WETENSKAPLIKE BYDRAES VAN DIE PU VIR CHO
Reeks H: Inougurele Redes Nr. 21

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NOVEL

W.J. de V. Prinsloo

Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir CHO
1976

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NOVEL

Teaching the novel is such an absorbing activity that the opportunity for theoretical speculation does not often arise. I wish therefore on the assumption of a second chair in the Department of English to indulge myself a little by discussing very briefly the special nature of the novel, and then to consider some of the reasons why I regard the novel as an eminently satisfying field of study.

As its name implies the novel is a new literary genre whose first acknowledged masters are Defoe, Richardson and Fielding. Although these three pioneers do not have much in common, the fact that their first novels all appeared in a span of about twenty years in the first half of the 18th century is generally accepted as significant. Prof. Ian Watt ascribes the rise of the novel to a change in the structure of English society at the time and to a change in attitudes which led to a rejection of the romances which had been fashionable for centuries[1].

The most important characteristic of the novel, as compared with other literary genres, is its realism. By this is meant the novelist's predilection for individual experience as opposed to the universal. Earlier epics, and even the plays of the greatest of all dramatists, Shakespeare, derived their plots from history or fable, and this led to the establishing of literary conventions which lent to each genre a fairly rigid traditional structure. The excellence or otherwise of any work of literary art was consequently in the first place dependent upon its author's adherence to formal convention. The novelist, however, in attempting to convey an impression of fidelity to human experience, has to avoid the semblance of imitating any other novel. The result is that the apparent lack of structure is a basic problem in the study and interpretation of the novel.

I use the words "apparent lack of structure" advisedly because novelists like Charlotte Brontë in *Jane Eyre* and Jane Austen in virtually all her novels have shown that structure can be an important attribute of the good novel. And even such a notoriously untidy writer as Charles Dickens has succeeded in creating a well-structured work like *Great Expectations.* Novelists of our own time have learned a great deal about structure from the master Henry James, but it is significant that the comparatively loosely built works of D.H. Lawrence seem to be more popular than the painstaking works of Henry James. Structure, it is suggested, is not a basic requirement for the acceptance of a novel. In truth, structure in the novel is as new as the genre itself. It is not an architectural concept, but depends on what has been called "unity through metamorphosis", which is a musical concept[2].

In his quest for realism the novelist ignores the plot sources used by

writers from as far back as ancient Greece and Rome down to Shakespeare and Milton. Defoe and Richardson disregarded mythology, history, legend and previous literature, and thus set an important precedent. In its concern with individual experience in preference to collective tradition the novel reflects a tendency which has become apparent since the Renaissance. The gradual decline of the great tragic hero of the stage and his replacement by the comic protagonist of the novel must be seen as an apect of the changing cultural climate which originally gave rise to the novel and in latter years has made possible its wide acceptance. Novelists have not completely discarded myth as a source of plot but it is significant that when they do employ archetypal mythical figures it is Don Juan or Don Quixote rather than Oedipus or Dr Faustus that they choose. The novel concerns itself with individual man and studies him in such detail that the abstraction and the simplification required by the heroic view become impossible. Human inadequacy rather than man's potential greatness is the basic theme.

And this theme is presented by means of particular people in particular circumstances. In older narratives the protagonist is more often a general human type moving against a stylised background in accordance with literary tradition. Fielding in his *Tom Jones* achieves an effective blending of this traditional convention and his new approach. The protagonist, Tom Jones, is a highly individualised character with a many-faceted nature, a true original in the by now accepted novelistic tradition. But the schoolmaster who employs the time-honoured birch to correct the manners of his pupil is called Mr Thwackum. The philosopher (who insists on close definition of every word used in argument) is Mr Square.

Fielding in this manner achieves a differential focus which seems admirably to emphasize the individuality of his protagonist while retaining the author's freedom of satirical comment on the social environment.

Satirical comment has ever since Richardson and Fielding been an important aspect of the novelist's function and has distinguished the work of contemporary authors like Kingsley Amis, Joyce Cary and Anthony Powell no less than that of the past giants Jane Austen, George Eliot and Charles Dickens. Satire is of course not new to literature, but in comparison with the highly artificial and stylised satire of the Restoration type of theatre, for example, satire in the novel usually has an immediacy which elicits reader response on a more personal level. This may be ascribed to the fact that the novelist deals in the particular rather than the general, which leads to closer identification of the reader with the character.

Reader identification is in fact an important aspect of what Prof. Watt calls "the realistic particularity" of the novel. The novel is different from all other genres in the particularity it achieves by means of individualization of character and detailed presentation of setting.

Interest in the definition of the individual was philosophically fashionable in the 18th century – at the time when the novel became popular – and it is assumed that this interest was part of the cultural climate which gave rise to the novel. The new tendency is evidenced in the novelist's use of proper names to establish individual identity. Prior to the novel the tendency was to use names which suggested the characteristic or non-particular rather than the individual. Defoe established the new tendency by choosing casual names instead of conventional or fanciful ones, and Richardson followed him by giving to all his major characters both a given and a surname. His famous first heroine, Pamela Andrews, is an appropriate example, but his interest in realism did not prevent him from occasionally choosing a name which hints at its owner's special propensity, like the villain of his first novel, Robert Lovelace. In the matter of names Richardson is in fact something of a transitional figure between the classical preference for the universal and the realistic preference for the particular, for he does have characters called Mrs *Sin*clair and Sir Charles *Grand*ison, while Fielding even names an important character in *Tom Jones* Squire Allworthy. Gradually, however, the tendency was more and more to choose the names of major characters more or less at random, and Smollett and Sterne, who wrote in the late 18th century, were the last major novelists to use type names.

Of greater importance than the use of individual names, however, is the novel's depiction of personal identity through duration in time. The philosopher David Hume in his *Treatise of Human Nature* published in 1739-40 echoes the earlier John Locke when he says: "Had we no memory, we never should have any notion of causation, nor consequently of that chain of causes and effects, which constitute our self or person"[3]. And it is in its depiction of the individual's self-awareness against a background of time and place that the novel is unique. In this it is also a typical product of the post-Renaissance mind. The novel breaks with the older tradition of presenting unchanging moral precepts by means of timeless stories. It presents causal connection between past experience and present action as the basis of human conduct and rejects the older use of disguise and coincidence in narrative.

Characterization therefore becomes less stereotyped than in earlier narrative. The character is usually depicted in a state of flux and in extreme cases such as the stream of consciousness technique the novelist even attempts a direct portrayal of his character's thought processes. In present-day critical thought development of the protagonist is generally seen as essential to literary excellence in the novel, and in this function the novel differs basically from drama. In its greater freedom from suggestive concentration, as compared with drama, the novel carries the additional obligation of detailed observation of the minutiae of existence and of their interpretation in

terms of emotional response. In fulfilling his function of imposing a pattern on the raw material of everyday life the novelist has to depend on his reader's own awareness of the role of time in meaningful existence.

The detailed depiction of the environment in which the character moves is a necessary adjunct to his existence in time. It has been said that most great novels are regional novels, and while such a statement calls to mind the marvellous integration of character and landscape achieved by Thomas Hardy or the uncanny resemblance between materialistic man and sordid commercial environment as depicted by Arnold Bennett, there are also other levels of environmental evocation: the mystical in Mary Webb, the symbolic in D.H. Lawrence, the overwhelming in Joseph Conrad, the puzzling in Samuel Beckett, the imprisoning in Graham Greene, the threatening in Franz Kafka. The list is endless. More: the awareness of Jane Austen's ghost that the visitor experiences in some of the stately homes of England is eloquent testimony to the skilful novelist's ability to transform environment from objective geographical entity to subjective emotional experience. It is only on the large canvas of the novel that this is possible.

Having attempted a description of the novel as a genre, I should now like to give an outline of the reasons why I have chosen to specialize in the study of the novel.

A basic need in the teaching of any subject is usually the definition of that subject. Now it is an interesting fact about literature that defining it is extremely difficult. Most people when rejecting a particular work, would contemptuously declare: "It isn't literature." That would imply some objective, absolute definition which enables them to make such a statement, but closer questioning will usually reveal that rejection is based on the presence or absence of some peripheral characteristic which quite often is not entirely relevant.

The situation is even more confusing when one tries to define the novel as a way of distinguishing it from other literary genres, and it has to be conceded that, despite many attempts by capable minds, no generally acceptable definition of the novel exists at this stage. So there is the situation which many of the scientifically inclined would probably shudder at: that of a teacher teaching something which he cannot define. But to the teacher of literature that is not an important problem, especially at undergraduate level, because the emphasis is on acquainting the student with as many as possible of the basic works which in the course of time have come to be generally accepted as belonging to the body of English literature. In other words, the student is made familiar with examples of excellence in literature in the belief that discrimination and taste thus formed are more valuable than abstract definition. And in this process it is natural that the teacher should concentrate on those specific aspects which afford him the most satisfaction, for in the study of literature, perhaps more than in any

other subject, the emphasis is on enjoyment.

E.M. Forster in his famous book, *Aspects of the Novel*, points out that the novelist appeals to our intelligence and imagination, not merely to our curiosity, and that he places the emphasis upon value[4]. Laurence Lerner reduces the functions of literature, and therefore of the novel, to three: it is knowledge, it expresses emotion, and it arouses emotion[5].

The words *value* and *knowledge* should not, however, suggest that the novel is a substitute for formal philosophical speculation. Plato's suggestion in his Republic of "an ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" remains valid to this day. It is still true that literature is not philosophy. The study of literature cannot take the place of the study of philosophy, nor can the philosopher's methods be applied *per se* to the study of literature, for if the philosopher does not avoid the expression or the arousal of emotion he will be in danger of writing either bad philosophy or bad literature.

In the same way literature can be shown not to be psychology or sociology or history. The novel in particular leans heavily, sometimes, on these and other sciences, but it can never replace any of them and it can never be judged by their principles, for the knowledge that the novel brings also takes into consideration what D.H. Lawrence has called "the knowledge of the blood", or what George Eliot has called "the need of the heart", although they do not mean the same thing.

It is possible to gain an enormous amount of knowledge about people by reading other works than those called literature, and psycho-analysis can be seen as a more systematic source of human insight than, say, *Sons and Lovers* by D.H. Lawrence which is clearly based on a theme from Freudian psychology. Yet, the knowledge obtained from the novel is not the same as that gained from a scientific treatise of for example the Oedipus theme. The scientific treatise provides rational information; the novel, imaginative information, or as Shelley has said: "Reason is the enumeration of quantities already known; imagination is the perception of the value of those quantities, both separately and as a whole"[6].

Most works of literary art do not contain factual information with which the reader is unfamiliar. Everyone knows that if a father is unreasonable and his daughters without love the family life is bound to break up. Yet we read and see *King Lear* repeatedly without feeling a surfeit of this particular bit of information, because, in the words of Laurence Lerner, "we do not really know anything until we have proved it on the pulses"[7]. Literature offers intuitive knowledge or imaginative understanding. The novel, especially, by virtue of its ability to place the protagonist in his environment of time and space and to subject him to a minute analysis of motivation and reaction, enables the reader so closely to identify himself with the character that he gains knowledge by vicarious expe-

rience, and it is a very special characteristic of such knowledge that its acquisition is accompanied by the kind of enjoyment that enables one to read again and again the same work in spite of already knowing the information it has to offer. Reading is a creative experience because it enables us in the words of Shelley "to imagine that which we know"[8], and because, as F.R. Leavis has said, the great novelist changes our awareness of the possibilities of life[9]. And although the reader is quick to reject any presentation which is felt to be untrue, the grotesques in Charles Dickens, for example, are accepted and enjoyed because they are realized to be exaggerations of basic human characteristics. Man derives endless delight from the observation of humanity.

The bond between observer and observed humanity is clearly emotional; so the novelist, if he is to gain the creative co-operation of the reader, has to take cognizance of the fact that his work has the function of both expressing his own emotion and evoking the reader's emotional response.

Emotion, in fact, seems to be the essence of the kind of creative intuition that distinguishes the novelist, but it is usually in his creation of tone, or in other words, of the emotional atmosphere of his work that a novelist displays that most vital of all artistic endowments, intelligence. The restrained and clear expression or depiction of emotion remains one of the more pleasing aspects of the pattern imposed upon his raw material by the skilful novelist, and although even the greatest novelists are prone to the occasional lapse in this respect, it is counterfeit or surplus emotion, in other words sentimentality, more than any other weakness, that condemns an incompetent writer. Intelligence is revealed in the self-knowledge of the novelist which is a prerequisite to restraint, and also in his knowledge of people which enables him to judge nicely the expected reaction of his reader.

If the generally held ideas about the powerful influence of literature on people are true, it is a vast consolation to believe that the civilizing precept of emotional restraint can be absorbed from the reading of good novels.

The question of the effect of literature on the reader is one of those controversial ones which are the subject of both involved aesthetic theory and divergent moral speculation, and the situation is not simplified by the grain of truth implied in the tongue-in-the-cheek question by Laurence Lerner: "Why say that the appreciation of poetry, being so richly satisfying, must in some way make you a finer person; why not say that you need to be a fine person to appreciate poetry?"[10]. Bluntly stated as it is here, this question leaves an unpleasant taste of arrogance, but in truth it underlines the very important duty of the serious reader to be aware always of the need for clarity in his own response to literature.

Emotion is not aroused by literature only. Melodramas, thrillers, detective stories, pornography – all of these are capable of arousing stronger emotions than does art. The point is that the full response to a story like *Heart of Darkness* by Conrad demands a more sustained and intense effort than does a science-fiction story. The emotional impact of the more serious work may therefore be delayed or even blunted because of lack of attention on the part of the reader, or because of lack of insight, or by mental conditioning. The tremendous financial success of the sentimental book *Love Story* may be seen as a good instance of how a segment of the film-going public can be conditioned by years of violence on the cinema screen to the enthusiastic reception of any competently written story which posits a different pattern of living.

The more sophisticated reader, it is hoped, is less easily conditioned into the acceptance of inferior work, but it is only through training by means of contact with the products of the best writers that one can develop an adequately balanced sensibility which makes it possible to prefer the satisfaction derived from continued application to the demands of a great novel to the instant emotional release (if that is the word) of a "tear-jerker". The pleasure that one derives from reading good literature is therefore also to some extent the result of knowing that one is in contact with the best minds.

And this contact can be more thorough in the novel than in any other genre, because of the very completeness of the novelist's treatment of his material, and of the time the reader has to devote to the reading and re-reading of the worthwhile novel. D.H. Lawrence, in his characteristic style, has put this fact in these words: "In their wholeness (novels) affect the whole man alive, which is the man himself, beyond any part of him. They set the whole tree trembling with a new access of life, they do not just stimulate growth in one direction"[11].

It is important to remember that reading is a creative activity, i.e. that the reader in responding to the work of art may be said to be making a new work by imposing his own interpretation on it. Valéry states this thought as follows: "There is no such thing as the true meaning of a text. No such thing as the authority of the author. Whatever he meant, he has written what he has written. Once it is published, a text is a kind of apparatus which everyone can use in his own way and according to his means: it is not at all sure that the man who made it uses it any better than others. Besides, if he knows what he wanted to do, this knowledge will always hinder him from seeing what he has done"[12].

This is perhaps too extreme a statement of the reader's creative role, but it places due emphasis on the reader's responsibility of unending effort at plumbing the full depths of meaning in the novel, and of avoiding interpretations which do not do justice to the novel as a complete work

of art. The best possible preparation for this function is long-continued and intimate contact with worthwhile works of fiction under the guidance of enlightened and mature minds. Evaluation in literature, as in all other art, depends largely on comparison with other works of agreed excellence. The person who has not had access to the body of established classics in literature, and who is therefore uninformed on literary or artistic conventions, is apt to base judgment on irrelevant grounds or on insignificant details or on misunderstanding.

So far, in my attempt at enumerating those qualities of the novel which make it a worthwhile field of study I have not mentioned the most important factor: the moral. F.R. Leavis in his influential work on the novel, *The Great Tradition*, lists the handful of novelists who, in his judgment, are the really great ones. They are Jane Austen, George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, Charles Dickens and D.H. Lawrence. These artists are to him "significant in terms of the human awareness they promote"[13] – a statement which is further enlarged when, in a reference to Jane Austen, Leavis says: "The principle of organization, and the principle of development, in her work is an intense moral interest of her own in life that is in the first place a preoccupation with certain problems that life compels on her as personal ones"[14]. Leavis explains that the value of this moral preoccupation lies in the manner in which Jane Austen impersonalizes it, in other words in the way in which she presents her personal moral concerns, and it is important to note that Leavis lays great stress on the distinction between a *discussion* of problems and ideas and the manner in which a skilled novelist incorporates them into the body of his artistic creation. In order to be successful in this the novelist needs to have been "disturbed" by life.

If I understand Leavis as I hope I do he thus sees the tradition of the English novel as a concern with morality at work, which would bear out my earlier statement that the study of literature brings knowledge, although I hasten to qualify the statement by a rejection of the didactic novel. The didactic novelist, I feel, moves outside the realm of art by trying to usurp the functions of other, more competent minds in their own field.

The great novelist, in Leavis's view, is "distinguished by a vital capacity for experience, a kind of reverent openness before life, and a marked moral intensity"[15]. The novelist is therefore in the first place concerned with human beings and not with morality in the abstract. Leavis quite correctly points out that the aesthetic attitude which professes superiority to moral issues in the novel leads to triviality. On the other hand, it is exactly the disturbing picture of man – ordinary man, not heroic man – facing the full moral consequences of his actions that lends to the novel its enormous appeal and makes of it the civilizing factor it has become in its 250

years of existence. The novel – all literature – to be of value must be "on the side of life".

Leavis's insistence upon "moral intensity" and "reverent openness before life" is rejected by David Lodge on the grounds that these are not literary concepts but ethical ones[16]. His objection seems valid when, as he himself points out, consideration of these concepts leads away from the consideration of the literary work itself. He does not, however, seem to take into account that the literary work of art is after all not identical with life itself, however realistic a novel may be. The novel always remains an idealised representation of life which has been given meaning by having a pattern imposed upon it, and part of this pattern is the moral interpretation which the author has placed upon his material. In the words of H.R. Rookmaker: "Form can never be without content nor content without form"[17].

Derwent May presents a more cogent argument: "The 'moral' critic of the novel finds himself doing precisely one of the things that the pure 'literary' critic does. The good novel cannot fail to please the moralist. For what does it do but show unfalteringly the consequences of men's actions, and invite us with unique persuasiveness to share the feelings of all who are involved?"[18].

This sharing of feelings, or identification between reader and protagonist, presents one of the most difficult problems that face the student of the novel. Serious students are sometimes perturbed by having read descriptions of activities which they regard as immoral and they are at a loss to reconcile their enjoyment of the novel with their rejection of what a character does. And the problem is not made easier by their lack of awareness of literary convention, their inability to distinguish between reality and the artificial "reality" of the novel, and by the unconscious attitude of many otherwise well-informed laymen that literature must be didactic. In its extreme form this didactic demand finds expression in the anomaly of a person contentedly – if not avidly – reading in the newspapers about activities which he rejects in a novel, because art in his view is concerned only with the "beautiful". Fortunately the teacher of literature at advanced undergraduate level rarely has to deal with naivety of such an extreme nature, but this question has to be faced by any teacher who hopes to introduce his students to the rewarding study of literature as opposed to the reading of novels to pass the time.

Tentatively the answer has already been suggested by various remarks in the preceding argument. The key to the problem is the fact that the novelist is not reproducing reality. This is, of course, true of all literary genres, but it is often forgotten in the case of the novel because the novel is less subject to rigorous literary conventions than the other genres.

Even when a novelist chooses the first-person point of view for tel-

ling his story, it is always obvious that the writer is not the same man who engages in the activities of his domestic routine. The narrator assumes a special persona in order to tell his tale, he becomes himself a character in his book, and, if as I have argued, the reader has a creative function, or, more accurately, a re-creative function, in the reading of a novel, then for as long as the reader is actively engaged with the novel he also assumes a different persona. The reader who is actively concerned with Marlow's moral dilemma in *Heart of Darkness* is not the same man who was washing up after the evening meal. Coleridge has stated this idea more elegantly in his famous phrase, "the willing suspension of disbelief", by which he postulates the need for the reader temporarily to submerge his own persona in the total experience of reading a work of literature. If this "suspension" were impossible it would be impossible for anybody to read any work dealing with a theme or ideas which he does not accept completely.

Wayne Booth has devoted wise attention to this problem. "The author," he says, "creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader; he makes his reader, as he makes his second self, and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find complete agreement"[19]. While this postulation of two different personae is a handy device, Booth immediately admits that it does not always work. There will always be books in which one cannot accept the role required of the mock reader, and the fault may lie in either inadequate craftsmanship or incompatibility of attitudes. Although we are capable of reading many authors from whose expressed attitudes we differ, it nevertheless remains an inescapable fact of human nature that the pleasure we derive from a literary work is in proportion to the degree of our acceptance of these attitudes. "Differences of belief, even in the sense of abstract, speculative systems, are always to some extent relevant, often seriously hampering, and sometimes fatal," says Booth.

T.S. Eliot, that giant of 20th century letters, writing in 1936, laid down a very useful guideline: "In ages like our own, in which there is no ... common agreement, it is the more necessary for Christian readers to scrutinize their reading, especially of works of imagination, with explicit ethical and theological standards. The 'greatness' of literature cannot be determined solely by literary standards; though we must remember that whether it is literature or not can be determined only by literary standards"[20].

Eliot does not, however, advocate withdrawal. He advises: "We shall certainly continue to read the best ... of what our time provides; but we must tirelessly criticize it according to our own principles, and not merely according to the principles admitted by the writers and by the critics who discuss it in the public press."

It is reassuring to realize that there are great works of art which seem to be capable of rising above differences of belief. Shakespeare's work is a

pre-eminent example, but the wide acceptance of Shakespeare's plays is perhaps the most eloquent testimony to the way in which he has presented those values which are most widely accepted in Western civilization. Through the tangible experiences of his characters he has found a vocabulary expressive of what people of divergent beliefs have in common.

Reference to Shakespeare underlines the importance of what I have called craftsmanship. The quality of a work of literature depends upon the author's ability to transmute raw experience into literary form. Shakespeare may have been favoured by the fact that he was writing in a genre which is more clearly defined than the novel. The novelist because of the greater realism of his work is in greater danger than the dramatist of failing in the process of transmutation, and when this happens the reader is moved from his correct role of contemplation to that of action, which is an inappropriate response like that of the child who has been reading a horror story and is then afraid to go to bed[21].

The reader who has had the fortunate experience of "surrendering" himself to a great work of literary art, as C.S. Lewis demands, has been permanently enriched because he has had his consciousness extended. "We value literature not only for what it says, or for what it points towards or teaches", says A.E. Dyson, "but chiefly and most importantly for what it is"[22].

Or, as C.S. Lewis rather grandly summarizes the literary experience: "In reading great literature I become a thousand men and yet remain myself. Like the night sky in the Greek poem, I see with a myriad eyes, but it is still I who see. Here, as in worship, in love, in moral action, and in knowing, I transcend myself; and am never more myself than when I do"[23].

REFERENCES

1. WATT, I. 1957. The rise of the novel; studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

2. FURBANK, P.N. 1972. *In* a review of Jean-François Reve's, *On Proust. The Listener*, 87(2250): 626-627.

3. HUME, D. Treatise of human nature. Bk. I. pt. 4 sect. VI as quoted by WATT, I. 1957. The rise of the novel; studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 21.

4. FORSTER, E.M. 1962. Aspects of the novel. Pelican ed. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 51.

5. LERNER, L. 1960. The truest poetry; an essay on the question: what is literature? London, Hamilton. p. 2.

6. SHELLEY, P.B. 1962. A defence of poetry. (*In* Enright, D.J. & De Chickera, E., *eds.* English critical texts 16th century to 20th century. London, Oxford Univ. Press. p. 255).

7. LERNER, op. cit., p. 30.

8. SHELLEY, op. cit.

9. LEAVIS, F.R. 1962. The great tradition: George Eliot, Henry James and Joseph Conrad. Harmondsworth, Penguin. p. 10.

10. LERNER, op. cit., p. 107.

11. LAWRENCE, D.H. 1962. Why the novel matters. (*In* Enright, D.J. & De Chickera, E., *eds.* English critical texts, 16th to 20th century. London, Oxford Univ. Press. p. 289).

12. Quoted by LERNER, op. cit., p. 90-91.

13. LEAVIS, op. cit., p. 10.

14. Ibid., p. 15.

15. Ibid., p. 17.

16. LODGE, D. 1966. Language of fiction; essays in criticism and verbal analysis of the English novel. London, Routledge & Paul. p. 67.

17. ROOKMAKER, H.R. 1970. Modern art and the death of a culture. London, Inter-Varsity Press. p. 233.

18. MAY, D. 1968. The novelist as moralist and the moralist as critic. (*In* Kumar, S.K. & McKean, K., *eds.* Critical approaches to fiction. New York, McGraw-Hill. p. 177).

19. BOOTH, W.C. 1961. The rhetoric of fiction. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. p. 138.

20. ELIOT, T.S. 1949. Religion and literature. (*In* Essays, ancient and modern. London, Faber and Faber. p. 93).

21. Cf. DYSON, A.E. 1972. Between two worlds; aspects of literary form. London, McMillan. p. 139.

22. Ibid., p. 149.

23. LEWIS, C.S. 1961. An experiment in criticism. Cambridge, University Press. p. 141.