

ECATERINA PĂTRAȘCU
Universitatea „Spiru Haret”, București

***Flaubert's Parrot and the Masks of Identity:
Between Postmodernism and the "New Humanism"***¹

Keywords: postmodernism, ethics, discourse, personal history, relativism, identity, official history, mask, distorted truth, "new humanism".

Abstract: *Flaubert's Parrot*, the novel written by Julian Barnes in 1984, combines the postmodern thematic of the relative truth, unstable history and multiple discourses with the tendency of significant foundation of a redeeming ethic system. The fundamental value that Barnes opposes to the multiplicity of the elements of the real, to the plurality of the discursive plans, consists in the assiduity of involving the protagonist in illusory searches of the truth about himself and the others, no matter its outcome. Although knowledge is not an immediate one, but a mediated and fictionalized one, this aspect does not prejudice Barnes' endeavour to follow establishing the authenticity of the most plausible variant. The partiality of reconstruction is complemented by the sustained recuperative effort, by the writer's doctrine that history, in spite of textuality and the perspectival limitation, can be recuperated or built and thus instituted as a testimony of the envisaged logical truth.

Flaubert's Parrot highlights the joining of the postmodern interpretation of history with the necessity of establishing a saving ethic system, which characterizes the British "new humanism." For Geoffrey Braithwaite, the protagonist of the novel, reality means not the identification of an ultimate structuring plan or finding absolute meaning, but his openness to get involved in the search for meaning and in the attempt to recuperate the past. Geoffrey Braithwaite is aware of both the impossibility of the past to be integrally regained and the fact that discourses only approximate the disparate data of history; despite this and the degrees of imagination as to the past, the line of reality must never be disregarded, since it limits our fabulatory capacity. Barnes' reaction to the historical relativism is not a contemplative one; on the contrary, it is one of uneasiness since the novelist is concerned with the human constants that confer universal signification to existence against the variable masks of transitory discourses.

The article focuses on the modality in which the evolution of the main character includes the call for a fictional mask in order to relate to reality. The biography of Gustave Flaubert and his significant work, *Madame Bovary*, institute themselves as interpretation frames by means of which the character wends his way to his own reality, proving, initially, that art can found reality – Braithwaite's attempt to bookishly justify his personal tragedy by equating the values, attitudes and examples from art with those in real life. This endeavour proves, however, completely

¹ *Acknowledgements:* This paper is a result of the project "Transnational Network for Integrated Management of Postdoctoral Research in Communicating Sciences. Institutional building (postdoctoral school) and fellowships program (CommScie)" – POSDRU/89/1.5/S/63663, financed under the Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013.

artificial, the conclusion that Braithwaite draws being that art and the masks that one may assume cannot modify reality by imposing either moral standards or value hierarchies. In spite of the failure of his attempt to find the truth about his wife's death cause and thus to clarify some coordinates of his personal life, the profit gained by the protagonist is the awareness of the reference terms in his self-defining process, namely, the vocabulary of the reality transformed imaginatively.

The novel, published in 1984, is the story of Geoffrey Braithwaite, a former physician, a widower and a fiery admirer of Gustave Flaubert, in search of a detailed understanding of the latter's work and life. Braithwaite collects bio-bibliographical references about Flaubert: he is in possession of diverse anecdotes and incidents related to the French writer and he has direct access to a corpus of letters and journals; yet all these prove unsatisfactory for his initial purpose: "Nothing much else to do with Flaubert has ever lasted. He died little more than a hundred years ago, and all that remains of him is paper. Paper, ideas, phrases, metaphors, structured prose which turns into sound."¹

Braithwaite wishes to establish a personal relation with the world of the one he worships and who dominates his preoccupations: thus, the stuffed parrot which he discovers at Hôtel-Dieu from Rouen is, from the immediate perspective of the old physician, the direct testimony of the writer's existence. From a museum Flaubert chose a parrot, Loulou, as an inspiring source when he worked at his *Un coeur simple*: Braithwaite believes that the stuffed parrot he discovered is Flaubert's model – parrot, and this connotation makes him feel "ardently in touch"² with the French writer, the parrot becoming the "emblem of the writer's voice."³

Starting from this supposition, Braithwaite will divagate consistently on the theme of the "true parrot" and on the authentic unfolding of Flaubert's spirit. All these digressions that cannot be united coherently hide, in reality, a totally different endeavor of the protagonist, namely, that of narrating and thus of explicating his wife's story, the story of a suicide. "Three stories contend within me. One about Flaubert, one about Ellen, one about myself. My own is the simplest of three ... and yet I find it the hardest to begin. My wife's is more complicated and more urgent; yet I resist that too.... Ellen's is a true story; perhaps it is even the reason I am telling you Flaubert's story instead"⁴ – confesses the main character, against the background of the discussion about Madame Bovary. Braithwaite cannot relate to his reality and private history unmediatedly; he cannot confess directly what he has not understood in the case of his wife's death and he is not capable of talking about himself, the real one, starting from himself alone. The attempt to build the story about Flaubert in terms of credibility and authenticity is, in fact, the projection he makes in order to perform the same endeavor personally as well.

The fact that he talks about someone else makes him train the arguments of his discourse and coaches him to tell his own story. Under these circumstances,

¹ Julian Barnes, *Flaubert's Parrot*, Picador, London, 2002, p. 2.

² *Idem*, p. 7.

³ *Idem*, p. 12.

⁴ *Idem*, pp. 94-95.

Flaubert is not an aleatory choice – we find Ellen’s story in “Pure Story”: a woman “happy, unhappy, happy enough”, who used to have extramarital relations, unconfessed to her husband, yet tolerated by him. Moreover, a woman who, in spite of having everything she wished for – “a husband, children, lovers, job... friends, and what are called interests”¹ – could not feel herself fulfilled, suffering from depression and a tormenting feeling of nothingness. The portrait sketched to his wife explains, beyond any trace of doubt, the choice of Flaubert as a pretext in the protagonist’s endeavor to finally understand the suicidal gesture of his wife: the eponymous character in Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* evolves similarly to Ellen, at least at the level of the biographical facts, which determines Braithwaite to assume the fictive character’s life scenario in order to understand the real character’s one. Georgia Johnson summarizes the reasons for which the former physician chooses Flaubert: “The autobiographical ‘I’ cannot understand his wife’s suicide; that inability to understand provides the impetus of Braithwaite’s current life. The quest to find Flaubert’s parrot, while unable to give direct information about Ellen’s suicide, can and does present information about Flaubert and about Madame Bovary. By presenting information about the real Flaubert, the fictional Braithwaite invokes Emma Bovary’s suicide, and her suicide provides a textual parallel to Ellen’s suicide.”²

The awareness of the parallels between the two feminine characters will lie at the bedrock of the personal history that Braithwaite intends to write. Therefore art is, at this level of identity construction, more “real” than the assemblage of questions without any answers that the main character has access to. In the same time, in order to comprehend his personal tragedy and thus be part of real life, Braithwaite resorts to this fictional discourse. Matthew Pateman adopts the same position when he asserts that “Braithwaite’s desire to be able to understand his relationship with Ellen and his relationship with himself is what necessitates the construction of [the] contexts of Flaubert and Emma Bovary.”³ The role of the parrot is that of an intermediary between the real and the masks of the fabulous.

Flaubert’s biography and his most significant work become interpretation frames by means of which the protagonist is in search of himself. One of the explanations for this definition of the subject by appeal to another subject is offered by Wojciech Drag: “One of the ways to account for this phenomenon is the postmodern theory of the death of the autonomous subject. The self is no longer construed as a unified whole but rather as a decentred and free-floating construct of multiple texts and discourses. The figure of Flaubert can therefore be seen as one of the forces that constitute Braithwaite’s identity.”⁴

¹ *Idem*, p. 120.

² Georgia Johnson, “Textualizing Ellen: the Patriarchal ‘I’ of *Flaubert’s Parrot*”, in *Philological Papers*, Vol. 46, 2000, p. 66.

³ Matthew Pateman, *Julian Barnes*, Northcote House, Tavistock, 2002, p. 29.

⁴ Wojciech Drag, “The Search is All?: The Pursuit of Meaning in Julian Barnes’s *Flaubert’s Parrot*, *Staring at the Sun* and *A History of the World in 10½ Chapters*”, University of Glamorgan, 2007, p. 45.

Flaubert becomes the reference model, including all qualities: he is, for Braithwaite, both a moral and an aesthetic authority. In “The Case Against”, the protagonist enumerates the ‘teachings’ of Flaubert that can be found in his life and work: “courage, stoicism, friendship”, “to gaze upon the truth and not blink from its consequences”, “to sleep on the pillow of doubt.”¹ More than that, he tries to copy or to mimic the writer’s characteristics and attitudes; thus, David Higdon sends to “the Flaubertian detachment, objectivity and impersonality”² taken over by Braithwaite in the way in which he relates his story.

The contrivance realized by Barnes between the ‘real life’ of the protagonist in his novel and Flaubert’s ‘imaginary biography’ aims at proving the thesis according to which art can found reality – at least until this moment, of Braithwaite’s intention to bookishly justify his tragedy. Out of art one can take over values, attitudes and examples that have the capacity to explain real situations and to restore meaning in a reality that otherwise seems absurd. Yet, this grounding orientation, which produces significant contexts, is not the best postmodern orientation; it is, rather, a role of the modern art. Neil Brooks speaks about this modernist approach of art which consists in the desire of the subject to discover “stable hierarchies and master-narratives” that would re-establish “order and intelligibility to his life.”³

However, all these thesist assumptions are as artificial and unstable as the process of identification of the parrot found in the hotel. The moment in which the protagonist raises again the problem of the parrot’s identity, his whole enterprise as to the recuperative role of art in his private life is put under the sign of fallibility. In the last chapter of the novel, the protagonist visits the two museums in which the true Loulou is said to be, and then establishes a meeting with Monsieur Andrieu, an expert in identifying the original; the latter sadly announces him that the specimens from the two museums could be counterfeited, the two stuffed parrots having been chosen at random from a number of fifty in the custody of the Natural History Museum in Rouen. Once at the museum, Braithwaite remarks: “Perhaps it was one of them.”

Braithwaite invaded Flaubert’s biography, or at least he thought he had entered his intimacy by assuming as ‘original’ the parrot that inspired Flaubert: this represented the guarantee of authenticity, conferring certitude to his process of understanding his own life. Once the multiplicity of identity revealed, and therefore the undermining of any authenticity, the immediate question relates to the efficiency of appealing to art while building up meaning at the level of reality. James Scott asserts that the whole direction undertaken by Braithwaite through the life and work of Gustave Flaubert ends up with “the awareness of aimlessness”; similarly, Vanessa Guignery remarks: “Braithwaite’s synecdochal journey from the part to the whole proves impossible.”⁴

The protagonist himself acknowledges, close to the end of the novel, that his attempts of understanding reality by means of art cannot have the result at stake; in

¹ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

² In Vanessa Guignery, *The Fiction of Julian Barnes: A Reader’s Guide to Essential Criticism*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2006, p. 47.

³ *Idem*, p. 45.

⁴ *Idem*, p. 47.

the same time, the acknowledgment of failure is accompanied, for augmentative reasons, by the celebration of the superiority of art *per se*. In “Pure Story”, the main character admits that he understands Flaubert better than his life or his wife’s life: “Books say: she did this because. Life says: she did this. Books are where things are explained to you; life is where things aren’t. I’m not surprised some people prefer books. Books make sense of life. The only problem is that the lives they make sense of are other people’s lives, never your own.”¹

This new perspective on the art-reality relation, the masks of the imaginary and the solidity of the real, in which art cannot restore or build meanings is, justifiably, associated to postmodern theories according to which art does not function as Narration but, more plausibly, as descriptive narrations. Neil Brooks asserts about Braithwaite that he “discovers in postmodern society that even stories cannot tell tales that provide a secure foundation”² and thus comparing him with Dowell, the protagonist from Ford Maddox Ford’s *The Good Soldier*, for whom art proves to be saving: “he lives in an age and a novel where Modernist assertions of order can be upheld.”³

The juxtaposition of modern and postmodern elements results from the continuous confrontation between “Braithwaite’s modernist project” of structuring comprehension of reality by appealing to discourse and the “plurality and contradiction”⁴ inherent to postmodern poetics. The image of the parrot is significant in this context: a symbol of mimicry, the parrot is considered, as mentioned before, the “emblem of the writer’s voice”: the postmodern art is an art of mimicry, of pastiche and numberless masks in a cultural and social context in which we are no longer faced with the originality and authenticity of entities. “Postmodernist art has nowhere to turn to but to the past: the imitation of dead styles, speech through all the masks and voices stored up in the imaginary museum of (...) culture”⁵ asserted Fredric Jameson, contrasting, skeptically, the postmodern to modern art.

From this perspective, art cannot play any significant role in modeling reality by imposing moral standards or value hierarchies: it is similar to a “pyramid which stands in the desert, uselessly”⁶ or, more explicitly, art does not play the role of a “brassiere” which has the role to ensure “uplift or self-confidence.”⁷ This positioning to the role of art means recognizing its autonomous character: “It defines art as essentially separate from the realm of morals and therefore beyond the notions of ‘goodness’ or ‘badness’.”⁸

¹ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

² Neil Brooks, “Interred Textuality: The Good Soldier and Flaubert’s Parrot”, in *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol. 41, Issue 1, 1999, p. 49.

³ *Idem*, p. 46.

⁴ In Vanessa Guignery, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

⁵ Fredric Jameson, “Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism”, in *Postmodernism: A Reader*, edited by Thomas Docherty, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, 1993, p. 74.

⁶ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

⁷ *Idem*, p. 161.

⁸ Noel Carroll, “Art, Narrative, and Moral Understanding”, in *Art and Ethics: Essays at the Intersection*, edited by Jerrold Levinson, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 2001, p. 126.

Art is also, for Braithwaite, the one which offers lessons – the work of Flaubert itself constitutes a model by means of the values it promotes – and the one which cannot be perceived as intervening or participating to reality. The dual character of art invites to plurality – art may refer to other aspects as well, the enumerative series having already been started -, while plurality confirms, at this level, the identification of Barnes' novel as postmodern.

Braithwaite fails both in his process of identifying the parrot and in the one of reconciliation with Ellen's suicide: what links, however, the two projects, is the openness of the character to get involved in searching for meanings, a search whose fragile dynamic should be demotivating. James Scott compares him with a "Grail-seeking knight for whom the failure to find the object of his quest does not preclude, or even undermine, the purposefulness of the pursuit."¹ For Braithwaite, searching is everything, despite the outcome of the whole enterprise or the disappointment which can be fatal – the case of Ellen who, in search of something beyond everything else, is overwhelmed by the failure of not having discovered anything and consequently commits suicide.

Although none of his quests ends – not to mention a potential success of his searches – Braithwaite does not revolt against this permanent floating of surfaces and masks; on the contrary, he lets himself prey to the "joy of indeterminacy" and, somewhere else, he declares his preference "to feel that things are chaotic [and] free-wheeling, permanently as well as temporarily crazy – to feel the certainty of human ignorance."² The simple acceptance to let himself drawn into illusory searches generates meanings and builds the protagonist's existential trajectory, no matter their finality. The more Braithwaite interrogates the data he has at hand, the more ignorance extends, dishearteningly. However, this exponential growth does not necessarily lead to the renunciation to know any more nor does it undermine the goal of exploration.

The search for and the recuperation of the past are essential aspects of the novel – Geoffrey Braithwaite constantly asks the question: "How do we seize the past?" and the answer proves the difficulty of the enterprise: "The pursuit of the past is like a game of chasing a piglet smeared with grease; it squirmed between legs, evaded capture, squealed a lot. People fell over trying to grasp it, and were made to look ridiculous in the process. The past often seems to behave like that piglet."³

As in any postmodern approach to history, here too one faces the problem of the modalities of recuperating history: the means that Braithwaite has are unreliable – memory is deceptive, while the witnesses of the past are partial discourses: "All that remains of Flaubert is paper."⁴ Consequently we cannot establish "the truth", but we can establish probable chronologies, Braithwaite placing at the reader's disposal three equally plausible chronologies of Flaubert's life: the first, an optimistic one, is the proof of the social and artistic fulfillment; the second, a pessimist one, proposes a

¹ James Scott, "Parrots as Paradigms: Infinite Deferral of Meaning in *Flaubert's Parrot*", in *ARIEL*, Vol.21, Issue 3, 1990, p. 61.

² Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

³ *Idem*, p. 5.

⁴ *Idem*, p. 2.

biography of the delusions related to the reception of his work and to a precarious health, while the third is constituted from quotations of Flaubert about himself.

All three biographies are edified on the basis of the same concrete data; what is different relates to the modality and the logics on which events are correlated. Establishing the truth or the most plausible version is a futile attempt, given the fact that each version is the result of the “logic of subjectivity”, an illusory discourse. James Scott asserted about Barnes’ novel: “it speaks in favor of the postmodern idea that reality and truth are illusions produced when systems of discourse [...] impinge on human consciousness.” Also, what Barnes follows is “the registering of the non-existence of truth.”¹

Opposed to this extreme categorization of the postmodern relativism in Barnes seems to be Merritt Moseley’s position according to which Braithwaite really has doubts about the possibility of discovering the true parrot, yet he never questions its existence, some time ago. In fact, the two considerations do not exclude each other; on the contrary, the two perspectives cross each other in the analysis of the historiographic novel. The identification of a variant as the only truth is impossible, given the precariousness of evidence and, on the other hand, reality as a constant generator of historical masks. Therefore, “Barnes’s position is more tentative or more ambiguous than the postmodern skepticism about referentiality and knowledge.”²

The postmodern elements of the novel are circumscribed to the thematic of the past that cannot be recuperated integrally and to the discourses that approximate the disparate data of history. The reconstruction of the past is sentenced to failure from the very beginning, a fact symbolically exemplified through the image of the parrot that can no longer be identified: “It isn’t so different, the way we wander through the past. Lost, disoriented, fearful, we follow what signs there remain; we read the street names, but cannot be confident where they are. All around is wreckage. (...) We look in at a window. Yes, it’s true; despite the carnage some delicate things have survived. A clock still ticks. Prints on the wall remind us that art was once appreciated here. A parrot’s perch catches the eye. We look for the parrot. Where is the parrot. We still hear its voice; but all we can see is a bare wooden perch. The bird has flown.”³

What remains in the present is under the form of partial accounts, therefore unfolding subjective images and texts that often signify interpretation paradigms equally plausible though, sometimes, incompatible. The novel itself unfolds as multiple narrative models: critical exegesis, dictionary, biography, autobiography, a written test.

Another argument in favour of the postmodern character of *Flaubert’s Parrot* is the focalization on the process of interpretation, an aspect that Andrzej Gasiorek refers to: “Flaubert’s Parrot, a novel about interpretation, not only discusses the difficulties of its own interpretation but also informs the reader how to interpret it.”⁴

¹ James Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.

² Merritt Moseley, *Understanding Julian Barnes*, University of South Carolina Press, 1997, p. 87.

³ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁴ Andrzej Gasiorek, *Postwar British Fiction: Realism and After*, Edward Arnold, London, 1995, p. 159.

Barnes compares biography with a fishing net, expressing in this way his perception of the interpretative act: "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. You can do the same with a 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 all 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?"¹

To illustrate the variety resulted from the multiplicity of interpretations, Barnes suggests the reader Flaubert's masks: in the first chapter, Flaubert appears in the hypostases of "writer as healer", "writer as butcher, the writer as sensitive brute", "writer as a sophisticated parrot", "un symbole du Logos", "writer as a pertinacious and finished stylist"; in the second chapter the reader is faced with three different chronologies of Flaubert's life so that in the next chapter he should live the "intensity" of the plausible, yet unverifiable relation between Flaubert and Julie Herbert. The evasive character of the French writer's portrait is illustrative, as we have already mentioned, for the perception of history, generally speaking, in the postmodern writing.

Geoffrey Braithwaite, the "recuperative" character of Flaubert's identity, as he (re)constructs the biographic portrait of the admired writer, defines his own existence, asking the reader: "you must make your judgment on me as well as on Flaubert."² But the elements that compose his biography are as imprecise as those the protagonist collects about Flaubert. Andrzej Gasiorek significantly portrays the character: "His life-story is a laughably conventional Freudian one: he is sexually impotent and a failed writer; a potentially repressed homosexual; a figure desperate for recognition who dreams of bringing off a literary coup; a buffoon who denies he is a crank while writing to French grocers to enquire if the colour of redcurrant jam is the same now as it was in 1853. (Yet) These all-too-obvious clues are intended to divert the inattentive reader down a series of blind alleys."³

What hides beyond this surface portrait is, as we have previously analyzed, the continuous search for elements that could explain his tragic biography. As Braithwaite displays in front of the reader disparate fragments and incidents from Flaubert's bio-bibliography, so the reader finds himself in front of some biographical scraps of the protagonist beyond which he may have the intuition of a signification or of the significations of his existence.

¹ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

² *Idem*, p. 176.

³ Andrzej Gasiorek, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

Returning to the more general terms of the discussion, we may assert, in conclusion, the fact that Julian Barnes postulates the historical knowledge under the form of fabulation, “another literary genre”, in which the data of the past will never be recoverable except as interpretative masks: “The past is a distant, receding coastline and we are all in the same boat. Along the stern rail there is a line of telescopes; each brings the shore into focus at a given distance. If the boat is becalmed, one of the telescopes will be in continual use; it will seem to tell the whole, the unchanging truth. But this is an illusion; and as the boat sets off again, we return to our normal activity: scurrying from one telescope to another, seeing the sharpness fade in one, waiting for the blur to clear in another. And when the blur does clear, we imagine that we have made it do so all by ourselves.”¹

However, the image of fabulation may mislead: no matter the degrees of imagination or the number of masks adopted, in spite of the discourse obviously focused on the problematic of interpretation and the decisive importance it has in edifying the perspective upon the world, “the shoreline” cannot be ignored. All subjective processes and all discussions about the dynamic of personal organization of “discourses” spin around the “real” that cannot be eluded.

Flaubert's Parrot combines the postmodern approach of the themes of truth, history, discourse and knowledge with the propensity, constantly met in Barnes, towards the significant foundation of a saving ethic system. The writer's reaction to the contemporary relativism is not a jubilatory one; it is not negative towards the possibility of establishing meanings but, on the contrary, it is a solemn one, which sustains his “humanist” enterprise of finding those constants that confer signification to existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Barnes, Julian, *Flaubert's Parrot*, Picador, London, 2002.
- Carroll, Noel, “Art, Narrative, and Moral Understanding”, in *Art and Ethics: Essays at the Intersection*, edited by Jerrold Levinson, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 126-60.
- Drag, Wojciech, “The Search is All?: The Pursuit of Meaning in Julian Barnes's *Flaubert's Parrot*, *Staring at the Sun* and *A History of the World in 10½ Chapters*”, University of Glamorgan, 2007.
- Gasiorek, Andrzej, *Postwar British Fiction: Realism and After*, Edward Arnold, London, 1995.
- Guignery, Vanessa, *The Fiction of Julian Barnes: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*, Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2006.
- Jameson, Fredric, “Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism”, in *Postmodernism: A Reader*, edited by Thomas Docherty, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, 1993, pp. 62-91.
- Johnson, Georgia, “Textualizing Ellen: the Patriarchal ‘I’ of *Flaubert's Parrot*”, in *Philological Papers*, Vol.46, 2000, pp. 64-69.
- Pateman, Matthew, *Julian Barnes*, Northcote House, Tavistock, 2002.
- Scott, James, “Parrots as Paradigms: Infinite Deferral of Meaning in *Flaubert's Parrot*”, in *ARIEL*, Vol.21, Issue 3, 1990, pp. 57-68.

¹ Julian Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 114.