**Metadiscourse Analysis of Frederick Clegg’s Writing in “The Collector” by John Fowles: How Interactional Resource Reinforces Unreliability**

Metadiscourse analysis is not often considered an efficient linguistic tool for studying fictional literary works. However, it may appear very useful for analysing explicit and implicit interaction between the author and the reader. This work aims to demonstrate how metadiscourse analysis could be applied in terms of examining literature based on the novel “The Collector”, written by John Fowles in 1963.

Frederick Clegg, the central character of “The Collector”, is a vivid example of an unsophisticated and bewildering individual, one in two guises. On the one hand, Clegg utilises primitive language and always focuses only on the object of his passion. On the other hand, his motivation is usually disguised and difficult to comprehend due to his mental instability. According to the plot, Clegg kidnaps a young artist Miranda, since he is obsessed with her. For Clegg possession and love are aligned, he calls Miranda “his guest” and aspires to her reciprocal feelings. *“For roughly half of the book the reader is trapped inside an appallingly sick mind”* [Tarbox, 1986, p. 51]. Clegg’s distorted perception of reality and biased description of the events suggest the representation of an unreliable narrator. He is a classic, and even exaggerated, type of an unreliable narrator; his incohesive language and self-defensiveness immediately give rise to suspicion in the reader [3].

The first part of the book and the very end are the notes from Clegg’s diary or, more precisely, his journal of observation. Clegg meticulously records everything that Miranda says, and what he responds, how they act, and how they interact. However, there are some excerpts which exceed the limits of a mere recap of the events. These are the parts where the character tries to justify or explain his actions towards Miranda to his implicit reader, apparently, unconsciously. His attempts to warrant his own behaviour reach a peak in such cases; these excerpts are usually marked by some specific language devices. Therefore, in the current research, such excerpts were distinguished and analysed. We posit that metadiscourse analysis is applicable in this regard, as metadiscourse model suggests a convenient frame for analysing the writer’s (in our case the narrator’s) intentions and the means of engaging the reader in the process of narration.

Following Hyland, we assume that interactional dimension of metadiscourse model involves readers and concerns the ways writers conduct interaction [2]. Employing Hyland’s classification of interactional resources, we have identified relevant linguistic devices in each section. The examples are taken from the last two chapters of the novel, where Miranda is dying from flu, and Clegg does not rescue her.

* Boosters

Example: *“Of course, I rushed down to see what had happened”* [1].

Boosters highlight certainty and strengthen the illocutive force of the utterances. The booster ‘of course’ emphasises that Clegg, according to his own perception, did everything to save Miranda, who was dying. Obviously, he did not do what he could have done.

* Hedges

Example: *“A doctor could have done little good, in my opinion”* [1].

Although the hedge ‘in my opinion’ is commonly used to open opportunities for negotiation, here it tends to justify Clegg’s behaviour who neglected the chance to save Miranda from death.

* Attitude markers

Example: *“What I am trying to say is that it all came unexpected”* [1].

Here the attitude marker ‘unexpected’ once again serves to persuade the reader of Clegg’s inability to help Miranda. The character tries to prove his guiltlessness with all his might.

* Self-mention

Example: “*I couldn’t do anything, I wanted her to live so, and I couldn’t risk getting help, I was beaten <…>*” [1].

The text is saturated with personal pronouns, especially ‘I’, which denotes an explicit writer’s representation. Obviously, this applies to all first-person narratives. The frequency of self-mentions increases with the Clegg’s anxiety rising.

* Engagement markers

Example: *“I don’t know why it was one little thing that did it: you’d think it would be seeing her dead or carrying her down <…>”* [1].

A direct appeal to the reader (‘you’) is intended to guide the reader to particular interpretations [2] and awake compassion. Direct appeals to the reader are not numerous in the text, and they appear in the excerpts where the main character is abnormally nervous, as it was with the high frequency of self-references.

From the preliminary analysis of interactional resource in the provided quotes we may conclude that the identified linguistic markers contribute to the representation of unreliable narration and even reinforce and extend it. This model could be used for analysing other literature works with unreliable narrator and scrutinising the nature of such narrative from the perspective of linguistics.
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