

OTDK-dolgozat

2025

SAPIENTIA ERDÉLYI MAGYAR TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM
CSÍKSZEREDAI KAR



Metafiction in Literature and on Screen.
John Fowles/ Karel Reisz: *The French*
Lieutenant's Woman

Ugri Bernadett

Konzulens: Dr. Pieldner Judit, habilitált egyetemi docens

Kézirat lezárásának dátuma: 2023. 04. 17.

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Introduction	2
1. Metafiction	3
1.1 Definition	3
1.2 Antecedents	4
1.3 Metafiction and Postmodernism.....	5
2. John Fowles' <i>The French Lieutenants' Woman</i> as a self-reflexive postmodern novel	7
2.1 Intrusive narrator	7
2.2 Metalepsis.....	9
2.3 Mise en abyme	10
2.4 Double closure.....	11
2.5 Intertextuality	12
2.6 Anachronism	13
3. Karel Reisz' <i>The French Lieutenant's Woman</i> as a metafictional adaptation	15
3.1 The challenges of metafiction in adaptation	15
3.2 Strategies of metafiction.....	17
3.3 Metalepsis.....	18
3.4 Mise en abyme	21
3.5 Double closure.....	22
Conclusion.....	24
Bibliography.....	26

Abstract

Metafiction is as old as literature itself, however, it evolved into a major feature in the period of postmodernism, when novelists started to be more aware of the rhetorical issues when constructing fiction and, as a consequence, particular dimensions of self-reflexivity started to be embodied in these works. According to the leading theorist of metafiction, Patricia Waugh, the aim of metafiction is to simultaneously create fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction. It is certainly a multilayered factor in postmodern fiction that raises several intriguing questions. During my research I would like to find out through what forms of metafiction can be found in John Fowles' famous novel entitled *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. The paper looks at the strategies of metafiction, from narrative perspective, through metalepsis, to *mise en abyme* and double closure. Besides this, my aim is also to figure out how a metafictional novel can be cinematized, trying to analyze and interpret the metafictional analogy created in Karol Reisz's screen adaptation as well. To conclude, the paper raises questions as to what impact metafiction has on the contemporary reader.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to observe the way metafiction is present in John Fowles' novel, *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, taking into consideration metalepsis, *mise en abyme* and several other aspects. Besides this, the metafictional film adaptation directed by Karel Reisz entitled *The French Lieutenant's Woman* will also be carefully examined from the same aspects as in the case of the novel, trying to find an answer to how metafiction reveals itself on screen.

In terms of structure, three major parts can be distinguished: the theoretical one followed by the exploration of the novel and finally having a look at the film. At first I intend to focus on metafiction, while representing some definitions and mentioning a few literary works that can be considered antecedents. Afterwards the novel will be investigated closely from a number of perspectives. Then the third part includes the film presented from the same aspects but highlighting the differences between the adaptation and the novel.

As regards the questions to which this paper aims to find answers are the following: "What are the strategies of metafiction?" "How can a metafictional work be cinematized?" "What kind of impact does metafiction have on the reader and the audience as well?" "Does it make the story boring, or on the contrary, confusing and untraceable?" "Is it exciting to read such books and watch films or it does not stir up attention at all?"

All in all, the method which I opted for is, on the one hand, analyzing the novel by highlighting certain excerpts and trying to interpret them, making comments and assumptions at the same time. Striving to find out the motivations behind particular decisions and solutions through which metafiction is realized is certainly an objective of high importance in this paper. On the other hand, the film adaptation is also analyzed by placing emphasis on the most significant scenes and describing them in details. The camera movement, the different shots like long shot or medium close-up that exist in cinema, lightning, editing, the cut, some techniques such as fading in or out, zooming are elements that I endeavored to take into account, in order to reflect on the film as extensively as possible.

1. Metafiction

1.1 Definition

Since the appearance of the term “metafiction” several theorists and critics working in the field of literature have been preoccupied with it and have held debates on its history from the beginnings till now, the current situation. They have raised several thought-provoking and controversial issues, mentioned problems, dilemmas and difficulties as well. It is undeniable that it has become a popular topic to cover.

Metafiction is one of the common devices of postmodern literature. According to Mark Currie, the term can be linked to William Gass, an American novelist and literary critic who coined it in 1970 in his collection of essays *Fiction and the Figures of Life*, referring to fiction characterized by self-consciousness, self-awareness and self-knowledge (1995, 1). Besides Currie, Patricia Waugh, a specialist in modernist and postmodernist literature, investigates this term well: “*Metafiction* is 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” (Waugh 1984, 2, emphasis in the original). She adds that during the first half of the twentieth century, novelists started to be more aware of the rhetorical issues when constructing fiction and, as a consequence, particular dimensions of self-reflexivity started to be embodied in these works (1984, 2). According to her, language is no longer conceived as presenting an “objective” world in a transparent manner, instead, it transforms into an independent system which generates its own “meanings”. So the relationship between the phenomenal world and language is quite complex, problematic, being regulated by convention as well. “Meta” terms are essential in fiction to explore the relationship between the world of the fiction and the world outside fiction (1984, 2-3). An important aspect of metafiction is its history. In terms of its origin, Waugh remarks that in spite of the fact that it started to be used more prominently prior to the 1980s, the application of metafiction is quite old. At the time her book about metafiction was published, she underlined the following: “although the *term* ‘metafiction’ might be new, the *practice* is as old (if not older) than the novel itself” (Waugh 1986, 5, emphasis in the original). Thus, she believes that it is inherent in all novels and lies within each one (1986, 5). The aim of metafiction from her point of view is to simultaneously create fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction (1984,6). Besides this, she also mentions a subcategory of

metafiction called as “historiographic” metafiction, in connection which she remarked: “history itself is a multiplicity of ‘alternative worlds’, as fictional as, but other than, the worlds of novels” (1984, 105).

Janet Witlec is another literary critic who deals with metafiction, and similarly to Patricia Waugh, she states the same about language: “Proponents of metafiction reject the concept that language reflects a coherent and objective world; instead, they assert that language is a complex, arbitrary system that can create its own forms and meanings” (Witlec 2003,43).

1.2 Antecedents

When it comes to metafiction, it is indispensable to emphasize that a great number of metafictional works were created before postmodernism. Several works can be viewed as metafictional ones, although they aren’t postmodern, being written way before that period. Among these metafictional literary creations we rate the following: *The History of Tom Jones* by Henry Fielding, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* by Laurence Sterne and *Vanity Fair* by William M. Thackeray, which are obviously just some of the many. All three have become popular over the centuries and have received a lot of attention, being read nowadays as well and regarded as the forerunners of postmodernism.

The first novel to discuss from the mentioned ones is Henry Fielding’s novel, published in 1749. The novel representing Tom Jones depicts the eighteenth-century English society in which individuals are not as important as social types, manners. The reader gets a look into the problems and secrets of novel writing while reading this book. In fact, the introductory chapters can be interpreted as meditations over literary composition, a discourse on the philosophy of writing. In addition, the narrator of the novel is intrusive who talks out to the reader and invokes him into his narration.

Taking into consideration *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*, it is remarkable that Sterne’s novel is an anti-novel actually, it appeared in 1759 during the period of Enlightenment. What makes Sterne’s book stand out is that being an anti-novel, it breaks with the traditional conventions. In other words, what he does is actually to parody the conventions of novel writing in a traditional sense. Postmodern texts also parody traditional elements and storytelling. So in this sense, although Sterne is not a postmodern writer, he creates a

metanovel, a metatext, namely a novel about novel writing in which Tristram also intends to write a book about his life story.

Vanity Fair by Thackeray is, likewise, a metafictional novel, published in serial form in 1847. This is the age of Realism, manifested in literature by portraying everyday life in novels, presenting characters from all social-classes, without idealization. The narrator is open-omniscient who frequently interrupts the plot, comments on the events, on the characters, on humanity in general. As readers, we realize in the preface entitled *Before the Curtain* that the novel is written by a narrator who is self-conscious, reflects on his way of creating the story, draws the reader's attention to the title and gives background information. Additionally, he expresses judgments about characters, as readers we get a full social criticism.

To sum up, all the three novels mentioned above can be considered metafictional works, even if they are not written during postmodernism when metafiction becomes a salient feature of many literary works.

1.3 Metafiction and Postmodernism

Postmodernism was a broad-ranging and highly controversial cultural movement in the second half of the twentieth century. As Linda Hutcheon mentions in her book *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, it is usually associated with a lot of negative elements, aspects e.g. discontinuity, disruption, dislocation and others (1988, 3). She also adds,

While all forms of contemporary art and thought offer examples of this kind of postmodernist contradiction, this book (like most others on the subject) will be privileging the novel genre, and one form in particular, a form that I want to call "historiographic metafiction." By this I mean those well-known and popular novels which are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay claim to historical events and personages: *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, *Midnight's Children*, *Ragtime*, *Legs, G.*, *Famous Last Words*. (1988, 5)

Over the years a number of theorists have formulated their opinion connected to this comprehensive movement and tried to define it. According to Hutcheon, "[i]n general terms it takes the form of self-conscious, self-contradictory, self-undermining statement. It is rather

like saying something whilst at the same time putting inverted commas around what is being said” (2002, 1). In *The Politics of Postmodernism*, she claims that the main focus of postmodernist works, besides the parody of the past, is on the processes of their own production and reception (2002,179). Nevertheless, it is also essential to enumerate some thinkers who contributed a lot to analyzing the world view of postmodernism, e.g. Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and many more. To begin with, in *The Postmodern Condition*, Lyotard states the following:

A postmodern artist or writer is in the position of a philosopher: the text he writes, the work he produces are not in principle governed by preestablished rules, and they cannot be judged according to a determining judgment, by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work. Those rules and categories are what the work of art itself is looking for. The artist and the writer, then, are working without rules in order to formulate the rules of what will have been done. Hence the fact that work and text have the characters of an event. (1984, 81)

Secondly, in his influential essay *The Death of the Author* Barthes argues that a writer is a linguistic construct and authors have no power over their works. The reader is the one who gives a meaning to the text, whilst the author relies on the reader’s interpretation (1977, 142-148). As a reader, I also have certain thoughts, impressions, opinions and expectations while I am reading a text which can subvert or undermine them.

On the whole, as Linda Hutcheon remarked, postmodernism was present in many fields, such as architecture, literature, photography, film, music and more (2002, 1). However, what matters the most, in my view, is that during this cultural movement several changes have taken place in the field of literature: reading becomes an active process, language is seen as a means for constructing reality. Self-reflexivity, metatextuality, intertextuality and irony as popular modes of writing are all features of this period.

2. John Fowles' *The French Lieutenant's Woman* as a self-reflexive postmodern novel

2.1 Intrusive narrator

John Fowles was an English novelist in the twentieth century, who wrote several novels, poems and short stories. Mahmoud Salami claims in his book *John Fowles' Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*: "Fowles' fiction is in fact an embodiment of freedom, of individuality, and of existentialism" (1993, 13). His third novel, *The French Lieutenant's Woman* was published in 1969, becoming a great success and a bestseller, also winning several prizes. It received critical attention and praise, for instance, Ellen Pifer noted: "Fowles' success in the marketplace derives from his great skill as a storyteller. His fiction is rich in narrative suspense, romantic conflict and erotic drama" (quoted in Thomson Gale 2005, 70).

In terms of background and source of inspiration, before writing the novel, Fowles served as a lieutenant in the Royal Marines. He travelled a lot from France to Greece and in the end he decided to return to England. In fact, he was inspired by a mental image of a woman on the quay before starting to write this book.

From the perspective of theme, the novel presents issues relevant in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as the relationship between women and patriarchal society, despite being set in the 1860s. More precisely, the events represented take place in 1867 during March, in England. This is the Victorian era, which starts from the beginning of Queen Victoria's coming to throne in 1837, until her passing in 1901. Fowles, in fact, does not present a Victorian world that is solid, but one that looks like this from outside. He also promotes the idea connected to Utilitarianism that we should make our lives purposeful, whereas the age in which the author lives, pervaded by the views of Existentialism, is a period mostly characterized by lack of meaning and purpose of life. Additionally, the novel contains many features of great nineteenth-century novels, like the presence of a dominant narrative voice, a love story hampered by the class system, the effort of an independent woman to overcome obstacles.

As mentioned previously, Fowles was inspired by the image of a woman standing on the quay. Therefore, the beginning of the novel involves the description of the scenery, presenting

the two walkers on the Cobb who are actually Charles Smithson and Ernestina Freeman, then another character is showed, Sarah Woodruff, who stands staring out to the sea. At first sight we may get the feeling that she resembles popular female characters present in other novels taking place in the nineteenth century, such as Tess of the d'Urbervilles or Hester Prynne, who are also pushed out of society. Sarah is a social outcast as well, alienated from society who embodies the woman on the quay. Quite frequently she has mood swings, most of the times she does not even know what she wants. We can observe that she is going through an internal fight but it is almost impossible to find out what causes this state. Sarah's outlook is presented in a very detailed way, as readers we instantly have the feeling that she is someone special, who stands out but also enigmatic, hard to be figured out. The very moment Charles notices her, it is like he has fallen in trance, being mesmerized by her emanation and aura.

Concerning the narrative point of view in Fowles' novel, the narrator overtly situates himself in the present, which is the twentieth century, during the 1960s, at a century's distance from the events presented in the novel. He is actually a metafictional narrator who often makes comments, expresses his opinion in connection with the events from the perspective of the *Zeitgeist* of the age in which he lives, draws parallels or compares certain elements from the 1860s with the 1960s-1970s, the present time of the novelist. An example can be the twentieth-century Henry Moore sculpture which is mentioned in the novel or the moment when the narrator introduces Mrs. Poulteney, the employer of Sarah and affirms that "there would have been a place in the Gestapo for the lady" (Fowles 1969, 28). This seems strange due to the fact that Gestapo was created many decades later, at the beginning of the twentieth century, not during the time in which the novel is set.

As readers, on the whole we can observe the presence of an omniscient narrator, but not in a traditional way. He moves back and forth in time, for example, the description of Lyme Regis is interrupted by mentioning the existence of the Cobb, a stone harbour wall in Jane Austen's novel entitled *Persuasion* as well, written before Fowles' novel. It is not a secret, moreover, the narrator openly undertakes that he lives in a different period of time compared to the one in the novel, showing some differences between these two ages. In Chapter 13 he even reminds readers of the fact that they are reading fiction, a story created by him, using his imagination and not reality:

This story I am telling is all imagination. These characters I create never existed outside my own mind. If I have pretended until now to know my characters' minds and innermost thoughts, it is because I am writing in (just as I have assumed some of the vocabulary and "voice" of) a convention universally accepted at the time of my story: that the novelist stands next to God. He may not know all, yet he tries to pretend that he does. But I live in the age of Alain Robbe-Grillet and Roland Barthes; if this is a novel, it cannot be a novel in the modern sense of the word. (Fowles 1969, 104)

Actually, in this metafictional chapter the narrator confesses a lot of things by discussing the story, the characters, the position of novelists and narrators. Additionally, what concerns the closure of the novel, it may be quite surprising for us to read that the narrator flips a coin in order to decide what to do in the last six chapters: "I take my purse from the pocket of my frock coat, I extract a florin, I rest it on my right thumbnail, I flick it, spinning, two feet into the air and catch it in my left hand" (Fowles 1969, 418). To be honest, this is not a conventional way of deciding how to continue the plotline at all. In my opinion, as readers, we have the image of a serious, thoughtful author who thoroughly works on writing his book from morning till night and casts over what the next step is. For me, it is funny and surprising as well to see that luck or fate influenced the rest of the novel. This shows very well that Fowles' narrator does not reign over his creation, he gives freedom and space for the plotline to unfold.

2.2 Metalepsis

In John Fowles' novel metalepsis is a key element. First of all, Gérard Genette promotes it to a narratological notion: "any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc.), or the inverse [...], produces an effect of strangeness that is either comical [...] or fantastic" (1980, 234–35). In Fowles' novel, there are leastwise two narrative levels: the primary or, as Genette calls it, metadiegetic level is the one implying the time frame of the narrator who creates this novel in the 1960s and in many cases sets his present time against the past, the Victorian era during which events take place in the novel, be it about traditions, developments, new ideas or else. The second or diegetic narrative level is the love story depicted in the novel, which takes

place in the 1860s, including the love triangle between Charles and the two women, Sarah and Ernestina. These two narrative levels “normally” exist separately, however, in Chapter 55, when the narrator also appears as a character, the two narrative levels conjoin due to his appearance. At first sight his presence is introduced in a way that we might think the man staring at Charles on the train is a stranger, a whosoever. However, if we continue reading slowly we realize that as readers we were tricked and it turns out to be the narrator persona eventually who observes Charles, described as a bearded man. After this trick so to say, the narrator reveals himself towards the reader: “And I will keep up the pretense no longer” (Fowles 1969, 416). He confesses to be the one travelling by train in the same compartment with Charles.

Linda Hutcheon talks about metalepsis in Fowles’ novel as well in her book entitled *Narcissistic Narrative* and brings into evidence that in this literary work we can find a series of worlds within worlds:

Here we are dealing with a number of worlds within worlds. The core or most traditional novelistic universe is that of the characters. Outside and including that is a world in which exist the man in the train, the impresario – in other words, the narrator’s personae who enter, at times, the core world. Outside that is the diegetic world of the narrator’s voice. But beyond even that stands John Fowles – the man who masterminds both the creation of the Chinese-box structure *and* the tensions which exist between these worlds and which are functional within the novel as a whole. In each universe, there is a *mise en abyme* of a creator figure – Sarah, the personae, the narrator – and outside the last of these worlds stands the author, *outside* it. (1991, 57-58, emphasis in the original)

2.3 Mise en abyme

Regarding *mise en abyme*, Lucien Dällenbach’s name is inevitable to be mentioned. In his book entitled *The Mirror in the Text* he deals with this popular term. According to him, “The common root of every *mise en abyme* is clearly the idea of *reflexivity*” (Dällenbach 1989, 42, emphasis in the original). He describes it as “any internal mirror that reflects the whole of the narrative in simple, repeated or ‘specious’ (or paradoxical) duplication” (Dällenbach 1989,

43). In other words, in Fowles' novel *mise en abyme* mirrors in little the whole story, for example, Sarah's storytelling. Metalepsis and *mise en abyme* both result in stratification. Eventually, the whole Fowles text has a Chinese boxworld structure and resembles the Russian *babushka* dolls which means that there is a story within which there is another story, and another. There are certain stories put into each other and once we start to read the novel, gradually other ones unfold as well, besides the main plotline. Brian McHale also talks about *mise en abyme* in his book entitled *Postmodern Fiction* and affirms the following: "*Mise-en-abyme* is one of the most potent devices in the postmodernist repertoire for foregrounding the ontological dimension of recursive structures" (1987, 124). Furthermore, he mentions that *mise en abyme* is not exclusively a characteristic of postmodern writing, but it can be found in all genres and periods. It is also noted that "*mise-en-abyme* is another form of short-circuit, another disruption of the logic of narrative hierarchy, every bit as disquieting as a character stepping across the ontological threshold to a different narrative level" (1987, 125).

2.4 Double closure

To begin with, closure, in the case of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, is a quite problematic aspect to discuss. Namely, there is a constant dispute whether there are two or three endings, because the first one takes place only in Charles's mind, it is just an imagination, while he is on the road, heading back to Exeter. Nevertheless, the majority of critics believe that the novel indeed has three endings. In fact, the narrator shares his thoughts and dilemmas in connection with the closure of the novel. In Chapter 55 he reveals that he has already thought of ending Charles' story as he is travelling back to Exeter, still, he cannot accomplish this because, as he declared: "the conventions of Victorian fiction allow, allowed no place for the open, the inconclusive ending; and I preached earlier of the freedom characters must be given" (Fowles 1969, 417). On the whole, as readers we can distinguish the first ending, in which Charles returns to Lyme Regis and gets married, having seven children with Ernestina. This may sound as a perfect closure, however, we find out that they could not enjoy being together forever. Sadly, Ernestina passes away and Charles lives on, mourning her. The second ending depicts the moment when Charles reconciles with Sarah in Dante Rosetti's house and finds out that he has a daughter, Lalage. This is a pretty intimate scene, as they hug each other and seem like a true family which reunites after a long time.

Lastly, the third ending presents the same scene, however, the outcome is different from the previous one. Charles and Sarah meet again and start a discussion. What is surprising in this closure of the novel is that Sarah suggests they should stay friends and not get married, whereas Charles refuses this decision and leaves the house devastated.

In conclusion, we can all agree that the reader has the freedom to decide which ending s/he likes the best, which one is the most suitable for the novel. Besides this, the presence of these three endings may also suggest that Charles is torn between Sarah and Ernestina, being incapable to choose among them. Staying with Ernestina would mean keeping his social status and not being judged. On the other hand, if he opts for Sarah, this will entail a lot of judgment and drawback financially. Therefore, it is impossible to make a right decision which is accepted from all perspectives. Satisfying everyone's vision is unreal. Even Fowles discloses the following way in his novel: "For I have returned, albeit deviously, to my original principle: that there is no intervening god beyond whatever can be seen, in that way, in the first epigraph to this chapter;" (1969, 479). In short, there is no absolute truth given by the narrator, the reader has free hand to decide.

2.5 Intertextuality

One of the most common characteristics of metafictional literary works written during the postmodern period is intertextuality. Hutcheon determines this notion in her book *A Poetics of Postmodernism* as follows: "Postmodern intertextuality is a formal manifestation of both desire to close the gap between past and present of the reader and a desire to rewrite the past in a new context" (1988, 118). At the same time, she adds that by now a literary work cannot be viewed original, what is more, it is part of a grid created by previous discourses: "intertextuality replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself. A literary work can actually no longer be considered original; if it were, it could have no meaning for its reader. It is only as part of prior discourses that any text derives meaning and significance" (1988, 126). In Fowles' novel we can find a series of intertextual and cultural references, other writers' textual universes also appear, for instance, he inserts short excerpts or quotations from all sorts of literary works into his text: a scientific one, namely *On the Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin, as well as *Maud* by Alfred Tennyson or *At a Seaside*

Town by Thomas Hardy. It is essential to highlight that metafiction does not wind up merely by pointing at fiction, but it mobilizes a lot of things. The whole novel should not be looked at as an individual text, instead, it is part of a system. According to the postmodern approach, nothing exists on its own, but it is entangled into a network, in fact, one text acts upon the other. Even Thomas S. Eliot, a literary critic, talked about the relationship between texts in his essay “Tradition and the Individual Talent”. He said that there is no poet or artist whose art could be interpreted in an isolated way. Moreover, “His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead” (Eliot 1919, 1). The previously written texts together form an ideal system which changes when a new one is being integrated and goes through some modification. This is an organic, living order from which the writer gains inspiration and creates his own artwork which becomes part of it and influences the past, changes this system, the interpretation of works. Texts interface through citation, reference, paraphrase, parody or by other methods. Actually, the whole essay reveals the nature of intertextuality because it highlights that works are always in rapport with each other. It is a text about texts, writing, literature and tradition.

2.6 Anachronism

Previously I mentioned that during the scene when Mrs. Poulteney, who gives job to Sarah, is introduced, the narrator brings up the Gestapo. This is quite ironic and confusing at the same time because it has nothing to do with the historical period in which the novel’s plot takes place, the Gestapo was only established during the Second World War. So it is fair to raise the question how this is compatible with the novel and what the author’s purpose was. This is an example for the phenomenon of anachronism, defined as “the fact of placing something in the wrong period of history” (Strub 2021, 11). At the same time, anachronism reveals itself in the formation of Sarah’s character too, who differs from the rest of society what concerns her mentality, value system and world view. In connection with this, McHale declared that:

in *The French Lieutenant’s Woman*, where Fowles’s narrator attributes to Sarah, the novel’s heroine, the attitudes and psychology of a modern, that is, late-twentieth-

century, woman. Here, however, the projection of a 1960s mentality back into the 1860s is realistically motivated: Sarah, we are told, represents the first glimmerings of modern sensibility in Victorian culture, the historical opening wedge of modernity; she is not anachronistic but, so to speak, progressive. (1987, 93)

Fowles' novel contains a series of anachronisms and twentieth-century allusions. The narrator constantly attracts the reader's attention by mentioning certain characteristics of the present period in which he lives, be it a significant personality, inventions or objects which exist now but in the past, during the Victorian era they were unknown, for example: "the Cobb at Lyme is compared to a Henry Moore sculpture, a servant's dandyish taste to that of a 1960s mod; the landscape near nineteenth-century Lyme is described anachronistically as viewed from the air; a Victorian evening at home is characterized in terms of the absence of cinema and television; and so on" (McHale 1987, 93).

3. Karel Reisz' *The French Lieutenant's Woman* as a metafictional adaptation

3.1 The challenges of metafiction in adaptation

First of all, from the perspective of the novel's success and critical recognition, it is no surprise that this literary work has been cinematized. John Fowles himself supported the idea of his novel being adapted into film: "John Fowles, an author highly interested in film as art, wanted to see this work on the big screen" (Dodson 1998, 299). However, it was definitely a challenge to do so. For a long period, Fowles tried to find the right director and screenwriter who was able to bring his novel to life. Fortunately, the film produced by Juniper Films, directed by Karel Reisz and the screenplay written by Harold Pinter, debuted in 1981. It was praised by critics what concerns its rich storytelling and also its innovative style.

As Pinter and Reisz started working, they realized how difficult it was to transform the novel into film due to all the techniques that Fowles used, like metalepsis, *mise en abyme* or anachronism. Reisz declared the following: "[t]he novel is a science fiction - a Victorian story and a modern speculation about fiction. Take away that acknowledgment of the 20th century, and the story doesn't add up. Our sense of Sarah's sexual awareness is a modern thing; inside her head, during the story, she jumps from the 19th to the 20th century" (Dodson 1998, 299).

What concerns the movie itself, viewers can observe very rapidly that what they see is actually a film-within-a-film. There is a moment when a clapperboard is shown, entitled "The French Lieutenant's Woman" and we can see that a scene is being filmed. As regards the characters, Meryl Streep and Jeremy Irons play the main roles, Anna and Mike. However, Anna is also an actress who plays Sarah Wodruff and Mike as well who portrays Charles Smithson. Mike and Anna represent a contemporary "romance", during the 1980s, while Charles and Sarah develop an intimate connection during the Victorian era. Therefore, we can look into the highs and lows of these two relationships, two parallel love stories being presented actually. From my point of view, it is quite confusing for the spectator to differentiate fiction from reality while watching this film, because these two parallel stories intersect many times. In fact, they are very similar, despite the discrepancy in time, one taking place in the nineteenth century and the other in the twentieth.

Having a look at the actors' perspectives and opinions, in an interview by Bobbie Wygant, in 1981 around the premiere of the film, Jeremy Irons was asked whether the concept of film-within-a-film works well. He gave a quite valid answer, saying that as an actor who is involved into the whole process of shooting it is hard to decide because you cannot really differentiate yourself or look at the film from outside, objectively. By all means, he believed that those who watch it can make a judgment, as they are outsiders in a sense. Another question of the interviewer was how these two stories were filmed, whether it was difficult to play two characters. Irons replied that they did not film the two stories separately but they would bounce back and forth depending on the location and he also confessed that it was much easier to play the modern scenes, it felt for him like a day off. His co-star, Meryl Streep was also interviewed by Bobbie Wygant, who asked what her exact reaction was when she found out that the structure of the movie would be a film-within-a-film. Surprisingly, she responded that it did not frighten her at all that they would have to jump from the nineteenth century to the twentieth century, in fact, it made her even more excited. She considered it a challenge that tests concentration. Besides this, the interviewer asked her whether she had a fear that the audience could not follow these two stories and the movie itself. She admitted that at first she thought it might be difficult. However, after watching the film she observed that the two stories enhance each other and by the end they become one, they get merged. During another interview, Meryl Streep praised Karel Reisz, the director of the film for his delicacy. He never tried to control the actors and say what they should do, instead, he gently led them in a direction. Jeremy Irons claimed that the only remark Reisz gave him was not to project so much, to relax his mouth. This habit of Irons' originated in the fact that before playing in this film, he was more dominantly a stage actor and he used to talk in that way even during filming *The French Lieutenant's Woman*.

To sum up, we can draw the conclusion that transforming this novel into a film was quite puzzling and it required creativity to truthfully reproduce the original literary work. Even Fowles himself admitted that there are "visual things the word can never capture, and word things the camera will never photograph nor actors ever speak" (Dodson 1998, 302).

3.2 Strategies of metafiction

Brian McHale wrote about the ways in which cinema influences modern and postmodern fiction. He pointed out that there are major differences in the ways in which modernism and postmodernism make reference to movies. From his perspective:

For modernist fiction, the movies served primarily as a source for new techniques of representation. Such modernist cinematic techniques as cinemontage do persist in postmodernist fiction, of course, but they are no longer the most important or conspicuous function of the cinema model. Instead of serving a repertoire of representational techniques, the movies and television appear in postmodernist writing as an ontological level: a world-within-the-world, often one in competition with the primary diegetic world of the text, or a plane interposed between the level of verbal representation and the level of the “real.” Postmodernist fiction at its most mimetic holds the mirror up to everyday life in advanced industrial societies, where reality is pervaded by the “miniature escape fantasies” of television and the movies. (1987, 128)

The film adaptation of Fowles’ novel transforms the self-reflexive text with the twentieth-century allusions, comments on the Victorian society and other elements into another medium, namely creating a metafictional allegory. Surprisingly, the film does not follow directly the narrative technique present in the novel and transpose it into cinematography, but the method of “film-within-the-film” is chosen and by this the ontological differences that are present in the novel can be highlighted. There is no character or voice in the film that could correspond to Fowles’ narrator because we cannot find a writer who reflects upon writing a script or a director commenting on directing a film. This procedure opted by Reisz, the director, is actually called “functional correspondence” (Pieldner 2008, 71). For instance, in the novel Sarah writes down her thoughts, feelings in a notebook which functions as a diary for her, whereas, in the movie she paints. Although she may not be able to express herself through speaking in order for others to understand her and to get to know her as a reader and as an audience, she still shows her individuality in both cases through different ways. The diary that Sarah writes is connected to the novel as they both suggest the idea that words have power. While we are reading a book, what is written down counts the most. In contrast with

this, during a film what we see is more relevant, it affects us very much. Sarah's self-portrait is in connection with the film as they both offer a visual experience. So the portrait is the obverse of the diary, transformed into a visual image as it functions more effectively in a film than writing a diary. The whole movie focuses on the act of shooting an adaptation, while in Fowles' work, novel writing was emphasized. Furthermore, the two worlds become so strongly connected that it is harder and harder to distinguish as a spectator what is reality and what is fiction. These two universes intersect each other in a way that it is problematic to draw the line between what belongs to the twentieth-century actors', Anna and Mike's contemporary world and what is actually just part of their roles which they have to play. They are incorporated on a level that even the actors 'real personality merges with the one of their characters'. Anna and Mike start to behave often as if they were acting, playing the role of Sarah and Charles even when they are not shooting.

3.3 Metalepsis

As I have mentioned before, metalepsis is present in the novel beyond doubt just like in the film. There are two narrative levels which intersect each other, conjoin in many cases and as we are heading towards the end it gets harder and harder to distinguish them. Already at the beginning of the film as viewers we get confused by the image of a woman dressed in old-fashioned clothes, behind her a car goes away and a voice asks the woman whose name is Sarah if she is ready. She nods yes and then suddenly a clapperboard is shown [Fig. 1]. The way this film starts is quite confusing because we get the feeling that something is definitely not right, rather strange. In the next scene, a long shot image [Fig. 2] can be observed which shows a street full of people with all the hustle and bustle, then the camera zooms in and presents the same street from three different angles. As a matter of fact, in connection with metalepsis, self-reflexivity needs to be mentioned. The mirrors, the door and window frames all suggest this, that it is a film-within-a-film. None the less these two narrative levels, stories are presented without any mark, there is a constant jump from one to the other with a direct cut. An important scene that appears afterwards is when Charles and Ernestina are walking near the ocean and suddenly the camera shows Sarah's figure at long range [Fig. 3]. Suddenly he decides to approach her and warn her not to stay on the Cobb because it is too dangerous. When he gets close enough, standing from a couple of meters from her, the camera shows

Charles' and Sarah's faces separately, switching from one to the other [Figs. 4-5]. This moment feels like it is slow-down in order to show closely the emotions of the two characters. Charles seems shocked and surprised while Sarah feels distant and enigmatic. In one of the following scenes we are witnesses of a discussion between Sarah and Mike about morality and prostitution. On the one hand, it was a real phenomenon already in the Victorian age, on the other hand, the fact that they are discussing morality feels ironic because as we dive into the story it becomes clear for us that both of them are cheating on their partners. In the next scene, we see Charles in the forest searching for some rocks when suddenly he notices Sarah passing by. The camera angle changes and we see Sarah in subjective photography when he takes out his binoculars, exactly what Charles sees through the lenses, from that position, it feels like watching with his eyes the distant figure of Sarah [Figs. 6-7]. In the nearest modern scene, we can follow how Anna and Mike rehearse for the Victorian scene in which Sarah falls in the woods and Charles helps her up. This scene begins with Mike saying "Miss Woodruff" confusing the spectator once again because for a second we think Charles calls Sarah. Obviously, as I said this happens due to the fact that there is no mark at all which indicates when the two levels switch. The camera movement changes in this scene as well, zooming in the figure of Charles in almost a theatrical way [Fig. 8], as if he were superior, some kind of hero. Then there is a direct cut from the rehearsal scene into the film-within-the-film when Sarah falls because of the mud and Charles helps her up. Jumping a little we are watching the scene when Sarah and Charles meet in the to tell him what happened to her eighteen months ago. She confesses that she lost her virginity with the lieutenant. Charles vehemently stands up and the camera shows his upper body, a close-up image is presented [Fig. 9]. In this way his facial expressions are clearly visible. For a few seconds the camera focuses on him, to portray his instant reaction as Sarah is speaking. His mouth is a little opened then he closes it, his eyes narrow and furrows his eyebrows. It seems like he is confused and surprised at the same time. After skipping some scenes, we can follow Sarah running in the forest at night while it is lightening and thundering. She was fired by Mrs. Poulteney and rushes to the granary to find shelter. Her face is not really visible because of the darkness but whenever it lightens we see it for a moment. This scene contains a play with lights, darkness and brightness alternate in a chiaroscuro manner. In one second we see nothing, then suddenly there is a flash and Sarah's figure is visible again [Fig. 10-11].

Previously I have mentioned that as the story unfolds the two narrative levels intersect each other more frequently as well. A representative scene for this is when Anna steps out of the caravan which is placed in the forest where they are shooting the film. There are a lot of people, the whole crew is sitting and having lunch, talking with each other. Anna walks to the table where Mike is and informs him that she will go to London. Mike is in his character's clothes, in the Victorian costume and wearing artificial facial hair. He has not got changed yet, which confuses the spectator again. It is really hard to separate Charles the character from Mike the actor in this way and it is strange to see him in old-fashioned clothes in the modern age, using colloquial language. This shows very clearly that the two levels do cross each other and conjoin in many cases. We have the feeling that Anna is talking to Charles because of his appearance even though it is Mike who sits near her. What is more, as the characters start to travel in both levels, the passage between them becomes even more subtle and labyrinthine. Sarah goes to Exeter, while Charles travels to London but on his way back home he also stops in Exeter and meets Sarah in her hotel room. At the same time, Anna is also traveling by train to London because she has no more scenes to shoot at the current place where they are. Presenting all these trips back and forth simultaneously totally confounds the audience and it is really challenging to follow which character goes where and why. In a way we might have the feeling that the two levels resemble because Anna has to leave just like Sarah, the character in the film while Mike and Charles do not want to lose their partner. It can be observed that what has been written in the script, what happens in the characters' lives which they play, the same thing or at least a very similar one takes place in Anna's and Mike's private life. They do not overtly assume their relationship, but meet secretly just like Sarah and Charles. Towards the end of the film, the spectator may think that Anna and Mike do not even have to put such enormous effort into their acting because no matter if they are playing their roles or not, it feels like they experience the same events. The world of the film which they are shooting fuses with their own lives, the modern age and one starts to affect the other and vice versa. At one point they become inseparable and do not exist on their own but they are connected.

All in all, metalepsis makes the audience watch the film carefully in order to interpret it as much as possible. It is a technique that raises several questions in the spectators' minds and draws their attention to what is presented.

3.4 Mise en abyme

In the case of the film, *mise en abyme* is present in it just as in the novel. Brian McHale claimed:

Or one might choose to do what Harold Pinter and Karel Reisz actually did when they made their film of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, and transform one type of ontological structure into a different but related type with greater chance of being grasped by the average film-goer. Pinter and Reisz recast the double ending of Fowles's novel as a film-within-the-film, locating the unhappy ending (the hero loses the heroine for good) at the level of the film's "real world," the happy ending (hero and heroine reconciled) at the level of the film-within-the-film. (1987, 112)

There are a lot of scenes where the mirror, the idea of reflexivity occurs not accidentally but with a specific role. Already at the beginning of the film, during the very first scene, Anna appears holding a hand-glass and looking into it [Fig. 12]. She is dressed in a Victorian costume because they are shooting, near her there is a woman in modern clothes who takes it away from her as the shooting starts. One would think that Anna looked into the mirror to fix her makeup or check her face, but it is more complex than that. This act of hers symbolizes some kind of duality which lies in her character. She turns her back on the spectator, we do not really see the whole face of hers, only half of it through the mirror which reflects it. There is instantly this feeling of mysticism and obscurity, because her face is not fully revealed yet, we only get a glimpse of it and nothing more. As the shooting starts, the camera shows her quite distantly, her face is still not visible, being hidden by a pelerine which has a hood. The first time she meets Charles on the Cobb is when her face is clearly showed. This is not only a moment that shocks him, being mesmerized by her beauty, but the audience was also impatient and curious to find out how she looks like. Apart from this, a representative *mise en abyme* scene is when Sarah sitting in her room is looking into the mirror on her table. The camera is positioned behind her so we see everything that happens through the mirror which reflects it. We might think that she is writing something but when the camera suddenly shows in extreme close-up her drawings, we realize she is drawing her self-portrait [Figs. 13-14]. All of them suggest obscurity, mysticism, the fact that she is inscrutable. The drawn self-portrait

illustrates a romantic dark self which is looking directly into the eyes of the viewer. Her portrait is quite frightening, enigmatic, almost demonic which feels like it hypnotizes the spectator. Actually, this scene functions as a diminutive mirror that summarizes the duality of Sarah's character which has also an effect on Charles. A further scene which functions as a *mise en abyme*, towards the end of the film, is when Anna is at a dress shop and she is standing in front of a huge mirror, half of her body is covered with a white coloured textile. She is wearing her own clothes but partially because of that material it looks like Sarah is looking back at us from the mirror [Fig. 15].

On the whole, there are a great number of scenes which can be considered *mise en abyme* and they all serve to partly show the duality of Sarah's character, enigmatic and dark, but vulnerable at the same time.

3.5 Double closure

To begin with, the novel offers the reader three endings to choose from. In the case of Reisz' film, we also have more than one ending, however, in a different way. Already at the metadiegetic level the idea of ending surfaces. This reveals itself when Mike and David, Anna's husband are discussing the closure of the film and it is foreshadowed that they will play the first and the second ending. For the audience this is not understandable, only those who have read the novel and are familiar with the story might presume what this refers to. At the same time, Anna and Mike need to decide about the future of their relationship. During the party at Mike's house, he tries to move aside with Anna and talk with her in privacy, mentioning that they have to talk about themselves. The last scene is up next, it is time to decide what they want. However, their conversation is interrupted by David who is looking for Anna, so nothing is settled down yet. After this, what we see is that the picture fades out, there is total darkness then an inscription appears: "Three Years Later". This is quite ambiguous as we do not know what to expect. Does this mean that the relationship between Anna and Mike is shown after three years or we will get to know of Sarah's and Charles' future? Then the image fades in and we can see Charles sitting in a chair in a beautiful garden near the sea when he gets a telegram which contains the information that Sarah has been found, living under the name "Mrs. Roughwood". He instantly decides to visit her and they have a long conversation. It turns out that she herself gave the address in order for Charles to find her. This makes him really angry and disappointed because through this whole time she

knew that he was looking for her, he gave up many things, made sacrifices in order to be with Sarah, suffered a lot, in spite of this, she disappeared and chose not to start a new life with him. They shout at each other and then Sarah confesses that she wanted him to come here in order to ask for forgiveness. Finally, they get reconciled and kiss each other. It surely ends happily, as spectators we see their boat drifting away through the camera placed under the bridge. Whereas, the second ending is less joyful. After the crew completes the filming, they throw a wrap-up party. Everyone is dancing, having fun while Mike is searching for Anna everywhere. He finally arrives to the room where the reconciliation was shot but she is nowhere. Suddenly we can hear the sound of the engine so he rushes to the window and looks out of it, seeing her leaving by car. The moment he opens the window and cries out the camera zooms in rapidly and we see his face when he realizes Sarah is gone [Fig. 16]. Mike is in a total shock and instantly shouts out “Sarah” instead of “Anna”, losing her forever. This act from the part of Mike, mistaking the two feminine names, also makes evident that fiction and reality are merged. After this, the scene with the drifting boat appears again, with Sarah and Charles which is quite confusing for the viewer. The fact that they are leaving by boat on a calm lake symbolizes freedom and peace.

All in all, I suppose this scene reoccurs to lead back the audience that although Anna’s and Mike’s story was not ended in an idyllic way, Sarah and Charles have found each other. Another interpretation of mine is that albeit Anna and Mike did not end up together, on Earth, maybe in another life they have the chance to be happy side by side, in an imaginary world.

Conclusion

After presenting the theoretical part connected to postmodernism, including the antecedents, metafiction, metalepsis, *mise en abyme* and other terms, besides analyzing Fowles' novel *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and its film adaptation directed by Karel Reisz, it is worth mentioning what is gained and what is lost in it compared to the literary work.

First of all, as I have noted before, many of the novel's elements are present in the film as well, however, with certain modifications. There is an intrusive narrator in the case of the novel, who situates himself in the 1960s, while making comments not only what concerns the age he lives in, but also judges the Victorian period. As readers the novel may seem a little chaotic, especially at the beginning, but as we continue reading it becomes clearer to see the correlations. The narrator even lets us have a look into the process of writing. Thus, I totally felt that an intimate and close relationship evolved between me and the narrator while reading. In contrast with Fowles' novel, the film does not present a narrator who is telling the story. We have to figure out by ourselves the logic behind the film, why it has a film-within-the-film structure, what the function of the two levels is, how they intersect and others. Still, even if it was challenging to watch the film just as much as reading the novel, I did not feel the absence of a narrative voice. As a matter of course, for those who read the novel previously, it was a little easier to understand the happenings. From this perspective, it can be said that what is "lost" in Karel Reisz' adaptation is, for example, the role of the narrator. Another element which is of high importance would be metalepsis. In the novel there are two levels, the metadiegetic one implying the twentieth century, during which the novel is written and the diegetic level representing the love story between Sarah and Charles in the 1860s. What concerns the film, there are also two levels in it: the metadiegetic one, depicting Anna and Mike's relationship and the diegetic level which lies in the story set in the Victorian period. Both in the novel and in the film, these two levels intersect each other, conjoin at many points. For me personally it was more difficult to follow the plotline in the case of the movie than the one in the novel. As soon as the characters started to travel back and forth I had to pay even more attention not to mingle. In this sense, we can say that metalepsis was kept and present in the film as well. For me it is definitely a gain compared to the novel because it functioned more efficiently and really gave the story a twist. As an audience, we would never know which level was up next, in fact, there were scenes which tricked us for a second.

Furthermore, it is indispensable to discuss a little bit about *mise en abyme* as it is an integral part of both the novel and the film. As I have said before, it reveals itself by the fact that Sarah writes a diary. This act is transposed to the film in the form of drawing and painting. There is a scene almost in the middle of the film when Sarah draws herself. This self-portrait is frightening, dark and ominous. The role of it is to show the duality of Sarah's character, her mystique and inscrutability which also piques Charles' interest. At the end, when Sarah and Charles get reconciled, the paintings and drawings reoccur but as we can see they are much brighter, more colorful, pleasant and transmit simplicity. The aim with this may have been to mirror her character development, that the environment in which she lives now influenced her in a good sense. For me, the film would definitely reflect more efficiently this sense of stratification and mirroring which can be connected to *mise en abyme* probably because I am a visual person. Finally, the last aspect I intend to cover is the topic of closure. In general, there are three endings within the novel, one of which takes place only in Charles' mind so the majority of critiques do not consider it a real ending. As of the film, the way it ends is quite interesting. The scene where Anna and Mike get separated is positioned between the boats scenes, reappearing twice. This decision from the part of the director is really thought-provoking what concerns the audience and it raises many questions to which I tried to find an answer in the previous chapter.

On the whole, I think the film adaptation of Fowles' novel managed to cinematize it despite that insomuch as it is a metafictional and postmodern literary work, creativity and ingenuity was in any way needed in order to remain faithful to the source-text to some degree. I reckon that the structure of film-within-the-film was a great idea to be applied, in this way reflecting the duality and passage between the two levels. From the perspective of the spectator, all these elements definitely catch one's attention but in many cases tend to be confusing, chaotic and hard to follow the story. We need to concentrate, focus and pay attention to what we see on the screen because everything has a function and even if something may appear strange or inappropriate, it is still chosen with a reason.

Bibliography

1. Andrew, Dudley. 1984. *Concepts in Film Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
2. Barthes, Roland. 1977. *The Death of The Author*. London: Fontana.
3. Currie, Mike. 1995. *Metafiction*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
4. Dällenbach, Lucien. 1989. *The Mirror in the Text*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
5. Dodson, Mary Lynn. 1998. "The French Lieutenant's Woman: Pinter and Reisz's Adaptation of John Fowles Adaptation." *Literature/Film Quarterly* vol. 26 no. 4: 296-303.
6. Fludernik, Monika. 2003. "Scene Shift, Metalepsis, and the Metaleptic Mode." *Style* vol. 37 no. 4 (Winter): 382- 400.
7. Genette, Gérard. 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
8. Hutcheon, Linda. 1988. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
9. Hutcheon, Linda. 1991. *Narcissistic Narrative: the Metafictional Paradox*. London: Routledge.
10. Hutcheon, Linda. 2002 [1989]. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. Cornwall: Routledge.
11. Levin, Yael. 2016. "Metalepsis and the Author Figure in Modernist and Postmodernist Fiction". *Twentieth Century Literature* vol. 62 no. 3 (September): 289-308.
12. Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
13. Mchale, Brian. 1987. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Routledge.
14. Milne, Ira Mark and Timothy Sisler. 2005. *Novels for Students vol. 2* Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale.
15. Pieldner, Judit. 2008. "Medial Equivalences, Functional Analogies? The Rhetoric of Adaptation." In *Words and Images on the Screen: Language, Literature, Moving Pictures*, ed. Pethő Ágnes, 58-75. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
16. Salami, Mahmoud. 1992. *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses Inc.
17. Scruggs, Charles. 1985. "The two endings of The French Lieutenant's Woman." *Modern Fiction Studies* vol. 31 no. 1 (Spring): 95-113.
18. Stam, Robert. 2000. *Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers.
19. Stephenson, William. 2007. *Fowles's The French Lieutenant's Woman*. London: Continuum.

20. Strub, Rachelle Claire. 2021. "The Postmodern Neo-Sensation Novel: Metalepsis as Narrative Strategy in John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* and its Filmic Adaptation." *The Foundationalist* vol. 5, issue 1: 2-19.
21. Waugh, Patricia. 1984. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction*. London- New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
22. Witalec, Janet. 2003. *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism Topics Volume*. Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale.