**Research Paper**

# A Rhetoric of Metafiction

## Dr. SUNIT KR BERA

*Asstt. Teacher Deptt of English, Kurpai High School (H.S.), WB, INDIA.*

***ABSTRACT:-*** *To illustrate "THE EVOLUTION AND FORM OF NOVEL: A STUDY OF METAFICTION" comes the phrase "A RHETORIC OF METAFICTION". Now, I have to analyse the term "metafiction". Actually "metafiction" means "anti-novels". Basically post-modern anti-realists generally write metafiction. These texts seem to resist the usual categories of criticism with their metalinguistic concerns. Really reading-metafiction is different from reading mimetic-fiction.*

*Many writers who employ metafictional technique do indeed question, not the importance of literature, but its ultimate impact upon readers. In fiction generally important matters are writers, readers, and especially critics like to believe. The writers do recognize that we are readers as well as lovers. So we need rhetoric to enable us to understand how individual authors use metafictional techniques in particular works both to delight their readers and to teach them about language. This dissertation is designed to develop that sort of ornament or rhetoric. My study of Wayne Booth's* <u>The Rhetoric of Fiction,</u> *echoes that it actually shares more with the project of* <u>A Rhetoric of Irony</u>*. As a whole metafiction calls its narrative audiences' attention to its own artifice, to its own rhetoric. Thus it usurps the authorial readers' role by foregrounding the intention of the fiction. Moreover, metafictional texts finally remind us that literature is unique in both transactional and solitary ground. Metafiction also raises intriguing questions about the nature of authorial audience.*

*To conclude, the use of irony in a text does not mean that the entire work is ironic and the use of self-consciousness techniques does not mean that the entire work is anti-realistic or anti-mimetic or even belongs to exclusively in that class of texts we call "metafiction". Metafiction texts are always anchored in the "art of didactic".*

***Keywords:-*** *Metafiction, Mimetic fiction, Language, Audience, Rhetoric.*

## I.  INTRODUCTION

I do believe personally that discussion about the concept of "Rhetoric of Metafiction", its importance in the field of The Evolution and Form of Novel, is immense. We can seriously theorize the concept of Rhetoric of Fiction as an object of contemplation. The relation between rhetoric and fiction is the first thing to go through. So at the very beginning of the abstract I personally try to analyze metafiction, then the authors' concept and finally its nature. .

**A Rhetoric of Metafiction**

Current literary jargon indicates that post-modern anti-realists write metafiction or anti-novels; these texts seem to resist the usual categories of oriticism with their metalinguistc concerns, and their self-reflexive, self-conscious literary structures have, as a current literary handbook puts it, "a puzzled self at the centre." Perhaps this preponderance of prefixes indicates that the reader is the self puzzled by the otherness of texts as diverse in style, form and substance as those from authors like Barth, Gass, Barthelme, Coover, Borges, Calvino, Fowles, and even pre-post-modern writers like Cervantes, Fielding, and Sterne. Critics and readers alike often respond negatively to metafictional texts, usually arguing that the reader must "dig too hard" to make sense of he works. Typical of the critics of metafiction is Cynthia Ozick, who in "Innovation and Redemption: What Literature Means," suggests that this type of 'experimental' writing is unreadable. It fails because it is neither intelligent nor interesting. Without seriousness it cannot be interesting and without seriousness it cannot be interesting and without mastery it will never be intelligent" At the heart of Ozick's complaint, however, is the assumption that fiction should be about "life," that it should enable us to "enter a land, a society, a people, and to penetrate into the whole lives of human beings." Taking the high moral road, Ozick suggests that experimental writers have abandoned their responsibility to readers by not anchoring their fiction in the "art of

the didactic"; suggesting that fiction should "educate its readers in its views of what it means to be a human being," Ozick asks "to which black-humorist or parodist would you entrust the whole lives of human beings? [1]

Ozick's response illustrates the problem many readers influenced by the Jamesian view of fiction have with metafiction –a term concisely defined by Patricia Waugh as "fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as any artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality."[2] The mimetic tradition has created the expectation that fiction be about "life" and that it teaches truths about the reality it depicts. Readers steeped in the tradition want to be involved emotionally and morally in a character's situation; they expect, as Ozick says, "a coronal of moral purpose" in their fiction[3] But as peter Rabinowitz has suggested in "**Truth in Fiction**: A Re-examination of Audiences", the more an author increases our awareness of the novel as art , the more he diminishes our "direct emotional involvement" in his work.[4] An author who constantly exposes the structures and language which make up his fiction--one who reminds us within the fictional construct that places and the people in them are merely made of words as chairs are made of smoothed sticks and sometimes of cloths or metal tubes"[5] – does indeed make it difficult for readers to come emotionally involved in a world constructed from "mere" words. And by performing his own first critical analysis within the text itself, the writer of metafiction makes it difficult for the critic-reader to respond in familiar ways. The most satisfying mimetic fiction, most readers would agree, also defies the reader's expectations and demands a new response, but it does so by respecting, and for the duration of the reading we temporarily consent to the illusion that the text is about "real" people and "real" events; we can—and do---of course step out of that world whenever we wish to make intellectual and aesthetic observations about those structures, but even an arresting metaphor or a well-turned phrase does not so much remove us from the world of the narrative by reminding us of the text as linguistic construct as much as it makes us see something within the narrative world more clearly. In other words, though we might admire the author's verbal virtuosity, we see that virtuosity as a means of sustaining or intensifying the realistic illusion of the work, not as an invitation to foreground his role as constructor of a fictional world.

The experience of reading metafiction is different from the experience of reading mimetic fiction, in part because we are never allowed to forget that the text before us is a fictional construct, but also because our roles as readers and our attitudes toward literature are redefined by these texts. Instead of viewing the text as a mirror of the "real" world – a product--we must concentrate on the process involved in constructing and reading that text. Even in novels that retain strong ties to mimetic fiction, as for example does The French Lieutenant's Woman, our involvement is never only in the narrative world of the text, but always also in the process by which that text is constructed. Fowl's novel, for instance, is in many ways an imitation of a Victorian novel, which itself is generally an imitation of some non-fictional genre, such as autobiography or history; but because The French Lieutenant's Woman uses metafictional devices, the reader is never allowed to forget that the novel is a fiction, an orderly construct made by a artificer about characters who exist only as words. Texts that flaunt their use of artifice offer different satisfactions and demand different readerly responses from those that respect the mimetic tradition. Readers who approach metafictional texts with the expectations they bring to traditional literature are thus likely to the unsatisfied, frustrated, even angry, but to follow such readers' impulses and condemn authors of metafiction as lacking seriousness, substance, and a didactic purpose is simply wrong-headed. John Gardner, after denouncing Barth's "artistic self-consciousness," claims that our "more fashionable writers feel, as Chekhov and Tolstoy did not, that their art is unimportant; and they're correct":

… the fact remains that our serious fiction is quite bad. The emphasis, among younger artists on surface and novelty of effect is merely symptomatic. The sickness goes deeper, to an almost total loss of faith in – or perhaps understanding of – how true art works. True art, by specific technical means now commonly forgotten, clarifies life, establishes models of human action, casts nets toward the future, carefully judges our right and wrong directions, celebrates and mourns…. It designs visions worth trying to make fact. [6]

Many writers who employ metafictional techniques do indeed question, not the importance of literature, but its ultimate impact upon readers, suggesting as Barth does in Chimera that "the treasure of art…could not redeem the barbarities of history or spare us the horrors of living and dying."[7] And by exposing the man-madness of fictional constructs, these writers reject the metaphor that equates author and god, thus denying the author's role as a prophet who teaches absolute truths. Yet these assumptions do not necessarily imply that metafictional writers believe their art is unimportant. Critics who condemn the self-consciousness of contemporary literary experiments generally do so by appealing to standards similar to those outlined by Gardner; they insist again and again that fiction should be about human beings, human action, and that it should make judgments about right and wrong directions. Writers of metafiction do, in a genuine sense, meet this standard. If fiction, in other words, matters as much as writers, readers, and especially critics like to believe, are not the processes of creating and reading and responding to fiction uniquely human actions and thus valid subjects of literature? Writers of metafiction recognize that we are readers as well as lovers, and if a text resists our emotional involvement by flaunting its construction, its man-madness, then perhaps we must alter our approach to the text rather than condemning wholesale all metafictional works as "unimportant" and

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Sunit Kr Bera
Asstt. Teacher Deptt of English, Kurpai High School (H.S.), WB, INDIA.*

"unreadable." Metafictional texts seem "unreadable"-- a term I take as both descriptive and value-laden-- only because they defy expectations created by mimetic art; what we need is neither unexamined praise nor condemnation of self-conscious techniques, but an understanding of how these techniques involve readers in the process of the narrative's construction. In other words, we need rhetoric to enable us to understand how individual authors use metafictional techniques in particular works both to delight their readers and to teach them about language, the conventions of literature, and their roles in the narrative transaction provided by the text. This dissertation is designed to develop that rhetoric.

Since John Barth's "The Literature of Exhaustion" appeared twenty years ago, there have been a number of book length studies of metafiction. In one of the best known, Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-Conscious Genre, Robert Alter defines a self-conscious novel as one that "systematically flaunts its own condition of artifice and that by so doing probes into the problematic relationship between real seeming artifice and reality."[8] Arguing that Don Quixote is both the first realistic novel and the first self-=conscious novel, Alter suggests that a tradition characterized by playfulness in the text and scepticism about the status of fiction developed concurrently with the noel's realistic tradition, and he claims that the subject of novelists such as Cervantes, Stern, Diderot, Gide, and Nabokov is the "disparity between the structures of the imagination and things as they are. "[9] As this art/life dichotomy suggest, Alter is essentially concerned with ontological and existential questions. He begins his history by suggesting that the printing press created an "erosion of belief in the authority of the written word," which self-conscious writers saw as the "key to the Predicament of a whole culture"; he ends by suggesting that metafictional writers "tap the tension between the coherence of the artifice and the death and disorder implicit in real time outside the artifice.**"[10]** Although alter does not concern himself much with post-modern practitioners of the self conscious novel (he devotes only twenty pages to writers after Nabokov), his book does provide the philosophical foundation for an extended study of post-modern texts.

Tony Tanner, in City of Words, takes as his subject American writers between 1950 and 1970, arguing that as a group they "evince a heightened awareness of the separateness of words and thisgs."[11] The American hero's struggle for freedom and identity against society's constraints, says Tanner, parallels the American writer's struggle for stylistic freedom against language and the existing forms of literature. Although Tanner includes several metafictional writers in his almost encyclopaedic study of recent American fiction, he does not really make meaningful formal distinctions between a metafictional writer like John Barth and a more realistic writer like John Updike. While he is a excellent reader of texts, Tanner seems more interested in studying the impulse which makes writers seek new way to use language to organize reality than in studying the effects this impulse enables writers to create.

In Fabulation and Metafiction, Robert Scholes does attempt to show the diversity of metafictional types. Using Lost in the Funhouse, Prick songs and Descants, City Life, and The Heart of the Heart of the Country, Scholes suggests that there are four modes of metafiction, which are derived from the four types of traditional fiction he identifies: formal metafiction (derived from romance): structural metafiction (from myth); behavioural metafiction (from the novel); and philosophical metafiction (from allegory). But in his discussions of these four categories, schools concentrates not so much on the different effects of these forms, but on, once again, the philosophical assumptions of each from and each author, and concludes that "Barth and Barthelme are the chroniclers of our despair: despair over the exhausted forms of our despair: despair over the exhausted forms of our though forms and behaviour some ultimate value, some truth."[12]

A more recent work, Charles Carmella's Silverless Mirrors: Book, Self & Post-modern American Fiction, seeks to answer this question: "How do the problematic of the book and of the authorial self figure in post-modern American Fiction?"[13] Carmella suggests that a complex and ambivalent relationship exists between the physical book as a regulated system assigns and the (American) self who organizes and makes coherent that book. He explores questions of the authorial self depicted by American critical theory and literary history and then suggests the ways these critical practices have influenced post-modern fiction. He concludes that "under the tutelage" of critical theory, this "fiction proclaims itself to have rejected the unities of the book and the authorial self; but…under the differing pressures of …literary modernism and the Native American tradition, it seeks to reclaim precisely those unities."[14] Though Carmella suggests that this ambivalence is peculiarly American, his work does provide a theoretical basis for an assumption that has fuelled the present study from its inception: that, as Fowles suggests, "Not even the most aleatory avant-garde modern novel has managed to extirpate its author completely."[15]

These essentially ontological studies typify much of the or devoted to metafiction. "A fictional technique always relates back to the novelist's metaphysics," claimed Sartre in an essay on Faulkner; "the critic's task is to define the latter before evaluating the former." We have several important studies on the metaphysics of metafiction, and we now need to explore its rhe3torical techniques. Linda Hutcheon's book, Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox, is an important beginning for the study of the role of the reader in post-contemporary fiction, but by relying heavily on the Iserian definition of the reader as "co-creator" in her exploration of the art/life dichotomy provided by self-conscious techniques, Hutcheon's work is both

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Sunit Kr Bera
Asstt. Teacher Deptt of English, Kurpai High School (H.S.), WB, INDIA.*

more limited and encyclopaedic than my study of the rhetorical nature of metafiction. And like another recent work that is concerned with the similarities between the construction of fictional texts and the construction of a sense of reality, Waugh's <u>Metafiction</u>: <u>The Theory and Practice of self-Fiction, Narcissistic</u> <u>Narrative</u> frequently fails to distinguish between different uses of similar metafictional devices. While I owe a considerable debt to both Waugh and Hutcheon, a debt which will be acknowledged throughout the text of this dissertation, my own work differs from theirs in several ways, most importantly, I believe, in my rhetorical approach to text that on the surface seem anti-rhetorical, and in my attempt to distinguish between different uses of similar techniques. As a rhetoric, then, this work does not so much cover the same ground as Waugh's and Hutcheon's as much as it attempts to show the multiple effects possible when the theories they outline are practiced by different authors.

While the title of my study echoes Wayne Booth's <u>The Rhetoric of Fiction</u>, it actually shares more with the project of <u>A Rhetoric of Irony.</u> That is, the first two words describe my approach, the last two my subject. More broadly, I attempt to describe-- and to evaluate--the kinds of transactions that occur between authors and readers in the class of texts we label "metafiction". With Booth, then, I share a basic assumption that a text's internal signals- -signals of form, of convention, of language--provide us with clues as to the type of readerly role into which the individual writer is casting us; that is, I am interested in the ways that metafictional techniques both unite and divide authors and readers. Of course, the explosion of reader-response criticism in the past twenty years is one of the most significant developments of modern criticism and has produced many ways of describing readers and their roles: in addition to Iser's co-creating implied reader, we have, to name just a few, Gibson's mock reader, Fish's informed reader, Culler's competent reader, and Ong's fictionalized reader. For the purposes of my rhetorical study, however, I have employed the terms developed by peter Rabinowitz, who distinguishes between the narrative audience and the authorial audience of a text: in traditional narratives, the narrative audience pretends to read a narrative as though the events it describes actually happened, while the authorial audience is the audience for whom the writer fashions his rhetorical effects. In other words, the narrative audience most closely resembles the reader for whom the narrator writes, while the authorial audience is the reader for whom the author writes.

Although, as Rabinowitz acknowledges, both audiences are fictions and the reader's ability to enter these audiences does not constitute the final act of interpretation, writers generally imagine as authorial audience similar to "real" readers, while the narrative audience is clearly a created fiction:

… the author not only knows that the narrative audience is different from the actual and authorial audiences, but he rejoices in this fact and expects his actual audience to rejoice with him. For it is this difference which makes fiction, and makes the double-levelled aesthetic experience possible. As we shall see, the author plays with this distinction and builds much of his effect on it. [16]

And successful readers naturally attempt to become the types of readers implied by the text. For example, the narrator of <u>Great Expectations</u> pretends to be writing his autobiography, so the reader enters the narrative audience by reading the text as a memoir which chronicles pip's life; Dickens' authorial audience, however, is composed of Victorian novel readers who are well-versed in the social and literary conventions of their time, and Dickens fashions his novel not only to entertain his contemporaries but to persuade them to question some of their society's values. Of course, many of the lessons learned by the narrative audience are the same as those learned by the authorial audience, but it is the authorial audience who also experiences the aesthetic pleasures of Dickens' fictional construct. Since Dickens' artistic choices, and thus the effects of those choices, are influenced by the hypothetical beliefs and knowledge he attributes to his Victorian audience, the modern reader must make an attempt to enter that audience.[17] Worker like Altiock's <u>Victorian People and Ideas</u> and footnotes which accompany most modern editions of Great Expectations help readers bridge the gap, and, as Rabinowitz suggests, a liberal arts education helps to provide "the relevant information so that we can join various authorial audiences."[18] But while background information helps, the most fruitful way to discover our position as members of the authorial audience is to look at how the text, in its significant appeals and silences, both creates and assumes its audience. In other words, if all choices of form and language are viewed as rhetorical, all provide clues abut the author's intended audience and its role in the transaction provided by the text.

Since self-conscious fiction is frequently denounced as both "unreadable" and "solipsistic," it might seem to seriously challenge the rhetorical approach I have just described. That is, metafiction calls its narrative audience's attention to its own artifice, to its own rhetoric, and thus seemingly usurps the authorial readers' role by foregrounding the intentions of the fiction; and critics who suggest that metafictional techniques are inherently solipsistic indicate that self-consciousness promotes an independent and wary intelligence in readers at the expense of a more satisfying confirmation of the specific narrator or artist."[19] These charges of solipsism and unreadability suggest that author and reader never experience that "meeting of minds" whose intricacies and process rhetorical criticism seeks to analyze, but as I suggest throughout, the foregrounding in the narrative text of the process by which that text was constructed does not necessarily make a text unreadable or solipsistic; instead, it requires the authorial reader to ask different questions about the literary transaction than does mimetic

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Sunit Kr Bera*
*Asstt. Teacher Deptt of English, Kurpai High School (H.S.), WB, INDIA.*

fiction. Just as the successful reader recognizes that pip is not Dickens, the reader of metafiction must understand that the narrator of a self-conscious fiction is frequently quite distant from its author (surely, for example, Barth cannot be identified with the narrator in "Life-Story" who suggests that he can't even commit suicide without the help of the reader). But by calling our attention to the ways by which the author manipulates literary conventions, metafictional texts finally remind us that literature is unique in that it is both transactional and solitary, "both produced and consumed, or received, by individuals as individuals."[20]

Metafiction also raises intriguing questions about the nature of authorial audiences. Very few metafictional texts have been best- sellers suggesting that few self universal audiences. As Rabinowitz suggests, sometimes writers seem not even attempt to write for "real" renders:

Some writers, such as the Joyce of Finnegan's Wake, appear not to care about actual readers at all; others, such as John Barth, have intentions which are so subtle and complex that they can only write for an authorial audience which they know to be, at best, but a tiny portion of their actual audience.[21]

Many metafictional texts are indeed difficult to read, sometimes resisting even readers who are critically sophisticated, and thus their writers are frequently charged with elitism. Of course, it is possible to simply disregard this charge by suggesting that it corresponds to the pattern of literary history and that innovation in narrative form--and in artistic endeavours in general -- have always been met with resistance. Eco, for instance, reminds us that "the great innovative moments" in the history of painting reveal the difficulty artists face whenever they attempt to radically alter artistic conventions:

Take the case of the Impressionists, whose addressees absolutely refused to 'recognize' the subjects represented and said that they 'did not understand,' that the painting 'did not mean anything,' that real life was not like that, etc. this refusal was due to the addressees' mapped items might be referred, but also of a percept to guess at, since they had never perceived in this way. [22]

The more radical the innovations - - the more the author attempts, in Eco's words, to change codes - - the more the reader must struggle to understand the text. I would also suggest that a rhetorical strategy of many metafictional texts is to make readers work hard and then to pay them well. That is, those who enter the authorial audience of a innovative text are made to feel they have accomplished something that not everyone can; one of the pleasures of reading difficult fiction, self-conscious or mimetic, then, is the intellectual satisfaction of entering an elite authorial audience. The question, finally, should be to what extent must readers share with metafictional writers--and plead guilty to - - these charges of elitism?

Throughout the following analysis, I consider these charges of elitism and unreadability as I describe and evaluate the effects of metafictional techniques. Since this is a rhetorical study, I have loosely organized the chapters around the elements of the narrative transaction (teller, tale, told, and the medium) emphasized by different types of metafiction, though my own emphasis is always on the authorial audience implied by these techniques. The first chapter thus focuses on self-conscious fiction that stresses the author's role as performer and teacher, fiction which draws the audience's attention to the processes by which the author seeks to alter our expectations about literary conventions and to teach us to read performance literature. The second, then, focuses primarily on metafiction that draws its reader's attention to the importance of the tale itself through the parody of traditional narratives, such as legends and fairy tales. Metafiction which takes language--its own medium-- rather than the forms of fiction as its subject is the focus of the third chapter, and self-conscious fiction which actually dramatizes and makes a character of the reader is the subject of the fourth. Most authors of self-conscious literature draw our attention to more than one of these elements, but the division is useful nevertheless because most writers of metafiction finally concern themselves more with one of the elements than with the others. Within each chapter, I attempt to show the range of effects created by the emphasis on the particular element of the narrative transaction; in other words, one author may dramatize his reader and achieve quite different effects than another author who uses the same self-conscious technique, and I indicate these distinctions at the same time that I am concerned with they uses of similar techniques.

Speaking of the term irony, both suggests that "once a term has been used to cover just about everything there is, it perhaps ought simply to be retired; if it can apply to everything, it can hardly be rescued for everyday Purposes."[23] Before the term metafiction reaches such a condition, I should like to suggest that there is a difference between works that are radically metafictional and those that merely employ metafictional techniques; the use of irony in a text does not mean that the entire work is ironic, and the use of self-conscious techniques does not necessarily mean that the entire work is anti-realistic or anti-mimetic or even belongs exclusively in that class of texts we call "metafiction." In the chapter that explores the device of the dramatized reader, for instance, I discuss Gardner's October Light and Puig's Kiss of the Spider Woman, works which use a specific metafictional technique but, to different degrees, subordinates the metafictional elements to the mimetic. The final chapter of this study, then, is centred on The French Lieutenant's Woman, a text that employs several different metafictional techniques but essentially retains strong ties to conventional "realistic" fiction, in order to test the validity of my claims about the effects of these techniques. While the radical metafictional text like Gass' Willie Master's Lonesome Wife may have seen it heyday in the late nineteen-

sixties and early seventies, it is difficult to find a contemporary work of serious literature that does not, in at least some minor way, exhibit signs of authorial self-consciousness or acknowledge its own fictitiousness. Even readers who deplore the experimental and the self-conscious should understand the effects an author attempts to create by calling our attention to the processes by which the text is constructed. For the most part, metafictional texts are finally anchored in the "art of the didactic." Just as writers like Woolf, Joyce, and Faulkner made readers conscious of our unconscious activity, writers of contemporary metafiction make us conscious of our activity as readers. What they have to teach us about how we read applies not only to metafiction but to mimetic fiction as well, and though we may not be able to come away from a radically metafictional text with a summary truth about the world outside of the fiction, we may come away as better readers--of both texts and world.

## (NOTES)

[1]. Cynthia Ozick, "Innovation and Redemption: What Literature Means," in Art and Ardour (New Your: Dutton Publishers, 1984), P. 239
[2]. Patricia Waugh, Metafiction: The theory and practice of Self-Conscious Fiction (London: Methuen Books, 1984), P.2 Ozick, P. 245
[3]. Peter Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Re-examination of Audiences, "Critical Inquiry 4 (1977), P. 132.
[4]. William H. Gass, Fiction and the Figures of Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), P. 27
[5]. John Gardner, On Moral Fiction (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), P. 97, 100.
[6]. John Barth, Chimera (Greenwich: Fawcett Publications, 1972), P. 25.
[7]. Robert Alter, Partial Magic: The Novel as Self-Conscious Genre (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p. x.
[8]. Alter, p. 87.
[9]. Alter, p. 3, 235.
[10]. Tony Tanner, City of Words: American Fiction 1950 – 1970 (London: 1971)
[11]. Robert Scholes, Fabulation and Metafiction (urban: University of I Illinois press, 1979), p. 123.Charles Carmella, Silverless Mirrors (Tallahassee: Florida State University Book, 1983), p. 3.
[12]. Charles Carmella, Silverless Mirrors (Tallahassee: Florida State University Book, 1983), p. 3.
[13]. Carmella, p. 211.
[14]. John Fowles, The French Lieutenant's Woman (New York: Signet Publishers, 1969), p. 82.
[15]. Rabinowitz, p. 130
[16]. Though it is quite possible for a writer to fashion his effects for an authorial audience which extends indefinitely into the future, Dickens, I would argue, writes for his own time.
[17]. Rabinowitz, p. 127.
[18]. Carol Schuss and Khachig Tololyan, "The Siren in the Funhouse: Barth's Courting of the Reader," Journal of narrative Technique (Winter 1981), p. 73.
[19]. John Barth, "The Future of Literature and the Literature of the Future," in The Friday Book (New York: Perigee Books, 1984), p. 165
[20]. Rabinowitz, P. 126.
[21]. Umberto Eco, A Theory of Semitics (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press,
[22]. 1976), p. 254.
[23]. Wayne Booth, A Rhetoric of Irony (Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1974),
[24]. p. ix.

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Sunit Kr Bera
Asstt. Teacher Deptt of English, Kurpai High School (H.S.), WB, INDIA.*