T.C.

CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

POSTMODERN CHARACTERIZATION IN CONTEMPORARY BRITISH NOVEL AS REFLECTED IN D. M. THOMAS'S *THE WHITE HOTEL* AND JOHN FOWLES'S *MANTISSA*

MÜRÜVVET PINAR

YRD. DOÇ. DR. PAPATYA ALKAN GENCA

MANİSA

2014

ÖZET

Postmodern romanın önceki dönemlerde yazılan romanlardaki karakter geleneklerine karşı gelmesi ve bu gelenekleri yıkması nedeniyle postmodern edebiyatta karakter kavramı bir sorunsal teşkil etmektedir. Postmodernizmin çelişkili ve belirsiz doğasıyla ilişkili olarak, postmodern edebiyatta karakter önemli ölçüde dönüşüme uğramakta ve alışılagelmiş karakter özellikleri dâhilinde tanımlanamamaktadır. Postmodern karakter, metnin postmodernizmin ortaya koyduğu epistemolojik ve ontolojik sorunları yansıttığı bir alan olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu sebeple, postmodernizmin sorunsallaştırdığı özbenlik, kimlik, öz, tarih yazını, kurmaca ve gerçek gibi kavramlar postmodern edebiyatta karakterler üzerinden tartışılmaktadır.

Bu tez postmodern romanda karakterin nasıl ele alındığını D.M. Thomas'ın *The White Hotel* ve John Fowles'ın *Mantissa* adlı romanları üzerinden incelemektedir. Postmodernizmin ele aldığı epistemolojik ve ontolojik sorunlar dâhilinde postmodern edebiyatın geleneksel anlamda karakterden yoksun olması bu iki romandaki karakterler üzerinden örneklenmektedir. Sonuç olarak bu tezde postmodern romanda karakterlerin postmodern temaların işlenmesi ve postmodern tekniklerin kullanımında nasıl bir rol oynadığı ve bunların sonucunda postmodern edebiyatın kendi karakter geleneklerini nasıl ortaya koyduğu incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: postmodernizm, postmodern roman, postmodern karakter, D.M. Thomas, John Fowles, *The White Hotel*, *Mantissa*.

ABSTRACT

The concept of character is quite a problematic term in postmodern fiction since postmodern texts overtly subvert and transgress the conventions of characterization of the novels of previous ages. In relation to the paradoxical and ambiguous nature of postmodernism, character undergoes a radical transformation in postmodern fiction, and it cannot be pinned down with regards to the conventions of characterization. The character in postmodern fiction becomes a site where the text reverberates the epistemological and ontological concerns postmodernism rests upon. Thus, postmodern problematization of such contentious concepts as self, identity, essence, history writing, fiction, and fact is carried out and presented through postmodern characterization in the novel genre.

As such, this thesis analyzes D M. Thomas's *The White Hotel* and John Fowles's *Mantissa* to lay bare how postmodern fiction employs characterization. It aims to exemplify how postmodern fiction is deprived of characters in the conventional sense. As a result, this thesis examines how postmodern character is utilized in the employ of postmodern themes and techniques, and it shows how postmodern fiction establishes its own conventions of characterization.

Keywords: postmodernism, postmodern fiction, postmodern character, D.M. Thomas, John Fowles, *The White Hotel*, *Mantissa*.

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum "Postmodern Characterization in Contemporary British Novel as Reflected in D.M. Thomas's *The White Hotel* and John Fowles's *Mantissa*" adlı çalışmanın tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin bibliyografyada gösterilen eserlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

08/09/2014

Mürüvvet Pınar

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI

Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 03.09.2014 tarih ve 18/11 sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jürimiz tarafından Lisans Üstü Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 24. Maddesi gereğince Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Mürüvvet PINAR'ın"Postmodern Characterization in Contemporary British Novel As Reflected in D. M. Thomas's The White Hotel and John Fowles'sMantissa" konulu tezi incelenmiş ve aday 08/09/2014 tarihinde saat 14.00'da jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini savunmasından sonra 90 dakikalık süre içinde gerek tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından jüri üyelerinin sorduğu sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin,

BAŞARILI olduğuna ☒   OY BİRLİĞİ ☒

DÜZELTME yapılmasına * ☐   OYÇOKLUĞU ☐
  ☐

RED edilmesine **   ile karar verilmiştir.

* Bu halde adaya 3 ay süre verilir.
** Bu halde adayın kaydı silinir.

BAŞKAN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Papatya ALKAN GENCA
(Danışman)

ÜYE   ÜYE
Yrd. Doç. Dr.Mahinur AKŞEHİR UYGUR   Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL

Evet   Hayır
*** Tez, burs, ödül veya Teşvik prog. (Tüba, Fullbright vb.) aday olabilir
  ☐   ☐

Tez, mutlaka basılmalıdır
  ☒   ☐

Tez, mevcut haliyle basılmalıdır
  ☐   ☐

Tez, gözden geçirildikten sonra basılmalıdır.
  ☐   ☐

Tez, basımı gereksizdir.
  ☐   ☐

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> "I believe that all novels […] deal with character,
> and that it is to express character"
>
> (Woolf, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* 9)

Postmodern fiction[1] is marked by its deliberate subversion of the conventions of characterization, and characterization is regarded to be one of the most significant markers of the postmodern text. Distinguished by an overt self-reflexivity, it explores and speculates on the ontological status of its characters, and it puts an evident stress on the fictional, textual, and constructed nature of characters. While metafictions and historiographic metafictions extensively rely on their characterization in order to underscore the textuality of the text and problematize historiography, characterization also becomes a significant device in the employment of such narrative strategies as intertextuality, parody, collage, and rewriting. Simultaneously utilized and exploited in postmodern texts, characterization obtains a distinctively unique status in contemporary fiction. Hence, this thesis focuses on the employment of characterization in postmodern fiction. Discussing how postmodern characters transgress the technical and thematic conventions of characterization in the novels of the previous ages, it demonstrates how characterization is utilized in postmodern fiction in laying bare the postmodern quality of the text.

Even though the study of characterization is often assumed to be the analyses of characters in terms of their traits, their cultural, historical, and autobiographical references, and their developments throughout the text, characterization has numerous epistemological and ontological facets. Literary characterization has undoubtedly undergone radical technical and thematic changes in the course of literary history. These drastic, innovative, and revolutionary changes with regard to characterization have occurred mostly in relation to the emergence of new literary genres and new artistic movements; or, characterization has evolved mostly as a reaction to the previous modes and employments of characterization. Therefore, before postmodern characterization can be discussed, how characters are specifically and differently rendered in the literary

texts of previous ages and how literary theory elaborates upon characterization before postmodernism should be thoroughly interrogated.

Characterization is evidently an inseparable constituent of a literary work as confirmed by numerous literary critics and theorists. Roland Barthes, for instance, indicates that "there is not a single narrative in the world without characters" (105). On a similar note, Héléne Cixous states that "[c]haracter occupies a privileged position in the novel or the play: without character, passive or active, no text. He is the major agent of the work, at the center of a stage that is commanded by his presence, his story, his interest. Upon his life depends the life of the text" (386). Even though the term character etymologically comes from Greek *kharattein,* which means "the drawn, written, preserved sign" (Cixous 386), it is designated by a great variety of concepts throughout the history of literary theory such as agent (Aristotle), actor (Aristotle), dramatis persona (Vladimir Propp), actant (Algirdas Julien Greimas), and people (E. M. Forster).

No matter whichever term is used, the concept of character has been critically elaborated since the emergence of the first theoretical texts. First theoretical writings about literary characterization specifically dwelled upon how dramatic work should render characterization. Aristotle's *The Poetics,* which is one of the earliest texts of literary theory, for instance, regards characterization as one of the six essential constituents of a dramatic work, and he asserts that characterization should be conducted on mimetic premises. Thus, he states that "[t]he objects the imitator represents are actions, with agents who are necessarily either good men or bad" (21). Aristotle indicates that "the agents represented must be either above our own level of goodness, or beneath it […] since the line between virtue and vice is one dividing the whole of mankind" (21). Moreover, he specifies literary agents according to the sub-genre of the work, and he contends that comedy should portray lower-class characters while tragedy should display those from upper class. Horace's *Art of Poetry* similarly underlines the importance of characterization in a literary work. Horace talks about the requirement of the portrayal of coherent characters in a text. Accordingly, he claims that characters in a literary work should act compatible with their social, sexual, and age-wise context. Furthermore, he draws attention to the necessity of the consistency and the gradual development of a character within the text. Thus, he addresses to the dramatist

saying that "you must note the manners of each several age, and their fitting hue must be given to the tempers which change with the years" (70).

While ancient dramatic texts portrayed characters who were either good or evil, in medieval literature, both secular and religious texts similarly rendered extremely stereotypical and unrealistic characters. For instance, medieval epics such as *Beowulf*, *Tain bo Cuailnge*, and *Nibelungenlied* displayed characters who were significantly far-fetched from real life. Heroic characters in medieval epics were characterized by their exhibition of extreme power and strength. They are usually portrayed involving in personal fights with dragons, bulls, and spellbound creatures to demonstrate their loyalty to their country and to gain a lifelong reputation. Thus, heroic characters in the medieval epics were utilized as a vehicle to convey heroic codes and the values of the age. Even though a major part of the heroic medieval verse was based upon actual battles and historically existent rulers, kings, and warriors, heroic values were still reinforced by means of characters who accomplished unrealistic deeds. For instance, although *The Battle of Brunanburh* and *The Battle of Maldon* were based on actual battles; the characters of these texts demonstrated an exaggerated heroism. Thus, they did not give a true account of history; on the contrary, they represented the heroic values of the age by way of a larger than life characterization.

Romance, which was another popular genre of the period, was similarly recognized by its stereotypical and unrealistic characterization. Presenting such characters as knights, princesses, princes, kings, and queens, medieval romances depicted imaginary, mythological, and fantastical characters. Romance characters were presented in an overtly idealized manner. They went on quests, accomplished noble deeds, and displayed excessive physical strength as exemplified in *Le Morte d'Arthur* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. Furthermore, they exhibited an extreme loyalty and commitment to their ladies, knights, countries, and rulers. Thus, their portrayal was detached from real-life people; instead, they were types and representatives of aristocratic values such as chivalry, and courtly love, or the vices of the nobles.

Religious works of medieval literature such as mystery, miracle, and morality plays were also characterized by their extremely stereotypical, allegorical, and accordingly flat characters. For example, mystery and miracle plays which enacted Biblical stories such as "cosmological history of the world in Christian time, [...] God's

creation, […] incarnation, passion and resurrection of Christ, […] eschaton, the future time of the Last Judgement" (Beckwith 45) made use of allegorical characterization so as to embody the divinities. Allegorical characterization was most evidently utilized in the morality plays of the period. Morality plays aimed at didactically equipping its audience with morally good deeds. While they portrayed the constant conflict between the evil and the good, they thematically demonstrated the cycle of "alienation from God and return to God" (King 240). Morality plays relied on *prosopopoeia* (i.e. personification) in their characterization, and they presented moral ideals, supernatural beings, human categories, and human attributes as characters (King 241). Written in the fifteenth century *Everyman* and *Mankind* were the two most significant morality plays of the period that exemplified the allegorical function of characterization in medieval literature. In these plays Mercy, Mischief, God, Death, Fellowship, Kindred, Knowledge, Beauty, and Strength, just to name a few, were presented as characters who tried either to tempt or redeem the protagonist. In addition, the protagonists of the plays who were respectively Everyman and Mankind were also allegorical in that they represented the entire humanity along with its weaknesses, strengths, desires, and fears.[2]

Written in the fourteenth century, *The Canterbury Tales* (*TCT*) by Geoffrey Chaucer portrayed characters who were relatively close to real-life people in their real-life conditions. Howard R. Patch points out that the variety of the tales represents "the whole character of English life in Chaucer's day" (2). Despite its affinity with the lives of ordinary people and its portrayal of down-to-earth characters, characterization in *TCT* was, in fact, quite stereotypical. The characters were not given proper names; instead, they were types that represented different estates of the period. Thus, as Patch exemplifies, in *TCT* "[t]he Knight has been to all places where it is necessary that a typical knight should go; the Franklin is the typical Epicurean, and the Monk is your perfect hunting parson of a later age" (13). Even though Chaucer's characters transgressed the overtly fantastical and allegorical nature of other examples of medieval literature, they simultaneously displayed "the mannerism of Medieval romantic literature" (Patch 2). Thus, in relation to the stereotypical rendition of characters in Medieval literature, each pilgrim was presented as "the best of his kind, or the extreme of his type" (Patch 2) in *TCT*.

Contrary to medieval literature, dramatic texts of the Renaissance and Restoration literature abandoned purely allegorical characterization in favour of more down-to-earth and lifelike portrayals. The plays written in those periods aimed at reviving the old doctrines of the classical genres. Dramatic works of both the Renaissance and Restoration removed everyday objects, actions, and people from the stage, and they adhered to the conventional distinction between comedy and tragedy characters as it was the case with classical literature. While tragedies of the Renaissance and Restoration portrayed people of nobility in elevated language, comedies were distinguished by their adoption of a relatively low style and use of bawdy language. Such playwrights of the Renaissance as William Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe, for instance, wrote historical plays, in which, they depicted kings and their lives. Most significantly, Shakespeare's tragedies focused on the tragic downfalls of aristocratic characters such as Hamlet, Macbeth, and King Lear. Restoration comedies such as William Wycherley's *The Country Wife* and George Etherege's *The Man of Mode,* on the contrary, depicted witty and glamorous characters, whose lives revolved around sexual intrigue.[3] [4]

As a result, characters of literary works up until the eighteenth century were different from the characters of the novel genre in terms of their psychological depth, complexity, and development. Overtly detached from real-life people, characters in previous centuries mostly functioned as representatives of the manners, morals, and the values of the nobility or the Catholic Church. However, with the emergence of the novel genre in the early eighteenth century, literary characterization underwent a radical transformation. Indeed, the novel is significantly characterized by its innovative rendition of characters, and characterization distinguishes the novel genre from the classical and medieval genres. Hence, the birth of the novel genre and the reasons that gave rise to it should be thoroughly examined so as to comprehend the drastic transformation of characterization in the eighteenth century.

Literary genres emerge and are shaped in relation to their social, political, historical, economic, and cultural contexts, and this was most evidently the case with the birth of the novel. Even though there is no definite consensus regarding its first example and the exact time when it first emerged, the novel genre is thought to come into being in the early eighteenth century in relation to major social and economic

changes occurring at the time.[5] At the beginning of the early eighteenth century, agricultural society started to be replaced by an industrial society. As a result of industrialism and changing economic order, middle class started to gain a distinct economic, political, and social power in society while aristocracy's domineering status started to relatively decrease in the early eighteenth century.

The new economic and social order and especially the rise of the middle class became profoundly influential in the domain of literature in multiple respects. Industrialism accelerated printing industry and paved the way for the easy, fast, and cheap circulation of the printed material. Industrial processes of printing caused an increase in the number of printed material and reduced the cost rendering both literary and non-literary texts available not only for the aristocracy but also for the middle class. Moreover, as the middle class gained a distinct economic power, they became more invested in getting a better education. Accordingly, this resulted in an increase in literacy, and middle class constitutued a new reading public. Produced and read by the aristocracy, literature used to represent the experiences, values, and the manners of the noble class in the previous ages; however, the emergence of the middle class as a dominant force also resulted in a change in the way literature is produced and consumed. Middle class's acquisition of a distinct economic, social, and cultural position and their easy access to the printed material resulted in an implicit demand for representation of their experiences, needs, and ordinary lives. Thus, no longer limited to the aristocracy, literature became a means of representing the way the middle class lead its life.

As such, such a demand brought up realistic representations with regards to characterization as opposed to the depictions of idealized and larger than lives. In his renowned book *The Rise of the Novel*, Ian Watt calls the realistic orientation of the eighteenth-century novelists "formal realism" (32), which he defines as

> the premise, or primary convention, that the novel is full and
> authentic report of human experience, and is therefore under an
> obligation to satisfy its reader with such details of the story as the
> individuality of the actors concerned, the particulars of the times
> and places of their actions, details which are presented through a

more largely referential use of language than is common in other
literary forms. (32)

"Formal realism" was not consciously and deliberately used by the novelists of the
period (Watt 33); in this sense, it is a retrospective claim. Yet, the realistic
representation of the human experience in its realistic setting and socio-historical
context was the most discernable characteristic of the eighteenth-century novels
according to Watt. This realistic orientation of the eighteenth-century novel is most
evidently reinforced by the portrayal of realistic, ordinary, and down-to-earth
characters. Contrary to previous depictions of literary characters who are exceedingly
idealized, stereotypical, and far-fetched from real life, the eighteenth-century novel is
distinguished by its depiction of idealized, life-like, and probable characters in their
authentic environments. While characterization in the previous forms of literature had
focused on types such as damsels-in-distress, knight errants, and heroes of extreme
physical strength and classified characters as either good or evil, the eighteenth century
novel confounded the portrayal of such larger-than-life characters. Instead, it refrained
from embellishment with regard to characterization in order to maintain authenticity.
Accordingly, it depicted real-life characters with real life professions such as doctors,
prostitutes, merchants, tradesmen, physicians, lawyers, and convicts. Daniel Defoe, for
instance, represented both female and male characters from a great variety of
professions. Not only did he depict middle class tradesmen and adventurer merchants
such as Robinson Crusoe and Captain Singleton but he also portrayed prostitutes and
courtesans such as Moll Flanders and Roxana. While Henry Fielding depicted the
maturation processes and experiences of lower-class male characters such as Joseph
Andrews and Tom Jones, Samuel Richardson's novels revolved around female
protagonists such as Pamela and Clarissa who tried to preserve their virtues as they
strive to fit into the society they lived in.

Hence, one of the key features of characterization in the eighteenth-century
novels was their verisimilitude, namely, their likeness to truth. In *The Anatomy of the
Novel*, Marjorie Boulton underlines *verisimilitude* as one of the essential characteristics
of the novel proper. Moreover, she contends that a novelist should operate like a
historian in his representation of characters. She states that just like a historian, "a
novelist uses selection and pattern to try to make sense of the muddled turbulence or

dreary chuggings of human life and to give them a clear casual sequence" (15). In this respect, the novelists of the eighteenth century empowered lifelikeness of characters by complying with actual settings and inscriptions of exact dates. Furthermore, they deliberately gave characters proper names to reinforce authenticity. It should be noted that the tradition of giving characters proper names, in fact, did not start with the novel genre. Indeed, "[c]haracters in previous forms of literature, of course, were usually given proper names" (Watt 18). However, the use of proper names in the eighteenth-century novel was based on a different epistemology than it had been in the previous ages. Earlier forms of literature utilized "historical," "characteristic," "non-particular," and "unrealistic" proper names "which excluded any suggestions of real and contemporary life" (Watt 18-9). As opposed to this, eighteenth-century novelists gave their characters common proper names and surnames "to suggest that they were to be regarded as particular individuals in the contemporary social environment" (Watt 19). Thus, by "naming [them] in the exactly the same way as particular individuals are named in ordinary life" (17), the novelists of the era aimed for "particularization" (Watt 17) with regard to characterization.

In addition, not only were the characters given proper names but also the names of the characters were mostly the titles of the novels so as to mark these books as personal histories rather than fictional accounts. Thus, the titles, which combined such expressions as "tale," "life," "fortunes," adventures," "memoirs," "expedition," "history," "true history" (Goring 91) with the names of the protagonists, reinforced the lifelikeness of actions and characters; moreover, they created the illusion that novels were authentic accounts of the lives of actual people.

The rise of individualism and characterization in the eighteenth-century novel are closely related. Even though individualism was conceptualized in the mid-nineteenth century (Watt 60), its foundations were, in fact, laid in the early eighteenth century in relation to the major social and economic changes occurring at the time (Watt 60-1). Watt indicates that the shift from agricultural society to industrial society, and the rise of industrial capitalism resulted in an individualistic society which is governed by individual pursuits of wealth, economic achievement, advantage, and profit. In this respect, individualism in the eighteenth century was developed in relation to this new economic and social order. Watt explains economic individualism as follows:

Capitalism brought a great increase of economic specialization; and this, combined with a less rigid and homogenous social structure, and a less absolutist and more democratic political system, enormously increased the individual's freedom of choice. For those fully exposed to the new economic order, the effective entity on which social arrangements were now based was no longer the family, nor the church, nor the guild, nor the township, nor any other collective unit, but the individual: he alone was primarily responsible for determining his economic, social, political and religious roles. (61)

Therefore, the eighteenth-century novel is distinctively marked by its rendition of characters who displayed economic individualism. Contrary to the preceding poets and playwrights such as Edmund Spenser, William Shakespeare, John Donne, Ben Jonson, and John Dryden "who tended to support the traditional economic and social order and had attacked many of the symptoms of emergent individualism" (Watt 61), novelists such as Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, and Samuel Richardson drew "heroes of economical individualism" (Watt 62). While earlier literary texts distinctively focused on lineage in the depiction of a character, the eighteenth-century novel character is distinguished by its economic self-sufficiency within society. Instead of depending family names and certain places in the rendition of characters, these texts rendered characters in their individual states. In this respect, heroism, physical strength, loyalty, nobility, and aristocratic background were no longer necessarily regarded as the essential qualities of literary characters. On the contrary, individualism of the characters was suggested to be contingent upon their self-accomplished economic statuses and self-sufficiency within the capitalist society.

Even though the novel in England came into being in the eighteenth century, it was in the nineteenth century that it established itself as a distinct genre. It was also in the nineteenth century that the novel genre started to be evaluated within a theoretical framework. Published in 1884, "The Art of Fiction" by Henry James was a significant critical text that presented an anatomy of the nineteenth-century novel. In his article, James draws attention to the mimetic function of the novel genre claiming that "[t]he only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does attempt to represent life" (30). In

addition, he draws an analogy between the novel and painting to emphasize the representative function of the former. He resembles "the art of the novelist" to "the art of the painter" contending that they both aim at giving a realistic impression of life:

> Their inspiration is the same, their process (allowing for the different quality of the vehicle) is the same, their success is the same. They may learn from each other, they may explain and sustain each other. Their cause is the same, and the honor of one is the honor of another. (30)

Not only does James see an analogy between painting and the novel, but he also associates the novel with history writing in that both take life as their subject matter. He claims that similar to history, "[t]he subject matter of fiction is stored up […] in documents and records" (30). In relation to this, he argues that the novel "must speak with assurance, with the tone of the historian" (30).

On a similar note, in her novel *Adam Bede*, George Eliot devotes a whole chapter inscribed in the novel to elaborate upon the realist novel of the period. Eliot interrupts the novel amidst the story, and she self-defensively explains the style of her novel, which is overtly realistic. She contends that even though "it is a very hard thing to say the exact truth" (152), an author should do his best for reflecting the reality:

> The mirror is doubtless defective; the outlines will sometimes be disturbed, the reflection faint or confused; but I feel as much bound to tell you as precisely as I can what that reflection is, as if I were in the witness-box narrating my experience on oath. (151)

As far as characterization is concerned, Eliot advocates realistic representations of characters in a novel rather than rendition of stereotypes. As Eliot argues, the idealized and stereotypical characters of previous forms of literature reflect neither the reality of society nor the lives of ordinary people. Hence, she asserts that a novelist should always cast his characters from his environment, and that he should portray characters who represent the everyday struggles of ordinary people. In *Adam Bede*, Eliot clarifies her understanding of characterization as follows:

There are few prophets in the world; few sublimely beautiful women; few heroes. I can't afford to give all my love and reverence to such rarities: I want a great deal of those feelings for my everyday fellow-men, […] whose faces I know, whose hands I touch, for whom I have to make way with kindly courtesy. (154)

As demonstrated in the critical essays of James and Eliot, the nineteenth-century novel was distinguishably characterized by its realistic representation of the social realities of the era. The realistic orientation of the nineteenth-century novel was an outcome of a social transformation which was mainly caused by the Industrial Revolution (1780-1840). The scientific and technological advances, the innovations in engineering, as well as the developments in transportation and communication promoted industrial production and capitalism, and opened up new professions. However, while the Industrial Revolution increased the economic and social power of the middle class, it also bred a working class who work on small wages and live in poor conditions. As a result, this working class became the very source and material for characterization in the nineteenth-century novel, thereby expanding its focus.

Informed by the socio-economic conditions of their time, the novelists of the period deliberately aimed to reflect the society they lived in as well as its people in the most realistic way possible. The prominent novelists of the period such as Charles Dickens, George Eliot, William Makepeace Thackeray, Anthony Trollope, and Elizabeth Gaskell concerned themselves with giving a true picture of the industrial contemporary society. In this sense, the nineteenth-century novel, which is specifically characterized by its focus on social realities, portrayed individuals who struggle to survive in an industrial society. Accordingly, the novelists drew characters who acted and spoke compatible with their economic, social, and cultural statuses so as to maintain realism. Dickens and Gaskell, for instance, depicted characters from middle class and working class, and they aimed to represent the realities of the industrial urban life of their time. On the other hand, while Gaskell distinctively depicted female characters and their struggles in making a living in industrial society, Eliot represented the lives of the people in the rural area in a realistic mode.

The novel genre was primarily representational in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novel with regard to its plot, setting as well as characterization.

However, in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, it underwent an overt transformation. It became considerably innovative and experimental both technically and thematically. Such innovation and experimentation are now considered to be the markers of modernism. Modernism, which had its origins in the late nineteenth century, emerged as a consequence of grand historical, social, philosophical, scientific, economic, and political changes of *fin-de-siècle* Europe.

One of the most significant characteristics of the era that gave rise to cultural modernism was the extreme social modernization due to technological progress and industrialism. The increase in the number of factories led people to emigrate from rural areas to cities to work, and this emigration stimulated urbanization. The developments of the railways eased and quickened transportation, and not only did such advances give rise to mass transportation but they also sustained mobility for individuals. Furthermore, the invention of the electrical telegraph was quite revolutionary in that it accelerated communication. In short, such advancements in architecture, communication, transportation, and technology altered the way people lived; more importantly, they transformed the way the novel genre presented and represented character and their experience.[6]

In addition, major scientific and philosophical developments that took place in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries immensely influenced the way characterization was rendered. Published in 1859, Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* introduced the groundbreaking theory of evolution. Darwin's contention that all living animals come from a common descent demolished the notion of life as God's design, and it undermined the religious explanations of creation. Hence, the theory of evolution disconcertingly revolutionized people's perception of humanity as essentially superior, and it resulted in skepticism toward religion's certainty.

On the other hand, Karl Marx's *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) written in collaboration with Friedrich Engels as well as his *Das Kapital* (1867) brought a serious criticism to capitalism drawing attention to its unjustness, contradictions, and duplicity. Examining the socio-economic process, Marx criticized the advantaged classes's legitimation of their own conditions. Marx's philosophy was an intellectual challenge to the capitalist economic and social order ruled by the economically and socially

advantaged bourgeois class, and it laid bare how modernization, technology, and industrialism commodified and exploited the labour force.

However, a more groundbreaking influence came with Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytical theory as far as literature is concerned. Hence, as Nicole Ward Jouve points out, "[t]hroughout the twentieth century, in the West, psychoanalysis has had a huge impact on how human beings think of their own mental and psychic life. It has led to new ways of looking at art, new ways of reading texts, literature in particular" (245). Freud's discovery of the unconscious, his division of the psyche into three components as id, ego, super-ego, and his interpretation of dreams to unfold the unconscious made a breakthrough in understanding the human psyche. Freud's psychoanalytical theory shattered the notion of the human mind as ordered and rational; indeed, it suggested a new perception of the human psyche, which is chaotic, repressive, irrational, and driven by impulses.

Such developments in the philosophical and scientific realm are coupled with the historical events that impacted modernism as an artistic mode. Hence, modernism was an artistic and intellectual outcome of modernization, philosophical, scientific developments, the destruction of the war, and the disillusionment in its aftermath. Regarding the multiple factors that contributed to the rise of modernism, Michael Levenson asserts that

> The catastrophe of the First World War, and before that, the labor struggles, the emergence of feminism, the race for empire, these inescapable forces of turbulent social modernization were not simply looming on the outside as the destabilizing context of cultural Modernism; they penetrated the interior of artistic invention. They gave subjects to writers and painters, and they also gave forms, forms suggested by industrial machinery, or by the chuffing of cars, or even, most horribly, the bodies broken in war. (4)

The use of modern technology, machinery as well as chemical weapons in the First World War, for instance, altered the nature of warfare. As the use of new technologies maximized and aggravated the damage of the war, people were disillusioned by the

modernization they created. The large number of casualty, economic loss as well as the intense physical and emotional destruction cast doubt on the institutions and the moral values of the past. Thus, the devastating effects of the First World War disrupted the notion of an ordered, rational, and comprehendible world; and, the optimistic world view was replaced by a pessimistic perception of the world which was assumed to be irresolutely chaotic and unordered. This, in return, is reflected in the literature of the era through a characterization that corresponds well with the chaotic and unordered world.

As such, modernism found its most significant reverbation in the domain of literature. Starting in the late nineteenth century, there had been an explicit break with the thematic and technical conventions of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels. Modernist novel "foreground[ed] language and technique as opposed to straightforward traditional content" (Barth, "The Literature of Replenishment" 199), and it was distinctively distinguished from its precedents in its formalistic experimentalism. Thus, such conventional formal characteristics of the novel genre as chronological narration, coherent plot structure, and single point of view were deliberately abandoned in the modernist novel. Indeed, the modernist novel propounded that "linearity, rationality, consciousness, cause and effect, naïve illusionism, transparent language, innocent anecdote, and middle-class moral conventions are not the whole story" (Barth, "The Literature of Replenishment" 203). Hence, it was characterized by its deliberate inscription of multiple narrators, shifting and multiple points of view, non-chronological sequence of events, incoherent plot structure, and a deliberate disruption of cause-and-effect development. As such, the modernist novel confounded the seamlessness of both the eighteenth- and the nineteenth-century novel. It took a deliberate flight from the ordered structure of the novels of the previous ages by means of such innovative and subversive narrative devices.

This deliberate break with the formalistic conventions of the novel genre was most notably exemplified in the rendition of characters in the modernist novel. Conventional features of characterization such as lifelikeness, coherence, and individualism were intentionally contested. Accordingly, the formal realism of the eighteenth-century and the social realism of the nineteenth-century novel were replaced by a new mode of realism, which might be called psychological realism. In *The Tradition of the Realist Novel*, Stephen Regan explains how the modernist novelists

deliberately distanced themselves from the social concerns of the nineteenth century novelists preferring instead to portray characters in their psychological reality:

> a new generation of novelists writing in the early years of the twentieth century – among them, James Joyce and Virginia Woolf – should dissent from the conventional methods of realism and express a preference for a fiction of fleeting sensations and impressions, a preference for psychological intensity rather than social comprehensiveness. (99)

Therefore, the modernist novel focused on the psychological reality of characters rather than straightforwardly representing their social realities. A deliberate focus on the psychological state of the characters aimed to represent the chaotic, irrational, and unordered human psyche. As Virginia Woolf attests in her article entitled "The Modern Fiction," "[f]or the moderns […] the point of interest, lie[d] very likely in the dark places of psychology" (162). In relation to this, the novelists of this era intentionally abandoned representing characters in their socio-economic, historical, and cultural contexts. Instead, they inclined towards depicting the inner world, struggles, and psychological conflicts of characters.

Accordingly, characterization in the modernist novel was significantly distinguished by its frequent use of the stream of consciousness technique, which served to unfold the inner reality of the characters. By way of employing the stream of consciousness or fragmented interior monologues, the modernists aspired to portray the unordered, irregular, and unorganized flow of thoughts, perceptions, impressions, and emotions of characters. In this sense, characterization in the modernist novel not only mirrored the changing reception of the human psyche and selfhood, but it also became a site where modernists resorted to formal experimentalism and employed innovative narrative techniques.

On a similar note, in *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, Virginia Woolf claims that "human character" underwent a drastic change in the early twentieth century (4). She relates the formalistically experimental and technically innovative characterization in the modernist novel mainly to the change in the meaning of reality. Likewise, in "The Modern Fiction," she asserts that the human mind "receives a myriad impressions"

(160) throughout the day to process, shape, make sense of, and reflect. In this sense, she contests the notion of reality as essentially singular, ordered, and organized. Indeed, she suggests that reality is relative, subjective, and multiple:

> Whether we call it life or spirit, truth or reality, this, the essential thing, has moved off, or on, and refuses to be contained any longer in such ill-fitting vestments as we provide. […] Life is not a series of gig lamps symmetrically arranged; life is a luminous halo, a semi-transparent envelope surrounding us from the beginning of consciousness to the end. ("The Modern" 160)

At this juncture, the modernist novel contests the conventional bond between lifelikeness of characters and the novel genre. Likewise, Woolf confounds the assumption that "it is only if the characters are real that the novel has any chance of surviving. Otherwise, die it must" (*Mr. Bennett* 10). She bases her argument on the relative and subjective nature of reality asking "what is reality? And who are the judges of reality?" (*Mr. Bennett* 10). Thus, Woolf argues that in the modernist novel, "[t]here is nothing that people differ about more than the reality of characters" (*Mr. Bennett* 10), and a character who is real to someone might be rather unreal to another person, and vice versa. In this sense, Woolf suggests that one should not "expect just at present a complete and satisfactory presentment" (*Mr. Bennet* 23) of characters in the modernist novel. Indeed, she states that one should "tolerate the spasmodic, the obscure, the fragmentary, the failure" (*Mr. Bennet* 23) in the rendition of characters.

As a result, modernist novelists intentionally depicted characters whose psychologies were displayed as fragmented and chaotic. For instance, Virginia Woolf's novels such as *Mrs. Dalloway* and *To the Lighthouse* and James Joyce's *Ulysses* were regarded to be the quintessential examples of modernism, and they were appreciated for their elaborate use of the stream of consciousness technique. By resorting to interior monologues, they represented the irregular flow of thoughts, the shifting modes, and the fluctuating emotions of characters. On a different note, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and E. M. Foster's *A Passage to India* utilized characterization in order to represent the effects of colonialism on both society and the individual's psychology. They illustrated the hazards of colonialism and imperialism by focusing on the characters's psychologies.

As the historical survey of characterization points out, conventional theories of novel characterization ostensibly focus on the representational quality of characters. Characterization in the novel has for so long aimed at giving a true picture of the human experience within the framework of the socio-economic, political, and historical circumstances of the era the characters are part of. The representational function of characterization constituted the basis of the birth of the novel genre, and characterization was employed on mimetic premises. The characters were portrayed in such a way to create the illusion that they were particular individuals. In this regard, character was assumed to "behave[…], think[…], dress[…], and function[…] roughly according to ways that are present in the culture in which the realist text originates" (A. Fokkema 57). In relation to this, the concordance of characters and their experiences with real life people and experiences constituted the main motive of the novel. On a similar note, in *Postmodern Character: a Study of Characterization in British and American Fiction*, Aleid Fokkema underscores the conventionally representational function of characters, and she states that

> [F]or a long time nothing seemed more natural than […] that characters represented human beings, that novels were about people, and that psychological motives sustained plots. […] Not to be confused with the real thing – a human being – character represents humanity in a report of people's experience, or a work of fiction that obeys artistic conventions. The author of a work of fiction mediates and interprets human experience. (18-9)

The representational basis of characterization in the novel form was so substantial that E. M. Forster calls novel characters "people" (54) in *The Aspects of the Novel* to underscore their likeness to human beings. He indicates that it is "convenient to entitle" the aspect of characterization people "since the actors in a story are usually human" (54). Moreover, he occasionally designates characters as "Homo Fictus" (63) as a derivative form of "Homo Sapiens" (63).

Even though the novel and its characters have been extensively bound up with realism since the birth of the genre, there were numerous novels written in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries that presented rather unrealistic characters. For instance, while Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* depicted unrealistic

characters which called themselves Lilliputians and Yahoos, Charles Dickens's *A Christmas Carol* portrayed ghosts as characters. In addition, while Bram Stoker's *Dracula* depicted a vampire, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* portrayed a character whose body is made of the body parts belonging to different dead people. In addition, there were also novels in which animals and inanimate objects became characters such as Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in which a great variety of animals, inanimate objects, and legendary creatures were presented as characters. In the novel many animals such as rabbit, lizard, mouse, caterpillar, duck, turtle, and cat as well as such inanimate objects as playing cards were personified and rendered as distinct characters. Set in a farmhouse, George Orwell's allegorical novel *Animal Farm* revolved entirely around animal characters fighting for their freedom. Although deviations from realistic modes of representation were present in any age, the dominant form has always been the realist mode as far as the novel genre and characterization are concerned. Thus, despite the inscription of such anti-realistic characters, "[t]he traditional theories of character in literature [generally] yielded a representational concept of character which was to become a tacit norm" (A. Fokkema 56).

The rendition of characters in the novel has undergone various changes in time; however, the tacit norm of character as expressive, representational, and mimetic has been maintained until it is explicitly challenged in and by the postmodern fiction. The modernist novel, for instance, was quite radical in its characterization due to its experimental mode. However, the shift from realism to modernism was still "not as radical as the later shift to postmodernist conventions" (A. Fokkema 57). Despite its explicit break with formal realism of the eighteenth-century novel, representational function of the character was still prevalent in the modernist novel. Indeed, the modernist novel was recognized by its focus on the psychological realities of its characters. In this respect, the modernist novel did not dismiss the notion of self, and it did not "result in a disintegration of character" (A. Fokkema 57); on the contrary, it aimed to give a true picture of the chaotic human psyche via its characters.

Nevertheless, the representational function of characterization is most overtly subverted and contested in postmodern fiction. Postmodern fiction puts forth a new outlook of character which accommodates the social transformations and new artistic expansions of contemporary society. Thus, first and foremost, postmodernity should be

examined as a social condition and a cultural mode before construing characterization in postmodern fiction.

The term postmodernism is firstly "used around 1870" by an English painter, John Watkins Chapman, to qualify paintings "that were more modern than French impressionist" (Meinert, Pardeck, and Murphy 1). However, it is around the mid-twentieth century that postmodernism achieved world-wide acclaim as an artistic mode. The concept of postmodernism is, in fact, quite problematic since it has no single, fixed, or unitary definition. As Brian McHale also underscores in *Postmodernist Fiction*, "[n]othing about this term is unproblematic, nothing about it is entirely satisfactory" (3). The definitions of postmodernism are rather various since postmodernism has become influential in a wide spectrum of disciplines from architecture to literature. Likewise, in his article entitled "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity: The Local/Global Context," Ihab Hassan marks postmodernism as an umbrella term before even suggesting a definition. Hassan states that

> [postmodernism] haunt[s] the discourse of architecture, the arts, the humanities, the social and sometimes even physical sciences […] not only academic but also public speech in business, politics, the media, and the entertainment industries; […] the language of private life styles like postmodern cuisine – just add a dash of raspberry vinegar. ("From Postmodernism" 1)

The theorists who attempt to define postmodernism differ from each other in terms of their focus, ideology, political stance, and intent. Hence, the definitions of postmodernism are not only divergent, but they are also most of the time conflicting and contradictory. Even though "no consensus obtains on what postmodernism really means" (Hassan, "From Postmodernism" 1), there is still one common ground that nearly all critics meet: postmodernism cannot be designated and defined by a single definition.

It should be noted that the multiplicity and variety of definitions with regards to postmodernism comply well with its very nature. Postmodernism is characterized by its constant interrogation and problematization of totalizing discourses. It celebrates plurality, diversity, and the continual process of problematization, and thus promotes

multiplicity with regard to its own definition as well. In "On the Problem of Postmodernism," Hassan speaks favorably on the lack of a metadiscourse, stating that "the softness of postmodernism as concept does not indicate its nugacity. Quite the opposite is the case: soft concepts generate interesting, heuristic, and productive debates" ("On the Problem" 21-2). In this respect, postmodernism can be regarded as a contested category that embraces a great variety of ideas regarding itself. These various ideas concurrently negate and support each other, and they all together suggest an epoch that welcomes multiplicity and multivocality within.

Postmodernism can be defined in relation to its precedent, modernism. Modernism refers to a cultural sphere which was both an outcome of and a reaction against modernity. As Simon Malpas contends, artistic modernism was "made up of a range of movements and formations that set out to overthrow any concensus that might exist within a given community about what art is and how it should represent the world" (17). By relying on such avant-garde movements as Surrealism, Dadaism, and Futurism, artistic modernism challenged the established styles and forms (Malpas 17), and it aimed to "shock and scandalize public taste and transform the ways in which the world could be represented (Malpas 16). In this sense, artistic modernism was marked by its distinguishing high culture from popular culture, and it regarded art as a vehicle to change the world. Contrarily, postmodernism is characterized by its refutation of both such a mission of art and the distinction of high and popular culture. Indeed, it deliberately interfuses the elements of high art and popular culture wherein it juxtaposes and superimposes these seemingly irreconcilable domains. Malpas likewise maintains that

> [T]hat art should seek to define for itself a domain separate from popular culture [is] rejected by many strands of postmodernism. So, for example, in the 'pop art' of American artists such as Roy Lichtenstein or Andy Warhol that begun in the 1950s […] the commodities of the bourgeoisie are depicted in ways that are as much celebratory as they are critical. The former, Lichtenstein, reproduced frames from comic strips as huge oil paintings that ironically capture the stock images of American popular culture in all of their sentimentality and violence. Warhol, on the other

hand, experimented with reproductions of a wide range of the objects of consumer culture, from soup cans to boxes of cleaning products and the faces of famous people including Marilyn Monroe and Richard Nixon. (20-1)

Postmodernism is the outcome of a socio-economic and cultural state of contemporary world just as modernism was the result of modernity. Around the mid-twentieth century, the world is claimed to enter a new phase, which is designated by the term postmodernity. In the post-war era, modern societies evolved into postmodern societies which are characterized by an omnipresent media, media-empowered capitalism, computer technologies, mass production, and mass consumption. Fredric Jameson focuses on the social change starting around the mid-twentieth century, and he announces this change as "the arrival and inauguration of a whole new type of society, most famously baptized postindustrial society […] but often also designated consumer society, media society, information society, electronic society or high tech, and the like" (*Postmodernism, or* 3). In his article entitled "On Postmodern Debate," Hans Bertens similarly draws attention to the culmination of what is called modernity and the arrival of a new state of society. He suggests that "postmodernism refers to the state of the world after modernity, a state that we supposedly have entered at some point in the last twenty-five years" (8). Even though Bertens uses the term postmodernism to describe the new form of society, the condition of society he refers to can be most properly called postmodernity. In this respect, postmodernism and postmodernity should be distinguished from each other as separate concepts. While postmodernism is an artistic, aesthetic, and cultural mode that comes after modernism, postmodernity designates a time period which follows modernity. Such a periodizing definition evidently marks postmodernism both as a historical concept and a reactionary mode. Thus, as Brian McHale points out, "postmodernism signifies a poetics which is the successor of, or possibly a reaction against, the poetics of early twentieth-century modernism" (*Postmodernist* 5).

In his renowned book, *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Frederic Jameson relates postmodernism mainly to the socio-economic status of contemporary societies, which he claims is ruled by late capitalism. Jameson argues that the new moment of capitalism, which dates from post-war boom in the late 1940s (*The*

Cultural Turn 3), leads to a commodification in postmodern culture (*Postmodernism, or* x). Thus, he contends that postmodernism promotes commodification of the capitalist order as opposed to the modernist critique of it:

> So, in postmodern culture, "culture" has become a product in its own right; the market has become a substitute for itself and fully as much a commodity as any of the items it includes within itself: modernism was still minimally and tendentially the critique of the commodity and the effort to make it transcend itself. Postmodernism is the consumption of sheer commodification as a process. (*Postmodernism, or* x)

Jameson perceives postmodernism as a negative concept. He neither appraises it as an aesthetic and cultural mode nor uses the concept for the description of a particular style (*The Cultural Turn* 3). On the contrary, he defines it as a

> a periodizing concept whose function is to correlate the emergence of new formal features in culture with the emergence of a new type of social life and a new economic order – what is often euphemistically called modernization, postindustrial or consumer society, the society of the media or the spectacle, or multinational capitalism. (*The Cultural Turn* 3)

Jean-François Lyotard also provides one of the most acknowledged definitions of postmodernism in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Lyotard relates postmodernism mainly to the change in the legitimation of knowledge in the economically and technologically developed contemporary society. Lyotard defines postmodernism "as incredulity towards metanarratives" (*The Postmodern* xxiv), in other words, grand narratives, grand stories, and discourses such as the Enlightenment, Marxism, science, progress, emancipation, technology, and religion. He argues that the transformations occurring since the beginning of the nineteenth century have changed the state of society. In relation to this, in "a new social and economic moment (even a system), which has variously been called media society, consumer society, the bureaucratic society of controlled consumption, or postindustrial society" (Jameson "Foreward" vii), it becomes impossible for these narratives to legitimate themselves.

22

Hence, Lyotard's conceptualization of postmodernism contests the logocentric worldview constituted by such grand narratives and their legitimating power. In this sense, postmodernism designates a state of world where totalizing discourses and narratives are rather illusionary and discourse-oriented.

As such, postmodernism has many different facets ranging from philosophical to political, aesthetical to economic, and cultural to sociological. As far as the aesthetics is concerned, postmodernism applies to a wide range of fields. Nevertheless, it receives the most profound and extensive debate in the field of literature, especially in the novel genre (Woods 49). In *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, Linda Hutcheon iterates Ortega y Gasset's contention that each epoch prefers a particular genre, and she maintains that the genre of postmodern literature is the novel (38). Even though postmodernism manifests itself in multiple literary genres, it has found a greater resonance in the novel. One should acknowledge, however, that postmodernism does not singlehandedly dominate all modes of contemporary writing (McHale, *Postmodernist* 4). Indeed, there are numerous contemporary novels written in the realist mode. However, as the postmodern mode is the discernable narrative style for most contemporary fiction, contemporary fiction is generally associated with postmodernism.

Although postmodernism has been the dominant mode since the second half of the twentieth century, one should note that postmodernism arrived rather late to the British scene. In "The Literature of Replenishment," John Barth asserts that "in the United States, in the latter 1960s and the 1970s, postmodernism enjoyed a very considerable currency, particularly with regard to […] contemporary fiction" (194). However, as far as British fiction is concerned, it was not until the 1980s that the aesthetic tendencies of postmodernism were properly exhibited. Douwe Fokkema similarly draws attention to the fact that the very interesting works of postmodern fiction appeared later in the late 1970s and 1980s (29). Likewise, Tim Woods contends that

> In the 1960s, the use of the term postmodern emerged to describe a frequent use of random techniques, mixed and merged styles, and increasingly provisional methods in certain types of fiction, although the concept only gained its dominance as a generic term in 1980s. (50)

Contemporary British fiction since 1980s has been characterized by its explicit employ of postmodern techniques, strategies, and themes. Even though postmodernism is a problematic concept, the aesthetic, thematic, and stylistic characteristics of postmodern literature are comparatively discernable. The aesthetic concerns of postmodern fiction are exceedingly bound up with the contemporary state of world where the "traditional forms of legitimation" are no longer available due to broad social and political changes (D. Fokkema, "The Semiotics" 22). Thus, postmodern fiction is marked by its problematization of metanarratives, the mediums of knowledge, as well as conventional forms of representation.

In *Postmodernist Fiction*, Brian McHale distinguishes postmodern fiction from modernist fiction in terms of the former's focus on ontological concerns. McHale maintains that while modernism's concern is epistemological, "the dominant of postmodern fiction is ontological" (10). While modernist fiction explores "the ways of how to know the world we live in and how to represent it" (D. Fokkema 20), postmodern fiction problematizes the world and the mediums that attempts to represent it. Thus, as McHale maintains, postmodern fiction explores such questions as

> What is a world?; What kinds of world are there?, how are they constituted, and how do they differ?; What happens when different kinds of world are placed in confrontation, or when boundaries between worlds are violated?; What is the mode of existence of a text, and what is the mode of existence of the world (or worlds) it projects?; How is a projected world structured? And so on. (*Postmodernist* 10)

Accordingly, postmodern fiction puts representations of historical, scientific, and cultural knowledge into question, and it problematizes how this knowledge is acquired and legitimized. In so doing, it relies on such narrative strategies as parody, pastiche, intertextextuality, and collage. Most significantly, however, postmodern fiction mainly rests upon the utilization of two narrative modes: metafiction and historiographic metafiction.

Coined by Linda Hutcheon, historiographic metafictions refer to "those well-known and popular novels which are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically

also lay claim to historical events and personages" (*A Poetics* 5). Historiographic metafictions represent the postmodern contestation of the notion of historiography as the supposedly true and objective account of history. They put into question the objectivity, availability, and transparency of historical archives, documents, letters, biographies, and autobiographies by means of which history writing functions. Transferring historically existent people, events, and documents into the fictional universe, they blur the distinction between fact and fiction, and emphasize the textuality and fictionality of the documentation upon which history writing relies.

Postmodernism problematizes historiography since it contests the hierarchical distinction between history writing and literature attesting that historiography selects, arranges, orders, and presents events using the very narrative techniques and styles literature makes use of. In "Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth," Hayden White argues that the historical events and facts are represented through emplotment, that is to say, through the different generic modes of story telling the historian opts for. He maintains that "one narrative account may represent a set of events as having the form and meaning of an epic or tragic story, and another may represent the same set of events – with equal plausibility and without doing any violence to the factual record – as describing a farce" ("Historical" 376). As White emphasizes, the employment of different generic story patterns in the representation of historical events disrupts factual accuracy, and adoption of competing narrative styles indeed elicits different perspectives on the same set of events. In relation to this, "emplotment produces not so much another, more comprehensive and synthetic factual statement as, rather, an interpretation of the facts" ("Historical" 376), and rhetorical elements, generic forms, as well as narrative techniques used in history writing transform events into stories in which fictionality becomes indispensable.

It should be noted that historiographic metafictions do not deny or disregard the events of the past; instead, they become a site where history writing and historical documentation are problematized. They underscore the impossibility of a complete acquisition of historical knowledge in the postmodern state where everything is exceedingly discursive and textual. In relation to this, they rely heavily on such documental forms as letters, memoirs, journals, newspapers, and postcards. While they sometimes utilize actually existent sources, sometimes they replicate such texts. As

such, they constantly obscure the distinction between what is fictional and factual, and highlight the impossibility of neutrality and objectivity in history writing.

Postmodern fiction also depends heavily upon metafiction. In *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction,* Patricia Waugh defines metafiction as "a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality" (2). Indeed, postmodernism is marked by its overt contestation against the singularity of reality. It asserts that within contemporary culture, language constructs and maintains people's sense of everyday reality (Waugh 3), and thus everything becomes discursive and textual:

> The simple notion that language passively reflects a coherent, meaningful and 'objective' world is no longer tenable. Language is an independent, self-contained system which generates its own 'meanings'. Its relationship to the phenomenal world is highly complex, problematic and regulated by convention. (3)

This kind of contestation manifests itself as a deliberate eradication of the sense of real in fiction. The realist novel has a "shared nature of reality" which anticipates the creation of the "illusion that the characters are real people living in the real world" (Acheson and Rose 2). Accordingly, it attempts to conceal the constructed nature of the text by creating a supposedly seamless narrative in which characters and events are represented faithful to reality.

Nevertheless, postmodern fiction regards reality as a problematic term, and it emphasizes that "what constitutes reality is a matter for speculation and debate" (Acheson and Rose 2). It sees conventional representations on mimetic premises as insufficient and redundant to project the condition of contemporary societies. Instead, it promotes the plurality of reality by dismissing the so-called seamless and objective representations in the realist novel. As such metafictions prove to be overtly self-conscious and self-reflexive. They underscore the artificiality, fictionality, and textuality of the literary text by continuously referring to and commenting upon its internal structures.

As such, historiographic metafiction and metafiction extensively utilize parody and pastiche. Even though these narrative strategies have already been used in the literary works of the previous ages, they were considered central to postmodern fiction in underscoring the textuality of the historical documentation, problematizing the objectivity of history writing, drawing attention to the textuality of the fictional text as well as highlighting the limitation of the past literary forms. Although parody and pastiche are related to each other for their employments rely on the use and abuse of the past texts, they are, in fact, different from each other in terms of their motives and the way they inscribe those texts.

Parody refers to "a mocking imitation of the style of a literary work or works, ridiculing the stylistic habits of an author or school by exaggerated mimicry" ("Parody" 185). Parody is conventionally used in a derogatory sense since it wittily ridicules and mocks a certain form, convention, or a text. However, postmodern parody is a rather subversive form in its investigation, interrogation, and problematization of literary techniques, conventions, and forms. As it simultaneously utilizes and subverts the existing forms and conventions of the past texts, postmodern parody becomes "both deconstructively critical and constructively creative" (Hutcheon, *The Politics* 98). Subverting and transgressing the form and the content of an already existing text, it puts forth a new original text which is exceedingly allusive and critical all at the same time. Thus, as Hutcheon puts it, postmodern parody "paradoxically mak[es] us aware of both the limits and the powers of representation" (98). Rereading and rewriting the past texts, their characters, settings as well as narrative conventions prevailing in them, it offers stylistically and thematically a new narrative on the same set of events.

Closely related to parody, pastiche is a narrative strategy which is defined as "a literary work composed of other elements borrowed either from various other writers or from a particular earlier author" ("Pastiche" 185-6). Contrary to the subversive and critical nature of parody, pastiche is a non-subversive form of imitation. As opposed to the mimicking, mocking, undermining, and underrating motive of parody, pastiche is characterized by its neutrality in its imitation of the past forms. Fredric Jameson distinguishes pastiche from parody as follows:

> Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique,
> idiosyncratic style, the wearing of a linguistic mask, speech in a

> dead language. But it is a neutral practice of such mimicry,
> without any of parody's ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric
> impulse, devoid of laughter and of any conviction that alongside
> the abnormal tongue you have momentarily borrowed, some
> healthy linguistic normality still exists. (*Postmodernism or* 17)

Pastiche is widely-used in postmodern fiction especially in historiographic metafictions. Historiographic metafictions present pastiches of historical documents, memoirs, biographies, newspapers, and correspondences where the conventions of such forms are maintained. Perpetuating the formalistic characteristics of such texts, pastiches in historiographic metafictions blur the distinctions between fiction and fact, and they contribute to the problematization of history writing.

All these techniques translate well into how postmodern fiction employs characterization. As such, in postmodern fiction, characterization becomes a site where the problematizing, subversive, transgressive, and challenging nature of postmodernism is most explicitly and excessively reverberated. The tacit norm of character which anticipates its representational function is openly contested in postmodern fiction. This contestation is so radical and evident that that numerous literary critics and theorists suggest that the concept of character is depleted in postmodern fiction. In her article, entitled "The Character of Character," Hélène Cixous, for example, propounds "the death of the hero" in contemporary literature (386). Cixous recognizes the identification of the reader with the character as the central motive of traditional reading. She claims that in contemporary literature the reader cannot find a hero, namely a character, whom he can identify with. Thus, she defines the character's death as

> a death generally experienced by the reader as a murder, a loss,
> on which follows the reader's quick withdrawal of his investment,
> since he sees nothing more to be done with a text that has no one
> in it? No one to talk to, to recognize, to identify with. The reader
> is loath to venture into a place where there is no mirror. (387)

On a similar note, in his article entitled "Character in Contemporary Fiction," Brian Phillips emphasizes "the decline of character" (636) in contemporary fiction. He states that "[w]hile character remains essential to any idea of fictional narrative, and

involvement in character remains the signature pleasure of fiction, still, when one opens the contemporary novel, character is not precisely one finds" (635). Such expressions as the death, decline, and absence of character, as the critics suggest, refer to a crisis in legitimating the conventions of characterization in postmodern fiction. Postmodern character explicitly confounds the representational function of character, and it disintegrates the conventional character whose very being is defined in relation to his socio-economic and psychological reality.

Distinguished by its transgression of the conventions of characterization, postmodern character is an outcome of numerous problematics that lie at the very heart of postmodernism. The most significant of them is undoubtedly the postmodern perception of self. The notion of self constitutes one of the most focal questions of Western philosophy. Indeed, self, as Ihab Hassan maintains, "has become an essentially contested category, continually revised, devised, supervised, or denied" ("Quest" 428). The different perceptions developed with regards to the notion of self have substantially affected and determined the way characterization is conducted in a novel. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels, for instance, are marked by characters who display a static, essentialistic, singular, core, and centered selfhood. The novel characters of these periods represented the human-centered mind-set of the Enlightenment. The centered self is embodied in the rendition of individualistic characters who are endowed with proper names, stable configurations, and a discernable socio-economic background. In the early twentieth century, Freud's structural model of the human psyche which is constituted of id, ego, and super-ego contests the supposedly rational, ordered, and organized self. The conceptualization of the unconscious has instead propounded a new perception of self as repressed and subdued. In relation to this, the modernist novel has focused excessively on the fragmented and unorganized psychologies of characters to represent the changing perception of self. Even though this changing perception of self in the modernist novel is rather radical, it does not point at a decentering and disintegration of the self. On the contrary, it situates the centre in the unconscious.

Nevertheless, Humanistic view of self as comprehendible, intact, and singular is challenged in postmodernism, most significantly in relation to the postmodern condition as Lyotard would call it. Self becomes rather a vague concept in the postmodern mode

where everything becomes discursive, and accordingly it takes a linguistic turn. As Jaber F. Gubrium indicates, "[i]n the condition of postmodernity, the self is no longer a metanarrative, as Lyotard might put it, but one term among others for representing experience" (685). Hence, in the context of postmodern, one can no longer talk about a unitary concept of self; on the contrary, the idea of self becomes polysemous, disseminated, and diverse. These polysemic selves are often contradictory to one another, and they co-exist without culminating into a unified whole. In his article entitled "Quest for the Subject: The Self in Literature," Hassan similarly recognizes the plurality and diversity of the self, and he emphasizes that a single and static notion of self in postmodern fiction is not possible. Accordingly, he defines the chaotic state of the present society and its dismissal of self as follows:

> Ideas clash; slogans fill the air; heresies follow heresies, become dogmas within a decade. The critical laity is in disarray. Sometimes, the smoke clears, the alarums subside, revealing the abstract body of a critic signaling to us through the flames. Some spectators cry, "Chaos, anarchy, nihilism!" Others rejoice bravely in the fray, or whisper seductively with Barthes, "Happy Babel." Others still truculently proclaim, "Everything is ideology, everything politics!" How, then, see a subject, the self in literature, "plain"? There is, of course, no way but to commence with some plausible hypothesis or belief and reason our way into possibilities of that subject. ("Quest" 420)

Postmodernism posits that the current socio-economic, technological, scientific condition of society hinders an intact, core, centered, and comprehendible self. In postmodern society where the individuals are pervasively exposed to audio-visual images from all kinds of media, self becomes rather fluid and fluctuating. This is most significantly an outcome of the problematical status of reality and its representation in the contemporary world. Indeed, the representation of reality becomes largely problematic in postmodern society which is girded by computer technologies, omnipresent advertisements, and mass communication. In such a chaotic media-driven world, the conventionally immediate relationship between reality and its representation is disrupted. Reality does not simply become blurred and vague; indeed, the very notion

of reality becomes a problem itself. In *Simulacrum and Simulation*, Baudrillard argues that reality in contemporary society is in actuality a hyperreality. He maintains that the image, the sign, or the symbol no longer represents an essential referent. The conventional relationship between the real and its representation does not apply to contemporary societies where the images of electronic media have changed people's perceptions of time and space. Thus, in the postmodern condition, the real does no longer precede the image; instead the image precedes and constructs the real rather than copying it. This constructed reality refers to what Baudrillard calls hyperreality, a situation of reality which is not essentially existent but an outcome of omnipresent images:

> [The real] no longer needs to be rational, because it no longer measures itself against either an ideal or negative instance. It is no longer anything but operational. In fact, it is no longer really the real, because no imaginary envelops it anymore. It is a hyperreal, produced from a radiating synthesis of combinatory models in a hyperspace without atmosphere. (Baudrillard 1)

Baudrillard designates the image that replaces the real as simulacrum, and he contends that simulacra comes into being in four stages. In the first stage, the image or the symbol reflects "profound reality;" therefore, the image is a "good appearance" and represents "sacramental order" (Baudrillard 4). In the second stage, however, the image begins to mask and pervert basic reality thus being an "evil appearance" and of the "order of maleficence" (4). In the third stage, a certain break occurs between the reality and representation. This break marks the absence of reality, and the image becomes appearance itself. In the fourth stage, the image bears "no relation to any reality whatsoever; it is its own pure simulacrum" (Baudrillard 4).

In the postmodern state, self continues its existence only in the form of a simulacrum. It is no longer an essential and ever-present being; rather, it is a matter of display on multiple platforms of media. Postmodern self is constantly presented and represented in the media, and in the meantime, it is invaded by a great variety of images from different mediums. Hence, it becomes a commodity which is constructed, commercialized, and consumed within the capitalist order promoted by the electronic media. This kind of contention significantly rejects the anthropocentric world view

which situates the human being and the self at the center of all kinds of discourses. In the postmodern era, self does not create the images; rather, it is the images that create and construct the self. Thus, searching for a "self as a central presence in experience" (Gubrium and Holstein 685) becomes an illusion in the postmodern condition. The self instead becomes a constituent, a product, and a portion of experience.

In this regard, postmodern character becomes an embodiment of postmodernist conceptualization of self. The novel genre has conventionally attempted to promote individualism, and it has centered selfhood by the portrayal of individualistic characters with consistent identities throughout the text. Postmodern characterization, however, is marked by its subversion of such an attempt. Thus, postmodern character not only rejects allegorical names of the medieval genres but it also confounds aristocratic titles. Moreover, it is frequently portrayed fluctuating between different names. Its multiple names, identities, hence selves are constructed within the text by the other characters as well as the discourses they are imposed upon. Therefore, postmodern character shifts between different roles, and it adopts different identities in the course of narration. Its denial of singularity and stability with regard to self asserts that one can only talk about multiple selves in postmodern condition.

Postmodern character rejects the coherence, consistency, and rationality that define the anthropocentric perception of self. It disrupts the logical and biological order by means of temporal and spatial incoherence and different configurations it adopts in the course of narration. Postmodern character liberally traverses different time periods and different places by which it highlights the instable and decentered position of postmodern self. As such, postmodern character, as Fredric Jameson suggests, marks "the death of the subject itself – the end of the autonomous bourgeois monad or ego or individual" (*Postmodernism, or* 15). In relation to the postmodernist view of self that denies essence and center, postmodern character becomes extremely fragmented, discontinuous, and fluctuating.

Conceptualization of the self as constructed, fragmented, and dispersed is closely related to the poststructuralist theory.[7] Indeed, the aesthetic practice of postmodernism derives heavily from poststructuralist approaches to language and reality. Bertens also notes the parallelism between postmodernism and poststructuralism, and he argues that "the postmodern literary work begins to

approximate theory and operates within an intellectual framework that is very close to, or even identical with that of poststructuralism" (8). Poststructuralist tenants prove to be overtly influential in postmodern characterization. Poststructuralist re-conceptualization of the sign constitutes the very epistemology postmodern characterization rests upon, and postmodern fiction depends heavily upon poststructuralist views on language and discourse in characterization.

Poststructuralism is marked by its contestation against the center. It highlights the impossibility of a singular and linear relationship between the signifier and the signified due to the different cultural, ideological, and historical contexts of the perceiving subject. In this regard, it becomes the context, or the discourse of the subject that discerns the signifier that decides on the meaning. This contestation of poststructuralism disintegrates the center, which structuralism painstakingly aims to situate; and it propounds that meaning is discourse-oriented, hence plural. Likewise, Derrida states that

> It was necessary to begin thinking that there was no center, that the center could not be thought in the form of a present-being, that the center had no natural site, that it was not a fixed locus but a function, a sort of nonlocus in which an infinite number of sign-substitutions came into play. This was the moment when language invaded the universal problematic, the moment when, in the absence of a center or origin, everything became discourse-provided we can agree on this world- that is to say, a system in which central signified, the original or transcendental signified, is never absolutely present outside a system of differences. The Absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and the play of signification infinitely. (506)

Poststructuralist problematization of the sign as suggested by Derrida lies at the heart of the ontologically problematical status of postmodern character. The contestation against the conventionally singular and linear relationship between the signifier and the signified asserts itself in postmodern characters who significantly lack essence and center. In relation to the deconstruction of the conventional notion of sign, postmodern character disrupts continuity, coherence, and singularity. Indeed, it reveals

itself as a dispersed and fragmented being who rejects fixed meanings, identities, and roles. Thus, in postmodern fiction one can no longer talk about a singular referent that which postmodern character signifies. Postmodern texts, then, offer multiple selves and subjectivities that are constituted through language. In this regard, language does not function to represent individuals or an external reality in postmodern fiction; instead, it creates and constructs both the characters and the world they are within. Likewise, Aleid Fokkema states that

> [L]anguage is not an instrument of anonymous power nor is it an arbitrary system of signs that cuts us off from the real world by a representation that continuously misrepresents. It is, instead, seen as the fertile, truly creative, almost rejuvenating articulation of the world. (66)

Postmodern character which is deprived of a fixed origin becomes a linguistic being whose very existence is constructed through language within the internal structures of the text. This contention evidently recalls Derrida's renowned statement "there is nothing outside of the text" (163). In relation to this, in postmodern fiction, it is the text itself, and not an external author, that constructs character. In this sense, postmodern character becomes the product of discourses within the text. The historical, and socio-economic context of the text as well as the other characters continuingly construct deconstruct, and reconstruct the postmodern character. Thus, as Bertens contends, postmodern agent's identity is "largely other-determined, multiple, and always in process" (11). As postmodern character lacks a stable identity and is exposed to a constant construction process, it has a variety of differing roles, identities as well as configurations, rather than a stable and singular one.

As a result, postmodern character, which is constructed through language and discourse, negates the conventional notion of character which is largely perceived as the referent of human beings. As Raymond Federman indicates in *Critifiction: Postmodern Essays,* character instead becomes a "word-being" (45) in postmodern fiction. Federman emphasizes the dismissal of the conventional connotations of character in postmodern fiction, and he explains the transformation of the character into word-being as follows:

[T]he people of fiction, the fictitious beings will no longer be
called characters, well-made characters who carry with them
a fixed personality, a stable set of social and psychological
attributes (a name, a gender, a condition, a profession, a situation,
a civic identity). These surfictional creatures will be as
changeable, as volatile, as irrational, as nameless, as unnameable,
as playful, as unpredictable, as fraudulent and frivolous as the
discourse that makes them. This does not mean, however, that
they will be mere puppets. On the contrary, their being will be
more complex, more genuine, more authentic, more true to life in
fact, because since life and fiction are no longer distinguishable)
they will not appear to be what they are: imitations of real people;
they will be what they are: word-beings. (44)

As Federman points out, the concept of character becomes rather problematic in
postmodern fiction since the conventional theories of character, which revolve around
the characters's representational function, do not account for the postmodernist view of
self. Moreover, the conventional concept of character does contain neither the
problematic ontology nor the constructed nature of postmodern character. Therefore,
theorists and critics engaging in postmodern characterization put forward alternative
terms for postmodern character that will contain postmodern concerns more properly. In
an interview, for instance, Federman claims that "[c]haracters belong in old-fashioned
realistic 19th century novels" (n. pag.). Therefore, he regards "the notion of character
[as] obsolete for him," and he states that he "invents VOICES – only voices" (Amerika
n. pag.) (emphasis in the original). In a similar vein, Aleid Fokkema draws attention to
the problematical status of the concept of character, and she states that

Critics seem to agree that character is outdated, that postmodern
novel demonstrates that there are only fragile subject positions of,
that language is the only constituent of self, and that multiplicity
(of identity, of selves, of subjectivities) has superseded the
unified, coherent, old stable ego. [...] Those who adhere to this
view have no time for such critical terms as character, agent,
protagonist, or heroine. The only term that is admitted is the one

that allows for the constititutive role of language or discourse: the subject. (13)

In the discussions about postmodern character, "subject" proves to be the preferred term as it relates to the subjectivity of character stripping it from the indivisibility of the individual.[8] In addition to subject, theorists and authors also opt for such terms as "subjectivities," "figure," "cipher," and "cartoon" to designate postmodern character (A. Fokkema 60). On the one hand, these terms break the conventional bond between character and its supposed referent (i.e. human being). On the other hand, they install the elements of popular culture into the terminology of literature, which has traditionally been regarded as a part of high culture (A. Fokkema 60). In this sense, the alternative terms for postmodern character aim to contain more postmodern concerns rather than referring to the representational and individualistic perception of characterization.

As such, even though there is a loss of reality in postmodern characterization, postmodern character indeed reflects the very postmodern world where such notions as self, subject, reality, and its representation become overtly problematic. In this respect, postmodern characterization proves to be quite paradoxical. While it supposedly contests and subverts the assumed representational function of characterization, it simultaneously attempts to represent the postmodern condition as well as the postmodernist conceptualization of self. Behind this simultaneous confrontation and reliance on representation lies the problematic status of reality. Indeed the problematization of reality and its representation constitutes one of the most significant focal points of postmodern fiction. Postmodern fiction puts a great emphasis on the unavailability of a singular and objective truth in contemporary society, and it contends that one can only talk about multiple realities in the current state of the world. Regarding the loss of the sense of reality, Hutcheon asserts that

> [N]owadays everything in our culture tends to deny reality and promote unreality, in the interests of maintaining high levels of consumption. It is no longer official reality which is coercive, but official unreality, and postmodernist fiction, instead of resisting this coercive unreality, acquiesces it, or even celebrates it. This

means ironically enough, that postmodernist fiction, for all its
antirealism actually continues to be mimetic. (219)

Hence, in such a world where such notions as singular self and reality are no longer
maintained, classical realism and its conventional means of representation can represent
neither the society nor its individuals. In this respect, postmodern character becomes a
means through which the text attempts to give a picture of the contemporary society
where the real, its representation, and the self are problematical. Even though
postmodern character transgresses the conventional means of representation, this kind
of contention ironically renders postmodern characterization somehow mimetic. Thus,
as A. Fokkema indicates "such experimental characters simply constitute a new (and
sometimes superior) representation of reality" (68), and "[d]espite their apparent anti-
mimetic tendency, then postmodern characters may point to a new concept of mimesis"
(68). This new concept of mimesis as suggested by Fokkema indeed constitutes a new
mode of realism which can be referred to as postmodern realism. In "Meta-*mimesis?*
The Problem of British Postmodern Realism," Amy J. Elias similarly stresses the
shortcomings of the conventional ways of representation in representing the current
state of the world. She indicates that postmodern realism offers new ways of
representation to project the problematical status of reality and self:

> Postmodern Realism records the multiple worlds/texts within
> contemporary culture and recognizes the *inability* to evaluate
> society's conflicting values; it mimics the multiple selves of
> characters (more accurately, the self as subject within a
> textualized culture) and recognizes the problem of articulating an
> essential Self in this social context. Both of these definitions and
> limitations are realistic, postmodern Realism is true to the new
> definitions of self and society in a postmodern culture. (12)

As postmodernism and realism are seen epistemologically at opposite ends, the
term postmodern realism is quite paradoxical itself. Nevertheless, this paradox
complies well with the very nature of postmodernism at the centre of which lies
incoherence, inconsistency, and contradiction. In this respect, characterization becomes
unrepresentative and representative all at the same time in postmodern fiction. It utilizes
the conventions of the realist novel, not to reinforce verisimilitude and authenticity of

the text and its characters but to problematize reality and its representation. On a similar note, Papatya Alkan Genca regards postmodern realism a paradoxically intrinsic quality of much of contemporary fiction, and she maintains that

> [I]n an age of lost innocence, realism becomes a postmodern realism: one that still uses certain conventions such as characterization and attention to detail, yet one that is painfully aware of the limitations of such conventions. So, postmodern realism uses the realist conventions only to point at their problematic nature, acknowledging the inevitability of the embeddedness of these conventions within the novel genre. (27)

As a result, postmodern characterization proves to be rather paradoxical and inconsistent for it makes use of the conventions it problematizes, it inscribes the documental forms it interrogates, and it becomes both representational and unrepresentational at the same time. Hence, recognizing such problematics of postmodern characterization this thesis focuses on the conventions of postmodern characterization by way of examining D. M. Thomas's *The White Hotel* (1981) and John Fowles's *Mantissa* (1982) as case studies. Both novels are written around a time period when postmodernism is regarded to be at its peak in Britain. Even though a totalizing definition of the term was still non-existing, in the 1980s postmodernism has been acknowledged as a new artistic mode following and contesting modernism, and its aesthetic concerns have been recognized. On the one hand, some of the most influential theoretical texts about postmodernism were written around this period such as *The Postmodern Condition* (1979), *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981), and *Postmodernist Fiction* (1987). On the other hand, there was a significant number of novels written during this time that engage in the aesthetic tendencies of postmodernism. Being products of such a momentous and prolific time in the history of postmodern fiction, *The White Hotel* and *Mantissa* exhibit an extreme postmodern quality in terms of their technical and thematic characteristics. However, they can be regarded as postmodern most significantly in their characterization. *The White Hotel* as a historiographic metafiction and *Mantissa* as a metafiction exemplify the two most significant narrative modes of postmodernism which depend heavily upon characterization. The rendition of

characters in these novels contests the conventional theories of characterization, and displays a distinct postmodern mode.

As such, this thesis consists of an introduction, two chapters, and a conclusion. The first chapter focuses on D.M. Thomas's *The White Hotel* and examines the formation, re-formation, and de-formation of characters in the text. Since the novel is a historiographic metafiction, characterization in *The White Hotel* is examined mainly in relation to how historiographic metafiction posits and situates characters within its own narrative and technical strategies. The chapter lays bare how historiographic metafiction utilizes the historically existent people as well as documental forms in the problematization of the transparency and neutrality of history writing. Moreover, it shows how postmodern character becomes a representative of the postmodern perception of self in postmodern fiction.

The second chapter, on the other hand, concentrates on John Fowles's *Mantissa,* and it examines how characterization constitutes the technical and thematic concerns of the text. That the text is overtly metafictional becomes a focal point in the theoretical and technical discussion of the novel in relation to characterization. The chapter discusses how postmodern fiction transfers characters from one literary, cultural, and/or mythological text into another fictional text so as to underscore the intertextual nature of literature. By examining characters that comment upon the text they are part of, the second chapter demonstrates how characterization contributes to the metafictional quality of the novel.

As such, analyzing these postmodern texts, this thesis concludes that postmodern fiction rejects and subverts the conventions of the realist novel's characterization, and it creates its own conventions with regards to characterization.

CHAPTER ONE

"THE SOUL OF A MAN IS A FAR COUNTRY, WHICH CANNOT BE APPROACHED OR EXPLORED:" POSTMODERN CHARACTERIZATION IN D.M. THOMAS'S *THE WHITE HOTEL*

D. M. Thomas (Donald Michael Thomas) is regarded one of the most significant novelists of contemporary British literature. Born in 1935 in Redfurth, he had a relatively sheltered early childhood in Cornwall (Nicol, "Thomas D. M." 359). After attending Trewirgie Primary School and Redruth Grammar School in his hometown, Thomas and his family moved to Melbourne, Australia. The long journey to Australia not only had a considerable impact on Thomas's psychology at the time, but it also had a lasting impression on him especially with regard to his fiction. As Bran Nicol notes, journey becomes a recurring motif and symbol in his poems as well as in his novels in the following years ("Thomas D. M." 359). After returning to England, Thomas did his National Service during which he studied Russian. Learning Russian initiated Thomas's career as a translator and had a great impact on his writing since his acquaintance with Russian texts catalyzed some of his novels, most notably, *The White Hotel*, which was inspired by Anatoli Kuznetsov's novel, *Babi Yar: A Document in the Form of a Novel.* Having completed his National Service, Thomas studied English at Oxford and published a short story titled "The Opportunist" in the university magazine, which marked his entry into the literary arena. Moreover, Thomas also started writing poetry when he was a student. After graduating, he taught English at Teignmouth Grammar School and later at Hereford College of Education during which he continued writing poetry, and he became an established poet (Nicol, "Thomas D. M." 359). After the closure of Hereford College, Thomas became a full time writer and published his first novel *The Flute Player* in 1979.

Thomas is quite a productive writer and has published numerous non-fiction and fiction including several novels and poetry collections. His novels are *The Flute-Player* (1979), *Birthstone* (1980), *The White Hotel* (1981), *Ararat* (1983), *Swallow* (1984), *Sphinx* (1986), *Summit* (1987), *Lying Together* (1990), *Flying in to Love* (1992), *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1993), *Eating Pavlova* (1994), *Lady with a Laptop* (1998),

and *Charlotte* (2000).[9] His poetry collections are *Personal and Possessive* (1964), *Two Voices* (1968), *The Lover's Horoscope* (1970), *Logan Stone* (1971), *The Shaft* (1973), *Lilith-Prints* (1974), *Symphony in Moscow* (1974), *Love and Other Deaths* (1975), *The Rock* (1975), *Orpheus in Hell* (1977), *The Honeymoon Voyage* (1978), *Protest* (1980), *Dreaming in Bronze* (1981), *News From the Front* (1983), *Selected Poems* (1983), and *The Puberty Tree* (1992).

As a novelist, poet, playwright, biographer, translator, memoirist, and academic, Thomas writes in a great range of generic plurality. Even though he started his professional writing career as a poet, his novels have always received more attention than his poems from both the critics and readers. However, as Nicol notes, "[c]ritical opinion about [Thomas's] work has tended to be sharply divided between those who laud his writing as powerful and innovative, and those who find something reprehensible about the books and the author who wrote them" (*D.M. Thomas* 1). Most notably, Thomas's employ of such subject matters as sex, violence, and the Holocaust in his fiction in the most explicit ways has caused heated debates. While he has been praised for his symbolic way of elaborating on these subject matters and his technicality, he has also been criticized for his repulsive and pejorative depictions. Natasha Walter, for instance, wrote a negative review on Thomas's *Pictures at an Exhibition* focusing on the intertwined presentation of sexuality and the Holocaust. She openly indicates that the "growing feeling of distaste turns to disgust […] when Thomas lets his imagination run amok with the pornography of suffering" (n. pag.). She also expressed her dissatisfaction with the novel claiming that "[r]eaders [of the novel] will receive the impression that Auschwitz was an orgy, only occasionally interrupted by the transports and the genocide" (n. pag.). Moreover, Walter also criticized the technicality of the novel indicating that

> There is nothing to rejoice over stylistically in this tangled web,
> nothing to make us believe that the mess is deliberate and the
> result of a grandly ironic masterplan. Rather, the characterizations
> and motivations are sketchy, with clichés and stereotypes verging
> on the ludicrous. (n. pag.)

As opposed to Walter's critique, Frederick Busch, for instance, regarded "Thomas's construction of a narrative puzzle that [the reader] become eager to unlock [as]

masterly" (n.pag.). Moreover, regarding the joint depiction of sexuality and the Holocaust, he claimed that Thomas offers "a truth about human nature," and he "seek[s] to establish or invalidate the horror of the Holocaust as a higher order of truth about humanity" (n. pag.). *Charlotte*, Thomas's rewriting of Charlotte Brönte's *Jane Eyre*, likewise received quite contradictory reviews as is the case with *Pictures at an Exhibition*. *Publisher's Weekly*, for example, provides a highly negative review on the novel. It regards "Thomas's pastiche of Brönte […] so dreadful" (n. pag.). While it evaluates Miranda's narrative as "Eurotrash," it asserts that the book fails to justify its exploitation of Brönte's story and name" (n.pag.). The Squeee review, on the contrary, praises the novel for its quintessential employment of sexuality. It states that "[p]ursuing the unforgettable characters of Jane and Rochester through time, D.M. Thomas brings them into focus for the modern reader as their sexual and moral actions are starkly and unflinchingly exposed in this deeply entertaining work of imaginative brilliance" (n. pag.). As such, Thomas's novels have evidently received contrasting reviews; narrative techniques or themes one critic critisizes are, most of the time, appraised by another one.

Published in 1981, *The White Hotel* is by far the most popular, widely reviewed and critically evaluated novel by Thomas. Just as his other novels, it received overtly controversial and relatively hostile reviews regarding its technical and thematic aspects around the time it was first published. In his review of the novel which came one year after its publication, William H. Pritchard, for example, asserted that Thomas "exploit[s] sex'n violence" (162). Likewise, Mary Joe Hughes, who had been teaching *The White Hotel* at a college class, expressed the strong resistance of her students against the novel who perceived it as a "challenge to the most gifted psychotherapist" (38) (i.e. Sigmund Freud) as the novel problematizes the discourses of psychoanalysis. However, the harshest criticism about *The White Hotel* was in terms of the novel's technicality since it incorporates various fictional and non-fictional texts such as Anatoli Kuznetsov's documentary novel *Babi Yar: A Document in the Form of a Novel,* Sigmund Freud's case histories along with his theoretical books, and articles. Thomas was accused of plagiarizing other sources, specifically Kuznetsov's *Babi Yar,* some parts of which Thomas directly utilizes and some of which he alludes to.[10] Accordingly, Thomas's talent as an author was questioned since he was thought to have "stolen from

others to compensate for his inadequacies as novelist and translator" (Nicol, *D. M. Thomas* 6).

Nevertheless, *The White Hotel* was simultaneously appreciated. It was nominated for the Booker Prize in 1981, and it won the Cheltenham Prize in 1982. In addition, its reliance on the other texts was regarded as a postmodern strategy rather than plagiarism. As such, *The White Hotel* is claimed to be a historiographic metafiction with its engagement in intertexuality, parody and pastiche. Moreover, Thomas's expressing his debt to Kuznetsov and Freud (a)[11] on the copyright page of the novel was regarded as an explicit evidence of his intentional use in *The White Hotel*: "I also gratefully acknowledge the use in Part V of material from Anatoli Kuznetsov's *Babi Yar* … particularly the testimony of Dina Pronicheva" (*WH* n. pag.). In this respect, Thomas cannot simply be labeled as a plagiarist. On the contrary, his parodic rendition of various literary texts, historical documents, and psychoanalytical case studies needs to be read with a postmodern focus. Thomas's intentional incorporation of other fictional and non-fictional texts should be examined as his attempt to put emphasis on the intertextual nature of literature which is one of the focal points of contemporary literary theory.

The novel opens with a group of letters exchanged between Sigmund Freud (f) and the eminent psychoanalysts of the time such as Sandor Ferenczi and Hans Sachs. In one of the letters, Freud (f) mentions one of his female patients who has delivered a highly pornographic poem and its prose version to him. The letters are followed by these fictional writings which present the imaginary relationship between the unnamed female patient and Freud (f)'s son at a hotel. In the white hotel, which also gives its name to the novel, the female protagonist and Freud (f)'s son are involved in a sado-masochistic sexual relationship; moreover, they are occasionally joined by the other residents of the hotel. Then, the novel continues with a new section entitled "Frau Anna G"[12] in which Thomas replicates a case history of Freud (f). Narrated by Freud (f), the case history gives an account of the therapy sessions between him and the female patient whom he mentions in his letters. The female patient, whose name is subsequently revealed as Lisa Erdman, suffers from chronic pains on her pelvic region and left breast with no apparent physical basis. Furthermore, she complains about having bizarre dreams and hallucinations. Throughout this case study, Freud (f) seeks

the reason of Lisa's psychological disorder in her past, namely in a traumatic experience she had had in her childhood. Therefore, Freud (f) who digs into Lisa's past puts forth a diagnosis stating that Lisa's hysteria stems from her being witness to her mother and her uncle having sex. Even though Lisa occasionally hints that she has a Cassandra-like gift, that is to say, she can see future events, Freud (f) disregards her claims and puts an end to the treatment thinking that Lisa is partially recovered. After the therapy sessions, Lisa Erdman becomes an opera singer and later marries a Jewish widower who used to be her vocal partner. The plot line which starts as a story of an individual, however, evolves into an account of a historical event -Babi Yar massacre- in the following sections. Lisa and her family are exposed to brutal violence in Babi Yar and are killed savagely by the Nazi soldiers. The last section takes place in a purgatory-like place where the souls of the victims of Babi Yar as well as the dead people Lisa loves – including Freud (f) – are gathered.

As such, technically Thomas adopts a fragmented, partially non-chronological and collage-like narration. Rather than consisting of chapters, the novel is structured upon an "Author's Note," "Prologue," and six separate sections all of which illustrate a great variety of narrative techniques. Throughout the novel, Thomas utilizes verse form, prose narration, a psychoanalytical case history, epistolary form as well as such texts as postcards and memoirs by which he sustains "multiple perspectives on the same events" (Thompson 70). Each section is presented independently from both the preceding and the following sections in terms of their generic quality, narrative mode along with spatial and temporal presentations. Nevertheless, after the act of reading is complete, the sections are tied up together, and the so-called hysterical condition of the protagonist, its reasons as well as the symbolic function of the white hotel are clarified to a certain extent. Thomas H. Thompson similarly observes that "[o]nly when with the ending can the reader hope to satisfy himself about the genuine subject of this hotel" (69). Likewise, Richard K. Cross draws attention to the unordered structure of the novel and suggests that "[o]ne has to read the book back to front, with the design of the whole in mind, in order to make proper associations" (22). In the same vein, Thomas himself confirms in an interview that he has arranged the sections interrelatedly: "[i]deally I hoped someone could open the book anywhere and read a paragraph and it would make them think of some other episode in the book, some other particular image" (Wingrove

34). Thus, *The White Hotel* disrupts the chronological structure of conventional novels in which the actions are connected to each other through a cause and effect relationship. As it presents events in a non-chronological order, it does not achieve a conventional closure; on the contrary, even the last section of the novel requires turning back to its beginning in order to fully make sense of the subject matter of the entire text.

Thematically, *The White Hotel* also brings together a great variety of subject matters. Even though it basically revolves around a neurotic protagonist who dies in a massacre, it simultaneously elaborates upon "Freud, Vienna between the two world wars, forthright and abundant sexuality, The Shroud of Turin, anorexia, the massacre at Babi Yar, and migration to Palestine" (Cross 21). Furthermore, adopting a wide range of narrative modes such as realist, surrealist, and epistolary in exploring such subjects, the novel leads to multiple meaning making processes. Therefore, as Thompson notes in his review of the novel, even though "the bare story [of the novel] is quite ordinary, [e]verything depends on the author's decision to risk a literary method that combines poetic, psychoanalytic, and prophetic modes of narration in a novel palimpsest" (68).

Despite the controversial criticism and accusations of plagiarism, *The White Hotel* is now regarded as one of the most significant examples of postmodern fiction in relation to its both technical and thematic aspects. More importantly, for the scope of this thesis, the novel achieves its postmodern focus most evidently in its rendition of characters. Even though there are numerous characters, *The White Hotel* manifests postmodern narrative techniques and problematics most explicitly in the characters of Sigmund Freud (f) and Lisa Erdman. In terms of the portrayal of the eminent psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud (a) as a fictional character, *The White Hotel* points at the use of actual personages as characters in postmodern fictions. The fictionalization of Freud (a), who is an actual person, renders the novel as a text of historiographic metafiction. Furthermore, actual people's engaging in purely fictional events and their interaction with fictional characters blur the distinctions between such dichotomies as fact-fiction and fantasy-reality. Eradicating the borders between historical writing and fiction via Freud (f), the novel confounds historiography as an objective account of actual events. Moreover, parodying Freudian case histories, *The White Hotel* also problematizes the discourses of psychoanalysis, and epitomizes the collapse of grand narratives in postmodern societies as suggested by Jean-François Lyotard. In addition,

by means of its female protagonist, Lisa Erdman, *The White Hotel* explores the changing notion of self in postmodernism. In its portrayal of a character with an incurable psychological disorder and a talent of foresight, the novel calls into question the conventional concept of character that displays a centered self, individualism, and verisimilitude. By so doing, it emphasizes the postmodernist view of self which is chaotic, decentered, fragmented, and constructed via discourses. Hence, this chapter specifically focuses on Freud (f) and Lisa Erdman as postmodern characters. Analyzing these characters, this chapter examines how postmodern fiction employs characterization in laying bare the postmodern concerns and problematics.

Such employment is most explicitly achieved in the way *The White Hotel* fictionalizes Sigmund Freud (a). The transference of Freud (a) into the fictional universe qualifies the novel as historiographic metafiction. However, firstly postmodern problematization of history writing should be examined so as to understand Freud (f)'s contribution to *The White Hotel* as a historiographic metafiction. Postmodernism is marked by its overt problematization of history writing. It contests the notion of historiography as the absolute and objective representation of historical events and individuals, and it evaluates history writing as a discursive, textual practice instead. Accordingly, it eradicates the dichotomy between history/literature as well as fact/fiction, and it regards historiography as an ideological and an institutional practice. In *Tropics of Discourse*, Hayden White presents an extensive study on the problematical nature of historiography. White regards history writing as indispensable from fictionality putting emphasis on the human agent as a determining factor. According to White, the inhesion of the human agent results in an inevitable subjective characteristic in historiography. Thus, he claims that in history writing "facts do not speak for themselves, but the historian speaks for them, speaks on their behalf, and fashions the fragments of the past into a whole whose integrity is – in its representation – a purely discursive one" (125). Therefore, history writing becomes a representation of actual events not only within the limitations of archives but also within the constraints of the social, economic, political, and cultural circumstances of the historian who writes it. In this sense, White makes an analogy between the historian and the novelist claiming that both perform a representational activity. He states that

the facts exist only as a congeries of contiguously related fragments. These fragments have to be put together to make a whole of a particular, not a general, kind. And they are put together in the same ways that novelists use to put together figments of their imaginations to display an ordered world, a cosmos, where only disorder of chaos might appear. (*Tropics* 125)

The problematic status of history writing finds an overt resonance in postmodern fiction in the form of historiographic metafiction, a term coined by Linda Hutcheon. In *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, Hutcheon defines historiographic metafiction as "well-known and popular novels which are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay claim to historical events and personages" (5). She makes a distinction between the ontological existence of historical events that took place in the past and the representation of these events in writing. As she contends, historiographic metafiction acknowledges the empirical existence of historical events; however, it simultanously problematizes the notion of history writing as objective and true accounts of the historical events. Hutcheon further asserts that postmodernism perceives historical knowledge as quite problematic since it claims that historical events are only available through signifying systems. Hence, it emphasizes the impossibility of objectivity and singularity in the representation of actual events. This challenge to the supposedly objective, neutral, transparent, and impersonal historiography results from the recognition of history writing as an ideological, relative, and subjective discourse which rests on textuality. Hutcheon regards historiography as a human construct rather than the objective accounts of the past, and she accordingly states that

What the postmodern writing of both history and literature has taught us is that both history and fiction are discourses, that both constitute systems of signification by which we make sense of the past ("exertions of the shaping, ordering imagination"). In other words, the meaning and shape are not in the events, but in the systems which make those past "events" into present historical "facts." This is not a "dishonest refuge from truth" but an acknowledgement of the meaningmaking function of human constructs. (*A Poetics* 89)

As she indicates, historiographic metafiction "does not in any way deny the value of history writing; it merely redefines the conditions of value" (*A Poetics* 129) As such, it highlights the textuality, narratitivity, and discursive nature of historical knowledge through playfully manipulating the documental sources of historiography such as archives, memoirs, personal correspondences, biographies, and chronicles. Historiographic metafiction ironically installs these documental sources so as to problematize the reliability of both the textualized sources of history and history writing based on such documentations. It makes use of actual historical sources, freely makes adjustments on them, or it produces entirely fictional but seemingly authentic sources.[13] By means of such strategies, it subverts the conventional ways of thinking about historiography.

This problematization of historiography is most evident in the way historiographic metafiction constructs, deconstructs, and reconstructs characterization. Historiographic metafiction transmits historically existent personages into the fictional universe so as to problematize the singularity and objectivity of history writing and to contest the perception of history as *logos*. It relies upon biographies, memoirs, letters, and other documental sources regarding the lives of actual people. It deliberately mingles fictional and factual elements or constructs seemingly factual yet entirely fictional sources. Freely speculating beyond the content of already existent historical sources, historiographic metafiction embarks upon the textuality and inescapable fictionality of writings about factual people. While classical and empiricist way of thinking of history writing regards archives as the transparent, impersonal sources to the lives, works, and studies of historical people, historiographic metafiction transports actual people into the fictional realm, and it simultaneously uses and abuses the sources about them; hence, it puts into question the reliability and neutrality of this kind of documentations.

In this regard, the character of Freud (f) in *The White Hotel* exemplifies how postmodern fiction utilizes historically existent people to problematize history writing. In the novel, Thomas transforms the twentieth century psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud into a fictional character. Although he portrays him in his historical context, this fictional Freud (f) is situated within a fictional world where he interacts with fictional characters such as Lisa.

In his short article about *The White Hotel*, Thomas explains how the idea of a novel, in which he is going to fictionalize the pshychonalayst Freud (a), come to his mind after he comes across a brief mention of a female patient of Freud (a) in Ernest Jones's biography of Freud (a):

> [A]nd then sometime later in Ernest Jones's biography of Freud I was intrigued to read a sentence or two about how Freud was analysing a patient and she told him that she was having an affair with one of his sons – I forget which one, but I thought how extraordinary that Freud should analyse this patient and go into her sexual life in great detail, and inevitably get secrets of his own son from it. I thought, maybe some day I will write something about it. (Thomas, "Freud" 1958)

Whether Freud (a) continued to analyze this anonymous patient; or whether there is an existent document about this patient remains unclear. However, Thomas's acknowledgment of the limitations of documental sources and his subsequent attempt to fictionalize this anecdote utilizing the lack of documentation epitomize the epistemology behind historiographic metafictions: the impossibility of neutrality, impersonality, and transparency in historiography due to human agency as well as the limitations of documental sources. In this respect, the "Author's Note" becomes a departing point in the novel that transfers Freud (a) from the actual world into the fictive one. Here, Thomas indicates his deliberate attempt to fictionalize Freud (a) and to intermingle fact and fiction:

> Freud becomes one of the dramatis personae, in fact, as a discoverer of the great and beautiful and modern myth of psychoanalysis […]. The role played by Freud in this narrative is entirely fictional. My imagined Freud does, however, abide by the generally known facts of the real Freud's life, and I have sometimes quoted from his works and letters, passim. (*WH* n. pag.)

The "Author's Note" constitutes the metafictional quality of the novel. Thomas readily acknowledges that he has used Freud (a)'s texts intentionally and that Freud (f) is

entirely fictional. This deliberate entwining of fact and fiction in *The White Hotel* in particular and in historiographic metafiction in general, serves to problematize historiography and the availability and reliability of historical sources.

This problematization of history writing is maintained specifically by such narrative strategies as parody, pastiche, and intertextuality in *The White Hotel*. Thomas not only fictionalizes Freud (a), but he also parodies his private correspondences, and inserts pastiches of his case studies. In so doing, Thomas mimics the conventions of historical writing in the novel by means of replicating seemingly genuine texts of documental quality. While parodies of such texts contribute to the creation of an authentic aura, the recognition of the fact that these texts are either partially or entirely fictional puts into question historiography which is based on this kind of documentation.

In this sense, the "Prologue" of *The White Hotel* exemplifies how historiographic metafiction simultaneously uses and abuses the means of history writing. Even though the letters endorse an air of authenticity in the beginning, as a historiographic metafiction, *The White Hotel* problematizes the reliability of such sources rather than to render verisimilitude. The letters assemble actual events and people with purely fictional events and characters by which they obscure the boundaries between fact and fiction, history and literature. For instance, even though Thomas openly indicates in the "Author's Note" that "[t]he letters of the Prologue […] have no factual basis" (*WH* n.pag.), the content of the letters partially resorts to actuality regarding Freud (a)'s life. Most significantly, Thomas bases Freud (f), Carl Jung, and Ferenczi's trip to America to give lectures at Clark University and their exchange of views during this trip on actual history.[14] However, the mention of an anonymous patient (who is, as subsequently revealed, Lisa) exemplifies the way Thomas inserts fiction into actual events. Freud (f)'s mentioning that his patient writes semi-pornographic poetry and his sending the poem of this patient's journal to Sachs for consideration are purely fictional elements that Thomas subjoins in actual history.

Not only does historiographic metafiction interfuse fact and fiction mimicking historical documentation but it also intentionally intermingles fictive and factual people in its characterization. Therefore, the presence of Lisa, who is a fictional character, on the same realm with Freud (f) might be examined as another significant feature that points at how characterization functions in historiographic metafiction.

The existence of Lisa Erdman as a character in *The White Hotel* relies upon a gap in the historical sources regarding Freud (a)'s female patient who allegedly has had sex with Freud's son. Thomas's recognition of the limitations of history writing catalyzes his inquiry and speculation about what might have happened between Freud (a) and this female patient. Even though Lisa's character is partially based upon an actuality, Thomas responds to the lacking detail about the anonymous patient by creating a fictional character and situating her Freud (f)'s life. Thomas fictionalizes the anonymous patient and provides her with a fictional background; however, he still maintains an effect of historicity by letting her interact with semi-fictional characters such as Freud (f). This blurred presentation of factuality and fictionality, especially with regard to characterization, underscores postmodernism's emphasis on the epistemologically and ontologically problematic situation of historiography. Even though spatial and temporal authenticity is sustained via appealing to actual dates, actually existent places or historically accurate events, characters surpass the worlds they are assumed to inhabit. On the one hand, actual people do not abide by the verified data of history and traverse the fictive universe by involving in entirely fictional events and situations. On the other hand, fictive characters constantly transgress their fictional existence exploiting historically existent events, settings, and people.

Historiographic metafictions also put a great stress on the essentially intertextual existence of literature; hence, they make use of other literary texts. They evaluate literary canon as a literary history in which literary texts cannot subsist independently from each other. They attest that a literary text is affected, influenced or indirectly, unconsciously is related to previous texts. In relation to the understanding of literary history as essentially referential and intertextual, historiographic metafictions deliberately implement intertextuality. To this end, not only do they fictionalize historical people but they also relocate and transfer fictive characters from different texts into their own bodies. Historiographic metafictions utilize intertextuality as a narrative strategy so as to resist "[t]he realist notion of characters" which can only "be able to coexist legitimately if they belong to the same text in both historical and fictional terms" (Hutcheon, *The Politics* 77).

In "*Lector in Fabula*: Pragmatic Strategy in a Metanarrative Text," Umberto Eco calls this kind of characterization "transworld identity" (230). Transworld identity is

constituted not only by the transmission of already fictional characters into another fictional text but also by the transmigration of historical personages into the fictional world. Thus, as Brian McHale indicates, transworld identity becomes "a sign of the penetration of one world by another," and it points out the "violation […] of an ontological boundary" between worlds (*Constructing Postmodernism* 153). Hence, blurring the ontological distinctions between fictive and historical worlds by the use of transworld identities, historiographic metafictions underline the intertextual nature of literature as they also highlight the indispensable fictionality in history writing.

In *The White Hotel*, there are numerous characters that can be classified as transworld identities. Freud (f), his son, and the other psychoanalysts with whom Freud (f) corresponds exemplify transmigration of real-world-historical personages into a fictional universe. In addition to those characters, Dina Pronicheva can also be examined as an example of transworld identity. Even though Dina Pronicheva is a minor character and is briefly mentioned in the last sections of the novel as one of the victims of the Babi Yar massacre, her significance stems from the fact that she is both an actual eye-witness of Babi Yar and the protagonist of Anatoli Kuznetsov's novel, *Babi Yar*. In this respect, Pronicheva's character proves to be a transworld identity in both senses of the concept. On the one hand, Thomas can be claimed to transfer historically existent Pronicheva into the fictional realm as it is the case of with Freud (a). On the other hand, he can also be asserted to transfer already fictionalized Pronicheva from *Babi Yar* into his novel especially considering the fact that Thomas confirms his use of *Babi Yar* in the construction of Pronicheva on the copyright page of *The White Hotel*. Accordingly, Thomas's utilizing *Babi Yar* for the construction of Pronicheva rather than directly consulting historical sources renders Thomas's Pronicheva a doubly-constructed and doubly fictionalized character. Hutcheon draws attention to this characterization and asserts that

> D. M. Thomas used the text of Dina Pronicheva's eye-witness account of *Babi Yar* in his *The White Hotel*, but this account was already doubly distanced from the historical events: it was her later recounting of her experience, as told by Anatoli Kuznetsov in his book, *Babi Yar*. (*The Politics* 87).

Even though Dina Pronicheva is an actual person who indeed experienced the Babi Yar massacre, *The White Hotel* cannot be regarded to provide a true, objective, and transparent presentation of her experience. Moreover, the novel becomes more distanced from actuality since it is already based upon a fictionalized account of it. In this respect, *The White Hotel* draws attention to the impossibility of the objective and true representation of historical events; and this is achieved by means of implementing a thoroughly postmodern characterization. By blurring the distinctions between the fictional and historical worlds through transworld identities, postmodern characterization contests the dichatomic relationship between those worlds, and highlights the problematic status of historical knowledge. In this sense, postmodern characterization becomes the very tool to such contestation historiographic metafictions embark upon. The presentation of historically existent people as characters proves to be one of the essential characterization strategies in historiographic metafiction. Just as it makes use of the textual means of history writing, it also simultaneously uses and abuses actual people, and utilizes characterization as a means to problematize the authenticity, objectivity, and transparency of history writing.

In addition to problematizing historiography, Thomas also puts the discourses of psychoanalysis into question throughout the novel by transmigration Freud (a) and his theory into the fictive webs of the novel. Throughout the novel, such psychoanalytical discourses as interpretation of dreams, Oedipus complex, sex and death drives are predominantly accentuated especially in diagnosing Lisa's psychological disorder. Moreover, Thomas writes a pastiche of Freud (a)'s case histories, alludes his actual psychoanalytical readings such as Wolf Man case history, or he openly refers to his theoretical texts *ad passim*. For instance, "Frau Anna G." might be evaluated as a pastiche of the actual case studies of Freud (a). In "Frau Anna G." Thomas adopts the conventional characteristics of the actual case histories imitating the narrative voice of Freud (a).[15]

In addition, Freud (a)'s renowned essay *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* is highly crucial in understanding *The White Hotel*. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud (a) develops his theory of the death drive (i.e. *Thanatos*) in addition to his theory of pleasure principle (i.e. *Eros*). He asserts that human psyche is governed by two

opposing drives. While *Eros* is the drive of production, sexuality, and self-protection, *Thanatos* is the drive of self-destruction and compulsion.

In *The White Hotel*, Freud (f) uses these two drives in explaining Lisa's hysteria. Even though Lisa is a fictional character, her case becomes the very source of Freud (f)'s theory of death instinct, *thanatos*. In one of his letters, Freud (f) states that

> I have also found myself drawn back to my essay *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, which had been hanging fire, with a strengthened conviction that I am on the right lines in positioning a death instinct, as powerful in its own way (though more hidden) than his libido. One of my patients, a young woman suffering from a severe hysteria has just given birth to some writings which seem to lend support my theory. (*WH* 12-3)

Thus, not only does Thomas fictionalize Freud (a) but he also transfers Freud (a)'s theory into the fictional realm. Transmigrating Freudian psychoanalysis to the fictional world, *The White Hotel* investigates and explores the limitations of Freudian psychoanalytical readings. The novel explicitly negates Freud (f)'s diagnosis he reaches by means of conducting a conventional psychoanalytical reading on Lisa. Therefore, it puts the discourses that derive from Freudian psychoanalysis into question. The negation of Freud (f)'s interpretation and problematization of the psychoanalytical discourses in the novel might be examined in terms of postmodern problematic of metanarratives as suggested by Jean-François Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*.

Although Lyotard does not comment on psychoanalysis in his critique, psychoanalysis can also be regarded as a metanarrative as it has become a groundbreaking phenomenon in the early twentieth century by introducing a new and unprecedented understanding to the human psyche. Freud (a)'s division of the human psyche into id, ego, and super-ego contested the anthropocentric view of the self as rational and unified. Psychoanalysis instead suggested a new perception of the human psyche which is chaotic, fragmented, and is shaped by the constant conflict between id, ego, and super-ego. As Anthony Elliott indicates, contrary to the apprehension of the "human agent as rational and autonomous, psychoanalysis [has] recast the relations

between selfhood and desire, reason and passion. In psychoanalytical terms, the self is not a stable or unified entity" (6). On the one hand, psychoanalytical contention of the chaotic and disordered human mind and its re-endorsing of the self have radically transformed modern psychology. On the other hand, the discoveries of Freudian psychoanalysis have become highly influential in a great variety of disciplines, especially in the fields of Humanities such as literature and art. In Elliot's words,

> Mostly within the academic disciplines of sociology and social theory, comparative literature, cultural studies and feminism, psychoanalysis has been used to cross conventional intellectual boundaries, highlighting he masculinist bent of traditional separations of the rational and irrational, reason and emotion, science and art, culture and nature. In the light of Freud's monumental discoveries about sexuality and the unconscious, the nature of critical practice in the human sciences has been radically transformed. Focusing on individual subjectivity, on the complex emotional experiences of people in relation to society and politics, on the quality of cultural relations, on gender divisions and our unequal sexual world, and the fundamental assumptions of Western knowledge and science, psychoanalytic theorists have instigated a powerful restructuring of the major theoretical traditions in the social sciences and humanities. (3)

As such, psychoanalysis has caused a paradigm shift in the early twentieth century especially in literature as the new perspective towards the human psyche has introduced a new way of interrogating and making sense of the text as well as the representation of self in the text. The division of the human psyche as unconscious and conscious and the consideration of the unconscious as the repressed yet the essential implement in the formation of identity have found resonance in the understanding of the mechanism of language. The assertion that the language of a literary work has both a conscious and an unconscious dimension has transcended conventional studies of literature and stimulated for delving into the unconscious of a literary text (Bertens 160). Furthermore, the dissolution of "the liberal humanist view of the subject as an ultimately free, coherent, and autonomous moral agent" (Bertens 158), and the

manifestation of a chaotic, unordered, non-linear subject instead called for different and innovative narrative techniques in fiction. In relation to the re-conceptualization of the human psyche, the authors utilized such narrative strategies as the stream of consciousness, nonlinear, unchronological sequence of events, and shifting points of view. Regarding psychoanalytical criticism Hans Bertens states that

> Psychoanalytic criticism focuses on such 'cracks' in the text's façade and seeks to bring to light the unconscious desires of either the author, or the characters that the text presents. It does not ignore what the text ostensibly would seem to be about, but its real interest is in the hidden agenda of the language that the text employs. (160)

Treating psychoanalysis as a metanarrative, *The White Hotel* simultaneously uses and abuses psychoanalytical discourses. By means of Freud (f)'s misreading of Lisa's psychological disorder by conducting a conventional psychoanalytical treatment, it problematizes psychoanalytical theory whose discourses at times become exceedingly generalizing, deterministic, and overtly stereotypical.

Throughout the therapy sessions, Freud (f) interprets Lisa's dreams, hallucinations, her physical symptoms as well as her pornographic journal and poem in psychoanalytically symbolic terms. He tends to rationalize and make sense of Lisa's psychological disorder completely in relation to his psychoanalytical theory. Accordingly, he seeks the root of Lisa's pains as well as her respiratory condition in a traumatic event she has experienced during her childhood. Therefore, Freud (f) grounds Lisa's physical symptoms on her late acknowledgement of her mother's sexual relationship with her uncle, her mother's subsequent death, and her troubled relationship with her father:

> But, what, then, were her mother and her jolly uncle doing together in the summer-house? It was too disturbing and puzzling, and the child forgot it in the play. The adult Anna, when it flashed back to her with all the accretions of mature knowledge, immediately assumed the worst; and likewise found it impossible to bear. […] The symptoms were, as always with the unconscious,

appropriate: the pains in breast and ovary because of her unconscious hatred of her distorted femininity; anorexia nervosa: total self-hatred, a wish to vanish from the earth. Also, the breathless choking condition which had afflicted her during her puberty reappeared, as a consequence of having glimpsed the true circumstances of her mother's death. (*WH* 121- 7)

In the same vein, Freud (f) also interprets the image of the white hotel that perpetuates in Lisa's fictional writings and her hallucinations in symbolic terms. Freud (f) initially relates "two of her recurrent hallucinations in adult life – a storm at sea, and a fire at a hotel" (*WH* 86) to her mother's death in a hotel fire. He bases his argument on the assumption that childhood traumas manifest themselves as hysteria in the later periods of one's life; hence, he claims that adult Lisa is haunted by the child Lisa's loss of her mother in a tragic event. However, as Freud (f) becomes more acquainted with Lisa's past, he gradually associates Lisa's hysteria and her fantasy of the white hotel with her simultaneous loath and idealization of her mother. Thus, he claims that the sexuality in the white hotel might refer, on the one hand, to the indiscreet relationship between her mother and uncle. On the other hand, however, it might also point at her unconscious wish to return to the womb of the mother. Hence, Freud (f) interprets the sexuality Lisa depicts at the white hotel as a "commitment to orality – sucking, biting, eating, gorging, taking in, with all the blissful narcissism of a baby at the breast" (*WH* 105). In addition, he brings a detailed interpretation to the white hotel presented in "Don Giovanni" and "The Gastein Journal" as follows:

All who have hitherto, in a learning capacity, had the opportunity to read Frau Anna's journal have had that feeling: the "white hotel" is known to them, it is the body of their mother. It is a place without sin, without our load of remorse; […]. Here is the oceanic oneness of the child's child first years, the auto-erotic paradise, the map of our first country of love. […] Frau Anna's document expressed her yearning to return to the haven of security, the original white hotel – we have all stayed there – the mother's womb. (*WH* 105, 129)

In addition, Freud (f) also interprets Lisa's dreams based on his psychoanalytical theory. For example, in a dream Lisa tells him she hands a telegram to a man about the news of the death of his daughter (*WH* 94). He links this dream mainly to Lisa's tense relationship with her father, and he interprets her dreams as her fantasy of making her father sorry with her own death (*WH* 97). Even though Lisa explains afterwards that the man she saw in her dream was actually Freud (f) and that she foresaw the death of his daughter since she "is cursed with what is called second sight," (*WH* 101) he insistently disregards her ability to predict the future, and he responds to Lisa's expression quite sardonically:

> I have no comment to make on Frau Anna's "prediction," except to say that the sorrowful news did arrive (not unusually) by telegram. It seems plausible that the patient's sensitive mind discerned in me anxieties, much below the level of consciousness, over a daughter with small children, living far away, at a time when there were many epidemics. (*WH* 102)

Freud (f)'s insistence on explaining everything about Lisa in psychoanalytical terms disregarding any alternative ground is emphasized in many instances throughout the novel. Not only does he relate her hysteria to Lisa's traumatic childhood, but he also puts forward various diagnoses regarding Lisa's psychology. He claims that Lisa's hysteric condition and her disability to settle down in her relationships are based on her repressed homosexuality as it might be evidenced in her intimacy with her aunt, and Madame R. who is her female friend. Considering symbolic readings Freud (f) conducts with regards to Lisa's hysteria, Freud (f)'s "interpretations of the recurrent images in Anna's hallucinations" might be claimed to be quite "stereotypical" (Atilla 148). Likewise, as Robert E. Lougy also suggests, "[c]onvinced that her dreams and fantasies reveal a neurosis that has its origin in repressed memories that need to be disclosed, Thomas' Freud assists Lisa in delving into her past and bringing her memories into the open where they are finally confronted" (92-3). However, Thomas contests these conventional and stereotypical psychoanalytical discourses by means of presenting Freud (f)'s diagnoses about Lisa's hysteria inefficient and fallacious. Freud (f) constantly inclines to look into Lisa's relationship with her mother and father as well as her past for seeking the foundation of her psychological problems; yet, his reading

displays a dismissive attitude towards any other possible explanation. Similarly, Laura E. Tanner draws attention to Freud (f)'s excessive commitment to his theory stating that

[T]he symbolic forms through which Freud approaches Lisa's situation blind him to the reality of her pain; within his psychoanalytical system of understanding of understanding, the immediacy of Lisa's suffering is denied as her pain is relegated to a purely symbolic status. (133)

Nevertheless, it is revealed during the course of the novel that Lisa's physical "symptoms and fantasies" as wells as her hallucinations, her dreams, and her white hotel imagery inscribed in her fiction ironically "refer less to Lisa's childhood traumas than to her tragic fate at Babi Yar" (Cowart 218). Contrary to Freud's psychoanalytical theory, it is Lisa's future not her past that traumatizes her in the present. In this regard, it is revealed towards the end of the novel that Lisa's hysteria, hallucinations, and her chronic pains, in fact, do not stem from a traumatic event in the past. Rather, they are caused by Lisa's foreseeing the extreme violence she is going to be exposed to in the Babi Yar massacre. Her chronic pains in her pelvis and left breast as well as the image of floating breast and womb around the hotel prove to be parallel to the violence in Babi Yar as she is kicked by the soldiers specifically on her breast and pelvis. Moreover, the explicit and highly disturbing sexuality in the white hotel as depicted in her poem and journal correlates with the brutal rape conducted by the soldiers in Babi Yar. These analogous violent acts are described in the novel as follows:

[Y]our son kept his hand upon my breast then plunged his mouth to it, the nipple swelled, […] I wanted to cry, my nipples were so drawn out by his lips, and tender, your son moved on from one nipple to another, both were swollen […] and for a time one of his fingers slid beside his prick in me there was such room, set up a crosswise flutter, in the gloom bodies were being brought to

He drew his leg back and sent his jackboot crashing into her left breast. She moved position from the force of the blow, but uttered no sound. Still not satisfied, he swung his boot again and sent it to cracking into her pelvis. Again the only sound was the clean snap of the bone. […] he found the opening, and they joked together

shore, we heard a sound of weeping, his finger hurt me jammed right up my arsehole my nail began caressing where his prick so fat it didn't belong to him any more was hidden away in my cunt. (*WH* 20).

as he inserted the bayonet, carefully, almost delicately. The old woman was not making any sound though they could see she was still breathing. […] Semashko grumbled at their wasting time. Demidenko twisted the blade and thrust in deep. (*WH* 219-20)[16]

Over the course of their therapy sessions and correspondence, Lisa indirectly hints to Freud (f) about her gift of second sight, and she tries to imply that Freud (f) is mistaken in his interpretation of her dreams. In one of Freud (f)'s interpretations, for instance, she openly warns Freud (f) that her dreams do not relate to her past: "[s]omething occurs to me […] but it cannot belong to the dream, for it happened a long time ago, and really was of no importance in my life" (*WH* 95). Evidently, despite Lisa's awareness of her condition and her implication of Freud (f)'s mistreatment, Freud (f) continues to ignore Lisa's claim to having foresight, and he rigidly focuses on his own theory by which he represents "empirical biases of a materialistic age" (Cowart 220).

Freud (f)'s misinterpretation of Lisa's dreams, his misreading of Lisa's condition, and his failure to treat Lisa calls into question the epistemological validity, certainty, and lays bare the limitations of the presuppositions of psychoanalytical discourses. In the novel, Freud (f) becomes a symbolic vehicle through which the novel problematizes the competence of empiricism, science, and institutionalized knowledge alleged by the discourses of the twentieth century which might be called grandnarratives. As Frances Bartkowski and Catherine Stearns argue, "Thomas's fictional Freud aids in deconstructing the Freud that has become culturally constructed fiction" (295). Casting Freud (a) and his theory in a sophisticated fictional world, Thomas initially depends on and subsequently contests Freudian psychoanalysis. While he "exploits the formal convenience of Freudian procedure" through pastiches of case histories, he later "subverts the positivistic […] assumptions on Freudian theory" (Cowart 217) by explicitly presenting Freud (f)'s failure, bias, and blindness to alternative reasonings regarding his patients's illnesses. When read retrospectively, the

"Author's Note," which designates Freud (a) as "the discoverer of the great and beautiful modern myth of psychoanalysis," and his case studies "masterly works of literature" (*WH* n. pag.) assures an ironic tone about Thomas's view of psychoanalysis. Thomas adds that "By myth I mean a poetic, dramatic expression of a hidden truth; and in placing this emphasis, I do not intend to put into question the scientific validity of psychoanalysis" (*WH* n.pag.). As John H. Barnsley puts it, "[t]his somewhat inconsistent statement indicates at least a partial acceptance of Freud's views" (457). However, even in his acceptance and praise, Thomas implies that psychoanalysis is no more than an act of interpretation and a process of meaning making. Psychoanalysis as an allegedly scientific activity might aim to find out the hidden truth; yet, its outcomes do not go beyond a "poetic" and "dramatic expression" of this "hidden truth" (*WH* n. pag.) as far as *The White Hotel* is concerned.

Even though Thomas "undermines the vaunted empiricism of science itself and thereby makes possible an exciting new aesthetic" (Cowart 217), it should be noted that he neither reduces the value of the psychoanalytical theory nor denies its quintessential achievements in understanding human psyche. Likewise, Nicol also draws attention to the fact that Thomas's aim is not to disinvent Freudian psychoanalysis, but to highlight its discursiveness:

> Throughout, then, at a deep level, *The White Hotel* continually undermines psychoanalysis. That it does so while also conveying Thomas's obvious admiration for Freud, however, suggests that what the novel really seeks to challenge is the idea of 'authorized reading' itself. As the Freudian reading of what happens in the novel collapses, 'unauthorized' readings are opened up. (40)

A similar argument is proposed by David Cowart in his article entitled "Being and Seeming: *The White Hotel.*" Cowart confirms that "Thomas understands Freudian theory and does justice to the pschyoanalytical method – at the same time that he politely suggests that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in Freud's philosophy" (220). Even though Freud (f) fails in comprehending the main reason behind Lisa's hysteria, it is suggested in the novel that his method of treatment, in fact, contributes to Lisa's reconciliation with her traumatic past. Even Lisa herself expresses her gratitude to him in her letters for she indicates that it is only through their

sessions that she clarifies the mystery behind the summer house event, which has always constituted an impediment before her:

> In a way you made me become fascinated by my mother's sin, and I am forever grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to delve into it. But I don't believe for one moment that had anything to do with my being crippled with pain. […] I am touched, beyond words, by knowing that so much wisdom, patience and kindness were devoted to a poor, weak-spirited, deceitful young woman. I assure you it was not without fruit. Whatever understanding of myself I now possess is due to you alone. (*WH* 171-2)

As the novel unfolds, Freud (f) also acknowledges the limits of his theory and his failure in resolving Lisa's case, albeit only partially. In one of his letters to his psychoanalyst friend, Sandor Ferenczi, he states that "[i]t may be that we have studied the sexual impulses, too exclusively, and that we are in the position of a mariner whose gaze is so concentrated on the lighthouse that he runs on the rocks in the engulfing darkness" (*WH* 13). As a result, Thomas might be claimed to "demythologize Freudian explanations" (Atilla 158) by means of Freud (f)'s misinterperations. Thomas negates Freud (f)'s diagnosis by which he emphasizes the impossibility of a "fixed subject-vision" as well as "uncertainty of vision" (Hutcheon, *A Poetics* 160), and by presenting Freudian psychoanalysis limited and biased, he resists generalizations of psychoanalytical discourses.

As a result, fictionalizing the eminent psychoanalyst and making him engage in a fictional case history, which eventually lays bare the limitations of Freudian psychoanalysis, Thomas underscores postmodern problematization of the twentieth century epistemology, empiricism, and science. Thomas's making psychoanalytical discourses collapse through Freud (f)'s misinterpretation of Lisa's psychological disorder might be related to Lyotard's postmodern skepticism towards grandnarratives. Lyotard perceives knowledge as "a question of competence that goes beyond the simple determination and application of criteria of truth […] [i]t is not a competence relative to a particular class of statements […] to the exclusion of others" (*Postmodern* 18). Accordingly, presenting a female character who possesses metaphysical abilities which

cannot be explained by Freud (f)'s theory, Thomas investigates and contests the reliability, universality, singularity, and validity of the totalizing discourses created by psychoanalysis. In this sense, portraying a character with metaphysical talents that cannot be scientifically explained, he constitutes an antithesis to not only psychoanalytical discourses but also the other metanarratives of the twentieth century.

In addition to Freud (f), Lisa Erdman, the female protagonist of *The White Hotel*, should also be examined as a postmodern character in multiple respects. Not only Lisa's portrayal throughout the novel but also the way Thomas constructs her character displays a significant postmodern quality. While Thomas's construction of Lisa's character points at how postmodern fiction engages in intertextuality, collage, and a fusion of factuality and fictionality in characterization, Lisa's character as displayed in the course of narration specifically manifests the postmodernist view of self.

First and foremost, Thomas's act of construction of Lisa's character maintains a significant postmodern quality, which clearly illustrates how postmodern fiction employs characterization. As Thomas's various interviews and articles point out, Lisa, as a character, is the end-product of a collage as she is composed of a collection of references to and from various sources. As much as Thomas openly states in the interviews, Lisa's character embodies fragments of at least three different personalities. While some of these people integrated into Lisa's character are historically existent people, the others are purely fictional personalities who are already characters in other literary texts.

In his short article titled "Freud and the "White Hotel," Thomas provides a detailed account of his construction of Lisa amassing these various fictional and nonfictional personalities. Lisa's existence initially depends on Freud (a)'s actual patient who allegedly has had an affair with Freud (a)'s son. As Thomas explains in his article, inspired by this patient and wondering the possible nature of this hypothetical relationship, he has written a poem entitled "The Woman to Sigmund Freud" which would later develop into "Don Giovanni" ("Freud" 1958).

While Lisa Erdman emerges as an anonymous persona of this explicitly sexual poem, having read *Babi Yar* by Anatoli Kuznetsov, Thomas detects resemblances between his sexual poem, its persona, and Kuznetsov's narration of the testimony of

Dina Pronicheva, who is an actual eye-witness of the Babi Yar Massacre (Thomas, "Freud" 1958). Therefore, Thomas decides to cultivate his poem into a novel and to cast Lisa as the female protagonist. He openly remarks his use of Kuznetsov's text in the formation of his female protagonist in an interview as follows: "I was going to the United States and wanted – needed – a long book for the flight. The account of the Holocaust suddenly connected with my poems. Everything fell into place" (qtd. in Brown 61). In this respect, Freud (a)'s patient who allegedly has had sex with his son and Pronicheva who is both an actual person and a character in Kuznetsov's novel constitute the main source for Lisa's character. However, as Thomas expresses in his article, he also integrates other personalities into Lisa's character. For instance, he bases Lisa's personal background on Anna Akhmatova's biography:

> When I began, I did not know who [Lisa] was and where she was born. I am very lazy, not like most novelists, who go in for lots of research; if I can get away with none I do so and it happens that I had some knowledge of Anna Akhmatova, a great Russian poet whom I had translated, and I knew her life fairly well. She had been born on the Black Sea in 1890 and later… (Thomas, "Freud" 1983)

Thomas gives a pseudonym to Lisa so as to construct a new a case study for her maintaining a Freudian discourse (Thomas, "Freud" 1959). Thus, while he utilizes the biography of a poet for writing a personal background for Lisa, he adopts the style of Freudian case histories in Lisa's portrayal as a patient:

> Then I had to think what Freud would have made of that prose passage and the poem: what kind of woman, what kind of psychology? The most difficult part was creating this case study I loved Freud's style, his rather dry reticent way of approaching very lurid erotic events. People are having incestuous scenes with their brothers in law or whatever, but Freud puts it so delicately and always uses not their real names but Frau Anna or Frau M. which seems to give it the mystery of a detective story. ("Freud" 1959)

As such, characterization in *The White Hotel* is explicitly postmodern since Thomas fuses various actual and fictive people in constructing Lisa's character. Lisa as such becomes a collage because she brings together Freud's patient, a real poet, Freud's patients, and the only surviving eye-witness of the Babi Yar, Dina Pronicheva. It should be noted that the portrayal of characters with reference to actual people does not only pertain to novels written in the postmodern mode. The novels written in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and the early twentieth century indeed depicted characters which are based on historically existent people. However, the use of referential characterization in postmodern fiction differs significantly in its epistemology. Postmodern fiction tends to base characters on actual people mainly to highlight the intertextual nature of literature. At this point, Thomas's utilizing numerous fictive and factual people and making use of collage and clipping in the construction of Lisa's character prove to be a technical strategy that underscores the intertextual nature of any text.

Furthermore, Lisa Erdman's representation in the course of the novel also lays bare how characterization is conducted in postmodern fiction. Throughout the novel, Lisa's character becomes a means through which *The White Hotel* contests the perception of self as coherent, unified, and singular. Instead, Lisa's character embodies the postmodernist view of self as constructed, fragmented, and deprived of continuity. Lisa's character is manipulated, interpreted, fabricated, and (de)constructed multiple times throughout the novel either by the formal construction of the text or by the other characters. In the course of the novel, the narrator, the other characters as well as Lisa herself are presented attempting to deconstruct, construct, and reconstruct Lisa's personality via discursive practices.

As such, Lisa's constructed self is most explicitly observed in "Frau Anna G.," the case history of Freud (f). The notion of self as constructed in this section is reinforced by the textual and fictional nature of case histories. Even though the case histories of Freud (a) maintain a factual ground since they derive from experiences of real patients, the fact that they are narrated leads to fictionality in their presentations. While psychoanalysis might already be evaluated as an interpretative act since the psychoanalyst is involved in a constant meaning-making, sense-making, and commentary-making process based on the data patients provide, the transmission of this interpretative act to a textual sphere in case histories doubly reinforces fictionality.

Thomas similarly draws attention to the fictionality integrated in the case histories in the "Author's Note." While Thomas's referral to "the genuine case histories" as "masterly works of literature" (*WH* n. pag.) in the "Author's Note" is semantically an oxymoron since it brings together the actuality of history and the fictional nature of literature, it simultaneously highlights semi-literariness of Freudian case histories. Therefore, replicating case histories which, he implies, are already partially fictive, Thomas confounds the perception of case histories as the absolute, objective, and neutral source to the understanding of the self. While the self is already perceived as fragmented and constructed in the postmodern context, Thomas asserts that Freudian case histories are merely one of the many discourses that claim to explain yet inevitably provide but a constructed notion of self.

Freud (f)'s method and his authoritative attitude towards his patient in "Frau Anna G." as well as the ultimate collapse of his treatment reveal how Freudian case histories can be seen as attempts to (re)construct the patients. Thomas perpetuates the conventions of case studies and conforms to their narrative mode; however, he does this so as not to deny but to underscore their constructed, textual, and narrative quality. Therefore, while Thomas relies upon Freudian case histories, he also investigates and questions them. Thomas E. Lougy similarly reads Thomas's utilization of certain narrative patterns in the novel as a simultaneous utilization and interrogation:

> [*The White Hotel*] invites interpretation and reliance upon certain
> narrative patterns while at the same time it calls such
> interpretation and pattern into doubt. Within it fiction and reality
> not only feed into one another, but also turn back upon
> themselves. (97)

In this manner, Lisa is exposed to a continual construction by Freud (f) not only during the therapy sessions but also in the case history he writes. The most significant indicator of this construction process is revealed in the name giving in accordance with the conventions of case histories. Even though Freud (f) introduces Lisa using a pseudonym for the privacy of his patient, the act of name giving can be read in symbolic terms in *The White Hotel*. In Thomas's pastiche, name giving becomes more of an act of tailoring an identity for Lisa. Lisa's pseudonym transforms her from the subject position into an object position. Freud (f)'s changing Lisa's name in the case history points at his

authorial power, and it symbolizes his evident construction of Lisa's identity and psychology throughout the treatment process.

In relation to this, in the case history, Freud (f) does not objectively relate to Lisa and Lisa's story; on the contrary; he provides Lisa with a story and an identity both of which are his own constructs. Lisa's pain and neurosis constitute symbols for Freud (f) by which he builds a narrative. Hence, Lisa's continuous denials of Freud (f)'s diagnosis and her "[b]elated responses show that Freud had not 'imagined the real' Lisa, but rather, without quite realizing it, had subordinated her to the imperatives of his own narrative" (Robertson and Thomas 469). Trying to find out the psychological root of Lisa's chronic pains through symbolic readings in psychoanalytical terms, Freud (f) "transforms his patient's body into a text and proceeds to interpret the pain that is written on that body in symbolic terms" (Tennar 133). He disregards the limitations of his knowledge concerning Lisa's past, and he also ignores any possibility of his patient's unreliability. Even though Freud (f) can never be sure about Lisa's providing him with the true account of her experiences, he insists on the validity of his treatment based on Lisa's past.

Freud (f)'s interpretative act in Lisa's case and his supposedly conclusive remarks about Lisa disrupts Lisa's subject-position in the text. Freud (f) functions like an author in the case history and constructs Lisa as if she was his character. He interprets and comments on Lisa's experiences, life and her past along with the symptoms of her hysteria, and he deprives her of her own individuality and subject position. Hutcheon similarly draws attention to how Freud (f)'s narrative diminishes the existence of Lisa as an individual being:

> [*The White Hotel*] profoundly disturbs and disperses the notion of
> the individual, coherent subject and its relation to history, to
> social formation, and even to its own unconscious. It is the
> presence of "Freud" as a character in the novel that underlines the
> specifically male inscription of subjectivity by psychoanalysis.
> But this text never any of the issues it raises: It offers no
> totalizing solution because it both cannot and will not. All it can
> do is contextualize and confront the contradictions of history,
> both public and private. (*A Poetics* 166)

Hereby, Freud (f)'s claim to find the cause of her hysteria in her distorted relationship with her family, his supposed revelation of her repressed homosexuality, his rationalization of her dreams paying no attention to Lisa's gift of foresight, and his eventual claim to cure her – "I told her she was cured of everything but life" (*WH* 127) – all demonstrate how Freud (f) constructs Lisa by means of his psychoanalytical readings.

At this juncture, the textual and discursive nature of Freudian case histories accords with the postmodern context of the novel itself. On the one hand, Thomas deconstructs and reconstructs Freud (a) by inscribing him as a fictional character. On the other hand, Freud (f) analogically fictionalizes an already-fictional Lisa. Likewise, Robertson and Thomas indicate that both D. M. Thomas and Freud (f), in fact, are similar in that they each write narratives, the former in the novel format, the latter in the form of a case study: "[t]he game-playing spirit of psychoanalytic sleuthing correlates well with the game playing of the novelist's art" and this correlation render "Thomas and Freud […] kindred spirits" (461). While Thomas constructs Freud (a) in *The White Hotel*, Freud (f) correlatively constructs Lisa in his case study. As such, in *The White Hotel*, not only the author construct, deconstruct, and reconstruct historically existent Freud (a), but also the characters continuously make, unmake, and remake the other characters.

In addition, Lisa exemplifies the constructed self not only in terms of Freud (f)'s interpretative acts, but also in terms of her own narratives concerning herself. As Robert E. Lougy writes, "[j]uxtaposed against Freud's interpretations of Lisa's experiences and history […] both Lisa herself and the narrator each provid[es] us with additional readings or interpretations of the history of "Frau Anna G." (103). Thus, in addition to Freud (f)'s case history, Lisa's own narrative attempts should also be examined as examples of how postmodern fiction embarks upon the notion of self that is constructed through language.

The sections titled "Don Giovanni" and "The Gastein Journal" can be analyzed as Lisa's first attempts to construct an identity for herself. While Lisa is already a fictional character in *The White Hotel*, in these sections she transmits herself to another fictional universe by becoming the anonymous protagonist of her own fiction. On the one hand, this layered fictionality contributes to the metafictive quality of the novel; on

the other hand, it renders Lisa a self-conscious character that eludes the authorial power by means of subsisting in her own fictional realm. While these qualities render the novel postmodern, they simultaneously underscore Lisa as a postmodern character who undermines the authorial power. In this sense, in "Don Giovanni" and its prose re-writing "The Gastein Journal," Lisa creates a new persona who could act free from the restrictions and responsibilities imposed upon her contrary to the "real" Lisa of Thomas's *The White Hotel*.

Even though Lisa is asked to write about her reflections on her vacation at the Bad Gastein as part of her treatment, she does not simply present what she has done, experienced, or felt.[17] Instead, she delivers "Don Giovanni" and "The Gastein Journal" which are partly fictional and extremely surreal. Indeed, Lisa builds a character quite detached from her identity in these pieces. She situates herself in a fantasy world which, as the novel unfolds, becomes a symbolic re-imagining of her repressed future. Moreover, Lisa liberally distorts certain facts about herself in these pieces. She claims, for instance, to have a child even though the "real" Lisa is known to have no biological children. Furthermore, she mentions buying a gift for her mother even though Lisa's mother is known to have passed away at a hotel fire when Lisa was a child. The discordance between the "real" Lisa and the Lisa portrayed in these pieces demonstrates how she constructs her own reality. Although she is simply expected to write a journal, Lisa fabricates a story in which she constructs an identity and an alternative history for herself.

Lisa's self-conscious intervention in her construction of an identity for herself continues even in her relationship with Freud (f) as Lisa misleads Freud (f) throughout their therapy sessions. During the therapies Freud (f) conducts, Lisa occasionally hides or alters certain events regarding her past; hence, she indirectly misguides Freud (f)'s interpretation and psychoanalytical analyses about her psychological predicament and its causes. While recounting the summer-house memory to Freud (f), for instance, Lisa distorts the story changing a crucial point: she initially says that she witnessed her aunt having sex with her uncle even though the person she saw was her mother. In addition, she later reveals that she has intentionally hidden from Freud (f) both her miserable relationship with her husband and the assault she was exposed to by the sailors when she was a child. Moreover, telling about her dreams to Freud (f), she deliberately omits

mentioning that she had seen Freud (f) in her dream. These deliberate acts of misinformation contribute to the problematization of psychoanalysis. They point at the limitedness of the psychoanalyst's reading with the information the patient provides him. On a similar note, Aylin Atilla draws attention to the unreliability of Lisa and her misguidance of Freud (f)'s psychoanalytical reading. Thus, she suggests that

> Thomas'[s] subversion of psychoanalysis is consolidated by [Lisa's] unreliable position not only during her therapy sessions with her doctor Sigmund Freud but also towards the reader throughout the novel. As fictional Freud relies on her patient's recounts, he fails to take the reliability of his subject into consideration. In this regard, "Freudian conception of essential subjectivity" is problematized in the novel through portrayal of such a character as Anna whose "subjectivity" is most of the time "contradictory and incoherent." (154-55)

The acts of misinformation demonstrate how a unitary self cannot be achieved as it is continuingly (mis)presented through language. Throughout the novel, neither Freud (f) nor the reader can attain an accuracy regarding Lisa. This unreliable position of Lisa is gradually recognized and expressed *ad passim* by both Freud (f) and Lisa herself in the course of the novel. In one of their therapy sessions, for instance, Freud (f) expresses that her silence to any question regarding her sexual feelings is "[a] much more decisive factor in the slowness of [their] progress" (*WH* 92). In another session, he bursts out and says that "I told her she was wasting my time; that I could no longer tolerate her lies; that unless she would completely frank with me there was no point whatever in continuing the analysis (*WH* 112). Indeed, Lisa acknowledges that she has manipulated Freud (f)'s treatment. Lisa initially confesses to Freud (f) that "you saw what I allowed you to see" (*WH* 163), and later she adds that there was already no point in being accurate about the past because she was more concerned about the future: "Frankly, I did not always wish to talk about the past; I was more interested in what was happening to me then, and what might happen in the future" (*WH* 171). As Peggy Muoz Simonds similarly underlines, Freud (f)'s strong "emphasis on sexual experiences forces Lisa to make up stories he wants to hear" (56). Hence, Lisa misinforms and lies to Freud (f) on purpose most significantly due to "his insistence on exploring only the past" (Simonds

56) as she is already aware that her hysteria is less related to the past than to the future awaiting her.

As a result, *The White Hotel* is weaved by multiple narratives which help the characters continuously construct and reconstruct the other characters. Throughout the novel, Freud (f) is presented passionately reliant on his psychoanalytical theory and readings. Disregarding Lisa's utterances about her gift of foresight, Freud (f) constructs a narrative out of Lisa's case which, in fact, does not relate to the actual cause of her hysteria. However, considering the fact that Lisa constantly misinforms and misleads Freud (f)'s readings, both characters can be claimed to be the manipulated and the manipulator. Moreover, Lisa occasionally foresees some events that would happen to Freud (f) such as the death of her daughter. This also conceives an ironical situation in that the "patient [in fact] read[s] and [manages] the therapist's mind when she is paying him to read her mind" (Simonds 55). Hence, *The White Hotel* consists of multiple acts of readings both Freud (f) and Lisa conduct. Lisa's gift of foresight disrupts the hierarchical relationship between the doctor and the patient. While Lisa's identity is constantly (re)constructed by Freud (f), Lisa simultaneously (de)constructs Freud (f)'s (re)construction process by means of her deliberate misguidance. In this sense, Lisa takes herself out of the object position she was put into by Freud (f). As Freud (f) threatens her existence as an individual being by means of his blunt interpretations, Lisa implicitly confronts this kind of objectification and construction; indeed, she ironically manipulates the act of construction Freud (f) conducts on her.

In addition, the name changings Lisa is exposed to throughout the novel dismisses the notion of unitary, singular, and coherent self. Apart from Anna G., which is the pseudonym given to Lisa by Freud (f), Lisa is provided with multiple names as the novel proceeds. Regarding these constant name changings, Frances Batkowski and Catherine Stearns states that

> Throughout *The White Hotel* names are given, changed, denied, and withheld. Even minor characters suffer from a profusion of identities, a symptom of hysteria that brings Lisa to the fictional Freud. The main character, presented as a series of fragmented selves, is variously known to the reader young woman, Frau Anna G., Frau Elisabeth Erdman, Lisa Morozova, and finally Lisa

71

Konopnicka. On a first reading this array of names appears as disarray; the confusion, however, makes the reader confront the complexity of naming – the always provisional constitution of the self in language. (284-5)

These continuing name alterations serve to various purposes in the novel. On the one hand, name changing occasionally provides pragmatic solutions for Lisa in certain situations. Lisa, whose father is Jewish, for instance, changes her surname on occasion where her Jewishness might put her in danger. On the other hand, however, name changing significantly reinforces postmodern characterization as it manifests a fluctuating and fragmented self who is deprived of a stable identity. As Lisa's story evolves, her name, and accordingly her identity is attuned to her changing environment and the different people she is acquainted with. In this respect, the modification of Lisa's names becomes a symbol of her displacement both spatially and psychologically. Richard K. Cross similarly reads Lisa's alternating names in terms of their symbolic function. He states that "[m]ore important than any of the other grounds for Lisa's name change is the fact that the novelty of the realm to which she has come invites correspondent freshening of identity" (44). Hence, Thomas's portrayal of a character whose name is not stable contributes to the representation of self through postmodern characterization. While the motif of name changing points at an unstable self, in the mean time it becomes a symbol of how the identity and selfhood is subject to constant (re)construction.

Postmodernist view of self as fragmented is also underpinned by the display of fragmented physiology in *The White Hotel*. The novel puts an overt emphasis on physiological fragmentation through Lisa's chronic pains and her surreal demonstration of dismembered body parts in her fictional writings. First of all, Lisa's physiological fragmentation is seen in her pain on her pelvic area and left breast. Freud (f), Lisa, and the readers try to make sense of Lisa's pains throughout the novel. While Freud (f) associates them with her psychological disorder in accordance with his own theory, the section entitled "The Sleeping Carriage" propounds them as the pre-symptoms of Babi Yar. Whether related to the past or the future or even the present, the incurable pains on certain parts of Lisa's body constitute a focal point in the novel. Lisa's material body, specifically her breast and pelvis, is continuingly objectified, scrutinized, and tried to be

72

made sense of so as to diagnose her so-called hysteria. In this regard, the construction of Lisa, as a postmodern character, is observed with regards to not only her name but also her body.

Likewise, the explicit sexuality and the way it is relayed in "Don Giovanni" and "The Gastein Journal" also underscore how Lisa, as a postmodern character, is represented through a physiological fragmentation. Physiological fragmentation is seen most significantly in the relatively surreal display of dismembered female body parts in the white hotel. In these sections, the residents of the hotel claim to witness a "breast flying through the yew trees" and a "womb gliding across the lake" (*WH* 54-5). The vision of these body parts are related to one of the guests's breast removal and the other's removal of her womb (*WH* 54-5). However, at the same time, these female organs floating over the white hotel complement the subsequently mentioned pains of the protagonist in her pelvic area and breast, hence reinforcing the image of her fragmented self. In his article titled "The Pornographic Mind and *The White Hotel*" Ronald Granofsky observes fragmentation as a perpetuating motif in the entire novel. Accordingly, he contends that both physical and psychological fragmentation are not only observed in Lisa's character; indeed, fragmentation of any kind is prevalent in the entire text. Thus, he maintains that

> fragmentation is an overall phenomenon in the novel in no way confined to the body or personality of the female protagonist. As the novel's Freud notes, the characters in Lisa's narrative are "interchangeable …Sometimes the voices are distinct, but more often they blend into each other…" (128). […] Thomas is describing an entire world in chaos through the eyes of a central perceiving consciousness and suggesting how external chaos and internal fragmentation interact. The sightings at the white hotel of a disembodied breast and embryo, for example, are the physical equivalents of physic fragmentation. (48)

In addition to her display of fragmented psychology and physicality, Lisa also has problems with her identity. Throughout the novel, there is an ambiguity in respect to her biological identity, her religion, as well as a distinct place she can claim to belong to. Most significantly, for instance, Lisa is represented as unable to settle down in a

certain place for she constantly moves from one place to another. She even herself indicates that she cannot identify a place which she can call her hometown:

> I am not even sure where my home is. I was born in the Ukraine but my mother was Polish. There is even a trace of Romany, I'm told! I've lived in Vienna for nearly twenty years. So you tell me what my homeland is. (*WH* 139)

Apart from her recognizing a distinct place as her hometown, Lisa's acknowledgement of the relationship between her mother and her uncle is another problematic for Lisa in terms of her identity. It is implied in the novel that Lisa starts to have doubts regarding the identity of her biological father after she finds out her mother's affair with her uncle. Even though Lisa is partially traumatized by this relationship and the highly sexual scene she is exposed to as a child, adult Lisa ironically finds relief in it since it puts her biologic father's identity into a questionable position thereby bringing in the possibility that she might not be Jewish:

> For a few moments I was filled with happiness! Do you understand? I was convinced that my father wasn't my father, I wasn't Jewish, and I could live with my husband, and get pregnant, with a clear conscience! But of course, I couldn't cope with feeling glad that my mother was an adulteress and that she might have passed me off to her husband as his child. (*WH* 170)

In the novel, Lisa never dispels her doubts regarding the identity of her biological father; thus, she can come to terms neither with her family nor with her own identity throughout the novel. As a result of her problematical relationship with her family, she can neither trust nor commit to other people as she cannot have a healthy relationship, romantic or otherwise. Hence, Lisa's lack of the sense of belonging underscores the postmodern emphasis on the rootless, displaced, and centerless selves and subjects. As a postmodern character, Lisa becomes the representative of the postmodernist perception of self who continues its fluctuating existence in constant chaos and ambiguity.

As a result, *The White Hotel* becomes a web of narratives through which the characters attempt to construct both other characters and themselves. As Robert E. Lougy similarly affirms, the novel "reveals variously successful and unsuccessful

narrative attempts" specifically by Freud and Lisa Erdman (97). Throughout the novel, Freud (f) and Lisa are involved in multiple narrative attempts. While Freud (f) utilizes Lisa's symptoms, her hysteria, and her past as constituents of his narrative, Lisa, who is aware of Freud (f)'s narrative attempts, continuingly and deliberately misleads Freud (f). Narrativity that prevails in *The White Hotel*, especially in terms of Lisa's characterization, propounds an understanding of self which is perpetually constructed. The characters who are only available to the readers as wells as the other characters through narrations dismisses what might be called a fixed notion of self. Multilayered narrative inscriptions presented in the novel such as Freudian discourses and Lisa's fictional writings problematize the understanding of self as coherent, singular, and centered. Indeed, they manifest the postmodernist view of self which is (re)produced via various narrative inscriptions, discourses, ideological, historical, and social circumstances.

To conclude, characterization becomes one of the most significant postmodern markers in *The White Hotel*. The characterization of Freud (f) and Lisa both rests on postmodern strategies, and they relate to certain postmodern problematics. The characterization of Freud (f) renders the novel a text of historiographic metafiction. By means of fictionalizing Sigmund Freud (a), Thomas problematizes historiography which supposedly sustains true and objective accounts of historical events as well as people's relation to such histories. Transferring Freud (a) into a fictional universe, Thomas deliberately engages him in fictional events. In this respect, the clash between Freud (a) and Freud (f) constitutes the basis of postmodern characterization that is prevalent throughout the novel. The characterization of Freud (f) functions as a means of blurring the distinctions between what is fictional and what is factual, and to highlight the inevitable fictionality in history writing. Moreover, Thomas also problematizes the discourses of psychoanalysis by means of Freud (f)'s characterization. Presenting Freud (f)'s psychoanalytical interpretation of Lisa's hysteria fallacious, Thomas puts one of the grand narratives of twentieth century into question. Furthermore, by means of Lisa's characterization, *The White Hotel* embarks upon the postmodern understating of self which is constructed and deprived of core essence and individualism as opposed to the Humanistic perception of self. Lisa's characterization exemplifies how postmodern fiction utilizes characterization as a vehicle to explore and represent the self as the end-

product of various discourses, narrations, and meaning-making practices. As it is demonstrated in Lisa's case, the novel propounds the postmodernist view of chaotic and centerless self which cannot be diminished or explained by a singular discourse.

CHAPTER TWO

"YOU CAN'T NOT EXIST AND ACTUALLY BE. THEY'RE MUTUALLY CONTRADICTORY:" POSTMODERN CHARACTERS IN JOHN FOWLES'S *MANTISSA*

John Fowles (John Robert Fowles) is considered "as the English-speaking world's greatest contemporary writer" (Lyall n. pag.). He is regarded one of the first novelists of British fiction, whose novels are acknowledged to engage in postmodernism in terms of their thematic and technical aspects. Fowles was born into a middle class family that runs a tobacco company in Essex, in 1926. Attending Bedford School, Fowles was a highly successful student becoming the head boy and taking part in the school's cricket team as captain. After serving in the Royal Marines for about two years, Fowles attended Oxford University where he studied French. While he was studying French, he also became interested in French philosophers such as Albert Camus. Moreover, when he was a student he was extensively interested in existentialism, and it partly influenced his later writing as he confirms in an interview (Baker 3). After he graduated, Fowles turned away from his upper-middle class background and family business in trade, and he adopted a teaching career (Baker 1). After he taught in Greece and in England at various schools for several years (Campbell 455), Fowles published *The Collector* in 1963 and became a full time writer. Even though he wrote a poetry collection, several nonfictional essays, movie scripts, made translations, and published photo collections, he is mostly known with his novels. namely *The Collector* (1963), *The Magus* (1965), *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969), *The Ebony Tower* (1974), *Daniel Martin* (1977), *Mantissa* (1982), and *A Maggot* (1985).[18] His non-fiction writings are *Aristos* (1964), *The Tree* (1979), *The Enigma of Stonehenge* (1980), *A Short History of Lyme Regis* (1982), *Wormholes* (1998), *The Journals Volume I* (2003), and *The Journals Volume II* (2006).

Although Fowles started writing in the early 1960s, he has remained academically unnoticed in Britain for a period of time whereas he gained a quick retribution in the States. Malcolm Bradbury points out that this academic ignorance towards Fowles's novels in Britain, however, did not result from Fowles's literary

inefficacy (259). As he emphasizes, Fowles's concerns and techniques were "very much of a piece with aesthetic speculation […] in the American novel" in the early 1960s when there is a "lack of mythology and sociology about the nature of fiction and art" (259) in British literary criticism at the time. Therefore, Fowles's early novels were ahead of the critical discourses that were prevalent in Britain at that time. However, it is only after the publication of *The French Lieutenant's Women*, which is now considered as his *magnum opus*, that Fowles's fiction started to receive serious criticism in his home country.

As Susana Onega indicates, "[t]hough Fowles's work drew more attention in the 1970s" (29), much of the critical responses was notably unsympathetic or "shallow" (29). Critical writings about Fowles's novels contained quite contradictory evaluations at that period; or, most of the critics ironically accused Fowles of being a contradictory writer (Onega 30). One of the harshest criticisms about Fowles's fiction comes from Pearl K. Bell in "The English Sickness." In her review of *Daniel Martin*, Bell sarcastically respects Fowles for exceeding his limitations (n. pag.). She acknowledges that "Fowles is immensely well-read and much-traveled;" however, she subsequently asserts that "a lot of miscellaneous learning can be a dangerous thing" (n. pag.). In relation to thia, she expresses her disapproval of the prolonged way to the conventional ending in *Daniel Martin*. Nevertheless, while Bell complains of the exhaustion of "the great tradition" of English novel by the contemporary novelists including Fowles, (n. pag.), John B. Humma expresses his admiration of Fowles's fiction. As opposed to Bell, he regards Fowles's fiction as the proof of "the signally evident continuation of the great tradition in English fiction" (80). Moreover, in his interview with Fowles, Joseph Campbell evaluates his fiction as experimental, innovative, and traditionalist all at the same time (462). In the same interview, therefore, Fowles himself asks Campbell "Are you saying I'm an experimentalist? A moment ago you were saying I was a traditionalist" (462). As the contradicting reviews point out, Fowles's novels, especially the earliest ones, can be regarded as rather versatile. They both perpetuate the realistic tradition to some extent while they simultaneously rely on formal experimentalism.

Even though Fowles's earlier fiction received negative critique, his novels have received more literary appreciation in Britain in the following decades. Fowles is now regarded as a postmodern author; however, it should be noted that the reception of

Fowles's earlier novels at the time of their publication is rather different from their reception in the following decades. Fowles's earlier novels indeed can be regarded to display an explicit realistic and modernist mode rather than a postmodern one. On the one hand, it is realistic in its depictions, life-like characters as well as settings drawn from actual places. On the other hand, it is modernist in its formalistic experimentations with regards to plot structure and narrative voice. *The Collector*, for instance, can be regarded as a realist novel in its down-to-earth characters and realistic setting. Nevertheless, it also displays a modernist quality in that the same set of events is narrated by two different narrators in the novel. As a result, Fowles portrays the two characters of the novel, the butterfly collector and the kidnapped girl, in a realistic way by which he creates the illusion that they are actual people. However, presenting the same set events initially from the collector's point of view and later the kidnapped girl, he perpetuates the modernist rejection of a single perception on the events.

In addition, as Onega indicates many contemporary critics such as John Barth, Robert Nadeau, Linda Hutcheon, and David Lodge acknowledge Fowles as a key writer in contemporary fiction; however, they also contend that his novels constitute a bridge between modernism and postmodernism (36). Nadeau, for instance, observes "a connection with the great English novelists of the recent past, like Conrad and Hardy" (65). However, he also adds that Fowles is obviously fascinated with contemporary intellectual dilemmas at the same time (65). Moreover, in her analysis of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, Hutcheon designates Fowles's novel as modernist ("The Real World(s)" 81). Nevertheless, she simultaneously puts emphasis on the fact that Fowles's text is a modern work, which experimentally displays self-reflective and self-conscious quality and resorts to metafiction which is "a recent development in narrative" ("The Real World(s)" 81). As a result, Fowles's fiction can be regarded as transitional between two artistic movements not only in terms of the time they are written, but also in terms of the technicality, narrative modes, and thematic purposes. While Fowles's fiction echoes modernist tenants on the one hand, it simultaneously employs postmodern strategies and themes on the other.

An extended study on Fowles's being a transitional author comes form Mahmoud Salami in his book entitled *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. Salami argues that Fowles "traverses the narrative space between

modernism and postmodernism" (23). Salami claims that Fowles's novels heavily engage in formal experimentalism of modernist fiction. Fowles fiction excessively depends upon multiple points of view as well as shifting narrative voices (23). However, Salami subsequently adds that Fowles's novels also display a distinct postmodern quality in that they employ certain narrative strategies that culminate in postmodern fiction such as intertextuality, parody, pastiche, and metafiction.[19] Thus, he indicates that Fowles's novels display overtly self-conscious and self-reflexive characteristic (24) through which they exemplify postmodern fiction's conspicuous referral to and commentary on its own structures. The appreciation of Fowles's earlier novels as modernist was mostly due to the reason that postmodernism was not fully established as a new artistic mode at the time. However, as the artistic tendencies of postmodernism was established in the following decades, and Fowles's novels are retrospectively read, they are attested to exemplify postmodernism most significantly in their self-reflexivity. In this respect, at present Fowles is regarded one of the first novelists of British fiction that write in the postmodern mode.

Although Fowles's earlier novels were regarded to be modernist at the time of their publication, when read retrospectively, Fowles's fiction is now acknowledged as an influential exemplar of postmodernism. Fowles's novels display numerous postmodern imprints which might be observed both on technical and thematic levels. As a significant marker of postmodernism, Fowles makes use of a deliberate temporal and spatial shifts. Moreover, he utilizes such narrative strategies as intertextuality, metafiction, parody, and pastiche. In terms of thematic purposes, Fowles's novels highlight the constructed and textual nature of a literary work. They are overtly self-reflexive and self-referential since the characters constantly refer to the internal structures of the text they are part of. Within the scope of such postmodern imprints, Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* is appreciated as one of the milestones of British postmodern fiction, and it has also proved to be by far the most well-known text of the author. The novel is reputed to be postmodern most significantly because of its parodic and metafictional nature. The novel's parody and thus critique of the conventions of the Victorian novel, its utilization of a narrator who intervenes in the plot throughout the novel, as well as the novel's referral to its own structures are regarded as significant postmodern imprints prevailing in the novel.

Compared to the popularity of his other novels, *Mantissa* is probably one of the least known novels of Fowles as far as its critical reception is concerned. Jan Relf similarly confirms in "Interview with John Fowles" that there is "very little criticism available" focusing on *Mantissa* (qtd. in Phillips 183). Jens Pollheide also points at the fact that *Mantissa* "provoked smallest amount of critical discussion […] since most of the postmodernist narrative strategies employed by Fowles have already been exemplified at the hand of his other novels" (160). Not only has *Mantissa* received scarce critical evaluation, but it has also been openly regarded as a failure when indeed it did receive criticism. In the year of its publication, for instance, *The New York Times* review of the novel has claimed that *Mantissa* would badly affect the retribution of Fowles (De Mott n.pag.). Michelle Phillips Buchberger similarly points at the bad reception of the novel, and she emphasizes that "[e]ven in America, where Fowles's novels had always been more enthusiastically received than in England, *Mantissa*'s reception was lukewarm at best" (176). Furthermore, Fowles himself draws attention to the negative critique of his novel in numerous interviews and in his nonfictional writings. In *The Journals:Volume II,* for instance, he contends that "*Mantissa* has done not too badly, despite very bad reviews from all the intellectual critics; only Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge were faintly kind, of that ilk here - we form a faint sort of school, I suppose" (268). Moreover, in an interview, he indicates his anticipation that *Mantissa* would be disapproved: "I suppose I wrote the book because I knew it was a book most people would disapprove of. Really I wanted to give people an opportunity to kick me – which they duly did" (Tarbox 167).

Despite the scarce and most often disapproving criticism, *Mantissa* is, in fact, one of the most technically experimental and thematically polysemous novels of the author. The novel opens with the protagonist Miles Green's waking up in a rather strange hospital room with no windows and no ornaments but only a cuckoo clock hung on the wall. Green remembers nothing related to his life, family, his occupation, or how he has ended up in this odd hospital room. He is accompanied by three women on his bedside, and he subsequently learns that one of these women is his wife and the other two are a doctor and a nurse. After Green's wife leaves, Dr. Delfie and Nurse Cory start Green's so-called treatment which quite peculiarly depends upon Green's sexual satisfaction. Suggesting that "[t]he memory nerve-centre in the brain is closely

associated with the one controlling gonadic activity" (*M* 22), Dr. Delfie and the nurse sexually harass Green claiming that the sexual act is a procedure of the treatment. However, it is later revealed that Miles Green is, in fact, a novelist and Dr. Delfie is his muse, Erato; and *Mantissa* is a novel which Green and his muse are writing at the time. The rest of the novel presents the dialogues between Green and Erato which take place in Green's mind. These dialogues cover a great variety of issues about literature, literary production, and literary theory. On the one hand, they plan and arrange the novel they are jointly writing. On the other hand, they discuss over such issues as the conventional depiction of the muse as female, the extent to which inspiration contributes to the construction of a literary text, the authority of the author over the text, contemporary literary theory, and contemporary novel. In the course of the novel, Erato is presented in different guises such as a doctor, a Greek maiden, and a rocker girl. The shifts in Erato's appearance accordingly change the mood of the narrative and the tension of their discussion. During their conversations, Green and Erato occasionally get sexually intimate which can be taken as the symbol of the production of a literary work by the author and the muse's collaboration. The novel ends with the disappearance of Erato and the cry of the cuckoo clock, which mark not only the end of Green's novel but also Erato's role in the act of writing.

While *Mantissa* is "a highly suggestive work, subject to a variety of plausible interpretations" (Haegert 175) on both technical and thematic levels, characterization in *Mantissa* is most certainly one of the most significant implements which contribute to the postmodern quality of the novel. Even though in an interview Fowles claims that "getting too deep into a character" is "often working against the laws of fiction" and regards analysis of character as "selective reduction" (Singh 181-2), Fowles's characterization in *Mantissa* attracts a remarkable critical attention. Although there are only a couple of characters in the novel, they are extensively utilized for discussing certain postmodern subject matters; moreover, their construction rests on postmodern techniques. Therefore, this chapter focuses on *Mantissa* in order to lay bare how characterization functions in postmodern fiction. To this end, this chapter examines the protagonist, Miles Green, Erato, Dr, Delfie as well as Nurse Cory as explicit manifestations of postmodern characterization in terms of both stylistic and thematic aspects. Hence, while Miles Green is analyzed in terms of the rendition of author-

character in postmodern fiction, Erato and her alternating guises Dr. Delfie and Nurse Cory are analyzed with regard to the portrayal of transworld identities and representation of self as fragmented and constructed in postmodern fiction.

The most significant postmodern imprint in the characterization of *Mantissa* can be observed in its employment of an author-character. Miles Green's portrayal as a contemporary author who simultaneously writes and contemplates upon his act of writing confounds the notion of the author as a God-like figure who creates and owns the text. The traditional approach to interpretation has long rested upon finding out the relation between the author and the text. Conventionally, the author has been perceived as a god-like creator and the supreme originator of the text. Accordingly, the literary text has been perceived as a mirror to the cultural, social, and historical background as well as the psychology of its author. In this sense, literary criticism before the arrival of the formalistic approaches has been conducted excessively dependent upon the author for the text is assumed to be essentially connected with its "creator."

However, the critical assessment of a literary text in relation to its writer has been strongly problematized in the twentieth century. New Critics contested against the analysis of a text based on the intention of its writer. Starting as a formalist movement in the early twentieth century, New Criticism condemned the perception of the literary text which supposedly delivers the intention and the emotions of its author. New Critics instead regarded the literary text as a self-contained entity the meaning of which should be sought within its own structures separate from its originator. Therefore, they encouraged a rather formalistic and objective close reading of the text itself. For instance, one of the first advocates of New Criticism, I. A. Richards experimented with this new way of critical assessment by handing out poems to his students for analysis without providing the information regarding their writers. Richards aimed to "encourage the students to concentrate on the words on the page, rather than to rely on preconceived or received beliefs about a text" ("Introduction to Practical Criticism" n. pag.), and he documented the outcomes in *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment,* which he published in 1929. Likewise, in their renowned article entitled "Intentional Fallacy," William K. Wimsatt Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley explicitly confronted critical judgment based on the author as well as his social and historical context. Claiming that "the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for

judging the success of a work of literary art" (465), they advocated to find the meaning purely and simply in the text rather than depending upon its writer:

> A poem can be only through its meaning – since its medium is words – yet it is, simply is, in the sense that we have no excuse for inquiring what part is intended or meant. […] The poem is not the critic's own and not the author's (it is detached from the author at birth and goes about the world beyond his power to intend about it or control it). The poem belongs to the public. It is embodied in language, the peculiar possession of the public, and it is about the human being, an object for public knowledge. (470-1)

Likewise, in the 1960s, poststructuralism also problematized the dominance of the author over the text. In his renowned essay "The Death of the Author," Barthes confounded the conventionally essential relationship between the author and the text. Barthes recognizes the traditional perception of the author, and he states that "[t]he explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produces it, as if it were always in the end […] the voice of a single person" (143). Moreover, he emphasizes that the author has conventionally been considered always already temporarily existing before his text: "The Author is thought to nourish the book, which is to say that he exists before it, thinksTsuffers [*sic*], lives for it, is in the same relation of antecedence to his work as a father to his child (145). Thus, he draws attention to the debunking of the subject position of the author in contemporary literary theory. Barthes claims that the act of writing no longer designates a mere "representation," "notation," "recording," or "depiction" (145). Instead, he proposes that the act of writing is a textual and linguistic one where the author is merely a product of his own text. Therefore, Barthes replaces the concept of the author with the "scriptor" who is "born simultaneously with the text [and] is no way equipped with being preceding or exceeding the writing" (145). This kind of contention transfers the author from the subject position to the object position, and it frees the text from both the authorial power and an interpretation based primarily on its writer. Hence, Barthes maintains that

> Once the author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that

text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing. […]
In the multiplicity of writing, everything is to be *disentangled,*
nothing *deciphered;* the structure can be followed, 'run' (like the
thread of a stocking) at every point and at every level, but there is
nothing beneath: the space of writing is to be ranged over, not
pierced; writing ceaselessly posits meaning ceaselessly to
evaporate it, carrying out a systematic exemption of meaning.
(Barthes 147)

In a similar vein, Michel Foucault also draws attention to the problematization of
the god-like author in contemporary literary theory. He regards the elimination of the
author in the interpretation of the text as "one of the fundamental ethical principles of
contemporary writing" (205). Foucault evaluates the conventional understanding of
author as the ultimate creator of a text as a barrier before "the free circulation, the free
manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction" (221).
Therefore, he argues that contemporary literary criticism does neither aims to "bring out
the work's relationship with the author" nor tries to reconstruct a thought or an
experience of the author through the text (207). On the contrary, Foucault emphasizes
that contemporary criticism analyzes the work in terms of its "structure" and its
"internal relationships" (207). Thus, as both Barthes and Foucault contend, in
postmodern fiction, the dominance of the author over the text is undermined, and the
singular authorial voice the meaning emanates from is contested. Accordingly, the
meaning of the text can be no longer assumed to depend upon the subject who writes it.

In relation to this, contemporary fiction shows "a deliberate attempt to overlap
the authorial voice with the narrating one" (Cazzato 30). This deliberate collision of
authorial and narrative voice is maintained through the portrayal of characters who are
involved in the act of writing throughout the text. The narrator or a character is
presented as the author of the very text he is part of. Moreover, not only does he write
the text at the time but he also comments upon the structure, form, and the content of
the text. In this respect, postmodern fiction depletes the conventional notion of the
author as the sole creator and owner of a literary text, and instead it transmits the role of
the author into the text. Luigi Cazzato calls this kind of characterization "author-
narrator," and he explains the use of author-narrator in postmodern fiction as follows:

I like to speak of an author-narrator instead, that is, a narrator who, at his will, drops his/her narrational mask letting the reader see the person of the author with a pen in his/her hand. The author acknowledges to the reader his/her presence and his power of manipulation S/he obtrudes into his story, manifesting his/her will to be outside and inside fiction and, thus, challenging the separateness of fiction and reality, hence the autonomy of the text. (31)

Such an author-character can be found in *Mantissa* in the character of Miles Green, who is portrayed as a contemporary author. Even though Green is not the narrator and *Mantissa* is narrated from third-person point of view, Green's presence as an author in the novel corresponds to the overlapping of narrative and authorial voice in postmodern fiction as suggested by Cazzato. While Green exemplifies Cazzato's conceptualization of author-narrator, various critics offer different names for this type of characterization. As such, Green is referred as an "author-persona" (Eddins 208), an "author-character" (Onega 34) as well as a "character-novelist" (Salami 191).[20]

On the one hand, Fowles problematizes his own authority over the text by inserting another fictional authorial voice. On the other hand, he creates the illusion that the novel is written during the reader's act of reading by presenting Green as the author of *Mantissa.* Even though neither Green nor the reader is aware of Green's authorship at the beginning of the novel, Green's authorship is implied by Nurse Cory almost at the end of the first part. When Nurse Cory is asked about the duration of Green's presence in the hospital, she answers to Green indicating the page number:

'How long have I been here?'
'Just a few pages.'
"Pages?'
She had folded her arms, and yet again there was the ghost of a quiz in her watching eyes. 'What should I have said?'
'Days?'
She smiled more openly. 'Good.'
'Why did you say pages?'

86

> 'You've mislaid your identity, Mr. Green. What I have to work on
> is your basic sense of reality. And that seems in good shape.' (*M*
> 19)

While Nurse Cory's association of the time with the page numbers is the first indicator of Green's authorship, the end of the first chapter explicitly suggests that *Mantissa* is, in fact, written by Green. Taking a paper from the desk, Nurse Cory claims that it is Green's story which he has just written. As she starts to read, the novel turns back to its beginning. This analepsis points at the fact that Green's act of writing starts the moment he wakes up from his sleep.

Green's amnesia recalls Barthes's contestation that the "modern scriptor is born with the act of writing" (145). Green is presented as waking up in the hospital room experiencing memory loss at the beginning of the novel. However, as the following chapters reveal, this memory loss does not affect his expansive knowledge on literary theory and the art of fiction; indeed, he makes assertive claims to Erato regarding literary theory, criticism, and literary canon during the writing process. Although he is unaware of his identity specifically as an author in the beginning, his identity as an author is only restored during the act of writing.

Moreover, Barthes's problematization of the notion of the author as the sole owner of the text is not only exemplified by Green's being an author-character but it also echoes in Green's ideas about the position of author in contemporary literary theory. During their long discussions about literature, Green and Erato occasionally refer to their perception of author. As a professional author, Green openly emphasizes that the text should be evaluated independent from its author. In a similar way, Green states that

> At the creative level there is in any case no connection whatever
> between author and text. They are two entirely separate things.
> Nothing, but nothing, is to be inferred or deduced from one to the
> other, and in either direction. The constructivists have proved that
> beyond a shadow of doubt. The author's role is purely fortuitous
> and agential. He has no more significant a status than the

bookshop assistant or the librarian who hands the text qua object to the reader. (*M* 118)

Furthermore, Green regards the writers who put their names on the title-page "[q]uite incredibly behind the times" claiming that "most of [these] writers are still under the positively medieval illusion that they write their own books" (*M* 118). Therefore, Green becomes a parodic representative of contemporary literary theorists. He argues that the text is independent from the author, and that it should be read, analyzed, and made sense of neither in relation to the socio-economic context nor the psychology of the author. He strongly defends the notion of self-contained literary text whose meaning is not reliant on its author.

Although Fowles problematizes the dominance of author over the text via presenting the author-character Green, he still does not ascribe a full authorial power to him, either. Even though Green is ostensibly the author-at work who writes *Mantissa,* Fowles explores the function of inspiration, influence (i.e. muse) in the construction of the text by which he puts into question Green's authorship. Rather than presenting inspiration as an essential part of the author, Fowles portrays the muse -Erato- and its connotations such as inspiration, influence, and imagination as a distinctly separate character. Through the relationship between Green and the personified muse, he suggests that Erato might as well be the actual author of the text.

This ambiguity with regard to the actual author of the text is reinforced by the symbolic function of sexuality in the novel. Even though it is not explicitly remarked in the text, the sexual intercourse between Green and Erato is implied to be the symbolic representation of the writing process which is jointly conducted by the author and the muse. This allegorical account becomes most evident when Nurse Cory associates Green's writings with the birth of a baby at the very beginnings of the novel. After Green, Dr. Delfie, and Nurse Cory have sex, Nurse Cory takes some papers from the desk, and she impersonates a nurse who handles the new-born baby to its parent:

"Hey, Mr. Green, who's a clever boy? Who's in luck?"

"What luck?"

> She came a step or two closer, beside the bed, and gazed down at
> the small sheaf of paper crooked in her right arms; then smiled
> coyly and roguishly up at him.
>
> "It's a lovely little story. And you made it all by yourself."
>
> […]
>
> Now she seemed to be hinting that he was some scribbler, a mere
> novelist or something. […] 'Look Mr. Green. Listen.' She bent
> her pretty capped head to read the top page, using a finger to trace
> the words, as she might have touched a new-born nose or tiny
> wrinkled lips. "It was conscious of […] CRASH! (*M* 48)

As the quotation points out, the novel associates the writing process with sexuality, and the written story with the birth of a baby. In this sense, the analogy between sexuality and literary production points at Green's evident need of Erato in writing *Mantissa*. Just as the conception is equally contingent upon male and female, the inscription of a text is also asserted to depend upon the collaboration of the author and the muse. Thus, as Brooke Lenz puts it, in *Mantissa* "Erato and Miles exercise a nearly equivalent authority, not only at the end of [the text] but throughout it" (198). In his article entitled "Re-Reading the Reforgotten Text: John Fowles' *Mantissa*," Tibor Toth also examines the sexuality in symbolic terms, and he confirms that *Mantissa* advocates the understanding of mutual dependence of the author and the muse in the creation of a literary text:

> Miles Green and Erato, man and woman, talent and inspiration
> are involved as the partners who are complementing each other on
> the sexual performance they managed to provide. It is useful to
> remember that earlier in the novel Miles Green explained Erato
> that sex was an objective correlative for the creative process
> behind the conception of a work of art. (64)

In fact, in the course of the novel, Erato occasionally creates the illusion that Green is the sole author of the text, and she is merely a mantissa, that is to say, a small contribution. She initially claims that her ontological existence relies upon Green.

Stating that she "didn't even exist at all a few hours ago" (*M* 96), she implies that there is not an Erato in existence prior to Green's act of writing. Furthermore, she also claims to "have absolutely no rights," and Green can "throw [her] in the wastepaper basket," and he "can kill [her] off in five lines if he wants to" (*M* 94). Erato's refusal of any right in the production of literary text ostensibly reinforces Green's authorial power and diminishes the function of inspiration and influence. On a similar note, Green also rejects Erato's contribution to the writing process, and he self-confidently states that Erato "must learn to accept that for [him and for all of writers] who are truly serious, [she] can never again be more than occasional editorial adviser in one or two secondary areas" (*M* 120). Thus, Green wants to erase Erato in his act of writing, and he eventually decides to end their relationship. Considering that the relationship of Erato and Green symbolically resembles a sexual relationship, Green's rejection of Erato can also be regarded as a break-up:

> Now I suggest we forgot this whole unfortunate episode and shake hands. Then I'll leave you here. At some future date, when and if I feel I could use a little advice, I'll give you a ring. No offence, but I'll call you. And I suggest that next time we meet in a public place. I'll take you to some kebap house for lunch, we'll talk, we'll drink a little retsina, we'll behave like two civilized contemporary people. If I have time I'll take you to the airport, put you on the plane back to Greece." […] "And one last thing. I also think I'd be happier if in future we operate on a financial basis. I'll give you a little fee for anything I use, right? (*M* 121)

In this respect, in *Mantissa*, such stages of a relationship as meeting, date, fight, and break-up are evidently likened to the stages of an act of writing such as the thought process, actual writing, writer's block, and closure/conclusion. Considering this analogy, the relationship between Erato and Green comes to a full circle with regard to its symbolic function. Even though they initially collaborate in the act of writing, they eventually conflict with each other. Just as a partner leaves the other in a relationship, Green decides not to continue the act of writing with Erato, and he leaves her.

However, as Green sardonically tries to walk out of the hospital room, the door of the room vanishes, and the couple is trapped inside the grey hospital room without

any apparent exit. As it is previously mentioned in the novel, the hospital room symbolizes Green's brain, and its grey walls stand for grey brain cells (*M* 114). Thus, Green's inability to leave the room symbolizes his inability of walking out of his own brain as Erato also tells Green that "you can't walk out of your own brain" (*M* 123). In this sense, as Ian Gotts claims, Erato, in fact, manages and manipulates Green throughout the novel, and she allows "her creator to enjoy only an illusion of power" (91) until the moment Green decides to discard her. After Green and Erato are trapped in the room, that is to say, in Green's brain, the muse starts to transgress Green's underestimation of her role, and Green who is helplessly entrapped in his own brain reconciles with his muse, Erato. This symbolic entrapment suggests that neither Green nor Erato is the sole owner of *Mantissa*; on the contrary, "it is the muse as much as the author who writes the story, weaves the text" (Haegert 179).

As a result, there is an ambiguity regarding the identity of the author throughout the novel, and the reader is constantly inclined to question who the actual author of *Mantissa* is in the course of the narration. Such a questioning with regards to the author of the text is made part of the novel through characterization, that is to say, the portrayal of an author-character and the muse. John Haegert also argues that the authorship is quite problematic and ambiguous in *Mantissa*. Accordingly, he emphasizes that the real author of the novel – if there is any – remains a question throughout the novel:

> [I]t is a moot and unresolvable question whether it is Miles Green, the novelist-hero, or his muse Erato who is the "true" author of the work entitled *Mantissa*. […] Rather than a being – as we might have thought – a mere projection of Miles's repressed imagination, Erato may in fact be the author of *Mantissa* itself. […] Insofar as she assumes a greater and greater role in the "revision" of their relationship and thus in the writing "their" text, it remains very much an open question whether Miles or his muse bears ultimate responsibility for the book we have before us. In *Mantissa*, in other words, the reader is never quite certain by whose authority or in whose name the novel has been written. Is it Miles's fiction, or Erato's? Who authorizes whom? Who

embodies whom? The controlling artist or his uncontrollable imagination? (167-174)

Thus, Fowles does not investigate merely his own or any other significant person's authorship; indeed he problematizes the general concept of authorship. In this manner, the eradication of the authorial power firstly via author-character Green and secondly via Erato explicitly blurs the distinctions between such narrative structures as author, character, narrator, as well as reader in *Mantissa*. The novel significantly rejects the conventionally hierarchical relationship between the author and the character. While the concept of author used to be perceived both separate from and hierarchically superior to the text and its characters, Fowles's deliberate relinquishing the notion of god-like author puts the author and the characters in ontologically equal positions in the fictional realm. Green and Erato thus simultaneously become characters and authors of the same text, and they fluctuate between the subject and object positions. For instance, while Green is introduced as a mere character of Fowles's *Mantissa* at the beginning of the text, he is transferred to the authorial position in the course of the novel. Furthermore, Erato, who is firstly presented as a character of Green's text, is subsequently implied to be the author of *Mantissa*. Dwight Eddins likewise draws attention to Fowles's use of narrative units in flux, and he implies that there are no distinct differences between them in the fictional realm:

> [Fowles] narrows the remove between himself and the characters – and thus between the reader-persona and the characters. Both author and reader as personae, however, are pulled deeper and deeper into the fictive web of the novel, and farther from their respective positions in reality. (218)

Moreover, in his article entitled "A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles," Thomas Docherty similarly contends that Fowles not only "refin[es] the authorial voice out of the novel" (119) but he also "den[ies] the formal artificiality of the printed text" (129). In so doing, Fowles blurs the distinctions between such narrative units as characters, author, narrator, and reader, and he constitutes a fictive world girded by ambiguities and uncertainties where narrative roles are deliberately fluid and vague.

On a similar note, in his article entitled "Power and Hazard: John Fowles's Theory of Play," Roy Mack Hill asserts that Fowles's use of author-character in *Mantissa* distinctively negates the concept of an ordered and organized fictional world. Hill argues that Fowles confounds "the concept of a god-centered world" (215); instead, he "accepts the concept of a hazard-centered world," (215). Indeed, the rejection of the god-like author and the transference of authorial voice to the internal structures of the text construct a chaotic fictive universe in *Mantissa.* "[D]ebunking human prototypes of a godlike authority figure" (212), Fowles presents characters who are ontologically free from authorial power in a centerless fictional universe. In such a centerless hazard-world, which Huizinga associates with "tension," "uncertainty," and "chanciness" (qtd. in Hill 217), there is no authorial power on the choices, roles, actions, and functions of the characters (Hill 215). The characters's fate relies upon "chance rather than deterministic role of an author (Hill 215). Hence, characters are not essentially the author's products; on the contrary, their existence is presented as contextual, dependent of and limited to the covert and overt positioning and repositioning of the other characters within the text.

Fowles contests singularity with regard to the authorial power, and he suggests multiple authors within the internal structures of the text. As a result, he provides the characters with the freedom to challenge any controlling authority. This contestation against the authorial voice and the presentation of free characters instead become evident in his other novels, as well. In *The French Lieutenant's Woman,* for example, Fowles considers the disobedience of characters as a requirement for their existence: "[i]t's only when our characters and events begin to disobey us that they begin to live" (*FLW* 98). In relation to this, Fowles becomes "no more than a recorder of his characters's independent whims and caprices" in his fiction (Eddins 218). This also applies to the author-character Green in *Mantissa.* Even though Green attempts to disregard Erato's role in the literary production, he is challenged by Erato herself, who is his character and co-author at the same time. Despite being a product of Green's mind, Erato liberally intervenes in Green's act of writing. Making assertive claims and suggestions, she shapes and reshapes the text, and she declines to be in the object position throughout the novel. In this regard, Fowles's portrayal of a character that challenges the author underscores how postmodern fiction renders autonomous and

defiant characters that can make their own decisions and claim rights to their own existence.

In *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity*, Pamela Cooper similarly draws attention to the autonomy of Fowles's characters. Cooper claims that Fowles is "suspicious and fascinated by the efforts of individuals to control and influence each other" (1). Therefore, she observes that "[m]ost of the significant relationships depicted in [Fowles's] fiction involve some sort of power struggle" (1). Regarding power relations between author and character, Cooper implies that authorial power proves to be illusionary in Fowles's fiction most of the time. Thus, she states that "despite their status as projections of the authorial imagination," characters in Fowles's fiction are "potentially and disruptively autonomous" (2). In relation to Cooper's assertion, it might be argued that even though Erato is the product of Green's imagination, she still manages to confound his authority. In this sense, Erato's freedom is most explicitly rendered in her interfering in Green's process of constructing a female character. While Green decides on the appearance and the personal characteristics of the female character of his novel, Erato also freely announces her preferences:

> 'You see … a cultural background for yourself?'
> 'I think I'd like to be … well, perhaps a graduate in English? Cambridge? I feel I might have written one or two commercially not very successful but in certain circles quite widely respected books of poetry. Something like that. I'd probably be an associate editor with one of the literary magazines.' (*M* 101)

As Erato's intervention in Green's construction of her character points out, the characters in *Mantissa* continuously construct and reconstruct, make and remake the other characters. Likewise, Thomas Docherty draws attention to the characters's constant "struggle to order and recognize the Other" in the novel (119). He argues that the struggle for power stems from Fowles's "desire to create free characters" who not only "determine their own history" but also "existentially create themselves in the writing of their own textual *historie*" (119). Thus, even though Fowles constructs those characters, he simultaneously aims for providing his characters with the freedom to shape their own faiths (Docherty 119). Therefore, *Mantissa* "reanimate[s] and expand[s] the commonplace that each man's life is a novel of which that man is the author"

(Eddins 204). Accordingly, the characters in *Mantissa* not only confront the constraints of formal textuality but they also confront other characters when their freedom is suppressed. While Green dismantles Fowles's authorial power via his author-character existence, Erato reclaims her freedom via opposing the authorial voice that Green tries to impose upon her.

Moreover, Erato can be seen as a postmodern character as she is referential. In *Mantissa*, the muse, whose existence is purely textual and fictional is transmigrated into another textual fictive universe, and is presented as a character. In this context, Erato's character resembles Sigmund Freud (f) in *The White Hotel* since they are both transmigrated characters. Nevertheless, *Mantissa* cannot be regarded as a historiographic metafiction as defined by Linda Hutcheon. Historiographic metafiction is specifically characterized by its use of historically existent figures as fictional characters so as to problematize historiography. In Mantissa, however, Erato's character is more an example of what Umberto Eco calls a "transworld identity" (qtd. in McHale, *Postmodernist* 57). By "transworld identity," Eco refers to transference of a fictional, mythological, cultural, or historical figure into the fictive webs of another text (qtd. in McHale, *Postmodernist* 57). In this sense, the use of transworld identity in postmodern fiction promotes intertextuality of the text. Accordingly, situating fictional characters or culturally existent figures into other fictional universes and presenting transworld identities, postmodern fiction juxtaposes "incommensurable worlds" (McHale, *Postmodernist* 57) and constitutes an "intertextual zone" (McHale, *Postmodernist* 56).

Thomas Docherty sustains a detailed study on Fowles's characterization, and he affirms that Fowles frequently presents characters that display an intertextual quality. He asserts that Fowles's naming his characters with reference to history or literary canon or his directly fictionalizing actual or historical people is a substantial device in his fiction:

> A more obvious device to do with names which Fowles uses to "real-ize" character, is the constant introduction of what Hamon calls "*personages-référentiels*" by the insertion of their names. Here, the name, be it that of an artist […] or simply that of a well-known person […] has its primary sense in the world of History,

and a certain amount of cultural competence is necessary to our comprehension of its place in the novel. (133)

Thus, by way of referring to historically, mythologically, or culturally existing personalities, Fowles pulls his characters out of their "arbitrary form" (Docherty 133), and he render them a signified in reality (Docherty 133). In other words, as Docherty stresses with a hyphen between "real-ize," Fowles makes his characters as referents of "something really existent" (133) in actuality. On the one hand, Fowles blurs the distinction between the fictional text and the historical text as well the distinction between the historical person and the fictional character by means of characters that refer to historical people. On the other hand, he challenges the "ontological boundaries between fictional worlds" (McHale, *Postmodernist* 58) by borrowing characters from other cultural, literary, and mythological texts. In this respect, the notion of "transworld identiy" is maintained by Erato's character in *Mantissa*. Fowles ensures an intertextual quality in the novel by presenting the mythological figure, the muse, as a character. As such, Fowles highlights the postmodern notion of literary text which is essentially intertextual and referential. By using a transworld identity, he shows that literary texts are not monolithic. On the contrary, their construction and meaning are always and inevitably related and linked to the other texts.

Erato can also be examined as a postmodern character in terms of embodying the postmodernist view of self. As Fredrick Jameson indicates in *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism,* "centered subject" once existed "in the period of classical capitalism" and the "nuclear family" (15). However, in contemporary societies which are ridden by pervasive media, communications means, advancing technology, and consumerism, the notion of an indivisible and core subject has come to an end. Self can no longer anchor itself to a center in relation to the continuous exposure to visual images, advertisements, and consumption products, and it accordingly becomes rather fluid and fluctuating. Accordingly, postmodernist condition results in a notion of self which is fragmented, multiple, incoherent, and constructed. Therefore, in postmodern societies, "unified subject" becomes a myth and is regarded to be "unreal or undesirable and inauthentic" (Jameson 13). The notion of subject is rather perceived to be "dependent" on a certain kind of society for its "construction and existence," and it is thought to be "menaced, undermined, problematized, or fragmented by other social

96

arrangements" (Jameson 137). Likewise, in *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*, Kenneth Gergen defines self in relation to the condition of postmodern societies. Gergen argues that emerging technologies result in the saturation of society, and accordingly "social saturation furnishes us with a multiplicity of incoherent and unrelated languages of self" (6). Thus, self is no longer found as singular in contemporary societies; conversely, one can only talk about the existence of multiple selves which are continuously appropriated, constructed, and reconstructed.

This philosophical elaboration on the notion of self finds resonance in postmodern fiction most significantly in characterization. Postmodern fiction utilizes characterization as a site to reflect the postmodern notion of self. As Aleid Fokkema posits in *Postmodern Character: A Study of Characterization in British and American Postmodern Fiction*, characterization in postmodern fiction is the embodiment of postmodern view of self. She states that postmodern characterization deliberately demonstrates self as constructed through language and discourse. She maintains that "[s]elves are enacted in language, and there is nothing outside the text" (13). Even though "[f]iction has always offered the illusion of the unified […] subject, [in postmodern fiction], that myth is now deconstructed" (A. Fokkema 13). As a result, postmodern characters are characterized by their lack of consistency and coherence. Indeed, they become representatives of the postmodern perception of self which is fragmented, centerless, inconsistent, incoherent, and verbally constructed.

Another extensive study on the changing notion of self and subject and its embodiment in postmodern characterization is provided by Linda Hutcheon. She indicates that the "subject" becomes a very trendy subject in contemporary criticism and literature (*A Poetics* 158). Even though the concepts of self and subject are not denied, such theorists such as Derrida, Foucault, and Lacan overtly attack the notion of self as a centered entity (*A Poetics* 158). As Hutcheon points out, this de-centering of the self in contemporary theory finds resonance in postmodern literature in the portrayal of characters who the reader cannot identify as unitary, coherent, and singular subjects. Indeed, Hutcheon claims that the narrative, historical, and subjective unity with regard to characterization is constantly frustrated in postmodern fiction (*A Poetics* 162). Accordingly, postmodern fiction disturbs the coherent, individual character's conventional "relation to history, to social formations, and even to [their] own

unconscious" (*A Poetics* 166), and the characters become manifestations of the fragmented, incoherent, unstable, and de-centered perception of self. Thus, Hutcheon, who recognizes the celebration of multiplicity and fragmentation in postmodern poetics, draws attention to the challenge to singularity in postmodern fiction via fragmented characters:

> [Postmodern works] also challenge narrative singularity and unity in the name of multiplicity and disparity. Through narrative, they offer fictive corporality instead of abstractions, but at the same time, they do tend to fragment or at least to render unstable the traditional unified identity or subjectivity of character. (*A Poetics* 90)

In *Mantissa*, Erato's character embodies the decentered self, and she cannot be classified as a character in the traditional sense. Indeed, one cannot pinpoint a single certainty with regards to Erato's character throughout the novel for she displays an ontologically problematical status. As her character is based upon a mythological figure, which obviously does not have an existence in the empirical sense, Erato's existence within the text as a character becomes one of the focal questions the novel rests upon. Throughout the novel, the ontological reality of Erato is problematized and investigated by herself, Green, as well as the text itself. Thus, in the course of narration, her character is directly or indirectly exposed to questionings with regard to her ontological status. To what extent Erato is real, whether she is existent or non-existent at all, if she exists, and if she is real, what kind of an ontological reality she has all remain ambiguous throughout the text. Green, for instance, get frequently and overly confused with regard to Erato's ontology:

> 'First you don't exist. Then you've been endlessly screwed by other men. Come on, make up your mind – which is it, for heaven's sake?' 'I am perfectly capable of making the kind of comparison I might have made, had I existed as I actually am. If I was.' 'You can't not exist and actually be. They're mutually contradictory.' (*M* 89)

Even though both Green and Erato agree that she does have some kind of existence, neither of them can exactly comprehend her unique ontology. Accordingly, every time they attempt to define the nature of Erato's existence, they find themselves lost in paradoxes not being able to make sense of it.

The problematical ontology of *Mantissa*'s Erato is also reinforced by the fact that the entire text is a figment of Green's imagination. As all of the events, dialogues, setting, and characters in *Mantissa* are the products of Green's perplexed mind, Erato is also no more than an artifact in Green's novel-to-be. In this respect, Erato as a postmodern character becomes doubly problematic. Even though characters in the novels are entirely fictional and do not have an empirical existence, fictional characters still have a unique ontology in the realm of fictional universes. Although they are not actual people, fictional characters in the novels are regarded as particular individuals. Not only are they are given human attributes and biographical backgrounds but they are also portrayed within a social, historical, and cultural environment.

In this sense, while Erato's character is already problematical in terms of her being the embodiment of the empirically non-existent muse, her being the product of Green's troubled mind reinforces her problematical ontology. In a similar vein, when Green asks Erato "who the devil do you think you are?" (*M* 85), Erato confirms that she is merely a creation of Green's mind, and the continuity of her existence is accordingly dependent upon him: "I don't think, I know. I'm just one more miserable fantasy figure your diseased mind is trying to conjure up out of nothing.' She turns her head to one side. 'I wish to God you'd just bang away and get it over with. Then throw me on your next bonfire" (*M* 85).

Green and Erato's acknowledgement of the fact that Erato exists in the author's mind results in a rather ironical situation with regard to Green. Throughout the novel, Erato and Green clash and contradict with each other in multiple respects. In the course of their dialogues, Green is presented disapproving of the sexuality he is exposed to by Erato. Moreover, they are portrayed involving in a continuous battle of words, and they are displayed to defend contrary ideas regarding literary production and literary theory. Not only does Green undermine Erato's contribution in the writing process, but as a contemporary author, he specifically thinks that Erato lacks theoretical knowledge as once he asks Erato "How can one possibly discuss theory with you when you haven't

read the basic texts?" (*M* 113). In this respect, Erato and Green can be considered as foil characters. Having different point of views with regards to literature and literary theory, they constantly contrast with each other. While Green symbolizes "contemporary," Erato becomes a representative of the "tradition." As such, characterization reinforces the metafictional quality of the text. *Mantissa*, as a metafiction, elaborates upon such subject matters as literature, literary text, and literary theory by means of the characters who are in clash with each other.

Considering that Erato is a figment of Green's imagination, Green indeed is the very source of what he confounds, undermines, degrades, and reacts to throughout the novel. Green's personification of Erato is no more than Green's concretization of his own internal conflicts and dilemmas with regard to literary production, contemporary literary theory, authorship, and the contribution of inspiration and influence to the construction of a literary text. Likewise, Erato's ignorance is also Green's own ignorance he unconsciously knows but cannot acknowledge. In *John Fowles: Visionary and Voyeur*, Brooke Lenz similarly draws attention to the constructed nature of Erato, and he indicates that all of the challenges and utterances of Erato towards Green, in fact, come from Green himself:

> As both characters repeatedly argue, Erato is not "real," except as figment of Miles' imagination, a psychic reality, or, as Fowles would undoubtedly argue, as an embodiment of his anima. Any analysis of Miles' authorship that Erato advances must therefore come from Miles himself. (190)

Therefore, Green's verbal battle with Erato is no more than his attempt to interrogate his own system of beliefs as an author. Consequently, as Pamela Cooper indicates "[i]n the lurid *Mantissa*, the relationship between Miles Green […] and Erato is a kind of internalized, affectionate war" (3) that occurs in the mind of Green. All the things Erato does and says come from nowhere but Green's uneasy and confused mind as an author. In relation to this, all Erato does and say throughout the novel is merely to "parrot what-ever lines" (*M* 86) Green gives her.

Erato's display of fragmented, discontinuous, and inconsistent self is also underscored by the changes in her external appearance and her identity. Throughout the

novel, Erato's external appearance and her outfits change, and she alternately adopts different personalities as Dr. Delfie, Nurse Cory, a rocker girl, and a Greek maiden. In addition, in the course of the novel she occasionally occupies multiple bodies at the same time, as the temporal co-existence of Dr. Delfie and Nurse Cory shows. Likewise, Lenz states that "[i]n the course of the novel, Erato appears in numerous incarnations, sometimes simultaneously occupying several female bodies, as in the opening sequence where she appears as both Dr. Delfie and Nurse Cory" (195-6). While Erato sometimes fully impersonates these identities with their roles and occupations (e.g. when she is Dr. Delfie and Nurse Cory), most of the time her changes are merely at the level of changing her outfits.[21]

Erato's alternating external appearance is of significance in analyzing her as a postmodern character. Erato's dismissal of a singular identity and her adopting various personalities instead are closely related to her problematic ontology and selfhood. The muse possesses a different ontological reality in the novel for she lacks a physical existence as a mythological figure. As Erato's ontology does not have a biological or empirical basis, she has an omnipresent, immortal, transcendental, and representational existence. Hence, Erato is a timeless character who is present everywhere and every time whenever there is an act of literary production.

In this respect, Erato's external appearance is suggested to change in accordance with the changing literary trends and movements in the course of time. Accordingly, her physical appearance is attuned to various cultures, social groups, and different time periods ranging from Ancient Greece to twentieth century. In the early chapters of *Mantissa*, Green, who is not completely conscious of Erato's omnipresent existence, is perplexed by Erato's random and abrupt shifts between inconsistent appearances. Thus, he condemns Erato for "trying to hide behind the roles and language of a milieu to which [she does] not belong" (*M* 55). Moreover, he says to Erato that "[f]or a start you've completely confused the uniform of three different sub-cultures, to wit, the Skinheads, the Hell's Angels and Punk. They're three rather different things, you know" (*M* 55-6).

However, as Green gradually acknowledges Erato's unique existence, her inconsistent external appearance becomes more fascinating for him. Accordingly, the narrator defines Erato "all at the same time, to be both demure and provocative,

classical and modern, individual and Eve-like, tender and unforgiving, present and past, real and dreamed, soft and…" (*M* 72). As for Green, he finally comes to the conclusion that Erato exists; yet, her existence cannot be defined in the traditional sense. Thus, he says that "[a]ll right, perhaps she does not exist in a historical or scientific sense. But as you're so subtle-minded I'm sure you'll agree that she has acquired a kind of apostrophic and prosopopoeic reality" (*M* 90). As for Erato, she defines her existence as a "whole historical situation" (*M* 92). Lenz similarly relates Erato's instability to her unique ontology, and she states that "Erato inherently lacks a specific situation that might preclude such variations in representation" (196). As a result, the Erato's problematical ontology becomes the very reason of her being variably configured in the course of history. Her lack of an essential physicality both in and out of *Mantissa* hinders her from having a static and definite rendition, and this becomes the reason of her different configurations throughout literary history as well as throughout *Mantissa*.

Mantissa obviously creates the illusion that Erato is a free-willed character as she assertively challenges Green throughout the novel and overthrows his authorial power. In a similar way, her changing appearances are initially presented to occur at her own will since every time she abruptly alters her appearance, it comes unexpectedly and shockingly for Green. Nevertheless, if Erato is evidently the artifice of Green's mind, the different identities and appearances accordingly prove to be no more than different roles and configurations he unconsciously casts for her. Green who becomes aware of the situation at some point openly says to Erato that "I've already changed your appearance twice" (*M* 97). Therefore, in *Mantissa*, Erato becomes s a character who is both real and constructed at the same time. Her existence can neither be defined in the empirical sense nor it can be completely denied; rather, she exists as a situational, conceptual, and mythological hence a cultural being. As a result, the fact that Green arranges, changes, in other words, constructs Erato's physical appearance in *Mantissa* draws attention to the fact that the muse has always been imagined, personified, depicted, and constructed differently by different writers in the course of literary history. Therefore, as Lenz also confirms, "Erato possesses an essential identity [and she] appears to others only as they construct her" (196). In *Mantissa*, the most explicit commentary on the constructed self of Erato comes from herself, and she grieves over her being continuously fabricated in the minds of others:

> I suppose it's never occurred to you what a horror it would be, if it existed, to have to occupy a role and function that escapes all normal biological laws. All on her own No outside help, never a day off. Constantly to dress up as this, dress up as that. The impossible boredom of it. The monotony. The schizophrenia. Day after day of being mauled about in people's minds, misunderstood, travestied, degraded. (*M* 92-3)

Erato's deprivation of a unitary, stable, and rigid self is indeed a significant characteristic of postmodern character. Erato's problematic ontological status, hence her display of a fluctuating and unstable character, points at how postmodern characters embody the perception of self as plural. In this regard, Erato's fluid character highlights the fact that there is no longer a singular self, instead there are "selves" and "subjectivities" (A. Fokkema 13) which are constructed through language.

Fragmentation proves to be a perpetuating motif for the characters of *Mantissa* as it can be observed in Erato's multiple identities and configurations. The different outlooks of Erato not only serve to problematize the notion of a fixed and unitary self but it also renders Erato a fluid and fragmented character who is devoid of essence. In addition to Erato, fragmentation is notably observed in the protagonist Green's character, as well. Even though *Mantissa* ostensibly presents several characters, who are Miles Green, Nurse Cory, Dr. Delfie, and Erato in multiple guises, it is revealed in the course of the novel that Miles, in fact, is the only actual character in the novel. Thus, the other characters prove to be Green's alternative personalities, and their ontology is presented dependent on Green. In this respect, Green's creating other personalities in his mind can be read as an evidence of his psychological fragmentation. Green's display of psychological fragmentation negates the notion of self as unified and singular. Instead it puts emphasis on the postmodern understanding of self which is plural, fragmented, and multiple.

In conclusion, *Mantissa* exhibits its postmodern quality most evidently in its characterization. Mantissa manifests the postmodern problematization of the notion of author as the ultimate owner of the text by means of the use of author-character, Miles Green. The postmodern contestation against the authorial dominance over the text is demonstrated by the characters who are constantly involved in the act of writing. By

means of characters who liberally and playfully impersonate the role of an author, *Mantissa* underlines the autonomy and textuality of fictional texts as well as their characters. Moreover, the portrayal of the mythological muse as a character points at how postmodern fiction transfer characters from different literary, cultural, and mythological texts into its own domain. Erato's being the embodiment of a mythological figure shows postmodern use of intertextuality in characterization on the assumption that literature is essentially referential, hence, intertextual. In addition, by means of Erato's problematic ontology, *Mantissa* explores postmodern perception of self, and it points out how postmodern characters embody the changing perception of subjectivity and selfhood. As a result, even though *Mantissa* has very few characters, characterization is of great importance in understanding the novel as an example of postmodern fiction. It not only lays bare how characterization is utilized in postmodern fiction as a technical and formal vehicle, but it also points at how postmodern problematics can be conveyed through the rendition of characters.

CONCLUSION

Postmodernism has been the defining term in the late twentieth and the early twenty first century for a great range of different disciplines such as architecture, art, literature, and history. Even though its overall problematics and aesthetic concerns are acknowledged, postmodernism is still a problematic term which resists a comprehensive and singular definition. Postmodern mode manifests itself most evidently in the domain of literature. Postmodern fiction is overtly versatile comprising a great variety of narrative strategies as well as themes which are frequently paradoxical, conflicting, and contradictory. Thus, postmodern fiction also dismisses a singular and unitary definition as it is the case with postmodernism itself. Being such a paradoxical mode, it concurrently uses and abuses, undermines and practices, utilizes and disrupts literary conventions, not to promote but to problematize them.

This problematization is most evident in the way postmodern fiction employs characterization. Postmodern fiction ostensibly subverts and transgresses the conventional aspects of characterization. The conventional theories of characterization that revolve around such terms as individualism and lifelikeness cannot explain the ontologically and epistemologically problematical condition of postmodern characters. While the birth of the novel genre is essentially related to character's representing the human experience in a faithful way, postmodern character is marked by its contestation against this representational function.

As Aleid Fokkema argues, characterization in postmodern fiction has initially been criticized for disrupting representational function. She maintains that early critics claimed that such authors as William S. Burroughs, Thomas Pynchon, and Donald Barthelme – who are later regarded to be postmodern – "produced flat characters, or […] the characters in their novels or stories were badly characterized, and therefore lacked representational qualities" (A. Fokkema 14). This initial disfavour is largely because postmodernism was not properly established as a distinct artistic mode at the time. Even though the early postmodern novelists were aware of the unconventionality of their characterization (A. Fokkema 13), their disruption of representational characterization was not an intentional attempt. Indeed, postmodern character was a result and embodiment of a world where everything is discursive, and self is fluid,

multiple, and decentered. In this respect, postmodern character proves to be rather paradoxical. On the one hand, postmodern character subverts the conventions of representational characterization which is conducted on mimetic premises. It contests such conventions as individualism and verisimilitude with regards to character that render it a referent of human beings. On the other hand, however, it simultaneously attempts to represent the postmodern condition and the postmodern view of self. In this regard, postmodern character perpetuates the mimetic function of characterization, albeit in a different mode of realism. The conventional ways of representation prove to be insufficient in postmodern fiction to provide an accurate picture of the postmodern condition. The lifelike and individualistic characters no longer account for the postmodern self which is continuingly exposed to images from a great variety of media means. Instead, characters with alternating names, unstable configurations, shifting roles as well as with references that disrupts historical knowledge become representatives of the postmodern self.

As such, postmodern fiction creates its own conventions with regards to characterization since characterization undergoes an excessive transformation in postmodern fiction, and it becomes one of the most significant markers of the postmodern quality of a text. Thus, critics and theorists specifically use the term "postmodern character" to differentiate it from the conventional notion of character. However, it should be noted that the concept of "postmodern character" as well as the theories regarding it are not monolithic and unitary. Such theorists as Aleid Fokkema and Helene Cixous emphasize the absence of character in postmodern fiction; and they accordingly claim that the character is dead. Thus, they suggest alternative names such as "subject," "subjectivity," and "figure" for the concept of character that would contain the innovations of characterization in postmodern fiction. At this juncture, they contradict not only other critics but also themselves. They paradoxically attempt to conceptualize and redefine the conventions of character which they claim to be absent. Thus, the debates over the death of character are paradoxically conducted in articles entitled postmodern character. In this respect, the notion of character becomes a problem in postmodern fiction. Not only does character display an ontologically problematical status but also the concept of postmodern character is rather contradictory and debatable.

However problematical and paradoxical its nature is, postmodern character is of great significance in laying bare the postmodern concerns the text elaborates upon. In postmodern fiction, character is not only utilized as a technical device, but it also becomes a site where postmodern themes are critically interrogated. Such interrogation is most efficiently and evidently put forth in the form of historiohraphic metafiction and metafiction. As a historiographic metafiction, D.M. Thomas's *The White Hotel* problematizes history writing; and as an example of metafiction, John Fowles's *Mantissa* underscores the textuality of a literary text. Even though the novels are written one year apart, they are quite divergent from each other, specifically with regards to their characters and characterization. This divergence indeed points out how postmodern fiction can employ characterization in rather diverse forms and modes.

In *The White Hotel*, characterization is utilized as a means to interrogate the neutrality and transparency of historical knowledge. The novel puts the objectivity of historical documents and archives into question by means of portraying historically existent people such as Freud and Dina Pronicheva as characters. Characterization thus becomes a site where fact and fiction is intentionally intermingled. Presenting these characters engaging with purely fictional characters and involving in fictional events, the novel problematizes the way historical knowledge is acquired. In this respect, transworld identities portrayed in the novel show how the historical knowledge is a matter of narration and story telling. The blurred fact and fiction with regards to characterization as well as fictional documents about these characters underscore the textuality of historical documentation, and they point at the impossibility of singularity and neutrality in attaining historical knowledge. Indeed, it underscores historiography as an inevitably textual and discourse-oriented activity where a complete objectivity is not possible.

Mantissa is different from *The White Hotel* in the way it employs characterization. As a significant marker of postmodernism, Fowles portrays an author-character in *Mantissa*. By means of an author-character, *Mantissa* confounds the conventional notion of author as the God-like creator and owner of the text; instead, it highlights the text's autonomy. The inscription of an author-character render the novel overtly self-reflexive and self-conscious since the novel continuously refers to and comments on itself by means of such characterization. Thus, the utilization of an author-

107

character in *Mantissa* reinforces the metafictional quality of the novel. Instead of concealing the fictionality of the text, the insertion of an author-character underscores the fictional, textual, and constructed nature of the literary text. Moreover, Fowles's presentation of a mythological figure as a character epitomizes how postmodern fiction resorts to intertextuality in the rendition of characters. The transmigration of a mythological figure into another fictional universe in *Mantissa* underlines the intertextual and interrelational nature of literature. It shows how postmodern fiction constantly borrows characters from different texts and incorporates them into its body.

Although *The White Hotel* and *Mantissa* employ characterization in considerably divergent forms, each novel aims to give an impression of the postmodern condition by means of the characters they portray. Despite the explicit difference between the way the characters are constructed and represented, they all epitomize the different aspects of the postmodernist conceptualization of self. Lisa Erdman's character, for instance, demonstrates how one's self is constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed by the discourses it is exposed to. Numerous narratives perpetuated over Lisa's character by the other characters as well as by herself exemplify the postmodern view of self as constructed via language. In a similar vein, Erato's character in *Mantissa* underscores the notion of self as decentered and fragmented. Her alternating personalities and configurations highlight the postmodern self as multiple, fluid, and fluctuating. On the other hand, Miles Green's character epitomizes the postmodern perception of self as fragmented. Erato's being a product of Green's mind and his interaction and communication with her throughout the novel display a selfhood which is multiple, fragmented, and lack of an essence.

As a result, the divergence of the novels is the very outcome of the versatile nature of postmodern mode. *The White Hotel* and *Mantissa* are rather different from each other in terms of the way they present its settings, characters, the narrative strategies they make use of, as well as their plot structure. Nevertheless, they both display a distinct postmodern quality in that they construe the ontological and epistemological concerns postmodernism problematizes.

In relation to the versatile, subversive, and interrogative nature of postmodernism, studying and writing about postmodern fiction is a rather challenging task in multiple respects. On the one hand, the traditional literary terms frequently

remain insufficient to include and underline the narrative innovations of postmodern fiction. In relation to its reliance on poststructuralist ideas on language and its overt focus on discourse, literary concepts take a linguistic turn in postmodern fiction. Postmodern fiction revolves around such arduous concepts as intertextuality, sign, subject, metafiction, hyperreality, decentricism, defamiliarization, and fragmentation. On the other hand, the literary scene continuously changes with regards to postmodern fiction. As Elizabeth Dipple indictaes, the authors die, the trends change abruptly, and "contemporary novels quickly become fictions of past" (3). For instance, this proves to be the very case with John Fowles and his fiction. Even though John Fowles published his last novel, *A Maggot*, in 1985 and passed away in 2005, he is still considered to be a contemporary author. Considering that literary conventions constantly evolve, it becomes a problem to evalute Fowles's fiction and the novels published in the 2000s within the same theoretical framework. As such, it becomes quite compelling to write about a literary mode which is still in the process of becoming. Hence, postmodernism should complete its evolution and give way to its succeeding epoch so that the affinity of "postmodernism" and "contemporary" as well as "postmodern fiction" and "contemporary fiction" can be broken, and the conventions of postmodern fiction can be clearly pinned down.

Indeed, since its emergence in the 1960s, postmodernism has been associated with the term "contemporary," and the concepts of postmodern fiction and contemporary fiction have frequently been used interchangeably. Nevertheless, theorists, academics, and critics mention the exhaustion of postmodernism in the last twenty years. Jose Lopez and Garry Potter, for instance, indicate that "postmodernism as an intellectual phenomenon in the year two thousand […] is in a state of decline! It lingers on, its influence for good or ill continues, but postmodernism has gone out of fashion" (4). On a similar note, cultural theorists and academicians such as Alan Kirby, Eric Gans, Timotheus Vermeulen, and Robin van den Akker assert the culmination of postmodernism and suggest the arrival of a new epoch. As this new epoch is in its early stages and thus still in the process of formation, there is neither a comprehensive theoretical framework nor a consensus among the critics regarding its name. Although post-postmodernism is likely to be the preferred term in terms of its designating it as a successor of postmodernism, this new epoch is variably called post-postmodernism,

post-millennialism, pseudo-modernism, metamodernism, altermodernism, and automodernism by different theorists.

The common ground contemporary theorists and critics meet is that postmodernism can no longer account for the contemporary society which it is initially claimed to emerge from and represent. They argue that contemporary scene has altered significantly since the emergence of postmodernism. Alan Kirby, for instance, contends that postmodern condition is most significantly related to the ubiquitous presence of audio-visual images and advertisements from television and cinema screen. Such images render the individual powerless and resulted in the problematization of the real. However, as Kirby claims, technology and the nature of media and television programmes have altered considerably since the 1990s, and contemporary society has entered a new phase, which is affected and shaped by the digital media. In relation to this, Kirby calls this new cultural epoch pseudo-modernism or digimodernism:

> I am arguing here precisely that digimodernism has succeded [postmodernism] as the contemporary cultural-dominant, and to study the habits of the current monarch presupposes the passing of his or her predecessor. It will be clear that I am not advancing the absolutist view that no trace of postmodernism can any longer be found in our culture; indeed, facets of postmodernism have found a place […] within the digimodernist landscape. (*Digimodernism* 6)

Kirby argues that the dominant of the digimodernist society is the internet. He contends that since the late 1980s, television and radio programmes as well as web sites have increased the function and participation of the recipient in the construction of cultural product. In the digimodernist society, the content of the television and radio programmes, computer games, news portals, and social networking sites "are invented and directed by the participating viewer and listener" ("The Death" n. pag.), and accordingly "the individual's action [becomes] the necessary condition of the cultural product[ion]" ("The Death" n. pag.). The digital content of such programmes, which are constituted by the immediate text messages, e-mails, and commentaries that the audiences and listeners leave, does not last long; indeed they become obsolete in a short span of time. As such, cultural product is continuously produced, unproduced, and

reproduced by the actions of anonymous viewers, audiences, and users in the digimodernist society.

While Kirby relates the decline of postmodernism mainly in relation to the change in the technology and communication, Timotheus Vermeulen, and Robin van den Akker underscore both the technologic and socio-economic changes that take place in the last twenty years as significant factors that call for a new cultural and artistic mode. In "Notes on Metamodernism," they draw attention to the severely disrupted ecosystem, uncontrollable financial system, digital revolutions, unstable geopolitical structure, terror attacks, and accordingly a desire for a change in the current world. They indicate that

> The postmodern years of plenty, pastiche, and parataxis are over.
> […] new generations of artists increasingly abandon the aesthetic
> precepts of deconstruction, parataxis, and pastiche in favor of
> aesthetic-ethical notions reconstruction, myth, and metaxis. These
> trends and tendencies can no longer be explained in terms of the
> postmodern. (2)

Even though Vermeulen and Akker's metamodernism temporally succeeds postmodernism, it denotes an artistic mode which mediates between the tenants of modernism and postmodernism. It is "characterized by the oscillation between a typically modern commitment and a markedly postmodern detachment" (Vermeulen and Akker 2). While recognizing the plurality of the postmodern mode, metamodernism perpetuates the modernist nostalgia for order. As such, it becomes "a renewed search for optimism and sincerity" (Potter n. pag.) that calls for an action.

It is difficult, for the time being, to pinpoint the stylistic and thematic concerns of metamodernism within a theoretical framework since the epoch is currently in its early stages. Indeed, different theorists each draw attention to the different applications and trends in the arts by which they underpin the emergence of a new artistic mode. Vermeulen and Akker, for instance, stress the excessive reliance on performatism in contemporary art as a new trend, and remark "how the author […] imposes a certain solution on [people] using dogmatic, ritual, or some other coercive means" (6). Kirby, on the other hand, argues that the revolutions in the digitals reshape and restructure the

relationships between author/producer/director, reader/viewer/audience, and the text. Accordingly, he proposes reality shows and movies as the cultural products of the digimodernist society. He maintains that reality is no longer problematized in digimodernism as is the case with postmodernism; instead, it is readily submitted to the recipient:

> Whereas postmodernism called 'reality' into question, pseudo-modernism defines the real implicitly […] 'interacting' with its texts. Thus, pseudo-modernism suggests that whatever it does or makes is what is reality, and a pseudo-modern text may flourish the apparently real in an uncomplicated form: the docu-soap with its hand-held cameras. ("The Death" n. pag.)

While the theorists tend to point at such audio-visual and performative texts to exemplify the practice of this new artistic mode, they do not suggest any certain convention, strategy, or technique in the domain of literature with regards to post-postmodernism/metamodernism, or digimodernism. Indeed, in *Digimodernism: How New Technologies Dismantle the Postmodern and Reconfigure Our Culture*, Alan Kirby asserts that "digimodernist literature does not exist" (218). He claims that digimodernist literature so far does not exist, and it is partly because digimodernism "gives no privileged status to a finished textual mode; indeed, it shatters and reconstructs textual modality" (*Digimodernism* 128). Nevertheless, it should be noted that literature has been undergoing a change since the late twentieth century mainly in relation to the penetration of internet into the every sphere of people's lives. Indeed, new genres such as fan-fiction and blog fiction have come into being as an outcome of the omnipresent status of the digital technologies. While such genres have enabled people to write fiction and distribute it to everyone on the digital platform, they have also dispensed the need for printing.

In this respect, contemporary fiction can be regarded in the process of a change. The changing conditions, circumstances, and problems of contemporary world such as fluctuating economy, terrorism, global warming, the destruction of nature, advanced technology, and digital media become the very concern of artistics production. Considering that a literary mode reverberates its epistemological and ontological concerns most explicitly in its characterization, characterization is likely to undergo a

transformation in the following decades, as well. Even though post-postmodernism is still a vague concept especially in the field of literature, it is contingent that characterization will turn its back to the conventions of its precedents, most significantly to postmodernism, in the following decades, and it will become one of the focal points in the theoretical and critical texts written with regards to post-postmodern fiction.

Even though postmodernism is regarded to be in decline, most contemporary fiction displays a postmodern quality in its technical and thematic characteristics, and characterization continues to be one of the significant components of a text in employing such techniques and themes. As such, this thesis concludes that *The White Hotel* and *Mantissa* show how characterization is one of the most significant literary elements in postmodern fiction in representing postmodern concerns. Both of these selected novels employ characterization in such a way that enable characters to embody the postmodern view of self as well as the postmodern problematization of historiography and metanarratives. Contributing to the problematization of such postmodern concerns, the postmodern characters in these novels subvert and transgress the technical and thematic conventions of literary characterization. In relation to this, they cannot be pinned down with regards to individualism, lifelikeness, and the conventional referent of literary character, i.e. human being. Even though critics and theorists announce the death of character in postmodern fiction due to the dismissal of conventions, the notion character cannot simply be regarded absent in postmodern fiction. Indeed, the transformation of characterization in postmodern fiction is so radical that postmodern fiction creates its own conventions with regard to characterization, and characterization becomes a vehicle by which text's postmodern quality is reinforced.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1] Even though postmodernism is manifest in all literary genres, it finds a greater resonance in the novel. In relation to the vogue presence of the novel form in postmodern literature, many thinkers, critics as well as novelists exclusively and consciously engage with the term postmodern fiction to specifically denote postmodern novel. Therefore, whenever postmodern fiction is used in this thesis, it is meant to refer specifically to the postmodern novel.

[2] For more information, see King, Pamela M. "Morality Plays." *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English* Theatre. Ed. Richard Beadle. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 240-64. Print.

[3] For more information, see Corman, Brian. "Comedy." *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 52-69. Print.

[4] For more information, see Snyder, Susan. "The Genres of Shakespeare's Plays." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare.* Eds. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley W. Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 83-98. Print.

[5] Even though early eighteenth-century novelists such as Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, and Samuel Richardson "saw themselves as the founders of a new kind of writing" which involved "a break with the old-fashioned romances" (Watt 9), they did not specifically write with awareness that they invented a new genre. Indeed "the term 'novel' was not fully established until the end of the eighteenth century" (Watt 10).

[6] For more information, see Levenson, Michael. Introduction. *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism.* Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 1-8. Print.

[7] Structuralism, the predecessor of poststructuralism, suggests a linguistic model of structure where the constituents of human culture exist in terms of their relationship to each other. In *Course in General Linguistics*, Ferdinand de Saussure defines linguistic sign as an outcome of the arbitrary relationship between the signifier and the signified (67). He suggests that the signifier, the perceived image, arbitrarily refers to the signified, the concept, and the idea the image represents. As a result of this arbitrariness, the meaning of the sign is achieved only in terms of its difference from the other signs. Poststructuralism, however, contests the unproblematic relationship between the signifier and the signified as suggested by structuralism. In "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences," Jacques Derrida states that the concept of

structure has been one of the most significant problematics since the beginning of western science and philosophy (504). The structure has always been given or reduced to a center to ensure a balanced, organized, and fixed existence. The center, therefore, has invariably identified with the presence of "essence," "existence," "substance," "subject," "truth," "transcendentality," "consciousness," "conscience," "God," "man, and so forth" (Derrida 505).

[8] The concept of individual comes from the Latin word *individuum*, which means "an atom, indivisible particle" ("Individual" n.pag.). Even though individualism as a social philosophy is conceptualized in the nineteenth century, it etymologically relates to such concepts as indivisibility, inpartibility, and inseparableness.

CHAPTER ONE

[9] Set in an anonymous city – speculatively Russia – *The Flute-Player* (1979) is about a female flute player named Elena whose personality and creativity are obscured in a totalitarian regime. *Ararat* (1983), *Swallow* (1984), *Sphinx* (1986), and *Summit* (1987) are part of the "Russian Nights" quartet. *Ararat* and *Swallow* are partly fantastical novels, and they incorporate rhyming narratives. *Sphinx* and *Summit* extend the characters and the plot of *Ararat* and *Swallow* adopting a more serious tone. Improvisatores are involved in a constant story-telling activity and occasionally presented competing each other, by which the quartet explores such themes as inspiration, real life as the essence of art, and the frontiers between reality and fiction. *Lying Together* (1990) might be considered as an extension of the "Russian Nights" quartet as its characters are the characters of the quartet who meet up at a conference. The novel blurs the lines between fantasy and reality as reality proves to more fantastical and fictional than the allegedly fictional narratives presented in the course of the novel. *Flying in to Love* (1992) is a postmodern parody of J.F. Kennedy's assassination. The novel mocks conspiracy theories, Americans's emotional bond to Kennedy, and Kennedy's relationship with Marilyn Monroe. *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1993) brings together Holocaust and psychoanalysis as is the case with *The White Hotel*. The protagonist of the novel, Galewski, apprentices Dr Lorenz, who conducts brutal experiments on inmates. In *Eating Pavlova* (1994), Thomas turns to Sigmund Freud's own life and portrays Freud in his last days. He wittily utilizes Freud's interpretation of dreams. In the novel, Freud's daughter Anna attempts to analyze her father's deathbed dreams in the light of her father's theories. In *Lady with a Laptop* (1998), Thomas mocks academics as well as his own profession through constructing a protagonist who is a cynical creative writing lecturer. The novel mainly revolves around the intermingling of fact and fiction. In the novel, a group of students in a workshop works on a murder mystery story in a team writing exercise, and one of the students becomes a real murder victim in the end. *Charlotte: The Final Journey of Jane Eyre* (2000) is a postmodern re-writing of Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. In the first half of

the novel, which is allegedly written by a female author, Jane abandons Rochester upon discovering his sexual impotency. The second half of the novel, which has a metafictional quality, takes place at present where the female author of the first half of the novel acts in a parallel way to Jane Eyre in terms of surpassing male authority and declaring freedom in terms of female sexuality (Cotton 974-5).

[10] Raymond Federman's re-conceptualization of plagiarism explains the epistemology behind Thomas's incorporation of other literary and non-literary texts in the novel. In his article titled "Imagination as Plagiarism [An Unfinished Paper]," Federman emphasizes the depletion of classical understanding of literature, which perpetuates two myths – the author as the creator of the text and originality of the text (569-70). Federman argues that the traditional view of literature which anticipates "an established meaning" ("Imagination as Plagiarism" 571) and fixed subject position "enclosed within the frame of the observer's vision" ("Imagination as Plagiarism" 569) is contested in contemporary literary theory. While the Romantic notion of author as the supreme power is refuted in contemporary literary theory, fiction is regarded merely "imitat[ing], copy[ing], repeat[ing], proliferat[ing], and plagiariz[ing] […] what has always been there" ("Imagination as Plagiarism" 565). Hence, problematization of authenticity in contemporary literary theory is embodied in deliberate intertextuality so as to highlight an understanding of literature that is referential and interrelated. Therefore, in relation to Federman's ideas of plagiarism, Thomas can be claimed to deliberately pla(y)giarize (Federman, "Playgiarism") other sources rather than plagiarizing them. In the same vein, Nicol draws attention to the referentiality in contemporary literary theory, and he evaluates Thomas's use of other texts in *The White Hotel* as a deliberate act. Nicol explains the use of intertextuality in contemporary fiction as follows:

> Theory has taught us that literary composition, rather than being a matter of individual genius (though genius plays a part), is really a complex process of selecting from the network of previously available conversations and discourses (Roland Barthes), or re-interpreting or 'misreading' influential works already in existence (Harold Bloom). Literature in this recent conception can be summed up by the term 'intertextuality', which refers both to a general condition where all texts refer to other texts rather than external reality, and to the practice of citing and echoing the work of specific precursors. (6-7)

[11] In *The White Hotel*, D. M. Thomas fictionalizes the pioneering psychoanalyst Dr. Sigmund Freud and presents him as a fictional character who engages in purely fictional characters and events. For the sake of clarity, the actual Freud is going to be referred to

as Freud (a) (i.e. actual), and the fictional Freud is going to be referred as Freud (f) (i.e. fictional) throughout this thesis.

¹² In "Frau Anna G.," Lisa Erdman's identity is not revealed; but she is referred to as Anna G. which is a pseudonym given to her by Freud in the fictional world. Sigmund Freud (a) is historically known to give his patients pseudonyms in his case studies in order to protect their privacy. Thus, Thomas's conforming to this characteristic of case histories reinforces the authenticity of "Frau Anna G."

¹³ Inscription of authentic documental sources such as newspaper, journals, memoirs, personal letters, and theoretical writings in fictional texts is a narrative strategy that is widely employed in postmodern fiction. The use of such actual data in postmodern fiction specifically aims at blurring the boundaries between history and fiction so as to put the objectivity of history writing in question. Apart from Thomas's *The White Hotel*, Alasdair Gray's *Poor Things*, Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *The General in His Labyrinth*, and Julian Barnes's *Flaubert's Parrot*, just to name a few, exemplify the use of seeming and actual historical documents in postmodern fiction.

¹⁴ The journey to America as mentioned in *The White Hotel* is affirmed in the introduction to *The Correspondences of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi:1908-1914* as follows:

> A few months later, in August, 1909 Freud, Ferenczi, and Jung set out on their trip to America, where Freud gave his famous lectures on the occasion of the twentieth century anniversary of the founding of Clark University, in Worcester, Massachusetts. By all accounts the problems he had been seeking to clarify over the years continued to absorb him and were the subjects of intense exchanges throughout the trip. The three men analyzed their dreams and tried to fathom all that was unknown, unconscious, and obscure in the realm of the psyche. (xxvii)

¹⁵ "Frau Anna G." is exceedingly compliant with the actual case studies of Freud (a) for Thomas intentionally replicates the language and the style of Freudian case studies. Below is given an actual case history written by Freud (a) in order to point out the similarity between actual case histories and Thomas's pastiche:

> The patient, to whom I shall in future give the name of Dora had even at the age of eight begun to develop neurotic symptoms. She became subject at that to chronic dyspnoea with occasional accesses during which the symptom was very much aggravated. […] When she was about twelve she began to suffer from hemicranial headaches in the nature of a migrane, and from

attacks of nervous coughing. […] I first saw her when she was sixteen, in the early summer. She was suffering from a cough and from hoarseness, and even at the time I proposed giving her psychological treatment. My proposal was not adopted, since the attack in question, like the others, passed off spontaneously, though it had unusually long. (*Dora* 16)

[16] The quotations are taken from different sections of the novel, the former from "Don Giovanni," and the latter from "The Sleeping Carriage." They are inscribed side by side in order to emphasize the parallelism between the explicit sexuality in the former and the disturbing violence in the latter.

[17] Even though "Don Giovanni" and "The Gastein Journal" are known to have been written after Freud (f)'s request, Lisa later confesses that she had written "Don Giovanni" even before Freud (f) asked for it. Though not openly mentioned, this most probably results from Lisa's gift to anticipate future. Thomas must also have inscribed this detail to constitute a reference to Lisa's gift.

CHAPTER TWO

[18] *The Collector* (1963) is a novel in which a female art student is kidnapped by a butterfly collector who tries to make her fall in love with him. The novel begins with the narration of the kidnapper, and it shifts to the kidnapped girls's point of view by which it epitomizes the shifting narrative voices (Stade and Karbiener 183). *The Magus* (1966) is a novel about a schoolmaster who temporarily stays on a Greek island which is gradually revealed to be ruled by a millionaire. The novel holds an existential debate as the schoolmaster realizes that his life as well as his identity is also governed by the same millionaire (184). Set in Victorian England, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) narrates a melodramatic story of a woman who is left behind by his sailor lover. Even though the novel starts in a realist mode mimicking nineteenth-century novels, it acquires a metafictional quality with the authorial intervention of the narrator to the text (184). *The Ebony Tower* (1974) is a collection of short stories (184). *Daniel Martin* (1977) is a partly autobiographical novel about a screenwriter who questions the meaning of his life retrospectively facing the mistakes he has made in his past (184). *A Maggot* (1985) is an on-the-road novel about the journey of a caravan in the eighteenth century. The spatial shifts in the narrative and blurred distinction between the fact and fiction render the novel postmodern.

[19] In fact, such narrative techniques as intertextuality, parody, and pastiche are also utilized in the modernist novel. However, the use of such techniques in the modernist fiction differs from their use in postmodern fiction in terms of their ontological and epistemological concerns. The use of such narrative devices in modernist novel is mainly related to the groundbreaking psychoanalytical theory, the change in the

perception of human psyche, and the depletion of the ordered, rational, and optimistic world view in the aftermath of the First World War. Thus, main concern of the modernist novel in utilizing such narrative devices was reacting to the seamlessness of the Victorian novel. Nevertheless, the motive of postmodern fiction in making use of such narrative strategies is rather different. By means of intertextuality, parody, and pastiche, postmodern fiction problematizes objectivity, transparency, and neutrality of historiography. Moreover, it puts language into question as a transparent and objective vehicle to convey truth and reality. It asserts that not only literary texts but also historical documents and other non-literary texts are also textual, subjective, and discourse oriented.

[20] Even though all of these concepts can be used to designate Miles Green's character, for the sake of clarity, Green's character is going to be referred to as author-character throughout this thesis.

[21] As far as the majority of the criticism regarding *Mantissa* is concerned, the changeable status of Erato functions as a subversive power against male authority. The constant changes in Erato's physical appearance are frequently interpreted as a symbolic defiance of the male attempt to dominate the female. In relation to this, Green and Erato are examined as the representatives of the male author and his female character who are portrayed as stereotypical throughout literary history. In *Mantissa,* however, Erato becomes a character who confronts the stereotypical representations of the female in literature. On a similar note, in her article entitled "Cyborg or Goddess: Postmodernism and Its Others in John Fowles's *Mantissa,*" Jane O'Sullivan similarly analyzes Erato's character from a postmodern feminist perspective, and she states that

> The portrayal of Erato's erratic, moody and irrational identity
> changes – from sex therapist to punk-like, man-hating feminist,
> and from goddess to nymph and then to geisha girl – constitutes
> both a bizarre parody and damning critique of a number of
> postmodernist and feminist concepts of subjectivity. By
> constantly changing her identity, Erato evades Miles's efforts of
> significations and challenges his power of authorship. (115)

Likewise, Lenz reads the changeable status of Erato as a subversive act against male authority, and she contends that "Erato relishes her status as a female archetype with an archetypallly good sense, and continuingly changing her appearance and attitudes in order to subvert Miles's controlling authority" (195).

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

Fowles, Johnn *Mantissa*. London: Vintage, 2009. Print.

Thomas, D. M. *The White Hotel*. London: Phoenix, 2004. Print.

Secondary Sources:

Acheson, James, and Sarah C. E. Ross. Introduction. *The Contemporary British Novel since 1980.* Ed. James Acheson and Sarah C. E. Ross. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005. 1-8. Print.

Alkan Genca, Papatya. "Postmodern Realism in Jeanette Winterson's *Sexing the Cherry*, Alasdair Gray's *Poor Things*, and Peter Ackroyd's *The Plato Papers*." Diss. Hacettepe University, 2011. Print.

Allan, Kenneth. "The Postmodern Self: A Theoretical Consideration." *Quarterly Journal of Ideology* 20 (1997): 3-24. Web. 3 February 2014.

Amerika, Mark**.** "The Word-Being Talks: An Interview with Ray Federman." N.d. Web. 18 July 2014.

Aristotle. *The Poetics*. Trans. Ingram Bywater. Oxford: The Clarendon, 1962. *Project Gutenberg*. Web. 15 May 2014.

Atilla, Aylin. *Historiography and the English Novel (1980-90).* İzmir: Ege UP, 2008. Print.

Baker, James R.. "John Fowles, The Art of Fiction No. 109." *The Paris Review*. Web. 30 December 2013.

Barnsley, John H.. "*The White Hotel*." *The Antioch Review* 40.4 (Autumn, 1982): 448-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 November 2012.

Barth, John. "The Literature of Exhaustion." *The Friday Book: Essays and Other Non-Fiction.* London: The John Hopkins UP, 1984. Print.

Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. London: Fontana, 1977. Print

Bartkowski, Frances and Catherine Stearns. "The Lost Icon in *The White Hotel*."
    Journal of the History of Sexuality 1.2 (October, 1990): 283-95. *JSTOR*. Web.
    24 August 2012.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Shelia Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor:
    Michigan UP, 1994. Print.

Bell, Pearl K. "The English Sickness." *Commentary* 12 January 1977. Web. 10 June
    2014.

Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basics.* London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
    Taylor & Francis. Web. 29 January 2014.

---. "The Debate on Postmodernism." *International Postmodernism: Theory and
    Literary Practice*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. 3-14.
    Print.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *Possibilities: Essays on the State of the Novel*. London: Oxford
    UP, 1973. Print.

Brown, Lady Falls. "*The White Hotel*: D. M. Thomas's Considerable Debt to Anatoli
    Kuznetsov and *Babi Yar*." *South Central Review* 2. 2 (Summer, 1985): 60-79.
    JSTOR. Web. 10 May 2012.

Busch, Frederick. "The Man from Auschwitz." *The New York Times*. 31 October 1993.
    Web. 20 May 2013

Campbell, James. "An Interview with John Fowles." *Contemporary Literature* 17.4
    (Autumn, 1976): 455-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 December 2013.

Cazzato, Luigi. "Hard Metafiction and the Return of the Author Subject: The Decline of
    Postmodernism?" *Postmodern Subjects/ Postmodern Texts*. Eds. Jane Dowson
    and Steven Earnshaw. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995. 25-41. Print.

"*Charlotte*." *Publisher's Weekly.* Web. 18 August 2014.

Cooper, Pamela. *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity*. Canada:
    U of Ottawa P, 1991. Print.

Corman, Brian. "Comedy." *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 52-69. Print.

Cotton, John. "D.M. Thomas." *Contemporary Novelists*. Eds. Neil Schlager and Josh Lauer. New York: St. James, 2000. 973-5. Print.

Cowart, David. "Being and Seeming: *The White Hotel*." *A Forum on Fiction* 19.3 (Spring, 1986): 216-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

Cross, Richard K.. "The Soul is a Far Country: D.M. Thomas and *The White Hotel*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 18.1 (Winter, 1992): 19-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

De Mott, Benjamin. "The Yarnsmith in Search of Himself." *The New York Times*. 29 August 1982. Web. 20 June 2014.

Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *Postmodernism: Foundational Essays*. Eds. Victor E. Taylor and Charles E. Winquist. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 504-20. Print.

Dipple, Elizabeth. *The Unresolvable Plot*. New York and London: Routledge, 1988. Print.

Docherty, Thomas. "A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 14.2 (Winter, 1981): 118-34. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 August 2012.

Eco, Umberto. "*Lector in Fabula*: Pragmatic Strategy in a Metanarrative Text." *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. USA: Midland, 1984. 200-60. Print.

Eddins, Dwight. "John Fowles: Existence as Autorship." *Contemporary Literature* 17.2 (1976): 204-22. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 December 2013.

Elias, Amy J. "Meta-mimesis? The Problem of Postmodern British Postmodern Realism." *British Postmodern Fiction*. Eds. Theo D'haen and Hans Bertens. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 9-31. Print.

Eliot, George. *Adam Bede*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1997. Print.

Elliott, Anthony. *Psychoanalytic Theory: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. Print.

Everyman and Mankind. Eds. Douglas Bruster and Eric Rasmussen. London: Arden, 2009. Print.

Federman, Raymond. "Imagination as Plagiarism [An Unfinished Paper …]." *New Literary History* 7.3 (Spring, 1976): 563-78. *JSTOR*. Web. 06 January 2014.

---. *Critifiction: Postmodern Essays.* New York: State U of New York P, 1993. 35-47. Print.

---. "Playgiarims: A Spatial Displacement of Words." *Substance* 6/7. 16 (1977): 107-112. *JSTOR.* Web. 06 January 2014.

Fokkema, Aleid. *Postmodern Characters: A Study of Characterization in British and American Postmodern Fiction*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991. Print.

Fokkema, Douwe. "The Semiotics of Literary Postmodernism." *International Postmodernism: Theory and Literary Practice*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996. 15-42. Print.

Forster, E. M. *Aspects of the Novel*. Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. Middlesex: Penguin, 1977. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Ed. James D. Faubion. Trans. Robert Hurley et al. New York: The New, 1988. 205-22. Print.

Fowles, John. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. Reading: Vintage, 2004. Print.

---. *The Journals: Volume II*. USA: Northwestern UP, 2006. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*. Trans. Philip Rieff. New York: Touchstone, 1997. Print.

---. *The Correspondences of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi: 1908-1914*. Eds. Eva Brabant, Ernst Falzeder, and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch. Trans. Peter T. Hoffer. USA: Belknap, 1993. Print.

Gergen, Kenneth. *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*. New York: Basic, 2000. Print.

Gotts, Ian. "Fowles' *Mantissa*: Funfair in Another Village." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 26.2 (1985): 81-95. *Taylor & Francis*. Web. 27 December 2013.

Granofsky, Ronald. "The Pornographic Mind and *The White Hotel*." *College Literature* 20.3 (Oct., 1993): 44-56. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 August 2012.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien. "Actants, Actors, and Figures." *On Meaning: Selected Writings in Semiotic Theory*. Trans. Paul J. Perron and Frank H. Collins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1987. 106-20. Print.

Haegert, John. "Memoirs of a Deconstructive Angel: The Heroine as Mantissa in the Fiction of John Fowles." *Contemporary Literature* 27.2 (1986): 160-81. Print.

Hassan, Ihab. "Quest for the Subject: The Self in Literature." *Contemporary Literature* 29.3 (1988): 420-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 June 2012.

Hill, Roy Mack. "Power and Hazard: John Fowles's Theory of Play." *Journal of Modern Literature* 8.2 (1980-1981): 211-18. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 February 2014.

Hobsbawm, Eric J.. *Industy and Empire: From 1750 to the Present Day*. New York: Penguin, 1999. Print.

Horace. *Art of Poetry*. Trans. E.C. Wickham. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1903. Print.

Hughes, Mary Joe. "Revelations in *The White Hotel*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 27.1 (1985): 37-50. *Taylor & Francis*. Web. 24 July 2013.

Humma, John B. "James and Fowles: Tradition and Influence." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 54 (1984): 79-100. Print.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

---. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. New York and London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

---."The Real World(s)' of Fiction: *The French Lieutenant's Woman.*" *Critical Essays on John Fowles*. Ed. Ellen Pifer. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986. 81-94. Print.

"Individual." *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Douglas Harper, 2014. Web. 18 August 2014.

"Introduction to Practical Criticism." *Faculty of English: Classroom*. 2011. Web. 16 April 2014.

James, Henry and James Edwin Miller. *Theory of Fiction: Henry James*. Nebraska: U of Nebraska P, 1972. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. Foreword. *Postmodern Condition: A Report On Knowledge.* By Jean-François Lyotard. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984. vi-xxi. Print.

---. *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998.* London: Verso, 1998. Print.

---. *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. North Carolina: Duke UP, 2003. Print.

Jouve, Nicole Ward. "Virginia Woolf and Psychoanalysis." *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf.* Eds. Sue Rose and Susan Sellers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 245- 72. Print.

King, Pamela M. "Morality Plays." *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre*. Ed. Richard Beadle. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 240-64. Print.

Kirby, Alan. *Digimodernism: How New Technologies Dismantle the Postmodern and Reconfigure Our Culture*. New York and London: Continuum, 2009. Print.

---. "The Death of Postmodernism and Beyond." *Philosophy Now*. 2006. Web. 20 August 2014.

Lee, Alison. *Realism and Power: Postmodern British Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Lenz, Brooke. *John Fowles: Visionary and Voyeur*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008. Print.

Levenson, Michael. Introduction. *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 1-8. Print.

Lopez, Jose, and Garry Potter. *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism.* London and New York: The Contributors, 2001. Print.

Lougy, Robert E.. "The Wolf-Man, Freud, and D.M. Thomas: Intertextuality, Interpretation, and Narration in *The White Hotel*." *Modern Language Studies* 21.3 (Summer, 1991): 91-106. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2013.

Lyall, Sarah. "John Fowles, British Author of Ambigous Endings, Dies at 79." *The New York Times.* 7 November 2005. Web. 12 May 2014

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report On Knowledge.* Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1979. Print.

---. "Rules and Paradoxes and Svelte Appendix." Trans. Brian Massumi. *Cultural Critique* 5. *Modernity and Modernism, Postmodernity and Postmodernism* (Winter, 1986-1987) : 209-19. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 May 2012.

Malpas, Simon. *The Postmodern*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

McHale, Brian. *Constructing Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

---. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. *Taylor & Francis.* Web. 2 May 2012.

Meinert, Roland G., John T. Pardeck, and John W. Murphy. *Postmodernism, Religion and the Future of Social Work*. New York: Haworth, 2007. Print.

Nadeau, Robert. *Readings from the New Book on Nature: Physics and Metaphysics in the Modern Novel*. Massachusetts: The U of Massachusetts P, 1981. Print.

Nicol, Bran. *D.M. Thomas*. Devon: Northcote House, 2004. Print.

---. "Thomas, D.M." *The Encyclopedia of Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Ed. Brian Shaffer. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. 359-61. Print.

Onega, Susana. "Self, World, and Art in the Fiction of John Fowles." *Twentieth Century Literature* 42.1 (Spring, 1996): 29-57. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 December 2013.

O'Sullivan, Jane. "Cyborg or Goddess: Postmodernism and its Others in John Fowles's *Mantissa*." *College Literature* 30.3 (Summer, 2003): 109-23. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 September 2013.

"Parody." *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Ed. Chris Baldick. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 185. Print.

"Pastiche." *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Ed. Chris Baldick. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 185-6. Print.

Patch. Howard R.. "Characters in Medieval Literature." *Modern Language Notes* 40.1 (1925): 1-14. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 May 2014.

Phillips Buchberger, Michelle. "Metafiction, Historiography, and Mythopoeia in the Novels of John Fowles." Diss. Brunel University, 2009. Print.

Pollhie, Jens. "Postmodernist Narrative Strategies in the Novels of John Fowles." Diss. Bielefeld University, 2003. Print.

Potter, Cher. "Timotheus Vermeulen on Metamodernism." *Tank Magazine*. May 2014. Web. 20 August 2014.

Pritchard, William H.. "Novel Discomforts and Delights." *The Hudson Review* 35.1 (Spring, 1982): 159-76. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale.* Texas: U of Texas P, 2003. Print.

Regan, Stephen. "The Tradition of the Realist Novel." *The Realist Novel*. Ed. Dennis Walder. New York: Routledge, 1995. 98- 107. Print.

Robertson Mary F. and Thomas [*sic*]."Hystery, Herstory, History: Imagining the Real in Thomas's *The White Hotel*." *Contemporary Literature* 25.4 (Winter, 1984): 452-77. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 August 2012.

Salami, Mahmoud. *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. London: Associated UP, 1992. Print.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Wade Baskin. New
      York: The Philosophical Library, 1959. Print.

Siegle, Robert. "The Concept of the Author in Barthes, Foucault, and Fowles." *College
      Literature* 10.2 (Spring 1983): 126-38. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 February 2014.

Simonds, Peggy Muoz. "*The White Hotel*: A Sexual Satire." *Critique: Studies in
      Contemporary Fiction* 27.1 (1985): 51-63. *Taylor & Francis*. Web. 24 July
      2013.

Singh, Raman K.." "An Encounter with John Fowles." *Journal of Modern Literature*
      8.2 (1980-1981): 181-202. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 December 2013.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Alton:
      Digireads, 2009. Print.

Snyder, Susan. "The Genres of Shakespeare's Plays." *The Cambridge Companion to
      Shakespeare.* Eds. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley W. Wells. Cambridge:
      Cambridge UP, 2001. 83-98. Print.

Stade, George and Karen Karbiener. *Encyclopedia of British Writers, 1800 to the
      Present*. New York: Infobase, 2009. Print.

Tannar, Laura E.. "Sweet Pain and Charred Bodies: Figuring Violence in *The White
      Hotel*." *Boundary* 2. 18 (Summer, 1991): 130-49. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

Tarbox, Katherine. "Interview with John Fowles." *Conversations with John Fowles*. Ed.
      Dianne L. Vipond. Mississippi: UP of Mississippi, 1999. 149-67. Print.

Thomas, D.M.. "Freud and *The White Hotel*." *British Medical Journal (Clinical
      Research Edition)* 287.6409 (Dec., 1983): 1957-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

Thompson, Thomas H.. "Carnal Innocence, Sinful Indulgence." *The North American
      Review* 266. 4 (Dec., 1981): 67-72. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2012.

Thornfield, Traxy. "*Charlotte: The Final Journey of Jane Eyre* by D.M. Thomas." *The
      Squeee Review*. Web. 18 August 2014.

Toth, Tibor. "Re-Reading the Reforgotten Text: John Fowles' *Mantissa*." *Eger Journal of English Studies* 8 (2008): 51-73. *EBSCO*. Web. 1 April 2014.

Vermeulen, Timotheus, and Robin van der Akker. "Notes on Metamodernism." *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture* 2 (2010): 1-14. Print.

Walter, Natasha. "Torture with Slingback Shoes: *Pictures at an Exhibition*." *The Independent*. 13 February 1993. Web. 15 June 2014.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1959. Print.

Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge, 1984. Print.

White, Hayden. "Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth." *The History and Narrative Reader*. Ed. Geoffrey Roberts. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 375-89. Print.

---. *Tropics of Discourse*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1992. Print.

Wilson, Raymond J.. "Fowles's Allegory of Literary Invention: *Mantissa* and Contemporary Theory." *Twentieth Century Literature* 36.1 (Spring, 1990): 61-72. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 September 2013.

Wimsatt Jr., W. K. and M. C. Beardsley. "Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 54.3 (1946): 468-88. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 July 2010.

Wingrove, David. "Different Voices: An Interview with D. M. Thomas." *London Magazine* 21.11 (1982): 27-43. Web. *JSTOR*. 10 May 2012.

Woods, Tim. *Beginning Postmodernism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1999. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*. London: The Hogarth, 1924. Print.

---. "The Modern Fiction." *The Essays of Virginia Woolf: Volume 4: 1925 to 1928*. Ed. Andrew McNeille. London: The Hogarth, 1984. 157-65. Print.