CHAPTER 3

METAFOCTIONAL PLAY, PARODY AND INTERTEXTUALITY

i. “And as for coincidences in books, there's something cheap and sentimental about the device . . .
   the sudden but convenient Dickensian benefactors;
   the neat shipwreck on a foreign shore which reunites siblings and lovers. . . .
   I'd ban coincidences, if I were a dictator of fiction.”

   “When the writer provides two different endings to his novel (why two? why not a hundred?), does the reader seriously imagine . . .
   that the work is reflecting life's variable outcomes? . . .
   The novel with two endings doesn't reproduce . . . reality; it merely takes us down two diverging paths.”

   (Julian Barnes Flaubert's Parrot 67; 89)

Malcolm Bradbury, British critic and novelist, in his Introduction to Animal Farm: A Fairy Story, states: “We live in an age in which fiction has conspicuously grown more provisional, more anxious, more self-questioning, than it was a few years ago” (5-6).

Postmodern novelists deliberately and methodically developed the referential character of the novel and used the nonfictional modes of reportage, documentary, and journalism. In an international scale and even in England, at roughly the same rhythm, developments such as emphasis upon the dimensionality of characters, flattening of plot by parodying popular forms, and inventing of new forms of narration appeared in fictional world.
Bradbury in his *Newwriting* lists some British writers like Julian Barnes as a new generation of British writers "who no longer feel bound to realism, and who freely explore surrealism, fantasy, and metafictional play" (6). Arguably, the word "realism" in Bradbury's definition alludes to narrative and rhetorical conventions which came to dominate British fiction from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century and which, after being deprived of significance and power by the modernist aestheticism of the 1910s and 20s, reappeared in the novels of George Orwell, Christopher Isherwood, and Evelyn Waugh, and then again, nearly a generation later, in the prose fiction of Philip Larkin, Kingsley Amis, and John Wain (Sesto 1).

In spite of individual variations in technique, one principal consensus among all realist writers is that language is a transparent medium of representation. To these writers "reality" owes its existence to a special capacity of language which is faithfully transcribed in fiction. As David Lodge states, "realism" indicates not only "mimetic representation of experience," but also to the "organization of narrative according to logic of causality and temporal sequence" (*Newwriting* 205). However, according to Lodge, the structuralists and its "descendants" regard realism as "an art of bad faith because it seeks to disguise or deny its own conventionality" (*After Bakhtin* 13). By using an array of metafictional narrative conventions, namely authorial instruction, framing structure, and intertextual parody, Julian Barnes and his contemporary writers challenge the realist conventions in order to expose the fictionality of literary representation. This is not to argue that postmodern metafictional texts reject the "real world", rather they differently define and formulate that world by first installing and then abolishing the conventions of literary realism. Lodge argues, "it would be false to oppose metafiction to realism; rather metafiction makes explicit the implicit problematic of realism" (*After Bakhtin* 19).
Novels such as Peter Ackroyd's *Hawksmoor*, Charles Palliser' *The Quincunx*, Julian Barnes's *Flaubert's Parrot* and *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* and other popular recent novels had already been perceived in Linda Hutcheon's *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, where she used the by now well-known phrase of "historiographic metafiction" (5) for the first time, for their enhanced self-conscious narrative: "Novels which are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay claim to historical events and personages" (Hutcheon 5).

Contemporary metafictional writers distinguish themselves from novelists of other schools of thought such as materialist, positivists and realist by counting forms of history and truth as a series of constructions, artifices, and impermanent structures rather than a world of eternal verities. Waugh in her *Metafiction*, raises the same issue:

The materialist, positivist and empiricist world-view on which realistic fiction is premised no longer exists. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that more and more novelists have come to question and reject the forms that correspond to this ordered reality, the well-made plot, chronological sequence, the authoritative omniscient author, the rational connection between what characters ‘do’ and what they ‘are’, the causal connection between ‘surface’ details and the ‘deep’, ‘scientific laws’ of existence. (7)

Metafiction helps the writers to break the conventional frames of novel writing to lay bare the procedures of constructing the reality and novels. The same happens in Lyotard's process of rejecting metanarratives in which breaking the conventions was for releasing more details and getting more close to the truth.
Metafiction in Barnes’s Fiction

Julian Barnes in his fiction deals with this very postmodern aspect. It is through *Flaubert's Parrot* that Barnes dives into postmodernism and he brushes aside his earlier forms. The novel earns its metafictioanl aspects from successful use of literary devices that draw the attention of the readers to its fictionality. Metafiction is well-informed about its existence as a work of art. Considering such self-awareness in an art-form is expressing a frequent puzzling knowledge of its own artificiality. In the case of metafiction, a work of art such as fiction is not only created and observed by the author, but also it is co-created through its reception by the reader. Linda Hutcheon indicates this sentiment when she expresses:

> Reading and writing belong to the processes of “life” as much as they do to those of “art.” It is this realization that constitutes one side of the paradox of metafiction for the reader. On one hand, he is forced to acknowledge the artifice, the “art,” of what he is reading; on the other, explicit demands are made upon him, as a co-creator, for intellectual and affective responses comparable in scope and intensity to those of his life experience. (*The Politics of Postmodernism* 5)

The metafiction by illusion enters into a perpetual creation process wherein, the readers are invited to co-create. The creator and co-creator’s, or author and reader’s, dialogue together results in exposing the text of its meaning. Mark Currie states: "Above all, metafiction is committed to the idea of constructed meanings rather than representable essences" (15).

Likewise Holmes points out, "One such metafictional tactic is to turn the reader into a character in the novel, who crosses the English Channel with Geoffrey in
one chapter and in another accompanies Louise Colet on a walk while she tells her story” (79). The technique of addressing the reader is to urge them to trace their quest for greater self-awareness:

I thought of writing books myself once. I had the ideas; I even made notes. But I was a doctor, married with children. You can only do one thing well: Flaubert knew that. Being a doctor was what I did well. My wife . . . died. My children are scattered now; they write whenever guilt impels. They have their own lives, naturally. ‘Life! Life! To have erections!’ (Parrot 8-9)

Barnes infringes metanarratives of novel-writing and crosses the limits of narrative technical frames wherever he finds it necessary. By deeply reading the theme, format and narrations of Barnes's novels, one might simply get to know that philosophical, social, historical and cultural facts are much important to him. He breaks the limits of narratives of novel-writing in order to be heard and seen by the readers and the addressees. Barnes, on one hand, depicts a society wherein the metanarratives are no longer valid and believable and on the other hand, utilizes the same method of ignoring metanarratives in the way of writing novel. Ignoring frames in his novels, later, becomes the core of discussions among the critics: whether to call some of his literary works as novel or not. Though he emphasizes upon considering them as novels, critics have difficulty in categorizing his works as novels.

The documentary aspects in Flaubert's Parrot, the collection of short stories in A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters, the fragmentary plot in Arthur & George and The Sense of an Ending and the theatrical mode of narrative in Talking It Over and Love, etc are a few examples of devaluing frames as a linchpin in his fiction.
However, one of the central occupations of contemporary criticism is still the debate over precisely where the modernist and postmodernist "traditions" diverge. To many critics such as Robert Alter, Brain McHale, and Allan Wilde, it is postmodernist fiction's overtly self-conscious description of the "ontological" aspects of literary representation that crucially separates it from modernist fiction. Robert Stam eliminates the nature of this problem in his *Reflexivity in Film and Literature*:

> All art has been nourished by the perennial tension between illusionism and reflexivity. All artistic representation can pass itself off as 'reality' or straightforwardly admit its status as representation. Illusionism pretends to be something more than mere artistic production; it presents its characters as real people, its sequences of words or images as real time, and its representation as substantiated fact. Reflexivity, on the other hand, points to its own mask and invites the public to examine its design and texture. Reflexive works break with art as enchantment and call attention to their own fictitiousness as textual constructs. (1)

Stam further acknowledges that

> While illusionist art strives for an impression of spatio-temporal coherence, anti-illusionist art calls attention to the gaps and holes and seams in the narrative tissue. To the suave continuities of illusionism, it opposes the shocks of rupture and discontinuity. (7)

Barnes in *Flaubert's Parrot* introduces the literal self-reflectivity and self-consciousness by means of either narration or utilizing real historical figures. The state of self-consciousness pervades the novel; however, its impact varies through the
novel. Braithwaite is completely aware of the border between reality and fiction, yet he believes that sometimes reality mingles with fiction to make itself more acceptable. Unquestionably, metafiction, the most dominant form of postmodern fiction, reveals the fact that what the readers accept as real in the novel has simply been made up. This is exactly what Braithwaite mentions:

I have to hypothesise a little. I have to fictionalise (though that’s not what I meant when I called this a pure story). We never talked about her secret life. So I have to invent my way to the truth. Ellen was about fifty when the mood began to come upon her. . . . A maxim upon maxims. Truths about writing can be framed before you’ve published a word; truths about life can be framed only when it’s too late to make any difference. (142; 148)

Braithwaite argues that even for implying reality and truth, authors employ different language and words, what he calls as “Style”. Thus, transferring the truth or any fact might differ from one to another. He continues that while some authors suffer greatly to choose the right word and correct phrases for implying whatever they truly mean in a perfect sentence, others have no particular concern in selecting words:

Flaubert is different. He believed in style; more than anyone. He worked doggedly for beauty, sonority, exactness; perfection - but never the monogrammed perfection of a writer like Wilde. Style is a function of theme. Style is not imposed on subject-matter, but arises from it. Style is truth to thought. The correct word, the true phrase, the perfect sentence are always ‘out there’ somewhere; the writer’s task is to locate them by whatever means he can. For some this means no more
than a trip to the supermarket and a loading-up of the metal basket; for others it means being lost on a plain in Greece, in the dark, in snow, in the rain, and finding what you seek only by some rare trick such as barking like a dog. (Parrot 75)

Whereas authorial intrusion as a technique was not utilized by modernists for preserving impersonal texts, postmodern writers frequently include themselves in text to reveal ontological "seams" and by that means expose the "constructedness" of fictional world. David Lodge argues that what mostly distinguishes postmodernist from modernist fiction is the author's preference to diegesis over mimesis, rather than authorial intrusion. To Lodge, postmodernist narrative device as a phenomenon has never been found as widely as it is now. So he considers authorial intrusion as paradoxical in light of postmodernist assault on the "author" via Barthes and Foucault:

The foregrounding of the act of authorship within the boundaries of the text which is such a common feature of contemporary fiction is a defensive response, either conscious or intuitive, to the questioning of the idea of the author and of mimetic function of fiction by modern critical author. (After Bakhtin 19)

In the same spirit, Robert Alter in his Partial Magic views modernist novel as artful and postmodernist novel as the novel that calls into attention its own artifice:

I should like to make clear that a self-conscious novel, where the artifice is deliberately exposed, is by no means identical with an elaborately artful novel, where the artifice may perhaps be prominent. The first person narrators, for example, of Conrad's Lord Jim and Ford Madox Ford's The Good Soldier, on some level make us aware of the
intricate artifice of their narrations as they circle round and round the same central events, gradually divulged more and more information, leading us to experience through the narrative pattern itself the complexity and elusiveness of morally judging people and their actions. Nevertheless, in both those novels the conspicuous elaboration of narrative artifice is performed in the service of a moral and psychological realism, operating even in its occasional improbability as a technique of verisimilitude, not as a testing ground of the ontological status of the fiction. Conrad and Ford give us the world through a labyrinthine narrative because that seems to them the most faithful way of representing a labyrinthine world. (Xiii)

By contrast, Alter asserts, a self-conscious novel is one in which "there is a consistent effort to convey to us a sense of the fictional world as an authorial construct set up against a background of literary tradition and convention (xi). Brain McHale in his book, Postmodernist Fiction, develops an implicit thesis in Alter's statement. McHale views the modernist poetic in employing linguistic and narrative resources in following epistemological verification.

The impact of frame-breaking in Barnes’s novels results in the emergence of another “fundamental and sustained opposition” which belongs to metafictional novels (Waugh 6). This is exactly what Waugh notes:

[...] the construction of a fictional illusion (as in traditional realism) and the laying bare of that illusion. In other words, the lowest common denominator of metafiction is simultaneously to create a fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction. The two processes
are held together in a formal tension which breaks down the distinctions between ‘creation’ and ‘criticism’ and merges them into the concepts of ‘interpretation’ and ‘deconstruction’. (6)

Given that the ‘crisis’ of emergence of oppositional process stems from uncertainty, insecurity, self-question and cultural plurality of postmodern world, contemporary fiction echoes this dissatisfaction with breakdown of conventional and traditional values. Unlike realism in nineteenth-century, in which fiction arose from "a firm belief in a commonly experienced, objectively existing world of history", metafiction reflects the loss of belief in such a world (Waugh 8). Such breaking down in both traditional beliefs and frame is represented in Barnes's novels several times.

Another known form of narration in novels, which is employed in most of Barnes fiction, is crossing the borders of three demarcations past / present narrative, first person / third person narrative and historical / fictional discipline, to endure a very unpleasant and prolonged experience of settling in the land of metafiction. Bruce Sesto compares Barnes's use of narrative techniques in A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters with James Joyce’s Dubliners: “Like James Joyce’s Dubliners, Barnes's A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters makes use of variety of styles and narrative forms” (68). The diversity of narrative forms and styles culminates in the fourth chapter entitled "The Survivor". The story unfolds inside the dreaming mind of the main character, Kathleen Ferris, who steals her boyfriend’s (Greg’s) boat and accompanied by two cats, Paul and Linda, sets out to sea. With the illusion of escaping from a nuclear war, which happens somewhere in the Northern Hemisphere, she escapes sand and spends several days at sea.
Then she beaches-up on a deserted island, where soon after landing, she falls asleep and continues her voyage in her dream. However, her dreams also disclose some details and facts from her life, such as her beliefs, her relationship with Greg, her fears and finally an incident which supposes her incarnation in a psychiatric hospital, which is repeatedly explained as a nightmare. The narrative voice confuses the readers by alternatively using first and third person points-of-view. This shift in narrative form rightly depicts the mental problem of the main character, however, it puts the readers in the difficulty of determining which of the events recounted in Kathleen’s dream actually happened to her and which are merely ‘fiction’ within that dream. In a scene in the hospital, the doctors inform Kathleen that she suffers from an illness called persistent victim syndrome, and also they reveal the fact that unlike her imagination of reaching an island, she was rescued some miles away. This creates more doubts on the authenticity of all the incidents in the story. Moreover, she denies being abused by Greg because she is victimized by the enormous emotional investment in her relationships with men.

Furthermore, her fear of nuclear turns to be sheer fabulation as it stems from no reasonable basis. Kathleen is informed that she “make[s] up a story to cover the facts [she doesn't] know or can't accept. [She] keeps a few true facts and spins a new story round them” (272). This statement raises the story to a metafictional level to the extent that fabulation becomes a metaphor for what Barnes is doing in his novel: keeping a few true facts and spinning a new story around them. Kathleen appears to be aware that she is dreaming and she is wrestling with her own mind, however the end of the chapter suggests that Kathleen’s hospitalization is another fiction and a dream within a dream: “The next day, on a small island . . . Kath Ferris woke up to find that Linda had given birth” (265).
Two major modes of presenting in metafictional novels, 'showing' and 'telling', are employed in Barnes's fiction numerously. As Waugh comments, “while modernism pursued impersonality (‘showing’), such contemporary metafictional texts pursue personality, the ironic flaunting of the Teller” (131). In other words, unlike modernist novels, postmodern metafictional novels uncover the "degrees of telling" to indicate the authorial presence in relation to story (qtd in Waugh 131). Although the real author rarely steps into the fictional world, the narrator claims that he is Barnes, in the only unnumbered chapter in *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters*.

Metafictional authors cross the ontological divide. Instead of bringing the 'fictional' and the 'real' into equal participation as they are in traditional omniscient narrative, the author separates them by commenting on the "construction" of the story (narrative) rather than on the "context" of the story (Waugh 131). The narrator in *Flaubert's Parrot* confesses, “you see how easy it is to write, how much fun it is? That’s why I’d ban the genre” (100). This statement by Braithwaite is contrary to what the whole novel implies, which is, the difficulty of writing about Braithwaite’s own life and his wife. Moreover, Braithwaite says of Flaubert’s writing:

The control of tone is vital. Imagine the technical difficulty of writing a story in which a badly-stuffed bird with a ridiculous name ends up standing in for one third of the Trinity, and in which the intention is neither satirical, sentimental, nor blasphemous. Imagine further telling such a story from the point of view of an ignorant old woman without making it sound derogatory or coy. But then the aim of *Un Coeur Simple* is quite elsewhere: the parrot is a perfect and controlled example of the Flaubertian grotesque. (12)
Shifting from one mode (telling) to the other (showing) in Barnes's fiction happens abruptly, thus the readers are aware of it. Even directly addressing the readers in the novels helps to emphasize more on this shift.

In *Talking It Over*, which is the life story of three people living in their thirties in London, and its sequel *Love, etc* each narrator separately narrates the story from their perspectives. Stuart and Oliver were close friends since high school and their friendship was intimate and strong. Their relationship continues with no serious problem for about fifteen years until Stuart meets Gillian, the third character, and marries her. On the day of their wedding, Oliver finds out that he is already in love with Gillian and the triangle love relationship begins. In the rest of the novel, Oliver regardless of the consequence of his deeds on his close friends, attempts to win away Gillian from Stuart and marries her. At the end of the novel, Stuart, who loses Gillian, leaves for America and Oliver and Gillian move to France to live a new life and have a daughter. Thus, the reader is retold the events of the novel from at least three perspectives, and the reader apparently gets close to the truth by hearing each story.

The layers embedded in the process of their narrations in metafictional novels, distinguishes them from other types of novels. Barnes in *Flaubert's Parrot, A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters, Arthur & George*, and *The Porcupine*, achieves to embed the various levels of stories in the novels. In *Flaubert's Parrot*, Braithwaite says, "Three stories contend within me. One about Flaubert, one about Ellen, one about myself. My own is the simplest of the three…" 73). Yet the fourth story is the story of the Flaubert's parrot which is one level higher than the rest, since the readers are conscious that it was written by the main author, Barnes. Braithwaite openly informs the readers that he aims to write Flaubert's biography. However, as the novel
unfolds, it is revealed that he chooses Flaubert's life because he finds it close enough to his own. By narrating it, he becomes capable of recounting his own life.

In *Flaubert's Parrot*, Braithwaite uses Flaubert's writing to find out his secret and Flaubert's life to make sense of his own life. Sesto observes in his book: "*Flaubert's Parrot* is a book which thematizes the relation of fiction to historiography, Barnes takes his place in the ongoing debate between poststructuralist linguistics and traditional "realist" theory of language" (31). The narration of the novel is very close to postmodern narrative technique with alternation of first and third person points of view, addressing the readers directly in some parts of story, and more important, using metafictional elements to assume a variety of forms as a narrative strategy.

*Flaubert's Parrot* is also a story of a person who is lost in the world of parroted truths and small life-narratives where he is unable to make a whole of their meanings. Geoffrey Braithwaite lacks the skill of either giving up or being inspired by a belief in the existence of truth that makes his life truly meaningful. The ontological gap between fiction and reality widens in both novel and the life of the protagonist, Braithwaite, by utilizing tools, which uncover the text's structural artifice. The novel employs multiple narrative entries and non-narrative kinds of prose discourse which do not bear any discernible relation to each other. Bruce Sesto describes it as “an encyclopaedic collection of disparate fragments, relics, anecdotal bric-a-brac which resist coherent integration” in order to defamiliarize the standard delight of reality by portraying its artifice and to catch the reader “between the poles of true and not true” (Sesto 43; Scott 64).

The reason of writing the novel according to the protagonist is preparing a reliable biography of Flaubert, yet as the story unfolds, Braithwaite's supplementary
life story and relationship with his late wife Ellen reveals that he has a problem with encountering the reality of his wife's unfaithfulness or his attempts to know more about the reality of his own life than Flaubert's. This matter makes Flaubert's Parrot a combination of at least four stories which all run along together in one novel. The story of Flaubert's personal life, the story of Braithwaite's life, the story of Madam Bovary, and the most wide-ranging account of the search for Flaubert’s parrots all together form the whole framework of the novel. Braithwaite by referring to Flaubert's affair with Louis Colet, attempts to imply that Flaubert's relationship was projected onto his major and significant literary work, Madam Bovary. Thus, basically what tempted him to write the story could be his own inner need of finding the truth about his own life which he does through parroting Flaubert.

In chapter four of A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters, “The Survivor,” Barnes like in many postmodern fictional narratives employs the Chinese-box structuring of a dream within a dream within a fiction. As explained earlier, the story is recounted by a woman who appears to be in mental disorder. Barnes's use of alternating first and third person points-of-view enables him to achieve both “an extraordinary juxtaposition of dreams and reality, and exposition of the different ontological levels of fictional elements” (Sesto 70). This alteration of narrative voices provides different angles of vision, from different directions. They frequently meet at the same action, which makes it difficult to distinguish between the two main narratives: Kathleen's and the third-person’s narrative.

In the same novel, the chapter "Upstream" presents a series of letters written by Charlie, a British TV and movie star. Charlie, in letters to his girlfriend in London, portrays what happens in a remote area in the jungles of South Africa, where a film is
being shot about two Catholic missionaries who baptized the Indians inhabited there some two or three hundred years earlier: Father Firmin, whose role is played by Charlie, is opposed to baptizing the natives and Father Antonio (Matt) favours converting (more elaboration about “Upstream” will be represented later in this chapter).

"Upstream" like “The Survivor” features a Chinese-box structure, in which a fictitious series of letters is used to give an account of making of a fictitious film. On the other hand, the film is based upon a story whose history and figures are as fictitious as that of the actors who portray them in the film. The readers might find themselves lost in the levels of narrative wherein all the accounts are fictitious unlike their previous perception that the film is originated in the real historical incident. Thus, Barnes's choice of cinema and epistolary frame allows him to thematize the conflict between illusion and reality, which will be elaborated later.

Barnes's other novel, The Porcupine, through rather traditional style and narrative form, illustrates numerous significant tendencies of postmodernist fiction. The Porcupine follows postmodern fictional narrative style in employing levels in the story which leads to metafiction. On one level, we are gradually becoming aware of the political status of the country through the nationally televised trial, which includes not only the interior monologue or soliloquies of the two main characters, but also the occasional eradication of spatial distances. On the other level, the group of characters, Vera, Atanas, Dimiter and Stefan, are portrayed watching the TV trial, which eventually led to the downfall of Petkanov's government and meanwhile they add their opinion: "Their observation, which Barnes strategically intersperses between Petkanov's courtroom statements, function as a kind of chorus" (Sesto 117). Both
levels of narrative in the novel are subsets of another higher level which is a fictional account written by the author, Barnes. The novel’s seeming "journalistic" verisimilitude is occasionally lessened by effects which call to attention the text's artificiality or fictiveness (Sesto 123). As the story tells, what Petkanov states during his hearing is interpreted by the four young people who are not present in the courtroom, but in their own apartments.

Another device which draws attention towards the novel's fictiveness is the use of historical figures. For instance, in one of the soliloquies at the beginning of the novel by Petkanov, he strongly criticizes Russian Mikhail Gorbachev for associating with American capitalists and their culture-idols.

[...] And you, Gorbachev! You treacherous bastard! You sold an entire nation, the sixteen million citizens of the DDR, for forty-one billion German marks. The biggest slave auction in history! Like pigs at the fucking market! Your thirty pieces of silver for Socialism! And, for what!? For fucking Disneyland! (Porcupine 31)

Almost at the end of his trial, Petkanov reads selected statements by various heads of state about his outstanding qualifications and his political achievements as a leader. The list includes Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Presidents Nixon and Carter, King Juan Carlos of Spain, and Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

Barnes's use of real-world figures like Gorbachev, Sinatra, and Yeltsin on one hand authenticates the historical context of his novel, and on the other hand, foregrounds the ontological boundaries between fiction and reality. In an essay entitled “Shouts and Murmurs: Stranger than Fiction,” which was written in 1992, Barnes lays bare his awareness of the reality/fiction ontology, by intimidating that his
character, Stoyo Petkanov, is partly based upon Bulgaria's Todor Zhivkov. Barnes admitted to have been inspired by the former Bulgaria's communist leader's imprisonment and the outline of his trial. He questions Bulgaria's reaction towards the book: "They think I had imaginatively transformed their recent history or pillaged and perverted it? Would day even view the book as a novel, rather than just a history à clef?" (140). In the same essay he notes, "There are certainly problems over the democratic line between fiction and reality. Some complained that my dictator was more intelligent than they had been; others wanted to correct what they saw as factual errors" (140). According to Brain McHale, the intrusion of real-world figures into fictional texts has the scent of scandal about it. And what, exactly, is the source of the scandal? Ultimately, its source is ontological: boundaries between worlds have been violated. There is an ontological scandal when a real world figure is inserted in a fictional situation, where he interacts with purely fictional characters. (85)

Besides, contemporary historical fictionists unlike their predecessors often use what McHale calls 'transworld' figures in order to achieve parodic or satirical effects. In one scene, to mock Bakhtin's notion of 'Carnival', Petkanov's blanket which is his only property is sold off to bidders such as Saddam Hussein, Geothermal Bush, Mahatma Gandhi, Josef Stalin, and "several claimants of both sexes purporting to be Stoyo Ptkanov's secret lover" (Sesto 128). Furthermore, the relationship between Petkanov and Gorbachev occupies most of the intersection of the fictional and the historical in the novel. Petkanov calls Gorbachev "Bastard," "weak fool," and says "a
bird had shat in his head” in kremlin, for his betraying communism and for rejecting Petkanov’s suggestion of union between two countries (Sesto 126).

Barnes’s primary interest in employing historical figures and incidents in *Flaubert's Parrot, A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters, Arthur & George*, and *The Porcupine* results in his achievement of a kind of conventional documentary verisimilitude mostly used in historical fictions. This aspect in Barnes’s fiction, on the other hand, makes possible for him to achieve the kind of postmodernist historical fictions, in which different ontological dimensions help thematize the relationship between fiction and reality. For instance, in *The Porcupine*, Barnes insists upon simultaneously engaging both historical reality and the novel's status as a work of fiction. This is what Andreas Huyssen, in his *After the Great Divine*, considers central to the postmodernist literary experience. Huyssen argues that in postmodernism the dead-end dichotomy of politics and aesthetics should be abandoned. He adds that the point is not to eliminate the productive tension between the political and aesthetic, between history and the text, between engagement and the mission of art, but it is in heightening the tension and in rediscovering it and bringing it back into the arts as well as criticism (221).

The very metafictional technique of blurring the boundary between the scientific facts and fictitious world is one of Barnes's interest. He employs this technique even in those novels which are categorized as his traditional novels. In his *Before She Met Me*, he portrays an academic historian who encounters a problem in separating his wife's screen persona from her 'real' life. Graham is completely obsessed with his wife's sexual history from her film performances. His lunatic jealousy of the male actors with whom his wife, Ann, has made love on the screen
reaches to that point that he suspects a long-time friend of his, Jack Lupton, who is a popular author of pulp fiction. He sustains his jealousy with frequent viewings of Ann's love scenes at both local and not so local movie theatres. Graham utilizes all the tools of his trade like books, maps and films, in his investigation into Ann's past. He employs whatever provides him with information to extrapolate his wife's past romances. Retrospective jealousy in Graham leads to conceive two categories of male actors; those who have slept with Ann only on screen and those who have slept with her either on or off screen. Moreover, with the help of atlases and maps, he draws out a whole geography of his wife's sexual liaisons. However, he ends up with accusing their close friend, Jack, to have had sexual relationships with her and to have depicted them in his novels.

Graham's inability to separate fiction from reality, although he is an academic historian, appears to be odd. The real contradiction of having a historian as a central character, who estimates and concludes upon fiction rather than fact, embodies the contemporary novel's concern with the problematical relationship between fiction, fact and historiography. Barnes's main characters Graham, Ann and Jack fail in their fictionalizing real and history. Graham is misled about Ann’s earlier life by his fiction-based jealousy. Jack fails in reconstructing reality in his fiction and Ann fails in informing Graham about her love affairs with Jack.

Furthermore, it is Barnes's narrative device that involves transgressing the boundary between a fictional world and the real, it reincarnates in Graham, whose "'metaleptical' blurring of his wife's 'film' and 'real life'' highlights in the novel (Sesto 27). In Before She Met Me, as the boundaries between fiction and real shift in Graham's mind, illusion forms an essential element of his reality by degrees. Thus, he
assumes his wife's screen image to occupy a dominant role in his emotional and perceptual experience. In a short time his wife's and her male partners' sexual promiscuity takes shape in his imagination where it becomes a battlefield of film images and reality:

The carwash dream was compared by Larry Pitter, with whom Ann committed adultery in The Rumpus, a street-gang movie Graham had managed to catch twice in the last week. [In the dream] Pitter sat behind his desk smoking. . . . The door opened and three men walked in. Each in his different way struck Graham as dirty and malign. . . .

[pitter:] 'Now stop me if I'm boring you, Graham, but you see, what she really liked wasn't just me. It was all of us. . . . I know that these things can be hurtful; I'll just leave you to imagine it. But the first time she got us all to do things to her, . . . she said it was like being in a carwash. So we called her the Carwash Girl. . . . I mean, she made it quite plain that it was the more the merrier as far as she was concerned. And how would any husband cope with that, we wondered. Unless, of course, there's more to you than meets the eye.' Pitter grinned. (88-89)

Graham's investigation into Ann's past ends in his discovery of her affair with Jack. His initial suspension about their love affairs leads him to spend a day on skimming through Ann's collection of Jack's novels, in search of a clue to confirm his suspicions. Needless to say, he finds them. Jack's weakly disguised affairs with Ann in his novels are soon discovered by Graham. This discovery pushes Graham over the edge to take maniac revenge by stabbing Jack to death and then turn the knife on himself.
Barnes, in the eighth chapter of *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* entitled "Upstream", again gets back to the theme of blurring borders between reality and fiction. The story is about filming a historical incident that has happened two or three hundred years ago in a remote area. Some of the actors are from London and others are natives who have been hired as 'extras' to play essentially the same roles as their ancestors did. The main problem of the process is raised when the film’s crew find themselves incapable of educating the 'extras' to distinguish between the actual 'historical' missionaries from the actors who impersonate the missionaries on film: "Unable to comprehend the concept of 'acting,' the Indians, whose job it is to paddle the 'priests' upstream just as their real-life ancestors had done two or three centuries before fail to differentiate between the 'real' missionaries and the actors who are playing those roles in front of the camera" (Sesto 101). To the natives, Charlie and Matt, who play the role of the missionaries and dress like them, are not actors but the actual missionaries themselves:

Here's funny thing. . . I mean sure they're acting their ancestors and they're quite willing. . . to build us a raft and transport us upstream on it and be filmed doing this. But they won't be anything else. . . Absolutely refuse. This is how we pole a raft and just because a white man is watching through his funny machine we aren't going to do it differently. . . They actually think that when Matt and I are dressed up as Jesuits we actually are Jesuits! . . . The crew think this is pretty stupid of them but I wonder if it isn't fanatically mature. The crew think they're such a primitive civilization that they haven't discovered acting yet. (*A History* 355)
As the film reaches its climactic scene, the historical capsizing of the raft, Charlie feels that fiction is beginning to intrude on reality. The relationship between fiction and reality is given further ironical edge in the film. Indians are unable to realize that it is all an illusion. Therefore, in the final shooting of the scene, instead of twelve, only two Indians are poling the raft and before they know it, the raft is breaking loose into the rapids and going over. Charlie, with great difficulty, manages to swim to the shore, but Matt disappears: "it wasn't like that. That sort of thing is strictly for the movies. Matt was gone. . ." (215). Matt's death, as the death of Father Antonio in the historical account, results in the movie version of the accident ironically copying the historical capsizing. Later the crew and Charlie realize that the safety rope, which was supposed to be fastened to the tree, is gone as well. These, together with the sudden disappearance of the natives with the supplies, clear all the suspicions and convince the crew that the natives had schemed to rob the crew right from the beginning.

Bruce Sesto in *Language, History and Metanarrative in the Fiction of Julian Barnes* mentions metafiction as “self-destruct mechanism, setting in opposition those linguistic and narrative elements which 'construct' illusions of reality, in the manner of classic 19th century realist fiction, and those which 'deconstruct' them” (37-38).

According to Sesto Metafiction is a literary device which is based upon a diversity of techniques, among which he lists; intertextuality, literary criticism, metaleptical intrusions, author/narrator, use of 'real people' in the text and parody. Later, by emphasizing upon the employing real people and real places in the *Flaubert's Parrot*, Sesto names it as novel's influential metafictional tool. Barnes by mentioning names of places, famous personalities, writers, and poets as well as "widen[ing] the ontological gap between fiction and reality", stress on impossibly of
perceiving the truth (Sesto 40). Truth in *Flaubert's Parrot* is constructed as an image always present, yet unattainable.

Julian Barnes's wide-ranging use of postmodern elements in his fiction makes him a postmodern writer. These undoubtedly include profound and thorough examination and almost immediate subversion of “realistic strategies, [and are combined with] essentially self-reflexive writing techniques” (Sesto 1). The result of realistic strategies' subversion in his fiction is the overtly metafictional colouring of his novels. His works are presented as “a novel no different from composing or constructing one’s reality” (Waugh 24). The extensive use of irony and parody leads to the creation of contradictory truth in his fiction. The bulk of Julian Barnes's fiction is embodied within the framework of A. S. Byatt's definition of postmodernism:

An awareness of the difficulty of realism combined with a strong attachment to its values, a formal need to comment on their fictiveness combined with a strong sense that models, literature and tradition are ambiguous and emblematic goods combined with a profound nostalgia for, rather than rejection of the great works of the past. (34)

Creating a self-conscious narrator who directs the flow of the narrative, overtly comments on the process of narration and writing, wittingly blurs the border between fact and fiction, openly travestying other literary works and bringing them into the text as a source. These are some metafictional milestones which could be found in Barnes's fiction. Most of the aforementioned techniques are illustrated in detail in the previous section of the chapter. In the following, parody and Intertextuality which are two prominent metafictional techniques, will be dealt with in detail.
Parody and Intertextuality

Many critics such as Poirier (1968) and Bradbury (1980) believe that parody is one of the most important forms and tropes of the 20th century literature and particularly Postmodernism. Parody, intertextuality and irony used in popular genres hint towards two very important issues about writing fiction: the first is the exhaustion of traditional forms and genres; and the second is both parody and irony express a critique of some modern myths associated with particular cultural experience. In this section the way parody was applied in fiction by Barnes is investigated and each part contains an explanation of the kind of parody that has been used.

Parody of Biography: Echoing Academic Biographies

Before entering the main domain of how Barnes managed to write the parody of biography it is important to clarify the terminology in use. The immediate, albeit over-simplified, and yet true, definition which springs to the mind is 'the life story of a person'. Like any other literary genre, biographies and autobiographies have also undergone a historical process of transfiguration. The first types of the biography mostly dealt with the lives of emperors, leaders, or eminent public intellectual figures. These biographies largely focused upon public aspects of life without any room for private or everyday aspects of life. In early eighteenth century biographies were written about intellectuals based on their achievement in order to set an example.

Still the private life was avoided and biographies were fully based upon public lives. Jean-Jacque Rousseau's *Confession* in late eighteenth century is being hailed as a milestone in writing biography for regarding private emotions and feeling as important as the public sphere of life. Nowadays a biography highlights both the public and private life of a subject; however, reproducing a life and a person on paper
proves problematic enough. A mere physical description would only depict "No one. A poor mortified body, waiting for someone to take it" (Pirandello transl. Weaver 19). The same problem of representation is raised by Goodman in relation to painting, by which the old idea of copying the object precisely as it is to reflect reality is rather unsettling. Thus, literature, precisely biography, cannot mirror the life and person as it is, nor painting can do it to the object. Goodman observes that these are just "modes of being" of an object, and not its "essence" (Goodman in Berton 99).

In conventional biographies, as in Arthur & George, the area of inquiry is limited to what happened to the subjects, what they did, and what they became, in the linear style of narration with clear beginning and ending. Flaubert's Parrot, on the contrary, appears to be more ambitious since the author reserves a chapter entitled "The Flaubert Apocrypha" to the book that was never written by Flaubert, and the lives he never lived. The author not only believes that the private life of the subject should be added to their biographies, but he also believes that a life is made of both what happened and what not happened, because "[i]t is not just the life that we know. It is not just the life that has been successfully hidden. It is not just the lies about the life, some of which cannot now be disbelieved. It is also the life that was not led" (Barnes Parrot 105).

"When you write the biography of a friend, you must do it as if you were taking revenge for him" (Flaubert qtd. in Parrot's Preface). Thus, Braithwaite as a loyal avenger and a dutiful compiler lists all the lives that Flaubert wrote, or was reported to have said in a chronological order from the age of seventeen to thirty-five, when "the real life has really begun" (Parrot 109). Barnes's untraditional biography of
Flaubert proves that Flaubert is a writer only because he is not a "muleteer", "a lazarone in Naples", "a bandit is Smyrna", or "a Brahman" (109).

In Flaubert's Parrot, the reader faces a protagonist who is unable to fill the blanks of his knowledge of his wife and her motives behind her suicide, except with his imagination. Paradoxically, he finds it much easier to sympathize with "dead foreigner" than his own wife (145). He continues with an unknown pulse that makes him pursue Flaubert and his parrot rather than his loss and his pain. The forced selection of the content of a biography emerges also in the choice to insert three chronologies, which can simultaneously be true and false. They are true because all are based on true information and they are false because all are unavoidably partial. In most biographies, the chronology of a person's life is usually provided before the beginning of a novel in order to help the reader understand the novel better. To put it simply, the chronological information of a person's life provides a key source to easily understand and interpret the fictional text. Such a section is what Genette calls the "para-text" or simply everything that is "around the text".

In biographical accounts, chronology or any other text with determined socio-political and cultural background helps the readers to look for the author in order to parallelize between life and fiction. The chronology as Braithwaite notes is a way to "pursue and find a writer", what he is precisely doing with his own Flaubert. In Flaubert's Parrot the section chronology is not part of the para-text but it is a distinct chapter of the novel. What was mostly outside the novel and was ignored by a lazy reader now has entered the domain of the fiction. The confusion which might arise here is that, in normal biographies the chronology, shared by the author, belongs to the reality and both the readers and critics accept it without any doubt. In Flaubert's
Parrot both chronologies are a part of the fictional world; the first that belongs to Flaubert is inserted in the novel like a chapter and the second which belongs to Geoffrey Braithwaite and Ellen, was inhabited by them when she was fictionally alive. In the chapter entitled "Chronology", Braithwaite portrays three different figures of Flaubert all of which could be possible and all are based on the same facts. This chapter exemplifies what Hayden White states in Metahistory, that the meaning of an event is not carried in the event itself, on the contrary it is in the story which is emplotted. However, on the other hand, these three chronologies of Flaubert might resemble the three biographies embedded in the novel including Flaubert's biography, Ellen's biography and Braithwaite's autobiography.

Undoubtedly the data which is actually available in the archive directs the biographer to select the order of writing. Braithwaite's obsession for Flaubert is mirrored in his desire for exhaustiveness which translates into the creation of lists and catalogues, following an almost encyclopaedic approach in order to "impose order and coherence upon a set of disparate fragments" (Guignery 40). Many chapters are structured as a list: "Chronology", "The Flaubert Bestiary", "Snap!", "The Train-Spotter’s Guide to Flaubert", "The Case Against", "Braithwaite’s Dictionary of Accepted Ideas", and "Examination Paper". There are also lists of sorts in "Cross Channel" and in "The Flaubert Apocrypha". The list implies how Braithwaite attempts to logically organize the selected material among the vast, yet limited, mass data at his disposal. The logical attitude reveals that not all the puzzle can be found.

The other dramatic gap in the archive is the lack of documents about female characters in Flaubert's life. Since this biography is not the conventional one, which only focus on provable and recorded facts, the novel also locates a space for materials
about Louise Colet and Juliet Herbert and for the version of what really happened. In the most fictional chapter of the novel, "Finders Keepers", Braithwaite comes across fresh material about Juliet Herbert, whose existence and role in Flaubert's life is surrounded by mystery. The utter lack of documents and information has led biographers to put forward the more disparate theories:

For some, the shortage of evidence indicates that she was of small importance in Flaubert’s life; others conclude from this absence precisely the opposite, and assert that the tantalizing governess was certainly one of the writer’s mistresses, possibly the Great Unknown Passion of his life, and perhaps his fiancée. (33)

The material Braithwaite earns from his acquaintance with Ed Winterton, an American academic, seems to solve the mystery. It contains seventy-five letters between Flaubert and Juliet by which the nature of their relationship would be unfolded. According to Winterton they were in a relationship, and she was almost his fiancée. Yet proofs and evidences are immediately shattered by his revelation that, after having read such letters, he decided to burn them all. Only because he gets to know that Flaubert himself asked Juliet to destroy all their correspondence, and according to Winterton, "if your business is writers, you have to behave towards them with integrity, don’t you? You have to do what they say, even if other people don’t" (47). A doubt about the reliability of any information is cast by a rather strange instruction Flaubert gave Juliet. According to Winterton, “If anyone asks you what my letters contained, or what my life was like, please lie to them. Or rather, since I cannot ask you of all people to lie, just tell them what it is you think they want to hear” (47). Such a statement, considering Winterton's open declaration of his moral
integrity in respecting the will of the writer, leads to a suspicion that even in this case, he is either lying or telling what Braithwaite wants to hear.

In writing about another woman of Flaubert's life, Louise Colet, Braithwaite again encounters limitation. What survived from their relationship is only from Flaubert's side. Therefore, what has been found so far is only what Flaubert told her or saw in her. On the other side, there is no way to justify his version of the account of their correspondence. Thus, in Luise Colet's version, Braithwaite fills the missing parts of the puzzle with his imagination, as he does when confronting his own wife's case. Her account of their relationship is clear, yet in contrast to the conventional biographies' narrating voice, which is third-person narrator with neutral and objective view. Here instead, Colet's 'I' emerges strongly in her personal singularity. All that changes in her account is the interpretation and therefore the meaning of the events. In "The Train-Spotter's Guide to Flaubert" Braithwaite assumes the tone of the third-person narrator who is impersonally reporting a fact:

Louise, of course, could play the platform scene as well. Her habit of jealousy bursting in on Gustave when he was dining with friends was notorious. She always expected to find a rival; but there was no rival, unless you count Emma Bovary. On one occasion, Du Camp records, 'Flaubert was leaving Paris for Rouen when she entered the waiting-room of the station and went through such tragic scenes that the railway officials were obliged to interfere. Flaubert was distressed and begged for mercy, but she gave him no quarter' (Parrot 95).

According to this account, louse appears to be the villain and a maniac blinded by jealousy. However, Du Camp's first-hand testimony proves her as a melodramatic and
obsessive woman; Colet's explanation of motives behind the scene makes it less certain:

Gustave went off on his tour of Brittany. Was I wrong to make a fuss? Three months! We had known one another less than a year, all Paris knew about our passion, and he chose three months in the company of Du Camp! . . . Was it not a direct insult, an attempt to humiliate me? And yet he said, when I expressed my feelings to him in public (I am not ashamed of love – why should I be? I would declare myself in the waiting room of a railway station if it were necessary), he said that I was humiliating him. Imagine! (Parrot 124).

The second account which retells the same scene of the waiting room from Colet's perspective changes the meaning and puts into question the reliability of Du Camp as a witness. Therefore, in the absence of one version of the story, the biographer satisfies himself with that of Flaubert, basically because his version is the only version available. But this as implied in the story is not enough to make it true.

Another significant difference between conventional biographies and Flaubert's Parrot indeed is its polyphony. What is obvious in conventional biographies is that the biographer reports what he believes to be true account of the subject's life, while in Flaubert's Parrot, Barnes portrays Braithwaite's explicit personal view of Flaubert along with opinion of other people who lived and interacted with him. This aspect of the story not only does not prove reliability of biographer but also conveys indeterminacy to the account for its incongruous, yet equally reasonable, voices. Other preference of Barnes’s text is that even the silenced voices of the official history get the opportunity of being listened. This section of the account
influences the meaning and the taken-for-granted facts. Unlike conventional biographies in which the subject is the hero of the account, not only Flaubert is not simply the hero of the story, but also he can be the villain. No need to indicate that the lack of the archive prevents the polyphony as everyone is given the democratic right to express their opposition, into a monophony. Certainly the one stable truth in monophony is gained by silencing discordant views.

As 'Louise Colet's Version' proves, in Flaubert's Parrot there are often at least two versions of the same event. Even a biography, like other forms, can be looked at from different perspectives and it influences the meaning and nature. In a scene in the novel, Braithwaite's definition of a net implies a different view of things, opposite to what is normally accepted:

You can define a net in one of two ways, depending on your point of view. Normally, you would say that it is a meshed instrument designed to catch fish. But you could, with no great injury to logic, reverse the image and define a net as a jocular lexicographer once did: he called it a collection of holes tied together with string. (31)

This same subversion of perspectives is done in biography:

The trawling net fills, then the biographer hauls it in, sorts, throws back, stores, fillets and sells. Yet consider what he doesn’t catch: there is always far more of that. The biography stands, fat and worthy-burgherish on the shelf, boastful and sedate: a shilling life will give you the facts, a ten pound one all the hypotheses as well. But think of everything that got away, that fled with the last deathbed exhalation of the biographee. What chance would the craftiest biographer stand
against the subject who saw him coming and decided to amuse himself? (31)

There are known facts about a person and his life, yet more facts are lost because of the deficiency in documentation and with the biographer’s death. On the other side, even the available versions of an account could be biased in the writer’s opinion, feeling and interests. For instance the image of the Flaubert and Louise Colet that emerges from Du Camp's memoir is influenced by his personal view when he inserts his definition of Colet as a woman who "compromised Victor Cousin, ridiculed Alfred de Musset, reviled Gustave Flaubert, and tried to assassinate Alphonse Karr. Requiescat in pace" (154).

This biased view is not limited to those who are personally involved in Flaubert's life, but even by others who have imposed their views upon their subject of study. According to Braithwaite, even an authoritarian expert such as Dr Enid Starkie, a "Reader Emeritus in French Literature at the University of Oxford, and Flaubert’s most exhaustive British biographer", can make mistake and be enrolled in the ever-lengthening list of unreliable sources (Parrot 63). Paradoxically enough, according to Braithwaite, Dr Starkie made mistake in her critique of Flaubert's mistake. She claims that Emma's eyes in Madam Bovary described variously as all brown, deep black and blue. And she condemns Flaubert for being inaccurate in his description. Yet, Braithwaite, by going back to the primary source, can prove that according to the light, situation, and the viewer, all these colours are possible (Parrot 63; 70-71). Thus, Flaubert's personality exactly as Emma's multi-coloured eyes can have many ostensibly contradictory personalities.
Inasmuch as the "process of selection and arrangement of data from the unprocessed historical record" is an inevitable duty of the analyser, one way of relating events is through chronological order (White 5). Immediately after selecting and arranging the events in casual relations, analyser, in the process of fictionalization, adds a beginning, a middle and an end to the narration of the objective chronology, and converts it into a story. Indeed, "all good biographers struggle with a particular tension between the scholarly drive to assemble facts as dispassionately as possible and the novelistic urge to find shape and meaning within the apparently random circumstances of a life" (France and Clair 16-17).

According to Hutcheon's distinction, the analyser, by arranging the "raw material" into story, transforms past "events" into "facts" (92). Simply, the analyser based on his own intention emplotts the past events. Basically, historical events do not appear to have any meaning and that is the narration which includes the meaning. The scene that Louise Colet makes at the train station gets different meaning according to her or Du Camp's account. As explained in the second chapter, the historiographer, here biographer, has significant role within the history and biography respectively. It is the biographer who selects and arranges the raw material, who asks certain questions and raises certain hypotheses, and finally who finds certain connections. The biographer’s perception of reality is refracted by his subjectivity: "We look at the sun through smoked glass; we must look at the past through coloured glass" (81). While this image can be a reference to Barnes's other novel, Staring at the Sun, it may also be a reference to Immanuel Kant, who used a similar metaphor of coloured lenses to explain phenomenon (reality as it appears) and noumenon (reality as it really is). Thus, considering human physical bounds and mental limits of perception of the world, only phenomenon is accessible. All in all, what the readers face in
historiographies and biographies are merely a human perspective of reality which is
influenced by many factors.

Braithwaite’s ‘Dictionary of Accepted Ideas’, surely, is modelled on Flaubert’s ‘Dictionnaire des idées reçues’, which was "a catalogue of clichés’, and "a handbook of fake advice, both social . . . and aesthetic": "Study it carefully and you
would never say anything wrong, while never getting anything right” (74). Our
knowledge of the world and encyclopaedia is often made of clichés and conventions
which are accepted without further consideration.

The plurality of meanings affects both cultural concepts and every day words.
The concept of 'beauty' and the meaning behind the words such as 'tall', 'fat', and 'mad'
might have changed through the time. Braithwaite raises the same issue by referring
to Flaubert's metaphor of the redcurrant jam's colour to describe the colour of sunset
in the beach:

Would he [Flaubert] have seen what we now see? Presumably. But
what about this: in 1853, at Trouville, he watched the sun go down
over the sea, and declared that it resembled a large disc of redcurrant
jam. Vivid enough. But was redcurrant jam the same colour in
Normandy in 1853 as it is now? (Would any pots of it have survived,
so that we could check? And how would we know the colour had
remained the same in the intervening years?) It’s the sort of thing you
fret about. (Parrot 79)

Thus, polysemy of language can play a role of hindbrain to our understanding of the
past, for the same words’ connotations or psychological association may differ. So
uncomfortable questions such as: how is it possible to write a biography? Or how is it
possible to know completely a person? Or how is it possible to translate such a
multiple life into an arbitrary system of signs? may be raised in the mind which rarely
accept an exhaustive answer. More frequently,

'[i]t can only problematize what Barthes (1973) has called the "given"
or "what goes without saying” in our culture. History, the individual
self, the relation of language to its referents and of texts to other texts –
these are some of the notions which, at various moments, have
appeared as “natural” or unproblematically common-sensical. And
these are what get interrogated’ (Hutcheon A Poetics of
Postmodernism xiii).

In general, the act of writing a biography is problematic enough because of
many reasons including the archive is no longer accepted as an indisputable source of
knowledge; the reliable sources prove not to be reliable at all; first-hand witnesses
insert their own personal and biased version of the events; the scholars are not totally
neutral and objective; language itself is not a transparent medium which can
unproblematically reproduce reality.

It appears that in the postmodern epistemological uncertainty where all
metanarratives have lost their reliability, the biographer and the reader of biography
play crucial role: the biographer by imposing his/her subjectivity on the narration and
the reader by interpreting again the biographer's interpretation of raw material and
data. Both sides of this puzzle, however is portrayed in Flaubert's Parrot. As a
biographer, Braithwaite with his hidden intention of understanding his wife is trying
to reconstruct Flaubert's life. The novel draws attention to the fact that a biography is
just one of many other possible and plausible images that can emerge from a subject's
life according to the biographer's intention. On the other hand, a reader is depicted frequently by stressing the invocations to a 'you': "You expect something from me too, don’t you?" (73). Braithwaite is well aware of the reader's expectations. The reader is omnipresent, and sometimes Braithwaite feels the reader's presence is intrusive, and tries to get rid of the reader:

Listen, I hope you won’t think this rude, but I really must take a turn on deck; it’s becoming quite stuffy in the bar here. Why don’t we meet on the boat back instead? The two o’clock ferry, Thursday? I’m sure I’ll feel more like it then. All right? What? No, you can’t come on deck with me. For God’s sake. Besides, I’m going to the lavatory first. I can’t have you following me in there, peering round from the next stall. (Parrot 77)

Despite the troublesome questions raised by postmodernism, Julian Barnes did manage to convey many pieces of information about Flaubert, maybe more than a biography could have possibly done. Indeed, in Flaubert’s Parrot, instead of secretly hiding the holes that any biographer done, they are unmasked. Through this perspective, a fictional biography can be closer to the truth than any conventional biography because, ultimately, the purpose of fiction is to "tell the truth. It’s to tell beautiful, exact, well-constructed lies which enclose hard and shimmering truths" (Barnes, from The Observer 30).

**Parody of Trial**

in "The Case Against", in which a fan defends Flaubert from all the accusations against him and appears to be imaginary, the most contrary account to the conventional trial belongs to “The Wars of Religion”. The trial accounts in The Porcupine and in Arthur & George look more like conventional theme of trial. Since the procedure of the trial in both The Porcupine and Arthur & George has been explained in previous chapter, here Barnes’s technique in dealing with the theme of the trial in “The Wars of Religion” and in “The Case Against” will be elaborated.

In “The Case Against” in Flaubert's Parrot, the “charge-sheet” lists fifteen offenses, among them are “he was against the commune,” “he hated humanity,” “he hated democracy,” “he didn't involve himself in life,” “he tried to live in an ivory tower,” “he was a Sadist,” and that "he teaches no positive virtue" (114; 111; 111; 112; 115; 117; 116). Braithwaite mocks the tone of the defense attorney for responding to the assertion that Flaubert "wasn't interested enough in politics" (151). He concludes his address by stating:

The present looks back at some great figure of an earlier century and wonders, Was he on our side? Was he a goodie? What a lack of self-confidence this implies: the present wants to both to patronize the past by adjudicating on its political acceptability, and also to be flattered by it, to be patted on the back and told to keep up the good work. If this is what you understand by Monsieur Flaubert not being ‘interested enough’ in politics, then I’m afraid my client must plead guilty. (113)

What is significant is the linguistic aspect of the statements. The issue at stake is the very idea of guilt and innocence and of right and wrong. All the assertions against Flaubert might be true, yet the meaning and value of each can be changed. One might
ask, why being pessimist is wrong? In postmodernism by breaking the metanarrative authority and through the influence of social conventions in assessing conventional conceptions, many meanings are added to a text. As this defence of Flaubert demonstrates, the value of the very same statement shifts from positive to negative according to the narration.

"The Wars of Religion" which is written "in an inflated, almost mock-heroic style", is an account of a trial which took place in sixteenth century France (Sesto 66). The story, on one hand reveals the religious extremism and superstitions of the period which leads to the kind of fanatical excesses which promote intolerance and pave the way for such events as inquisitions and religious war. On the other hand, just like what happens in Arthur & George, the story represents the situation wherein truth, evidence, and testimony can be twisted to support completely different viewpoints (Sesto 66).

Given the serious undertones in the whole story, funny and humorous tone is obvious, which stems from the incompatibility between the nature of the case being judged and the seriousness of the legal court being displayed. The other feature which highlights the comic/satiric effect is the mock-heroic quality of the language employed in the story, specifically in attorney's bombastic tone and his several allusions to the bible and classical mythology to accuse the woodworm:

Gentlemen, it does me honour to appear before your solemn court, to plead for justice as did that poor offended mother who appeared before Solomon to claim her child. Like Ulysses against Ajax I shall fight the procurator for the bestioles, who has produced before many arguments as bedizened as Jezebel. (236)
The defendant, the woodworm, is accused of blasphemy by inhabiting the Saint-Michel church and causing so much damage to bishop's throne. Their infestation results in the collapse of bishop's seat and sends him crashing to the floor, which injures his head, during his annual ceremonial visit. The attorney's opening argument revolves around the woodworm's avoidance of appearing before the court after having been served a writ of summons. He calls for both their banishment from the village and for their ostracizing from the church. To support his argument, he hints at the Genesis that there is no record of woodworm's having been aboard Noah's Ark. He concludes that they must have been produced by Satan and can be punished in any way.

In the Middle Ages, animals were prosecuted in trials; they were considered as having a soul and therefore their actions were interpreted as intentional:

There is a chapter in *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters*, as you will know, about medieval animal trials. Most people who look at animal trials tend to think that if in medieval times they gave judicial trial to a pig for eating the face of a man who was lying in a ditch in a drunken stupor, that this was a sign of how incredibly primitive and stupid the Middle Ages were. It seems to me that it’s a sign of how wonderfully larger and more extended the sense of what life was in those days, and that when the pig was executed by an official hangman, it was actually elevating the status of the pig rather than anything else. It was putting it into the order of God’s creation, it was giving it a conscience, you could say, whereas now the horizon has
lowered. God is not in his sky and we treat pigs worse now than they
did in the Middle Ages (Barnes in Freiburg 41-42).

On the other side, the defense solicitor, Plaidoyer des insects, who seems to appreciate
the absurdity of the situation begins his argument by demonstrating how the court has
no power and right to judge insects. As an example, on the matter of ostracizing from
the church, the solicitor notes that such verdict is unthinkable for not having immortal
souls; woodworms do not belong to any church from which they could be ostracized.
In another scene of the story, the solicitor undermines the prosecuting attorney's
strategies on the matter of summoning of the woodworm to court. He observes that
summoning has validity in case of presupposing that woodworms have the ability of
speaking, reading and making rational judgments. As he goes on to argue, woodworm's inability to do any of these things prevents the court from conforming
the verdict. Furthermore, woodworm were merely following their instincts in eating
wood therefore it should not be considered as a criminal act.

The other matter mentioned in the court by the solicitor is that some aspects of
the case need more clarification: how many woodworms exactly are summoned?
Whether all of them, or only those who are directly responsible for the bishop's injury
should be summoned? And, since infestation might have been done by the present
generation's ancestors, why the court is targeting the present generation? The solicitor,
then, directs the court to the path wherein his own skill of allusion plays an important
role. Arguing that Almighty God would never stand back and permit the destruction
of His church as well as the injury of one of His ministers, if it were not for a specific
purpose, he observes:
Did the lord not send a plague of frogs against Pharaoh? Did He not send lice and grievous swarms of flies upon the land of Egypt? Did He not, against the Pharaoh, send also the plague of boils, and thunder and hail, and grievous plague of locusts? Did He not send hailstones against the Five Kings? Did He not strike even His own servant Job with boils? (242)

"The Wars of Religion" ends with no conclusion while an editorial note is added which informs the reader of the incomplete documentation and explains its physical condition:

Here the manuscript in the Archives Municipales de Besançon breaks off, without giving details of the annual penance or remembrance imposed by the court. It appears from the condition of the parchment that in the course of the last four and a half centuries it has been attacked, perhaps on more than one occasion, by some species of termite, which has devoured the closing words of the juge d'Église. (245)

By the adding the editorial note, which claims that his account is derived from the actual documentary material, the writer succeeds in creating the illusion of historical actuality. This implication enables Barnes to further explore the relationship between literature and reality.

**Parody of Historiography: Recreating History and World**

Julian Barnes's personal interest in perusing justice and truth in real life surfaces in his fiction. Perhaps that is one of the reasons for his endeavour to write
about the case of George Edalji and Sir Arthur Canon Doyle. Despite the fact that he was at the very beginning of his literary career, he published four detective novels under the pseudonym Dan Kavanagh and he confessed he has never practiced writing real historical detective novel in an interview with Amanda Smith: "I was getting more pleasure out of doing a round-up of four novels [have been published under the name Dan Kavanagh] for a provincial paper that I was out of preparing, what I might say defending some criminal" (73).

In *Flaubert's Parrot*, Barnes portrays a real fan of Flaubert in an attempt to defend and clear him from all the accusations that have been put against him in the course of time, particularly in the chapter entitled "The Case Against". However, one significant point here is that the idea of guilt and innocence or of right and wrong is changeable in the course of time. One might ask, why being pessimist is wrong. The important role of social conventions in assessing guilt is also obvious in defence of Flaubert, wherein the same statement's value shifts from positive to negative by the narration.

In *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters*, particularly in the chapter "The Wars of Religion", notwithstanding the exaggerated title, Barnes deals with the story of a trial against woodworms. He represents a trial in which the citizens of French town, Mamirolle, accuse the inhabitant woodworms of Saint-Michel Church of humiliating Bishop of Besançon in front of his perish by having gnawed his throne. Again, Barnes depicts two opposite interpretations of the same event simultaneously, to disclose the impact of random choice or personal whim in assessing guilt and the idea of right and wrong. The idea of fallible justice, which is based upon relative and arbitrary opinion rather than upon undeniable facts, is the principal theme of both

In Arthur & George, which can be deemed as a historical and biographical novel, the George Edalji’s case is a miscarriage of justice. The narration of the past and inserting the biography of two characters is not new to Barnes, since it appeared in his previous fiction. Though this novel is also categorized as detective fiction, it seems to imitate art as well. Sir Conan Doyle, like his consulting detective Sherlock Holmes, is leading a parallel investigation, searching "for clues, truths, answers, in amongst the false memories, circumstantial evidence, virulent rumour and concealed prejudice" (Childs Julian Barnes 10). It is a quest for justice, for truth, and for knowledge, which however, turns out to be opinions, interpretations, and beliefs.

After Flaubert's Parrot, A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters is generally regarded as Barnes's second postmodernist novel. Barnes in an interview discloses his initial decision of writing a sequential novel for Flaubert's Parrot and re-employing Geoffrey Braithwaite's narrative voice, "I was going to write Geoffrey Braithwaite’s Guide to the Bible. Which would be the entire Bible, restructured for handy modern use, with the boring bits cut out, written by an agnostic skeptic rationalist" (Guignery 61).

Barnes's own interest in history and history writing link his attempts of portraying Braithwaite who makes sense of Flaubert's life in Flaubert's Parrot and his attempts to order a history of the world in ten and half chapters. In Flaubert's Parrot, history is described and defined in different ways such as raising questions that are left unanswered: "Can we ever do so [seize the past]?") (5). Barnes's technique of using metaphors and comparisons instead of offering a straightforward answer is seen
in different parts of the novel like when he compares the past to the greased piglet or to distant, receding coastline while we look at it through a line of telescopes in a boat, or to a ferry that merely shuttles back and forth. *(Parrot 97; 148; 91)* Sometimes the past may be a greased pig; sometimes a bear in its den; and sometimes merely the flash of a parrot, two mocking eyes that spark at you from the forest *(Parrot 97).* However the past emerges as inaccessible is most of the images in *Flaubert's Parrot.*

A simple and comprehensive definition of historiography is an act of writing history based on a certain pattern behind the raw material of the past. Traditional historiography is considered as a narrative which unmasks the relation between the past events to look logically consequential. In historiography, events, one after the other, appear in chronological, logical and cause-effect order. Conventional historiography follows either linear or circular pattern to represent the raw material. Both models are challenged to be assumed as master narrative or as a system that claims to be definite and fully comprehensive to explain the world and the past. However, history itself may follow no pattern at all. Barnes, in his *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters,* employs both models, but inscribed paradoxically and subverted. He problematizes both patterns, linear and circular, to leave the door of doubt open. The structure of *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* framed between Genesis and Revelation, looks to reflect the jumbled structure of history itself.

Christian religion and secular Darwinism are formed based on a linear pattern, which may lead either to the Last Judgment or to a constant evolution. Yet, if history is considered to follow circular pattern, the past, present, and future cannot be clearly distinguished as in the linear conception of history. Religion is one of the crucial themes in the novel which emerges in both patterns from many of the stories narrated.
In the stories, the subverted and parodied form of history represented, according to Linda Hutcheon's definition of parody. A further conception of history represents a chaotic sequence of events with no pattern. It is noted that like any other kind of ordering the raw material of the past such as biography, history is also constructed artificially. As Barnes concludes in the half chapter entitled "Parenthesis", history is fabulation, a partly fictional construction. Such a theorization of history bears many resemblances to Hayden White’s concept of 'metahistory'. Barnes problematizes the repressive voice of authority by celebrating diversity and plurality in the concept of history and by distancing from a nihilist vision of it.

The stories in *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* do not follow any manifest pattern of progression or development and only a shadow of order can be detected in the opening and closing chapters, "The Stowaway" and "The Dream". Except the first chapter which is the story of Noah’s Ark told in the Genesis and the last chapter which is an unusual description of the afterlife, the eight and half middle chapters make the reader leap from the Deluge to a contemporary Mediterranean cruise, from a post-nuclear future to the past, and from the frigate Medusa shipwrecked to the present filming of a docu-drama set in the jungle. As in *Flaubert’s Parrot*, *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* ignores the chronological order to make a parody of the conventional historiography.

After considering Barnes’s novels from the standpoint of ‘metafictional historiography’, it is perhaps worthwhile to look at them from Hutcheon’s definition of the same term. Hutcheon evokes in *A Poetics of Postmodernism* the poststructuralist foundations being founded in a particular type of novels (40). Her notion of "narrative representation" embraces both the similarities existing between
historiography and fiction, and the means to gradually lessen the impression of authenticity in scientific historiographic analysis. One year later, in *The Politics of Postmodernism*, Hutcheon extended her study to other aspects of postmodernism but her emphasis was still on the socially subversive capacity, "historiographic metafiction".

Hutcheon in *The Politics of Postmodernism* mentions the cultural tension between traditional humanist values and the most recent theories of culture analysis in our contemporary society. She declares:

> The equivalent on the literary scene has been the hostile response of some critics to the mixing of historical and fictive representation in historiographic metafiction. It is not that the fact of the mixing is new: the historical novel, not to mention the epic, should have habituated readers to that. The problem seems to reside in its manner, in the self-consciousness of the fictionality, the lack of the familiar pretence of transparency, and the calling in to question of the factual grounding of history writing. The self-reflexivity of postmodern fiction does indeed foreground many of the usually unacknowledged and naturalized implications of narrative representation. (35)

In 1991, as a sophisticated critic, Hutcheon strengthened her analysis on this type of fictional narrative, which calls into question "the factual grounding of history-writing" (106). She confirmed fictional narrative's attack on humanist values and its foregrounding of the ideological element that considers all human discursive practices. However, this time her concept of "historiographic metafiction" included almost all postmodern fiction.
Certainly, as Hutcheon mentioned, historical issues were becoming significant in some of the fiction written in English. In this particular belief she was not alone when she emphasized the influential role of ideology in contemporary historiographic studies. It is undeniable that 1960s are marked with a deep-rooted disrespect for the dominant capitalist values of the time, a disrespect that is obviously represented in a number of striking events such as the revolts in USA and in France. But, the 1960s also marked the beginning of poststructuralist theories that obviously hinted towards the postmodern ideological values as inseparable from all discursive human practices. For several years, their theoretical attitudes rested upon a social circumstances specified by severely criticizing the traditional ideological values or the present master narratives that have influenced our perception and understanding of reality. This Cultural Revolution of the present time gradually demonstrated either the importance of class, gender, and race issues, or in historiography, though its appearance was not as quick as one could have expected.

In the early deconstructive studies ‘history’ was not accepted as an object of analysis. The historical referent did not draw the attention of the first deconstructive critics, but a few years later a metahistorical criticism began to emerge. Critics and historians like Hayden White gradually perceived that even the historiographer is trapped inside his or her discourse. Critics found out that historiographers are unable to achieve direct and unmediated contact with an objective historical referent. The historian becomes a metahistorian since they are writing about writing and since they utilize narrative discourse. White affirms:

[…] far from being a neutral medium for the representation of historical events and processes is the very stuff of a mythical view of
reality, a conceptual or pseudo conceptual 'content' which, when used to represent real events, endows them with an illusory coherence and charges them with the kinds of meanings more characteristic of oneiric than of waking thought. (9)

It is with a strictly epistemological perspective, that British postmodern realist fiction has typically been dealt with. Ever since Linda Hutcheon coined the term "historiographic metafiction" to denote postmodern novels that "are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay claim to historical events and personage" (5), critics have directed their attention to the way in which the works of such writers as Peter Ackroyd, Martin Amis, Julian Barnes and Graham Swift undermine the historical truth by making it overlap with the most prominent feature in fiction. The ethical aspect of these works is frequently eclipsed in most analyses.

Novel’s primary interest may lie in its clever metafictional denaturalization of the realistic plot. Simultaneously as a biography of Flaubert, an undermining of any lingering faith in historiographic objectivity, and a contemporary English love story, *Flaubert’s Parrot* garnered substantial critical attention. It was an instance of the breed of postmodernism that Linda Hutcheon labels 'historiographic metafiction' (xiv). In *The Modern British Novel* Malcolm Bradbury observes, *Flaubert’s Parrot* is 

[…] half critical text, half a human narrative. . . the text itself takes multiple forms: it is a research, a meditation, an examination paper, a playful latter day commentary, on Flaubert’s own ambiguous realism, and on the strange stimuli of art. It busily plays with the notions of the real and the fictional, makes its own rules, breaks up its own discourse, leaves behind its own ambiguities: a postmodern “text” indeed. (437)
As a result, historiography occupies the place of history and is called man's ability to write history, which is a major theme in historiographic metafiction. It is necessary to note that this coinage is relevant to another major characteristic of postmodern novel: 'metafiction'. Metafiction though is a convention as old as the genre of novel itself, generally described as fiction about fiction, which, as Hawthorn describes, is “the sort of novel or short-story which deliberately breaks fictive illusions and comments directly upon its own fictive nature or process of composition” (21). According to David Lodge, metafictional discourses like 'asides' are used to describe characters and actions in a realistic way. In contemporary fiction, it accepts the artificiality of the conventions of realism while employing them, disarms criticism by incorporating it in the novel, but above all emphasizes the fictional status of the novel by integrating the writing process into the novel (206-207). Probably, this is the reason metafictional novels are also named as self-reflexive or self-referential novels by some critics.

Realistic point of view lost its significance in the fictional world of postmodernism, hence novelists prefer to acknowledge the fictionality of the book to the reader than to see their novels considered as a slice of life. Lodge comments, “metafictional discourse is not much a loophole or alibi by means of which the writer can occasionally escape the constraints of traditional realism rather a central preoccupation and source of inspiration” (208).

Historiographic metafiction is any kind of self-reflexive novel that combines the difficulties of writing history and fiction. It is a fact that in the old world history and literature were considered to be the same and the validity and credibility of literary works were mostly assessed by comparison and emulation of history. One needs to recall how Defoe defends his writings as histories or how Fielding claims the
superiority of novel over history. Yet, after more than two centuries postmodernism once again sheds light upon the shared concerns among historians and novelists. Hutcheon enumerates the similarities in brief in the following:

They have both been seen to derive their force more from verisimilitude than from any objective truth; they are both identified as linguistic constructs, highly conventionalized in their narrative forms, and not at all transparent, either in terms of language or structure; and they appear to be equally intertextual, deploying the texts of the past within their own complex textuality (A poetics of Postmodernism 105).

These are the “implied teachings” of historiographic metafiction, “novels that are intensely self-reflexive but that also both re-introduce historical context into metafiction and problematize the entire question of historical knowledge” (Hutcheon The Politics of Postmodernism 54-55). In other words, historiographic metafiction is the result of the common skepticism in empiricist and positivist epistemologies. Both fiction and history reject to be able to reflect reality. Fiction is said to create its own reality, rather than presenting reality. Hutcheon observes, “postmodern fiction suggests that to re-write or to re-present the past in fiction and in history is, in both cases, to open it up to the present, to prevent it from being conclusive and teleological” (A Poetics of Postmodernism 110). She then continues that historiographic metafiction “… both installs and then blurs the line between fiction and history” (Hutcheon A Poetics of Postmodernism 113). To clarify, historical discourse employs historical facts, personages and documents to foreground possible and accidental mistakes in the recording of history.
Unlike traditional historical novels, historiographic metafiction distorts the reason for using real facts in order to challenge the idea of representation. Barnes employs the same technique of using historical fact and characters in fictional world particularly in his very postmodern fiction. Barnes in his *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* writes some chapters based on some historical incidents or stories from religious sources and in *Flaubert’s Parrot* he portrays a life of a person obsessed with the life of Gustave Flaubert.

*A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters* can be categorized as historiographic metafiction based on Linda Hutcheon’s assertions:

This conjunction manages to ironize both metafiction’s (modernist) trust in the imaginative power and the closed, reflexive structures of art and also its opposite, history’s assumed correspondence between narration and event, between world and thing. This mutual critical irony functions as a mode of internalized self-conscious theorization that is as paradoxical as any postmodern theory today: it inscribes and then undercut both the autonomy of art and the referentiality of history in such a way that a new mode of questioning/compromise comes into being. (*A Poetics of Postmodernism* 56)

The metafictional elements of self-security enables Barnes to construct a history of the world, which celebrates polyphony and plurality, in a very postmodern way like in *Flaubert's Parrot*. 
Parody of Baudrillard’s Famous Statements: Simulacra and Stimulation

_England, England_, in a good postmodern fashion, demonstrates a society completely suffused with simulacra, the theories of the French postmodernist philosopher Jean Baudrillard. Barnes reflects the blurring border between the real and the inauthentic, artificial or hyperreal in this novel in an extended way.

Baudrillard's famous statement of the advent of “an age of simulacra and simulation,” wherein, distinguishing between real and artificial is no longer possible as they become alike and there is no criterion to judge or decide on them (Baudrillard _Simulacra and Simulation_ 347). Baudrillard argues that the concept of postmodernism is based upon four successive phases making the transition from the real world to the hyperreal. The first phase is the image, which represents a reality as it is. In the second phase named 'simulation,' the image "masks and perverts" the reality and appears more real than the real. The third phase, 'Implosion,' is a stage wherein the collapse between real and unreal leads to the disappearance of the real and "mask[s] the absence" of the reality. 'Hyperreal, the fourth and final phase, which literally signifies 'more than real,' indicates generation of something that “bears no relation to any reality whatever." (347)

In Barnes's novel _England, England_, the idea of creating a small island called 'England, England,' on which the replicas and icons of all the landmarks of England are presented, reflects the dominance of Baudrillard's theory of hyperreal. As the story unfolds, the project earns more and more success and the popularity of the simulacrum surpasses the popularity of the original nation. Tourists much prefer to visit the island, _England, England_, because all the national icons and replicas, for instance Big Ben and Hadrian’s Wall, are organized in a distance incomparably
shorter than the original. All the paradigms in the novel imply how the hyperreal proves to be more superior to the real. Unquestionably, *England, England* draws heavily on postmodernist theories of hyperreality, yet what remains for disputation, according to the comic tone of the novel, is whether it endorses or ridicules the theory. Vanessa Guignery claims that the novel can be read “as both a reflection on and a parody of” Baudrillard’s concept of hyperreality (*The Fiction of Julian Barnes* 110). What makes it problematic to realize the author's main attitude towards the theory of hyperreality is the novel’s duality in implying the message.

On one hand, at the beginning of the novel, the lecture about the probable triumph and glorious result of project by the French intellectual assures the superiority of the replica over the original. The lecture exaggerates achievements of the project in a way that the passage appears to be “a reasonable pastiche of a sort of postmodern theory” (*England* 79). It visualizes and accordingly celebrates the victory of the replica over the original and is not considered as a loss of the real but as an “enhancement,” a superior form of it, and a “victory” (*England* 53). More important, the over-the-top tone of the lecture leaves no doubt as to the novel’s mocking attitude towards it. Yet, it does not seem, the novel is written only for ridiculing Baudrillard’s theory and is a mere parody of the idea. Perhaps, what is parodied is not the idea of hyperreal but is the celebratory tone and immoderate sense of postmodern intellectual sophistication.

On the other hand, the parallel plot that runs with the victory of hyperreal over real in the developing project of 'England, England', shows author's concern about the danger of the loss of real. The story of the life of Martha Cochrane, which is pervaded by the sense of absurdity and intricate desire for a firm pattern of life and authentic
reality, depicts the reality of life in an increasingly inauthentic world. Her relationship with her boyfriend, Paul, makes them both feel that their love "made things real" (England 103). Their relation, however, implicitly reveals the extent hyperreality penetrates in the most intimate level of life. According to James Miracky, Martha and Paul’s love is also an illusion, for they have been “constructing their sexuality out of replicas and imitations” (in Guignery The Fiction of Julian Barnes 113). Paul always finds it easier “to be alone with magazine girls” than have any sexual relation with real women, and Martha was making love in order to pursue the dream of an ideal man (England 99).

**Intertextuality**

Double Code is a strategy by which the dissent and opposition within a text could be concealed. This term first was coined by Charles Jencks before it was applied to literature. Double-coding implies the relationship between elite and popular, old and new, and subversive and accommodating (Jencks The Language of Postmodern Architecture 340).

Postmodernism inscribes itself by subverting the conventional discourse in fiction as in A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters, which is a combination of history, tradition and humour. According to Jencks, past together with tradition leads to double-coded and ironic texts:

Post-Modernism is fundamentally the eclectic mixture of any tradition with that of the immediate past: it is both the continuation of Modernism and its transcendence. Its best works are characteristically double-coded and ironic, because this heterogeneity most clearly captures our pluralism. Its hybrid style is opposed to the minimalism of
Late-Modern ideology and all revivals that are based on an exclusive dogma or taste. *(What is postmodernism?)*

In postmodernism, intertextuality is significant because postmodern individual literary works are not deemed to be self-contained. Much of focus in studying postmodern texts is on intertextuality by the means of adapting a prior style or referring to another past event. Some critics consider it as merely lack of originality and reliance on cliches. Neither Saussure nor any of his predecessor employed the term 'intertextuality' although many scholars believe that Saussure's sign-system paved the way for the appearance of the term. Some critics consider Julia Kristeva as the pioneer of the term, 'intertextuality' *(Allen 11)*. In fact, Kristeva was a person who conflates Saussure with Bakhtin's models and exposes the impact of it in other texts. Intertextuality is the technique of incorporating previous texts into new texts. An author can borrow part of the prior text into her/his own text.

Intertextuality in *Flaubert's Parrot* consists of multiple quotes from works, letters, and journals of Gustave Flaubert; various instances of literary criticism; and references to the identity or works of other writers such as Yeats, Browning, Tennyson, Golding, Woolf, Zola, Renan, Henry James, and many others. These intertextual examples praise the fictiveness of the text rather than preserving the illusion of reality by shedding light on the similarly between the text and the mentioned fictive works.

Fredric Jameson, whose analysis of contemporary cultural trends is well-known, utilizes the term 'cultural dominant' *(woods 38)* for postmodernism to not consider it as a bounded entity but as a feature with variety of alternatives that are
specialised under the pressure of organized capitalism. For Jameson, what he calls 'pastiche' is a way to parody domain norms.

Jameson argues that Pound’s 'Make it new' paved the way to a play of images and styles with no attachment to cultural norms and parody and simulacrum appeared in many literary works and consequently the connection to history and its reality loses in time. Apparently, Jameson's concept of 'pastiche' is different from Linda Hutcheon's understanding of parody (Allen 182-84).

Julian Barnes's Arthur & George can be viewed as the other clear example of intertextuality in literature. The novel, generally, is based on the real event that happened about a hundred years ago. Barnes reconstructs the parallel biography of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a famous creator of the infallible consulting detective Sherlock Holmes, and George Edalji, a Birmingham solicitor of Scottish-Parsee origin, in fragmented forms. In the second phase of the novel the two protagonists’ paths cross and they meet with regard to the case of mutilation of horses and other livestock known as the 'Great Wyrley Outrages” in 1903. George was accused of maiming and wounding a number of animals leading to their death in the area of Great Wyrley, Staffordshire. George's name was listed among the gang of culprits, which claimed authorship of the maiming, pseudonymous letters were sent to police. After receiving the threat of targeting little girls in the next attacks, Chief Constable Anson ordered to keep a watch on Vicarage, where George lived with his family. On some circumstantial evidences, George was found guilty of having mutilated a pit pony and of having sent slanderous letters to himself.

Later, he was suspected to have committed a widespread work of maiming cattle and livestock as a member of the so-called "Great Wyrley Gang". Despite,
having been found guilty and sentenced to seven years of penal servitude and deprived of working as a solicitor forever, he was released after only three years without any explanation. After unexpectedly being released George requests Arthur to vindicate him of the libellous accusation and make it possible for him to resume his work as a solicitor. The case emerges to be more intricate than it appeared at first, it leads to demonstrating George's complete innocence and discovering the name of the real culprit, Royden Sharp. Sir Arthur makes the case into a big stir by publishing a pamphlet entitled 'The Story of George Edalji' and draws the public attention to it. Though there seems to be racial prejudice and anti-Semitism at the root of this miscarriages of justice, the attempts lead to granting a free pardon to George which enable him to resume his work as solicitor.

In Barnes’s novel, after a short description of both characters, *Arthur & George*, the author employs intertextuality and parody. Barnes's Arthur is fairly well realized, since he is loyal enough to the documentary record. Barnes takes advantage of Canon Doyle's accounts in Memories and Adventures and of published materials arguing for Edalji's case. He even borrows the language from Canon Doyle. Yet, the other character, George, is not realized as much as Arthur. Although, the readers follow George from childhood and the narrative voice of the representation is omniscient, his character has some ambiguity in it. It is apparent to the readers that George is innocent of any of the events that completely destroyed his family and later his community. This marginalizes the evolution of the evidence in the case as well as Canon Doyle's defense of the case. On the other hand, the George who was created by Barnes is not very credible. Strangely infantile behaviour of George towards his family and his situation, in both his exterior manifestations and interior reflections, throw doubt on the reliability of his character. George as a character emerges to be
somehow flat and lifeless, that is partly due to the lack of documentation of George's life rather than the author's obligation.
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