

## The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

Wael M. Mustafa \*

Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University, Egypt

Sameh A Galil

Department of English, Faculty of Language Studies, Arab Open University, Saudi Arabia

Received on: 17-12-2023

Accepted on: 7-2-2024

### Abstract

This paper investigates metafiction, intertextuality, and the multiple points of view that are identified as fundamental characteristics of contemporary fiction. These narrative strategies are interweaved in Lodge's biographical novel, *Author, Author*, to show fiction, history, and theory in a state of narrative play. These strategies have enabled Lodge to present a narrator with multifaceted nature. In some moments, the authorial voice is visible to guide the reader through the narrative. In other moments, the authorial voice blends with that of the protagonist, obliterating the narrative's boundaries to show the protagonist's stream of consciousness. The novel presents a historiographical metafictional analysis of Henry James' movement away from fiction writing to playwriting. Through metafiction, self-reflexivity, and intertextuality, Lodge interweaves history, literary theory, and fiction together in the narrative to draw the reader's attention to the narrativity itself.

**Keywords:** Henry James, Intertextuality, Lodge's *Author, Author*, Metafictional Narrative.

### Introduction

Contemporary fiction seeks to present an experimental attitude towards this genre by showing the experiment itself in process even though its subjects are fact-based writings. David Lodge expresses his interest and attraction to the "fact-based writing" as "a trend in contemporary literary culture generally" that depicts "the lives of real people represented in the written word" (2014, ix). In the authorial preface of Lodge's biographical novel, *Author, Author* (2004), the author states that the novel is based on facts and real characters related to the American writer, Henry James (1843-1916). However, Lodge, with his novelistic capacities, has represented these real characters' thoughts, feelings, and conversations, imagining some events and personal details that are absent in historiography. The authorial voice, in an essayistic tone, gives a metafictional frame to the narrative of the novel. With the multifaceted masks, the metafictional narrator penetrates deeply into the protagonist's consciousness and creates episodes to discuss the character's internal conflicts and some aspects related to the art of fiction. Throughout the narrative, the narrator seals with the problem of choosing a point of view in fictional narratives, the

---

© 2025 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

\* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.17.4.13>

\* Corresponding Author: [wms02@fayoum.edu.eg](mailto:wms02@fayoum.edu.eg)

specifics of the language used in fiction and dramaturgy, and the construction of the metafictional fictional character. Although it is biographical, this novel does not focus more on Henry James' life as it does on the construction of the art of fiction itself.

The effective narrative requires the joint work of three entities (the author, the narrator and the reader) that reveals the complexity of the points of view in the fictional narrative. The objective of this paper is to investigate how the strategies of self-reflexivity, intertextuality, and metafiction are used in Lodge's novel, *Author, Author*, to draw the attention of the reader to the narrativity itself and to the theoretical reflections embedded in it. The authorial voice adds an atmosphere of verisimilitude of the factual aspects addressed by fiction and contributes to the figuration of Henry James in the fictional world. Lodge's novel presents intertextual and metafictional discussions of the art of fiction, theatre, and literature in general. The hypothesis of this paper is that contemporary literary theory does not effectively contemplate the constitution of the metafictional authorial narrative voice that is invested in Author, Author. The essayistic tone of the novel is sometimes assumed by the dialogues between the characters, sometimes by the narrator's voice, sometimes by the authorial voice. The narrative of Lodge's novel arises from the creation of episodes that question, discuss and propose directions for literary work. The proposal of this paper is that Lodge in *Author, Author* has adopted the narrative strategies of self-reflexivity, metafiction, and intertextuality to fictionalize the life and literary trajectory of Henry James. For this, he creates a metafictional jungle with multifaceted nature that oscillates between critical or interpretive perspectives.

Henry James works in a tradition of fiction writing that highlights the modernist tendency towards experimentalism in fictional narrative. Historically, he was a forerunner of the modernist psychological novel and the most prominent figure in realist, non-naturalistic fiction in the late nineteenth century. He is guided by the theories of his older brother, William James (1842-1910). William wrote *Principles of Psychology* (1890) and coined the term "stream of consciousness". This explains why Henry James becomes more interested in the consciousness of his characters. Henry James's psychological realism is "distinctive in its groundbreaking methods of capturing the complexities of interpersonal relationships, as well as simulating the fluctuating evolution of the individual consciousness of his central characters" (Dimuro 2018). The implied author attributes authority to the narrator in the weaving of the narrative threads of fiction on a documentary basis. Investing the roles of critic, theorist, and professor of literature, Lodge inspires the reader with the necessary confidence in relation to the documentary research to create *Author, Author*. Lodge's authorial voice in the narrative is very subtle and, curiously, in parentheses. The narrator is unnamed and in the third person to draw the reader's attention to the narrativity on the authorial voice that shows the meta-fictionality of the work itself.

Since its publication in 2004, Lodge's novel has received many critical reviews that reflect overarching themes and topics. Firstly, many of these reviews have discussed the biographical intent in the novel. Russell Perkin (2010) explores the hybrid genre of Lodge's novel as a 'biographical novel'. According to him "the strong presence of Henry James hinders Lodge's efforts to create an autonomous work of fiction" (2010, 126). Secondly, a number of critics point out that Lodge's emphasis on facts has

overshadowed the fictional or the novelistic aspect of this biographical novel. Lodge's close adherence to the factual documentation over the fictional storytelling has agitated a number of critics. Such overdependence on the factual aspect of the lives of actual people creates a confusion concerning the author-as-character and the actual author. Therefore, the critics seek to discover aspects of biographical fiction and authorial control in the novel. Vanessa Guignery sees Lodge's novel as a biographical novel where ontological boundaries between fact and fiction, authenticity and invention, have tended to fade away (Guignery 2007, 162). The previous studies, then, are not solely directed to the internal qualities of the text but rather to the biographical knowledge of the author and his oeuvre. According to Karen Scherzinger (2008), in Lodge's novel, "James-the-author is transformed into a *dramatis persona*" (Scherzinger 2008, 182). Thus, one of the primary objectives of this paper is to provide a more extensive and complete study that reflects the internal qualities of the novel and their relation to postmodernist metafiction. In specific, the paper explores the metafictional jungle created by Lodge in the novel to show how he mixes and blurs the boundaries between fact and fiction. Such paper may contribute to the existing studies on the works of Lodge to form a more complete overview of the oeuvre of Lodge.

### **1. The Metafictional Narrator**

Contemporary fiction in the twenty-first century has witnessed increased experimentation using postmodern narrative techniques that endorse hybridity, multiplicity and self-reflexivity such as historiographic metafiction. In such a narrative, the novelist "appears to be standing not at a crossroads but at a far more complicated intersection that offers routes in several directions" (Bentley 2008, 196). In his oeuvre, Lodge interweaves the factual with the fictional, infusing his narrative with theoretical reflections on the nature of postmodern fiction. The most important feature of postmodern metafiction is what Lodge calls the "short-circuit", whose purpose is to reduce the distance between fact and fiction and to shock "the reader and thus resist assimilation into conventional categories of the literary" (Lodge 1977, 239–240). The "short-circuit" involves "combing in one work violently contrasting modes – the obviously fictive and the apparently factual; introducing the author and the question of authorship into the text; and exposing conventions in the act of using them" (Lodge 1977, 240). Lodge has introduced the short-circuit as one of the main features of metafiction. By short-circuit, the author reduces the distance between the reader and the text and becomes present in the story. This reduction includes the distance between the real world and the text. With the short-circuit, the author talks to the reader and the characters of the story and explains the process of writing story to them. On the other hand, the short-circuit takes the reader out of passivity to participate in the process of creating the story and get closer to the author and the text. According to Brian McHale, the important characteristic of postmodernist fiction is the blurring of the distance between the literary text and the real world. By creating a short circuit, the postmodernist author "seeks to avoid having to choose either of the poles of metaphoric (modernist) or metonymic (antimodernist) writing" (McHale 1987, 7). In other words, Lodge's contention is that the authorial intrusion in the text and the revealing of story writing arrangements are tricks used with the aim

of creating a short circuit through which the distance between the fictional and the real worlds becomes impenetrable, to the extent that it becomes impossible to distinguish them from each other.

In defining metafiction, different opinions have been raised. Despite all these differences, there are similarities and consensus in several cases. The most important definition of metafiction that most theorists accept is Patricia Waugh's definition. According to Waugh, metafiction is a fictional writing that "self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality" (1984, 2). It is, then, a tendency within the novel that works "through exaggeration of the tensions and oppositions inherent in all novels: of frame and frame-break, of technique and counter-technique, of construction and deconstruction of illusion" (Waugh 1984, 14). This means that there are three pairs of elements in metafictional writings. Each pair suggests a disruption or subversion of the established structure, technique, or the illusionary aspects of the narrative. By doing so, authors can create a sense of contrast, surprise, or even chaos within their narratives. Moreover, they can push the boundaries of storytelling and create innovative, thought-provoking narratives, creating a heightened sense of awareness in readers and challenging their perceptions and inviting critical engagement with the text.

Linda Hutcheon (1980) defines "Metafiction" as "fiction that includes within itself a commentary on its own narrative and/or linguistic identity" (1980, 1). Regarding whether metafiction should be considered a different genre or not, Waugh believes that "metafiction is not so much a subgenre of the novel as a tendency within the novel which operates through exaggeration of the tensions and oppositions inherent in all novels" (Waugh 1984, 14). Moreover, she notices that: "metafiction explores the concept of fictionality through an opposition between the construction and the breaking of illusion" (1984, 16). In her opinion, the aim of metafiction is to re-examine the rules and conventions of realism to discover a form of fiction through self-reflection: "In showing us how literary fiction creates its imaginary worlds, metafiction helps us to understand how the reality we live day by day is similarly constructed, similarly 'written'" (Waugh 1984, 18-19). Most of the postmodern theorists, in terms of time, consider metafiction as a trend within the postmodernist writing. Waugh points out that metafiction is "a mode of writing within a broader cultural movement often referred to as post-modernism" (1984, 21).

These definitions of metafiction rely on the fact that metafiction is a story about writing a story. However, they do not include the various dimensions of metafiction. Relying on these definitions causes many aspects of metafiction to be ignored and the proper functioning of the characteristics of metafiction to be blurred. To clarify this point, Waugh indicates that "the lowest common denominator of metafiction is simultaneously to create a fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction" (Waugh 1984, 6). However, these are not all the features of metafiction, but only contains one of the short circuit features called "story writing story". Therefore, metafiction consists of several levels of existence, which includes the main author and other characters who are engaged in the work of writing in the story. Waugh determines the role of the author in the metafictional texts: "Questioning not only the notion of the novelist as God, through the flaunting of the author's godlike role, but also the authority of consciousness,

The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David  
Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

of the mind, metafiction establishes the categorization of the world through the arbitrary system of language" (Waugh 1984, 24-25).

Metafictive novels employ techniques wherein the author endeavors to disengage the reader from the story's fictional realm, inducing the reader to perceive it as an artificial narrative. Simultaneously, the author seeks to foster the reader's belief in the credibility of the story, utilizing the principle of verisimilitude. However, this principle is violated, and the author tries to make the reader accept that he is dealing with a story with all kinds of tricks that reveal artificiality. Hutcheon considers metafiction as a form of narcissistic paradox that is "both narcissistically self-reflexive and yet focused outward, oriented toward the reader" (Hutcheon 1980, 7). Therefore, metafictive author examines the nature of his literary writing in a process accompanied by evaluation and criticism to the work of art itself. Such fictive writing critiques itself by revealing the process of its creation and the artifices employed. This type of writing can create a sense of closeness between fictional writing and literary theory. Such a metafictive approach shows the creative engagement of contemporary authors with modernist writers to reinvigorate "the prospects of the unrealized potentialities of modernist fiction" that needs "to be continually tested, redesigned, and remade" (James 2012, 16). In *Author, Author*, Lodge invests postmodernist fictional strategies in fact-based writing on the life of the modernist writer, Henry James. He starts with a description of the largest, the airiest, the most beautiful, the best equipped master bedroom in Carlyle Mansions, that is occupied by Henry James, the protagonist. At the outset of the narrative, two voices are heard: the authorial and the narrator. The authorial voice appears in parentheses "(never was the estate agent's epithet more appropriate)" (Lodge 2004, 3). Meanwhile, the other voice is that of the narrator who officially continues the narrative. This leads to the concept of the "implied author" as a sort of alter ego of the actual author. The implied author is in charge of controlling the actions and behaviors of the narrator and other characters. S/he creates disguises, hiding behind a character or the narrator and "chooses, consciously or unconsciously, what we read [...] as an ideal, literary, created version of the real man; he is the sum of his own choices" (Booth 1983, 74-75). The implied author hides behind a nameless omniscient narrator to tell the story of Henry James. It is through this narrator's gaze that the reader becomes aware of what happens in the narrative. This narrator's gaze, eventually, dominates the dynamics of the narrative. The implied author is a textual presence, mostly abstract, responsible for the enunciation in a fictional text, but should not be confused with the real author. Sometimes, both coincide ideologically or, on the contrary, their point of view differs, because a real author creates different implied authors. The idea reveals the explicit and represented textual presence of the author. The identification between the implied author and the character of his novel contributes to the metafictional configuration of the literary text, because the intention of the former is concise: the implied author represents his experience as a novelist and the difficulties he is going through in a fictional text. In short, the metafictional reading of this text begins with the self-reference of the implied author, since his presence is represented by identifying himself as the protagonist of his own novel. One can find the pragmatic function of the implied author represented, because he intends to reveal a hidden side to the reader.

Metafiction allows the author to continue writing realistic novels and at the same time recognizes that it is a literary artifact, the result of the use of a series of established literary conventions: “Realism is not rejected, but it is not employed naively, innocently.” either. The text no longer seeks to disguise its own literariness, and realism is played off against other modes of writing —mythopoeic, surrealist, confessional, documentary” (Lodge 1978, 50). For Lodge, the opposition between realism and metafiction that many critics have established is totally false, since what metafiction does is reveal the problematic implicit in realism. Therefore, what defines the postmodern novel is not its antirealism, but its narrative self-consciousness, which allows at the same time to use and reveal the conventions of literary realism. The most interesting thing is that for Lodge the self-conscious text by elevating the act of authorship to the foreground becomes a defensive response, whether conscious or intuitive, to the questioning of the concept of author and the mimetic function of fiction that has been carried out by critical theory in recent decades. Hence the importance of the presence of metafictional elements in *Author, Author* that, evidently, vindicate the figure of the author.

The novel commences in *medias res*, with the protagonist already significantly weakened, lying in bed at Carlyle Mansions in December 1915. The narrator sticks to the protagonist and becomes almost a character, an integral part of the plot of the novel. It is from this authorial voice that the reader sees Henry, an elderly man on his deathbed. The narrator “is separate from the characters and superior to them, sympathizing with them or judging them but definitely not trusting them to tell their stories ‘In their own words’” (Zeidner 2021, 35). The narrator in the novel establishes a parallel between the agony of an elderly patient (Henry) surrounded by special care, while young boys are agonized and died without even the right to burial. As an authorial voice, Lodge evokes this theme to underscore the stark contrast between perishing with a vast, published work (as experienced by Henry individually) and perishing like “blank pages that will never be filled” (2004, 3), akin to innocent young soldiers fighting for a collective cause.

Throughout the first part of the novel, the narrator presents himself in third person, making use of historical data, the First World War. The authorial voice is heard in a subtle way that a less attentive reader barely notices the presence of an individualizable narrator in the story. The narrator does not fail to make his own judgment about the protagonist's reaction to the Lamb House, when he says that Henry recognizes the Garden Room with a “a little thrill of pleasure” (Lodge 2004, 317). Elsewhere in the novel, the narrator insinuates that Henry has already seen the Garden Room at Lamb House in a picture sketched by his friend, the architect, Edward Warren: “It’s the Garden Room of Lamb House, in Rye” (Lodge 2004, 314). The residence is first seen as a work of art and as a reality. It seems that Henry is living in a dream, and, in objective reality, he can appreciate what he has seen as an abstraction, an imaginative work, at his friend's house.

Throughout the second part of the novel, a significant portion of the story develops through the dialogues between the characters. In the first chapters, Henry is at the height of his artistic career, being highly respected and appreciated by the literary world as “the coming man of the literary novel in the English-speaking world” (Lodge 2004, 43). At this point, Henry meets George Du Maurier and befriends

him. As with the approach to Lamb House, Henry also knew and followed Du Maurier's artistic work as a cartoonist for *Punch* magazine, before meeting him in person. Du Maurier (1834-1896) was a respected cartoonist and illustrator for the British weekly humor and satire magazine *Punch*. For uncertain reasons, he loses the vision in one eye. This forces him to use a technique of inferior quality, with thicker strokes, for his drawings. Thus, he begins to write novels – which he dictates to his wife, Emma – as a means of artistic expression and as a way of survival that does not depend so much on vision. *Peter Ibbetson* (1889), *Trilby* (1894) and *The Martian* (1897) are the three novels of his authorship. In one of the conversations between friends, Henry confesses to Du Maurier what his ambition is as a novelist: “‘I have immoderate ambition [...] to be the Anglo-American Balzac’” (Lodge 2004, 49). With little interference from the narrator and through the dialogue between the friends, it is possible to glimpse Henry's concern for his own privacy and the fear of being ridiculed for having such a bold ambition. The way his ambition is handled reveals that Henry is perjuring himself for wanting to be the "Anglo-American Balzac". He reveals his ambition as something so intimate, confidential, and private. Moreover, Henry has vowed never to marry, giving up his sexuality for the sake of his art: “He had made up his mind in his early thirties that he would never marry” (Lodge 2004, 54). Henry himself does not seem to want to reflect on these decisions. It seems that Henry envies Du Maurier for being able to manipulate art, marriage, wife and children.

Lodge's authorial voice manages the narrator's positioning in the face of the act of producing fiction: “Writing fiction, however artful, was inevitably to some degree an exposure of the author's own self, his own soul” (Lodge 2004, 63). For the narrator, it is inevitable that the author exposes his inner self, revealing aspects of his private life when producing a fictional narrative. At the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, literary criticism, in general, was concerned with the form, the person of the author and the socio-historical context, in which the literary work had been produced. At the end of the nineteenth century, there was “a quarrel over the author's intention” that prevailed in literary criticism (Compagnon 2004, 111). In his novel, Lodge brings Henry's concern with his private life through his work to the discussion. Constance Fenimore Woolson appears in the novel not as a successful novelist, but as “the grandniece of Fenimore Cooper, that great, if (as he now seemed) quaintly archaic pioneer of the native American novel” (Lodge 2004, 63). The expression [as he now seemed], in parentheses, conveys the authorial voice that is intermingled with the discourse of that narrator who gives direction to the narrative diegesis, through the first-order discourse.

## 2. Intertextual Reflections

Intertextuality enables Lodge to interweave threads of narrative that depends on the intricate relationship between author, history, and theory. The authorial voice appears again in the novel when Lodge plays the role of both the intrusive omniscient author and a professor of literature and literary critic. He assesses Henry's ambitions to surpass the antiquated works in form and content written by the generation that preceded him to “impress the materialistic nineteenth century. Dickens and George Eliot had managed it” (Lodge 2004, 95). The narrator-author manifests himself in parenthesis by referring to

himself as “(to me)” (Lodge 2004, 95). The appearance of the authorial voice, mixing with the narrator's manifestation that guides the narrative, makes the reader bring the story to the present evaluating Henry's works in relation to those of other authors. These manifestations in parentheses indicate a narrative pattern that is maintained throughout the novel.

Henry considers the possibility of moving away from fiction and embracing dramaturgy as a form of artistic expression as “he had always been fascinated by the theatre” (Lodge 2004, 107). He adapts the novel, *The American*, for the stage, under the direction of Edward Compton. The play was being staged in the provinces and, later, premiered in London. Ironically, Compton gives up on giving continuity to the performances of *The American* in London and decides to return to his itinerant activities in the provinces. This leaves the possibility of Henry conquering the London stage even further away. Henry sees the theater as a possibility to earn money, since his fiction does not receive a satisfactory reception neither from critics nor from the public. However, his adaptation and acceptance of the protocols that govern the dramaturgy is to transport to the theater the same norms that govern fiction. Henry still has great enthusiasm for dramaturgy in which, obstacles arise after the play is written. What wears out the most is rewriting, cutting, adjusting, revising, changing the ending, inverting an episode to please the director. However, he recognizes that both the idea of adapting *The American* for the stage and the hopes placed on its success are doomed to failure. In this way, he convinces himself that he would only conquer the London stages with a play that is conceived as a theatrical play from the beginning. The great obstacle that Henry sees in dramaturgy is the short time within which a play unfolds, consequently, the conciseness of the language. According to the narrator of *Author, Author*, the refinement of the language of the novel, *The American*, ends up being destroyed by the reduced language of the theater, which cannot adequately expand – at least, not as Henry would like to be able to develop it – due to the limited time, what causes disappointment in the public.

With his frequent ventures into London's theaters, Henry tries to discover which scenic tricks are adopted by successful playwrights, comparing them to his own work in dramaturgy. Oscar Wilde, for example, premieres the play *Lady Windermere's Fan*. Although Henry was not very fond of Wilde as a person – especially after rumors that he was going through a period of moral degradation – he recognized his intelligence and acumen as a playwright. In *Author, Author*, Henry refers to Wilde's play as “so wittily managed, with such an abundance of amusing mots, batted back and forth across the stage like so many shuttlecocks, that one scarcely noticed” (Lodge 2004, 148). Here, the narrator-author explores the protagonist's consciousness and, through free indirect speech, conveys to the reader Henry's assessment of Wilde's play as an instrument of fun and relaxation. It analyzes the Wilde's perceptiveness in observing the profile of the English public and bringing to the stage what would cause laughter by the irony put into words and actions. Using free indirect speech, Lodge draws the attention of the reader into the narrative and that what is being told, or shown, becomes present, although it is narrated in the past tense. In assessing Wilde's plays, Henry reflects that Wilde “was not backward in responding to the calls of ‘Author! Author!’” (Lodge 2004, 149). There is an irony placed in the expression “Author! Author!” which refers the reader to the title of Lodge's novel.

The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David  
Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

Henry meets with Du Maurier and asks him about the new novel he is going to write. Du Maurier replies that he is writing a novel entitled *Trilby*. Du Maurier explains that he comes across the story “in a French fairy tale” and Henry remembers that “It was the name of Eugénie Guérin’s pet *dog!*” (Lodge 2004, 159-160). By alluding that the name *Trilby* is not for a person but for a pet dog, Henry proves himself as an avid reader of French literature. This allusion integrates a sense of an “intertextual encyclopedia” which “encompasses all the semiotic systems with which the reader is familiar” (Eco 1979, 21). After a trip through Europe, Henry returns to London with a draft of a new play he initially called *Mrs. Jasper*: “a light-hearted comedy of manners, verging on farce” (Lodge 2004, 160). According to the narrator, Henry begins to consider part of the well-made play formula, especially when he deals with misunderstandings, persecutions, dissimulations of characters and, above all, the play as pure entertainment. There is no concern in philosophical-religious discussions and renunciations. The novel refers to intertextuality at this point as Henry takes his story as a starting point, changes the scenario to England and places it in a new process of signification. Intertextuality is “a field of transpositions of various signifying systems” (Kristeva 1980, 60). The transposition takes place from fiction towards the theater. In a subtle way, the narrator of *Author, Author*, takes the reader’s gaze away from fiction and directs him to dramaturgy.

The omniscient intrusive author realizes the state of depression and dissatisfaction of his protagonist with the playwright career that does not go ahead. This dissatisfaction leads Henry to seek refuge in fiction and not in dramaturgy. It is through the writing of the short story “The Middle Years” that the character verbalizes his anxieties and frustrations: “The hero, Dencombe, was a novelist whose work, produced slowly and with immense pains, was respected but not widely appreciated” (Lodge 2004, 168). Philippe Lejeune states that “Confronted with what looks like an autobiographical narrative, the reader often tends to think of himself as a detective, that is to say, to look for breaches of contract (whatever the contract)” (Lejeune 1989, 14). Lodge plays this role of the detective reader of Henry James. He reads the short story, “The Middle Years”, and sees in the characteristics of the story’s protagonist the agonizing phase and the conflicts with which James, the empirical subject, would have lived. The implied author of *Author, Author* embodies his protagonist. Even more exciting is the fact that Dencombe, the writer, protagonist of “The Middle Years”, has an interlocutor (Doctor Hugh), who plays the role of the detective reader of his works. In the narrative diegesis, author and reader accidentally meet, and both read “The Middle Years”: a tale with metafictional characteristics that shows us the tale within the tale. Furthermore, James, the implied author, creates this figure of the reader, at a time when it was not considered valuing this character to give meaning to the literary work. Returning from a trip to Paris, Henry brings with him an idea for writing a new play that is “Above all I thought it dramatic” (Lodge 2004, 176). The play is based on a story that Henry had heard in Venice. A plot full of resignations, moral scruples, and personal dilemmas. The director and the playwright do not reach an agreement regarding the theme and the end of the play. Thus, Henry decides to continue working on it, the way he had thought. He would, one day, find someone to play it. According to the narrator’s view of *Author, Author*, Henry “felt an intense personal identification with his hero, seeing in Guy’s final, heroic renunciation [...] a parallel

to his own celibate dedication to the vocation of authorship” (Lodge 2004, 176-177). This is an implied author judgment, imposed on the narrator of *Author, Author*. In James' novels, what matters most is not the events themselves, but the characters' consciousness. His protagonists are always carrying out self-assessments that ultimately culminate in revealing the subtleties of human relationships.

### 3. The Narrator-Author and Metanarrativity

Lodge uses meta-narrativity in a clear authorial voice in which the narrator – through free indirect speech – draws the reader's attention to the narrative itself. Henry's literary struggle is precisely against those authors whose novels have happy endings. He builds a bridge between psychological realism and modernism. His works are modernist novels with no episodes in place. They open space for an effort of interpretation to be imposed on the reader. Umberto Eco states that “a text is a lazy machine that appeals to the reader to do some of its work” (Eco 1994, 49). However, in James' works, Eco's assertion seems insufficient to account for the complexity of these works. The plot of *Author, Author* takes place in the mid-1870s. The narrator-author makes his subtle intrusion into the narrative to make his assessment of Henry's psychological state.

Everything indicates that the protagonist of *Author, Author* is, little by little, understanding the difficulties of the career of the playwright. In the third part of *Author, Author*, the narrator-author's speech follows, giving direction to the narrative, using first-order discourse, with an explicit authorial intrusion judging the protagonist and advising him. Henry explains his own assessment of the people who make up the theatrical environment, especially the directors. This mixture of indirect discourse or meta-narrativity, not only makes the reader feel an integral part of the story, but also makes it present. In a state of stream of consciousness, Henry “had decided to fill the time by watching somebody else's play [...] He had conceived no fresh ideas for plays since then which had progressed further than the pages of his notebook” (Lodge 2004, 204-205). In fictional narratives, the stream of consciousness is nothing more than the presentation of what is happening in the character's consciousness, which, most of the time, happens in a disorderly way. The implied author of *Author, Author*, when handling the steps of the narrator, appropriates the indirect interior monologue. The discourse is that of the narrator-author, plunging deeply into the character's consciousness. For William James, the stream of consciousness flows like the waters of a river and expresses itself as an ongoing mental process so that one memory leads to another. The mimicry of this process in fiction takes place as if the character, by himself, was not capable of expressing all his inner conflicts, lacking the perceptive sensibility of the fictionist. In this way, the triangle is formed: writer-protagonist-reader.

In the fictional text, references to the real world are sometimes intertwined in such a way that, suddenly, the reader no longer knows very well in which of the two worlds the episodes take place. Such a postmodernist mode of writing seeks “to illuminate the unstable relationships between contemporary culture and its histories” (Morrison 2003, 16). This makes the reader project the fictional model onto reality and come to believe in the real existence of fictional characters. A story is fiction because it “had been reinvented by the curator; it was history because it recounted what had happened in the cosmos at a

moment in the past; it was real life because I was real, and not the character of a novel" (Eco 1994, 140). The behavior of *Trilby's* readers, according to the narrator of *Author, Author*, clearly illustrates Eco's theory. This is what happens to readers of fiction in general: hence, the number of letters and inquiries about *Trilby*, sent to Du Maurier, the cartoonist-novelist, however, complains about the harassment of fans and talks about the possibility of moving from Hampstead to London, believing that this will keep fans at bay.

In the opening of the fifth chapter of part III of the novel, the authorial voice is apparent through the narrator's speech. The narrative voice says: "Long ago, in the Middle Ages, when the sea had covered most of this land, Rye had been a flourishing port. But the sea had withdrawn" (Lodge 2004, 316). The narrator interweaves the story of the town of Rye with the story of Henry's psychological recovery. In this sense, the intertextual dialogue takes place between the fiction writing and historiography. It is possible to observe the intertextuality that is established between fiction writing and painting, especially when the narrator-author mentions that "[...] he [Henry] enjoyed a view that might have been painted by some Italian or Flemish master" and later mentions "the picturesque hill towns in the background of old religious pictures that often drew one's eye away from the martyrdoms or miracles in the foreground." (Lodge 2004, 316). In this place, Henry finishes "The Old Things" and starts working on "The Other House". The latter, a sensationalist tale, based on a play he had written that was rejected by Compton to be staged. The protagonist of *Author, Author*, whenever possible, went out on a bicycle, on tours through the region. And as the story of Henry's psychological convalescence develops, we are faced with another clear intervention by the narrator-author to refer to the monuments that Henry enjoyed along the way, on his bike rides. At this moment, the intertextual dialogue takes place between fiction writing and architecture: "St Mary's was a Norman church much added to and restored, with Gothic flying buttresses, an eighteenth-century clock with mechanical moving figures to strike the hour" (Lodge 2004, 317).

#### 4. Henry's Consciousness at Play

Henry begins a new story about a girl named Maisie, victim and witness of the arm wrestling between adulterous parents and their respective lovers. This required an exquisite technical resource to present a degenerate and perverse adult world, through the perceptive and innocent conscience of a child. The plot progressed well; however, the idea was to write a short story and, depending on the developments, the story was turning into a novel. Meanwhile, Henry receives a letter from Du Maurier, informing him that his friend was not in good health and was very weak, and that, even so, he had finished his third novel, *The Martian*. He only lacked a few illustrations that he insisted on doing, even with visual difficulties. Henry goes to visit him and is shocked by his physical appearance and thinness. Du Maurier died a few days after Henry's visit, at the age of sixty-two. At his friend's funeral, Henry meets many artists, including Clarence McIlvaine, Du Maurier's editor. They talk about *Trilby's* success: "it's quite possible that *Trilby* is the best-selling novel ever" (Lodge 2004, 326). In a state of stream of consciousness, Henry assesses *Trilby's* performance, and reflects on death and the void left by him. The narrative voice of *Author, Author* penetrates Henry's consciousness to reveal what goes on in the most

intimate part of his being: “However deeply and sincerely one grieved for the dead, they gradually and inevitably occupied less and less of one’s conscious thoughts as time passed. [...] He [Henry] would distil and preserve his memories, his friendship, and his love for George Du Maurier in a memorial essay” (Lodge 2004, 327-328).

A few days after Du Maurier's death, Henry receives a note from the Lamb House neighbor informing him that the house was now available. Henry effectively moves to Lamb House: “He [Henry] vividly recalled moving through the house as if in a dream, because the rooms so perfectly fulfilled his vague desires in their size and disposition” (Lodge 2004, 341). It is possible to observe that the narrator looks back at Henry as he enters the Lamb House for the first time, and what catches Henry's attention is the “master bedroom”. What intrigues him the most is the story that “George the First had slept there for four nights” (Lodge 2004, 342). The authorial voice is heard in parentheses: “(with what instant relish he had anticipated of this boasting to William and Alice of this royal association and teasing their republican prejudices)” (Lodge 2004, 342). The authorial intrusion into the narrative is made in parentheses. Henry is convinced that he had failed as a playwright and that he would never get rich as a fiction writer. He uses the image of the ship to figure the Lamb House of which he was the captain “steaming into the future, with MacAlpine as first officer and his little band of servants as crew; this bedroom was his cabin, the lawn was the main deck, and The Garden Room the bridge” (Lodge 2004, 348). The implied author of *Author, Author* shows that Henry has taken back command of his career as a novelist. The symbol presented in this image is that of a safe harbor that denotes robustness, strength and firmness, totally under Henry's command. MacAlpine, the first officer, is the cornerstone of his literary output. The other employees – the crew – are responsible for maintaining the organization of the house, meals, clothes and cleaning. The cabin, the place where you can rest and, the next day, be inspired to produce. The Garden Room, the studio, works as the bridge between Henry's artistic production and the world of literature. In this environment his latest novels will be produced. The image of the ship denoting a firm grip on command also appears when Henry goes to Alexander's office, set up inside the St James Theater, for the first time, when the director expresses an interest in Guy Domville: “The whole theatre had the atmosphere of an extremely well-run ship whose captain was respected and a little feared by the crew” (Lodge 2004, 184). The move to Lamb House has a liberating effect on Henry's imagination and causes his literary production to increase significantly .

The first and fourth parts of the novel form a sequence in terms of temporal reference. In the first part, the narrator had let loose the narrative threads that refer to the gradual and galloping deterioration of Henry's health and the receipt of the Order of Merit. In the fourth part, the narrator took up these threads and weaved them. until Henry's death in February 1916. The curious thing is that the Order of Merit is awarded to people who have rendered great service to the community. Henry’s obtaining of the Order of Merit, has left Alice, the widow of William James, ““puzzled and irritated by the paradox” (Lodge 2004, 361). She alludes to the unreadability and the poor selling of his works. The reader is unable to clearly distinguish whether the Award is for Henry’s participation in the War or for his contribution to the literary world. It is possible that Lodge, the authorial voice, maintains the two possibilities of explanation

for Henry's receipt of the Order of Merit. In Lodge's novel, the character of a metafictional narrator with multiple disguises is assigned the role of the center of consciousness. The narrator's successive intrusions into the narrative remind the readers that not only the characters of the novel construct their reality in words, but they themselves are verbal constructions.

## 5. Historiographic Metafiction

Historiographic metafiction is a strand that crystallizes postmodern fiction, privileges the narrative and incorporates three domains in its arena: history, theory and fiction (Hutcheon 1988, 5). In this way, Hutcheon's theoretical self-awareness about the writing of history and fiction as discursive constructs becomes "the grounds for its rethinking and reworking of the forms and contents of the past" (Hutcheon 1988, 5). The responsibility of filling the gaps left by the writing of history is attributed to the historical fiction that has been viewed "more sympathetically, as complementary, with its ability to fill in certain gaps left by conventional histories" (Southgate 2009, 194). Moreover, that kind of fiction is designated to occupy the empty space left by events that history has not mentioned as "the repressed other of historical discourse'" (Southgate 2009, 195). As a biographical novel, *Author, Author* presents fiction built on documentary research on Henry James. Beyond the seam between the writing of history and fiction, this novel supports historical fiction that engenders the mixture of fiction, literary theory and the writing of history. Historiographic metafiction "works to short-circuit what critics like to call the 'referential fallacy'" (Hutcheon 1988, 144-145), as it concentrates on the narrativity of the fictional text. There is inevitably a gap or a boundary between the literary text and the real world that postmodernist writings seek to blur. To obliterate this boundary, the author combines different aspects of the story with apparently reality-based aspects in his work, expressing authorship in the text, revealing customs and literary arrangements when using them.

The author-narrator of *Author, Author*, based on the creation texts and the critical texts of Henry James, establishes a continuous process of reflection on Henry's literary work (self-reflexivity), creates intertextual dialogues with these works (intertextuality) and promotes the denudation of the mechanisms adopted by the implied author to deal with fiction that focuses on fiction itself, thus revealing the "backstage" of artistic creation (metafiction). In this way, the unnamed narrator participates in the historical action fictionally constructed by the novel as if he were an integral part of the group of characters that make up the plot. In this sense, the novel simultaneously presents readers with a referential insertion and the imaginative invention of a world totally immune to judgments of truth or falsity, since in fiction they remain suspended. The narrator, with his documentary view, addresses the reader, to inform him not only of the textualized facts of the literary and historical past, but also of the conventions and narrative strategies that govern novelistic texts. Therefore, Lodge's text requires a reader who recognizes these traces of the past and can link these historical-literary traces to the present of the narrative. The unfolding of this narrator to tell the story of Henry James' literary career can be considered exemplary of what Hutcheon calls the "pluralizing multivalency of points of view" (Hutcheon 1988, 161). In other words, this metafictional narrator can be an example of this narrator who uses different masks throughout

the *Author, Author* diegesis. This metafictional narrator of this novel has many faces: a novelist, a professor of literature, a literary critic, and a scholar of James' works. These faces of the narrator draw attention to the narrative itself and challenge the reader .

In *Author, Author*, Henry decides to reread *Peter Ibbetson*, the first novel by Du Maurier. At the first contact with *Peter Ibbetson*, he considers it autobiographical and melodramatic. Through indirect speech, the narrator says that Henry did not consider the use of pseudo-autobiography as an adequate fictional form. For him, "An 'I' narrator might serve very well for a short story or tale, but in the long haul of the novel it was apt to encourage diffuseness and irrelevance" (Lodge 2004, 104). The narrator of *Author, Author* takes advantage of Du Maurier's artistic diversification to discuss some of the aspects of the art of fiction, dear to James, such as: the choice of point of view, the resistances to the autobiographical narrator, plots that depend on ideological debates, as in Mary Ward's narrative, plot inconsistency and the abrupt change of point of view. According to the narrator Henry as a novelist has "a firm faith in the superior expressiveness and verisimilitude of the limited point of view" and a belief that the novelist "should represent life as it was experienced in reality, by an individual consciousness" (Lodge 2004, 230). It is obvious that Lodge makes *Author, Author* a vehicle to express James' conceptions about the construction of point of view in fictional narrative. In his narratives, James internalizes action as what happens in the character's consciousness is worth more than what happens in the physical world; the character makes evaluations, imagines situations, considers choices and consequences of those .

Henry observes that the narrator of *Trilby*, Du Maurier's novel, acts in the opposite direction of what he considers acceptable in fiction: "the authorial narrator [...] took out his puppets from the box, and set them capering, and told you in his own confiding ruminative voice exactly what they were all thinking at any given moment" (Lodge 2004, 230). Here, Henry takes the opportunity to establish a parallel between the limited point of view, with expressiveness and verisimilitude and the point of view that changes course according to the winds without concern for logical coherence and intensity of effects. The narrator explores Henry's current of thoughts and his moments of introspection and self-evaluation, made metafictional reflections on narrative strategies used in fiction, and intermediates the dialogues, without making his authorial voice visible. Reflecting on his Guy Domville, Henry thinks that his story has "drastically limited point of view" with "other connected stories were in progress, other points of view were in play, at the same time, in parallel, in brackets as it were" (Lodge 2004, 231). The authorial voice enters the fictional world and faces the characters of the story in his role as an author. By being in the story, Lodge does not want to show the characters and events as real but wants to make himself into the story through comments and opinions. The metafictional author always penetrates his own fictional world with such verisimilitude as to deceive the reader that he is "fictional as any other character" obliterating the "barrier between [him] and the interior of his fictional world" (McHale 1987, 15).

## **6. Double way of Narration**

The narrator of the novel adopts a double way of narration. First, he narrates the actions of the people who have relation to Henry. Here, the narrator's opinions are presented in square brackets in the

The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David  
Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

narrative. So, this gives the reader the impression that everything that is reported by the narrator is really pending, since Henry was not there to check the reliability of his narration. Second, the narrator probes into Henry's mind to present his stream of consciousness. Henry's psychological state and his physical movements are reproduced by the narrator in a direct way, as if they happened at that moment, in the present of the narrative. As an example, the first way of narration is presented in brackets when Henry is not in the action: "[[A cheer went up as the doors to the gallery entrance were opened and the crowd surged forward. [...], hurrying to claim the best seats] (Lodge 2004, 235). When the narrator's gaze is on Henry, he narrates: "his own play, the action of which divided naturally into three acts, had had to be cut to the bone to avoid an over-long evening" (Lodge 2004, 234). Thus, there are two distinct narrative plans for the same narrator. Simultaneously, the narrator holds a camera on the people away from Henry and can reproduce the manifestations of interior monologue and to show the stream of consciousness movements, the psychological activities that mirror Henry's internal conflicts.

The novel, *Author, Author*, employs a dual narrative style, consisting of both a pictorial and a linear approach. The pictorial style is utilized when the narrator presents Henry's discourse, detached from its immediate reporting context. In this mode, the narrator aims to depict Henry's words with a visual quality, evoking a vivid and detached portrayal of his thoughts and expressions. On the other hand, the linear style is employed when the narrator reports the actions, evaluations, and statements of the individuals surrounding Henry. This style offers a more straightforward and chronological account of the interactions, providing a coherent and sequential narrative of the events and dialogues involving Henry and those around him. By employing these two distinct styles, the author effectively creates a layered and multifaceted storytelling approach, allowing for a nuanced exploration of Henry's inner world as well as the external dynamics that shape his experiences. For Volosinov, "The reported discourse and the reporting context are but the terms of a dynamic interrelationship" (Volosinov 1973, 119). There are two directions for this dynamic interrelationship. The first direction moves between reporting discourse and reported discourse rendering the linear style, whose function is to create clear contours around the reported discourse. This style displays "a complete stylistic homogeneity (in which the author and his characters all speak the same language)" (Volosinov 1973, 120). The second direction moves in the opposite direction to the first as a pictorial style in which "[the] reporting context strives to break down the self-contained compactness of the reported speech, to resolve it, to obliterate its boundaries" (Volosinov 1973, 120). The novel, *Author, Author*, adopts the pictorial style as there is an erasure of the boundaries between the narrator's discourse and the internalized discourse of the main character. He reduces the limits between the reported speech and the narrator's speech as in Henry's reflections on *An ideal husband*: "If *An Ideal Husband* was the kind of thing that pleased the contemporary West End audience, then Guy Domville [...] certainly wasn't". reflecting on Henry's psychological mood, the narrator reports: "he [Henry] had made himself almost ill with anxiety, it was only now that he really believed in the possibility of failure" (Lodge 2004, 253-254). The pictorial style comes to the foreground of the narrative when Henry's thoughts are involved. The disappearance of square brackets and the silence of the implied author draw the reader's attention to Henry's fears. The narrator penetrates Henry's

consciousness, converting his innermost thoughts into words, sometimes making his own assessment of the disastrous debut of *Guy Domville*: “His play was a failure – there was no evading that fact. [...] *Guy Domville* had been his last throw of the dice – ‘*le sort en est jeté*’ – and he had lost” (Lodge 2004, 263). However, the presence of the square brackets demonstrates the absence of Henry’s thoughts from the scene and the predominance of the linear style. George Bernard Shaw in a conversation with H. G. Wells assesses the influence Henry’s play, *Guy Domville*. The dialogue is presented in direct speech, with well-marked borders and between square brackets. Shaw points to the unfolding of the play’s failure: [‘The second act was hopeless [...] but the first act was charming. [...] Henry James uses words like a poet, even though it’s written as a prose’]. He goes on to say that the play is “‘flawed, it has its langueurs, it deals with a very narrow strip of human life. But it’s written by an artist!’]” (Lodge 2004, 261).

In the final part of the novel, Lodge’s authorial voice appears to draw the reader’s attention to Henry’s literary trajectory and his disappointments and failures. Although the examples of narrative self-awareness in *Author, Author* are not limited to the last pages, but are scattered throughout the novel, it is obvious that it is in the final section where they acquire a special prominence. Likewise, Lodge, true to his desire to reach a compromise between realism and experimentation and not to break the “illusion of life” that he has managed to create until now, introduces the authorial comments in italics so that the reader less versed in games and metafictional allusions do not feel lost and can adapt to the new narrative situation. The author’s first words clearly vindicate his conviction that he is the origin of his work: “*while for me, as I conjure up this deathbed scene, looking at it as through the curved transparency of a crystal ball, perhaps the most poignant fact about Henry James’s life is that*” (Lodge 2004, 373).

The authorial voice, in an essayistic tone, establishes an intertextual dialogue with essays written by James and other artists. The implied author makes the narrator unfold into two different faces. In third person, the narrator wears the face that forwards the narrative, using first-order discourse. In first person, the other face of the narrator appears in a clear authorial voice. This face reflects on the entire journey of Henry’s literary career. The narrator-author looked back Henry’s entire literary trajectory. Lodge inserts in italics a short essay in the text of the novel to draw attention of the reader to meta-narrativity and the authorial voice: “he [Henry] became convinced that the whole project had been a gigantic folly, which would ruin him financially and bury his reputation” (Lodge 2004, 373). Here, Lodge makes predictions about the future of Henry’s work after his death. He wants to rescue the contributions of James’ works to Western literature and not let Henry, a fictional character, die without the knowledge of this rescue: “It was essentially an act of revenge against the uncaring, unsympathetic literary world that had scorned or ignored his work” (Lodge 2004, 374). The point of view adopted by the implied author is self-reflective, metafictional and is capable of metamorphosing and unfolding both in two third-person narrators – both in the use of first-order speech, without losing sight of authorial intrusions and the use of free indirect speech – as in a third-person narrator and a second-person narrator acting in the first person as an essayist and literary critic. This shows the multi-faceted nature of the metafictional narrator. “Ironic allusions” and “re-contextualized quotations” proliferate in fictional texts “as part of previous discourses that any text obtains meaning and importance” (Hutcheon 1988, 126). These allusions and quotations involve intertextuality, which reinforces the metafictional nature of the novel and promotes the overlapping of

The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David  
Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

three discursive modalities: fiction, history and literary theory. The authorial voice invades the narrative foreground to discuss aspects of Jamesian fiction and to let the story tell itself. The particularities of the metafictional narrator of the novel enables him to discuss aspects of the art of fiction creating, through the essayistic tone, fiction leaning over fiction.

Lodge even fantasizes about the idea of “somehow time-travelling back” to cast “*a spell on the little group of weary watchers at the bedside, pulling up a chair oneself, and saying a few reassuring words to Hf, before he departs this world, about his literary future*” (Lodge 2004, 375). Although he admits that it is an absurd dream, since Henry is dying and, therefore, his brain is unable to hear or understand anything, what is interesting here is the reference to the power that every author has to create new and unexpected worlds with his imagination. It should also be noted how the presence of elements of narrative self-awareness is accompanied by the introduction of humor and jokes. The same example that we have just seen about the author's fantasy is a clear illustration. It is obvious that if he is the one who has written the text. He can manipulate the material as he pleases and ensure that it is not too late to whisper to the dying man. what the future holds for him. Another example is found when he explains that James's work has been the central theme of many doctoral theses, books and academic articles and adds: “*and of course biographies —but it wouldn't be tactful to mention them, or the fact that he “would be adopted by a branch of academic criticism known as *Queer Theory*, whose exponents claim, for instance, to find metaphors of anal fisting in the Prefaces to the New York Edition*” (Lodge 2004, 375). Henry James was a character who hated investigations into his personal life or that parallels were established between his work and his own experiences. Moreover, Lodge has used humor to subvert the way in which part of contemporary criticism places emphasis on the sexual aspect of the texts it analyzes, reaching conclusions that would make their authors turn in their graves. It is true that in the case of James there has always been a certain ambiguity regarding his sexual orientation, but it is evident that Lodge is satirizing here what he considers “nonsense” of a certain sector of criticism. Here, Lodge is playing the biggest joke on with his metafictional games. In *After Bakhtin* (1990), Lodge has explained that the absence of metafictional elements is applicable not only to James but to modernist authors in general, who in their search for impersonality and to reflect human consciousness as verisimilitude as possible, flee from authorial intrusions. According to him, the modernist writers pursue “impersonality and mimesis of consciousness” whereas postmodernists use metafictional devices that are “all-pervasive in postmodernist fiction” (Lodge 1990, 43). the metafictional section of the last pages of the novel is not limited to reviewing James's literary development. However, the author, taking advantage of the fact that we are witnessing the writer's last moments, analyzes a text by James titled “Is There Life After Death?” in which the question arises whether human consciousness becomes extinct or survives death.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to reflect on self-reflexivity, intertextuality and metafiction in Lodge's novel, *Author, Author*. This biographical novel encompasses narrative strategies that metafictionally and intertextually discuss the literary work itself and other literary works. Metafiction, self-reflexivity,

metanarrative and intertextuality are strategies that lay bare resources of fiction. Lodge covers a period of thirty-six years in the life and literary trajectory of the novelist, Henry James. The implied author, using disguises, creates a narrator who, although not part of the frame of the action, can be considered a character that functions as a center of consciousness. Through the narrator, Lodge mixes the novelistic text with the essayistic tone and historiographic intent. Throughout the narrative, an authorial voice manifests itself (sometimes in parentheses, sometimes in first person) within a text primarily in third person. This procedure generates a mixture of discourses that not only culminates with metafictional reflections but also makes the author visible in the narrative in a way that challenges the reader.

The hypothesis is that literary theory does not consider this model of metafictional narrator. Therefore, no intention exists for creating a delimiting boundary for this type of narration. This paper draws attention to this modality of metafictional voice that often aims at reflecting on the narrative itself. The essayistic, metafictional and self-reflexive aspects of the novel highlight formal elements that suggest a reflection on novelistic prose. Historiographic and documentary content brings up James' way of looking at the art of fiction and opens space for the authorial voice to make use of his historiographic and theoretical knowledge to reinvigorate James' perspectives. To achieve the effect of his invisible presence in the narrative, the narrator presents the plot in three ways: direct speech, indirect speech and free indirect speech. Although the narrator is there, his presence is barely visible. The narrator uses the stream-of-consciousness technique to delve deeply into what is happening in Henry's stream of thoughts, analyses, opinions and judgments. The narrator has two distinct faces, both in the third person. One face observes and reports about the people connected to Henry. The other follows Henry's stream of thoughts and brings to the foreground of the narrative metafictional reflections on art and literature.

**Funding:**

The authors extend their appreciation to the Arab Open University for funding this work through research fund No. (AOUKSA-524008)

غابة السرد الشارح: الرواية والتاريخ والنظرية في رواية ديفيد لودج (مؤلف، مؤلف (2004))

وائل مصطفى

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة الفيوم، مصر

سامح جليل

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الدراسات اللغوية، الجامعة العربية المفتوحة، المملكة العربية السعودية

الملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في قضايا السرد الشارح، والتناص، وتعدد الرؤى، التي حدت على أنها خصائص أساسية للرواية المعاصرة؛ ففي رواية لودج عن سيرته الذاتية، "مؤلف، مؤلف"، تتضافر تلك الاستراتيجيات السردية، وتتشابك لإظهار الرواية، والتاريخ، والنظرية في حالة لعب سردي، مما مكن لودج من تقديم شخصية راوي ذات طبيعة متعددة الأوجه؛ فصوت المؤلف يبرز تارة لتوجيه القارئ خلال السرد؛ وتارة أخرى، يمتزج صوت المؤلف مع صوت البطل، مما يطمس حدود السرد لإظهار تيار وعي البطل؛ ومن ثم، فإن الرواية تقدم تحليلاً تاريخياً، سردياً شارحاً، لتحول هنري جيمس بعيداً عن الكتابة الروائية نحو الكتابة المسرحية؛ لذلك استطاع لودج أن ينسج التاريخ، والنظرية الأدبية، والرواية في نسيج واحد، من خلال السرد الشارح، والتأمل الذاتي، والتناص، لجذب انتباه القارئ إلى السرد ذاته.

الكلمات المفتاحية: هنري جيمس، التناص، رواية لودج "مؤلف، مؤلف"، رواية السرد الشارح.

## References

- Bentley, Nicholas. 2008. *Contemporary British Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Booth, Wayne C. 1983. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Compagnon, Antoine. 2004. *The Daemon of Theory: Literature and Common Sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dimuro, Joseph. 2018. *Gale Researcher Guide for: Henry James and Psychological Realism*. Gale: A Cengage Company.
- Eco, Umberto. 1994. *Six Walks in the Fictional Woods*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1979. *The Role of the Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Guignery, Vanessa. 2007. "David Lodge's Author, Author and the Genre of the Biographical Novel." *Études Anglaises*, no. 60 (February): 160–72. <https://doi.org/10.3917/etan.602.0160>.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 1988. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 1980. *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- James, David. 2012. *Modernist Futures: Innovation and Inheritance in the Contemporary Novel*. New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora and Alice Jardine. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lejeune, Philippe. 1989. *On Autobiography*. Translated by Katherine John Leary. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota P.
- Lodge, David. 2014. *Lives in Writing: Essays*. London: Harvill Secker.
- Lodge, David. 2004. *Author, Author*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Lodge, David. 1990. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge.
- Lodge, David. 1978. "The State of Fiction: A Symposium." *New Review*, no. 1: 49–50.
- Lodge, David. 1977. *The Modes of Modern Writing. Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*. London: Edward Arnold.
- McHale, Brian. 1987. *Postmodernist Fiction*. New York.: Methuen.
- Morrison, Jago. 2003. *Contemporary Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Perkin, Russell. 2010. "Imagining Henry: Henry James as a Fictional Character in Colm Tóibín's *The Master* and David Lodge's *Author, Author*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, Volume 33 number 2: 114–30.
- Scherzinger, Karen. 2008. "Staging Henry James: Representing the Author in Colm Tóibín's *The Master* and David Lodge's *Author, Author! A Novel*." *Henry James Review*, volume 29, number. 2: 181–96.
- Southgate, Beverley C. 2009. *History Meets Fiction*. London: Taylor & Francis Group / Books.
- Vološinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Waugh, Patricia. 1984. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

The Jungle of Metafictional Narrative: Fiction, History, and Theory in David  
Lodge's *Author, Author* (2004)

Zeidner, Lisa. 2021. *Who Says?: Mastering Point of View in Fiction*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.