JOHN FOWLES' DANIEL MARTIN

JOHN FOWLES' DANIEL MARTIN:

"ILL-CONCEALED GHOSTS"

By

ALISON M. LEE, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1981

MASTER OF ARTS (1981)
(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: John Fowles' Daniel Martin: "Ill-Concealed Ghosts"

AUTHOR: Alison M. Lee, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Linda Hutcheon

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 76

ABSTRACT

John Fowles' Daniel Martin can best be viewed in the context of his previous novels, The Collector, The French Lieutenant's Woman and The Magus, as well as his non-fictional work, The Aristos. Fowles is particularly conscious of himself as author and his novels invite the reader to participate in them as co-creator. Therefore, the way in which Fowles develops this self-awareness in his novels and the purpose behind his use of metafiction are central to any discussion of Fowles' works.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my sincere gratitude and respect to Dr. Linda Hutcheon for her enthusiasm, encouragement and participation in the "shared creative process".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Daniel Martin is in many ways unique in the context of John Fowles' fiction. As its title suggests, it is essentially a novel of character rather than plot and as such has received less critical acclaim than have Fowles' other works. As he has proved in The Collector and The Magus, Fowles has a remarkable talent for producing tales which are suspenseful, mysterious and thrilling. In Daniel Martin, however, he has deliberately chosen to vary his style from one which is, to use his character's terms, "linear and progressive", to one which is "dense, interweaving, treating time as horizontal, like a skyline."[1] It is this rejection of the linear mode which has caused critical furor since it is claimed that it lessens the immediacy found in his previous novels. Time in Daniel Martin is often suspended, a device used first by Fowles in Chapter Thirteen of The French Lieutenant's Woman for a narrative intrusion about the creation of character. In Daniel Martin it is Daniel himself who eschews chronology. Since the novel involves the protagonist's recollections of his life from childhood to the present, the narrative follows the often erratic path of remembered events. As Daniel explains it, the novel is written in the two past tenses: "the present perfect of the writer's mind and the concluded past of fictional convention" (D.M., p. 239). This allows Daniel to further suspend time in order to comment with hindsight on the events of his past. Although the suspension of time through narrative intrusions and

the rejection of a linear style make the novel appear to be constructed on aleatory principles, its structure is not purely random:

> The one principle the ordinary writer tries to abolish from his work, at least in the finished text, is precisely that of randomness. He calculates, plans, strives where the great question-mark is indifferent and leaves all to hazard; and his final, revised product is in intention as rigid and pre-conceived as a piece of machinery or an architect-designed building.
>
> (D.M., p. 271)

In fact, then, Daniel is extremely conscious of structure and the search for, and discussion of structure in his novel parallels his quest for direction in his own life. This parallel development of character and text makes Daniel Martin the most verisimilar of Fowles' novels. As a fledgeling novelist, Daniel is often uncertain about the craft of novel-writing, and the novel reflects this both in his self-doubt and his sometimes stilted prose:

> Dan arrived at the somehow doubly empty--Caro being in Paris, and having in any case moved out--flat, the next day, feeling vaguely depressed. It was not so much Jenny, since on a third reading he had decided to see what she had written, and whether it was true or imagined, as a sign of health, that is, of independence, weaning; but considerably more a belated wondering why he was once again forsaking Thorncombe.
>
> (D.M., p. 447)

Although he attempts to write objectively, "to escape the first person and become one's own third" (D.M., p. 62), Daniel realizes that complete objectivity about one's own life is impossible. Therefore, unlike Fowles' other characters, he struggles between the first-person narration of narcissism, and the more difficult third-person of objectivity.

The length of the novel, particularly since its plot is relatively nonexistent, has also raised critical hackles. Fowles himself called Daniel Martin "A long journey of a book,"[2] but the critics have not been so kind. "Ponderous" seems to be the favoured adjective. This kind of criticism, however, as is suggested by Daniel Martin itself, is the result of a growing lethargy on the part of readers, spawned by the immediacy of cinema and television. These not only demote art to mere entertainment,[3] but atrophy a vital psychic function: "the ability to imagine for oneself" (D.M., p. 274). As the controversy between the novel and the cinema is a central one within Daniel Martin, so is the reader invited to participate in the controversy surrounding the novel in general and this novel in particular. Daniel is a successful scriptwriter whose first novelistic venture often shows traces of verbal cinematography. The descriptive passages are extremely detailed as if Daniel is constantly aware that the novel cannot present as immediate and all-inclusive a vision as does the cinema:

> For once a camera would have done better; the
> queries in eyes, the avoided looks, the hidden
> reservations on both sides, the self-consciousness.
> (D.M., p. 155)

Words, however, must take the place of the camera, focusing as the camera does, on minute details of light, colour and changes of expression:

> She wore a red scarf, she was covered in flecks
> of down, plucking chickens in the dairy; but
> those shy eyes, a subdued awareness of him,
> that one curve at the corner of the pressed lips.
> (D.M., p. 349)

. . . . .

> After a while they sat on a bench in one of the side-walks. There were other strollers on the main paths, specks of distant color who idled through the sunshot shadow like figures not from a Rousseau, but in a Manet or a Renoir.
>
> (D.M., p. 537)

As Daniel says of his own métier, "Film excludes all but now; permits no glances away to past and future" (D.M., p. 155). The purpose of his novel is to reject the cinematic "now" in favour of a detailed, objective look at his past. However, the habit of his métier is pervasive and Daniel often draws from his experience as a scriptwriter in the writing of his novel. Although the novel is about his past, Daniel often describes scenes in the present tense, a concession to the immediacy of the cinema. Appearing as they often do in the middle of chapters written in the past tense, these scenes sound like stage directions:

> Dan hesitates, then reaches across the white cloth and touches her hand lightly. She says nothing. He beckons for the waiter.
>
> (D.M., p. 192)

They are consistent, however, with the parallel development of the character and his text and with Daniel's admission that,

> I was writing myself, making myself the chief character in a play, so that I was not only the written personage, the character and its actor, but also the person who sits in the back of the stalls admiring what he has written.
>
> (D.M., p. 69)

Similarly consistent with Daniel's screen writing technique is the occasional use of film jargon such as "Cut" (D.M., p. 125) and "One last shot" (D.M., p. 379), and the creation of dialogue which often rejects the novelistic "he said" in favour of forcing the reader to visualize the scene and the speakers:

"Proves my point"
"Well someone's fishing"
"Not the smallest check"
"You don't even . . . and you know it"
"Only by local standards"
"Balls"
"Darling, when you're -- "
"Oh Gawd, here we go again"

(D.M., p. 14)

It is admittedly difficult to follow dialogue such as this, but it must be remembered that Daniel is not yet a novelist and is therefore not going to write like one. Throughout the novel, he quarrels with the cinema and eventually, in the last eleven chapters, rejects the style of screenwriting although quite naturally maintains its metaphors and detailed description.

Despite Daniel's cinematic technique, Daniel Martin is an attempt to rid the novel of the artifice and superficiality of the cinema. As Christopher Lehmann-Haupt points out, things are forever not happening in Daniel Martin[4]. A corpse is discovered by Daniel and Jane as they are punting on the Cherwell, but the mystery is not solved or mentioned again. Cars drive up to places where the characters are interacting, stop, and then simply drive away. Stones are thrown at Daniel but it is never discovered who has thrown them. These are the type of events which create suspense in the cinema, but the omission of any explanation about them is an affirmation of both the novel and the verisimilitude which the novel is trying to express. While it is not likely to be a common experience to discover a floating corpse or to be victimized by a mysterious stone thrower, disembodied events like these create what Roland Barthes calls "l'effet de réel"[5]. They serve the purpose of placing Daniel in a broader context than that of his novel. Because it

is never discovered who threw the stones or how the corpse came to be murdered, the impression is created of a world which exists outside the narrative and will continue to exist even though the novel's characters are otherwise engaged.

Another function of these events is to lend a structure to the novel though their repetition, something which Daniel likes both artistically and in his life: "But I knew something in Jane's presence satisfied some deep need in me of recurring structure in both real and imagined events; indeed, married the real and imagined; justified both" (D.M., p. 396). The corpse becomes for Daniel and Jane a symbol of the ugliness of reality invading the unreal idyll of their student life. Daniel links this to a scene from his childhood when helping with the harvest in a lush pastoral landscape, he sees a rabbit get caught in the blades of the reaper and have its hind legs sliced off. As he says, "It's all I can remember about that day now. The whole summer" (D.M., p. 27). The corpse appears in a chapter called "The Woman in the Reeds" and its symbolism reoccurs in Daniel's story of his first love affair with Nancy Reed, a young farm girl. Into the innocent romance comes the reality of class differences and the brief affair ends with Daniel's dismissal from his job at the farm and Nancy's being sent away. Similarly, the appearance of mysterious cars links events in the novel. Each time a car is mentioned it is when Daniel and Jane are interacting. As the novel progresses so does their relationship develop into a more intimate one, and the cars therefore become tacit milestones in the development of their intimacy.

The style of Fowles' earlier novels is essentially one which conforms to that which Daniel Martin rejects. Therefore, it is Fowles himself who has conditioned his audience into expecting an exciting, fast-paced tale. His previous protagonists are usually described in fantastic and unexpected situations, whereas Daniel Martin is primarily distinguished by his ordinariness. However, Daniel Martin is in many ways a logical progression from Fowles' earlier work. Despite differences in style and technique, there are many thematic similarities which occur and progress through Fowles' novels.

The Collector is a disturbing novel whose plot involves the kidnapping and imprisonment of a young art student. The collector is Frederick Clegg, a small town clerk whose two passions are lepidoptery and pornography. From a distance he falls in love with Miranda Grey, and concocts a frightening fantasy in which she is added to his collection. He sees her in the same way as he does his butterflies and reduces her to a status similar to theirs, confusing a love of beauty with a desire for possession.

As Miranda says of Clegg, "He's a collector. That's the great dead thing in him."[6] His winning a large sum of money allows Clegg to realize his fantasy and he secures Miranda in his basement in the hope that she will fall in love with him. Clegg is a humorless, solitary young man who refuses to take moral responsibility for his actions. His class consciousness makes it difficult for him to understand or communicate with Miranda. Instead, he dehumanizes her, treating her first like a rare butterfly and later as a subject for his pornographic photographs. Indeed, it is their inability to communicate with each other on a human level which eventually causes Miranda's tragic death.

Miranda is, as Fowles calls her, "a liberal-humanist snob,"[7] but unlike Clegg she has the potential to change. As she suggests to Clegg, it is her contact with art that gives her an intuitive understanding of man's moral responsibility towards others:

> "Do you know anything about art?" she asked.
> Nothing you'd call knowledge.
> "I knew you didn't. You wouldn't imprison an innocent person if you did."
>
> (C., p. 41)

Miranda's potential, however, is overcome by Clegg's inability to understand others. She attempts several times to escape, by feigning illness, digging through the wall and eventually by hitting Clegg with an ax--an attempt which fails because she is unable to think of herself as a murderer. Finally she attempts to seduce him, to show him that "sex is just an activity" (C., p. 97), but the seduction fails because Clegg is not only imaginatively but physically impotent. She fails more seriously because it changes his attitude towards her. Her sexuality disgusts him and because he can only think in extremes, she becomes for him not a priceless butterfly but a "common street-woman" (C., p. 102). When she develops pneumonia he believes she is merely acting, and when she becomes too weak to struggle he ties her to the bed and takes pornographic pictures of her.

As in all of his novels, Fowles illustrates his themes through contrasts. Miranda is everything Clegg is not. She comes from a wealthy family and is creative, lively and imaginative, whereas Clegg is anti-life, anti-art and imaginatively impotent. The novel is written in alternating first-person narrative which gives both sides of the story. Through Miranda's diary it becomes obvious that she has the capacity to take

responsibility for her actions. Clegg's narrative, however, constantly disclaims responsibility. When Miranda dies, Clegg chillingly insists, "It was her fault for having played that game before" (C., p. 107).

Like Clegg, Nicholas Urfe in The Magus is a collector. Nicholas is a collector of affairs, and while his collecting is more subtle than Clegg's collecting of Miranda, it shows a similar tendency to dehumanize others. Nicholas confuses the end of an affair with freedom, and, like Clegg, refuses to take moral responsibility for his actions, excusing himself by a show of "honesty":

> I was always careful to make sure that the current victim knew, before she took her clothes off, the difference between coupling and marrying.[8] (M., p. 23)

When he gets a teaching post in Greece, Nicholas feels the same relief at leaving his current affair with Alison, narcissistically assuming that "she loved me more than I loved her, and that consequently I had in some indefinable way won" (M., p. 50). On Phraxos, Nicholas soon exorcises Alison with the discovery of an Athens brothel, but he soon discovers he has contracted what he assumes to be syphilis. This, coupled with a realization that he is a poor poet, lead him to the brink of suicide. Although he is far too self-absorbed to kill himself, the failed suicide is the beginning of a new self-awareness. Later, when writing of his experiences, he realizes that the attempts at suicide and poetry have been substitutes for his inability to form genuine relationships or to take responsibility for himself.[9] At the time, however, he feels only depression at his failings. Soon after his failed suicide he meets Conchis, a supposed collaborationist, and with this meeting, "the mysteries began" (M., p. 66).

Conchis is a mysterious figure who weaves ever more entangled webs around Nicholas. He tells Nicholas the story of his life, often illustrating parts of it with actors and actresses. Through his story he teaches Nicholas about the true nature of freedom, which comes not from relief at the end of an affair, but from the assumption of responsibility for oneself and one's actions. Nicholas is shown this through the elaborate machinations of Conchis' masque which mirror Nicholas' own self-centered manipulations of others. Through the masque, the "disintoxication", and the "waiting game" which follows, Nicholas becomes aware that his treatment of others in relationships has been merely pornographic and dehumanizing.

The Magus is written in the first person and is presumably Nicholas' story of what happened on Phraxos. Nicholas fancies himself an artist, and the narrative is littered with artistic metaphors and similes. Julie, one of the actresses in the masque, is "Like a Renoir" (M., p. 198), and one of the scenes from the masque is "Henry James. The old man's discovered that the screw could take another turn." (M., p. 145) The Magus is an intoxicating and dazzling novel, and is made so by the method of narration. Since Nicholas is the narrator the reader is given the same limited perspective on the events as Conchis gives to Nicholas. Therefore, the masque is just as mysterious and engrossing to the reader as it is to the protagonist.

The French Lieutenant's Woman is the novel for which Fowles is best known and the one which has attracted the most serious scholarship. It is a combination of historical fact and fantasy, and modern stylistic and narrative experimentation. Because of its historical accuracy and the

wealth of both modern and Victorian allusions, both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are seen to illuminate each other. The reader is conscious both of the Victorian age and the fact that he is viewing it from a great distance.

At the beginning of the novel, Charles Smithson and his fiancée, Ernestina Freeman, are strolling on the quay at Lyme Regis. At the end of the quay is a figure whom Charles assumes to be a fisherman but Ernestina identifies as "poor Tragedy,"[10] the "French Lieutenant's . . . Woman" (F.L.W., p. 9). Within the first few pages it becomes apparent that Sarah Woodruff, the woman in question, has a character quite different from that of the "demure, obedient, shy" (F.L.W., p. 10) Ernestina. When she turns to look at Charles, he feels himself pierced as if by a lance and "deservedly diminished" (F.L.W., p. 10). Sarah's look, combined with the gossip that she has been seduced and deserted by the French Lieutenant, have an attraction for Charles, who soon begins to fall in love with her. Sarah is an enigmatic and almost anachronistic figure. She has all of the qualities which the Victorian age tried to suppress in its women: passion, imagination and independence.[11] She tells Charles what is later discovered to be a lie, that her seduction was desired and planned in order that she could achieve a new existence and a new freedom. When she is finally seduced by Charles, it is discovered that she is a virgin and that her story was mere fabrication. Charles leaves Ernestina, but upon his return to London discovers that Sarah has vanished. Although he tries to find her, he has no success and for nearly two years he travels around Europe and America in order to occupy himself. This period, like the "waiting game"

in The Magus, gives Charles a chance to re-evaluate his life. Like Nicholas and Clegg, Charles is a collector. He is passionately interested in paleontology and geology, fancies himself a rationalist and "healthy agnostic" (F.L.W., p. 15), and is a devoted, though naïve, follower of Darwin. His fault, like that of Nicholas, is in being more narcissistically concerned with maintaining a modish style than learning to interact with others, and it is through Sarah that he eventually learns, or develops the potential, to understand humanity.

In character, Daniel Martin is essentially a matured Nicholas Urfe, although he shares traits with both Clegg and Charles. While Daniel is not a collector in the sense that Clegg is a collector, he shares with him the tendency to reify living things. As Nicholas does with Alison, Daniel attempts to make Jane into something she cannot be, imposing upon her the persona she had as a student. It is only when he realizes that she has developed a different personality and is not merely stepping out of character, that he can give her the freedom to assert herself. The difference between Daniel and Fowles' other protagonists is that Daniel has the maturity to educate himself. Miranda and Nicholas both have to develop their self-consciousness through isolation in fantastic settings and with the catalysts of Conchis and Clegg. Charles only develops an understanding of himself through the enigmatic Sarah. Daniel, however, has gained a certain objectivity as a result of his maturity, and uses it to try to see himself as others see him. Daniel is the first of Fowles' hero to achieve his self-awareness by himself in a context which is much broader and more realistic than that in which Fowles' other protagonists move. Daniel Martin is also Fowles' first novel to deal with

the development of a love relationship. Concerned as he is with the exploration of human freedom, it is quite natural that Fowles should eventually write of the necessity for love.[12] As Fowles says in The Aristos, "Adam is stasis or conservatism; Eve is kinesis, or progress" (A., p. 165-6), and the ideal harmony between these poles lies in the union of men and women in love. Fowles has, in Daniel Martin, outgrown what Barry Olshen calls his "adolescent vision".[13] It is a novel which examines compromise rather than choices between extremes, and interaction between mature individuals in the context of the real, rather than a fantasy world.

Fowles is essentially a moralist, and his themes of individual freedom and awareness of the freedom of others are paramount in his fiction. However, the most striking aspect of Fowles' fiction is not his moral concerns as much as it is his awareness of himself as novelist presenting his morality to the reader and his subsequent awareness of his fiction as artifice. This is in fact the most interesting and important link between Fowles' novels, and the one which makes him a serious and important artist.

Notes to Introduction

[1]John Fowles, Daniel Martin (Toronto: Collins Publishers, 1977), p. 331. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text with the title abbreviated to D.M.

[2]Barry Olshen, John Fowles (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1978), p. 11.

[3]John Fowles, "Is the Novel Dead?", Books, No. 1 (Autumn 1970), p. 2.

[4]Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, "Un-Inventing the Novel", New York Times, 13 September 1977, p. 29.

[5]Roland Barthes, "L'Effet de réel", Communications, No. 11 (1968), pp. 84-89.

[6]John Fowles, The Collector (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1963), p. 151. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text with the title abbreviated to C.

[7]John Fowles, The Aristos (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1970), p. 10. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text with the title abbreviated to A.

[8]John Fowles, The Magus (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1978), p. 23. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text with the title abbreviated to M.

The first edition of The Magus was published in 1965, but Fowles was dissatisfied with it and published a revised edition in 1978. As he explains in the preface to the later edition:

> In 1964 I went to work and collated and rewrote all the previous drafts. But The Magus remained essentially where a tyro taught himself to write novels--beneath its narrative, a notebook of an exploration, often erring and misconceived, into an unknown land. Even in its final published form it was a far more haphazard and naively instinctive work than the more intellectual reader can easily imagine; the hardest blows I had to bear from critics were those which condemned the book as a coldly calculated exercise in fantasy, a cerebral game. But then one of the (incurable) faults of the book was the attempt to conceal the real state of endless flux in which it was written.
>
> (M., p. 6)

For this reason I have decided to use the revised edition since it is this one with which Fowles is more satisfied.

[9]Olshen, p. 37.

[10]John Fowles, The French Lieutenant's Woman (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1969), p. 8. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text with the title abbreviated to F.L.W.

[11]Olshen, p. 11.

[12]Robert Scholes, Structuralism in Literature (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 198.

[13]Olshen, p. 62.

CHAPTER ONE

The self-consciousness of the authorial persona is necessarily one which promotes an awareness of fiction as artifice. Fowles' novels are "metafictional", they are fictions about fictions, and as such are aware of the sharing of the creative process by author and reader. Metafiction is mimetic in that it seeks to represent reality, but paradoxically, it is equally aware of the unreality of fiction. The relationship between life and art, then, is particularly important since the reader must recognize the fictional reality of the novel, the experiential reality of his life, and the correlation between the two. Life and art cannot be distinctly separated, however, since the processes of reading and writing, as Linda Hutcheon points out, belong as much to the processes of "life" as they to to those of "art"[1]:

> It is this realization that constitutes one side of the paradox of metafiction for the reader. On the one hand, he is forced to acknowledge the artifice, the "art," of what he is reading; on the other, explicit demands are made upon him, as a co-creator, for intellectual and affective responses comparable in scope and intensity to those of his life experience. In fact, these responses are shown to be <u>part of</u> his life experience. In this light metafiction is less a departure from the mimetic novelistic tradition than a reworking of it.[2]

The product, or completed work, is, as in the case of Fowles, about the process of creation. Because the author is aware of himself as author, there is a corresponding self-awareness engendered in the reader.

Equally, the realism of the characters in the novel forces the reader to equate their actions and responses with his own. The result of this is that the reader will increase his self-awareness concurrently with the increased self-awareness of the characters.

In his novels, Fowles wants to create the impression that his characters are as real as his readers. He does this by juxtaposing his fictional characters with real people and by placing them in real settings. Therefore, if Daniel Martin, who began his career as a playwright, claims to know British drama critic Ken Tynan (D.M., p. 100), then the impression is given that they have the same ontological status. Similarly, if Sarah Woodruff lives with the Rossettis (F.L.W., Ch. 60), and Charles exists in the same reality as does Karl Marx (F.L.W., p. 12), then it is assumed that Sarah and Charles occupy the same historical reality as Rossetti and Marx.[3] By making his characters move in real settings such as Lyme Regis, London, Egypt, Sussex and Greece, Fowles creates the impression that they occupy the same virtual space as the "real and actual space" inhabited by his readers.[4] If the characters created are verisimilar, then it necessarily follows that they must be seen to create their own lives and make their own decisions without authorial intervention. In essence, then, the characters seem to create and shape their own narratives or texts. Fowles creates this impression through the inclusion of various actual and fictional texts within the text of the novel. Daniel and Jane read the works of Lukács and Gramsci, partial texts of which are reprinted in Daniel Martin. Even the fictional texts, "An Alarme for Sinners" in The Magus and "The History of the Human Heart" in The French Lieutenant's Woman, although written by Fowles himself, serve the same

purpose as do the real texts of Lukács and Gramsci. Rather than having an omniscient author or narrator explain both the text and the character's reaction to it, the text is printed within the novel and the reader observes what seems to be the character's own opinion of it. As a result, the author is refined out of the novel, leaving the character to assert his own opinions and identity. As Fowles says in Chapter Thirteen of The French Lieutenant's Woman, his characters assert an autonomy which he, as author, must respect if he wishes his characters to seem realistic (p. 97). Essentially Fowles gives his characters the freedom to exist, to shape their own texts, and therefore to appear to enter the same reality as his readers. Similarly, the epigraphs which begin each chapter of The French Lieutenant's Woman give a realistic tone to each chapter. By setting the tone with Victorian poets and thinkers, the fiction gains a reality which is premissed in the reality of Hardy, Tennyson, Marx, Darwin and others.[5]

Posited against this realism, however, is the constant reminder of the fictiveness of the text. Paradoxically, while the characters achieve their own verisimilar identities, the reader is repeatedly assured that, as one of Fowles' characters says, "Nothing is real. All is fiction."[6] This places the reader in a precarious position since he is at once expected to see the novel's characters in the same reality as himself, yet is always reminded that he is reading a novel, and that his own perceptions of his life may be (are) fictional. The reader must, then, question his relationship to the "reality"[7] of the characters, his relationship with the author, and his own participation in the text. In fact, these relationships are dealt with within the texts of the

novels so that the experience of reading and the plot of the novel become inextricably linked. The most striking example of this is The Magus, where the reader participates in the same events and achieves a similar status in the text as does Nicholas Urfe. Nicholas' relationship to Conchis is very much like that of reader to novelist. Conchis is a fiction-maker and his comments to Nicholas on the experience which Nicholas undergoes are reminiscent of those which the narrator makes to the reader in The French Lieutenant's Woman. The title which Fowles originally intended for The Magus was The Godgame, and as a god/novelist Conchis creates reality. It is, however, a tenuous reality since, as Nicholas discovers, it fails to exist outside the boundaries of Phraxos. Like Fowles, Conchis repeatedly warns Nicholas of the fictiveness of his experience. The elaborate masque in which Nicholas participates is called by Conchis "meta-theatre", the object of which is "to allow the participants to see through their first roles in it" (M., p. 415). Like the characters in Fowles' novels, the characters in the meta-drama seem real to Nicholas. However, Nicholas, like Fowles' reader, is warned that: "We are all actors here" (M., p. 411). Nicholas, however, fancies himself a rationalist and a cynic. He has little imagination and this makes him not only a failure as a poet, but as a reader. Fooled by the apparent realism of the characters in the masque, he is more concerned with attempting to make them part of his own reality than he is with incorporating what they are trying to teach him. When he falls in love with Julie, he attempts to make her follow his rules. He invents a fantasy of love and marriage in which, as a character in a drama, Julie cannot participate. Conversely, however, in his relationship with Alison,

a woman from his own reality, Nicholas tries to fictionalize her by making her into something she cannot be.

Like Fowles, Conchis makes his fiction and his characters seem real. In her role as Lily, Conchis' long-dead fiancee, Julie is a fictional character whose role is not confused, either by Nicholas or the reader, with reality. However, when she steps out of this part into one which more closely approximates reality and admits that her role as Lily was indeed scripted, then both Nicholas and the reader are fooled into assuming that she has left the "stage". She is, as is later discovered, however, merely taking on another role which is more confoundable with "reality". During the disintoxication, she appears again as psychologist Dr. Vanessa Maxwell, and this role, too, becomes "real" to both Nicholas and the reader. When Nicholas returns to London, however, and tries to verify this last role, he discovers that it, too, is fiction. The reader, then, is in a position similar to that of Nicholas, and is as controlled by Conchis as he is. The novel is written in the past tense and it is assumed that Nicholas is narrating with the benefit of hindsight. However, even though Nicholas has already gone through the experience about which he is writing, he appears not to be an omniscient narrator. Having had the experience of Conchis' masque, he has taken on the persona of a Conchis-like novelist, leaving the reader to participate in the masque as he did. After he leaves Phraxos, Nicholas attempts to discover the whereabouts of several of his predecessors at the school to "compare notes" (M., p. 581). As he finds out, not one of them is prepared to discuss the experience. One of his predecessors sends him what he later discovers to be a false letter and another rebukes him

coldly when he suggests they discuss Conchis' masque: "The essence of . . . his . . . system is surely that you learn not to 'compare notes'" (M., p. 581). Even Nicholas himself, once he understands the masque, does not warn his replacement of what he knows will happen at Bourani. Instead he remains silent, as he does in his retelling of the story, leaving the reader to make his own judgements and decisions about it. The reader must discover the validity of the masque and deal, as Nicholas does, with the constant reality of the characters and the constant fiction of the text.

This paradox, which exists in all Fowles' novels, is explained in The French Lieutenant's Woman:

> Fiction is woven into all, as a Greek observed some two and a half thousand years ago. I find this new reality (or unreality) more valid; and I would have you share my own sense that I do not fully control these creatures of my mind, any more than you control --however hard you try, however much of a latterday Mrs. Poulteney you may be--your children, colleagues, friends, or even yourself.
>
> But this is preposterous? A character is either "real" or "imaginary"? If you think that, hypocrite lecteur, I can only smile. You do not even think of your own past as quite real; you dress it up, you gild it or blacken it, censor it, tinker with it . . . fictionalize it, in a word, and put it away on a shelf--your book, your romanced autobiography. We are all in flight from the real reality. That is a basic definition of Homo sapiens. (F.L.W., p. 97)

The distance between life and art, then, is diminished. The reader is invited to participate in the fiction as something which is not far removed from his own life, and to make choices which are similar to those made by Fowles' characters. Indeed, the reader becomes an active participant in the creation of the novel, as in The French Lieutenant's

Woman, where the reader has a choice of conclusions, and in the open ending of The Magus, where the reader can choose to unite or part Nicholas and Alison. This heightened self-consciousness causes the reader to become more aware of his role in the fiction-making of his own life. The choices made by Nicholas, Charles and Daniel are not far from those which the reader might make in the shaping of his own text. The boundaries between art and life are constantly being traversed in Fowles' novels. The narrator of The French Lieutenant's Woman enters the novel both as story-teller and character. His position is similar to that of the modern reader who can observe the Victorian world from a twentieth-century armchair. The narrator, however, is free to move between the two centuries, at once addressing the reader with modern references and riding in Charles' train compartment. Fowles himself enters Daniel Martin, albeit subtly, in order that Daniel should be seen to be writing his own novel without Fowles' intervention. It is suggested to Daniel that the protagonist of the novel he wants to write should have a name other than his own: "Who'd ever go for a character called Daniel Martin?" (D.M., p. 18). The name which he eventually takes is S. Wolfe--an anagram of "Fowles."[8] Simon Wolfe becomes Daniel's "putative fictional" self (D.M., p. 414), and it is only after Daniel rejects him that he can write his own text, free not only from apparent authorial manipulation, but from his own deliberate fictionalizing of his own life.

The relationship between life and art, then, is a particularly important one in Fowles' novels, since through Fowles' art the reader develops a greater self-consciousness in the shaping of his own life-text. The relationship between reader and novel is often paralleled

within the fiction. In each of Fowles' novels there is a character who is an explicit as well as implicit creator, and it is through the creation and contemplation of art that they make the decisions which influence their lives. The reader, then, is at once in the position of both voyeur and participant. He subjectively participates in the creation of the novel, and by extension his own life-text, and also watches objectively as the characters create their own art and shape their own narratives. The reader becomes simultaneously Conchis and Nicholas, Sarah and Charles, Daniel Martin and Simon Wolfe.

The relationship between life and art was first explored in The Collector, Fowles' first published novel. The Collector is, in many ways, a perverse variation on The Magus, the writing of which Fowles interrupted to write The Collector. Clegg adopts the persona of novelist, since from his fantasies he creates and maintains his own reality. Unlike Conchis and Fowles, however, he does not allow his character, Miranda, to develop freely, but rather imprisons her and imposes his own fiction upon her. While Nicholas is trapped in Bourani by his own curiosity, his imprisonment is metaphorical. Indeed, the lesson he eventually learns is about the freedom to make choices and, more importantly, about "the freedom that allows other freedoms to exist" (F.L.W., p. 97). Freedom also involves the assumption of responsibility, for oneself as well as for others. Conchis teaches this to Nicholas through the staging of Alison's suicide, his story of his collaboration with the Germans, and through Nicholas' disintoxication, where he learns the difference between dehumanizing pornography and the humanity of love. In all of these situations, a choice has been made which involves both the freedom to make the choice and the acceptance of responsibility for its outcome.[9]

Clegg is, in essence, a poor novelist. His one concession to Miranda's reality is his putting her sentences in quotation marks. This is also a reifying gesture, however, since it makes Miranda into a fictional object in Clegg's mind. He fails to give Miranda the freedom to choose her own lifestyle or fully shape her own text. As a novelist, he refuses to take responsibility either for Miranda or for his own actions. Within the confines of her basement prison, Miranda does manage to assert her freedom to change. She is an embryonic artist, and it is through her art and her newly formulating ideas about art that she achieves a limited freedom. Her tragedy is that she cannot communicate her art to Clegg and she dies before she can shape her own narrative in the world outside her prison. Miranda's literal prison mirrors the two other prisons which are important in the novel. The first of these is the prison of social and environmental forces over which the characters have no control. Both Miranda and Clegg can achieve only a limited freedom because of the hazard of birth. To a large extent, this dictates the lives which they both lead and seriously impairs their ability to communicate with each other. As Miranda complains of Clegg when he is incapable of understanding art:

> I tried to teach him what to look for in abstract art after supper. It's hopeless. He has it fixed in his poor dim noddle that art is fiddling away (he can't understand why I don't "rub out") until you get an exact photographic likeness and that making lovely cool designs (Ben Nicholson) is vaguely immoral. I can see it makes a nice pattern, he said. But he won't concede that "making a nice pattern" is art. With him, it's that certain words have terribly strong undertones. Everything to do with art embarrasses him (and I suppose fascinates him). It's <u>all</u> vaguely immoral. He knows great art is great, but "great" means locked away in

> museums and spoken about when you want to show off. Living art, modern art shocks him. You can't talk about it with him because the word "art" starts off a whole series of shocked, guilty ideas in him.
>
> I wish I knew if there were many people like him. Of course I know the vast majority--especially the New People--don't care a damn about any of the arts. But is it because they are like him? Or because they just couldn't care less? I mean, does it really bore them (so that they don't need it at all in their lives) or does it secretly shock and dismay them, so that they have to pretend to be bored? (C., p. 210)

Thus a dichotomy exists which prohibits understanding and eventually leads to Miranda's death and Clegg's potential repetition of his collecting. However, even within these environmental prisons, a relative freedom, of the kind Miranda eventually achieves, can be established. Freedom involves the making of choices and the acceptance of responsibility not only for what one has become, but for what one has been. Miranda eventually achieves this limited freedom. She has the potential, but not the literal freedom to create and shape her own narrative. This is the freedom Clegg can never attain. While he is literally free in the novel, he is metaphorically more limited than Miranda. Since he is anti-life and anti-art, so is he incapable of achieving a freedom beyond his social limitations.

The second prison in The Collector is that which is caused by the novel itself. It is written in alternating first-person narratives; Miranda's diary is bound on either side by Clegg's story. Because of the narrative point of view, the reader is directly involved with both Miranda and Clegg. However, as the reader cannot participate in the events of the novel, he becomes a mere voyeur. During Clegg's narrative,

the reader becomes an unwilling accomplice but is unable to change or influence the events. Because the first part of Clegg's narrative relates the same events as Miranda's, the reader reads Miranda's diary with a prior knowledge of the outcome. When her hopes are raised for a new attempt at escape, the reader already knows it will be a failure. In fact, the reader is aware by the end of Clegg's first chapter that Miranda will die. The reader becomes, therefore, as helpless a victim as Miranda and is as trapped by the events of the novel as is Miranda in her prison. Although the end of the novel is an open one, the reader has no choice as to its outcome. The novel ends with the terrifying prospect of the repetition of the cycle, and the reader is powerless to change it.

While The Collector excludes the reader so that he becomes an observer of events, The Magus involves the reader in its development. The relationship between Conchis and Nicholas parallels that between Fowles and the reader. Similarly, Nicholas' involvement in Conchis' masque extends to the reader's involvement with the novel. This parallelism allows the reader to participate, by extension, in the same choices which are made by Nicholas, and the open ending allows the reader to make a subjective choice of his own. The purpose of art in The Magus is similar to that in The Collector. It is through her contemplation of the teachings of her artistic mentor, G.P., that Miranda manages to assert what limited freedom she can. It is suggested in The Collector that it is art that teaches moral responsibility both to oneself and to others. Similarly, in The Magus, it is through his direct participation in Conchis' art, the meta-theatre, that Nicholas finally learns the

nature of freedom and the responsibility freedom entails. Nicholas is a poor poet, just as Clegg is a poor novelist. The difference between them, however, is that Nicholas is educable. Clegg turns his fantasies into reality and cannot then see the difference between them. Nicholas, however, after having tried to turn fiction into reality and having failed, accepts the masque as fiction. Because of his heightened self-consciousness engendered by the masque, however, he is better prepared to return to an exploration of his own life, and "know the place for the first time" (M., p. 71).

In The French Lieutenant's Woman, the relationship between Sarah and Charles is similar to that between Conchis and Nicholas. Sarah Woodruff is a fiction-maker who assumes the responsibility of creating and living within her own text. Like Conchis, Sarah is a teacher and, having chosen her own freedom, leads Charles to an understanding of his. The reader is constantly invited to make choices, not only about the narrative, but about the structure. He is also addressed by the modern narrative voice first in Chapter One and subsequently throughout the novel. The reader is, therefore, an assumed part of the tale, since he and the narrator are the only two who are aware of both the modern and Victorian references and points of view.

The French Lieutenant's Woman forms a bridge between the narrative structure of The Magus and that of Daniel Martin. It is far closer to the "dense, interweaving" structure of the latter than it is to the "linear and progressive" one of the former. The reader is much closer to the narrator in The French Lieutenant's Woman than he is to Nicholas Urfe. Indeed the narrator, like Daniel Martin, frequently suspends time

to discuss the writing of the novel and the development of character. Unlike Nicholas, he tells the reader explicitly that the novel is fiction, even though the characters, like all Fowles' characters, assert a "realistic" autonomy. The narrator is far closer to a Conchis figure, suggesting endings which he knows are unsatisfactory and teasing the reader into discovering the "true" one. The most appropriate image to describe the structure of the novel is that of the Chinese box, an image which is frequently used in Fowles' fiction. The focus of the novel, the innermost box, is the relationship between Charles and Sarah. Sarah is, or so it is assumed, the French Lieutenant's "whore". The fictions that have been built around her brief liaison have caused her to be ostracized from Lyme Regis society. Not only have stories been invented among village gossips about her supposed affair, but as it is discovered, Sarah herself perpetuates the myth. She has indeed purposely invented her own fiction so that through it, she can achieve a freedom which other women can never share:

> "What has kept me alive is my shame, my knowing that I am truly not like other women. I shall never have children, a husband, and those innocent happinesses they have. And they will never understand the reason for my crime." She paused, as if she was seeing what she said clearly herself for the first time. "Sometimes I almost pity them. I think I have a freedom they cannot understand. No insult, no blame, can touch me. Because I have set myself beyond the pale. I am nothing, I am hardly human any more. I am the French Lieutenant's Whore."
>
> (F.L.W., p. 175)

The story she tells Charles is merely a fiction, but it is a fiction which she relates in order to turn it into reality. When she is finally seduced by Charles, he discovers that she has lied and that, in fact,

"He had forced a virgin" (F.L.W., p. 354). It is the fiction of her life which has sustained Sarah. The educated daughter of a tenant farmer, she had a place neither with the elite nor the working class. Her fiction, then, has given her a place in society which is her own. Having realized the fiction, through Charles, she has "the strength to go on living" (F.L.W., p. 355). As the narrator explains in Chapter Thirteen, "Fiction is woven into all" (F.L.W., p. 97). Sarah is essentially a novelist writing her own life, and as the narrator explains, all novelists "wish to create worlds as real as, but other than the world that is" (F.L.W., p. 96). Sarah, however, has created a "real" narrative from a fictional one. She has taken the responsibility for her own life and, therefore, has the freedom to make choices about it. Charles, "the scientist, the despiser of novels" (F.L.W., p. 10) must learn from Sarah the same freedom and the responsibility it entails. Sarah is defined by her choice and this freedom to define oneself is one which Charles does not begin to understand until the last ending of the novel. Through Sarah's "art", Charles develops a greater awareness of his own potential to create his own text.

Outside this central core are the narrator's personae; the man on the train and the "impresario"[10] who leans on the gate outside the Rossetti's house, commenting on the novelist's craft. That he should allow himself to enter the inner core of the novel and still remain part of the modern world, increases the tension between the Victorian world and the reader's world. It allows the reader to draw parallels between the two and increases his awareness of his own century. Outside this "box" is the narrative voice who addresses and teases the reader. He beguiles the reader into thinking that the reader is free to make choices about the structure of the novel. Although the reader is invited to

make free choices about the ending of the story, he is constantly, as the narrator realizes, influenced by "the tyranny of the last chapter" (F.L.W., p. 406). As the narrator says, this tyranny is so "strong" as to force the reader to continue to read. He is free, then, to choose which of the endings seems best to him, but he is not free to escape the tyranny which forces him to finish the novel. This tyranny of the last chapter reinforces the fictiveness of the text. Like Nicholas' need to return to Bourani, the reader must return to The French Lieutenant's Woman. It is only after the reader has fully contemplated the finished product that its self-consciousness will correspondingly increase his own.

Beyond the narrative voice is Fowles himself who is, of course, the creator of the Chinese box structure and of the worlds which exist within the novel.[11] Within each level of the structure is a creator figure: Sarah, the narrator's persona, the narrative voice, and Fowles himself.[12] Each level, then, appears to have created itself and to exist without authorial manipulation. Just as Fowles' characters seem to shape their own narratives, so does each creator figure take the responsibility to create his own part of the text.

Daniel Martin is a logical progression from The French Lieutenant's Woman. The narrative structure is similar in that the distance between reader and narrator is minimal. The reader participates in the creation of Daniel's novel and Daniel, like the narrative voice in The French Lieutenant's Woman, presents the problems which must be solved in order to create a novelistic work of art. Both Daniel Martin and The French Lieutenant's Woman are novels about the creation of novels, but the

former is about the twentieth century and as such must reject nineteenth century traditions for more modern ones. The modern narrator of The French Lieutenant's Woman is particularly conscious of the differences between the centuries, and with his heightened awareness of both, writes what could be seen as a perceptive and appropriate introduction to Daniel Martin:

> I said earlier that we are all poets, though not many of us write poetry; and so are we all novelists, that is, we have a habit of writing fictional futures for ourselves, although perhaps today we incline more to put ourselves into a film. We screen in our minds hypotheses about how we might behave, about what might happen to us; and these novelistic or cinematic hypotheses often have very much more effect on how we actually do behave, when the real future becomes the present, than we generally allow.
>
> (F.L.W., p. 339)

Notes to Chapter One

[1]Linda Hutcheon, Narcissistic Narrative (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980), p. 5

[2]Hutcheon, p. 5.

[3]Thomas Docherty, "A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles", Novel, 14, no. 2 (Winter 1981), p. 133.

[4]Docherty, p. 133.

[5]As well as the Victorian texts, Fowles also uses epigraphs from modern texts. The purpose of this is to remind the reader of the fictiveness of the world of The French Lieutenant's Woman. It also causes the reader to make observations about the parallels and differences between the Victorian and the twentieth-century worlds.

[6]John Fowles, "The Enigma" in The Ebony Tower (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), p. 236.

[7]In order to avoid confusion, fictional, as opposed to experiential, reality will appear in quotation marks.

[8]Olshen, p. 162.

[9]This idea is an existentialist one, but Fowles, in The Aristos, explains his peculiar notion of the existentialist position:

> There is an invitation in existentialism to reject traditional codes of morality and behaviour, especially when these are imposed by authority or society without any clear justification except that of tradition. There is a constant invitation to examine motives; the first existentialist was Socrates, not Kierkegaard. The Sartrean school invented commitment. But permanent commitment to religious or political dogma (so-called Catholic and Communist existentialism) is fundamentally unexistentialist; an existentialist has by his belief to judge every situation on its merits, to assess his motives anew before every situation, and only then to choose. He never belongs as every organization wants its members to belong.

> It is to me impossible to reject existentialism though it is possible to reject this or that existentialist action. Existentialism is not a philosophy, but a way of looking at, and utilizing, other philosophies. It is a theory of relativity among theories of absolute truth.
>
> (A., p. 122-3)

[10]Hutcheon, p. 57.

[11]Hutcheon, p. 58.

[12]Hutcheon, p. 58.

CHAPTER TWO

The narrator of The French Lieutenant's Woman might well have been describing Daniel Martin when he commented on the making of "novelistic or cinematic hypotheses" about one's own behaviour. Indeed, this fictionalizing of his own life is something with which Daniel struggles throughout the course of the novel. The opening epigraph from Gramsci's Prison Notebooks encapsulates the dilemma which Daniel faces in trying to write a novel about his life:

> The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appears.

Dissatisfied with the screenwriting profession and the life which it has caused him to lead, Daniel decides to write a novel to try to "make reality honest" (D.M., p. 16). In order to write it convincingly, however, he must reject his old cinematic self and adopt a new novelistic one. He has defined himself in terms of his profession, and in attempting to redefine himself, he must explore both the easy artificiality of the medium he knows and the complexities of the one he does not. However, having been used to a medium in which "you create other people. Always other people" (D.M., p. 15), he is tempted to create himself in the same way. His "marked symptom" is his attempt to fictionalize his own life, to write about Simon Wolfe rather than Daniel Martin:

> Already he had toyed with two solutions in his other and increasingly related problem with his novel. One that he had considered, enough to make a note or two concerning it, was to give "Simon Wolfe" disadvantages he did not have: an even hollower career, an unhappier family background, no Jenny in his life. He had even descended, under the real experience of Anthony (and the influence of a film he had deeply admired when he saw it, Kurosawa's Living), to contemplating cancer in some less terminal form.
>
> (D.M., p. 404)

Daniel realizes, however, that this account of his life would be a lie. Having accepted that he must face the "inner private symbolisms" (D.M., p. 404) of his novel, he decides to discard the "fictional" in preference for a "real" account of his life: "To hell with cultural fashion; to hell with elitist guilt; to hell with existentialist nausea; and above all, to hell with the imagined that does not say, not only in, but behind the images, the real." (D.M., p. 405). Discarding Simon Wolfe, however, necessitates a search for Daniel Martin. Having decided to present the "real", Daniel must first discover "reality".

The search for his "real" self involves Daniel's examination of the two métiers which have defined and will redefine his life. Accordingly, one of the central tensions in Daniel Martin is that between the novel and the cinema. To Daniel, this tension is not merely that between two different métiers, but between two entirely different ways of life. In fact, the language of the novel and the cinema is linked, in Daniel's mind, to the cultural difference between the British and the Americans. The commercial cinema is, according to Daniel, "like a hallucinogenic drug: it distorts the vision of all who work in it" (D.M., p. 136). It is a distortion of reality since it excludes all but the here and now and exalts in superficiality. Above all, however, the cinema denies individual imagination:

> I had in any case nurtured a deeper and less local quarrel with the cinema and its child, television. All art is a surrogate for the individual imaginations of its audience; but these two are beyond that role now, and into that of usurpation. They sap and leach the native power away; insidiously impose their own conformities, their angles, their limits of vision; deny the existence of what they cannot capture. As with all frequently repeated experience, the effect is paradigmatic, affecting by analogy much beyond the immediately seen--indeed, all spheres of life where a free and independent imagination matters. The much-proclaimed ephemerality of television is no consolation; one might as well argue that since no one cigarette can in itself cause cancer, smoking holds no danger.
>
> (D.M., p. 274)

To Daniel, the novel is the antithesis of this. It is an occasion for retreat from the public eye of the camera into a richer and more private form: "In Robin Hood terms I saw it as a forest, after the thin copses of the filmscript" (D.M., p. 275). The metaphor which Daniel uses to describe the novel is la bonne vaux, the sacred combe, in which retreat and privacy are the essence of life. The novel allows individual imagination to flourish and is, therefore, not only a retreat for its author but for its reader into "a place outside the normal world, intensely private and enclosed, intensely green and fertile, numinous, haunted and haunting, dominated by a sense of magic that is also a sense of a mysterious yet profound parity in all existence" (D.M., p. 273). The novel, then, becomes for Daniel similar to what Bourani becomes for Nicholas, and it is through the novel that Daniel will eventually achieve the same self-consciousness as does Nicholas.

The form of the novel requires a subjectivity in which Daniel is ill-versed. The retreat into fiction is, as Daniel realizes, a retreat into himself. In order to portray himself honestly, therefore, he must see himself with both a novelistic and a cinematic eye. The habit of

his profession is so pervasive that he finds that "the objectivity of the camera [corresponds] to some deep psychological need in him" (D.M., p. 62). Similarly, as a student at Oxford, Daniel had an obsession with mirrors, but denies that this obsession is evidence of narcissism. Rather, he says, it is a desire for objectivity, and is "symbolic of an attempt to see oneself as others see one--to escape the first person and become one's own third." (D.M., p. 62). The subjectivity of fiction, however, is foreign and slightly distasteful to him, and "he reserved an especially and symptomatically dark corner for first-person narration, and the closer the narrative I approximated to what one could deduce of the authorial I, the more murky this corner grew." (D.M., p. 62). Throughout the course of his novel, then, Daniel attempts to find a balance between a purely subjective and purely objective view of himself, since it is only in this way that he can achieve complete honesty. Daniel's search for his "real" self, like that of Nicholas Urfe, is characterized by the lines from Eliot's "Little Gidding" quoted in The Magus:

> We shall not cease from exploration
> And the end of all our exploring
> Will be to arrive where we started
> And know the place for the first time.
> (M., p. 71)

Having explored both the part of himself which finds an affinity with the novel and that which clings to the cinema, Daniel gains greater awareness of himself and of these two influences on his life. By the end of the novel he, like Nicholas, can see himself and his relationship to the world around him as if for the first time.

The scheme of Daniel Martin, like that of Fowles' other novels, is dualistic. Daniel tends to see things in terms of polarities, and

the growth of his self-consciousness, both as an author and as a character, involves the reconciliation of counterpoles. As Fowles suggests in The Aristos, each pole has its counterpole and "even when contrary propositions are meaningless or demonstrably false they contribute life and meaning to the propositions they oppose" (A., p. 84). This is a device used frequently by Fowles, but not before Daniel Martin were these seemingly irreconcilable poles seen to be complementary rather than in opposition. In The Collector, Clegg and Miranda are representative of evil and potential good. It is impossible for them to develop a system of communication which might reconcile their differences because the very tenets of their lives are antithetical. In The Magus, fantasy and reality are juxtaposed as Nicholas must choose between the "stage" persona of Julie and the "reality" of Alison. Although Nicholas tries to reconcile fantasy and reality they are, as he discovers, eternally antithetical. A similar juxtaposition occurs in The French Lieutenant's Woman, where Charles chooses between Tina, and the conventions of Victorian society, and Sarah and modern existential freedom.

The first sentence of Daniel Martin, "Whole sight; or all the rest is desolation" (D.M., p. 3), offers a choice between what appear to be polar opposites. Throughout the novel, Daniel attempts to gain "whole sight" both into himself and into others. This requires, as he discovers, compromise between what seem to be antithetical ideas. Therefore, what he sees as absolute opposition, such as that between the lushness of the novel and the sterility of the cinema, becomes an attempt to see qualities in both which will "tally better with this real structure of [his] racial being and mind" (D.M., p. 331). "Whole sight", then, involves Daniel's

learning to see both subjectively and objectively in order to achieve a "totality of consciousness" (D.M., p. 331). The opposition between "whole sight" and desolation anticipates the antitheses in the rest of the novel and, like them, is eventually seen to be reconcilable. It is finally in the desolation of "The End of the World" that Daniel develops an understanding both of Jane and of his capacity to love her. His "whole sight" into his potential to develop a compassionate, loving relationship allows Daniel to change the loneliness and desolation which he and Jane both feel.

Antithesis pervades all levels of Daniel Martin in terms of character, ideas, technique and structure. Structurally, each significant event has its counterpole. This serves not only to facilitate "whole sight" through opposition, but also to link events in the novel. The first two chapters set up an opposition which becomes an important one to Daniel and one which is echoed throughout the novel. The tension between the natural, pastoral world of Daniel's Devon childhood and the superficial, empty one of Hollywood reappears in the tensions between the novel and the cinema, England and America, and la bonne vaux and "The End of the World". The pastoral symbolism of "The Harvest" is echoed throughout Daniel Martin. Daniel's experience of this simple natural world eventually causes him to understand and change the superficial being he has become in "Games". The epigraph to the first chapter suggests the theme of underlying changelessness as illustrated by the harvest ritual and the cyclical nature of the novel itself, which returns from the last line to the first one:

'The body dies the water clouds the soul
hesitates
and the wind forgets always forgets
but the flame doesn't change'

(D.M., p. 3)

"The Harvest" combines past, present and future tenses in order to point out that only through understanding the past in relation to the present can future "whole sight" be created. This also demonstrates the timelessness of the harvest ritual, not only in fact but in memory: "And his heart turns, some strange premonitory turn, a day when in an empty field he shall weep for this" (D.M., p. 9). Juxtaposed with the ceaseless harvest ritual is a memento mori, in the form of a German war plane, which disturbs the peace of the fields and the complacency of the farmers. Although the narrator comments about young Daniel that "The boy, who is already literary, knows he is about to die" (D.M., p. 7), this chapter is a beginning rather than an end. It is Daniel's first brush with mortality and it is the first fear of the loss of his potential, "dying before the other wheat was ripe" (D.M., p. 11), which causes the narrator to bid "Adieu, my boyhood and my dream" (D.M., p. 11).

The narrator's detailed and descriptive language in "The Harvest" contrasts with the direct, thick Devon dialect of the stookers. The educated young Daniel is "already in exile" (D.M., p. 11) from this rural scene with his "knowledges; signs of birds, locations of plants, fragments of Latin and folklore" (D.M., p. 11). Similarly, Daniel the narrator is in exile because of the time between experiencing and writing. In memory, however, the language and landscape of Devon are indistinguishable. The absence of quotation marks reinforces the merging of the stookers and the harvest. The Devon voices speak a "language so local, so phonetically

condensed and permissive of the slur that it is inseparable in his mind, and will always remain so, from its peculiar landscapes; its combes and bartons, leats and linhays" (D.M., p. 6). The country life holds both fascination and embarrassment for Daniel. He is "ashamed of his own educated dialect" (D.M., p. 6), and is gently teased about it by Nancy Reed in "Phillida": "'I never know what to say.' He added, 'In case you think I'm being stuck-up.' 'It's just the way you talk sometimes.' Then she said, 'I know you can't help it.'" (D.M., p. 357). Yet, as a young man at Oxford, Daniel is eager to exchange a cosmopolitan aestheticism for the crudeness of his rural background which, "still--and for many years to come--had to be presented to one's friends as so much unspeakable drag." (D.M., p. 85). In his later life, this dualistic relationship with his past is evidenced by Daniel's purchase and restoration of Thorncombe and his subsequent refusal to live there.

Daniel's rejection of his rural past, his "betrayal of myths" (D.M., p. 15), results in his "Games" persona. If "The Harvest" is the first chapter, "Games" is, by Daniel's own admission, "the last chapter. What I've become" (D.M., p. 16). It is, however, an ending which promises a new beginning since Daniel is trying to reconcile his Hollywood present with the betrayal of his past. The setting for this chapter is Jenny's Hollywood apartment with its "fake Biedermeier table" (D.M., p. 13), contrasting with the natural setting of "The Harvest". As opposed to the shifting tenses of the previous chapter, "Games" is written in the present tense of a movie script: "She stands and wanders across to the window, stubs out her cigarette--yes, she is acting--in a pottery dish by the telephone; then stares out, as he had, at the

infamous city's artificial night" (D.M., p. 13). The concern with the present tense reflects the lack of "whole sight" which has been cultivated in Daniel by his profession and which he now regrets: "How all the king's plays and all the king's scripts . . . and nothing in your present can ever put you together again" (D.M., p. 14). However, having recognized that his living completely in the present has caused him to be "totally in exile from what I ought to have been" (D.M., p. 15), Daniel attempts, in the rest of the novel, to reconstruct his past. "Games" is bound on both sides by chapters which present scenes from Daniel's childhood and student days and both contrast with the artificial tone of his Hollywood persona. Therefore, there appears to be a structure to the novel which recreates the past, even before the character Daniel has made a conscious choice to review his past. This reinforces the split between the Daniel-experiencing and the Daniel-narrating. In the writing of his novel, Daniel has attempted to return from his exile by taking account of his self-consciously maligned past. To the Daniel in "Games", however, the past is seen as unobtainable, perhaps because it is as yet undesirable. As he explains, "If you run away, Jenny, you can't find your way back. That's all I meant. Trying to . . . it's only a pipe dream" (D.M., p. 16). Like Nicholas, Miranda, Charles and Sarah, however, Daniel must learn to accept responsibility for his past and for the person he has been. It is only in this way that he can gain "whole sight" and consequently know himself "for the first time" (M., p. 70). As Daniel eventually explains to Jane in "Flights", "You can't leave old worlds behind. It's not on" (D.M., p. 566).

The language of "Games" contrasts sharply with that of "The Harvest". This chapter is perhaps the most blatantly cinematic, in Daniel's sense of the word, in the novel. The artificiality of the language and the word games played by Daniel and Jenny contrast with the simple direct speech of the Devon farmers. The artifice of this scene mirrors the artifice of the medium from which it comes. It is clipped, clichéd and reminiscent of a "B" movie: "'Do you want anything?' 'Just you. And neat. Just for once.'" (D.M., p. 13). The chapter is self-consciously littered with movie jargon: "You're such lousy casting" (D.M., p. 14); "She looks down, a little pause; a 'beat', in the jargon" (D.M., p. 16). Daniel thinks of himself as a character in a movie script, just as at Oxford, he will think of himself as a character in a play. He is at one with the superficiality of the cinema, just as in "The Harvest" he was "one with this land" (D.M., p. 11): "It's such a soft option. You write, Interior, medium shot, girl and man on a couch, night. Then you walk out. Let someone else be Jenny and Dan" (D.M., p. 15). Yet in both cases, Daniel is "in exile". His limited self-awareness sets him apart from both Devon and Hollywood, even though, in both chapters he takes on an appropriate persona for each setting. Knowledge of the counterpoles, however, is necessary to achieve "whole sight". Having experienced both "The Harvest" and "Games", Daniel has knowledge of the counterpoles and is ready, therefore, to begin writing his novel and returning, metaphorically, to his past.

In The Aristos, Fowles writes:

> I am made constantly aware of the otherness of things. They are all in some sense my counter-poles. A Sartrean existentialist would say that

> they hedge me in, they tyrannize me, they encroach on my selfhood. But they define me, they tell me what I am, and if I am not told what I am, I do not know what I am. I am aware too that all other objects are in exactly the same situation as myself: minute pole in a vast ocean of counterpoles, I am infinitely isolated, but my situation is infinitely repeated.
>
> (A., p. 84)

Daniel Martin's identity is similarly shaped by what he sees as the counterpoles of others. He says of his father that "he conditioned me . . . by antithesis" (D.M., p. 76), and the habit has pervaded Daniel's view of the world. Daniel's Oxford persona is perhaps best described in contrast to that of Anthony Mallory. Having rejected the pedanticism of his father's religion, Daniel develops a fashionable, frivolous persona: "I knew a lot of people, I would have said I had a lot of friends, but they were almost all like myself, at Oxford to mix, to prink and prance, to enjoy themselves, bound far less by real affection and interest than by a common love of the exhibitionistic" (D.M., p. 69). Anthony, however, is a devout Catholic and serious academic, and while most of Daniel's friends are "more or less onstage; the difference with Anthony was that he sat beside me in the stalls" (D.M., p. 69). Bound together by a common delight in orchids, their botany expeditions point out another important difference between them. Anthony is not a nature-lover, but rather a "crack field-botanist" (D.M., p. 69) who scientifically categorizes each plant. Like Charles Smithson, he is a collector of facts, "he had everything neatly compartmented in his life" (D.M., p. 70). Daniel, however, lives "poetic moments" (D.M., p. 70). Nature, for him, is a refuge, "it acquired an aura, a mystery, a magic in the anthropological sense" (D.M., p. 70). As Anthony later

articulates this difference between himself and Daniel: "you said that I knew only how to look at orchids--not for them" (D.M., p. 179). This distinction is a central one since, as Anthony says: "I have looked at myself. All my adult life. But as I am. Not as I might have been or ought to have been" (D.M., p. 180). Through the writing of his novel, Daniel looks both for and at himself. Despite his fear of judgement, he is honest about himself and his failings, realizing, as Anthony does not, what he might have been. As Anthony says on his death bed, "I'm still defeated by the conundrum of God. But I have the Devil clear . . . Not seeing whole" (D.M., p. 181). This is, however, an unresolvable counterpole, since it implies that "whole sight" is divine and, therefore, unobtainable. Daniel's polarities, either "whole sight" or desolation, however, are more realistic, and because he can look both for and at himself, more obtainable.

Another contrast in Daniel's life is that provided by the women with whom he is involved. Each of these, Nell, Jenny and Jane, reflects a stage in Daniel's development and each contributes to the growth of his self-awareness. Daniel's marriage to Nell is characterized by arguments and infidelity. While it is later apparent to everyone, including Daniel, that he should have married Jane, he and Nell, at the time of their marriage, are a splendid match. Both are shallow, showy and too self-centred to make the marriage work. Daniel is becoming a successful playwright and script-writer and is intoxicated by the medium. By the time of his relationship with Jenny, however, he has become dis-intoxicated with the cinema and has decided to write his novel. Jenny is an actress, and their relationship recalls Daniel's argument with

the superficiality of the cinema. She is also, however, blatantly honest and it is this candour which Daniel admires in her and which encourages him to honestly examine his past. Jane Mallory is the counterpole of both Nell and Jenny. She recalls Daniel's past, while Jenny confines him to the present: "Jenny's very young, Jane. With her I have to live very much in the present. In today. The past becomes like an infidelity, something one has no right to remember or refer to . . . like a past mistress. You've given me a quite marvelous relief from all that" (D.M., p. 541). Unlike Nell, Jane is pensive and introspective. Daniel's relationship with Nell was one which deteriorated into hiding and silences which, as Daniel says, "had principally ruined my marriage. We had used our silences like sabers, in the end" (D.M., p. 133). It is first through Jenny and finally through Jane that Daniel manages to break this silence and rediscover a system of communication.

As Daniel says of himself and Jane, "Of the four of us we two had changed the most, but in diametrically opposite directions" (D.M., p. 163). The reconciliation of this opposition is the most important one in the novel and one which eventually brings Daniel to a greater self-awareness. On their trip to Egypt both Daniel and Jane are attempting to redefine themselves. At first, Daniel sees Jane as his opposite rather than his complement. He is afraid that they are "at the opposite poles of humanity, eternally irreconcilable" (D.M., p. 607). When the German professor explains the concepts of ka, man as a separate individual, and ba, man at one with the universe, Daniel applies them to his relationship with Jane: "He was the first, Jane the second; a would-be ambition, a would-be selflessness; and equally insufficient" (D.M.,

p. 513). Recognizing, perhaps, this insufficiency, Jane and Daniel develop a "we-they"[1] relationship on board the cruise ship. It is at first a superficial one brought about by their ages and nationality, but it eventually develops into a growing consciousness of their need for one another in the face of a shared past and present. Daniel has already conceded that, in looking for Jane's student persona, he has been misjudging her: "Dan was very slowly realizing something: that he was looking or seeking for her old self as if it were a reality she was deliberately hiding from him; which was not only, of course, to dismiss the much greater reality of all that had happened since, but betrayed a retardation in himself" (D.M., p. 482). Having realized this, he must set about rediscovering her present persona and, by extension, his own. The desolation of Syria and the Lebanon makes the "we-they" relationship even stronger. Both Daniel and Jane feel that reality has been suspended and that their human contact is "the last contact with last reality" (D.M., p. 583). The desolation is also appropriately symbolic, however, of Jane and Daniel's still pervasive isolation from one another. It is not until "The End of the World" that each begins to truly understand the other. Their physical union recalls for Daniel their previous coupling at Oxford, but it does not end their isolation: "Yet it did not take place as he had dreamed, did not reach that non-physical climax he wanted, fused melting of all further doubt . . . It came to him, immediately afterward, when he was still lying half across her, that the failure could have been put in terms of grammatical person. It had happened in the third, when he had craved the first and second" (D.M., p. 599). Similarly, Daniel objectively misunderstands

Jane's desertion of his bed the next morning. Reduced by his narcissism to "wounded vanity" (D.M., p. 607) over what he takes to be a brutal trick, he writes a false script for her which is fueled by his seething anger. When he and Jane find a litter of mangy puppies amid the ruins of Palmyra, however, Daniel begins to realize that his anger at Jane has been the result of his selfishness. The puppies suggest "an unhappiness from the very beginning of existence" (D.M., p. 608), but despite this they are, for Daniel and Jane, symbolic of a capacity for survival even in the midst of ruin. This scene brings reconciliation of both Daniel and Jane, and "whole sight" and desolation:

> Beneath all her faults, her wrong dogmas, her self-obsessions, her evasions, there lay, as there had always lain--in some analogue of that vague entity the Marxists call totality, full consciousness of both essence and phenomenon--a profound, and profoundly unintellectual, sense of natural orientation . . . that mysterious sense he had always thought of as right feeling. But he had also always thought of it as something static and unchanging--and conscious, even if hidden; when of course it had always really been living, mobile, shifting and quivering, even veering wildly, like a magnetic needle . . . so easily distorted, shaken out of true by mind, emotion, circumstance, environment. It had never meant that she could see deeper. In a way it must be a thing that limited and confused rational vision, that would provoke countless errors of actual choice. Followed, it would always run her against nature, the easy courses of society; disobeyed, it would create anxiety, schizophrenia. It was simply that she felt deeper; and eternally lost conscious course because the unconscious knowledge of the true one always lay inexorably underneath. Mankind may think there are two poles; but there is, morally as magnetically, only one in the geography of the mind's total being; and even though it is set in an arctic where no incarnate mind can exist.
>
> (D.M., p. 609)

Each of the counterpoles which Daniel has experienced or imagined has led to this final reconciliation and the development of "full consciousness". It is with this understanding that the old Daniel can die and the new one can finally be born. Like Charles Smithson and Nicholas Urfe, Daniel chooses an existential freedom, taking responsibility for his past and present.

The purpose of the dualistic view of life presented in Daniel Martin is that through examination of antithetical ideas a "whole sight", which is essentially an understanding and reconciliation of opposites, can be achieved. The dualisms in Daniel Martin are finally reconciled by the character Daniel. There is, however, a Daniel other than the Daniel-experiencing presented here. The Daniel-narrating, who apparently writes the novel, has his own counterpoles, those between first and third-person narration and between reader and author.

Notes to Chapter Two

[1]In Fowles' philosophy as presented in The Aristos, the final, harmonious merging of the counterpoles of man and woman is through marriage. However, it is harmony rather than passion which should ideally be sought in a male/female relationship: "The first step is to eliminate passion as a source of tension. The second is to accept the oneness of the marriage. In passion everything is between thee and me; in harmony it is between them and us. I-thou is passion, we-they is harmony" (A., p. 97). Daniel and Jane eventually achieve a "we-they" relationship, beginning with the superficial one they have on the ship, and developing finally into the harmony which produces "whole sight".

CHAPTER THREE

The narrative technique of Daniel Martin is, perhaps, the most complex of all Fowles' narratives. As is evidenced by his previous novels, Fowles is particularly interested in methods of narrative presentation which include the reader as both participant in and co-creator of the novel. In The Magus, Nicholas narrates the story of his experience at Bourani. Even though he tells the story after it has happened, the reader never knows more than he did at the time. The effect of Conchis' masque on the reader, therefore, is similar to that which it had on Nicholas. In his retelling of the events, then, Nicholas becomes the magus-figure and the reader becomes a character in his meta-theatre. In The Collector, Fowles gives the reader two versions of the same events, the purpose of which is to allow the reader to have the experience of both captor and captive. During Clegg's narrative, the reader becomes both a participant in Miranda's capture and an observer of her imprisonment. The prior knowledge of events given by Clegg's narrative make Miranda's diary redundant, and the reader, therefore, becomes as helpless a victim as Miranda. The French Lieutenant's Woman is Fowles' first departure from a "linear and progressive" narrative technique. Rather than being an active participant in the story, the narrator is an outside observer. The Chinese-box structure of the novel allows him to suspend time and move between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with ease. As in The Magus, the relationship between the characters within the novel

is paralleled by the reader's relationship to the novel itself. Sarah is a novelist figure who teaches Charles the value of existential freedom, the same knowledge which Fowles consistently wishes to impress upon his reader.

In Daniel Martin, the reader is much closer to the narrator than in previous novels. Daniel invites the reader to witness the creation and structuring of both his life and his novel. He addresses the reader with the questions and conflicts involved in the creation of a work of fiction and it is thus that the reader participates in Daniel's novel. The structure of the novel is, as Daniel chooses to make it, dense and interweaving. It is made so by Daniel's interest in re-examining his past and in his alternating between the first- and third-person. Because the past and its effect on the present is important to him, Daniel moves between his childhood and adult memories. The question of his reliability as a narrator, then, is of particular significance. Like Nicholas Urfe, Daniel is presumably writing his story with hindsight, and therefore is able to make judgements on his past actions. He is not a deliberately misleading narrator. Indeed, he includes Jenny's contributions, not all of which are complementary, in order to prove both his own reliability and to give the reader a "whole sight" into Daniel himself. Daniel describes Jenny as frank and candid, and her own narratives establish her openness and honesty. Similarly, Daniel seeks a corresponding honesty for himself in writing the "real history of what I am" (D.M., p. 15). Both of them, however, are fiction-makers in the sense that has been explained by Chapter Thirteen of The French Lieutenant's Woman:

"You do not even think of your own past as quite real; you dress it up, you gild it or blacken it, censor it, tinker with it . . . fictionalize it, in a word, and put it away on a shelf--your books, your romanced autobiography" (F.L.W., p. 97). This creates an interesting tension in the novel since neither Daniel nor Jenny deliberately distort reality, yet both are writing from memory and are subject, therefore, to the desire to "create worlds as real as, but other than the world that is. Or was." (F.L.W., p. 96). The question of reliability, then, is a relative one. Both characters are verisimilar, and are in fact made more so by their occasional, self-admitted, lapses in memory. Yet, because of the time between experiencing and writing, in Daniel's case between childhood and adulthood, there is a constant reminder of the fictiveness of the narrative.

Jenny is, perhaps, more conscious of the distortion which time must cause on her memory of events. Her narratives do not disprove Daniel's memory of events, but since her perception of him is different from his perception of himself, her narratives reinforce the fictiveness of memory. Her first contribution is called "An Unbiased View", but this is already a fiction. Reality is subjective and must, therefore, be biased. The first lines of her narrative self-consciously deny the "reality" of her perceptions: "This isn't what I promised to write, just before you ran away. But it's still pure fiction. Of course. About Mr. Wolfe. Not you" (D.M., p. 31). Jenny's perception of Daniel's behaviour at Claridges must necessarily be "pure fiction" since she is not privy to the reasons behind it. Accordingly, she invents a literary fiction in order to explain his actions to herself. She also self-

consciously admits that her memory has, perhaps, distorted her feelings at the time:

> I knew Dan was slightly drunk and I wasn't impressed. Or I was disappointed . . . I sensed Dan was trying to dissociate himself. So why was he there? I think I thought he was rather pathetic, really. Like some character out of Hemingway. Or the man in Under the Volcano. You can see I'm tough and wise and sensitive and virile and literary and lost and totally above all this because I'm drunk . . .
>
> At one point I mentioned I'd been in one of his plays . . . I said how much I'd liked it. Actually I hadn't, it's one of his weakest (I now know, having read and re-read them all), but I wanted to say something. I knew Dan couldn't be for much in the decision, that he must be there mainly out of courtesy. Perhaps I was already sorry for him.
>
> (D.M., p. 31)

Jenny's first narrative does reinforce Daniel's Hollywood persona, one to which he has already admitted, and the dialogue is appropriately modish: "He said, if this was a script, I'd have the man get up and go. Or the woman get up and come. We're wasting footage" (D.M., p. 40). She omits quotation marks, the result of which is to make the dialogue move out of the novel and into "reality", and also to suggest the possibility of a discrepancy between her memory of the dialogue and what might actually have been said. Daniel's reaction to Jenny's first chapter is to explain what she could not possibly know about his behaviour: "I played pig at Claridges partly for this reason: to warn her that whatever her local successes she was now stepping out of home movies, in both senses, into a very different and potentially much more lonely world" (D.M., p. 64). His explanation adds credence to Jenny's impression not only that he was trying to dissociate himself, but that his is accomplished at "role-playing" (D.M., p. 32).

Like "An Unbiased View", Jenny's "A Second Contribution" is addressed to Mr. Wolfe. She knows that what she sees of Daniel is not the whole Daniel, and her writing of Mr. Wolfe, then, is particularly appropriate. In her second chapter she interprets what she feels is Daniel's professional melancholia:

> I have to imagine a secret Daniel who actually likes loss--both all he's lost in the past and all he has still to lose. In some way to him loss is a beautifull, fertile thing. I don't mean he wallows in it or moans about it (that would reveal too much), but he's discovered that he's much happier as a self-appointed loser than as a winner. It was there during the phone-call when his ex and her sister spoke to him. A kind of excitement as he sniffed a lovely old loss-area.
>
> (D.M., p. 234)

Although Daniel explains that her perception is "slightly wrong: his mistress was not loss so much as that he expected the loss of all his mistresses, and in more or less direct proportion to his discovery of them" (D.M., p. 239), Jenny's perception is sufficiently acute to give, along with Daniel's own account, a more complete view of his character. Jenny is also reliable in explaining that Daniel's presence is "like dark glasses, I've seen so much more since you left" (D.M., p. 234). Her opinion is later substantiated by Daniel's daughter, Caro, when she accuses her father of making people distort the truth: "You're so good at forcing people to give wrong impressions of themselves" (D.M., p. 224). Jenny is also sufficiently perceptive to notice Daniel's tendency to conceal not only his past, but his feelings about the present. She accuses him directly in "The Door": "'You hide. That's even worse.' 'What do I hide?' 'Your past.'" (D.M., p. 49), and by implication in her contributions by addressing them to Simon Wolfe. It is, perhaps,

this hiding which she misinterprets as being "faults of perception" (D.M., p. 233), and which she records in her third contribution as causing a failure of communication:

> It was so sad, these sudden bad vibes between us, and not being able to say anything, or rather saying anything but what we ought to have been saying, knowing I'd lost Dan, but not why . . . You understand so many outer things about women, but I sometimes think none of the inner ones at all. Or perhaps it's even worse, you know them and pretend you don't. You know I don't really know what I think, who I am, where I'm going. That girls like me do really deep down, need protection societies.
>
> When you withdraw like that, and just ban me.
>
> You knew. You should have said something.
>
> (D.M., p. 333-334)

Daniel self-consciously agrees with Jenny's view of his desire for retreat, not only in his constantly making himself a "written personage" (D.M., p. 69), but also in his admission that "I have always needed secrets" (D.M., p. 67).

Jenny's final chapter is far closer to "pure fiction" than the previous ones. In each of her first three contributions, even though she is aware that she has only partial sight into Daniel, many of her impressions are substantiated either by Daniel or by another character. Her final chapter, however, is pure imagination and is an elaboration of "an evening the three of us had together. Just a feeling in the air" (D.M., p. 444). Before the chapter appears in the novel, Jenny admits that it is a fabrication. Her admission, however, does not detract from the fact that this last contribution is the most convincing of all. She explains to Daniel that she has written it because "I don't really know you. I just think I know you" (D.M., p. 418). The revelation makes Jenny seem

honest despite her fiction. Essentially, Jenny is merely a character in Daniel's novel, just as she is a character in his movie. As such, her "reality" is dependent upon Daniel. Each of her contributions thus far have been about Daniel, denied or substantiated by Daniel, and placed in the text where Daniel decides. Admittedly, he sees "A Third Contribution" as "a sign of health, that is, of independence, weaning" (D.M., p. 447). It is not, however, simply a weaning from their relationship, but from Daniel's authorial manipulation. Like Charles and Sarah in The French Lieutenant's Woman, Jenny, in this chapter, asserts her autonomy: "I know this isn't what you want. But it's what you asked for. I won't be only something in your script. In any of your scripts. Ever again" (D.M., p. 443). Like the narrator of The French Lieutenant's Woman, Daniel must respect her independence if he wishes her to be "real".

Jenny's narratives are almost, to use Daniel's terminology, American in their frankness. Daniel, too, is as candid as he can be in writing of his life, but his narrative is far more complex, and occasionally results in a lack of clarity. As has been pointed out, his sentences are sometimes grammatically obscure and his dialogue, because it is that of the screen, is often difficult to follow. He is, however, particularly concerned about the structure of his novel which, despite its appearance of randomness is self-consciously "rigid and preconceived" (D.M., p. 271). Just as the development of his style parallels the development of his self-awareness, so does the structure of his novel mirror Jenny's first impressions of him: "Self-contained. Very planned and compact, like his handwriting. Like a good leather suitcase in an airport lounge, neatly locked, waiting to be taken somewhere else, with a destination label you

can't quite read. Or when you could go closer and did read, it was just the name and the airport at the other end, and you hadn't heard of either. To begin with I found this very attractive. Not being able to read him, which also meant knowing it couldn't last, he was passing" (D.M., p. 33). This parallelism would seem to suggest that Daniel has indeed found the structure for which he has been seeking, one which tallies with his "racial being and mind" (D.M., p. 331). Jenny's comment that she finds Daniel difficult to read could be maliciously applied to Daniel's difficult sentences with some justification. However, her comment does point out a problem with the novel. Daniel sees the novel as a retreat, specifically as a retreat into himself in order to rediscover his past and, consequently, to explain his present. He also equates this idea of retreat with his being English and explains that the English inadequacy, particularly in film-making, is the result of "endless camouflage" (D.M., p. 271):

> The film cannot be the medium of a culture all of whose surface appearances mislead, and which has made such a psychological art of escaping present, or camera, reality. For us English the camera, a public eye, invites performance, lying. We make abundant use of these appearances in our comedy, in our humour; socially and politically; but for our private reality we go elsewhere, and above all to words. Since we are careful only to reveal our true selves in private, the "private" form of the read text must serve us better than the publicity of the seen spectacle. Furthermore the printed text allows an escape for its perpetrator. It is only the spoor, the trace of an animal that has passed and is now somewhere else in the forest; and even then, given the nature of language, a trace left far more in the reader's mind (another forest) than outside it, as in the true externally apprehended arts like painting and music.

> With film-making our real "block" is our secret knowledge that any true picture of the English must express what the camera cannot capture --the continual evasion of the inner self, the continual actual reality of saying one thing and thinking another.
>
> (D.M., p. 273-274)

This statement is quite revealing about Daniel and his novel, and it also creates considerable tensions in reading it. Like his countrymen, however, Daniel does hide and therefore, he too rejects the public eye of the camera. However, the novel, which is not as public a spectacle as film, is still a public artifact. In his novel, Daniel attempts to be frank and informative about his own life in what would seem to be a most un-English fashion. However, he still manages to hide his true character even though his descriptions of the events in his life and of his past relationships are quite detailed and explicit. It is easier, in fact, to discern Jenny's character from her four small contributions than it is to develop a clear picture of Daniel. Ironically, the devices which he uses to present a "real" picture of himself are also those which tend to obscure his character. As he says above, the novel offers an escape for its perpetrator. The true author of Daniel Martin is, of course, John Fowles, who has not only refined himself out of the novel, but has in fact been discarded by Daniel along with Simon Wolfe. Within the reality of the novel itself, however, Daniel is the author and his purpose, at least superficially, appears to be to discover rather than to escape himself.

The division between the Daniel-experiencing and the Daniel-narrating is an important one. It is the former about whom information is given, but it is the latter who both structures the novel and either

reveals or hides his experiences. A further division which is consciously made by the narrator is that between the first- and third-person. The purpose of this is, as Daniel says, to gain "whole sight" into himself. His métier has conditioned him in the use of the objective third-person, but it is also for Daniel an attempt to see himself as others see him. There is no consistent pattern in his switching from first- to third-person and indeed this often arbitrary moving back and forth is sometimes difficult to follow:

> Of course it was partly pretending: we both had private income, indeed together just about enough not to have needed to work at all. If we had money troubles, then as later, it was because we were born squanderers--Dan in relation to his upbringing, Nell in conformity with hers. Neither of us ever showed anything but a very intermittent skill at economising.
>
> (D.M., p. 133)

> Though the ninety-nine year lease I bought of the Notting Hill flat was probably the best business deal I ever did, unaided, in my life, Dan and Nell began having doubts as soon as they moved in.
>
> (D.M., p. 140)

The discrepancy between the first- and third-persons emphasizes, as it does in these quotations, the distance between the narrator and the Daniel-experiencing. Often, the narrator will intrude in the first-person to comment on Daniel's actions: "He decided he must be very attractive--and I use 'must' in both its descriptive and prescriptive sense." (D.M., p. 139), or to assure his readers that he has learned from his experiences: "This type of non-actress always craves the nearest tame intellectual's reassurance: I know that now" (D.M., p. 137). The first chapter in which Daniel uses the first-person extensively is appropriately called "Passages". Interestingly, it is also in this chapter that he first speaks of his

dislike of first-person narration:

> perhaps this flinching from the I inherent in any honest recapitulation of his life was no more than a fear of judgement; and that . . . doing what he obscurely wanted was intimately bound up with doing what he obscurely hated. He even tried it out: "I missed my flight (or I nearly missed my flight), owing to a traffic hold-up on the San Diego freeway" --and did not like the sound and feel of it one bit . . . In his characteristic English fashion, Dan carefully filed away this added reason for why he was condemned to be what he was; how clear it was, if he ever did attempt the impossible, that anything would be better than to present it in the first person . . . even the absurdity of a mythical Simon Wolfe.
>
> (D.M., p. 63)

The next sentence begins the first long first-person section in the novel, and once more emphasizes the discrepancy between the narrating and experiencing Daniel. The use of the first-person is not limited to the narrator, however, any more than it is limited to making comments on Daniel's actions. Indeed, the functions of the first- and third-persons sometimes seem to be interchangeable in describing Daniel's past, in commenting with hindsight on the past and in describing the present. The switches between the two do, however, point out the difference in perspective, not only between Daniel and the narrator, but between Daniel and past Daniels.[1] His Oxford self reads Barney Dillon's account of the discovery of the corpse in the third-person, but "now I was standing, a quarter of a century later, and taking his hand" (D.M., p. 98). Other switches emphasize the difference between emotion, in the first-person, and reason, in the third.[2] In "Tarquinia", Daniel describes the period after his acte gratuit in the third-person which corresponds with the objective face he must put on in order to face Anthony and Nell. He uses first-person, however, to describe his emotional reaction to Tarquinia:

"It had been a memorable experience: in my case some kind of avatar of so many things I had derived from the Devon countryside as a boy. I felt it spoke more deeply to me" (D.M., p. 109). Similarly, Daniel impulsively asks Jane to accompany him to Egypt in the first person, but switches to third person "to wonder what he had done" (D.M., p. 400). The arbitrary nature of these switches defies having a consistent meaning attached to them. This parallels Daniel's own feeling about the "awful give-away of trying to be 'meaningful'" (D.M., p. 37), a word which he associates with the artificiality of Hollywood society.

If the switches between first- and third-person emphasize the variations in Daniel's perspective and that "like Jane, he was also two people" (D.M., p. 55), then the last chapters of the novel describing his trip to Egypt would seem to suggest a union of his various selves. However, despite the consistent third-person of the last eleven chapters, there are still inconsistencies in Daniel's character, as there must be if he is to be "realistic". It is more probable that the third-person is used to end the novel just as it was used to begin it. The first chapter suggests the cyclical nature of the harvest, just as the last sentence of the novel refers back to the first. Therefore, the novel itself suggests new beginnings just as Daniel finds a new life both with Jane and his development of self-awareness.

The structure of Daniel Martin is similar to the Chinese-box structure of The French Lieutenant's Woman. At the core of the novel is the Daniel-experiencing about whom the novel is written. Outside this is the Daniel-narrating who, like the narrator of The French Lieutenant's

Woman, is an impresario figure. He moves in and out of the central core both to comment on the events of the novel and to articulate the difference between the two Daniels. At the end of the first chapter he makes this distinction very clear by establishing himself as a kind of puppet-master manipulating the characters in the novel: "I feel in his pocket and bring out a clasp-knife; plunge the blade in the red earth to clean it of the filth from the two rabbits he has gutted; slit; liver, intestines, stench. He stands and turns and begins to carve his initials on the beech-tree. Deep incisions in the bark, peeling the gray skin away to the sappy green of the living stem. Adieu my boyhood and my dream. D. H. M. And underneath: 21 Aug 42" (D.M., p. 11). Outside this layer is, of course, John Fowles who has taken great care to refine himself out of the novel. Daniel himself discards Fowles when he discards S. Wolfe, his "putative fictional" self, and the impression is given, therefore, that Daniel, not Fowles, is the author. Fowles is, however, always subtly in the background, both in the choice of an anagram of his name for Daniel's fictional self, and in the structural similarities between Daniel Martin and The French Lieutenant's Woman. The Chinese-box structure is also used self-consciously by Daniel, but has for him a temporal, rather than an ontological purpose. Throughout the novel, Daniel is working on a script for a movie about Kitchener and the way in which he decides to structure his script becomes a mise en abyme[3] of the novel's structure: "Meanwhile, I took refuge in Kitchener; read back over what had been written to date; jettisoned one draft scene, and rewrote it; saw a chance to use a flashback inside a flashback, and possibly a flashback inside that as well; a Chinese-box gimmick but with

possibilities" (D.M., p. 416). The use of Kitchener allows Fowles what might be seen as self-parody. The French Lieutenant's Woman is his most obviously parodic novel, taking a great deal from Victorian poets and other writers. Daniel Martin borrows much less from other sources even though the first chapter echoes harvest scenes from both Hardy's Tess of the D'Urbervilles and Lawrence's The White Peacock. In his previous novels, Fowles' characters come to self-realization in unfamiliar and even fantastic settings: Miranda in her prison, Charles in Lyme Regis and Rossetti's house, Nicholas at Bourani. Similarly, Jane and Daniel begin to appreciate their need for one another, and to "smell the return of reality" (D.M., p. 532), in the lushness of Kitchener's Island. This reminiscence of Fowles' other novels makes his complete disappearance impossible, and the reader is faced with the question of who is writing Daniel Martin.

This tension is exacerbated by Daniel himself. The arbitrary switching between first- and third-person and his self-conscious hiding of himself make it difficult to make judgements about his character. It is certain only that he is inconsistent. This inconsistency is further evidenced by Daniel's view of the novel. Several times he refers to the writing of the novel as "impossible". In "Passage" he doubts his ability to write because he assumes that he is "long past finding in himself, poor asthmatic cripple, the athleticism of imagination and long wind the form must need" (D.M., p. 62). Later in the same chapter he says of the novel that "if he ever did attempt the impossible, that anything would be better than to present it in the first person" (D.M., p. 63). Primarily, this dismissal appears to be simply a "fear of judgement" (D.M., p. 63)

since Daniel is afraid he is incapable of novel writing. However, even on the last page of the novel he comments to Jane that "at least he had found a last sentence for the novel he was never going to write" (D.M., p. 629). Not only does he say that his writing a novel is impossible, he also denies what the novel seems to be about: "I couldn't write a novel about a scriptwriter. That would be absurd. A novelist who wasn't a scriptwriter might do it. But I'm a scriptwriter who isn't a novelist" (D.M., p. 391). Having denied the reality of the novel, however, he then proceeds to affirm it by making comments which leave no doubt that the novel has indeed been written: "What I was trying to tell Jenny in Hollywood was that I would murder my past if I tried to evoke it on camera; and it is precisely because I can't really evoke it in words, can only hope to awaken some analogous experience in other memories and sensitivities, that it must be written" (D.M., p. 87); "The tiny first seed of what this book is trying to be dropped into my mind that day" (D.M., p. 331). This tension between the reality and the fictiveness of the text is echoed by Daniel's view of himself. Although he is a "realistic" character, he constantly refers to his "writing" or fictionalizing himself, and to his being a character in someone else's fiction. In "Passages" he is "not unhappily reduced to watching himself, as if he were indeed a fiction, a paper person in someone else's script . . . the seed of a hypothesis, like the 'Simon Wolfe' planted in his mind the night before" (D.M., p. 62). Later in the novel, on Kitchener's Island, he repeats this idea: "For days now he had been split, internally if not outwardly, between a known past and an unknown future. That was where his disturbing feeling of not being his own master, of being a

character in someone else's play, came from" (D.M., p. 542). Strictly speaking, Daniel is a character in Fowles' novel but, more importantly, he is a fictional character in his own recollections. His novel self-consciously makes "reality the metaphor and itself the reality" (D.M., p. 269). The reality of Daniel Martin, like that of The French Lieutenant's Woman, is that "Nothing is real. All is fiction."[4] This idea is continued in the grammatically obscure last sentence: "She laughed at such flagrant Irishry; which is perhaps why, in the end, and in the knowledge that Dan's novel can never be read, lies eternally in the future, his ill-concealed ghost has made that impossible last his own impossible first" (D.M., p. 629). It is admittedly difficult to understand how, if the novel can never be read, it has just been finished. However, Daniel and Fowles have written a novel, the novel Daniel Martin, which can be read. The novel he intended, however, in order to give a "real" account of his life cannot be read because it cannot be written. Daniel Martin is not an autobiography, but a novel, and as such must be a fictional account. His perception of his life must necessarily be different from what actually happened because all remembered events, as is explained in The French Lieutenant's Woman, are fictional. Having discarded Simon Wolfe, then, does not mean that Daniel has discarded fiction, simply that he has discarded a conscious fiction. Although he has conceived of a novel which will tell the truth about his life, the finished product cannot be the same as the original conception of it. Similarly, the Daniel-narrating cannot be the same as the Daniel-experiencing. Daniel Martin, therefore, can be read, but Daniel's "real" account of himself must lie, in both senses of the word, "eternally in the future".

His "ill-concealed ghost", then, is his past, and therefore fictional, self and it is this necessary realization which gives both Daniel and the reader "whole sight".

Notes to Chapter Three

[1]Susan Strehle Klemptner, "The Counterpoles of John Fowles's Daniel Martin", Critique 21, No. ii (1979), p. 64.

[2]Klemptner, p. 65.

[3]For an explanation of this term see "Thematizing Narrative Artifice: Parody, Allegory, and the Mise En Abyme" in Hutcheon, p. 48 - 56. The only full-length study of the term can be found in Lucien Dällenbach, Le récit spéculaire (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1977).

[4]John Fowles, The Enigma" in The Ebony Tower (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), p. 236.

CONCLUSION

One of the most striking aspects of Fowles' art is its consistency. The ideas which are articulated in his non-fictional work, particularly The Aristos, are echoed throughout his novels. Like Daniel Martin, Fowles seems to feel the need for recurring structures and images. This, perhaps for him as well as for his character, "marries the real and imagined; justifies both" (D.M., p. 396). This is particularly appropriate since Fowles does indeed marry the real and imagined in his art and its relationship to life. Fowles is self-conscious in that he is aware of himself as author and his work as fiction, and hopes to engender a corresponding consciousness of life as fiction in his readers. Each of his characters develops self-awareness through art, just as Daniel Martin does through Rembrandt's self-portrait:

> Standing there before the Rembrandt, he experienced a kind of vertigo: the distances he had to return. It seemed frightening to him, the last of the coincidences that had dogged his recent life; to have encountered, so punctually after a farewell to many more things than one face, one choice, one future, this formidable sentinel guarding the way back.
>
> He could see only one consolation in those remorseless and aloof Dutch eyes. It is not finally a matter of skill, of knowledge, of intellect; of good luck or bad; but of choosing and learning to feel. Dan began at last to detect it behind the surface of the painting; behind the sternness lay the declaration of the one true marriage in the mind mankind is allowed, the ultimate citadel of humanism. No true compassion, without will, no true will without compassion.
>
> (D.M., p. 629)

His experience echoes that of Miranda with her own art, Charles with Sarah's fiction, Nicholas with Conchis' masque, and of course the reader with Fowles' novels. Each of the novels, too, contains a novelist-figure whose relationship to the reader-figure in the novel parallels the reader's relationship to Fowles' fiction. The reader is invited, then, to participate in the creation of the novel just as he creates the fiction of his own life. The one exception to this is Daniel Martin, which does not contain a reader-figure within the text. The reader of the novel, then, is much closer to the author-figure than in Fowles' previous novels. In fact, the reader takes the place previously occupied by Miranda, Charles and Nicholas. Daniel Martin illustrates more directly the way in which "Fiction is woven into all" (F.L.W., p. 97), even into our own recollections. Throughout the novel Daniel seeks to present an "honest", "true", "real" account of himself. To do this, he rejects a conscious untruth in the form of Simon Wolfe, but his subsequent account of himself is no closer to his original conception. While his memory of his life is not necessarily a lie, neither is it true. Rather, it is fiction, which is why, in the end, Daniel's novel can never be read.

As Barry Olshen says, Fowles is a moralist[1]. This is abundantly clear in his concern with communicating the idea of moral choice and responsibility. In each of his novels characters struggle with accepting responsibility for their actions despite the hazard of their existences. In The Collector, it is hazard which has inflicted social limitations on both Clegg and Miranda. Within these bounds, however, a limited freedom can be achieved as long as one accepts responsibility for one's actions. Even in her prison, Miranda begins to assert her freedom to change, a

freedom which Clegg, because he denies his responsibility, can never achieve. In The Magus, Conchis presents Nicholas with choices throughout his masque, choices whose outcome Conchis carefully contrasts. Nicholas' final choice is one in which he must take responsibility for Julie's life as well as his own. This is his first true moral choice, and only when he decides not to punish Julie for her role in the masque does he become "elect" (M., p. 540), that is, capable of taking responsibility for his own decisions. Similarly, Charles chooses to make his own decisions without the intervention of Sarah. From her, he learns the freedom to shape his own life and his leaving her illustrates his awareness of his own potential to make moral choices. Daniel Martin chooses to accept his past and its influence on his present. In his choosing Jane rather than Jenny, he is taking responsibility for his past and is, therefore, free to shape his future.

The open endings of these novels leave the reader to make choices based on those which the characters have made. In Daniel Martin is Fowles' first "happy" ending and although it is not an open one, it, too, invites the reader to make a choice. Daniel's reference to "his own impossible first" (D.M., p. 629), suggests the opening sentence of the novel, "Whole sight; or all the rest is desolation" (D.M., p. 3). "Whole sight" involves the recognition of the fictiveness of life. As the novel returns to Daniel's past, therefore, so is the reader invited to recall his own past and to recognize its fictiveness.

Through his self-conscious fiction, Fowles seeks to increase the reader's own self-awareness. As Robbe-Grillet explains the reader's participation in the modern text: "the author today proclaims his

absolute need of the reader's cooperation, an active, conscious, creative assistance. What he asks of him is no longer to receive ready-made a world completed, full, closed upon itself, but on the contrary to participate in a creation, to invent in his turn the work--and the word--and thus to learn to invent his own life."[2] The distance between art and life, then, is diminished, and the "metafictional paradox" in art is paralleled in the reader's own life. Like Daniel Martin, the reader must become aware of the fictiveness of his life before he can shape his own text. In the canon of Fowles' fiction it is in this way that the reader, too, becomes "elect".

Notes to Conclusion

[1]Olshen, p. 11.

[2]Alain Robbe-Grillet, "Time and Destiny in Fiction Today" in *For a New Novel* (New York: Grove Press Inc., 1968), p. 56.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Fowles, John. The Collector. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1963.

--------. The French Lieutenant's Woman. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1969.

--------. The Aristos. 1964. Revised edition. New York: New American Library, Inc., 1970.

--------. Daniel Martin. Toronto: Collins Publishers, 1977.

--------. The Magus. 1965. Revised edition. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1978.

Secondary Sources

Alter, Robert. Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-Conscious Genre. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Barthes, Roland. "L'Effet de réel", Communications, No. 11 (1968), 84-89.

Boomsma, Patricia. "'Whole Sight': Fowles, Lukács, and Daniel Martin", Journal of Modern Literature, 8, No. 2 (1980/81), 325-336.

Booth, Wayne. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bradbury, Malcolm. "John Fowles's The Magus". In Sense and Sensibility in Twentieth Century Writing. Ed. Brom Weber. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Churchill, Thomas. "Waterhouse, Storey and Fowles: Which Way out of the Room?", Critique, 10, No. 3 (1968), 72-87.

Donoghue, Denis. "Only Disconnect". Rev. of Daniel Martin. New York Review of Books, December 8, 1977, 45-46.

Docherty, Thomas. "A Constant Reality: The Presentation of Character in the Fiction of John Fowles", Novel, 14, No. 2 (Winter 1981), 118-134.

Fowles, John. "Is the Novel Dead?" Books, I (Autumn 1970), 2-5.

--------. "Notes on an Unfinished Novel". In The Novel Today. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury. Glasgow: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd., 1977. 136-150.

---------. The Ebony Tower. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974.

Gardner, John. "In Defense of the Real". Rev. of Daniel Martin. Saturday Review, 1 October 1977, 22-24.

--------. "Moral Fiction", Saturday Review, 1 April 1978, 30-33.

Gussow, Mel. "Talk with John Fowles", New York Times Book Review, 13 November, 1977, pp. 3, 84-85.

Halpern, Daniel. "A Sort of Exile in Lyme Regis", London Magazine, 10 (March 1971), 34-36.

Huffaker, Robert. John Fowles. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.

Hutcheon, Linda. Narcissistic Narrative. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980.

Iser, Wolfgang. The Implied Reader. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Klemtner, Susan Strehle. "The Counterpoles of John Fowles's Daniel Martin", Critique, 21, No. ii (1979), 59-71.

Lehmann-Haupt, Christopher. "Un-Inventing the Novel". Rev. of Daniel Martin. New York Times, September 13, 1977, p. 29.

Mahoney, Owen. "Authorial Self-Consciousness in the Fiction of John Barth". Unpublished M.A. Thesis, McMaster University, 1978.

Mason, Michael. Rev. of Daniel Martin. Times Literary Supplement, 7 October 1977, p. 1135.

McSweeney, Kerry. "Withering into the Truth: John Fowles and Daniel Martin", Critical Quarterly, 20, No. iv (1978), 31-38.

North, David. "Interview with John Fowles", Maclean's, 14 (November 1977), pp. 4, 6, 8.

Olshen, Barry. John Fowles. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1978.

Palmer, William J. The Fiction of John Fowles. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974.

Pritchard, William H. "An English Hero". Rev. of Daniel Martin. New York Times Book Review, 25 September 1977, pp. 1, 42.

Rackham, Jeff. "John Fowles: The Existential Labyrinth", Critique, 13, No. 3 (1972), 89-103.

Robbe-Grillet, Alain. For a New Novel. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1965.

Scholes, Robert. "Metafiction", Iowa Review, 1 (Fall 1970), 100-115.

--------. Structuralism in Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Wolfe, Peter. John Fowles, Magus and Moralist. Lewisburg, P.A.: Bucknell University Press, 1976.