven by a need for completeness. In her book *Eros the Bittersweet* (1998) Anne Carson describes the search for love in this way,

When I desire you a part of me is gone: my want of you partakes of me. So reasons the lover at the edge of Eros. His thoughts turn towards questions of personal identity. He must recover and reincorporate what is gone if he is to be a complete person. (31)

Anne Carson's description of Eros alludes to a promise for wholeness that intimacy seems to offer. Intimacy, or erotic relationships as defined by Greek philosophers as early as Plato and Aristotle, promises a kind of union with another which causes an awareness of identity, a deep nostalgia because of one's ultimate aloneness, and a deep connection to one's own life and experience. Lispector's novel explores important and unclearly defined boundaries such as self vs. other, language vs. silence, fulfillment vs. lack, and symbolic death vs. transformation. While these oppositional states exist within her text, I believe integration can be found through an intimate understanding of the text's thematic elements. Lispector uses silence as a powerful force in relationships of sexual difference. Through her use of the third- person omniscient voice, Lispector offers a forum for exploring the unsaid as it exists in the erotic relationships of her characters. In *An Apprenticeship*, Lori does not find in an impersonal divine what she could have found in a corporeal exchange with Ulysses all along. Lori's and Ulysses recognition and respect for the other's alterity and each's own becoming, grounded in silence, are crucial for the *mutual reciprocity* that they share through breath, silence, and physical consummation.

Lispector offers a female protagonist that cultivates love for herself and intimacy with another, grounded in and dependent on her own and his silence. Through this analysis, I offer a model of intimate exchange that involves spirituality and sexuality, that begins with emptiness and ends with *two-ness*.

Before examining silence's role in intimacy, let me clarify that I am loosely defining the intimate in terms of the erotic relationship which profoundly impacts identity, personal experience, and one's relationship to the absolute Other, or the divine. Philosophical binaries such as vulnerability/responsibility, cultivation/annihilation, transformation/death, language/silence, offer a starting point for finding points of integration in multidimensional relations between self, the other, and the divine. Lispector's use of the intimate has been of major concern for theorists of gender and sexuality of the French feminist school, such as Judith Butler, Luce Irigaray, and Helene Cixous. It is my hope to further open avenues for exploring Lispector's narrative representations of the intimate and silence by bringing in both dominant and marginal voices of discourse which may illuminate Lispector's complex portrayal of silence in a new way.

In *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights*, Clarice Lispector conceives of a kind of intimacy in which silence plays an ambivalent, paradoxical, and ultimately crucial role in fostering intimate exchange. Through this novel, Lispector illustrates what a beneficial and epistemologically positive role silence may play. In Chapter One, I will focus on Lispector's literary position and cultural history for its significance in relation to the current critical canon, including her relationship to existentialism, and various philosophical writers. Lispector's historical and literary location serves as the foundation

for further discourse around silence's role in Lipsector's work, which Chapter One will elucidate.

In Chapter 2, I will analyze the historical conceptions of silence as described by the Tantric/Zen Buddhist, Hindu traditions and distinguish them from Western traditions. While the complex application of silence in Buddhist philosophy may lead to self-realization, a phallogocentric interpretation of silence suggests conceptually that silence leads to self-destruction and annihilation of authentic exchange with the other. In contrast, the Buddhist philosophy's view of silence seems to allow for that which is outside of discourse and which can lead to self-actualization and intimacy with the other. I will test this hypothesis in order to synthesize the contrasting philosophies, applying them to the work of Luce Irigaray.

In Chapter Three, I will perform a textual analysis of *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* through a philosophical lens as I illustrate how Lispector offers a heterosexual love story where the characters transcend, through silence, the patriarchal and oppressive male/female hierarchal power relations. Through exploring the "negative," or silence in Lispector's last narrative, I believe that Lispector's important role within literary theory and philosophy will become clear. In Western academic studies, there is an unclaimed location for exploration with regards to Lispector's text and for understanding the implications for silence within intimacy.

## CLARICE LISPECTOR: AN AUTHOR LITTLE KNOWN AND WELL-RESPECTED

Many literary theorists including Jacques Derrida, Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Jacques Lacan, have discussed and written about the significance of Clarice Lispector's contributions as a philosophical and poetic novelist. While each of these theorists vary in their approach and use of Lispector's work, each has addressed Lispector with reverence for what she contributes to notions of responsibility to the other, identity, the intimate, and silence. In Brazil as well as the South Atlantic literary canon, Lispector has been designated as one of the most acclaimed Brazilian writers of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. In contrast, her work is seldom recognized or referenced in North American and Western European literary discourse.

Born in the Ukraine in 1920, Lispector moved to Rio De Janeiro in 1934, at the age fourteen. She quickly became fluent in Portuguese, French and Yiddish, and by age 19 she had already published her first book, *Near to the Wild Heart* (1941). Benedito Nunes, a Brazilian intellectual, writer, and winner of the Premio Jabuti award for literature, says of Lispector's fiction:

The development of certain important themes in the fiction of Clarice Lispector belongs in the context of the philosophy of existence, composed of doctrines which, although differing in their conclusions, have the same starting point: the Kierkegardian intuition of the pre-reflexive, individual and dramatic character of human existence. It deals with issues such as angst, nothing, failure, language,

communication between consciousness,<sup>1</sup> some of which traditional philosophy had ignored or relegated to a second plane. (Nunes qtd. Guetierrez 2)

Importantly, Nunes locates Kierkegaard as one of the epistemological starting points of Lispector's work. Lispectorian themes of *nothingness*, *language*, and *consciousness* are applied to her love narratives, much like the themes found in Kierkegaard. Lispector's application of these themes to her love narratives<sup>2</sup> complicate typical romance plots and echo a kind of Platonic search for *Eros*, but through very different means. This search always begins with a *desire* which is generated by lack and emptiness. Her literary representation of silence thematically and structurally challenges previous dichotomous privileging of language and includes concepts of silence which elude the boundaries established by phallogocentric<sup>3</sup> discourse. By challenging previous notions of silence, Lispector offers a new model of intimacy that is grounded in a positive, beneficial notion of silence.

Following the publication of her last novel *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights*, over a hundred essays and books have been written on Lispector's work. Other academic scholars have recognized her unconventional narrative structure, powerful poetic imagery, and complex plot development. Scholarship has targeted themes such as the heroine's journey, self-actualization, and post-modern notions of feminine identity,

---

<sup>1</sup> The word set that is underlined is taken directly from the source. Benedito Nunes underlined these in the original text, *O Drama da Linguagem*. The emphasis on these words is pertinent to my own analysis of silence as it functions in Lispector's texts.

<sup>2</sup> The angst and nothingness that act as foundations for Lispector's silence motif in her earlier love narrative *Near to the Wild Heart* is quite different than the emptiness and silence that Lispector portrays in *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights*. While her early work reflects existentialist and phallogocentric influences, *An Apprenticeship* reflects an interest in consciousness, silence, and the cultivation of intimacy through the unspoken and internal.

<sup>3</sup> "In post-structuralist, especially feminist, theory: a structure or style of thought, speech, or writing (often considered as typical of traditional western philosophy, culture, or literature), deconstructed as expressing male attitudes and reinforcing male dominance; phallogocentrism implicitly communicated in or through language" ("Phallogocentrism" Wolfreys 24).

though textual analysis around the theoretical implications of silence as related to the intimate, have been under- explored. I argue that by exploring silence as it functions to generate intimacy in *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights*, a deeper understanding of the intimate in philosophy and in Lispector's work can be found.

Lispector's literary reception cannot be easily defined. One reason for this is that her style is complex and not easily accessible. For instance, she uses silence within the narrative to complicate the relationship between her characters, thereby making it difficult to articulate containable themes, structure, and resolution. Her work has been compared to Jean-Paul Sartre, Franz Kafka, and other existentialist writers, though these comparisons only partially touch on what is at play in her novels. In "Taking her Measurements: *Clarice Lispector and The Smallest Woman in the World*," (1989) Judith Rosenberg says,

Most readings offer readings that locate Lispector within the tradition of Heidegger, Kierkegaard, Camus, and Sartre... Lispector's writing is such a radical departure from literature that precedes it that there exists among readers, critics, and translators of her work an attempt to normalize Lispector's texts. (75)

Rosenberg correctly points to the difficulties that other writers have had in succinctly determining Lispector's place in the literary canon. In her essay, "Mother, Blessed Be You Among Cockroaches: Essentialism, Fecundity and Death in Clarice Lispector," Tace Hedrick points out, "it is clear enough that Lispector does continually restage, or in a sense 'mime' (narrative) scenes taken from the tradition of European philosophical fictional writing" (44).

Lispector's work has at times been over-simplistically categorized with Sartre and Kafka because of her shared interest in the "experiential and material space of the body [which] is inescapably, though not reductively, tied to certain ontological and phenomenological concerns voiced by Western philosophers" (Hedrick 43). Sartre and Kafka are included in the philosophers Hedrick mentions. Rosenberg and Hedrick agree however that Lispector's writing turns the Sartrean project, (which is grounded in a more masculine concept of consciousness), "on its head" (44). Hedrick's essay helps to dislodge Lispector's work from existentialist concepts of silence, the body, and the inevitable presence of such discourse.

In *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights*, Lispector stylistically transforms the traditional love narrative, and integrates a phallogocentric narrative theme with a philosophy of emptiness which reflects more Buddhist, or prototypically "Eastern" concepts of silence. In *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex,"* Judith Butler suggests that Luce Irigaray and Clarice Lispector both bring into view what has been excluded from prototypically Western philosophy. By participating in what Butler sees as a mimetic uncovering of "western philosophy's 'blind spot' (Hedrick 45), Lispector and Irigaray both focus on a new way of heterosexual male/female relationships, through the unspoken.

Clarice Lispector's representation of silence draws attention to a "gap" (Hedrick 47) operates as an important literary device in her novels. When discussing Lispector's narrative style in "Clarice Lispector's (Post)Modernity and the Adolescence of the Girl Colt" Diane Marting says, "In Lispector's late writing, pointing to an object that cannot be named, an object beyond the 'word horizon' so to speak, requires, like a black hole,

signaling by other means, through a circumvention of naming” (442). Along these same lines Marting allocates Lispector’s position within Brazilian Modernism, a period of the early twentieth-century. According to Marting, Lispector’s work exists as part of the revolt away from both structural and existential modes of representation. While Marting does not address Lispector’s use of silence as generative, she validates its postmodern functioning within Lispector’s work. At the end of her essay, Marting states that Lispector’s work is in “accordance with a certain line of French theory, a desire for the unrepresentable object created by her language. It is the creation of a verbal space, a calling for an absent answer to ever-changing questions” (443). Marting aligns Lispector’s work with other French theorists who have sought to recognize the empty space that is crucial for the development of meaning and exchange, whether in language or intimacy.

Negative and the unspoken, or silence, is crucial to Lispector’s project. In “The Practical Mysticism of Clarice Lispector’s *Uma Aprendizagem ou o Livro dos Prazeres*”, Richard Mazzara recognizes Lispector’s interest in the mystical union with some notion of the divine. Her interest in mysticism illuminates the inchoate and profound meaning that silence holds for the seeker, or individual hoping for communion. He says, “Clarice is considered the first to use fiction for the purpose of metaphysical inquiry and the first to develop a style uniquely suited to such inquiry” (714). While Mazzara neglects to mention Plato as having used fiction to explore metaphysics, nevertheless- Lispector is the first female of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to use style as a tool for pursuing metaphysics. According to Mazzara, part of the metaphysical model that Lispector uses includes individual purging as a means of purifying the spirit and attaining a deeper level of

understanding. He uses Lori's profound transformation in *An Apprenticeship* as an example, yet he compares her preparation for union with Ulysses as parallel with Hindu and Buddhist metaphysics. Mazzara draws connections between erotic union between a man and woman and an individual's union to God. He suggests that Lispector's silence functions to create intimacy between the characters and God, saying,

Clarice's epiphanic use of silence has existential and mystical significance also. Silence is the key to both philosophies; nausea causes the protective cloak of language to disappear allowing silence to take its place as a means by which God communicates with the mystic... Catholic mysticism regularly uses marriage to symbolize the final stage in the journey, with the groom representing God and the bride, the soul. (712)

Mazzara also points out in his essay that for Lispector, language does not have the ability to express the most profound aspects of life. To further understand what Lispector hoped to portray in her novels, one must follow Lispector's narrative through the obscurity of its language and into the silences in order to "overcome [the] obstacles [and] gain access to a greater reality through silence"(712).

The necessary silences that Mazzara claims allow a deeper penetration into reality, apply particularly to the conscious contact between Lori and Ulysses. Though written in 1987, Earl E. Fitz's essay "A Discourse of Silence: The Postmodernism of Clarice Lispector," has been foundational to the discussion of silence in Lispector's work. Fitz speaks of the connection between the main characters Lori and Ulysses, and claims that "quiet contemplation of the self" (432) allows each character to transcend language and participate in Eros, which leads to their reciprocal "growth and fulfillment" (432).

Fitz also says that through physical and non-verbal exchange, Lori and Ulysses participate in an ancient and sacred practice of reuniting “word and deed, signifier and signified” (432). Fitz extends his analysis beyond simply locating Lispector’s work as a post-modern text, and begins to formulate a concept of the intimate as it relates to silence. However, scant scholarship regarding the male/female ritual of silence and exchange in Lispector’s work has been contributed since this essay was published. Fitz’s essay also gives Lispector credit for illustrating the power that silence has to “entrap and subjugate [which] can lead to the ruinous self-imprisonment of silence, bitterness and non-communication” (433). Fitz’s comment here endorses the idea that for Lispector, silence is destructive. While this argument can certainly be made for her first work, *Near to the Wild Heart*, silence is more complex, and arguably generative, in *An Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights*.

Hélène Cixous, a French feminist most well known for the concept of “écriture feminine” or “writing of the body,” was touched by Lispector’s work because of her view that Lispector participated in a deeply intimate relationship with her own writing process. Like the writing process, the search for the mutual exchange with the other of sexual difference usually threatens a collision with vulnerability, responsibility, and possibly even the death or transformation of the self. Elena Deanda says in her essay “On Joy Death and Writing: From Autobiography to Autothanatography in Clarice Lispector’s Work” (2006):

French deconstructionism and American postmodernism have found in the work of the Brazilian writer a rich land full of philosophy and literature to explore, with the French critic Hélène Cixous being the pioneer in inserting Lispector at the

crossroads of deconstruction and literature... Cixous named her *écriture féminine* after Lispector's work, and defined it—through the lens of psychoanalysis. (1) Deanda concisely sums up Cixous' influence on Lispector's critical reception (2). Cixous believed that as a writer, Clarice Lispector exhibited a profound understanding of the intimate relationship between her interior world and her external world as a writer.

Brazilian critic Regina Zilberman sums up one possible solution to the problem of reducing Lispector's literary position to a distinctly identifiable location within the canon. As quoted by Rachel Gutierrez, Zilberman says, "Clarice Lispector requires researchers that are willing to work with specific books, refusing the totalizing model of historiographic criticism"(qtd. Gutierrez 4). Zilberman treats Lispector as a literary anomaly, a rightful placement (if there is a right placement) for Lispector. Given Zilberman's assertion that any potential for understanding Lispector's work must exclude totalization, I will work with specific texts so that I can integrate various notions of intimacy and silence into an experimental model. With this integrative model of silence and intimacy, a new reading of Lispector's male and female protagonists can emerge.

Though I have mentioned Ashmita Khasnabish previously, I want to add that her work is significant in relation with Irigaray's concept of the couple. In Khasnabish's post-colonial interpretation of the divine Hindu couple Radha and Krishna, Khasnabish brilliantly connects Irigaray's body of work to Hindu religious history. She looks closely at Irigaray's recent works, *Between East and West* (2002), and *To Be Two* (2001). In both texts Irigaray creates a synthesis of Hindu and Tantric Buddhist concepts, using "Western" discourse. In my interpretation of Lispector's texts, I will support Irigaray's recent theory in collaboration with Anna Khasnabish's text, *Jouissance as Ananda*

(2002), because Khasnabish applies Irigaray's theories from a perspective that will greatly aid my textual analysis. Having created a conceptual structure for examining silence and intimacy, I turn my attention to an analysis of Clarice Lispector's *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights*.

## THE ROLE OF SILENCE, THE VALUE OF INTIMACY

### The Role of Silence

Silence, as it is defined in the Zen Buddhist tradition, is a generative force that creates peace and harmony on an individual and community level. Silence is foundational for the practice of Zen Buddhism,<sup>4</sup> and for individuals committed to the Buddhist path. Dainin Katagiri, a Japanese Zen Buddhist teacher, who played an instrumental role in bringing Zen Buddhism from Japan to America, addresses silence in his book *Returning to Silence: Zen Practice in Daily Life* (1988). Dainin Katagiri emphasizes how important emptiness and absolute silence are for attaining enlightenment and therefore transcending the *wheel of samsara*.<sup>5</sup>

Enlightenment, according to Buddhism, is not an eternal state, but rather a way of living life with clarity and purity. Within Buddhism, life and death are closely intertwined and paradoxically are considered one. In Zen Buddhism the individual can "see human life including death," by quieting the mind and reaching a state of emptiness

---

<sup>4</sup> Because Zen Buddhism is a vast, and potentially unlimited, tradition, I will not lay out all of its foundational principles. My primary goal is to define Buddhist silence as it is related to other notions of silence in Hindu and Western practices. I have chosen one significant Buddhist teacher to represent Buddhist notions of silence because an attempt to situate silence in precise relation to all of Zen Buddhism's precepts and principles would be exhaustive. While I refer to certain Buddhist concepts in my paper, I will only define those terms relevant to concepts dealing with a definition of silence.

<sup>5</sup> In Buddhism, the *wheel of samsara* is also called the *Cycle of Existence*. The idea is that by following the *Eightfold Path* (right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, right concentration), an individual can move beyond the wheel of samsara, and become free of suffering ("Wheel of Samsara").

accomplished through silence. Katagiri categorizes silence into two parts: silence seen through “human eyes, and silence seen through “Buddha’s eyes, or the universal eye” (1). He says that in the human perspective silence operates on three simultaneous levels: pessimistic, optimistic, and mystical. Alternately, from the universal perspective (*Buddha’s eye*) Katagiri describes silence as:

the total manifestation of our whole personality... Whole personality means our individual personality is manifested with the whole universe. All other beings are the contents of our personality. So when we manifest our whole personality it is not just our individual personality, but simultaneously through this personality we can feel the whole universe. (7)

Loyal to a more *experiential*<sup>6</sup> definition of silence, Katagiri highlights his personal interpretation as it is necessary in his teaching of Buddhism. While Katagiri defines silence in less than logical, linear terms, he is in essence saying that silence is a vehicle for merging with the universal.

In accordance with the Buddhist principle of *right faith*,<sup>7</sup> one must accept silence. For Katagiri,

Right faith is perfect trust. Perfect trust means to accept silence, and in the silence everything becomes zero. So come back, become a zero and there is wonderful peace. This is a silent world [...] If I try to know who I am finally I have to come back to silence. (43)

---

<sup>6</sup> Within Zen Buddhism, experiential knowledge of life is valued as much or more than intellectual and linear understanding. For more details refer to Chapter 2 of *Return to Silence* (1988).

<sup>7</sup> “Right Faith” refers to an individual who has accepted “refuge” in the three treasures of Buddhism (Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha), and who is willing to practice these precepts (“Right Faith”).

Katagiri suggests that in Buddhist thought the core of identity and meaning can be found in silence. Already he alludes to the paradoxical notion that one can find identity and meaning in life through the negation of language and action.

A method for achieving silence as suggested by Buddhism is *zazen*,<sup>8</sup> a practice that Katagiri suggests allows one to move from a *human view* of silence to a *Buddhist view* of silence. Simply, meditative sitting is considered a way to “come back to zero” and accept the transience of life (42). Katagiri speaks of the paradox inherent in Buddhist practice when he says, “purity is oneness between subject and object; there is no gap between them” (132). The benefit of gaining purity, according to this path, lies in the ability to reach, through silence, a state where there is no hierarchized ontological structure of existence for the individual. Once reaching silence, the individual is able to transcend attachment to life. Through this process, the individual can achieve a final literal and metaphorical death by transcending the *wheel of samsara*, which according to Buddhism is the cause of all suffering. In *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance* (1980), Bernard Dauenhauer discusses the ways in which the Buddhist idea of silence functions primarily to advance a disciple’s enlightenment. He says that silence “lies at the foundation of [a disciple’s] capacity to lead others, [and] to exercise influence within the community” (110). For Maharshi and other Buddhists, not only does silence play a key role on an individual level, but it is also crucial in showing others’ the way to enlightenment.

Very much like the Buddhist notion that the individual can find peace and enlightenment through silence, Hindu philosophies regard silence as a means to reaching

---

<sup>8</sup> Katagiri translates *zazen* to mean “surrender[ing] ourselves to tranquility and simplicity in life.

*Samadhi*.<sup>9</sup> Ramana Maharshi, a Vedantic Hindu teacher, emphasizes “non-duality”<sup>10</sup> and explains silence as a positive way to see life as non-dualistic. In his essay “Silence and Solitude in Ramana Maharshi” (Author Unknown) says “silence is ever-speaking, it is the perennial flow of ‘language.’ It is interrupted by speaking, for words destroy this mute language. Silence is unceasingly eloquence [sic]. It is the best language” (1). Maharshi explicitly expresses the view that silence is not only superior to written and verbal language, but claims that language acts invasively on the realm of silence. This is statement illustrates the vast difference between Hindu and phallogocentric notions of the language/silence relationship. In addition to proposing silence as a positive language, Maharshi's view acts as the inverse of post-structural theorists' ideas of silence such as Hegel, Heidegger and Derrida. While other Hindu teachers stress the importance of an individual following a guru Maharshi's teaching deviates slightly in that he believed that the guru, and therefore life's meaning exists within. Maharshi essentially suggests a pedagogy of silence.

In her book, *Wheels of Life* (1987), Judith Anodea explains that within Tantric Hinduism the silent teacher is personified as “Dakshinamurti, manifestation of *Shiva*,” and goes on to mention that “the god Shiva is also called the “destroyer” (29). While Shiva represents bliss and divine potential, he is separate from manifestation, which includes language. Within Hinduism, Shiva is thought to contain all unmanifested power, yet accessing his energy is almost impossible without *Shakti*.<sup>11</sup> Because of his formless

---

<sup>9</sup> a “cycle of *action, reaction, birth, death, and rebirth* [that] is a continuum.” (“samsara”) (wikipedia)

<sup>10</sup> “Non-duality” is not the same conceptually as monotheism. While in Hinduism and Buddhism. *Non-duality* expresses the idea that things are not separate from each other and that the individual is not separate from others or the divine. This is different from monotheism, which can be defined as “the belief in the existence of one deity or in the oneness of God” (“Non-Duality”).

<sup>11</sup> *Shiva*, like many other gods within the Hindu tradition, has a female counterpart, *Shakti*. *Shiva* is “identified as pure unmanifest yet pure consciousness without form (Anodea 64). *Shakti*, is the “entire

nature, Shiva is associated with the role of the Hindu teacher who lays out the path to Samadhi<sup>12</sup> through silence. The Hindu term *ananda*<sup>13</sup> describes the state of bliss that exists as a result of this union with the divine, i.e., Brahma.<sup>14</sup> For Maharshi and many other Hindu teachers, silence is the vehicle that leads to finding oneself and a blissful state of being.

Maharshi unapologetically claims silence as a “mature response to the vicissitudes of life” (Osborne 38). He views silence not as a negation of meaning, but rather as a way of conveying meaning to others so that they may reach *Samadhi*. Silence is not a negation but a tool for teaching others the way to liberation. Calling the word the “great-grandson of the Original Source”(Maharshi qtd.3). Maharshi asks the metaphysical question, “If the word can produce effect, judge for yourself how much more powerful must be the Preaching through Silence?”(Maharshi qtd. 3) The effect of language that Maharshi speaks of does not connote a positive or negative impact of the word. However, violence, destruction, and war are included. Maharshi conveys the idea that silence is the basis for all meaning, though his question points to a possible problem in his thinking. By positioning silence over language, he subscribes to a form of duality which separates the two states of existence. Maharshi does not represent all of Hindu thought on silence with

---

creation and mother of the universe [...] and inventor of *maya*, commonly thought of as illusion” (Anodea 65). Illusion in Hinduism is the tangible realm. It is thought that through their eternal embrace channels the world of non-form into the world of form.

<sup>12</sup> “In other words, the Samadhi experience of which yogis speak, of for instance, is an awareness of complete identification between subject and object” (Kalamaras 160).

<sup>13</sup>The current Indian philosopher, Sri Aurobindo has made great contributions to ways of understanding *ananda*, as an energetic union which can be experienced on the material plane. Prior to Aurobindo’s teaching, *ananda*, according to the Upanishads and other Indian religious texts, could only be attained through unconscious processes. For more information, see Sri Aurobindo’s *The Life Divine* (1973), and Ashmita Khasnabish’s essay “The Ascent and Descent: Irigaray and Brennan through Indian Philosophy” in *Jouissance as Ananda* (2003).

<sup>14</sup> “Though a variety of views are expressed in the Upanishads, they concur in the definition of brahma as eternal, conscious, irreducible, infinite, omnipresent spiritual source of the universe of finiteness and change” (“Brahma”).

this statement, though when he linguistically privileges silence over language, he repeats a dichotomy between language and silence. This dichotomy seems to refute the concept of union that is necessary for transcendence, according to the Hindu tradition.

Maharshi's privileging of silence over language is directly inverse to foundational theorists, particularly G.W.F. Hegel.<sup>15</sup> I mention Hegel's position on silence before discussing Maurice Blanchot's views in order to illustrate the contrast between Maharshi's privileging of silence, and Hegel's intent in privileging language. While silence is not directly addressed as a topic in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), it is clear that Hegel does not consider silence in any way generative of meaning or the construction of knowledge.<sup>16</sup> As Bernard Dauenhauer quotes in his book *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance* (1982), "Hegel writes 'what is called the unutterable is nothing else than the untrue, the irrational, what is merely meant'" (Hegel 66). In this statement, Hegel describes the unspoken as the untrue, thereby discrediting what is silent as lacking in truth or meaning. Commenting on Hegel's statement, Dauenhauer says:

For Hegel, then, Reality = Revealed Reality = Truth = Logos. All truth can and should be expressed in words. The truth is the real revealed by knowledge, and this knowledge is rational and conceptual [...] Silence is quite simply, a deficiency to be overcome. In its own right, it has no ontological significance. For him, silence elucidates nothing about reality. (86-87)

---

<sup>15</sup> Please refer to Alexandre Kojève's lectures, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel* (1934) and Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), for an in-depth explanation of Hegel's ontology of Absolute Knowledge as it relates to language.

<sup>16</sup> For a specific reading of silence in Hegel's *Phenomenology*, see Stanley Rosen's *Nihilism* (1969).

Dauenhauer accurately sorts out the complex interposition of lack as it exists within Hegel's ontological construction of meaning. Furthermore, Dauenhauer articulates the rationale that Hegel maintains in positioning language as synonymous with meaning.

Hegel represents logocentric notions of silence, while later philosopher and phenomenologist Maurice Blanchot remains more ambiguous in his negotiations of silence in relation to language. Blanchot was heavily influenced by Martin Heidegger,<sup>17</sup> though Blanchot's view of death extends beyond ontological concepts of Being as defined by Hegel and Heidegger. I use his theory within the framework of Eastern notions of silence, because although he was influenced by Heidegger, who was influenced by Hegel, Blanchot departs dramatically from the tradition. In language and literature, whether religious or philosophical, there is consistently a correlation between silence and the divine. For Buddhism and Hinduism, silence is one way to find God. Heidegger asks questions about the absent nature of God, suggesting, although from a literary and ontological perspective, that the existence of God depends on his absence.<sup>18</sup> Blanchot looks at the role of death and absence within language as violent, disruptive, and secretive, linking silence to absence and madness. In *Immemorial Silence* (2001), Karmen MacKendrick points out the important way that Heidegger's of "waiting" has been taken up by Blanchot. For Blanchot, MacKendrick tells us, *madness*

reveals a staggering depth, a subterranean violence, a knowledge that is

boundless, devastating, secret... From Freud to Bataille to Deleuze to Blanchot

---

<sup>17</sup> For a detailed explanation of Blanchot's philosophy as it follows Heidegger's tradition of "ontological investigation into being" (222), as well as Blanchot's ties to existentialism, see Ethan Kleinberg's *Generation Existential: Heidegger's Philosophy in France* (209-244).

<sup>18</sup> Karmen MacHendrick points out as one of Heidegger's most central concerns "the drawing of desire across the space of absence(of words across a space of silence" (11). Furthermore, she points out Heidegger's contemplation of a "God who withdraws," alluding to Heidegger's notion of God as absent.

we are reminded of something astonishing: violence is silent. And silence, in all of its gentleness, is violent still ... Silence is the absence of and in language, the break in meaning. (23)

While post-structuralist readings of Blanchot such as MacKendrick's seem to define Blanchot's concept of silence in nihilistic terms, silence in Blanchot's *The Space of Literature* (1983) is more ambiguous.

For many critics of Blanchot, silence points to madness, violence, and a break in meaning, as MacKendrick suggests. However in his work, there is great implication that at the violent, absent, heart of meaning which silence occupies, there is also fecundity. While unlike Buddhism and Hinduism, Blanchot does not suggest that the divine or Absolute can be found in silence, when Blanchot speaks of poetry, he recognizes a productive capacity for silence. Blanchot differentiates between Mallarme's *crude word* and *essential word*, Blanchot (*Space of Literature* 39). He allies the *crude word* with a silence that yields meaningless exchange which includes nothingness. He allies the essential word with the "questing poet" who, he says, creates a language whose "whole force lies in its not being, whose very glory is to evoke in its own absence, the absence of everything" (39). Calling *poetry*<sup>19</sup> the language of the unreal, he says that "this fictive language [poetic form] which delivers us to fiction, comes from silence and returns to silence" (39). While Blanchot is still giving the majority of meaning to the domain of language, even if symbolical language, he recognizes the "total rhythm" (39), of which, silence plays a major role in the making of meaning.

---

<sup>19</sup> *Poetry*, which rests firmly on metaphor and symbolism, includes epic poetry and mythology. Octavio Paz explains the relationship between poetry and eroticism in his book *The Double Flame* (1993), when he says, "[eroticism] is a poetry of the body and [poetry is] an eroticism of language" (2).

In his book *Reclaiming the Tacit Dimension: Symbolic Form in the Rhetoric of Silence* (1997), George Kalamaras makes stunning and powerful observations about the ways in which Western mysticism<sup>20</sup> has “contributed to the current misunderstanding and mistrust of silence in the West” (83). By looking at Zen Buddhist and Hindu notions of silence as compared to Hegel, Heidegger, and Blanchot, I am not attempting to supply a mystical interpretation of silence. Instead, moving beyond this, I want to use Kalamaras’s point that

Mystics of the East begin from the perspective of a reciprocity between self and other, personal and impersonal, and self and the divine that has informed their cultures for thousands of years; Western mystics, on the other hand, although enriched by their reciprocal unified experience, are still writing to and from a culture that has no tradition of reciprocity with which to interpret and express such experiences. (95)<sup>21</sup>

Kalamaras is not attempting to define, through differentiation, an encompassing notion of mysticism. He clearly states that his goal is not to communicate a description of the mystical experience, but rather to “authenticate [silence] as a mode of knowing ... and reclaim, for modern discourse theory, the tacit dimension by locating it as a rhetoric.”<sup>22</sup>

Kalamaras clarifies that because he is authenticating silence as a mode of knowing, he does not attempt to preclude logic or “seek to privilege the irrational” (8). He claims that silence and language act reciprocally to create knowledge. In addition, his investigation

---

<sup>20</sup> “mysticism [...] suggests particular contemplative practices that seek to interiorize consciousness in order to contact and have a direct experience of the divine ground of being” (Kalamaras 9).

<sup>21</sup> While Kalamaras refers to “East” and “West,” he prefaces his use of “the East” by acknowledging the vast differences among and within Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Sikhism, and Jainism” making it impossible to generalize about each. For more information on how he classifies his argument in terms of “East and West” see pages 9-11 of *Reclaiming the Tacit Dimension*.

<sup>22</sup> Kalamaras defines rhetoric as “a symbolic act that is a way of making meaning.”

of the levels of reciprocity between language and silence does not adhere to a mystical or rational definition of silence.

### The Value of Intimacy

I will now lay a framework for defining intimacy in relation to silence. I am speaking of an erotic intimacy that depends on silence, a formulation that Luce Irigaray has been discussing since the turn of this century. However, before beginning, it is important to look at intimacy, and the importance it has in relation to silence. As a precursor to my exploration of intimacy as it is defined through various philosophical disciplines, I mention Osho, an Indian teacher and writer who did not preach from one religious tradition alone. Instead he drew from the teachings of various philosophical and religious teachers such as Buddha, Krishna, and Jesus. In his book *Intimacy: Trusting Oneself and the Other* (2001), Osho defines intimacy as “allowing the other to come into you, to see you as you see yourself-to allow the other to see you from your inside (37). Osho points out that “the word *intimacy* comes from the Latin root *intimum*, which means your interiority, your innermost core” (37). The term intimacy as I mean to use it is compatible with Osho’s understanding of intimacy. Osho expresses the idea that silence is the medium for vulnerability and opening to the other: “non-language is needed for people with whom you have a love relationship” (58). For true exchange to exist, and for one to communicate and reveal oneself to the other, sacred silence is necessary, according to Osho. The willingness to reveal what Irigaray calls one’s process of *becoming*,<sup>23</sup> is the process of forming “an identity which is conscious, in a perpetual state

---

<sup>23</sup> I am alluding here to Luce Irigaray’s idea of *becoming*, which though comprehensive in meaning, can best be summed up here as an identity which is conscious, in a perpetual state of cultivation, evolution, and transformation.

of cultivation, evolution and transformation” (Irigaray 34). To experience a profound opening, one must listen deeply and respect the silence and space which signifies their inevitable separateness. With Osho’s concept of intimacy in mind, I now look at intimacy as it has been explained by George Kalamaras, Rainer Maria Rilke, Jayadeva, and Thich Nhat Hanh. Each of these writers articulate a conception of intimacy that contributes to the larger theme of *becoming* which precedes intimacy with the Other.

In his chapter “An Intimate Immensity: Silence and the Paradox of Attention,” George Kalamaras echoes Pablo Neruda’s attention to the relationship between movement and stillness. One of the greatest poets of the twentieth century, Neruda accepted the Nobel prize in 1971, saying “the poet must achieve a balance between solitude and solidarity, between feeling and action, between intimacy of one’s self, the intimacy of making, and the revelation of nature” (Merwin intro.) The intimacy that resounds in much of Pablo Neruda’s work is an intimacy that revels in and depends on silence. An example of this is his poem “I Like For You to Be Still.” Neruda’s awareness of silence as crucial in the cultivation of intimacy, pervades his love poetry. For Neruda, the intimate realm, like the poetic realm, relates directly to greater levels of self-understanding and consciousness that vulnerability to the senses, whether it be through love or poetry, brings. To reiterate, he says of silence,

the condition of silence is itself constituted of paradoxical tendencies...the relationship between movement and stillness is the key to our coming to an understanding of Eastern philosophical practice and its perception of mind-body...attentiveness to this reciprocity, according to yogis, cleanses the body of

physical, emotional, and psychological impurities...In yoga, paradox is perceived as a generative condition. (149)

Kalamaras' use of the yogic tradition in making an argument for the generative condition of silence is crucial to keep in mind as I examine *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* through a Buddhist and Hindu tantric lens. When viewed through a Hegelian lens of the dialectic, conflict is inherent before synthesis can occur between the opposing elements. According to Kalamaras, when controlled through the practice of the breath, such paradoxes become reciprocal rather than conflictive. There must be a balance between solitude and solidarity, and unlike logocentric notions of silence as a destructive force, in order for silence to truly generate intimacy, there must be consciousness that begins with individual union of an identity. Before there can be unity, reciprocity or exchange with the other, according to yogic tradition, a deep intimacy that is grounded in silence must exist within the individual. Solitude is required for this pursuit. Silence acts as the ground in which intimacy can grow, and in turn, intimacy is the true means through which the individual union is achieved.

In order for true intimacy to exist, there must be attention. For the purpose of this analysis, I define intimacy as a conscious attention to the other that includes silent meditation of experience, sensory perception, and consciousness. So intimacy is an attention to what exists between two individuals. It is a kind of involvement, a form of awareness that dissolves (through reciprocity) binary distinctions and integrates polarities. Silence is required for the cultivation of intimacy because, as T.S. Eliot describes, "at the still point, there the dance is" (qtd in *Self Knowledge* 1974). The "dance" of intimacy must exist where there is a fecund space to nurture the relationship

between lovers. Furthering the structure of Kalamaras's argument that "presence, [then] lies simultaneously in the nameable and the unnamable, in the existent and [in] that which does not exist" (102), I would like to suggest that intimacy, or erotic union lies simultaneously between the said and the unsaid.

As I mentioned before, in Hindu tradition the term *Samadhi* equals absolute union between subject and object. I suggest that intimacy connotes the *Samadhi* of self with other, a condition that lies in the balance between self-autonomy and absolute vulnerability. The *intimate* as I use the term, connotes a self-awareness and reciprocity with the other that respects distance, temporality, and separateness. When I refer to intimacy, I address more than the love that *ricochets* between lovers.<sup>24</sup> I am referring to an immense presence which in this context means vulnerability to the other, a revelation of feelings, gestures and caresses, which may exist in the interim between dialogue and physical separateness between partners, but that is grounded in absolute silence and solitude.

In the early 1900's, the Czech born poet Rainer Maria Rilke spoke of a kind of intimacy with the other which is grounded in solitude. Rilke's concept of intimacy was revolutionary for his time, and his definition of love between a man and woman defied and challenged existing social conventions. His writing about love was revolutionary because he foresaw a new kind of relationship between man and woman in which woman would be an equal partner (autonomous), rather than simply an extension of man's desire. His love-affair with Lou-Salome, the Russian born writer, biographically mirrored a new

---

<sup>24</sup> Anne Carson's use of this term is significant in relation to the intimate. In *Eros the Bittersweet* (1998) she says "If we follow the trajectory of Eros we consistently find it tracing out this same route: it moves out from the lover toward the beloved, then ricochets back to the lover himself and the hole in him, unnoticed before. Who is the real subject of most love poems? Not the beloved. It is that hole" (31)

way of relating to the other that was grounded in a universal emptiness, rather than adopted from a religious context. Saying that a “merging of two people is an impossibility,” he claims that once people accept this fact of “infinite distance” between lovers, a rather hopeful potential remains. He suggests that “a marvelous living side-by-side can grow up for them, if they succeed in loving the expanse between them.” One of Rilke’s most often quoted statements, “a good marriage is one in which each partner appoints the other to be *guardian of his solitude* and thus they show each other the greatest possible trust”<sup>25</sup>.

While Rilke’s ideas about intimacy may seem less than romantic when compared to Aristophanes’ image of the lovers joined into one body- as related in Plato’s *Symposium*, Rilke’s letters create a more autonomous picture of intimacy. In looking at Rilke’s *Letters to a Young Poet* (trans. 1984), one can see how he extends *loving* beyond a structure of subject/object that merge into *oneness*. Rilke foresees a new kind of female individuality that has “stripped off the conventions of mere femaleness” (77), and whose name does not mean “the mere opposite of the male” (77). This new female will transform the love experience, according to Rilke. Rilke suggests that once individual solitude and silence has been achieved, a more human love between man and woman will develop. He says:

And this more human love (which will fulfill itself with infinite consideration and gentleness and kindness and clarity in binding and releasing) will resemble what we are now preparing painfully and with great struggle: the love that consists in this: that the two solitudes protect and border and greet each other. (78)

---

<sup>25</sup> This sentence is quoted from *Rilke on Love and Other Difficulties* (1975) by John Mood.

Rilke's view of love is rooted in an innate duality between the sexes as well as individuals. The union that he describes involves a new model for intimacy. Instead of "merging, surrendering, uniting" (77), Rilke suggests that man and woman each participate in the other's becoming, before joining with the other. Rilke argues for a love between two individuals who meet as equals and who have a responsibility to the other to remain separate as they evolve. Lack of distance, space, and personal solitude ends tragically. As Rilke describes, "wherever people act out of a prematurely fused, muddy communion, every action is conventional" (74). This differs from depictions of the male/female relationship as has been formulated in more ancient religious traditions. An example of this can be seen within the Hindu literary/religious tradition.

Within Hinduism, one of the most potent models of erotic and spiritual intimacy exists within the *Gita Govinda* (12<sup>th</sup> Century), which tells the story of Radha and Krishna's love. Written by the poet Jayadeva, the *Gita Govinda* has been instrumental in the *bhakti* tradition of Hinduism, and symbolically conveys eternal erotic love. The Indian writer Anna Khasnabish clarifies the love relationship between Radha and Krishna in her book *Jouissance as Ananda* (2003), when she hints to the complex layers of Radha and Krishna's symbolic and intimate union. She says:

The relationship must be understood in the light of the divine origin of both Radha and Krishna and, it needs to be understood as something beyond a mundane love affair where one partner has a tendency to consume the other. Their love could also be understood as the devotion of a God or a Goddess. (37)

Intimacy as it exists in Hinduism, is symbolic of union with the divine, or ultimate consciousness, and is one of the greatest forms of devotion. Krishna is seen as an aspect

of God himself, and while Radha stands apart from him, she is considered an aspect of his divinity. While their love is beyond a love in which one lover consumes the other, Radha and Krishna are seen as complementary parts of God, joining to become one, no matter how fleeting their liaisons. The two lovers mutually worship one another as lover and beloved, though each maintains physical distance, at times for long duration. A paradox exists within the relationship of Radha and Krishna, as each live as distinct and separate entities, yet they are considered complementary aspects whose union equals wholeness, or *Brahma*. As Khasnabish notes, in Jayadeva's text, Radha is devoted to her union with Krishna, but experiences her own love and jouissance.<sup>26</sup>

The desire that exists between both Hindu deities maintains a level of duality which further generates desire and is temporarily suspended when the lovers join physically. This conundrum concerns Krishna, who recognizes his inability to possess her or appropriate her entirely. He says, "Oh slender waisted Radha! Your meaningless silence pains me, sing the sweet rhapsody of love in sestet shrill... Oh silly, your darling, loving, I am present here" (Ayengar 43). In this statement, Krishna's desire for Radha points to his fear of her absence as he reassures her of his full presence in their encounter. Both the reassurance of his presence and the fear of her silence illustrate a concern for consciousness and exchange that he looks for through his joining with Radha. The relationship between Radha and Krishna develops over many years, and much of their individual time is spent in these gaps of time and distance, for each deity's life path

---

<sup>26</sup> I am referring to a *female jouissance* which Julian Wolfreys describes as "the order of the constant and gradual creation dimension ranging from the most corporeal to the most spiritual, a dimension which is never complete and never reversible... Woman generates through her *jouissance*... a bridge between what is most earthly and more celestial... Women's dissatisfaction... no doubt stems from this perpetual deferment of a jouissance which is theirs, where they might find themselves, or find themselves anew" (Wolfreys 127).

requires separation. Much of the *Gita Govinda* is filled with longing and waiting. Their story offers a model of the significance of distance between lovers, and the paradoxical intimacy which results from such spaces. At times such absences involve great suffering:

Moonlight sings his body

Piteously he wails,

In the ceaseless fall of Love's arrows

Deems his death certain

Oh friend! Krishna suffers in your desertion. (118)

As Krishna's suffering illustrates, Radha and Krishna both experience a profound sense of connection to life and to the other that is made more intense, and develops in the others' absence. Radha and Krishna portray the Hindu concept that human life, and therefore love, involves duality, and because of this, there is suffering.

Less concerned with the problematic attempt to join male/female aspects of the divine into a unified whole, Thich Nhat Hanh, a Zen Buddhist monk from Vietnam, has significantly impacted the spread of the Mahayana (Zen) tradition to Europe and the Americas. His contribution includes his teaching of silence, non-violence, and peace that begins with the individual and extends outward to the *sangha*, or community of individuals living in harmony. He teaches the Buddha's precepts which are suggestions for ethical conduct that benefit the individual on the path to enlightenment. They are usually practiced within the context of the *Eightfold Path*. While there are up to 227 precepts practiced by Buddhist monks, most Buddhists practice at least the first five. These five precepts are, 1. not harming living beings, 2. not stealing, 3. not participating in sexual misconduct, 4. not lying, and 5. not using drugs or alcohol (Knierim).

In addition he has written dozens of books on key Buddhist principles. Hanh's eloquent portrayal of intimacy does not focus on erotic union specifically, however, by taking a deeper look at Zen Buddhism important themes regarding intimacy in Lispector's text, becomes clear. In *Teachings on Love* (1997), Nhat Hanh speaks of intimacy as an outcome of deep listening, understanding, and thoughtful speech. Saying that the most crucial act of love must begin with self-love, he suggests key ways of being that foster intimacy in relationships.

In line with Buddhist tradition, Hanh lays out the four elements to true love, called the *Brahmavahiras*. All of these elements rely on silence for their cultivation. They are: love (or *maitri*; the intention to offer true joy and happiness), compassion (*karuna*), joy (*mudita*), and equanimity. He explains that before love of others is possible, love of the self must first exist. In order to truly love another, one must understand what makes the other happy. According to Nhat Hanh, "Any other kind of love is not true-love" (23). Nhat Hanh gives an example of a lover who gives his beloved a gift that she does not need. Saying that before one can know how to offer *maitri*, Nhat Hanh says one must listen deeply to the other. For this, compassion is necessary. He says that to understand the needs, aspirations, and suffering of the other, one must look deeply. He claims that if love between two does not give joy to both, it is not real love.

While Thich Nhat Hanh does address intimacy, the ultimate attainment of nirvana is found through union with the larger community, not through erotic union alone. This is true for all of Buddhism, though *Vajrayana* Buddhism- a branch of Zen Buddhism also referred to as *Tantric* Buddhism- uses a model for union with the divine grounded in erotic union. Because Thich Nhat Hanh's teachings do not focus on the erotic aspect of

love and erotic love is the representation of divinity which I am exploring, I want to add a brief summary of key principles of *Vajayana* Buddhism, which is an extension of the Mahayana (Zen) tradition.

Tantric Buddhism relies on sex as a symbol of the union between the spoken and unspoken, seen and unseen, manifest and *unmanifest*, while stressing the powerful role of the erotic for attaining enlightenment. *Vajayana* also heavily emphasizes the erotic aspect of *intimacy*. *Vajrayana* adopts additional techniques for attaining enlightenment, using erotic union as a representative means for achieving consciousness. From the perspective of *Tantric (Vajayana)* Buddhism, the universal and creative principle (God) manifests through erotic union. Unity is found through the erotic, however, this becomes problematic when the male and female principle, each exist and must express themselves simultaneously. In her essay “Creative Polarity” (2006), Victoria Trimondi says:

The appropriation of the Other (the goddess) by the One (the Adi Buddha) is the core concept of Buddhist tantrism. Buddhist tantrism ...is a question of how the yogi (as the masculine principle of the one) can integrate the OTHER (the feminine principle) within himself and render it useful by drawing off its gynergy.

(3)

Trimondi makes an interesting point in this statement about the paradoxical polarity that exists, even within a religious tradition that recognizes both masculine and feminine elements of divinity. Tantric Buddhism suggests that male and female must join to manifest divine consciousness. While Tantric Buddhism makes a case for the union of male/female, the process of unification is still regulated and dominated by the male and takes place within the male’s consciousness. This assumption undermines the importance

of the female's experience and identity. Tantric Buddhism does not address the autonomy of the other with regards to an organic, present relationship between individuals.

#### Integration: Luce Irigaray, Intimacy Grounded in Silence

As my analysis has illustrated, the concept of silence and intimacy yield important information about the nature of male/female relationships, as symbolic of greater unity. While some thinkers from typically "Eastern" traditions have regarded silence as crucial to intimacy, the Western thinkers previously discussed have leaned toward a much more annihilistic understanding of silence. While Kalamaras has argued for silence as a form of knowledge, he does not develop silence as generative condition specifically crucial for intimacy.

The recent work of Luce Irigaray is particularly significant at this juncture, as her work inadvertently coincides with Kalamaras' notion that silence is generative. Further, she acts as a kind of bridge between Western and Eastern notions of intimacy, and the role that silence plays within intimacy. Irigaray argues for the profound capacity for silence to create and allow intimacy and a different kind of exchange between women and men. Although Irigaray is positioned within a European canon of discourse, her ideas about silence and intimacy, while stylistically influenced by "Western" philosophy, link Western approaches to intimacy with Eastern approaches. She argues for the cultivation of space and silence as a means for establishing erotic union, while preserving a dualistic structure for identity and relationship, offering a synthesis of these concepts. In *Between East and West: From Singularity to Community* (1999), Irigaray says,

Sexual difference is in fact, the difference that can open a transcendental horizon between humans, in particular between man and woman. The transcendence that is revealed and worked out in this manner, in respect for each person's natural and spiritual life, is more radical than that relating to genealogy. Transcendences, masculine as well as feminine, tied to genealogy are both too dependent on the natural world and too fabricated. . . . Between man and woman, thanks to love, an awakening to transcendence can take place that corresponds to the reign of spirit as spiritual breath, as soul. (90)

It is this idea, and Irigaray's theories about the power of love, reciprocity, and breath, that I believe offers crucial insight into the developing structure of relationships between self and other, both in personal relationships and in a larger, global context.

Keeping in mind that relationships with the other of sexual difference are not an end in themselves, I interpret Irigaray's most recent body of work, including her seminar given in Dublin (2006) entitled, "Becoming Divine in the Feminine." Irigaray's work offers a way of reading intimacy that promises new meaning which can open the "new cultural horizon."<sup>27</sup> Over the course of the last thirty years, and with the shift in the feminist movement as effected by gender theory and post-colonial theory, Luce Irigaray's work has evolved from her articulation of a theory of sexual difference into a more philosophical and spiritual claim. In *Between East and West: From Singularity to Community* (1999), Irigaray suggests that the individual can use breath to cultivate and create a respectful space for oneself and the other of sexual difference, where both can

---

<sup>27</sup> The "new cultural horizon" is a term thoroughly explained in Irigaray's short essay, "Why Cultivate Difference: Toward a Culture of Two Subjects" (2002). Her *cultural horizon* coincides with her belief in the creation of "culture of two." Both ideas imply a radically new way of relating and being with the other which respects difference and transcends hierarchal power dynamics. She mentioned this term in her lecture, "Becoming Divine in the Feminine" (Dublin, 2006).

“co-exist” and “co-become” while remaining two. The role of space is significant in my textual analysis of the unfolding and development of subjectivity, in both Irigaray’s theory and Clarice Lispector’s novel. In the space that yogic breath metaphorically and physically creates, a more spatial rather than linear possibility exists. This possibility allows transcendence beyond the subject/object power relationship that Hegel discusses in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*. I find what Irigaray refers to as a “loving transcendental”<sup>28</sup> to be a transformed and feminized version of Lacan’s “phallus,” which in patriarchal discourse has acted as the universal signifier. The loving transcendental is not limited, or fixed, and unlike the phallus, which symbolizes singular meaning, the transcendental signifier as it exists for Irigaray, promises to articulate through individual becoming, mutual reciprocity, exchange, and a different kind of intimacy.

For Irigaray, ethics plays a fundamental role in this new intimacy. Irigaray explores the philosophical implications of love as it generates or is generated by social conditions. If there is to be a political/social harmony and ethics, then love, self-love, and respect must exist. While her ideas about love and respect are informed by Kant in that Irigaray’s recent body of work offers a path for cultivating difference, which breaks free from a historically linear, patriarchal structure of relating.

Irigaray’s recent works, such as *To Be Two* (2001) and *The Way of Love* (2002), are particularly significant to my study because through them Irigaray opens a pathway

---

<sup>28</sup> Margaret Whitford’s book *Luce Irigaray: Philosophy in the Feminine* (1991) offers an encompassing explanation of the “sensible (loving) transcendental” Whitford calls the sensible transcendental a “vital intermediary milieu, a perpetual journey, a perpetual transvaluation, a permanent becoming, the immanent efflorescence of the divine [...], all the conditions of women’s collective access to subjectivity [...], the symbolic order in its possibilities of and for transformation” (Whitford qtd Simone Roberts 2). For more on Irigaray’s views on identity/ love in relation to Kant, see Joanna Hodge’s “Feminism and Utopia: Irigaray Reading Kant” (2003), and Marguerite La Caze’s essay, “Love, That Indispensable Supplement: Irigaray and Kant on Love and Respect” (2005).

and calls for a discourse which allows men and women to exchange and connect with one another as they build a space for mutual reciprocity. Margaret Whitford describes the effects of creating a language and culture of two in her book *Luce Irigaray: Philosophy in the Feminine* (1991). She says,

Each is a “subject” in love; each is transcendent to the other (each is divine for the other). The love that is created acts as “the mediator, [and is] a “shared outpouring” a “shared space,” a “shared breath,” bridging the space between two persons, two sexes. (167)

Irigaray integrates her historical and linguistic understanding of phallogocentric discourse with a deep reflection on Hindu and Tantric principles, to create a new ethics of the couple. However, as Irigaray suggests, in the space between lovers a *sensible transcendental* must exist.<sup>29</sup> Irigaray’s *transcendental* points to the divine, “which serves as a structuring force for identity and culture. As Tina Chanter quotes,

If the couple of lovers cannot care for the place of love like a third term between them, then they will not remain lovers and they cannot give birth to lovers.

Something gets solidified between space-time with the loss of a vital intermediary milieu and of an accessible, loving transcendental. (127)

Irigaray’s understanding of erotic love can be traced back to Emmanuel Levinas, a Lithuanian born French thinker, whose ideas have profoundly impacted Irigaray’s understanding of transcendence and love. In *Totality and Infinity* (Trans.1979), Levinas

---

<sup>29</sup> Tina Chanter explains Irigaray’s use of a “loving,” or “sensible” *transcendental* when she discusses Emanuel Levinas’s relationship to phenomenology. Prefacing her explanation of Irigaray, Chanter suggests that Heidegger’s *Being and Time* (1927) “prefigures” Irigaray’s “sensible transcendental.” Chanter says “[Irigaray] explains [the sensible transcendental] in terms that are very similar to Levinas’ explication of the paradox of an other-worldly freedom and materiality [...] Irigaray understands the ‘sensible transcendental as ‘that which confuses the opposition between immanence and transcendence’ (*Ethics of Eros* 1995).

offers a complex explanation of love, acknowledging the limits of language to convey love's meaning.

As Tina Chanter, an Irigaray scholar illuminates in *Ethics of Eros* (1999), Emmanuel Levinas describes a love which includes both desire and need. From *Totality and Infinity*, Chanter quotes: “transcendence goes both further and less far than language ... it is ‘situated at the limit of immanence and transcendence... as though the too great audacity of the loving transcendence were paid for by a throw-back this side of need’” (qtd Chanter 205). While Chanter acknowledges the ways in which Irigaray draws from Levinas’ ideas of *Eros* and *ethics*, she follows up by illustrating the important differing concepts between the two thinkers. For Levinas, the “third-party” that exists in ethics, is absent from erotic union. The transcendent signifier, or “third-party” as it does for Levinas’ concept of *Eros*, is the child that comes from erotic union. As Chanter states, “the ultimate meaning of *Eros* for Levinas lies in fecundity, in the production of the child” (207). Irigaray’s meaning of a “transcendental signifier” departs from Levinas’s at this juncture. In *To Be Two* (1999), Irigaray responds to Levinas’ call “for a feminine discourse on virginity and on a possible carnal future for woman, for those men and women who love each other.”<sup>30</sup> Much like Diotima’s view in Plato’s *Symposium*, Irigaray does not see the child as the ultimate fulfillment of *Eros*. She suggests the creation of a third, separate from procreation. Instead of “a child, which is the objectification[...] of the two in one and represents, in a certain sense, the death of the lovers, their alienation” (62), Irigaray hopes for a “common work” (62) that “allows each

---

<sup>30</sup> Though I am illustrating Irigaray’s phenomenology of *Eros* as it dialogues with Emanuel Levinas, a more in-depth argument for where she contests and responds to Levinas’ concept of *Eros* can be found in *To Be Two* (108-112).

of the two to become him/herself” (62). Irigaray regards *virginity*<sup>31</sup>, the cultivation of silence, and a respect for the other’s alterity, as key components for a new “culture of two.”

Though I have mentioned Ashmita Khasnabish previously, I want to add that her work is significant in relation with Irigaray’s concept of the couple. In Khasnabish’s post-colonial interpretation of the divine Hindu couple Radha and Krishna, Khasnabish brilliantly connects Irigaray’s body of work to Hindu religious history. She looks closely at Irigaray’s recent works, *Between East and West* (2002), and *To Be Two* (2001). In both texts Irigaray creates a synthesis of Hindu and Tantric Buddhist concepts, using “Western” discourse. In my interpretation of Lispector’s texts, I will support Irigaray’s recent theory in collaboration with Anna Khasnabish’s text, *Jouissance as Ananda* (2002), because Khasnabish applies Irigaray’s theories from a perspective that will greatly aide my textual anlaysis. Having created a conceptual structure for examining silence and intimacy, I turn my attention to an analysis of Clarice Lispector’s *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights*.

## LUCE IRIGARAY’S ETHICS OF THE COUPLE

Ana Khasnabish and Luce Irigaray

Luce Irigaray’s recent works *To Be Two* (2001), *The Way of Love* (2002), *Between East and West* (2003), *I Love to You* (1996), begin and continue a shift in

---

<sup>31</sup> Irigaray clarifies her definition of virginity when she writes, “I think of virginity instead, as your repose with yourself, in yourself, you as irreducible to me, irreducible to what is common in community [...] the caress makes a gesture which gives the other to himself, to herself, thanks to an attentive witness, thanks to a guardian of incarnate subjectivity” (*To Be Two* 27). This implies the notion of the “absolute, radical otherness ... For Levinas, the face of the other is the concrete figure for alterity. (Wolfreys 14) “in the very heart of the relationship with the other that characterizes our social life, alterity appears as a non-reciprocal relationship” (Levinas qtd Wolfreys 15).Irigaray’s essay “Why Cultivate Difference: Toward a Culture of Two Subjects” explains the idea of “a culture of two” in detail

Irigarayan theory, which emphasizes the male/female relationship. There is no question that Clarice Lispector's *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* is a work of fiction that explores the male/female relationship. While both deal with the complexity of identity, silence, sexual union, and most importantly, Eros, very few critics have sought to read Clarice Lispector through an Irigarayan lens. Khasnabish's book, *Jouissance as Ananda* (2006) serves as a solid beginning point for furthering and enriching an understanding of Irigaray's theory and Clarice Lispector's literary contribution to a spiritual philosophy of love, and Clarice Lispector's work can also be read through a feminist philosophy of Eros.

As her title, *Jouissance as Ananda* suggests, Anna Khasnabish eloquently and thoroughly compares Irigaray's concept of female *jouissance*, to the Hindu term *ananda*. According to Khasnabish *ananda*, "conveys not only simple joy but *transcendental joy*" (4). Khasnabish's goal is to offer an extension of Irigaray's philosophical school of thought by exploring the Indian philosophical concept of *ananda*. In chapter eight Khasnabish asks two questions: "Does Irigaray's theory of *jouissance* resolve the problem of establishing women in the symbolic plane, and once established in the symbolic plane could women and men transcend the ego?" (147). Khasnabish turns to *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* to help answer these questions. She focuses primarily on two Irigarayan ideas, *jouissance* and *carnal ethics*<sup>32</sup>. She argues that while

---

<sup>32</sup> While there is no concise definition for Irigaray's *carnal ethics*, the explanation that Simone Roberts gives in her essay "Sensible Transcendental" accurately describes the ethical approach to Eros that Irigaray envisions, "This kind of love is unlikely. It is natural, but also must be created by us. It requires that we consider the body not only as a thing of nature and matter, but also a place of cultural and spiritual creation. Without a reckoning of one's own place, the interval between oneself and one's other-subject, without men and women who have their own genealogies and subjectivities, Fusion, codependency, projection tend to happen because one or another partner in a relationship is not anchored in their singularity and therefore not free to risk. They seek their other-subject as the angel, and refuse or ignore the Eros that exists for them as well. Not only must each keep its body autonomous, each must keep its self autonomous in

the only female protagonist, Lori, “attains divinity through her contact with an impersonal divine” (185) she goes through her mystical experiences only to find that what she was seeking could have been found in a carnal relationship with Ulysses all along. While I respect Khasnabish’s argument, and the intricate method by which she compares Irigarayan ethics to Hindu spirituality, I believe she overlooks important aspects of Luce Irigaray’s theory yet to be explored, especially with regard to silence. For instance, Khasnabish is right to say that Lori connects with an impersonal divine, but the experiences that Lori undergoes are necessary prior to a corporeal union with Ulysses. As a way of showing this, I interpret *An Apprenticeship* by using three key Irigarayan concepts alluded to but not developed in Khasnabish’s analysis: *respect for difference, becoming, and mutual reciprocity*. These points are cultivated, according to Irigaray, through the *negative*. The *negative* as Irigaray defines it, is the space or nothingness that allows intimacy between two subjects. In the *Way of Love*, she says, “the practice of the negative is insurmountable in an absolute subjectivity or an absolute objectivity. It is what safeguards the unappropriable site of difference- the fact that the other will never be I, nor me, nor mine. [...] In order to meet with the other, I must first let be, even restore, the nothing that separates us. It is the *negative* path which leads to the approach of the different and the possible relation with him, or with her” (168).

Irigaray’s recent work speaks freshly to Lispector’s attempt to integrate individual identity with spiritual and sexual union. Morny Joy describes Irigaray’s utilization of Hindu spirituality in her ethics of the couple. In her essay “Irigaray’s Eastern Explorations” (2003), she says, “Irigaray’s perspective has changed from philosophical

---

interdependence and community” (11). Carnal ethics involves a new way of looking at a relationship of two subjectivities.

critique of Western tradition to a form of confessional advocacy that basically distances itself from a philosophical or theoretical study of religion” (58) Similarly, in *An Apprenticeship*, Lispector’s last novel, she points to a spiritual profundity accessible for Lori in her becoming and mutual exchange with Ulysses not grounded in any formal philosophical or religious tradition. However, though Lispector’s text has been read as “mystical,” Irigaray’s exploration of union is not mystical, but rather integrates Eastern and Western discourses about divinity, especially those of erotic exchange.

Before comparing Irigarayan notions of spiritual union to Lispector’s work it is relevant to briefly discuss the claim that Irigaray appropriates Eastern Hinduism for *orientalist*, essentialist purposes.<sup>33</sup> Morny generously describes Irigaray’s discussion of the East as part of a larger effort to “introduce a transformative way of appreciating a new dynamic of male and female relationships” (64). The view that Irigaray participates in a destructive form of *orientalism* has been taken by recent critics of Irigaray. While there is certainly room for such a claim, I think it more beneficial for discovering the type of discourse between Eastern and Western discourse that Kalamaras discusses to think along the lines of J.J. Clarke. Clark has advocated the orientalist method which “deploys the East as a means of intellectual and cultural criticism of the West” (Joy 64). In this sense while Irigaray’s locational identity is European, her purpose of incorporating the East in her model of a new intimacy between man and woman, is part of a greater attempt to “reform it [the Western legacy], initially from an intellectual, now from a more spiritual orientation” (64). She is not exploiting the East to further Western discourse, but to

---

<sup>33</sup> See Edward Said’s book, *Orientalism* (1978) and subsequent criticism and commentary offers a comprehensive understanding of this term. The concept of Orientalism involves the appropriation of Eastern history or culture by Western writers, who use aspects of the Eastern culture in a way that implies prejudice interpretations.

modify Western notions of intimacy, challenge its structure, and inspire change in its function.

Irigaray's concepts of *Sexual Difference*, *Becoming*, and *Mutual Reciprocity* apply succinctly to Lispector's work. Each of these concepts relies on *silence*, as Irigaray articulates: "Silence, therefore, is nothing. It is not even the substantialization of itself. It is the cultivation of the relation between nature and itself, the cultivation of the relation with nature in itself" (*To Be Two* 64). Irigaray claims that a *culture of silence* can be found through the "Buddha and the yogin and yogini" (64), or "through a respect and love between man and woman [...] in a practice of sexual difference" (65). Lispector's use of silence, when examined in the contemporary framework of recent Irigarayan ethics, is dislodged from an existential understanding of silence, and is allowed a more fruitful location where there is a breath, and a *becoming* that allows for exchange between sexes. Irigaray states that a respect between men and women that is free of "an almost insurmountable master-disciple relationship" depends almost entirely on a silence that "our [Western] tradition has erased" (64).

#### Sexual Difference: Recognizing the Other

*An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* follows a narrative structure of desire, delay, and finally, sexual consummation. Told in the third person from Lori's point of view, the novel focuses on the internal world of Lori and her quest toward self-actualization and union with Ulysses. Lori ponders Ulysses' ability to see her beauty, a beauty "so well hidden that an ordinary person missed it [...] but he did not, he saw it with only one glance"(12). The narrator conveys Lori's seemingly simple observations,

He was a man, she was a woman. And a miracle more extraordinary than this one could compare only to the falling star that one almost imagines crosses the dark sky and leaves in its wake the vivid surprise of a living universe. He was a man and she was a woman. (12)

Lispector's repetition of the first and last line attributes great significance to the difference between Lori's and Ulysses' gendered sexes. The imagery Lispector uses expresses sexual difference between the two characters and further conveys this significance. Like a comet crossing through the sky and leaving traces of a universe, Lori's thoughts hint to the expansive "universal" possibilities that exist between man and woman. Lori recognizes the power of a single glance, and the recognition of the other that can come in an instant. The playing out of the possibilities is propelled further by each's respect for time, difference, and the inevitable duality between each lover that cannot be overcome, even through their eventual sexual union.

Because of Ulysses' difference in *An Apprenticeship*, desire is generated for Lori. As the narrator states, "sometimes at night she would awake with a start, missing Ulysses as if she had slept with him once. She could not go back to sleep because her desire to be possessed by him was too strong" (77). While there is an inherent lack of reciprocity in the notion of possession, Lori's desire to be possessed by Ulysses is part of the early stages of her *becoming*. While desire exists for Lori and Ulysses, this is not a narrative that explores what union is found in merging physically, at least not right away. Instead, the *negative space* fosters a respect for difference, which leads to a love grounded in silence. Irigaray says of love,

The origin, if I can say this, of the love between us is silence [...] this silence which exists between the subjectivity of man and woman must be protected, cultivated, generated [...] I must protect the silence in me, and I must respect the silence of the other. (*The Way of Love* 62)

For Irigaray, as for Rilke, silence acts as the ground for two individuals who may approach each other as separate and sacred. As Lori enters a silence not known before and talks with Ulysses, he tells her,

Nice and easy Lori. Go nice and easy. But be careful. It's better not to speak, not to tell me anything There's a great silence inside me. And that silence has been the source of my words. And from the silence has come silence itself. (46)

Ulysses attributes his words to a silence that exists *within* him, and encourages Lori to protect the silence within her, which he sees as necessary for their connection. Silence becomes an integrative element within and between them. In light of these reflections, the act of becoming for each character is a transformative act. In *Between East and West* Irigaray says "in fact, all attraction is founded upon a difference, an 'unknown' of the desiring subject, beginning with what pushes the boy and the girl, the man and woman toward each other... if difference has nourished desire, why not respect it?" (136). For Irigaray it is the difference between the sexes that creates desire. If there is to be "relation between the sexes in which woman and man each have a different subjectivity [...] representing a universal way for attaining the respect of other differences" (137), two subjectivities must exist. In the beginning of *An Apprenticeship*, Lori is not ready for the kind of relation that Irigaray formulates because she has not cultivated her own

becoming. Instead, she has a carnal desire for Ulysses but knows that “for the time being she had nothing to give him, except her body” (77).

If carnal union were enough to produce a respect for difference that allows a new kind of universal relation, represented first in man and woman, Lispector’s narrative would be over before it had begun. Desire exists between Ulysses and Lori from the beginning. However, it is the silence and distance between them that must be cultivated, so that two subjectivities, so that each character’s subjectivities and *solitudes can protect and greet each other*.<sup>34</sup> As Irigaray says in *To Be Two*, “fidelity to one’s own gender opens the way to another becoming: a becoming woman, a becoming man, a becoming together” (55). Before Lori can participate in what the narrator calls “two mysterious worlds surrendering as confidently as two that can understand one another” (52), she has to cultivate herself in the negative space that acts as a vehicle for her exchange with Ulysses. As Irigaray describes, “this mutual task demands of all to become divine men and women, to become perfectly, to refuse to allow parts of ourselves to shrivel and die that have the potential for growth and fulfillment” (Joy 52).

For Lori, part of her task includes overcoming her apprehension of her own existence, accepting herself, and loving Ulysses as separate identity. Lori recognizes the impossibility of becoming one with another, and fears her solitude. Until she finds a way to accept this and allow it to become what Roberts describes as “turning [her] gender into a space of mediation and sexuality where admiration and becoming are possible” (6), union with Ulysses is delayed. He understands the importance of her becoming and the transformation she must undergo. Ulysses would appear more available for union, but because he chooses Lori, he waits. He maintains and allows the distance for her

---

<sup>34</sup> See Rilke’s quote from *Letters to a Young Poet* discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis.

becoming so that their union will involve two subjectivities. For Irigaray, “silence recalls that my becoming and that of the other cannot be confused” (*To Be Two* 63).

Where silence exists between Ulysses and Lori, intimacy develops. After Ulysses speaks of silence, the narrator states, “They remained silent as if the two of them had just met for the first time. They were existing”(47). This “existing” resembles the mediated space which Irigaray suggests, cultivates intimacy.

### Becoming

Before moving into a love grounded in silence, which becomes possible through a recognition of *alterity*, first let us look at the crucial “middle step” for the kind of intimacy that Irigaray discusses, the issue of female (and male) *becoming*. Becoming, as Irigaray defines it is crucial for a new kind of relation between man and woman. In her essay, “Sensible Transcendental,” Simone Roberts describes this new relationship. She says, “to be each fully participating subjects he and she have to be able to switch places, or share characteristics of intersubjectivity in both the private and cultural interval between and surrounding them. *He and she would have to become themselves*” (2).

In *An Apprenticeship*, Lori thinks to herself that “a human being’s most urgent necessity [is] to become a human being” (15). This means that for the intimate as Irigaray formulates the intimate, that Lori is searching for a path to her world through a self-intimacy that includes *virginity*, *jouissance*, consciousness, subjectivity, interaction with nature, prayer, and silence. Late at night, one of the many nights that Lori is without Ulysses, she falls into a sadness, and emerges to realize that though painful, she is on the way to become herself. The narrator relays, “No. Nobody would give her anything. She

herself would have to look for it [...] And now she had the responsibility of being herself. In this world of choices she seemed to have chosen.” (50). This choice can be linked to Irigaray’s concept of *becoming*, which recognizes the other’s alterity, and paves a path for transcendence. Irigaray asks, “How to attain in oneself the springing forth of the intimate and how to say it, to communicate it, without obstructing the path to return back to the source?” (*The Way of Love*, 58). First I will discuss Lori’s becoming, and then briefly discuss Ulysses’ becoming, keeping in mind that each of these mediations represents an aspect of what Irigaray refers to when she says,

*Becoming* requires our cultivating a relationship to world, sky, the sun, the plant or animal, humans, always chance to keep becoming by relating with exteriority. One can maintain autonomy by always becoming. If [we] reach autonomy, we really meet with other, respecting “two” and otherness- a place where we can experience autonomy. Returning to the self and respecting the other.- a world constructed by 2, belonging not to one or the other- vision of a more peaceful future. (Dublin, 2006)

Lori’s *becoming* occurs through the death of an old self that was afraid to live life fully and embrace interiority. About Lori the narrator says, “she wished she was already dead because she longed for that wordless communion. But the word of God was so completely silent that He and that silence were one and the same” (42). Lori begins to understand God as silent, rather than absent and impersonal. As she begins to reconceptualize a relationship to herself, she understands divinity and Eros in a new way. Confused about the delay in her union with Ulysses, Lori “was preparing herself as if for an eternal march [...] toward Nothingness. What was Nothing was really Everything”

(43). This Nothingness, when looked at from Irigaray's perspective, is the space that allows for true intimate connection with oneself and the other. Irigaray says, "silence is also a condition to meet with the other -- if not space for silence, one cannot meet with other" (Dublin 2006). Irigaray argues that the negative space may be used to cultivate intimacy.

Lispector's narrative allows Lori's becoming to unfold in silence, Lori learns to let go of the ambivalence that prevents her from experiencing peace in her silence. She says, "What am I to do with happiness [...] with this strange keen sense of peace that is already beginning to hurt me like anguish, like the great silence of space" (48).

Lori experiences anxiety around the growing Eros, or love, between her and Ulysses, and in response to her transformation. Her anxiety about happiness is not "cured" by union with Ulysses, but through her process of understanding her own silence. As she comes to embrace silence and interiority, she experiences a new kind of intimacy with Ulysses. She discovers silence before she joins with Ulysses.

One way that Lori discovers silence is through nature. After going to the ocean alone late at night, Lori becomes "totally one with herself" (53). The experience that Lori has in the ocean parallels Irigaray's notion of female "jouissance," and becomes an important experience for her development. Speaking about her immersion in salty water, the narrator says, "she is a lover who is unafraid because she knows that she will experience it all again" (54). Lori's silent communion with the ocean serves to metaphorically unite her with herself as she sheds her previous fear of experience. She cultivates her relationship with the sun, sky, and world, "the sun grows brighter and wrinkles her skin as it dries her. She dives again and again, drinks more water... for she

already knows what to expect and possesses the rhythm of life in the sea” (54). Lori’s experience illustrates a process of female becoming through silence, which allows her to maintain subjectivity, discover transcendence, and transform her relationship with love. One night she goes to the ocean and “enter[s] the limitless cold that roars without anger in the dawn’s silence” (53). Alone, she swims in the sea and “knows what she wants: she wants to remain standing still in the sea [...]. She neither receives nor transmits” (54). The stillness that Lori finds in the ocean is symbolic of what Irigaray means when she says, “At best I will discover myself in the sea. From there I can be reborn, it is true. But I fear losing the way to me, to you. I fear having to restart everything from the beginning again and again” (118).

Because she experiences the stillness and sensate elements of life before joining with Ulysses, it is clear that the love experience is an extension of her interaction with the world. She is transformed in her perceptions and experiences what Irigaray describes when she says, “touched by you, by lights, by sounds, by forms and colors, I try to preserve this gift, without appropriating it. I receive [this gift] as a guide for my becoming, an aid for advancing along in my journey” (61). Through her interactions with the sea, fruits, and plants, Lori discovers the source of her own transcendence, and therefore “cultivates [her] inclinations to the degree [...].” that she is “attracted by him [Ulysses]” (Two 92). Ulysses plays an important role in their union as well, because through his own *becoming*, mutual reciprocity culminates between the two lovers.

Lori’s becoming includes a return to her own identity that closely resembles Irigaray’s concept of *virginity*. Irigaray defines *virginity* as “repose with yourself, in

yourself,” which she says can be expressed to the other through touch, or caress. Lori’s transformative act of choosing to become herself includes her realization that “before she could completely experience another person, she had to be in touch with herself; she had to be in touch with the world” (*Apprenticeship* 35). This “virginity” Lori seeks in relationship to herself and her world before joining with Ulysses is not accomplished through her maintaining her “physiological hymen” (*Between East and West* 68), (though she does not exchange sexually with Ulysses until the end of the narrative). Instead, she moves forward to know her divinity and her world through nature, prayer and silence. The process is “virginal” in the sense that Lori develops what Irigaray calls an “aptitude [...] to conserve and cultivate her own identity in order to share its qualities with a man.” Irigaray claims that this process is “one of the most extraordinary spiritual riches of humanity” (*East and West* 68). The spiritual gift is not Ulysses, but a spirituality which Lori can share with Ulysses. At her seminar “Becoming Divine in the Feminine,” Irigaray was asked, “do we need the other to become divine?” Irigaray replied, “We must put other in just place. Not confusing other with divinity itself. Only at the end of our journey can we share divinity with the other” (Dublin 2006). Lispector’s narrative offers a journey toward the divine and intimacy with the other that depends on self-affection.

Once Lori recognizes Ulysses as her future lover, initial fear of her own *becoming* escalates and then shifts into joy for living. She grows to accept the aspects of herself that have lied dormant in the silence of her unconscious. Khasnabish points out, “According to Irigaray, *jouissance* is an expression of women’s unconscious, a ‘reservoir-yet-to-come,’ a creative and regenerative force” (176). Lori taps into her unconscious and the “reservoir” of her becoming through the solitude and silence she finds in nature. She

begins to learn how to live through her pleasure rather through her pain. Fruits become symbolic of her joy, and the water becomes symbolic of immersing herself in her unconscious. For example, at the market she compares herself to the fruit, “scorning her outer appearance, she consumed her inner self brimming over as she was with the juice of life” (91). Though Lori undergoes a period that includes “a total lack of articulation” (91), she symbolically connects to herself and her world before she consummates her love with Ulysses. As the narrator points out, “Lori herself had a kind of fear of going forward, as if she might go too far [...] she was reserving herself” (23). However, the distance between she and Ulysses, matched by Lori’s desire for union, propels her forward into her own becoming. Lori begins as unattainable to herself and Ulysses, but recognizes, through Ulysses, who is different from her, her need to go within. As the narrator points out, Lori “knew one thing, too: when she was better prepared, she would leave her isolation for others... her direction would be others [...] but before that happened she had to be in touch with herself;; she had to be in touch with the world” (35). The silences and distance between her and Ulysses facilitate and develop the narrative, and each one’s desire for the other. Much of their union occurs when Lori and Ulysses are not physically together, and when they share the same space, silences fill the space between them.

In the spaces and silences, Lori learns to leave behind her narcissistic need to be desired by the other as an object, and instead works toward finding her own subjectivity. For Irigaray, to merge totally into one with what one desires is to kill the dialogue and dialectic that is crucial for growth. However, the kind of narcissism that Lori renounces and Irigaray describes is different than the “finding of one’s outer self the echoes of one’s inner self” (*Apprenticeship 6*). Ulysses tells Lori, “what one cannot do is stop loving

oneself somewhat shamelessly” (64). Irigaray says in *Two Be Two*, “we still lack the knowledge necessary to interiorize, to be present to each other, and the knowledge necessary to interiorize the relationship between us” (52). For Ulysses and Lori, distance, silence, and finding the stillness of each one’s own interiority becomes necessary for the development of subjectivities where self-love, rather than a narcissistic need to be desired by the other, exists.

Lori writes a long letter to Ulysses about silence, which conveys the paradoxical inclusion of the negative in the language that she uses to communicate with Ulysses. She speaks of silence as an unavoidable reality, saying “then silence appears. And the heart beats faster in recognition, for it comes from within” (20). At this early point in the novel, Lori feels apprehensive about the silence that is needed for her to participate in a partnership where she is asked to ground herself in silence and discover herself as whole before joining with Ulysses. She tells Ulysses:

If a person has no courage, he shouldn’t enter it [silence]. He should wait before silence for the rest of darkness, with only his feet wet from the foam of something that spurts from within. Let him wait. One insoluble thing for another [...] Let him wait. Not for the end of silence, but for the blessed assistance of a third element: the light of dawn. (21)

Lori begins to affirm her individual subjectivity when she finds Ulysses because he invokes in her a process that allows her to renounce what Irigaray calls the “nostalgia of the one”, which “aspires to fusion [...] at times correspond[ing] to the self-love of Narcissus” (57). This revocation allows Lori and Ulysses to protect their own and the other’s *alterity*. Lispector’s narrative works well to reinforce Irigaray’s idea that “If I

become the other- through love, for example-- I abolish the two poles I-you, she-he. Thus the relationship between two disappears and with it, a possible dialogue and possible intersubjective dialect” (49). The joy that Lori finds is her own *jouissance*, but it does not come through her corporeal exchange with Ulysses. Her joy comes to her before she comes to Ulysses.

#### Ulysses' Becoming

In looking at Ulysses' character in relation to Lori, it is helpful to look at his chastity, prayer, and self-love, key components of Irigaray's ethics of the couple, keeping in mind that silence is the foundation for the intimacy Irigaray discusses. In Simone Roberts essay about the use of Tantric principles in Irigaray's ethics of sexual difference, Roberts explains ways in which man's own transcendence is aided by union. Illuminating tantric concepts of consciousness, Roberts explains, “Further, while woman may descend the chakras<sup>35</sup> on her own, it is believed that man cannot ascend to enlightenment without her help and guidance; however, descent and illumination is considered easier for a woman with a man's help” (10). Ulysses' help comes in many forms, fulfilling the “carnal and spiritual refinement of both partners through the incorporation and discipline of all aspects of human being” (Roberts 10). For Ulysses, patience and chaste preparation for his union with Lori further enables his own becoming. Ulysses tells Lori “I could have possessed you already with my body and my soul, but I will wait even though it takes years for you, too, to have a body and a soul to love with” (28). Ulysses remains chaste and does not have other lovers while he waits for the

---

<sup>35</sup> “A Sanskrit word meaning "wheel" or "circle"; usually refers to the centers or points of spiritual power that resides in or compose the human astral/subtle body. They are considered to have correspondences with the physical body and function as psychic portals to the world at large.” (Judith 55)

consummation of his union with Lori. On the contrary he tells her, “Lori, despite my apparent confidence, I am working to get ready for you also. And from now on until you are mine, I won’t have any woman in my bed” (66).

Ulysses’ sexual abstinence signifies the kind of *virginity* which Irigaray describes as “the other name for the fidelity of each gender to itself, with a respect for the other gender” (111). Irigaray calls this virginity a “proper identity conscious of its limit” (*To Be Two* 112), and claims “the need for an almost absolute silence between them so that they might begin truly to speak to each other” (112). Uncannily, Ulysses goes on to tell Lori that she is awakening to a curiosity that will push her along the path of *real* life. He acknowledges the necessity of silence between them and assures her, “don’t be afraid of the lack of articulation that will follow. The confusion is necessary so that you can see what, if it were articulated and harmonious, you would not see ....” (67). Later, after Lori has surrendered to the silence of the ocean, she surrenders, in silence, to her exchange with Ulysses, while maintaining her autonomy. During their exchange, “in the silence that enveloped them, she opened the floodgates, surrendered her soul and body and did not know how much time had passed, for she had abandoned herself to a deep, carefree plunge” (111). Lori’s “plunge” into silence and the unspoken begins long before the inarticulate sexual exchange with Ulysses, though silence enables such a connection.

Ulysses values silence as a form of reassurance, and values prayer as a channel for self-actualization. In the midst of a delicate conversation with Lori, Ulysses, “felt that she had taken a step forward and so had wanted to reassure her by becoming silent again” (46). Silence is an understood mediator between Ulysses and Lori, and allows space to unfold between them so that each one’s own autonomy remains. As Irigaray expresses,

“This silence which exists between subjectivity of man and woman must not be overcome either in words or in representations, but must be protected, cultivated, generated...” (*To Be Two* 62). Ulysses expresses the value for self-love and self-knowledge, which acts as a catalyst for Lori’s and self-love and self-knowledge. These elements are both crucial for Irigaray’s evolving *ethics of the couple*. Ulysses communicates as an equal and tells Lori, “It will be our responsibility to struggle to become what we really are.... The solution for the absurdity called “I exist” is to love another being that we understand does exist” (113). Though Ulysses’ statement resonates strongly with existentialist questions, his message can also apply to Irigaray’s concept of *respect for sexual difference*. In describing Irigaray’s ethics, Roberts refers to the “recognition and responsibility of men for their own complexity and their existence in a positive relation to women not to mother-lovers)” (13). Ulysses embodies the archetypal man that Irigaray imagines. Ulysses maintains what Irigaray calls a *masculine interiority*, which comes about through his prayer and silent contemplation. Because of Ulysses’ internal structure which does not seek appropriation, but respects difference, a shared silence, space, touch, and language comes to exist between him and Lori, which fuels their eventual physical consummation.

Ulysses continues to cultivate a type of male *becoming* that allows for mutual reciprocity between him and Lori. The narrator suggests that Ulysses recognizes the other as different, and allows this difference to generate desire, saying “he, who had become interested in Lori only through desire, now seemed to see how unattainable she was. And not only unattainable to him but to herself and to the world” (22). Lori, however, “longed for him exactly because he was the one who seemed to represent the limit between the

past and what was to come” (23). Ulysses is not responsible for the transformation that occurs within Lori, but she desires him for what he represents. Ulysses’ desire for Lori includes physical desire but he waits until she has cultivated herself before attempting to exchange with her erotically. He acknowledges to her, “Existing is so completely extraordinary that if the consciousness of existence lasted for more than few seconds we would go mad. The solution for that absurdity called ‘I exist’ is to love another being that we understand does exist” (113). Ulysses has an innate sense that before conscious love can occur, lovers must recognize their separate existence. In this way he participates in a form of becoming which powerfully impacts the formation of a love relationship grounded in silence. Ulysses says to Lori, “I won’t call you anymore until you come on your own. I’d prefer it if you didn’t call to let me know. I just want you to come without saying anything” (102) While Ulysses is speaking of when Lori will arrive at his apartment for the “exchange [that] will be made in bed” (102), he assures her “you can come whenever you like” (102).

Ulysses maintains a respect for his own and Lori’s process. When he catches Lori watching him in silence he says, “don’t be afraid of my silence... I’m a madman but inside there’s a kind of wise man guiding me” (45). Ulysses has his own process of finding himself in silence. Ulysses conveys wisdom in his communication with Lori. He says, “With me you can bare your soul even in silence” (63). He tells her that one day he will bear his soul to her and that they will never run out of things to say. Lispector conveys the sense that Ulysses respects the silence and space between him and Lori, saying “at first he had handled her delicately with a sense of expectation as if she were a virgin” (110). He tells her, “you’ll learn, Lori, and then you’ll fully experience the great

joy of communicating and sharing” (63). Lispector’s narrative goes on to illustrate the accuracy of Ulysses’ statement.

#### Mutual Reciprocity: Love Grounded in Silence

The last chapter of the novel begins with Ulysses telling Lori, “I want you as you are now and you want me as I am now. And this whole exchange will be made in bed” (102). What follows is a complex interplay of all that was built between the lovers earlier in the narrative. Ulysses somewhat forcefully claims that he is ready for their physical union and he also understands that Lori is also ready for erotic exchange. The narrator says of Lori, “although she felt complete and did not need anyone, it was enough for her to know that Ulysses loved her and that she loved him” (103). The discourse between Lori and Ulysses that follows holds within it a respect for the distance and silence that has been cultivated between them. Silence has acted as the mediator for Lori and Ulysses. As a result, each has his or her own solitude to give the other without appropriating or possessing each other. After their first sexual intercourse, Lori dreams about the “fruit of the World” (112). In the dream she “place[s] her mouth on the fruit and manage[s] to bite it, yet leave[s] it intact gleaming in space” (112), an scenario very much like Eve, though revised. Lori interprets the dream as representative of the way that she and Ulysses “possessed one another beyond what seemed possible and permissible, and yet he and she had remained intact” (112).

Lori’s knowledge of herself as separate and ultimately alone in nature and with herself paves the path for her embracing solitude, even in sexual union. As Luce Irigaray describes, “The construction of subjectivity for the woman implies [...] that she discovers the relation with a different other, while remaining herself” (130). In this sense Lori

serves as a good example for a different kind of female subject, grounding intimacy with herself and the other in her own created space. Lori and Ulysses' dialogue conveys that a deep transformation has taken place for each individual, and that their sexual exchange symbolizes this transformation. Though Lori becomes sleepy after making love to Ulysses, she is "afraid of awakening as her former self again" (112). The change that has occurred for Lori involves her fulfilling her responsibility to become herself, and entering a "relational dimension that the other must respect and cultivate" (*Way of Love* 114). Through her interaction with her world and her descent into the negative spaces, Lori experiences a deep intimacy with herself and Ulysses. While still in bed together Lori gets up to turn off the light in the room because "now that they had seen each other, the dimmer light was good for them" (115). In this statement, Lispector uses symbolism to reinforce the underlying motif of silence, darkness, and the negative. Lori is drawn back to the darkness/negative and solitude after sex, which cements the validity of her transformation.

Like many other silences between Ulysses and Lori, the silences after erotic consummation act in a way to further their intimate connection. After joining physically they "[a]ll into such a long silence that for a moment [Lori] does not know where she was [...] It was a chaotic, nebulous darkness so marvelous that she squeezed his hand" (115). In response to the silence between her and Ulysses, Lori reaches out to touch his hand. According to Irigaray, touch is a powerful means of approaching the other of sexual difference. The *sensible transcendental*<sup>36</sup> exists between Lori and Ulysses, and exists as silence. Silence allows for the cultivation of love and subjectivities which are necessary for a relationship of equals. As the narrator affirms, "they seemed to

---

understand that when love was too strong, when one could not live without the other, such love was no longer valid because the beloved did not have the capacity to receive so much” (109). By the same token, silence creates longing for each other that keeps them together and propels a dynamic of attraction. The lovers orbit one another rather than fuse with one another. Though “in the silence” (111) Lori surrenders her “soul and body” to love, she remains intact. Ulysses asks Lori, “Do you think love is making a mutual gift of one’s solitude?” (116) Lori answers “I don’t know” (116). Irigaray would answer with a wholehearted “yes!”

Just before Ulysses and Lori “made such great love” (109), Ulysses, “who had never been humble in love [...] was becoming humble” (109). Ulysses gets on his knees, gets Lori to kneel beside him, and “once they were both kneeling he finally kissed her” (109). After this, the lovers have an erotic exchange for the first time.

Lispector’s image of Ulysses and Lori both kneeling, facing each other in prayer-like position while each “kept silent” (109), conveys a powerful symbol for the divinity of the negative space for Eros. What begins with Lori’s discovery and subsequent *jouissance* through a realm beyond language, culminates with her sharing her cultivated space with another who is her equal. By individually “calling into question one’s own world”, including the silences and gaps in each’s own experience, Lori and Ulysses develop a union that acts as a model for the practice of the *negative*, a term that Irigaray refers to in *The Way of Love*. Intimacy, as well as mutual respect for each other rests on each’s subjectivity as well as a mutual respect for each other. This respect, as suggested through Irigaray’s concept of *mutual reciprocity*, involves *becoming*, includes *respect for difference*, and depends on *silence*.

The first time that they kiss, they are both kneeling in a humble, prayer-like position. Still “afraid to surrender completely, they [keep silent]” (109). Lori and Ulysses return to absolute silence just before making love for the first time. In suggesting a figure for two subjects in relation to each other, Irigaray advocates “the cultivation of sexual energy not merely as direct or indirect worship of a seed” (60). Lori’s connection to Ulysses is not idolatry, but rather, it includes her innermost reflections on God and the Universe. The religious implications of their union are clear. Their exchange elevates and reiterates each person’s search for a higher consciousness and a connection to the divine. Though she finds it difficult to express “thoughts that [are] almost wordless” (110), throughout the novel Lori continues to participate in discourse with Ulysses that constructs a kind of intimate language built on silence. Their language built on stillness is constructed of their separate individualities, which are formed through solitary pursuits of each’s larger union with Nature, or *God*. Ulysses tells her “We must follow Nature, not forgetting the low points, for Nature is cyclical and rhythmic, as a heart beating” (113). The Nature that Lori discovers is filled with a rhythm of intimacy and the divine.

Communication serves the purpose of building an intimate structure for Lori and Ulysses. The developed language between Lori and Ulysses includes silence and delay as its major developmental function. Ulysses tells Lori, “you’ll learn Lori, and then you’ll fully experience the great joy of communicating and sharing” (63). While Ulysses proposes a new kind of communicating previously foreign to Lori, he is not her guru or spiritual teacher, but rather a catalyst for challenging her to discover the divinity within her. Along these same lines, Irigaray says, “as man and woman- master and disciple for the other. Each, faithful to him or herself, would bring to the other his or her own energy

and his or her manner of cultivating it” (*To Be Two* 55). Ulysses “brings” Lori to her own energy which she later shares with him. He asks her, “do you know how to pray? [...] to pray to yourself, to ask the maximum of yourself?” (32) Though Lori is terrified at the thought of praying to an impersonal God, Ulysses’ question leads her toward a path that culminates in her own transcendence. Ulysses does not take her there, but challenges Lori to cultivate a relationship to herself and the divine.

In her prayer that follows her conversation with Ulysses about prayer, Lori calls out to God, speaking of the “mystery that is the world and that is us” (34). She acknowledges her inability to articulate the changes that take place as a result of her knowing Ulysses. Ulysses claims that he does not give her advice, he just “wait[s] for [her] to advise (her)self” (32). This distinction is important, because Lori’s transformation occurs in the gap that Ulysses creates by his waiting. Through her process of self-actualization, and the silences of her and Ulysses’ worlds, Lori “reaches the impossible within herself” (116). When Luce Irigaray says, “the return to oneself, into oneself, creates in this expanse that goes from the terrestrial to the celestial inner spaces” (149), I believe she is speaking to the same internal location where the “impossible” exists for Lori, and the location where *jouissance* can be experienced. Lori finds the expansiveness of existing through “go[ing] toward the other, [by] welcoming the other into oneself” (149), as a means of reaching a “dimension in relation to the human and to the divine” (*Two Be Two* 149). Lori and Ulysses both experience the divine in their connection to one another, and as a result of the time that passes between their initial encounter and their sexual consummation. Each recognizes the divine in the other because each has experienced the divine in their mutual solitudes.

Lispector uses the silence and space of time to create a fecund space that contains mutual reverence for the dynamic of exchange. As Irigaray states, “time itself becomes space, doubles spatiality without for all that surrounding it. Time and space remain open while continuously constituting a dwelling place in which to stay” (149). Time generates a silent, sacred location for desire to express itself between Ulysses and Lori.

#### CONCLUSION

Having most recently examined an *Apprenticeship, or the Book of Delights* from the perspective of Irigarayan ethics, I have demonstrated how Lispector’s work acts as a model for a heterosexual relationship where the characters participate in a complex form of intimacy, fueled by silence. By exploring the “negative” as it functions in Lispector’s work, I hope to have opened up a new way of viewing silence as it relates to the intimate. As I have mentioned, there is still a great capacity for exploring silence within the intimate in a way that creates opportunities for a male/female relationship unbound by hierarchal power dynamics. By first tracing Lispector’s work as it has been responded to and received critically, her relevance as a complex writer who uses subtlety and structure flawlessly, emerges. Lispector’s work illustrates the positive impact that silence can have on intimacy, which may serve as a foundation for further discourse around silence.

Within *An Apprenticeship*, silence, as it is defined by Irigaray allows for a relationship of equals. Preceding my analysis of Lispector’s work however, it has been crucial to lay out a framework for understanding silence and intimacy as understood by various philosophical and religious traditions. After laying a foundation for silence as it has been represented by thinkers such as Dainin Katagiri, Rmana Maharshi, Maurice

Blanchot, and George Kalamaras, I have offered diverse perspectives on intimacy as described by Thich Nhat Hanh, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Osho. Having looked at silence and intimacy as each have been articulated by these eight thinkers, Irigaray's theoretical integration of various schools of thought finds a fecund place for application in *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights*. Interweaving typically Eastern and Western notions of silence into a description of intimacy on which silence relies, Irigaray's work advocates the negative as generative of intimacy between man and woman.

Although Irigaray's work falls into the camp of Western discourse, her recent works such as the *Way of Love*, *To Be Two*, and *Between East and West* represent starting points for examining fiction about intimacy in a new light. Clarice Lispector's *An Apprenticeship* serves as a concrete piece of literature that allows such an examination of original ideas about intimacy. Though Lispector wrote *An Apprenticeship* in 1969, her narrative resonates deeply with the concept of silence that Irigaray articulates.

Lispector's complex use of silence to develop and maintain desire and respect between the sexes is similar to Irigaray's *ethics of difference*. Although Luce Irigaray has only begun to express her complex integrative notion of silence since 2002, her work reflects the thematic concerns of Clarice Lispector. While Clarice Lispector may not have had a direct relationship to Irigaray's work, her novel beautifully illustrates a concrete forum for exploring Irigaray's newest theory. By first recognizing Lispector's positive reception by modern theorists and critics in Chapter 1, I followed with an analysis of silence as it has been defined by various philosophical disciplines in Chapter 2. After situating silence within philosophical discourse, I offered Irigaray's theory as a bridge that connects and furthers previous notions of silence and intimacy. In Chapter 3, I

analyzed *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights* using Irigaray's recent theory of Eros. Future research may focus on applying the synthesis I have demonstrated to other texts. Further studies of Lispector's work may include examining the role of the negative in the annihilation of intimacy, such as can be found in her first novel *Near to the Wild Heart* (1945). *Near to the Wild Heart* shows the disintegration of lovers, which occurs in the silences and absences existent in the text. Silence works a diametrically opposite way, serving to annihilate and expose the lack that eventually breaks apart intimacy. Lispector uses *Near to the Wild Heart* to illustrate the destructive capacity of silence. Her convincing narrative shows an interesting though powerful function that silence may maintain in intimacy. Having applied Irigaray's theory to *An Apprenticeship*, I conclude that a richer understanding of silence and intimacy results from applying Irigaray's theory to Lispector's work.

## Work Cited

- Anodea, Judith. *Wheels of Life: A User's Guide to the Chakra System*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.  
Minnesota: Llewellyn, 1999.
- Auribindo, Sri. *The Life Divine. Book One and Book Two Part One*: Sri Aurobindo  
Ashram, Pondicherry: All India Press, 1973.
- Ayengar, Dr. N.S.R. *Gitagovindam. Sacred Profanities: a Study of Jayadeva's  
Gitagovinda*. Delhi: Penman, 2000.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Gaze of Orpheus and Other Literary Essays*. Trans. Lydia  
Davis. New York: Station Hill Press, 1981.
- The Space of Literature*. Trans. Anne Smock. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1982.
- "Brahma." *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. 4 Oct. 2007 Keyword: Encyclopedia  
Britannica.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limitations of Sex*. New York:  
Routledge, 1993.
- Carson, Anne. *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Chanter, Tina. *Ethics of Eros*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Time, Death and the Feminine: Levinas with Heidegger*. CA: Stanford  
UP, 2001.
- Daenda, Elena. "On Joy, Death, and Writing: Autobiography and Autothanatography in  
Clarice Lispector's Work." (2006): 11 pp. 22 Oct. 2006 <<http://workingpapers.wordpress.com/2006/10/12/deanda-on-joy/>>.
- Dhawan, Nikita. "The Word and the World: On the Limits of the Sayable." *Atopia* 7.4  
(2005). 22 Sept 2007 <[http://www.atopia.tk/index.php?option=com\\_frontpage](http://www.atopia.tk/index.php?option=com_frontpage)

&Itemid=1&lang=en>.

Dauenhauer, Bernard P. *Silence: The Phenomenon and Its Ontological Significance*.

Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980.

Eliot, T.S. *Four Quartets*. "Burnt Norton" Tristan Fecit.

[www.tristan.icom43.net/quartets/](http://www.tristan.icom43.net/quartets/) June, 2000.

Fitz, Earl E. "A Discourse of Silence: The Postmodernism of Clarice Lispector"

*Contemporary Literature* 28.4 (1987): 420-436

Guitierrez, Rachel. "Clarice Lispector" (2004). 22 July 2007

<[http://www.vidaslusofonas.pt/clarice\\_lispector2.htm](http://www.vidaslusofonas.pt/clarice_lispector2.htm)>.

Hanh, Thich Nhat. *Cultivating the Mind of Love. The Practice of Looking Deeply in the*

*Mahayana Buddhist Tradition*. Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1996.

---*Thundering Silence: Sutra on Knowing the Better Way to Catch a Snake*. Trans.

Annabel Laity. Berkeley: Parralax Press, 1993.

--- *True Love: A Practice for Awakening the Heart*. Boston: Shambala, 1997.

Hedrick, Tace. "Mother, Blessed Be You Among Cockroaches: Essentialism, Fecundity

and Death in Clarice Lispector." *Luso-Brazilian Review* 34.2 (1997): 42-57

Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. 1807. Trans. A.V. Miller. New York: Oxford

UP, 1977.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Essence of Truth: On Plato's Cave Allegory and Theaetetus*

Trans.Ted Sadler. UK: Continuum, 2005.

--- *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper, 1971.

Hodge, Joanna. "Feminism and Utopia: Irigaray Reading Kant." *Women: A Cultural*

- Review 14.2 (2003): 195-209*
- Irigaray, Luce. *Between East and West: From Singularity to Community*. Trans. Stephen Pluhacek. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.
- The Way of Love*. Trans. Heidi Bostic and Stephen Pluhacek. New York: Continuum, 2002.
- *To Be Two*. Trans. Monique M. Rhodes and Marco F. Cocito-Monoc. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- “Why Cultivate Difference? Toward a Culture of Two Subjects.” *Paragraph: A Journal of Modern Critical Theory* 25.3 (2002): 79-92
- Jayadeva, Sri. *Sri Jayadeva’s Gita-Govinda: The Loves of Krsna and Radha*. Trans. George Keyt. Bombay: Kutub-Popular, 1965.
- Joy, Morny. “Irigaray’s Eastern Explorations” *Religion in French Feminist Thought*. (51-55). New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Kalamaras, George. *Reclaiming the Tacit Dimension: Symbolic Form in the Rhetoric of Silence*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1994.
- Katagiri, Dainin. *Returning to Silence: Zen Practice in Daily Life*. Boston: Shambhala, 1988.
- Khasnabish, Ashmita. *Jouissance as Ananda*. UK: Lexington, 2003.
- Kleinberg, Ethan. *Generation Existential: Heiddager’s Philosophy in France*.
- Klobucka, Anna. “Quest and Romance in Lispector’s *Uma aprendizagem* ou *O livro dos Prazeres*.” *Luso-Brazilian Review* (1999): 124-130
- Knierim- precepts
- Kojeve, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the*

- Phenomenology of Spirit*. Ed. Allan Bloom. Trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. London: Cornell UP, 1969.
- La Caze, Marguerite. "Love, That Indispensable Supplement: Irigaray and Kant on Love and Respect" *Hypatia*. 20.3 (2005): 92-114
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Being and Time*. Ed. Richard McDonough. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- *Ethics as First Philosophy*. Trans. Sean Hand. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Penn: Duquesne UP, 1969.
- Lispector, Clarice. *An Apprenticeship or the Book of Delights*. Trans. Richard Mazzara and Lorri Parris. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- MacKendrick, Karmen. *Immemorial Silence*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2001.
- Maharshi, Ramana. *The Collected Works of Ramana Maharshi*. Ed. Arthur Osborne. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1972.
- Mazzara, Richard, and Lorri Parris. "The Practical Mysticism of Clarice Lispector's *Uma Aprendizagem ou o Livro dos Prazeres*." *Hispania* 68.4 (1985): 709-715
- Mood, John. *Rilke on Love and Other Difficulties*. New York: Norton, 2004.
- Neruda, Pablo. *Twenty Love Poems and a Song of Despair*. Trans. W.S. Merwin. New York: Penguin, 1969.
- Osborne, Arthur. *Ramana Maharshi and the Path of Self-Knowledge*. London: Rider, 1954.
- *The Collected Works of Ramana Maharshi*. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1972.
- Osho. *Intimacy: Trusting Oneself and the Other*. Ed. Wendy Champagne. New York: St. Martins, 2001.

Payne, Judith A. "The Heroic Journey: A Feminine Model in Clarice Lispector's *Perto Do Coracao Selvagem* and *Agua Viva*." *Romance Languages Annual* 3. (1991): 554-60

Plato. *The Symposium of Plato*. Trans. Suzy L. Groden. Ed. John A. Brentlinger. Boston: U of Mass P, 1970.

Pontiero, Giovanni. Afterword. *Near to the Wild Heart*. England: Caranet Press, 1986.

Roberts, Simone. "Sensible Transcendental." *Reconstruction: Studies in Contemporary Culture*. 5.1. (2005) 1-14

Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Letters to a Young Poet*. Trans. Stephen Mitchell. New York: Random House, 1984.

Rosenberg, Judith. "Taking her Measurements: Clarice Lispector and The Smallest Woman in the World" *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*. 30.2 (1989): 71-76

Rosen, Stanley. *Nihilism: A Philosophical Essay*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1969.

Ruta, Suzanne. "Dispatches" *New York Times* 15 Dec. 1996: 221.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, 1978

"Samadhi." "The Global Oneness Commitment" *Times Foundation*.

<<http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Samadhi/id/61925>.

*Silence and Solitude in Ramana Maharshi*. 4 Sept. 2002. 7 Oct. 2007.

< <http://www.hermitary.com/solitude/rmanan.html>>.

Spence, Alan. *Reflections on Meditation*. 04, Sept 04. 10. Oct., 2007.

<[http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/hinduism/ritesrituals/meditation\\_1.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/hinduism/ritesrituals/meditation_1.shtml)>.

Trimondi, Vicotria and Victor. "Postscript: Creative Polarity Beyond Tantrism." 23 Sept.

2007. < <http://www.trimondi.de/SDLE/Postscript.htm>>.

Whitford, Margaret. *Luce Irigaray: Philosophy in the Feminine*. New York: Routledge,

1991.

Wolfreys, Julian. *Critical Keywords in Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York:

Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.