

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 05.01.24

Om leksikonet: [https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om\\_leksikonet.pdf](https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf)

## Metafiksjon

(\_litterær\_praksis) Selvrefererende litteratur; tekster som peker på seg selv, som handler om hvordan de blir til og lignende. Dette er en form for “selvopptatt” diktning, diktning der en ikke prøver å skjule at den er diktet – tvert imot. Skriveprosessen tematiseres og fortelleren (eventuelt den biografiske forfatteren) kan være til stede i teksten. Metafiktive innslag i en tekst bryter ofte illusjonen om at det diktete er virkelig, og fungerer dermed som et distanseringsgrep (f.eks. ved fortellerens selvproblematisering), men metafiksjon kan også brukes til å skape nærhet/intimitet med leseren.

“The term metafiction was coined by American writer William H. Gass in 1970 and refers to a fictional form of writing in which a series of literary tools are employed by writers to draw attention to how fiction and reality interrelate, emphasizing the nature of the text as a constructed work, an artifact of the author.” (Canton, Cleary m.fl. 2016 s. 298)

Den fiktive verden er “less the mirror of nature, more an *artifact*, visibly a *made* thing.” (McHale 1987 s. 30) Teksten kan f.eks. “emphasize the unreality, the merely verbal or textual existence, of [an] event” (McHale 1987 s. 103). Vi kan oppleve forfatterens arbeid med å skape teksten (vi er så å si på kjøkkenet i stedet for å få servert den ferdige maten i restauranten). Slik diktning kan oppfattes som verk som vil vise fram det som tidligere forble skjult: en avsløring av det litterære maskineriet (Sollers 1981 s. 106).

Fortelleren vil både skape en distanse mellom teksten og leseren, og holde leseren fast i teksten. Bruken av metafiksjon kan sammenlignes med en forfatter som sitter foran et vindu og både ser ut på verden gjennom vinduet og samtidig ser sitt eget speilbilde i vinduet. Det er som om dikteren betrakter “sitt speilbilde i språkets vannflate” (Tadié 1994 s. 16). Forfatteren skriver både om verden der ute og om “skrivearbeidet”, “skriverollen” eller lignende. Og teksten kan “forholde sig til skrivningen som noget problematisk.” (Skyum-Nielsen 1982 s. 164) Oppmerksomheten rettes mot produksjonen av teksten og det å skrive (Ouellet 1972 s. 48).

Verket er “selvbevisst” (Sorin 2010 s. 214). Teksten er “bevisst” at den er fabrikkert, at den er et språklig fenomen som er atskilt fra verden (Groupe my 1990 s. 259). Tekstens fokus flyttes “fra virkeligheden til sprogets virkelighed, fra det der skrives *om* til det *at* der skrives. Selv-tematiserende, selv-reflekterende krummer teksten tilbake i bogstav, ord og setning og peger på sproget som sit materiale og vilkår.” (Skyum-Nielsen 1982 s. 12)

Diktningen foregår på flere dikteriske/narrative nivåer. Et meta-nivå er et nivå som dreier seg om et annet nivå. Metafiksjon omfatter f.eks. fortellerens kommentarer til egen skriving, om språket, om forfatterens funksjon i samfunnet og betydningen av å skrive den aktuelle teksten. Metafiksjon består vanligvis av eksplisitte metakommentarer, men kan i noen tilfeller være mer indirekte (f.eks. med tydelige intertekstuelle innslag). Metaperspektivet kan være mer eller mindre markant i en tekst, og det finnes mange versjoner og grader av selvsentrerte tekster. Noen fortellere problematiserer eller “leker” ustanselig med tekstens fiktive status, og framhever sin egen selvrefleksivitet. Forfatteren, filmskaperen osv. viser seg fram som verk-konstruktør i verket.

Den franske kritikeren og romanforfatteren Jean Ricardou kalte den moderne roman for “eventyret om en fortelling” i stedet for “fortelling om et eventyr” (sitert fra Ouellet 1972 s. 49).

“Self-reflexivity in metafiction is the product of its desire to expose the covert structures that allow fiction to masquerade as reality; it is always involved in the simultaneous processes of manufacturing illusion and revealing its artifice.” (Hayles 1991 s. 89-90)

Et eksempel på metafiksjon: “Du som leser dette, tror kanskje det må være en kjedelig fortelling siden den står i en bok med grått omslag. Derfor slutter du kanskje å lese her. Eller her. Eller her. Men fortsetter du, skal du nå få oppleve at vi skriver oss inn i handlingen på en dramatisk måte.”

Teksten eller fortellingen peker tilbake på seg selv som fortelling, tematiserer seg selv som skriftlig produkt. Teksten (formen) trekkes inn i innholdet, f.eks. ved at teksten blant annet handler om vanskene ved å bygge opp teksten. Eller teksten kan dreie seg om hvordan teksten blir til, f.eks. slik: “Erik hadde en av sine dårlige dager, men denne gangen ville han kjempe mot tungsinnet. Han hadde lenge ant hva som kunne gi han livsgleden tilbake. Nå tok han fram bunken med blanke ark og skrev den første setningen i det som skulle bli en stor roman: “Erik hadde en av sine dårlige dager, men denne gangen ville han kjempe mot tungsinnet.” ”

“*Metafiction* is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality. In providing critique of their methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures

of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary fictional text. [...] [metafictional writers] explore a *theory* of fiction through the *practice* of writing fiction.” (Waugh 1993 s. 2)

“Skrift-tematiske” eller “skrift-filosofiske” forfattere er forfattere som “på mere eller mindre eksperimenterende basis beskæftigede sig med skriften som medium og skriveprocessen som betydningsproduktion” (Skyum-Nielsen 1982 s. 172).

Metafiksjon som viser “reluctance to allow narrative to exist independent of its medium might also illuminate the anthropomorphic profile of our worldly narratives.” (Hayles 1991 s. 95)

“Illusionism pretends to be something more than mere artistic production; it presents its characters as real people, its sequence of words or images as real time, and its representations as substantiated fact. Reflexivity, on the other hand, points to its own mask and invites the public to examine its design and texture. Reflexive works break with art as enchantment and call attention to their own factitiousness as textual constructs.” (Stam 1992 s. 1) Det kan være “textual disturbances [...] descriptions can be “scrubbed” and projected anew.” (McHale 1987 s. 106)

“[A] “world of fixed and discrete objects” is given and then taken away, with the dual effect of destabilizing the ontology of this projected world and simultaneously laying bare the process of world-construction. There are a number of strategies through which this dual effect may be achieved. Events may be narrated and then explicitly recalled or rescinded [...] and the same strategy of explicit “un-projection” may be applied to objects and locales [...] and even more crucially to characters. Or self-erasure may remain implicit, as when two or more – often many more – mutually-exclusive states of affairs are projected by the same text, without any of these competing states of affairs being explicitly placed *sous rapture* [Derridas overkryssing av ord som både skal leses og ikke leses]. This violation of the law of the excluded middle becomes especially crucial when it occurs at one particularly sensitive point in the text, namely its ending. Not only presented objects but, says Ingarden, entire “ontic spheres,” worlds, may flicker. The worlds projected by means of these strategies of self-erasure are precisely such flickering worlds.” (McHale 1987 s. 101)

Lyrikere kan skrive dikt som handler om å dikte. Dette kan gjøres på mange måter, f.eks. ved at “[t]he writing of the poem becomes an analogue for the event which is its subject” (C. K. Stead sitert fra Ramazani 1990 s. 219). “The convention that poems may be read as statements about poetry is extremely powerful. If a poem seems utterly banal it is possible to take banality of statement as a statement about banality and hence to derive a suggestion that poetry can go no further than language, which is inevitably distinct from immediate experience, or, alternatively, that poetry should celebrate the objects of the world by simply naming them. The ability of this convention to assimilate anything and endow it with significance may

give it a dubious status, but its importance can be attested, for example, by most critical writings on Mallarmé and Valéry. There is a sense in which all representational poetry – all poetry which is not presented as taking place wholly within the mind itself – is allegorical: an allegory of the poetic act and the assimilation and transformation it performs.” (Culler 1986 s. 177-178)

Om diktere, filmskapere og andre som bruker mye metafiksjon, kan det sies: “Fully capable of charming their audience, they choose, for a variety of reasons, to subvert and undermine their tale. Their central narrative strategy is one of discontinuity. While illusionist art strives for an impression of spatio-temporal coherence, anti-illusionistic art calls attention to the gaps and holes and seams in the narrative tissue. To the suave continuities of illusionism, it opposes the rude shocks of rupture and discontinuity.” (Stam 1992 s. 7) Filmer kan peke tilbake på seg selv eller i hvert fall på filmmediet f.eks. ved å la publikum får se filmkameraet eller mikrofonen, ved påfallende kamerabruk eller musikk, ved at publikum får se baksiden av kulisser, ved at filmen handler om å lage en film (eller den filmen publikum ser), ved at filmen handler forholdet mellom filmen og tilskueren osv. (Limoges 2005).

Det kan brukes en duk-metafor om tekster. Den verdenen som skapes i en litterær tekst, er som en duk. Det finnes “realistiske” duker med livaktige bilder av trær, hus, mennesker osv., men duken er likevel *kunstig*, menneskeskapt, lagd av noen. Andre duker har abstrakte mønstre, bilder av ukjente gjenstander osv. Og noen duker har tydelige rugler og folder som får oss til å huske at det er en duk (metafiksjon). Duker kan lages på utallige måter og utstyres med en uendelighet av bilder, mønstre og farger, men de er aldri selve virkeligheten. De er skapt av mennesker med vilje og intensjoner, og de består av et materiale, et tilskåret stoff. Duken er nyttig, den tas i bruk og blir lett oversett når vi har vent oss til den. Metafiksjon er den strategien som går ut på å peke på duken i egenskap av duk (teksten *som* tekst).

Linda Hutcheon hevder i *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (1985) at metafiksjon er narsissisme ved å vise tilbake til seg selv. Hun skiller mellom blant annet diegetisk narsissisme og lingvistisk narsissisme. Det førstnevnte innebærer bl.a. at teksten tematiserer hvilken kraft fiksjonen har til å skape verdener, eller når teksten tydelig spiller på kjente fortellemåter. Lingvistisk narsissisme innebærer bl.a. at språkets makt og grenser blir tematisert, og vitser og ordspill henleder oppmerksomheten på selve språket. I begge tilfeller får teksten “ein sjølvreflekterande funksjon [...] Såleis vert lesarane tvinga til medvit om det fiksjonelle ved fiksjonen” (Bech 1995 s. 9).

Cervantes’ roman *Don Quijote* (1605-15) inneholder mye metafiksjon. “The self-conscious novel began with *Don Quixote* as a parodic summa, mocking in turn epic, pastoral, romance, comedy, and devotional literature. The self-conscious novel has strong affinities with what Northrop Frye calls the “anatomy,” a strand of

fiction characterized by digressive strategies and voraciously comic erudition. The great anatomists are those on whom no genre is lost. [...] The novel began by orchestrating a polyphonic diversity of materials – courtly fictions, travel literature, allegory, jestbooks – into a new narrative form, repeatedly plundering or annexing neighbouring arts, creating poetic novels, dramatic novels, cinematic novels, and journalistic novels.” (Stam 1992 s. 131)

“The paradox about *Don Quixote*, Harry Levin points out, is that it casts a spell while dispelling an illusion. This doubleness of what Borges calls the “partial magic” of self-conscious art, its simultaneous joy in both mystification and demystification, is reflected both in the process of art’s creation and in the process of its consumption. Within the artist a struggle takes place between the will to create an illusion and the conscious decision to destroy that illusion. The lucidity of the illusionist, the puppeteer, or the filmmaker does battle with the desire to create a believable and lifelike image. For the reader or spectator, meanwhile, all the reflexive devices in the world do not necessarily preclude affective participation.” (Stam 1992 s. 138)

Den kjente franske opplysningsfilosofen Denis Diderots bok *Fatalisten Jacques og hans herre* (1796) bruker metafiksjon som litterær praksis: “Like metafiction of the twentieth century, it comments continually on its own procedure of composition and guesses continually at the reasons why its story might have turned out as it did, satirizing the reader’s appetite for romantic tales or the thrills of an improbable adventure.” (Boxall 2006 s. 77) “Reflexive fictions defiantly call attention to their own artifice and operations, refusing a transparent self-effacing language that opens quietly onto the world. When Cervantes interrupts the story of Don Quixote’s battle with the Biscayan, in a novelistic equivalent to the freeze-frame, leaving them both with swords upraised, on the grounds that his source went no farther, only to resume his account upon discovering a parchment depicting the very same battle, he is consciously destroying the illusion created by his story. When Fielding halts the flow of his narrative to expatiate on the novelist’s craft, he reminds us of the artifice involved in writing a novel. And when Diderot boasts, at the beginning of *Jacques the Fatalist*, that he can marry off the *maître* or cuckold him, just as he pleases, he, too, is a self-conscious narrator, asserting absolute power over his own creation. By seeing themselves not as nature’s slaves but as fiction’s masters, reflexive artists cast doubt on the central assumption of mimetic art – the notion of an antecedent reality on which the artistic text is supposedly modeled. Their nonreferential discourse is not subject to the laws of sublunary nature; it is subject, ultimately, only to the constraints of language itself.” (Stam 1992 s. 129)

Den spanske dikteren Lope de Vegas forfatterskap ble til på slutten av 1500-tallet og begynnelsen av 1600-tallet. I hans sonett “Violante ba meg skape en sonett” (“Un soneto me manda hacer Violante”) blir skriving innen sonettformen både demonstrert og kommentert. Den har blitt kalt en sonett<sup>2</sup> (= en sonett i andre potens, dvs. en sonett om en sonett).

Den tyske romantiske dikteren Ludwig Tieck lar personer som spiller roller i hans skuespill snakke om seg selv som roller (Szondi 1978 s. 29). Disse rollene i dramaene har innsikt i dramaturgiske betingelser for deres egen eksistens. Dette virkemidlet er ikke det samme som når skuespillere “faller ut av rollen” og snakker i egenskap av skuespillere. Tieck ville at det i hans komedier skulle inkluderes refleksjon over komediens dramatiske struktur (Szondi 1978 s. 31).

Den spanske (baskiske) eksistensialistiske forfatteren Miguel de Unamuno ble en pioner på 1900-tallet for bruk av metafiksjon. I hans roman *Tåke* (1914) opplever hovedpersonen Augusto Pérez seg som en litterær konstruksjon og diskuterer teksten han inngår i med forfatteren. Unamuno kalte boka en “nivola” i stedet for en “novela” (“roman” på spansk) (Wittschier 1993 s. 249).

Den engelske forfatteren William Hope Hodgsons *The House on the Borderland* (1908) presenteres som et manuskript snarere enn som en fortelling: “In this elusive novel, a recovered manuscript tells the broken tale of the Recluse and his sister who live in isolation, apparently under constant threat from glowing swine creatures. [...] [The Recluse] barricades the house against attacks. Here the manuscript stumbles. Left open to the elements several pages are indecipherable. [...] Then, under renewed attacks, the manuscript breaks off.” (Boxall 2006 s. 254) Den amerikanske forfatteren Steve Katz’ roman *The Exaggerations of Peter Prince* (1968; skrevet med 3 g-er i tittelen) “has the authorial spokesman in the text complain about the ontological insubstantiality of its hero, and makes him resolve on a radical course of action [...] what is more or less implicit in Borges’ *Averroës*, Beckett’s *Unnamable*, Katz’s *Peter Prince*, and the rest: the ineluctable writtenness of character.” (McHale 1987 s. 104-105)

Den irske forfatteren Brian O’Nolans roman *At Swim-Two-Birds* (1939) “approaches the whimsical. The narrator is an Irish student who, in the intervals of lying in bed and pub-crawling, is writing a novel about a man named Trellis who is writing a book about his enemies who, in revenge, are writing a book about a man named Trellis. In a way, then, the book is a book about writing a book about writing a book.” (Burgess 1971 s. 78-79)

Britiske Ian McEwans roman *Atonement* (2001) har en epilog der “McEwan paints Briony as an aging novelist, revisiting the past in fact and fiction and casting doubt over the truthfulness of her stories, which brings into question the author’s struggle to relinquish control over the reaction of his readers. The novel is not only about love, trust, and the war. It is also about the pleasure, pains, and challenges of writing, the burden of guilt, and, above all, the danger of interpretation.” (Boxall 2006 s. 911)

Den engelske forfatteren John Fowles’ roman *The French Lieutenant’s Woman* (1969) er en slags undersøkelse av hva som skiller den viktorianske romanen på

1800-tallet fra den moderne roman. Fowles oppløser skillet mellom fiksjonsverdenen og den reelle verdenen som teksten blir til i. Fortelleren grubler mye på måter å fortelle på: “And as we near London, I think I see a solution; that is, I see the dilemma is false. The only way I can take no part in the fight is to show two versions of it. That leaves me with only one problem: I cannot give both versions at once, yet whichever is the second will seem, so strong is the tyranny of the last chapter, the final, the “real” version.” (fra kap. 55) I kapittel 55 sitter fortelleren i samme togkupé som hovedpersonen Charles. Charles reiser til London for å lete etter Sarah, og fortelleren tenker “what the devil am I going to do with you?”:

“Now the question I am asking, as I stare at Charles, is not quite the same as the two above. But rather, what the devil am I going to do with you? I have already thought of ending Charles’s career here and now; of leaving him for eternity on his way to London. But the conventions of Victorian fiction allow, allowed no place for the open, the inconclusive ending; and I preached earlier of the freedom characters must be given. My problem is simple – what Charles wants is clear? It is indeed. But what the protagonist wants is not so clear; and I am not at all sure where she is at the moment. Of course if these two were two fragments of real life, instead of two figments of my imagination, the issue of the dilemma is obvious: the one want combats the other want, and fails or succeeds, as the actuality may be. Fiction usually pretends to conform to the reality: the writer puts the conflicting wants in the ring and then describes the fight – but in fact fixes the fight, letting that want he himself favors win. And we judge writers of fiction both by the skill they show in fixing the fights (in other words, in persuading us that they were not fixed) and by the kind of fighter they fix in favor of: the good one, the tragic one, the evil one, the funny one, and so on. But the chief argument for fight-fixing is to show one’s readers what one thinks of the world around one – whether one is a pessimist, an optimist, what you will. I have pretended to slip back into 1867; but of course that year is in reality a century past. It is futile to show optimism or pessimism, or anything else about it, because we know what has happened since. So I continue to stare at Charles and see no reason this time for fixing the fight upon which he is about to engage.”

Ernestina sier til Charles mens de nærmer seg en gåtefull kvinne som står ytterst på en molo: “These are the very steps that Jane Austen made Louisa Musgrove fall down in *Persuasion*.” Her henvises det til en roman av Jane Austen og et av åstedene i denne romanen, et fysisk sted som også finnes i verden utenfor fiksjonen.

Den amerikanske forfatteren Joyce Carol Oates’ roman *them* (1969; med liten t i tittelen) “focuses on the working-class lives of Loretta Wendall and her children, Maureen and Jules, in inner-city Detroit between 1937 and 1967. One of the novel’s most challenging features is the way it takes representation of the naturalistic novel to the limits. It opens with a famous author’s note claiming that

the text was based on the life of one of Oates' students at the University of Detroit. This note gives way to a naturalistic narrative about the lives of the Wendalls, juxtaposing a forceful psychological portrayal of each of the characters with the violent realities of their everyday life. Halfway through the novel, however, the main narrative is unexpectedly interrupted – with several letters from Maureen to “Miss Oates”. Maureen questions her teacher about the role of literature and Miss Oates' suggestion that literature gives form to life. Maureen, who has prostituted herself and been beaten by one of her mother's lovers, asks contemptuously if literary form can really give order and coherence to a life such as hers. Maureen's impassioned letters voice an irrepressible anger toward the type of literature that can only be understood and savoured in the safe middle-class world inhabited by Miss Oates and her kind. Through the very process of writing, Miss Oates is no longer part of the working-class experience she describes – she is no longer one of them.” (Boxall 2006 s. 605)

Ernst Orvils roman *Monument* (1956) har metafiksjon-innslag. Iris Murdochs roman *The Black Prince* (1973) handler om en forfatter med skrivesperre og om det å skrive (Boxall 2006 s. 633).

““Excluded middles,” muses Pynchon's heroine Oedipa Maas [hovedpersonen i Thomas Pynchons roman *The Crying of Lot 49*, 1966], are “bad shit, to be avoided.” She is lamenting the absence, in her world – as indeed in our world, according to conventional logics – of any third alternative to the polarity of true and false, any mode of being between existence and nonexistence. Pynchon would go on, in *Gravity's Rainbow*, to produce a fictional world in which there is such a third alternative: “Of course it happened. Of course it didn't happen.” But he would do so in defiance of an orthodoxy in poetics that outlaws such “in-between” modes of being in principle. The most that Umberto Eco, for example, can say for worlds in which the law of the excluded middle seems to have been abrogated is that they mount a subversive critique of world-building, although they do not constitute worlds themselves. But this description fails to capture the full ontological peculiarity of a world in which events apparently both do and do not happen, or in which the same event happens in two irreconcilably different ways.” (McHale 1987 s. 106)

“Self-erasing narratives [...] violate linear sequentiality by realizing two mutually-exclusive lines of narrative development at the same time, but this is not the only means of making linear sequences self-erasing. One can also “bend” a sequence back upon itself to form a *loop*, in which one and the same event figures as both antecedent and sequel of some other event. The presence of the same event at two different points in the sequence leaves the reader hesitating between two alternative reconstructions of the “true” sequence, in one of which event A precedes event B, while in the other event A follows event B.” (McHale 1987 s. 108)



Metafiksjon fikk et stort oppsving med postmodernismen i litteraturen på 1980-tallet, men det finnes mange tidligere eksempler. I Jan Kjærstads *Det store eventyret* (1987) er fortelleren en person som omtaler seg som “jeg”, men vi vet lite om hans identitet. På s. 37-42 i romanen har bokstaven “æ” falt ut av teksten. På s. 54 oppgir fortelleren at han nå har skaffet seg en skrivemaskin med “æ”. En tendens innen postmodernismen er å skrive om det umulige i å bygge opp en sann, autentisk verden i teksten. Det kan være påpeking, tematisering og/eller problematisering av fortellingen, språket eller annet som er “form” snarere enn “innhold”.

“What are the narrative and rhetorical strategies of postmodern fictions? [...] Here are a few of the most frequently used techniques: insertion of the situation of writing itself into the text in order to evoke the image of a space outside the text (self-cancelling, of course, because the assertion of the situation can exist only within the text); reminders that the narrative is an imposition of the order of a writer but that the writer is also constituted through the conventions of the narrative; structures of infinite regress which undermine the possibility of ground or foundation; dissolution of typographic, conventional or generic boundaries.” (Waugh 1992 s. 54) “The postmodern response is often to explore the possibility that if writing, as an attempt to articulate subjectivity, divided up the continuum of experience into the discrete and public orders of grammar, then maybe an exaggeration, a flaunting of the ‘now’, of the situation of writing itself, can capture identity in some more intuitive but absolute way. Here self-conscious fictionality is explored as a means through to immediacy.” (Waugh 1992 s. 64)

“Narrative self-erasure is not the monopoly of postmodernist fiction, of course. It also occurs in modernist narratives, but here it is typically framed as mental anticipations, wishes, or recollections of the characters, rather than left as an irresolvable paradox of the world *outside* the characters’ minds. In other words, the canceled events of modernist fiction occur in one or other character’s subjective domain or subworld, not in the projected world of the text as such.” (McHale 1987 s. 101)

I kapitlet “En offentlig kunngjøring” i romanen *Midnight’s Children* (1981) skriver Salman Rushdie: “Jeg må avbryte meg selv. Jeg hadde ikke tenkt det i dag, for Padma har begynt å bli ergerlig hver gang fortellingen blir selvbevisst, hver gang jeg som en udugelig dukketeatermann avslører hendene som holder i snorene, men jeg må rett og slett innlevere en protest. Følgelig bryter jeg inn i et kapittel som jeg, ved et lykketreff, har kalt “En offentlig kunngjøring”, og sender ut (i sterkest mulige ordelag) følgende alminnelige advarsel: [...]” (norsk oversettelse med tittelen *Midnattsbarn*; Rushdie 1985 s. 67)

Den amerikanske forfatteren John Hawkes er blant dem som “reflects in his works on their own fictional status, making them fictions about writing fiction rather than statements about the “real” world, which is regarded as inaccessible to linguistic

representation. In ways that parallel the self-reflexive methods of painters (Andy Warhol) and film-makers (Woody Allen), metafictionalists foreground the artificial and “made-up” games of language and composition acting themselves out in the text. There “are no events but words in fiction,” says William Gass in a characteristic statement. “The truth of the page is on top of it, not underneath,” Ronald Sukenick declares in another. In one of his stories (“What’s Your Story”), the narrator says: “I sit at my desk, making this up ...” Another, oft-cited example is John Barth’s *Lost in the Funhouse* (1969), an unconventional volume of stories “for Print, Tape, Live Voice.” Thus “liberated” from the duty to be representational, fiction glories in its freedom to engage in all kinds of narrative gamesmanship, however esoteric.” (Ro 1997 s. 266)

“A film such as *Contempt (Le Mépris)*, 1963 [regissert av Jean-Luc Godard], for example, opens with a still shot of a camera on tracks sliding toward the camera, making conspicuous the process of the very film being watched.” (Torner 2016)

“Når filmskapere velger å lage film om innspillingen av en film, er de gjerne på jakt etter to ting. For det første vil de kommentere motivasjonene for å produsere kunst generelt og film spesielt, enten det er satirisk (*Le Mépris*, Jean-Luc Godard), med lidenskap (*La Nuit Américaine*, Francois Truffaut), eller i desillusjonert desperasjon (*8 ½*, Federico Fellini). For det andre vil de forsøke å lage noen forbindelseslinjer mellom kunstneren og hans objekt: enten det er for å utdype og forklare, eller gjøre aparte og historiske filmatiseringer mer relevante (*Adaptation, A Cock and Bull Story*).” (*Morgenbladet* 30. mai–5. juni 2014 s. 34) Jean-Marc Limoges skiller mellom “heterofilmatisert refleksivitet” som innebærer at én film speiler en annen eller flere andre filmer, mens derimot “homofilmatisert refleksivitet” gjelder når en film på en eller annen måte speiler seg selv (f.eks. med en mise en abyme-effekt) (Limoges 2005).

Den engelske regissøren Michael Winterbottoms film *A Cock and Bull Story* (2005) er en adaptasjon av briten Laurence Sternes komiske og eksperimentelle roman *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1767). Filmen er en metafilm om en metaroman. Filmen handler om å filmatisere romanen, og har blitt kalt “[e]n film om en film om en ufilmelig bok” (<http://www.lovefilm.no/film/Den-nakne-sannheten-om-Tristram-Shandy-gentleman/309068/>; lesedato 15.06.13). “Michael Winterbottom skaper en selvstendig metafilm etter metaromanen. Eller meta på meta på meta, med så mange plan. Det vil si at Winterbottom delvis rekonstruerer romanens rollegalleri, handlingsmønstre, tid og miljø i en svært fri filmatisering, delvis lager en fiktiv dokumentar om filminnspillingen. Det vil igjen si at skuespillerne opptrer som skuespillere i ferd med å innstudere roller, finne veier gjennom manuset. En bakom-film, som det heter. Også regissøren opptrer i form av en stedfortreder.” (*Aftenposten* 20. juli 2006 s. 8-9)

Den engelske forfatteren David Mitchells *Cloud Atlas* (2004) har blitt kalt “a glittering compendium of interlacing parables” (Boxall 2006 s. 940). “Mitchell has

recalled that “lurking in *Cloud Atlas*’ primordial soup was an idea for a novel with a Russian-doll structure. What if narrative A was interrupted halfway by a narrative B which mentioned narrative A as an artifact ...? How many narratives could I go?” He notes how Italo Calvino accumulated twelve plot layers with this device, yet “never ‘came back’ to recontinue his interruptions.” Mitchell does make the return journey, allowing *Cloud Atlas* to “boomerang back through the sequence.” ” (Boxall 2006 s. 940)

Den franske illustratøren og tegneserieskaperen Marc Antoine Mathieu har lagd en eksperimentell tegneserie med protagonisten Acquefacques. “Meta-fictional elements stress the aspect of watching a city through the frame of a comic book page or panel, for example, in Acquefacques’ s first adventure in *L’Origin* (1990): Acquefacques starts to receive single pages of a comic book, pages the reader soon recognizes as pages of the very comic he or she is reading at the moment. Acquefacques realizes so too, feels the short lifespan of 42 pages rush past him, becomes the object of close scrutiny at the Ministry of Science and finally has to experience the last page of his story being burned by its author.” (Ahrens og Meteling 2010 s. 14)

“His second adventure, *La Qu* ... from 1991, finds Acquefacques in the aftermath of this event, falling through limbo, into the coffee cup of his author, from which he reappears in his familiar reality, as if from a dream. He is then taken into custody by “Living-Space Control” for illegally using non-assigned living space by means of an opened drawer. As punishment for this offense he is sent on a mission outside the city, where he eventually encounters the up-to-then unknown four colors – an epistemological shock for his black-and-white world, which sends all of it back into the limbo the story began in. The contact with color shatters the foundations of his “reality,” as “color” was not only unknown, but unthinkable before. A second meta-feature of comics is thus exposed – coloring. In the third installment, *Le Processus* from 1993, Acquefacques meets a doppelganger, on whom a scientific experiment is conducted. The effects of this experiment literally take the roof off of Acquefacques’ s world of dreams, which are presented as rooms that are in fact panels of the comic. So he starts to walk on the roofless walls of his dreams as if walking on the space between panels. Again, his actions pose an epistemological attack on the foundations of his world leading to an implosion in which the page’s orderly structure of panels is dissolved into a maelstrom. This is presented in frames on a die-cut paper spiral, which in fact materially links one page of the comic to the next. A vortex of panels dispels Acquefacques from his comic-world onto a photorealistic plane, from which he re-enters the pages of his story – only to be reclaimed by the maelstrom, which on the last page becomes a feedback loop once more leading back to the story’s beginning, finally explaining his first encounter with the doppelganger. By entering the space between panels Acquefacques encounters another founding principle of his world. The unsignified spaces between panels, on which he walks as if on top of a wall, are the grid normally holding his world, a grid that loses its hold in the all-consuming spiral of

the process. Framing is the distinctive meta-feature on which *Le Processus* concentrates.” (Ahrens og Meteling 2010 s. 233)

“In his fourth adventure *Le Début de la Fin* from 1995 Acquefacques realizes that something is wrong with himself as suddenly most of his daily life works the wrong way around. Again he meets a doppelganger, who started into the story from the other end of the book, namely from *La Fin du Début*. The book can be read from both ends and both directions of the story meet in the middle of the book through a mirror. Here, Acquefacques is primarily confronted with another basic principle of his world and sequential art in general, namely the meta-feature of linearity (or in this instance, rather its paradoxical inversion). The fifth adventure, *La 2.333<sup>e</sup> Dimension*, was finally published in 2004. It starts with two “Reality Enforcers” accidentally releasing a forbidden dream of Acquefacques. In this dream he loses a vanishing point, which affects the confined world of his comic once more. Its two-dimensionality starts to show. Acquefacques has to reinstate the three-dimensional illusion, which eventually allows the panels of his story to become stereoscopic, three-dimensional pictures to be viewed with a stereoscope that is sold along with the comic. It is the first time things work out: The dangerous dream, which triggered this inter-dimensional extravaganza, is collected by the “Reality Enforcers” and Acquefacques sleeps on as if nothing happened. In regard to the line of characteristic meta-features, *La 2.333<sup>e</sup> Dimension* exposes the two-dimensionality of comics as “flat” drawings on a page. With these meta-features, Mathieu explicitly draws our attention to the structural aspects of comics, to their process of production, their linear structure, framing, inking, coloring, and so forth.” (Ahrens og Meteling 2010 s. 233-235)

*The Unwritten* (2009), en tegneserie i mange bind av briten Mike Carey og amerikaneren Peter Gross, bruker mange typer og nivåer av metafiksjon.

Den tyske sosiologien Niklas Luhmann kom i avhandlingen *Samfunnets kunst* (1997) fram til at all kunst har en selvrefererende funksjon og leder oppmerksomheten mot sanse- og skapelsesprosessen.

En spesiell variant av metafiksjon er mise en abyme.

“The case has more than once been made that all literary works of art are auto-referential to a certain degree.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 140)

Metatekstuelle signaler i sakprosaer er blant annet “se s. 5”, “jamfør ovenfor” og “som allerede nevnt” (Lundquist 1983 s. 82). En del slike kryssreferanser brukes også i skjønnlitteratur.

Hans H. Skeis bok *På litterære lekeplasser: Studier i moderne metafiksjonsdiktning* (1995) har som et hovedpoeng at “metafiksjonen er en didaktisk form; den lærer

oss noe om hvordan fiksjoner konstrueres, hvordan de virker på leseren.” (<http://www.apollon.uio.no/bokanmeldelser/1995/skei.html>; lesedato 04.03.16)

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>