

The Question of Wholeness in *Daniel Martin*

Daniel Martin’de Bütünlük Sorunu

Hamdi Ali SERDAR *

Meryem AYAN **

Abstract: In *Daniel Martin*, a semi-autobiographical novel, John Fowles draws a portrayal of the powerlessness of a scriptwriter who wishes to make a significant change in his career, stop writing others into his scripts, instead to become a novelist and write himself into his own novel. Living in the United States in the late 1960s, Daniel feels detached from whatever and whoever he has had in his life to make himself the Daniel Martin of the late 1940’s. His earlier change of direction in his career from a playwright to a scriptwriter later brings Daniel to a point at which he feels disenchanting by what he has become. He also feels that he has become torn apart between his past and his present—something which pushes him to try to gather the bits and pieces of his life into a visible whole in a narrative. That is why he begins his narrative with a scene from his childhood in the first chapter. Yet, in the latter chapters of his narrative he is seen to have difficulties in sticking to a fixed tense and a fixed voice. The recurring zigzags in the choice of tenses and of voices eventually result in Daniel’s failure to respond strongly to fragmentation. His powerlessness is, however, covered up as well as made up for in the final chapters of the novel by someone else —the ill-concealed ghost of John Fowles’s third-person narrator. It is only through the interventions of this ghost in Daniel’s narrative that his search for a more stable way of assembling his fragmented consciousness and of being later able to devote it to the writing of a coherent novel becomes possible.

Keywords: Wholeness, Fragmentation, Narrative, Powerlessness, John Fowles, Daniel Martin

Öz: Yarı-otobiyografik bir roman olan *Daniel Martin’de* John Fowles, kariyerinde önemli bir değişiklik yapmayı, senaryolarında başkalarını artık yazmamayı, bunun yerine bir roman yazarı olup kendi romanında kendini yazmayı arzulayan bir senaristin başarısızlığının portresini çizmektedir. 1960’ların sonlarında Birleşik Devletler’de yaşayan Daniel, kendisini 1940’ların sonlarındaki Daniel Martin yapan ve hayatında yer alan her ne ve her kim var ise onlardan kopmuş hissetmektedir. Kariyerinde daha önce gerçekleştirdiği oyun yazarlığından senaristliğe doğru yön değişikliği Daniel’i olduğu şeyden hayal kırıklığı duyan bir noktaya getirmiştir. Keza, kendisini geçmişi ve şu anı arasında da parçalanmış hissetmektedir—ki bu durum onu bir anlatı içinde hayatının parçalarını bir bütüne dönüştürmeye itmektedir. İşte bu sebeple anlatısına ilk bölümde çocukluğundan bir sahneyle başlar. Fakat anlatısının sonraki bölümlerinde sabit bir zaman kipine ve sabit bir bakış açısına bağlı kalmakta zorlandığı görülmektedir. Zaman kipi ve bakış açısı seçiminde tekrar eden zikzakların sonucunda, Daniel’in bu parçalanmaya güçlü bir şekilde yanıt veremez. Ancak, romanın son bölümlerinde bir başkası tarafından —Fowles’un üçüncü-şahıs anlatıcısının kötü gizlenmiş hayaleti—hem güçsüzlüğünün üstü örtülür hem de güçsüzlüğü telafi edilir. Daniel’in parçalanmış bilincini toparlaması ve sonrasında bunu daha insicamlı bir roman yazımına adayabilmesi için daha istikrarlı bir yol bulma arayışı bu hayaletin, Daniel’in anlatısına yaptığı müdahaleler sayesinde mümkün olmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Bütünlük, Parçalanma, Anlatı, Güçsüzlük, John Fowles, Daniel Martin

* Res. Assist. Dr., Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Faculty of Science and Arts, Department of English Language and Literature, Rize, hamdi.serdar@erdogan.edu.tr. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4356-0625>

** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Pamukkale University, Faculty of Science and Arts, Department of American Culture and Literature, Denizli, mayan@pau.edu.tr. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3138-1523>

Daniel Martin is a lengthy novel which begins and ends with a similar emphasis upon the need to develop a holistic approach in considering such phenomena as life, self, existence, past memories, etc. from a critical perspective. The novel actually begins with a reference to the ending of it and ends with a reference back to its beginning—something which makes it circular. The narrative moves back and forth between the present and the past tenses amid a myriad of flashbacks and flash-forwards. The narrative voices change alike from the first-person to the third and vice versa. These factors make it, to use Peter Brandt's works, resemble “*a long and winding road towards*” its beginning (1996, 145). The purpose of the present study of *Daniel Martin* is therefore to argue that the narratorial zigzagging throughout much of this novel between the past and the present tenses, between the first and the third person voices, and between the flashbacks and the flash-forwards is a sign of powerlessness from which the hero, Daniel Martin, suffers to a significant extent. This powerlessness leaves Daniel unable to decide on a particular way for achieving a whole view of his past as well as his present life; and eventually, he gives up the idea of translating it into a coherent novel. His inability to develop a de-fragmented view of his whole life results from the fact that he is a living product of a culture which has been deeply stricken with various forms of fragmentation which make themselves visible as “*the desolation of contemporary life, the existentialist void, [and] T. S. Eliot's waste land of hollow men*” (Onega 1989, 95).

There are actually three different Daniel Martins, all functioning simultaneously at one level or another. As Salami points it out, we have *Daniel Martin* the novel in the first place, Daniel Martin the title character in the second place, and Daniel Martin the narrator in the third place (1992 168). To avoid a possible confusion, it appears essential to point out the differences between all of them at this early stage. Firstly, we do have *Daniel Martin* as the semi-autobiographical novel which John Fowles wrote in the late 1970's. Secondly, we have Daniel Martin as the title character of this novel. This is the Daniel Martin who is depicted in Fowles's narrative as a middle-aged English playwright who wishes to write a novel about himself. Thirdly, we have Daniel Martin himself who is the narrator of his own story in Fowles's narrative.

As the title character, Daniel Martin is an Englishman living in California. The present tense of the narrative is the late 1960's. His career as a playwright which began in England some thirty years earlier is followed by his move to California to start a newer career as a scriptwriter in the film industry of Hollywood. His decision to start afresh in California places him in a situation in which he becomes exiled from his own past—from whatever his past in England has given to him (Alter 1984, 149). Yet, he begins to feel that there is a huge distance between where he is now and where he thinks he should have been. He feels that he has to find a way to (re)cover that distance as someone in the film industry. However, he realises that his profession as a scriptwriter has not given him a real chance of writing about himself; it has rather confined him to choosing one option only—the option of creating characters other than himself and of writing them into his scripts. While in California, therefore, he begins to cherish the idea of writing an autobiographical novel upon the suggestion of his girlfriend, Jenny, a Scottish actress. As a matter of fact, the idea of writing a novel becomes an emblem of “*self-accountancy*” to him (Fowles 2004, 451). It is no wonder that Jenny describes Daniel as someone with “*a mistress*” called “*Loss*” (Fowles 2004, 264). He has lost himself. His desire to write an autobiographical novel thus appears to contain in itself a self-assigned task of finding a way to get “*back to himself and his formative experiences,*” and of going through a thorough confrontation with himself (Alter 1984, 145). Furthermore, he views the writing of an autobiographical novel as a way of looking back upon his life with “*honesty and insight*” (Wilson 1995, 310). In writing a novel of this kind, Daniel also hopes that he can revisit his

past, “*reshape it the way it should have been three decades ago,*” and bring the disjointed pieces of it into a coherent whole (Salami 1992, 166). In other words, Daniel intends it to be “*a novel of midlife re-examination*” (Cresap 2003, 160).

Daniel chooses the medium of novel over that of film. The reasons that Daniel wishes to write a novel rather than make a film about himself are manifold. To begin with, he equates the camera with the publicity—“*lying,*” whereas he associates the novel with the privacy—“*the private reality*” (Fowles 2004, 307). He also believes that a true representation of his life in its entirety can only be accomplished through the use of words rather than pictures, because the film is “*a crudely realistic art*” and it “*is incapable of rendering the real self*” (Onega 1989, 96). As Peter Brandt phrases it, Daniel realizes that “*to describe the real world, he cannot use the reel world*” (1996, 149). Compared with the film, it is only the novel which will provide him with a far better way of representation (Salami 1992, 161). Besides, his awareness of his in-between identity as an English-born scriptwriter living in California also leads him to choose the novel over the film. His sense of being an Englishman has a profound influence over his choice of the medium with which he can confront himself. He doubts that the English psyche can ever be truthfully pictured in the film, because “*the elusive and eluding nature of the English psyche is profoundly unsympathetic to visual representation*” (Fowles 2004, 307). The reason for this is that the film violates “*what he construes to be his own very English consciousness of living in an endless flurry of multiple recollections and anticipations*” (Alter 1984, 148). However, the absence of any previous experience as a novelist pushes Daniel to a point at which he feels forced to embrace a narrative form which “*is entangled in the cinematic means of representation, such as flashback, flash-forward, intercutting and close-up*” (Salami 1992, 161).

Daniel is well aware of the extent of the fragmentation from which he has deeply suffered. He even thinks that people in his life are mere fragments. His view of people in his life as mere fragments becomes noticeable enough in his words in which he addresses Jenny as “*one of the very few fragments [of his life] that make sense*” (Fowles 2004, 20). He is so deeply fragmented in his mind as well as in his existence that Jenny’s suggestion to write an autobiographical novel provokes Daniel into confessing that he “*wouldn’t know where to begin*” (Fowles 2004, 21). It is in this sense that this ought to be seen as a novel about the failure of a whole generation of Englishmen to respond soundly to despair, disillusionment, oblivion, and most importantly, to fragmentation in the 20th century. This should not be considered as the story of Daniel Martin only, but also of John Fowles, because as Peter Brandt points out, Daniel Martin and John Fowles share a couple of things in common: “*they are (bar a year) the same age; they are both interested in film and the theatre; in orchids, Englishness vs. Britishness, in Robin Hood; they hold the same views on the film industry, on the failings of their generation, on photography and Zen philosophy*” (1996, 160). This is why *Daniel Martin* is a semi-autobiographical novel which covers a timespan of three decades between the late 1940’s and the early 1970’s, and an area of four continents—America, Africa, Europe and the Middle East. Although it emerges to be a novel in which Daniel wishes to write about himself, it contains details from Fowles’s younger life which appear to be intended to develop a critical approach towards post-war Western culture as well. For instance, the first chapter, “The Harvest,” is entirely built upon Fowles’s own experience as a boarding school boy who used to help his family with the farming in Devon in the early 1940’s. In this respect, as Patricia J. Boomsma rightly points out, Daniel (and also Fowles) wishes his novel to be a product not only of his own past but also the past of his culture (1980, 330). A similar remark is also available in Cresap’s analysis of *Daniel Martin* as a novel with a scope expanding as far as “*to include the portrait of a generation (1940s Oxford) and, further, to become a portrait of the twentieth century*” (2013, 165).

Daniel Martin is both stylistically and thematically different from Fowles’s other novels to a

significant extent. Thematically speaking, it appears to be much less existentialist in its tone in comparison to Fowles's other novels—something which can be detected in the protagonist's decision to break away from “*cultural fashion*,” from “*elitist guilt*,” from “*existentialist nausea*,” and from “*the imagined that does not say, not only in, but behind the images, the real*” (Fowles 2004, 454). Over the course of his entire writing career, Fowles's understanding of freedom has changed significantly. As Butler remarks, Fowles's concern with the Sartrean freedom of the individual as an existentialist issue in the early years of his career has later been replaced with his newer focus on the Barthesian freedom of the author to play with the text. This can also be seen as a change from the existentialist conception of freedom as “*an indispensable absolute*” to the Poststructuralist perception of it as “*a chimera, an endlessly deferred goal*” (1991, 63). The structural differences, on the other hand, can be listed as follows: In the first place, *Daniel Martin* has a particularly “*ruminative pace*,” a “*studiedly unexciting plot*,” and “*frequently long and chatty sentences*” (Huffaker 1980, 19). One other important aspect in which *Daniel Martin* sets itself off from Fowles's other novels is that it has been described as “*a masterpiece of symbolically charged realism*” (Gardner 1977, 23). *Daniel Martin* is considered as the only realistic novel among Fowles's entire collection of fictional works for a number of reasons. One of them is that it is the only novel which Fowles brings to a “*unified and happy ending*” in which two lovers reunite after a long period of separation (Salami 1992, 20). The other one is that the exploration of themes such as friendship and familial love takes place for the first time in this novel (Olshen 1978, 117). And the third is that it is the only novel which reaches “*a genuine and satisfying resolution at its end*,” provides an occasion for the “*harmonizing of wills*,” and brings the separated minds of its two central characters to a true unification (Olshen 1978, 117).

Perhaps the most significant reason why *Daniel Martin* is so markedly realistic in comparison to Fowles's other works of fiction can be attributed to the theoretical background against which the writing of *Daniel Martin* was set. It is in the light of this theoretical background that both the composition of *Daniel Martin* as the novel and the sense of powerlessness from which Daniel Martin as the title character suffers can be better understood. This background derives its source from the views expressed by Georg Lukacs who, by and large, sets realism off against modernism, especially in those works of his from which Fowles took several excerpts and put them into his novel—namely *The Historical Novel* and *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. These views can be summed up as follows: To begin with, for Lukacs, realism reflects “*a writer's critical understanding of the world he lives in*” (1962, 72). The realist writer is the one who looks at the ontological context of his or her existence from a critical perspective. Therefore, Lukacs describes modernism as “*aesthetically appealing, but decadent*,” while he describes realism as “*fruitful*” and “*critical*” (1962, 92). The point at which the emphasis in *Daniel Martin* upon whole sight is crisscrossed with Lukacs's views becomes most noticeable when Lukacs associates modernist literature with “*the disintegration of the world of man—and consequently the disintegration of personality*,” whereas he treats realistic literature as a form in which the world is “*as a living whole inseparable from man himself*” (1962, 39).

Despite the theoretical allure of realism to provide a context in which the whole wins over disintegration, *Daniel Martin* cannot avoid displaying the most common properties of a postmodernist novel, becoming an example of contemporary fragmentation. The realistic touch to the narrative in *Daniel Martin* is shaded by Fowles's “*postmodernist gestures*” (Ferris 1982, 151). In addition to the shifts between flashbacks and flash-forwards and the shifts amongst different tenses, the most obvious postmodernist gesture in question can be identified as the manner in which the story is narrated. The story in *Daniel Martin* is told in a joint narration. It is

sometimes Fowles's third-person narrator who tells the story of Daniel Martin, sometimes Daniel Martin's first-person narrator who tells his own story, and sometimes Jenny herself who either takes over the narration just as she does before the chapter "Tsankawi" ends, or who contributes to Daniel's narrative in a few whole chapters. The narration, therefore, frequently shifts in between the first- and the third-person perspectives throughout much of the narrative.

On the whole, the shifts of time in the form of flash-forwards as well as flash-backs, the shifts in tenses from the past to the present, and the shifts in narratorial voices from the first- to the third-person throughout *Daniel Martin* have been variously accounted for. To begin with, Onega considers the shifts of narrative perspectives as instances in which not only the "empathy of the narrator with the hero" can be felt but also "the narrator's omniscience and the young hero's lack of hindsight" are juxtaposed (1989, 104). Olshen remarks that these shifts help to single out *Daniel Martin* as the only novel in which Fowles brings them to "a genuine and satisfying resolution at its end, [to] a real harmonizing of wills, [and to] a marriage of true minds" (1978, 117). Olshen also believes that they can be taken as representative of "the partial personae of the man attempting to see himself as others do" (1978, 113). One other perspective, suggested by Salami, places the stress upon the attempted reconciliation of subjectivity and objectivity through their use in the narrative (1992, 161). The same perspective also includes an interpretation of these shifts as the showcase of a challenge to the conventionality of the narration in almost every respect of it (1992, 174). As part of this perspective, these shifts are also conceived of as a search for the possible unification of the already shattered self of the narrator (1992, 183). According to Ruffaker, the shifts in the narrative perspectives as well as in the narrative tenses imply that while the third-person narrative voice makes it possible to get "a greater narrative objectivity," the use of the present tense works towards granting "greater immediacy to the present" (1980, 41-42). Alter suggests that the shifting of the tenses helps to create an occasion in which the narrator is able "to shuttle between times, to rediscover the past from later perspectives, to feel the subtle and shifting pressures of different pasts on present consciousness—in sum, to follow the precarious moral drift of a life awash in time" (1984, 149). And finally, Park believes that the shifts in question point to "the novelist's preoccupation with time" (1985, 158).

In particular, however, the shifts in the narrative perspectives have usually been accounted for by several scholars as part of a narrative strategy to strengthen the theme of wholeness in sight. Boomsma, for example, considers the back and forth movements in time and point of view of the narrative in *Daniel Martin* which have been intensified by the placement of Daniel "in the context of his and his culture's past" as specific manoeuvres, particularly employed by Fowles to fortify "the philosophical framework of 'whole sight'" (1980, 336). In support of Boomsma's opinion, Cooper also remarks that the flashbacks in *Daniel Martin* are intended to help "discover wholeness as an aesthetic principle governing form and as an ethical one shaping identity" (1991, 198). Similarly, Park argues that the reason why the storyline of *Daniel Martin* continually changes between a present scene and a past one without a regular pattern can be explained by the novel's early emphasis on the necessity for whole sight, basing her argument on a comparison of the narrative of novel to "a kaleidoscope of scenes" (1985, 157).

According to Cooper, one important aspect of *Daniel Martin* is the inseparability of the destination from its origin (1991, 201). This has also been described by Park as "the recircling at the end back to the beginning" (1985, 158). Cooper makes a similar point in her remark about the ending of the narrative where the reader is thrown back to the beginning (1991, 197). To understand the circularity of the narrative in *Daniel Martin*, it seems necessary to see how the ending of the narrative is tied to its beginning. Fowles's narrator starts the narrative in *Daniel Martin* with the following statement: "Whole sight; or all the rest is desolation" (Fowles 2004,

7). This is in fact the first sentence of the novel which John Fowles has written. However, this is also the very last sentence which Daniel fancies ending his own novel with:

That evening, in Oxford, leaning beside Jane in her kitchen while she cooked supper for them, Dan told her with a suitable irony that at least he had found a last sentence for the novel he was never going to write. She laughed at such flagrant Irishry; which is perhaps why, in the end, and in the knowledge that Dan's novel can never be read, lies eternally in the future, his ill-concealed ghost has made that impossible last his own impossible first (Fowles 2004, 704).

The ending of the narrative in *Daniel Martin* is thus craftily connected to its beginning. One other detail that can support the argument about the circularity of the narrative comes from Onega, who draws attention to the fact that the novel ends with Daniel and Jane being brought exactly to the point at Oxford where “they had taken the wrong fork of the road” twenty-six years before (1989, 120). The theme of returning therefore permeates much of *Daniel Martin*, which “consistently emphasizes the re-experiencing of things rather than first-time undertakings, and Dan's middle-age is a pattern of returnings – to England and Devon, to Egypt and Jane, to the writing of literature instead of film scripts” (Cooper 1991, 198). It is through such narrative acts of going back to an earlier period of time in his life that Daniel can establish an essential link between what he is about to be in the near future and what he has been so far. For this reason, as Onega also remarks, the circularity of the narrative appears to be intended to allow for a fusion of binary opposites between “the real and the imaginary, the written and the unwritten, the actual and the potential” (1989, 99).

One other important aspect of *Daniel Martin* is that it is built upon a mirroring structure. This is a semi-autobiographical novel which was written by John Fowles in the late 1970's while he was in his forties about Daniel Martin who is depicted as someone who seeks newer ways to write an autobiographical novel while he is in his forties (Onega 1989, 99). One further remark by Onega about the duality of Daniel Martin as a hero both in John Fowles's novel and in his own narrative helps to illustrate the mirroring structure of the novel as well:

By making the first sentence in the John Fowles's novel, “whole sight, or all the rest is desolation,” both the ontological author's real beginning and the unwritten intended ending of his character's future novel, Daniel Martin acquires a circular structure in which the real and the imaginary, the written and the unwritten, the actual and the potential, merge (Onega 1989, 99).

According to Park, the emphasis upon whole sight is further strengthened by Fowles's use of Tarquinia, Tsankawi and Palmyra as the three separate settings where the ruins of three different civilizations are interwoven with one another by “literary allusions,” “verbal echoes,” and “direct references” (1985, 160). In elaboration of Park's suggestion, Salami draws attention to the journey of Daniel and Jane to Egypt, Lebanon and Syria where they go in the hope of being able “to dig deep in the ‘archaeology’ of their self-knowledge and to achieve their own personal fulfilment” (1998, 143). In Salami's view, the last section of the novel is important for the establishment of a reunion between the two lovers because “the Orient cleanses, arranges, organizes, and reconstructs already disorganized and split selves, selves like those of Daniel and Jane” (1998, 147).

On the other hand, Cooper prefers to describe these settings as “mythic and timeless” places (1991, 200). The timelessness can be glimpsed in Daniel's references to the ancient settings in which he appears to wish to bring the ancient perception of time back to life. The ancient, Daniel (and also Fowles) believed, had had the key which we, moderns, have lost. The explanation of this key lies in the juxtaposition of the cultural perceptions of time between the

past and now. Indeed, Daniel himself expresses his view of the essence of being a modern Englishman in terms of entertaining a national inclination towards living in flashbacks. According to him, the English are “*the race that live in flashback, in the past and future*” (Fowles 2004, 371). In this respect, Daniel appears to be drawing attention to the absence of the present moment in the common perception of time among English people. Despite being an Englishman of the mid-20th century, therefore, he expresses a longing to avoid the use of flashbacks in his projected novel, and instead he wishes to follow in the footsteps of the Tsankawi people who had tended to treat time as “*horizontal, like a skyline; not cramped, linear and progressive*” (Fowles 2004, 371). His desire to treat time as a constantly present moment can also be observed in the final lines of “The Harvest,” the first chapter of *Daniel Martin* in which he goes back to his childhood years. The third-person narrator describes Daniel’s sense of time as follows: “*Without past or future, purged of tenses; collecting this day, pregnant with being*” (Fowles 2004, 16). Daniel thus reveals his awareness of the impact of modernism on the fragmentation of human consciousness, and he therefore shares his desire with the reader to consider time as unfragmented and as a constant now so that the “*totality of consciousness modern man has completely lost*” might be recovered and preserved (Fowles 2004, 371).

With respect to this emphasis upon the whole sight, it seems as if the whole novel would be built upon the dynamics of structural and thematic unity. However, contrary to the expectation, much of the narrative is left deeply fragmented. As Salami points it out, *Daniel Martin* emerges to be a novel of fragmentation, disorder and disorientation which Daniel, the first-person narrator, “*attempts to rearrange, reorganize, and reassemble*” (1992, 159). In a similar vein, Olshen regards *Daniel Martin* as a novel of narrative freedom “*to digress from the story line,*” “*to fracture chronology,*” and “*to halt the passage of time altogether for excursions into tangential areas and times past*” (1978, 111). It is only the last eleven chapters in which the third-person perspective is kept unaltered. The decision to stop changing from one narrative perspective to another signifies, according to some scholars, a change of direction from disorientation to orientation, and from disorganization to organization. Scholars such as Salami and Olshen tend to interpret the constant use of the third-person narration in the last eleven chapters as a sign that fragmentation has now been superseded by integration, and whole sight has now been finally achieved (Olshen, 1978, 115; Salami 1992, 169). In accord with Salami and Olshen, Onega puts forward the views that the narrative decision to stick to one single perspective over the last eleven chapters is a move away “*from unsteadiness and confusion of narrative persons [...] towards the desired steadiness and overall control of the narrative*” (1989, 108). In a similar manner, Cooper suggests that the changeover in the narration from fragmentation to integration points to “*both the progressive discovery of a sustained narrative voice and an unambiguous commitment to closure*” (1991, 196). Peter Brandt joins these scholars with his remark that the narratorial stability in the last eleven chapters provides proof that “*Daniel has now re-collected the necessary fragments from the past and is able to move towards the ‘whole sight’ of the future*” (1996, 154). As a sign of this discovery, it seems like Daniel has recovered the final missing link in the chain of his narrative with his happy reunion with Jane and he has finally achieved a durable whole sight.

In contrast to the abovementioned criticism, however, the structural fragmentation of the narration into varying voices as well as alternating tenses over a larger section of *Daniel Martin* appears to me to be a sign of powerlessness that prevents Daniel from deciding upon a specific way of turning his fragmented life story into a coherent whole. In this respect, Daniel can best be described as a man of irresolution. The reason why Daniel feels powerless and irresolute to write a novel in a specific manner comes from his own words which he speaks during a conversation with Jane. Observing a strict distinction between being a scriptwriter and being a

novelist, Daniel reveals to Jane his sheer lack of confidence in being able to turn himself into a novelist from a scriptwriter: “*I couldn’t just write a novel about a scriptwriter. That would be absurd. A novelist who wasn’t a scriptwriter might do it. But I’m a scriptwriter who isn’t a novelist*” (Fowles 2004, 437). Daniel cannot come to terms with being a novelist who is also a scriptwriter at the same time. This is partly due to his choice of scriptwriting as a profession which comes after he makes his mind up to live in America. He finds himself caught in between his sense of professional attachment as a scriptwriter to Hollywood and his sense of national attachment as a would-be novelist to England: “*The novel, print, is very English; the theatre (despite Shakespeare) is not*” (Fowles 2004, 180). It is also possible to see references in the novel to Daniel’s irresolution. To begin with, the chapter, titled “In the Silence of Other Voices,” contains a reference to Dan’s lack of confidence in himself as a novelist-to-be. The third-person narrator informs the reader that the idea of writing a novel turns into “*a pipe-dream, one more yearning for the impossible*” for Daniel while he reads some passages from Lukacs (Fowles 2004, 618). Furthermore, as he reads Lukacs’s notes on Scott’s novels, he begins to see “*himself as being like someone with a deep feeling for an art, but no creative talent for it*” (Fowles 2004, 617). Similarly, the next chapter, titled “Flights,” contains a description by Daniel of himself as someone who suffers from “*powerlessness*” and “*inertia*” (Fowles 2004, 624).

Fowles makes it evident in the final lines of *Daniel Martin* that Daniel has still not written one single line of his novel. The reader can clearly see that the writing of a novel is still an idea in his mind; and the reader is further informed that it will never become an actual thing, either. However, it is also an undeniable fact that by the time he or she turns the last leaf over, the reader will have read an actual story of more than 700 pages about Daniel Martin. At this point, the question arises as to whose narrative this actually is. Is it Daniel’s narrative or Fowles’s? The answer is that this is in fact a product of a joint narration. *Daniel Martin* deploys two separate narrators until the last eleven chapters—the narrator which Fowles as the author of *Daniel Martin* employs and the narrator which Daniel himself becomes as he tells his own story, rather than one single narrator using two different narrative voices at the same time. Daniel’s indecisiveness is covered up and made up for by “*his ill-concealed ghost*” in the final eleven chapters (Fowles 2004, 704). It is this ghost narrator who brings the bits and pieces of Daniel’s narrative to a closed ending for Daniel by discontinuing the alternation of the narrative voices as well as the tenses after Chapter 35, entitled “The Shadows of Women.”

It is Jenny who brings Daniel in their last meeting face to face with the fact that he will “*ever have the patience for a novel*” (Fowles 2004, 693). It is important to note at this point that long before Daniel reveals his powerlessness to maintain a position of control over his own narrative and therefore decides to exist in someone else’s narrative, Jenny, who had earlier suggested to Dan that he should write a novel, expresses her refusal to be part of Daniel’s narrative in her third contribution: “*I know this isn’t what you want. But it’s what you asked for. I just won’t be only something in your script. In any of your scripts. Ever again.*” (Fowles 2004, 495). The implication of this appears to be that she refuses to consent to the status of someone who is just one of the many characters in someone else’s fiction. Although the third-person narrator expresses a feeling of disgust on Daniel’s part at failing to be “*his own master*” as well as at “*being a character in someone else’s play,*” Daniel cannot help feeling inclined towards choosing the latter (Fowles 2004, 606). Therefore, in contrast to Jenny, Daniel favours the status of being one of the many characters in someone else’s fiction over the status of having characters in his own fiction.

As Robert Alter suggests, the novel *Daniel Martin* can be thought of as an attempt by Daniel to create a self-portrait of himself in fiction just like the Dutch painter Rembrandt had earlier

done in painting (1984, 156). This should be one of the reasons why Fowles brings Daniel after his breakup with Jenny to the art gallery in which the self-portraits of Rembrandt have been put on display. Yet he feels “dwarfed” in front of the Rembrandt painting, in the sense that both his own existence and his own art are much smaller than that of Rembrandt. It seems like he feels that the Rembrandt portrait is devoid of feelings, despite its representativeness of the modern art and its timelessness. For this reason, it dawns upon Daniel that true art means an attempt to combine skill with feeling: “*It is not finally a matter of skill, of knowledge, of intellect; of good luck or bad, but choosing and learning to feel*” (Fowles 2004, 703). The “*remorseless and aloof*” modern man has, however, turned his back against the humanist values of existence (Fowles 2004, 703). *Daniel Martin* is therefore brought to its conclusion with an emphasis upon the need to combine compassion with will, which the third-person narrator considers will be an embodiment of true humanism which Daniel has at last come to realize: “*No true compassion without will, no true will without compassion*” (Fowles 2004, 703). It is perhaps this statement which best expresses Daniel’s realization of the need for whole sight. Daniel also wishes to travel back to the times of the people who had lived in places like Palmyra and Tsankawi and who had produced no works of art without their feelings being involved in them; however, he sees that the distance between his now and their past is unbridgeable. For this reason, he feels powerless to walk back all of this distance.

To sum up, what begins as the need to make a significant change in Daniel’s life translates itself into a desire to stop writing others into his narratives; he rather wants to write himself into his own narrative. Triggered by Jenny’s suggestion to write a novel about himself, Daniel decides to take a step forward. He wishes to bring the fragments of his past and present life into a lasting unity both in real life and in fiction. In this respect, his ambition lies in his desire to “*recollect—literally re-collect—his own past selves [and] to achieve a viable wholeness*” (Brandt 1996, 151). Yet, defined by his creator John Fowles elsewhere as a “*thoroughness of vision,*” whole sight keeps eluding Daniel Martin (Fowles and Vipond 1996, 21). During the whole course of the narrative in *Daniel Martin*, it can be clearly seen that his chances of achieving that sort of wholeness gets diminished to nothing as his first-person narration gets heavily mixed up with the third-person narration. The switches in the narrative voices from the first person to the third and vice versa indicate that Daniel is suffering from both a sense of irresolution and a sense of incompetence in bringing the bits and pieces of his narrative together. The focus of the present discussion has therefore been placed upon *Daniel Martin* as Daniel Martin’s personal narrative which can be summed up as a story of failure, resulting from his abovementioned irresolution and incompetence, to combat fragmentation and to stop it from becoming visible in its narrative form. The reason why Daniel begins and remains so powerless and indecisive during the whole course of his narrative is accounted for by references to Georg Lukacs’s apology for realism up against modernism. His theory rests upon the assumption that the modernist writer cannot slip away from the grasp of the tendency towards fragmentation. Nevertheless, if there is some sort of success on the part of Daniel Martin in achieving a considerable degree of wholeness of this sort—as some would still be likely to suggest—it can only be claimed to exist thanks to the intrusions by a third-person narrator just like the one employed by John Fowles. The intrusions by Fowles’s narrator make the fragments of Daniel’s narrative come together for a relatively meaningful whole, just as they do especially in the last eleven chapters of *Daniel Martin*. Without these intrusions, the Daniel Martin of *Daniel Martin* as the novel John Fowles wrote would not have been as happy and united both in mind and in spirit with himself as well as with his lover—that is, Jane—as the Daniel Martin of *Daniel Martin* as the projected novel Daniel Martin thought of writing but never wrote.

REFERENCES

- Alter R. (1984). *Motives for Fiction*. Cambridge 1984.
- Boomsma P. J. (1980). “‘Whole Sight’: Fowles, Lukacs, and *Daniel Martin*”. *Journal of Modern Literature* 8/2 (1980) 325-336.
- Brandt P. (1996). “Somewhere Else in the Forest”. *Twentieth Century Literature* 42/1 (1996) 145-164.
- Butler L. (1991). “John Fowles and the Fiction of Freedom”. Ed. J. Acheson. *The British and Irish Novel since 1960* (1991) 62-77. New York.
- Cooper P. (1991). *The Fictions of John Fowles: Power, Creativity, Femininity*. Ottawa 1991.
- Cresap K. (2013). “The World-Making Capacity of John Fowles's *Daniel Martin*”. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 55/2 (2013) 159-183.
- Ferris I. (1982). “Realist Intention and Mythic Impulse in *Daniel Martin*”. *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 12/2 (1982) 146-153.
- Fowles J. & Vipond D. (1996). “An Unholy Inquisition”. *Twentieth Century Literature* 42/1 (1996) 12-28.
- Fowles J. (2004). *Daniel Martin*. London 2004.
- Gardner J. (1977, October 1). “In Defense of the Real”. *Saturday Review*, pp. 22-24.
- Huffaker R. (1980). *John Fowles*. Boston 1980.
- Lukacs G. (1969). *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. London 1969.
- Olshen B. N. (1978). *John Fowles*. New York 1978.
- Onega S. J. (1989). *Form and Meaning in the Novels of John Fowles*. London 1989.
- Park S. (1985). “Time and Ruins in John Fowles's *Daniel Martin*”. *Modern Fiction Studies* 31/1 (1985) 157-163.
- Salami M. (1992). *John Fowles's Fiction and the Poetics of Postmodernism*. Rutherford 1992.
- Salami M. (1998). “The Archaeological Representation of the Orient in John Fowles's *Daniel Martin*”. *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 29/3 (1998) 143-168.
- Wilson R. J. (1995). “Overcoming Reification in *Daniel Martin*: John Fowles's Response to George Lukacs”. *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 25/3 (1995) 304-319.