ABSTRACT

THE LATTICE-WORK GUN-STINGING INSECT: THE STORY OF GENRE IN THE SCIENCE FICTION NOVELS OF PHILIP K. DICK

Carl Fuerst, Ph.D.
Department of English
Northern Illinois University, 2014
David Gorman, Director

This dissertation examines the authorial techniques used by Philip K. Dick to establish his work as science fiction. It focuses on four of his novels (two relatively minor novels in *The Cosmic Puppets* and *Solar Lottery*, and two major novels in *The Man in the High Castle* and *Valis*). These novels represent four important stages in Dick's career, and in his conception of science fiction as a genre of storytelling. Throughout this dissertation, emphasis is placed on how these novels express their science fiction identity on the language level, from the structure of their sentences, to the organization of their chapters, to the specific generic elements (including pseudotechnology, pseudohistory, and pseudotheology) that each novel includes.

This project provides close readings of each novel. These readings are shaped by narrative theory, and they are informed by Dick's total body of work, and, more generally, 20th Century American science fiction. The result is a view of science fiction that sees the genre less as a product of plot elements (faster-than-light travel, telepathy, aliens, and so on), and more as a grammar that evokes a specific kind of relationship between reader and work. It also identifies a trajectory to the development of Dick's ideas about science fiction. Over the course of this study, it becomes clear that, in Dick's earlier works, science fiction is presented as an effective means of apprehending the universe. In Dick's later works, however, we can

locate an increasing cynicism in the ability of science fiction to offer real meaning to its readers. In the end, while Dick's later novels might relate a rather pessimistic view of science fiction's potential, his career as a whole reflects a dynamic and open-ended search for significance, purpose, and underlying truth.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
DE KALB, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2014

THE LATTICE-WORK GUN-STINGING INSECT: THE STORY OF GENRE IN THE SCIENCE FICTION NOVELS OF PHILIP K. DICK

BY

CARL FUERST

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Doctoral Director:
David Gorman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I. A Thesis

In the twenty-nine years between 1953 and 1982, Philip K. Dick wrote thirty-six science fiction novels. Additionally, he wrote at least twelve realistic (mainstream, naturalistic, etc.) novels, nine of which have been published (the manuscripts of others remain lost). He wrote at least 121 short stories, a children's book, and a screenplay adaptation of his novel *Ubik*. He was interviewed extensively, and he was a prolific writer of letters (six volumes of his correspondence, covering the majority of his life, were published from 1996 to 2010). In 1974, he began a rambling journal of metaphysical and philosophical theorizing and intense self-analysis. This journal, which he referred to as the *Exegesis*, would eventually fill more than eight thousand pages; a portion of the *Exegesis* was published in an edited volume in 2011, under the title *The Exegesis of Philip K. Dick*.

It is a challenge to form a cohesive and focused thesis about such a massive body of work. This is particularly the case for Dick, whose development as a writer was rapid and ever-changing. In 1975, almost a decade before Dick's death in 1982, Darko Suvin wrote that "Dick's work intimately influenced by and participating in the great processes of the American collective or social psychology in these last twenty years, shares the hesitations, the often irrational though always understandable leaps backwards, forwards, and sideways of that psychology" ("Artifice" 74). Suvin argues that the development of Dick's catalog defies "mechanical or linear logic." Indeed, any critic considering the work of Dick must decide not only which portion of his enormous catalog to discuss, but perhaps also which version of Dick to embrace. Is he the plucky and overachieving writer of science fiction pulps, dutifully cribbing the techniques of A. E. Van Vogt, yet somehow incorporating something more? Is he a counter-culture icon, munching horse tranquilizers while engaging in heady conversations with writers from *Rolling Stone*? Is he a gnostic disciple interpreting God's mysteries as revealed through visions of alternate worlds, or is he, as one of his several biographers asserts, a "treasure of American literature," using "the junk props of the SF genre... to fashion the most intensely visionary fiction written by an American in this century.... [and] widely regarded as one of our most original novelists, *period*---SF and mainstream labels be damned" (Sutin 1)?[1]

In this project, it is not my purpose to crystallize Dick's identity into a single image. Nor do I pretend to provide a definitive reading of his entire body of work. The former would be a fool's errand, and the later would require more time and energy than any one person could afford. However, despite Dick's enormous output of dazzling (and sometimes blinding) variety, we *can* locate tendencies that run through it, sometimes gushing like wild rapids, and sometimes trickling like underground streams. The specific tendency this project focuses on regards Dick's conceptions of language, meaning, and the science fiction genre. More specifically, this project argues that Dick's novels reject strictly deterministic forms of knowing in favor of a dynamic understanding of the universe. Adam Roberts defines

1 For an example of Dick as a science fiction hack, see Umberto Rossi's "The Game of the Rat: A. E. Van Vogt's 800-word Rule and O. K. Dick's *The Game-Players of Titan*." For Dick as rock-star, see Paul Williams' collection of interviews titled *Only Apparently Real.* For Dick as visionary, see Lorenzo DiTommaso's "Gnosticism and Dualism in the Early Fiction of Philip K. Dick, published in *Science Fiction Studies* in 2001.

deterministic knowledge as a “discourse that insists upon one and only one interpretation of the cosmos” (“History” 19). In Dick's novels, these “one and only one” interpretations of the universe manifest in broad ways, including, for example, the dehumanizing fascism embraced by Nazi characters in *The Man in the High Castle,* and the concept of “relativism” that negatively dictates every aspect of characters' lives in *The Man who Japed.* In other cases, deterministic knowledge is mere fact-stating. It includes the information provided by technical schematics, documents that provide rigid interpretations of history, or strict and limited theologies. In other words, the deterministic knowledge Dick's work resists is seen, throughout his body of work, as concrete, empirical, and rigid (and associated with discourses that are equally as concrete, empirical, and rigid). It stands in direct opposition to dynamic forms of knowing associated with art and, for Dick, science fiction. Dick sees science fiction as a medium that is particularly suitable for articulating the rejection of discourses that insist “upon one and only one interpretation of the cosmos,” and, in many of Dick's works, we see characters associate dynamic and opened-ended quests for meaning with elements of science fiction. In his early work, Dick eagerly and optimistically engages in this approach; his characters apply the reading strategies he associates with science fiction to successfully complete their quests. By the middle of Dick's career, we can see his faith in the ability of science fiction to offer an intuitive and open-ended understanding of the universe (as opposed to an empirical and deterministic one) become increasingly sophisticated while at the same time becoming increasingly tempered by doubts until, at the end of his career, we can observe disillusion with the ability of science fiction to offer real solutions to problems of knowing and being.

In support of this thesis, I provide close readings of four of Dick's science fiction novels, some widely considered major works, others having received little critical attention thus far: *The Cosmic Puppets* (written in 1953 and published in 1956), *Solar Lottery* (written in 1954 and published in 1955), *Man in the High Castle* (written in 1961 and published in 1962), and *Valis* (written in 1978 and published in 1981). Each of these works reflects key shifts in the development of Dick's concepts of language, meaning, and the science fiction genre, and I illustrate these shifts by tracing the quests for meaning that each novel's characters engage in, along with the strategies Dick uses to narrate those quests. The result does not provide a comprehensive account of every idea, innovation, or theme in Dick's work, but it does shed new and necessary light on the oeuvre of an author who John Clute and Peter Nicholls describe as “one of the two or three most important figures in 20th-century US sf” (328).

II. The Landscape of Dickian Studies

In 1975, *Science Fiction Studies* dedicated an issue to Philip K. Dick's work. By the time of that issue's release, Dick had published almost thirty science fiction novels; he had been nominated for five Nebula Awards, and he had won the 1963 Hugo Award for *Man in the High Castle*.[2] However, beyond commercial reviews and articles in fanzines, his writing had yet to receive serious critical attention. Thus, the appearance of a reputable academic journal with essays by Fredric Jameson, Stanislaw Lem, and Darko Suvin marks the “big bang” of

[2] *Dr. Bloodmoney* (1965), *The Three Stigmata of Palmer Eldritch* (1965), *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* (1968), and *Flow My Tears, The Policeman Said* (1974) received Nebula Award nominations.

Dickian scholarship.[3] The MLA International Bibliography lists one pre-1975 essay about Dick's work; it lists 379 articles published between 1975 to 2012. The first of three volumes of Dick's novels in the Library of America was published in 2007, and, each year, scholars continue to contribute to the already substantial number of essay collections and monographs dedicated to his work. It is reasonable, then, to claim that Philip K. Dick can now be regarded as an important contributor to twentieth-century American literature.

However, despite Dick's importance, critics writing about his work tend to offer apologies for studying a science fiction author. During the early phase of Dickian studies, essays about Dick's novels typically begin by addressing their audience's reservations about science fiction genre, distancing Dick from most other science fiction authors. More recently, as science fiction and other relatively marginalized genres have become more palatable to the academy, hesitancy to write about the science fiction genre has been replaced by apologies for the quality of Dick's prose.[4] In criticism, Dick has always been viewed as an unrecognized genius, while, at the same time, his work has been regarded as a guilty pleasure. For better or for worse, many of the developments in Dickian studies from 1975 to today can be attributed to a shift in the nature of the apologies presented by critics studying Dick's work.

In the initial phase of Dickian studies, critics describe Dick as a writer who transcends science fiction. Though their approaches are varied, these early works generally take the stance that Dick is an author worth writing about *despite* the fact that he wrote in a disposable

[3] In a 1994 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jim Zook writes that "*Science Fiction Studies* has charted the course for the most hard-core science fiction critics and comparatists. That focus has earned the journal its reputation as the most theoretical publication in the field, as well as the most daring."

[4] For a thorough discussion of science fiction's important, though not unchallenged, transition from a marginalized genre to one that is generally acceptable for professional literary study, see *Science Fiction, Canonization, Marginalization, and the Academy* (edited by Gary Westfahl and George Slusser), which explores this topic at length.

genre. In the 1975 issue of *SFS,* Suvin appeals to his American audience's competitive side, writing that “Dick is a prophet honoured much more abroad than in his own country,” and that “North American SF critics have lagged behind” (“Science” 3). In a 1985 article in the same journal, Kenneth Mathieson asserts that Dick is remarkable because he leads a group of “avowedly SF writers” who “extend the traditional boundaries of their genre, aware as they were of developments in the wider literary culture around them” (22). For Mathieson, "Dick seeks to transcend and extend the boundaries of his chosen form, and might, but for his untimely death, have taken this process to even greater lengths" (25). Stanislaw Lem similarly, if more bluntly, calls Dick “A Visionary Among the Charlatans,” a phrase that appears in both the 1975 issue if *SFS* and in his influential volume of essays titled *Microworlds* (106). He praises Dick while viciously attacking most of the science fiction genre. “Science Fiction merely apes and simulates the Olympian quality of literature” (66). For Lem, science fiction “is a whore” and it “comes from a whorehouse” (57, 59). Lem sees Dick as the exception to the rule, or as an author who “succeeds in changing a circus tent into a temple” (74). He “has more defeats than victories but the latter determine his rank as an author” (76). While Lem’s cantankerous rhetoric is troublesome on multiple levels, he echoes the majority of Dick's early critics when he champions Dick as a writer worth reading even though he wrote science fiction. Peter Fitting notes that Dick’s work meets the “two general criteria [that] are most commonly used to screen out the ‘trash’ from those SF works which are deemed worthy of critical attention and may be included in the university curriculum” (47). These are the criteria that Suvin, throughout his *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*, uses to identify the adolescent, unrealized, or underdeveloped narratives that he claims make up the vast majority of science fiction (with one exception, amongst others, being works by Dick).[5]

In more recent years, critics have become more likely to discuss Dick's works without taking steps to distance him (or themselves) from the science fiction genre. Farah Mendlesohn groups Dick, along with Ursula K. LeGuin and J. G. Ballard, into the "academic canon" of SF, as opposed to what she refers to as the "fan canon" made up of works by writers like Robert Heinlein, Isaac Asimov, and Arthur C. Clarke (10). J. Andrew Brown points to the tendency of new authors within the literary mainstream to embrace Dick and demonstrate his influence in their work. This, Brown claims, indicates "the emergence of a new generation of writers who are attempting to define themselves by organizing literary traditions that include both the Bloomian canon (Kafka, Borges) and the sf canon (Dick)" (480).[6] Jameson's obituary of Dick describes the author as "the Shakespeare of Science Fiction" (345). His statement is a far cry from Lem's harsh criticisms of the genre as a whole.[7]

5 In his preface to *Metamorphoses*, Suvin writes: "SF is one of the largest genres, and to my mind the most interesting and cognitively most significant one. This is not at all to say that an average SF text is 'good,' that is, aesthetically significant. On the contrary, 90 or even 95 percent of production is strictly perishable stuff, produced in view of instant obsolescence for the publisher's profit and the writer's acquisition of other perishable commodities" (xii).

6 In *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (1994), Harold Bloom organizes literature into three phrases according to the three cultural eras—Theocratic, Aristocratic, and Democratic—set forth by Giambattista Vico in *New Science.* Bloom sees the current era as one of chaos "out of which a new Theocratic Age [will] at last emerge" (1). *The Western Canon* includes four appendices, each of which providing a list of what Bloom regards as canonical works. Appendix D, titled "The Chaotic Age: A Canonical Prophecy," lists Kafka and Borges as essential writers of the twentieth century. While Dick's name is absent from the list, Appendix D does include writers of science fiction, including H. G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, Ursula K. Le Guin, and Thomas Disch.

7 Freedman comments on Jameson's statement, writing that Dick's "greatness, like Shakespeare's among Renaissance dramatists, is bound up with his being radically *typical* of his genre--and not least on stylistic grounds" (35).

While critics no longer so consistently apologize for writing about science fiction, another kind of apology has risen up to take its place. Essays, articles, book chapters, and monographs that deal with Dick's works now tend to begin by justifying their existence despite the perceived shoddiness of Dick's prose. Carl Freedman writes that Dick remains "the finest and most interesting writer in the entirety of Science Fiction" (164). It is, however, the "interesting" aspects of Dick's writing that Freedman pursues, leaving its "fineness" up to his audience's imagination. "Dick's style, while deeply science-fictional, does not, as we have already begun to see, characteristically display the evident polish, the syntactic elegance, and the allusive resonance that are stylistically valorized by hegemonic formalist criteria of value" (35). Damien Broderick endorses Bruce Gillespie's vision of Dick as "a writer of pulpy, even careless prose" and, when Broderick claims that Dick forged "a powerful new vision from sf's generic trash," he implies that Dick's writing is some kind of redeemable garbage (56). Scott Durham writes about the "notorious unevenness of [Dick's] work" (173). For Durham, Dick's prose "drops from hallucinatory peaks into equally unexpected moments of exhausted clumsiness and flagging attention, [and it] might seem to spring less from any consideration of form than from the metabolic lurches of an amphetamine-addict." Thomas Disch, an American science fiction author, poet, and critic, writes, "For those readers who require the genre always to aspire to the condition of art, Philip Dick is just too nakedly a hack, capable of whole chapters of turgid prose, and of bloopers so grandiose you many wonder, momentarily, whether they're not just his little way of winking at his fellow laborers in the pulps" ("Towards" 14).[8] Additionally, while *The New Yorker*'s review of one of Dick's

[8] Disch's *The Dreams Our Stuff is Made Of: How Science Fiction Conquered the World* won the 1999

Library of America editions identifies Dick as an author whose work "is at once fantastically original in its ideas and dutifully realistic in charting their consequences," it goes on to claim that "much as one would like to place Dick above or alongside Pynchon and Vonnegut—or, for that matter, Chesterton or Tolkien—as a poet of the fantastic parable, he was a pretty bad writer…. You end up admiring every one of his conceits and not a single one of his sentences" (Gopnick). Jonathan Lethem, editor of Dick's Library of America volumes and perhaps Dick's foremost and most visible current champion, assures critics that Dick's work is worth a look "despite, ahem, indelicacies in the prose," and that Dick "was writing with a kind of personal visionary intensity that didn't make time for some of the niceties, some of the second thoughts and revisions that you might wish a literary writer to be able to make" (Interview 2).[9] Lethem writes that Dick "was as formative an influence on me as marijuana or punk rock, as responsible for beautifully fucking up my life, for bending it irreversibly along a course I still travel" ("You" 22). Lethem's comparison of punk rock to Dick's writing echoes the attitude many critics have regarding Dick's prose; just as a note-by-note scrutiny of the technical aspects of a punk rock song would likely miss the point of the aggressive and unrefined energy that defines the punk rock genre, so would, according to this line of reasoning, a language-level study of Dick's novels and stories miss out on the unvarnished brilliance in Dick's work. In this sense, the interesting elements of Dick's work are of the accidental type associated with drug-induced hallucinations and the coincidental masterpieces

Hugo Award for best related work. Much of *Dreams* is a polemic against science fiction that is a "template of prophesying to the converted and assisting in the deceptions of the self-deceived" (39). In the same volume, however, he calls Dick "Better than any SF writer of his time" (91).

[9] In an introduction to a collection of Dick's stories, Lethem writes that "Dick is a necessary writer, in the someone-would-have-had-to-invent-him sense" (ix).

of outsider art. Looking at these examples and more, we can see the often-repeated notion that Dick's ideas need to be somehow untied from the cheap language in which they are communicated. Once they are freed from their terrible prose, those ideas are pursued with rigor while the sentences are ignored. It is as if the profundity, authenticity, and overall value of Philip K. Dick's work is hidden behind his badly written sentences, exposed and refined by the purifying light of strong academic critique. The badness of Dick's prose is generally excused as a tolerable, if annoying, side-effect of studying an author with such transcendent ideas.

This pervasive trend has resulted in a deficiency in the field of Dickian studies. Despite the ever-increasing critical attention Dick receives, his prose has been largely ignored or dismissed. In an academic climate in which purely evaluative criticism has been unfashionable for almost a century, it is the status quo to admit that the prose of Dick's novels is somehow irredeemably bad. However, even if Dick's prose evokes some lower quality of emotional or intellectual response than the prose of, say, Samuel Delany, William Faulkner, or Shakespeare, that is still a poor excuse for ignoring the language used by a writer if we are to simultaneously accept that writer as one of the most important American literary voices of the second half of the twentieth century. If we are to agree that Dick has something important to say, we must also agree that his prose provides our only access to those statements. This project operates on the premise that, whatever its quality, Dick's prose—his grammar, structure, tone, and, ultimately, his narration—says something important about his work and his genre. A close examination of the way Dick narrates his novels deepens and improves our interpretations of his works. It sheds much-needed light on Dick's lifelong project, and reveals important ideas that arc across his career and across the genre of science fiction. Such a study reveals an author making careful language-level decisions that have a dramatic impact on the meaning of his science fiction novels.

In the 1975 issue of *SFS*, Fitting wrote that "Dick's writing is not easily included within traditional academic limits, for his novels are, in appearance, badly and carelessly written, with superficial characterization, confusing plots and similar deviations from 'good writing'" (47).[10] It is not my intention to refute Fitting's claim by showering Dick's prose with unmitigated praise. However, by studying the features of Dick's narration at key points in his career, we can explore the meanings of his science fiction novels to depths inaccessible to critical approaches that make assumptions like Fitting's. Even more specifically, a study of Dick's narration reveals a common theme in the quests that his protagonists undertake. Eugene Warren echoes the sentiments of many critics when he writes that "Dick's protagonists generally begin as naive realists, firmly convinced that their perceptions provide them with knowledge about what is actually present in the world around them. But then an encounter with the radical uncertainty of reality throws the protagonists into a world where both external reality and their own identities are drastically questioned. The most basic question raised by such an experience is this: Is there an ultimate, absolute reality, and can we know it?" (161). We can not only see this "most basic question" when we closely examine how Dick's novels are narrated, but we can also get a sense of its answer. Throughout Dick's novels, characters who recognize the dialectic between what Warren terms "external reality and internal

[10] When Fitting's essay was reprinted eight years later in a collection edited by Joseph Olander and Harry Greenberg, he attached a qualification to this statement, writing that Dick's novels are "badly and carelessly written, with superficial characterization, confusing plots, and similar deviations from *recognized principles of* 'good writing'" [emphasis added] (150).

identity" (or, phrased differently, "objective truth and subjective experience") succeed in their quests, while characters who ignore that dialectic and cling to systems of meaning that are, on one hand, rigidly objective or, on the other hand, purely subjective, end their quests in failure.

III. Narratological Terms

It is important, at this outset, to define key terms used throughout this project. Many of these are drawn from the field of narratology, and are used to describe how Dick's language-level decisions shape his general rejection of deterministic knowledge in favor of a dynamic concept of meaning. Therefore, it may be prudent to begin by defining some key narratological terms that will be used throughout.

Mieke Bal, in *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, identifies three crucial elements that shape how we understand narratives: agent, focalizer, and narrator. The "agent," according to Gerald Prince, is "a human or humanized being performing an action or act" (4). Bal defines "focalizer" as "the represented 'colouring' of the fabula by a specific agent of perception, the holder of 'point of view'" (19). For example, while Saul Bellow's *Seize the Day* has a third-person narrator throughout, that narration is, at points, focalized through its protagonist Tommy Wilhelm. This gives *Seize the Day's* opening the tone and texture of Wilhelm's voice, even though the passage is not strictly narrated by that character: "When it came to concealing his troubles, Tommy Wilhelm was not less capable than the next fellow. So at least he thought, and there was a certain amount of evidence to back him up. He had once been an actor--no, not quite, an extra--and he knew what acting should be" (1).[11] For Bal, the "narrator" is a stricter term for "that agent which utters the linguistic signs which constitute the text" (18). Part One of *The Sound and the Fury*, for example, is narrated by Benjy Compson. That is to say, the section of the novel that he narrates is not merely focalized through his point of view, but rather told entirely from his perspective and exclusively in his voice. It is confined to his consciousness in a way that has a drastic effect on the audience's relationship to the story.

Bal demonstrates (as Wayne Booth did more than twenty years before) that the terms "first-person narrator," "second-person narrator," and "third-person narrator" are of limited use. She asserts a more accurate and useful way to label the relationship of the narrator to the story with the terms "external narrator" (EN), indicating a narrator who does not exist in the same settings as the characters and events described, and "character-bound narrator" (CN), indicating a narrator who is an actor in the "diegesis," a term used throughout this project to refer to (again, deferring to Prince) the "world in which the situations and events narrated occur" (20). Character-bound narrators are embedded within a diegesis, whether they play an active role in the events that occur within that diegesis, or whether they simply function as disembodied observer. While external narrators may be humanized fictional entities (thus, according to Bal, "perceptible," as opposed to "non-perceptible"), they occupy a space that is peripheral to the diegesis they describe.

---

[11] Compare this passage to one that appears later in the novel, and that is focalized through Tommy's father: "Before he struck the egg with his spoon he dried the moisture with his napkin. Then he battered it (in his father's opinion) more than was necessary. A faint grime was left by his fingers on the white of the egg after he had picked away the shell. Dr. Adler saw it with silent repugnance: What a Wilky he had given to the world! Why, he didn't even wash his hands in the morning" (33). In this passage, the narration gradually slips into Dr. Adler's "mind," adopting the characteristics of his speech and presenting the story's world as seen through his eyes, all while maintaining the work's general third-person narrator.

Take, for example, the opening sentences of Dick's *The Galactic Pot-Healer* (1969): "His father had been a pot-healer before him. And so he, too, healed pots, in fact any kind of ceramic ware left over from the Old Days, before the war, when objects had not all been made out of plastic. A ceramic pot was a wonderful thing, and each that he healed became an object which he loved, which he never forgot" (3). Using Bal's terminology, we can say that this sentence is expressed by a non-perceptible, external narrator, while the focalizer is Joe Fernwright, the novel's protagonist. Even though the passage is not presented in Fernwright's voice, the implied audience sees the scene more or less through his eyes. The information this passage provides is flavored by his personality when the past is referred to nostalgically as the "Old Days" (notice the capitalization of the term, which subtly communicates a certain reverence for the past), and we learn that "a ceramic pot was a wonderful thing," giving access to Fernwright's thoughts and feelings. Using Bal's terminology, we might schematize the novel's first sentence as follows:

EN [CF (Fernwright) – Event (contemplating the profession of pot-healing)]

The event is doubly mediated through the character-bound focalizer (CF), Fernwright, and also through the external, non-perceptible narrator (EN).

Since the terms "implied author" and "implied audience" are used frequently throughout the chapters that follow, it will also be helpful to clearly define them here. The term "implied author," it should be noted, refers to a different element than "narrator" or "focalizer" as defined above. According to Bal, if we regard the narrator "the agent which utters the linguistic signs which constitute the text," we can imagine the implied author as a figure standing *behind* the narrator, and behind the rest of the work, as well (18). Bal explains that the term "implied author" allows us to "discuss and analyze the ideological and moral stances of a narrative text without having to refer directly to a biographical author," and "is the result of the investigation of the meaning of a text, and not the source of that meaning." This makes the concept of an implied author particularity useful when dealing with works by Dick, who had, if not a carefully constructed public persona, at least a highly dynamic one that allows different notions of him as both an author and a person at different times. Dick's actual identity is difficult if not impossible to pin down. However, rather than projecting a false biographic image of Dick's intentions or ideological stances, we can use the evidence provided by a specific work or set of works to form, through analysis of that evidence, an image of the implied author. Prince defines the "implied author" as "the implicit image of an author in the text, taken to be standing behind the scenes and to be responsible for its design and for the values and cultural norms it adheres to" (42). For example, consider Angel Archer, the narrator of *The Transmigration of Timothy Archer*. She is Timothy Archer's daughter-in-law and, as Douglass Mackey writes, she "deplores [Timothy] Archer's readiness to disregard the consequences to his career and the necessity of keeping one's feet on the ground, in touch with the familiar and the concrete, as she is" (125). The gap between narrator and implied author is what allowed Dick, in an interview, to explain that Angel Archer is "smarter than I am, she's more rational than I am, she's more educated than I am, and she has a broader vocabulary than I have, and she's acquainted with source material, books, that she's read that I have not read. And yet everything is through her viewpoint" ("What" 55). It allows us, as readers, to describe Angel Archer as an agent that delivers the narrative utterances that make up the work, and, once we have read that work, we can regard that work in its totality to arrive at a concept of the implied author who produced it, and the ideological or philosophical ground on which he stood. In this project, the term “implied author” will be used when discussing the intentions or ideological positions of the implicit creative entity behind a work. Meanwhile, I will use the term “author” when referring to the details of Dick's life. For instance, we might claim that the *implied author* of *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* warns his implied audience of, among other things, an encroaching police state, while the *author* of *Do Android Dream of Electric Sheep?* spent most of his life in California, was a client of the Scott Meredith Literary Agency, and had an affinity for his pet cats.

Bal explains that that the “implied audience” is to the narratee what the “implied author” is to the narrator (81). Prince defines the implied audience as “the one who is narrated to, as inscribed in the text. There is at least one (more or less overtly represented) narratee per narrative, located at the same diegetic level as the narrator addressing him or her” (57). Prince assets that the narratee is a “purely textual construct,” and writes that the narratee must be distinguished from the implied audience, “the former constitutes the narrator's audience and is inscribed as such in the text; the later constitutes the implied author's audience (and is inferable from the entire text).” This is a particularly useful term in science fiction that depicts events that occur in imagined future worlds. In *Solar Lottery,* for example, which takes place in an imagined twenty-third century, elements that refer to the Cold War have different resonances for its immediate audience in 1953 than they do for its audience in 2013. Throughout this project, I attempt to remain consistent by using the term “implied audience” unless referring to specific political or cultural conditions prevalent when a novel was written, and which may not be obvious to a reader encountering the work today.

The final narratological term that should be defined in this introduction is “paratext,” which, in this project, broadly refers to framing elements of a work. Blurbs, dedication pages, copyright information, page numbers, and chapter breaks all may qualify as paratexts. Paratextual elements guide an audience’s understanding of the narration. Gérard Genette, who coined the term, calls paratexts part of an “’undefined zone’ between the inside and the outside, a zone without any hard and fast boundary on either the inward side (turned toward the text) or the outer side (turned toward the world’s discourse about the text)” (2). In this sense, paratexts function as one of the connections between the world of the audience and a work's diegesis, and they contribute to the audience's interpretation of a work. For instance, a spaceship on the cover of a novel might be all the paratext an audience needs to associate a work with the science fiction genre, dramatically affecting the interpretive decisions they make from that point forward in their reading. A different image on the cover of the same novel might encourage the audience to interpret the work as realistic, or as experimental fiction. In this way, paratexts can shape the relationship between a written work and its audience without involving a single word of the actual work.

IV. Terms Drawn from the Critical Study of Science Fiction

Two other important terms used throughout this project are “cognitive estrangement” and *novum*. These concepts are central not only to each chapter's thesis, but also to this dissertation's definition of science fiction as a genre.

In his *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*, Darko Suvin defines “cognitive estrangement” as the effect that distinguishes a narrative work's world from the audience’s reality while simultaneously highlighting the connections to the real world. Suvin presents this as central to science fiction, “a literary genre whose necessary and sufficient conditions are the presence and interaction of estrangement and cognition, and whose main formal device is an imaginative framework alternative to the author’s empirical environment” (8-9). For Freedman, when everything in the world of a (hypothetical) work is identical to familiar elements in the audience’s reality, “the result is ‘realistic’ or mundane fiction, which can cognitively account for its imaginings but performs no estrangement” (17). However, if the work “is flattened out to mere estrangement (or, it might be argued, pseudo-estrangement) then the result is fantasy, which estranges, or appears to estrange, but in an irratonalist, theoretically illegitimate way.” Science fiction results from a balance between cognition and estrangement and is a product of a relationship between the familiar, or the “cognitive, “and the alien, or the “estranged,” projecting a world whose strangeness is important because of its connection to the mundane. David Ketterer writes that science fiction is a “form which aims at the effects of realism while taking as its main plot device—its generic marker—an invention which is *known* not to be real and ironically so signaled. However, no work of SF can be of lasting value and interest unless it is in fact ultimately about something that is real, something of genuine concern to human beings” (47). The pseudo-scientific, pseudo-technological, pseudo-philosophical, and pseudo-historical discourses that run through works of science fiction are the result of authors’ efforts to create a world recognizably different from but also significantly connected to their own. For Suvin, as for many other scholars of