

A History of Personal Identification

—Growth of the Orator in *Invisible Man**

ZHANG Ting

Sichuan International Studies University, Chongqing, China

The notion of invisibility in *Invisible Man* is spoken out by the protagonist's growth as an orator. Rather than a recursive retrieving of his identity throughout the narrative, the invisible man reinvents his identity in his pursuit of pure persuasion. Both being terms in the Burkean system of literature rhetoric, pure persuasion, and identification become one for the unconscious purpose and the other for the symbolic action respectively in the protagonist-speaker's growth from an ideal emulator to speaker-audience mediator. In his identification with the audience and his ardent pursuit of pure persuasion, he paradoxically finds himself distanced from both his identity-to-be and the identity of his audience, with great division in-between. Though temporary corporation is achieved and occasional identification is resolved in the last two speeches, the protagonist only finds himself in a rhetorical context which is much more varied and more manipulative than he imagined. Such a realization renders the invisible man invisible again from the public stadium, who decides to resort to the pen for a life-long identification with the broader battlefield of racial discontinuity.

Keywords: *Invisible Man*, Kenneth Burke, pure persuasion, identification, division, race

Introduction

Exposing the invisibility of African-Americans in early 20th century is one of the major motives for Ralph Ellison to write the *Invisible Man*, which is explicitly stated in his introduction to the ideation for this novel:

Thus despite the bland assertions of sociologists, "high visibility" actually rendered one *un*-visible...It was a startling idea, yet the voice was so persuasive with echoes of blues-toned laughter that I found myself being nudged toward a frame of mind in which, suddenly, current events, memories and artifacts began combining to form a vague but intriguing new perspective. (Ellison, 1980, pp. xv-xvi)

Nevertheless, Ellison has gone even further than the sole intention of revealing racial invisibility. Invisibility is only a part of the protagonist's identity; and the notion of invisibility has actually functioned more as a revelation: It has in fact shed a light on issues related to identification, which makes the novel a far more profound and thought-provoking work. The personal identification of the protagonist is structured within his growth into and recession from his identity of public speaker, which delineates the clue of his way to identification.

* **Acknowledgements:** This paper is an outcome from the research project "Symbolism, Dramatism, and Deconstruction—Kenneth Burke's Rhetorical Poetics and Literary Criticism", Project No. sisu201311.

ZHANG Ting, Associate Professor, College of English Language and Literature, Sichuan International Studies University.

Many scholars have studied on the process of the invisible man's searching for identity in his life turbulence from different perspectives, focusing on the thematic significance and implication of the protagonist's rediscovering of his "true" identity. Valerie Smith (1988), for example, in his essay *The Meaning of Narration*, explores how the invisible man comes to realize after a series of disillusionments that "for the construction of his identity", he has to write reflective narratives of the sum of his own life experiences. Klara Szmanko (1988), by validating the *Invisible Man* as an epoch-making novel initiating the discussion of the trope of invisibility, analyzes its protagonist's acknowledgement of the prevailing invisibility of his race and the potentiality of striving for visibility entailed in invisibility. We shall never deny that discovering, or to be more precise, retrieving individual identity is an important motif in the novel. However, the rhetorical richness of the novel, which is embedded in those in-text addresses delivered by the protagonist with his unique identity as a public speaker, has always tempted us to get to the bottom of the thematic enigma of "identification".

Identity and rhetoric are never separated from each other; as inscrutably dissertated by Ellison's contemporary rhetorician Kenneth Burke in his *A Rhetoric of Motives*, identification more powerfully functions in a way persuasion does not in rhetorical discourses (2001, p. 1296). In his analysis of identification and "autonomous" activities, Burke dialectically points out that

...the specialized and intrinsic activity of the autonomous does not necessarily exclude the broader and extrinsic activities, and 'identification' is a word for the autonomous activity's place in this wider context, a place with which the agent may be unconcerned. (2001, p. 1329)

When logically extended, this idea further indicates that the autonomous activity may vary with the shifting of its context. This view applies well to the identification of the invisible man with the exterior world, explaining why the protagonist, as an individual striving for identification with the exterior world of injustice, has experienced a multitude of unique identities, caused by both his initial unconcern with and his being unconcerned by the outer world context, which just echoes Klara Szmanko's insightful discerning of the relationality of identities,

All of us, notwithstanding our race or ethnicity, speak from a particular place and are positioned in relation to each other in a particular way. Our positions are never set in stone. They may change together with the changing background. Depending on whom we speak to and with whom we interact, certain traits of our identity can become more or less vivid. (2008, p. 4)

It is exactly in this relationality that the invisible man experiences a flux of definitions of identities, from being a promising student to a jobless in New York, from a Brotherhood member to an autobiographer, and from a grandson who questions his own grandfather to an orator speaking for his own ethnic group. However, what has he figured out during the whole process of misplacements and self-discovering? How does he plan to "triumph over their visibility" (Szmanko, 2008, p. 25)? Is he going to recluse from the complexity of the exterior world and stay forever in the hole, in a way suggested by Smith with "the decision to remove himself from society and write his own story", because "he found his solutions to the problems of identity and authority in the double consciousness of reliving one's story as both narrator and protagonist" (1988, p. 43)? This double-consciousness implied here, while emphasizing the high awareness and astuteness on the part of the narrator, to a large degree denies the capability of self-consciousness on the part of the protagonist, which is in sharp contrast with the

protagonist's strong sense of self-identification when he acts as a public speaker. Let alone his being a successful or not an orator, the protagonist has to be self-defined, though most of the time in an unconsciously spontaneous way, when making his speeches in front of the audiences, experiencing a combination of the moment of pure persuasion and identification (Kraemer, 2013).

In Kraemer's (2013) critical reading of Kenneth Burke, pure persuasion lines up with identification in that in its sublimity as the ideal of the rhetorical "satisfaction intrinsic to the saying itself", it becomes the top of the ladder which identification strives to mount. In his pursuit of such a delight with the satisfaction in pure persuasion, the protagonist of the *Invisible Man* is actually dealing with the problems of his identity as biased against out of his race and the desire for authority when he is acting as a speaker to persuade. And from developing himself into an influential orator, he in fact creates his "identification", during which he discovers facts about his identity as being far more complex than that of invisibility: divisions and barriers among the different factions of the society. Through his receding from being an eloquent public speaker into temporary hibernation, we could discern the significance and implication of that sheer division and its consequent challenge that confronts both the protagonist and his audiences.

Identification Through Speeches

As suggested by Burke, whenever an individual tries to persuade people, identification occurs, because in order for persuasion to be achieved one must identify himself with those he attempts to persuade (2001, p. 1325). The need for this identification as a speaker is caused by the division between his identity and the audience's; thus what the speaker has to do is to first figure out the division and then to bridge it in order to achieve cooperation with the audience. This identification happens both interiorly and exteriorly in a dialectical way: He has to identify within himself before he identifies with the exterior world; and after he has completed his identification with the outside world he has simultaneously created a new self in a new round of interior identification.

In this manner, the invisible man undergoes intensified and tempestuous process of identifications along with his four major speeches in this novel—the "royal battle" speech, the mid-winter eviction speech, the initial Brotherhood speech and the speech made at Clifton's funeral. Not all speeches prove his eloquence, but all of them contribute to his identification, in which he discerns divisions, though along with which he paradoxically strives for cooperation. It is significantly symbolic to find that each speech is either preceded or followed by a certain form of violence, which coordinates with his discerning of division entailed in his identification. Ellison should not have been unaware of the coincident arrangement of all the forms of violence happening around the speech, since with identification comes change, just as Burke sharply points out: "An image of killing is but one of many terminologies by which writers can represent the process of change" (2001, p. 1324).

For the invisible man, the first speech could not have anticipated any form of violence, because it should have been a peaceful and honorable situation where the protagonist is able to deliver his graduate speech to the white elite as "a triumph for our whole community" (Ellison, 1980, p. 17). However, he is disappointedly and unexpectedly involved in the "royal battle" show, ultimately a violent form, though one of entertaining performance. When he finds himself one of the last two black boys left, he "fought back with hopeless desperation" (Ellison, 1980, p. 25), because what he desires is not to win the battle, but to get himself heard through making a speech. Fighting against his fellow black boy, he is brought into the conflict with people of his

own race; and the discontinuity he finds here is one from the rest of the black boys: He is more capable and excellent than those black guys; for he gets access to a chance of being heard by the whites, those who “could judge truly my ability” (Ellison, 1980, p. 25). After the boxing match, when he is dragged to a chair, being exhausted physically, the first thing that comes into his mind is nothing else than making the speech. He worries about whether the chance of speaking in front of the white assembly is going to be countermanded: “I wondered if now I would be allowed to speak” (Ellison, 1980, p. 26). This wondering anticipates the episode of all black boys diving for coins, after which all of them are told to leave, almost leaving the invisible man in despair before he is stopped by the M. C., who announces teasingly that they forget the boy’s speech as “a most serious part” of the program (Ellison, 1980, p. 29). Though painful and burned-out, he shouts out in his speech the famous metaphor by Booker T. Washington—“cast down your bucket where you are”—in order to convey the information of befriending all races as a “social responsibility”, which is only to be scorned by the white smokers (Ellison, 1980, p. 30). Just as what he reflects later on in his narration, he is surprised at his enthusiasm of making the speech at that time, in that he can overcome all the fatigue and even gulp blood and saliva and keep being louder and louder (Ellison, 1980, p. 30). Unfortunately, the louder he shouts the less audible he is. The white audience gives no credibility for his being a speaker and never intends to take seriously the young man, thus the speech is doomed to be a ridiculous and inefficient failure.

Even though the speech awards the protagonist a scholarship to the state college and seems to be a successful one that serves to start his “promising future”, it is in fact an unskilled and crude mimesis of the Burkean pure persuasion that is supposed to carry high ethical value motivating transcendence (Kraemer, 2013, p. 141). From the perspective of the delivery of the speech, it is a mechanical recital; for every single word of it, though not being left out, is uttered not from the heart and head of the speaker. It could be paralleled as a naive oratory practice of imitation, in which the student parodies Booker T. Washington, repeating without reinventing ideas, words and eloquence (Hanlon, 2005, p. 82). Emulating himself to his great predecessor, he believes in the power of pure persuasion in his speech; however, he actually parodies the predecessor out of his lack of knowledge in the audience’s role in a public speaking. Literally speaking, his speech is not a monologue; metaphorically, however, it is. He is confronted by a crowd of audience who talks and challenges him all along the speech; but their response is never intended as an interaction with the speaker. During the whole oration, they have listened to but heard no words; they have talked but spoken nothing; they have applauded but merely in order to show their generosity toward a diligent black student. He is not audible, in the same way that he is not visible. Thus, standing on the pulpit, the speaker is but identified as a performer or an entertainer. Without recognizing and getting across the sheer division between his audience and him, the invisible man fails in winning his audience’s minds over. This failure is subconsciously discerned by the protagonist in his symbolic dream, where he is at a circus with clowns and finds a letter in his briefcase which reads: “Keep This Nigger-Boy Running” (Ellison, 1980, p. 33).

Compared with the first one, the second speech turns out to be a big hit. It was made after the invisible man becomes outraged at the sight of the mid-winter eviction of a black old couple enforced by armed marshals, whose violence has also boiled up the anger of a crowd of onlookers. After struggling a while in his inner conflicts between his desire of averting the disaster and his fear of the consequences, the protagonist cannot suppress his anger any more but throws out the speech at the crowd. This violence initiated by the armed whites, symbolizing the class division and its consequent racial degradation of the invisible man’s fellow people,

prompts him into making the speech spontaneously. The speech is successful enough in fermenting the crowds' public anger and actuating their protection of the old couple against the white evictor. However, it is not achieved solely by the speaker's rhetorical capacity of accommodating his argument, tropes, and passion to the discourse, but is also endowed by the audience's active interference with the "trajectory" of the speaker's address (Hanlon, 2005, p. 92). To put it more precisely, it is the division between the speaker and his audience and the speaker's attempt to transcend the division that has channeled it into an effective oratory.

Even though the speaker has wisely aroused the attention and gathered the consensus of his audience at the very first beginning of his speech, by his categorizing the crowd's, the old victims', and his own identity collectively into "Black Brothers!" (Ellison, 1980, p. 275), he is constantly confronted with challenges from the audience. His appeal for a wise leader who could legally organize the oppressed to fight is doubted and mocked by the audience through their defiant and contemptuous responses together with their yells and screams, which at the same time tends to destroy the speaker's ethical credibility as a persuader. This linchpin clarifies the ambiguity in the speaker's awareness in the problem of doing "the wise thing in spite of what he felt himself" (Ellison, 1980, p. 276) and is almost going to prevent him from his further persuasion of the crowd. Realizing this division, he concedes by admitting that the leader is wise but coward and thus reestablishes his credibility as the speaker that arouses with his *de facto* leadership and charisma. After solving the first division, the speaker goes on to mock the unfairness of racial politics by showing the misfortunes afflicted upon the good citizen. He presents the broken and ratty daily stuff of the old couple that are strewn out on the sidewalk, the symbolic action of which obviously kindles a sense of pity from the audience by contrasting the old couple's present misery with their previous happy life as suggested in the "old breast pump" and "dance" (Ellison, 1980, p. 277). However, the speaker finds himself challenged again by one voice from the crowd, "Hell, they been dispossessed, you crazy sonofabitch, get out the way!" (Ellison, 1980, p. 278), and thus he is enforced to adjust to the speaker-audience discontinuity for a second time. He growls: "We're law-abiding. So who's being dispossessed? Can it be us? These old ones are out in the snow, but we're here with them" (Ellison, 1980, p. 279). He goes on revealing the ridicule of the dispossession by justifying the old couple's moral and religious appeals, and at the same time connects the appeals with the audience's by saying "They're facing a gun and we're facing it with them" (Ellison, 1980, p. 279), denoting that the crowd shares the same situation with the old couple and if they are to be dispossessed then the audience might be as well.

In the whole speech, the speaker is questioned, doubted, and challenged all along the way, but this does not extinguish the eloquence of it. On the contrary, the audience's response makes the antithesis against the speaker's thesis conspicuous, and thus leads the address into a dialectical discourse, during which the speaker acutely discerns the cause of the audience's hesitation, confusion, and uncertainty. And by smartly adjusting his discourse to their assumptions and expectations, the speaker neatly diminishes his division from his audience and gradually illuminates the identity of the blacks by revealing their oppressed and ridiculous status in the white-dominating society. And most importantly, it is not only the audience that has been persuaded, but he himself is also convinced by his own speech, and thus a shift of his identity occurs: from a recital speaker to a spontaneous addressor, from a black college student indulged in his unrealistic American dream to a political speaker, and from a white-value emulator to a human right propagandist.

In the third speech, the invisible man proves to be a thriving political speaker close to the pure persuasion with a dynamic articulation claiming for black people's rights, just as demonstrated by Szmanko, "sharing his feelings with the audience, he makes himself visible and gains a sense of belonging" (2008, p. 43). Though being stressful and nervous throughout the whole speech for its being the first one made with his new identity as a Brotherhood member, the speaker wittily renders the embarrassment caused by the raspy sound from the microphone into one form of contact with the audience: "Sorry, folks. Up to now they've kept me so far away from these shiny electric gadgets I haven't learned the technique", and when some one in the crowd advises him to keep a certain distance from the microphone, he goes on with his contact by saying "Is that better... You see, all I needed was a chance. You've granted it, now it's up to me" (Ellison, 1980, p. 341). This serves as an excellent beginning that initiates the following speaker-responder interaction in a similar pattern. At the end of this speech, the speaker not only wins a thunder of applause and tears from his audience, but has also undergone a rebirth: "Something strange and miraculous and transforming is taking place in me right now...as I stand here before you" (Ellison, 1980, p. 345).

However, this rebirth is not created without a certain form of violence or division, to put it more specifically. This division here is the sharp conflict between his true identity and his feigned credibility as the Brotherhood speaker. He is now speaking in his new name given by the organization, whose doctrines have been attentively studied by the invisible man in his preparation for the speech. Actually, he himself has foreshadowed the conflict of identity before the speech:

I sensed vaguely and with a flash of panic that the moment I walked out upon the platform and opened my mouth I'd be someone else. ... My name was different; I was under orders. Even if I met Mary on the street, I'd have to pass her by unrecognized. (Ellison, 1980, p. 336)

Though he has subconsciously realized the possible inhibition of speaking in another person's name, he still tries to justify this discontinuity between his inner voice and the public voice, in a way interpreted by him as a "science of history business":

But to hell with this Booker T. Washington business. I would do the work but I would be no one except myself—whatever I was. I would pattern my life on that of the Founder. They (the brotherhood) might think I was acting like Booker T. Washington; let them. But what I thought of myself I would keep to myself. (Ellison, 1980, p. 311)

But is the invisible man so manipulative as to be capable of handling his identity division in the "Booker T. Washington business"? If he is, then his speech would not have been assessed by Brother Jack as "the worst you could have done" (Ellison, 1980, p. 349). The speaker has, in fact, at the very moment when he stands on the stage before he starts the speech, obscurely discerned the sheer division between his real and feigned identity, which is symbolized by the narrator as a veil between the audience and him:

The light was so strong that I could no longer see the audience, the bowl of human faces. It was as though a semi-transparent curtain had dropped between us, but through which they could see me—for they were applauding—without themselves being seen. I felt the hard, mechanical isolation of the hospital machine and I didn't like it. (Ellison, 1980, p. 341)

Indeed this intuitive sense of dislike troubles him from keeping on with his feigning in another one's identity. This is exactly what he wants to "confess" at the crucial turn of the speech, after which he can not contain himself

within the fake self any more but has to let “the words forming themselves, slowly falling into place” (Ellison, 1980, p. 345). Though seemingly to be a most successful speech, he is in fact defeated by his inner voice, which is to a large extent precipitated by his audience. As explained by Szmanko:

...the enthusiastic response of the audience infuses the Invisible Man with strength and self-esteem. At the beginning he planned to wave his speech around the Brotherhood ideology; in the end he drops all ideological references. The speech ends with a personal confessional, of belonging to the African American community. (2008, p. 43)

So the protagonist, having his feigned identity defeated by his true voice, spans over his division with the audience caused by his imagined easiness of manipulating the “Booker T. Washington business” and temporarily completes his identification with the audience. He has achieved a greater degree of self-awareness compared with the occasions when he made the previous speeches, using his words: “Already it seemed the expression of someone else. Yet I knew that it was mine and mine alone, and if it was recorded by a stenographer, I would have a look at it tomorrow” (Ellison, 1980, p. 353). Obviously, the protagonist cannot help but has momentarily materialized his “dream of justice”, where he finds his senses and needs most conveniently and comfortably satisfied through an orientation toward others and himself, thus forming an consubstantiation of pure persuasion and identification (Kraemer, 2013, p. 149). Unfortunately, such an achievement does not last until after the speech is done due to his failure to discern the significant identification that has already occurred during the speech because of his misreading of the real objective of Brotherhood. His vain attempt at identification with Brotherhood directly leads to his almost fatal fall in the organization.

Being a spokesman for the Brotherhood, the invisible man cannot achieve the real cooperation between his own identity and his supposed-to-be identity, the schism of which has been less and less obscure to him and is brought to the fore after his witness of Tod Clifton’s death. In the funeral speech, the last speech of the protagonist, he is for the first time clearly aware of the division between his audience and him and the diversity within the audience as well. As a speaker, he has never been in such a striking cognizance of his audience:

I looked down into their sun-swept faces, digging for the words, and feeling a futility about it all and anger. For this they gathered by thousands. What were they waiting to hear? Why had they come? For what reason that was different from that which had made the red-cheeked boy thrill at Clifton’s falling to the earth? What did they want and what could they do? Why hadn’t they come when they could have stopped it all? (Ellison, 1980, p. 454)

All these considerations help him to pop up his speech starter: “What are you waiting for me to tell you?” (Ellison, 1980, p. 454). He keeps himself detached from the audience by repeating “Go home and don’t think about him...I’ve told you to go home...What are you waiting for, when all I can tell you is this name? And when I tell you, what will you know that you didn’t know already, except, perhaps, his name?” (Ellison, 1980, p. 455). Strangely enough, the identification that is normally attributed by closing up distance is now geared in motion through breeding distance. But it is exactly this detachment of the speaker that moves the audience closer to him; there is no sign for them to “go home”, but only of their silent emotional immersion in the speaker’s preach-like storytelling. By realizing and making use of the division, the speaker not only wins his audience over, but also comes to a more important recognition: the reality of his audience and thus the real situation of his identification. Callahan is sharp in seeing this: “Silenced by his own on-again-off-again performance, Invisible Man for the first time sees an audience in its own reality, distinct from his identity, his agenda” (1988, p. 78). Such an observation

fits in exact accordance with the protagonist's visual perception after the speech: "as I took one last look I saw not a crowd but the set faces of individual men and women" (Ellison, 1980, p. 459). It is in this revelation that the invisible man senses the actual process of identifying himself with the audience in pursuit of the pure persuasion and emotional appeal of his discourse; and it is again because of his revelation that he finds himself impotent as to complete the identification during the speech for the diversity of the audience: "I stood looking at the crowd with a sense of failure" (Ellison, 1980, p. 459). This sense of failure is further intensified by Brother Jack's accusation of the invisible man's "twin improvisation of funeral and speech" (Ellison, 1980, p. 79); however, this time, because of the strengthening recognition of the division, he is set off on his way of discovering and manipulating his division from the Brotherhood. Affirming the division as being the leader's blind spot, the invisible man plans to render himself into invisible and "yessing" the Brotherhood to death. Unfortunately, he is at present not so powerful an activist as a speaker. He tries to trick the organization by feigning his identity, but only to find himself being played into the hands of the leaders. Thus his identification with the external world is still to be pursued and continued.

Conclusion

Looking over the occurrences of identification of the invisible man in his four public speeches, we have come to the realization of the embedded division of identities and the implicated cooperation in the rhetorical activity of human beings. Just as pointed out by Burke: "If men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity. If men were wholly and truly of one substance, absolute communication would be of man's very essence" (Burke, 2001, p. 1326). It is exactly that men could never be of one substance, when a speaker tries to win his audience over, the first thing for him to recognize should be "division": "For one need not scrutinize the concept of 'identification' very sharply to see, implied in it at every turn, its ironic counterpart: division. Rhetoric is concerned with the state of Babel after the Fall" (Burke, 2001, p. 1327). This explains why the invisible man fails his first speech: his incapability to sense the rooted schism between his white audience and him renders him down to an entertainer. Then, the success of the following speeches is evidently backed up by his unconscious or conscious interaction with his listeners which is brought into dynamism through the divisions therein.

Nevertheless, realizing the division is never the end for achieving identification for the speaker, because he has yet to overpower the divisions and use rhetorical discourse to reach cooperation with his audience in order to persuade them. As we can clearly find in the second and third speech, the speaker is pushed forward by his audience's responses or even challenges, and thus the speaker has to resort to rhetorical eloquence to extinguish their defiance and complete his emotional and logical appeals. And in the last speech, the protagonist still tries very hard to challenge himself to overcome all the conspicuous divisions he feels within the audience, and by synthesizing his anger, passion, eloquent storytelling, and also the music of the chant, he ultimately moves the audience, though he himself deems the speech as a failure.

The realization of division and striving for cooperation for a speaker is closely related to the issue of his identification. Because of the discovering of speaker-listener division, the speaker may reassess his identity and thus find the interior conflicts between his true identity and his supposed-to-be identity, as in the third speech the speaker is driven by his passionate audience to the revelation that he belongs to the community of black people

and that he is a citizen of the country. In order to be persuasive enough to make himself in accordance with the exterior community and thus to convince his audience, he has to speak a language from the very true voice in his heart. Thus every time when the invisible man successfully arouses the applause from his audience, he is re-creating his identity by drawing his true voice from the very bottom of his heart and makes it resonant with the audience's inner voices. Therefore, we could say he is identifying himself all along with his speeches, from unconsciously sensing his being an entertainer for the whites, to realizing his rhetorical power of fermenting an anti-eviction crowd, then to finding himself belonging to the black community, and at last to figuring out his impotency in persuading the diversified classes of individuals. From this perspective, we shall see the fact that invisible man is gaining access to successful identification all along the process, during which he is not retrieving his "true identity" by recollecting his experience in the way of writing his own autobiography. On the contrary, he is constantly involved in the process of recreating and developing his identity. The protagonist's ending choice of writing his own story does not indicate his failure as an orator, but proves the potentiality of having his voice passed to people from wider spaces for a longer time. In this way, his role from being a speaker to being a writer indicates an extension of the media of discourse: The issue of rhetorical identification is not confined to oratory, but is also found in writing, or even more extensively, in living. Everybody in this world, is but in a way or another playing the role of an orator, recognizing his division from both the interior and exterior world, talking to himself and the outside world and trying to convince himself and his audiences. Therefore each one of us is actually living rhetorically, being on our way of identifying ourselves. We would never know where the end of the identification is, for the world is always changing and we are always facing different audiences. In this sense, what the author of *Invisible Man* tries to tell is not how the protagonist strives to regain his true identity by resorting to double-consciousness of being both the narrator and the protagonist; on the flip side of the coin, the novel is a symbolic narration of a man's history of identification, which implicates that every man in this world is a rhetorician who keeps but never completes his identifying with himself and his audience.

References

- Burke, K. (2001). A rhetoric of motives. In *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present* (pp. 1324-1340). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Callahan, J. F. (1988). Frequencies of eloquence: The performance and composition of *Invisible Man*. In *New essays on Invisible Man* (pp. 55-91). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellison, R. (1980). *Invisible man*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Hanlon, C. (2005). Eloquence and "Invisible Man". *College Literature*, 32(4), 74-98.
- Kraemer, D. J. (2013). Between motion and action: The dialectical role of affective identification in Kenneth Burke. *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 16(2), 141-164.
- O'Meally, R. (1988). *New essays on Invisible Man*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, V. (1988). The meaning of narration in *Invisible Man*. In *New essays on Invisible Man* (pp. 25-47). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Szmanko, K. (2008). *Invisibility in African American and Asian American literature*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc.