Chapter-2

Theory of Narratology

...Narratology is not a ‘once-and-for-all’ closed theory, but

a mode of theorizing that is open, dynamic, never-ending.

--Rimmon-Kenan

The study of narrative is called narratology. It would be important to define the term narrative before discussing the subject of narratology. Narrative means anything that tells a story. It may be a novel, a fictional book, a painting, a picture, a newspaper, an advertisement, a movie and even a prayer. Rimmon-Kenan observes: “Newspaper, reports, history, books, novels, films, comic strips, pantomime, dance, gossip and psychoanalytic sessions are only some of the narratives which permeate our lives” (01). Literature is not the only medium through which stories are told, but they are told on other different spheres of life—individual, social, cultural etc. Stories are told while sharing our experiences, biographic data, reciting hymns and folk songs and telling folklores. Stories are made even while making jokes or designing a menu card. Thus narratives are everywhere, in all kind of activities, all pervasive and all pervading. Narratives can be verbal or written. They can be true or false, realistic or non-realistic, fictional or non-fictional and literary or non-literary.

Narrative is constructed of two basic elements ‘the tale’ and ‘the teller’. This is integral to any narrative whatever the form may be. If we consider ‘the teller’ we will find that ‘the teller’ can adopt different roles in the telling of the tale. At the basic level he may be very much visible and his presence will be felt and recognized in spite of the tale which engrosses us with events, settings and characters, e.g. ‘The Duke’ in Browning’s ‘My Last Duchess’. Sometimes ‘the teller’ is completely unseen and withdrawing as it were and letting the characters speak and take over ‘the telling’ as in
Virginia Woolf’s *To the Light House.* What is important here is that it leads to dual focus which brings into play spatial and temporal distance which may keep shifting between different levels of narration in the narrative.

Narratives tell us stories about spatio-temporally distant things. They involve ‘the teller’ who is placed in the present by virtue of his position as a teller, and ‘the tale’ which is placed in the distant past, making the teller the mediator between the tale and the listener. The teller’s visibility can vary from being present to being completely invisible. The narrator is trusted by the addressee who in a sense becomes a subject even before he commences the reading of a text. Narrator has the authority to tell, ‘To narrate is to make a bid for a kind of power’ (Toolan *Narrative* 03). Toolan says that narratives can and many times do crucially affect the lives of people. The narratives are told by politicians, journalists, employees, celebrities, friends, enemies, parents, leaders or anyone from whom power originates and this gives authority or influence to the teller over the addressee and can affect the lives of those who are addressed through the narratives.

The present thesis is concerned with the fictional narrative. The word ‘fiction’ is thus of great importance. Rimmon-Kenan uses the words ‘narrative fiction’ for it. Lothe says, “Fiction comes from the Latin *fingere* (original meaning: to make by shaping) – to invent, to think up, to make up” (*Narrative* 04). Here the word ‘fiction’ is interpreted as a ‘made up’ story, but a narratologist is also concerned with the other part of the definition that is ‘by shaping’. It is clear that fictional narratives are not merely concerned with the making of stories, but they are also ‘shaped’. Thus, the important subject of the study is to understand the narrative form and the organizing and placing of the events in time and space.

Theorists have tried to interpret and theorize narrative in various ways. Prince gives the definition of narrative as “the recounting (as product and process, object and
act, structured and structuration) of one or more real or fictitious events communicated by one, two or several (more or less overt) narrators to one, two or several (more or less overt) narratees” (58). According to this statement, narrative being related to the act of narration of the events requires two participants—the speaker and the listener. This means only one person or a group of persons may tell a story and it can be told to one person or a group of persons. So narrative can be for single person at one time or for a group of people or the whole community.

Here we can easily say that the term narrative refers to a set event or events narrated by a narrator or narrators to a narratee or more narratees. There are debates by the theorists about what constructs a narrative – a set of events form a narrative or only a single event is sufficient to form a narrative. Different narratologists have different views in this regard. Gerard Genette advocates that in the formation of a narrative, only a single event is required. For Gerald Prince, three events are mandatory to form a narrative and these events should be related to one another through “chronology, causality and closure”. According to Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, to make a narrative there should be at least two events. She calls narrative to be “a succession of events in order to suggest that a narrative usually consists of more than one” (03). Michael J. Toolan quotes Tzvetan Todorov who has a view that “transformation” or “change of events” are of great importance in a narrative and opines that simple delineation of successive facts presented chronologically does not form a narrative:

These facts must be organized, which is to say, ultimately, that they must have elements in common. But if all the elements are in common there is no longer a narrative; for there is no longer anything to recount. Now, transformation represents precisely a synthesis of differences and resemblance – it links two facts without their being able to be identified.

(Todorov 233, quoted by Toolan, Narrative 07)
According to Toolan, change of position and state of events is the important aspect in a narrative. It means that single event in a narrative is not sufficient in itself. Toolan defines narrative as “a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events” implied that narrative is not merely an unstructured amalgamation of events, but a well managed set of events.

Scholes and Kellog define narrative as: “. . . all those literary works which are distinguished by two characteristics: the presence of a story and a story teller” (The Nature 04). Talking about narratives, Roland Barthes says:

. . . the narratives of the world are numberless . . . . Able to be carried by articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures and the ordered mixture of all these substances; narrative is present in myth, legend, fable, tale, novella, epic, history, tragedy, drama, comedy, mime, painting stained glass windows, cinema, comics, news items, conversation . . . . Narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society. . . . Caring nothing for the division between good and bad literature, narrative is international, trans-historical, trans-cultural: it is simply there, like life itself. (Image 79)

These lines underline the importance of narrative as a vehicle for the expression of human experience. Defining narrative, Toolan says it might be ‘. . . a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events’ (Narrative 07). Toolan brings out the importance of sequencing or inter connecting: “Narratives are seen to have a sequence of events which are interconnected. They are not randomly connected as in a collage, but have some kind of sequential arrangement, which creates the story” (Narrative 07).

For the first time, Tzvetan Todorov used the term narratology in 1969 “to designate a systematic study of narrative firmly anchored in the tradition of the Russian
and Czech formalism of the early 20th century and French structuralism and semiotics of
the sixties” (O’ Neil 13). Prince states that though the term can be used in a broader
sense for all “theoretical persuasions” of narrative theory, “it refers specifically to the
theories of narrative structure” (04). Gerald Prince also defines narrative as “the study of
form and functioning of narrative” (04) and says that the “term narratology may be new
but not the discipline . . . and in the Western tradition, it goes back at least to Plato and
Aristotle” (Barry 224). Since the outgrowth of structuralism, there was great study done
in narrative. O’Neil observes: “The current boom in narrative theories (and in books
about narrative theory) has by now reached something close to epidemic proportions”
(12). The other theories of narrative are Russian formalists’ Bakhtian or dialogical
theory, Chicago School, Hermeneutic and Phenomenological theories, etc.

The story of narratology has its base in Aristotle’s Poetics where Aristotle has
stated that ‘character’ and ‘action’ are the major components of a tragedy and ‘character
is revealed through action’. He has given the idea of hamartia, anagnorisis and
peripeteia. Though, Aristotle here talks about mainly drama, but these elements are
present in all kinds of narrative forms, irrespective of their mode of communication.

Structuralism begins with the writings of Russian Formalists like Propp and
Schlovsky. Their contribution to the development of narratology—the study of narratives
is acknowledged to a great extent. Narratives are now no longer perceived and
comprehended as restricted to certain cultures. They are viewed as representation of
fundamental aspects of human life. A.J. Greimas and Todorov concern themselves with
the way the social being is constructed through narratives and they try to describe the
constitutive elements of narrative. Rather than being concerned with individual texts,
Greimas looks at the grammar of narratives—a grammar that generates narratives. Just as
language has a finite grammar, but infinite possibilities of generating sentences, similarly
narratives also have a finite grammar which generates narrative representations.
Vladimir Propp, a Russian theorist, became famous for defining the constant “deep structure” or common elements in many narratives. In *The Morphology of Folk Tales* in 1928, he studied closely the Russian folk tales and their form. After their close observation, he presented a set of thirty-one key functions. He further asserted that each tale may or may not have thirty-one functions. It may have less than thirty-one functions, but these would be taken from the selected thirty-one functions and would always come in the same sequence as defined by Propp.

The criticism raised against this kind of analysis is that, it resorts to reductivism and does not take cultural context into consideration. Another objection is to the number of functions. Why the number is 31 and why not 30 or 32 functions or some other number? The justification offered is that only 31 functions are needed to describe the action structure of the stories in his (Propp’s) corpus of the Russian Fairytales. The division into only 31 functions becomes more a matter of intuition or perception than a matter of logical explanation. Yet, it is possible to say that most readers come to an agreement over what is essential / non-essential to the development of a story. It is this agreement which justifies the Proppian or Barthesian analysis and observation.

Roland Barthes, in his essay “Introduction to Structural Analysis of Narrative”, stresses on deductive method. He justifies his argument by saying that deductive method is “obliged first to device a hypothetical model of description what American linguist call a ‘theory’ and then gradually to work down from his model towards different narrative species” (*Image 81*). Further, he says ‘. . . either a narrative is merely a rambling collection of events, in which case nothing can be said about it . . . or else it shares with other narratives a common structure which is open to analysis’(*Image 81*). The question—which approach is to be adopted in this procedure is answered and finalized by Barthes who believes that in analyzing a narrative the deductive approach
would be more suitable. As there are millions of narratives, it is impractical to try an inductive approach.

The focus here is on importance of evolving a theory or model for description of narratives. Once the theory is evolved the study of narrative can be taken up, to analyze in what ways individual works conform or diverge / depart from the model. Barthes gives the following levels of a narrative analysis:

1) Functions  2) Actions  3) Narration

‘Functions’ are central to the progression of the narrative. It is through them that the writer achieves an overall coherence of structure. Barthes says ‘functions’ are of two types:

a) Functions Proper       b) Indices

‘Functions proper’ are distributional in nature. They are sequential and can be completed later on in the story. ‘Functions proper’ are also syntagmatic in nature. Indices give characters’ psychological information or about background or environment of the narrative. Barthes says that the narratives like folk-tales are mainly determined by functions and those like psychological novels are by indices. Functions proper are further divided into ‘cardinal functions or nuclei’ and ‘catalysers’. The cardinal functions constitute the ‘hinge points’ in narrative allowing it to move either way. For a ‘function’ to be ‘nucleic’ or ‘cardinal’, it must either open up alternatives or continue or close them. Between two cardinals there are a number of underline activities which may or may not alter the cardinals. These are petty or small incidents or descriptions called ‘catalysers’. Here Barthes doesn’t call the catalysers to be unimportant as he thinks that if cardinals cannot be erased without modifying the story, catalysers are necessary for the discourse of the narrative. Catalysers are the elements that help to fill up the narrative space with ‘areas of safety’ and ‘rest’. The catalysers may perform a weak function, but they are integral to the story. They perform a ‘phatic’ function according to Jakobson, as they
help to keep the addressee in touch. Indices are further subdivided into ‘indices proper’ and ‘informants’.

Indices proper is related to the character of the narrative agent, involves an act of making sense or trying to decipher or understand—a character, an atmosphere, a feeling or a philosophy. The informants help to identify, to locate in time and space. The ‘informants’ assist to ground the fiction in reality by giving facts like dates, time, places, etc. As compared to ‘indices proper’, they may lack depth, may be transparent or merely consist of data, yet they serve a useful purpose. They give a sense of reality to the narrative.

Gerard Genette, another prominent theorist of narratology, has his main focus on ‘story’ and ‘how it is told’. Narratology in modern era is basically related to the difference between ‘what’ is told (story) and ‘how’ it is told (discourse). Though the concept has its roots in its ancestry that traces as back as far Aristotle, who gave the terms ‘logos’ and ‘mythos’ which now stand for ‘story’ and ‘plot’ or ‘arrangement’ or ‘discourse’ respectively. To examine the relation between ‘what is told’ and ‘how it is told’, Seymour Chatman gives two level model or terms ‘story’ and ‘discourse’ respectively. ‘Story’ determines ‘what’ is told, ‘discourse’ determines ‘how’ the story is told. Narrative, in this sense, is related to ‘what’ (content) and ‘how’ (expression). The Russian formalist of the 1920, Victor Shklovsky presents two term—‘fabula’ and ‘sjuzhet’ in his two level models. Gerald Prince also believes in two-level model. Chatman’s ‘story’ is termed as ‘narrated’ by Prince and Prince’s ‘narrating’ is equal to Chatman’s ‘discourse’.

Further, the narratologists like Bal, Gerard Genette, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan and Michael. J. Toolan are among those theorists who have evolved a three level model of ‘story’ ‘narrative’ and ‘narrating’ while disapproving the two level model—‘story’ and ‘discourse’. “. . . analysis of narrative discourse will thus for me, essentially a study of
relationship between narrative and narrating and (to the extent that they are inscribed in
the narrative discourse) between story and narrating” (Genette 29).

Genette observes that events that are told is ‘narrative’ and the activity that “gives
birth” (29) to it is ‘narrating’. He states, “Story and narrating thus exist for me only by
means of the intermediary of the narrative” (Genette 29). For better understanding, a
comprehensive and comparative study of the terms used by major theorists is given by
Patrick O’Neil in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>logos</th>
<th>mythos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shklovsky(1921/1965)</td>
<td>fabula</td>
<td>sjuzhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todorov(1966)</td>
<td>histoire</td>
<td>discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genette (1972)</td>
<td>histoire</td>
<td>recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal (1977)</td>
<td>histoire</td>
<td>recit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatman(1978)</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genette (1980)</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince (1982)</td>
<td>narrated</td>
<td>narrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimmon-Kenan(1993)</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal (1985)</td>
<td>fabula</td>
<td>story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohan / Shires(1988)</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolan (1988)</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Sources. O’Neil, Patrick, *Fiction of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory* (21).

This may be quite intricate to use different terms for almost similar concepts. According to Mieke Bal, story is related to ‘sequential arrangement’, ‘frequency’, ‘rhythm’, and ‘focalization’ while text is concerned with ‘narration, ‘levels of narration’ and other such issues related to narrative. On the other hand Genette gives three level
modals and places all of those concepts under the titles of ‘order’, ‘duration’, ‘frequency’, ‘mood’ and ‘voice’, each dealing with different narrative aspects. It may be mentioned that when Bal uses the term ‘text’ for the narration part, she means here ‘narrative text’ only “in which an agent relates (tells) a story in a particular medium such as language, imagery, some combination thereof.” Initially the study of narrative was divided into two levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fabula</td>
<td>sjuzhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>histoire</td>
<td>discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story</td>
<td>discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terms in the first group are roughly equivalent terms used by different structuralists. They refer to the basic story structure or framework and constitute the events of the story in a linear chronological order along with the actants or characters of the story. The second group of terms refers to all the techniques that the author uses to present the story.

“A fabula (story) is a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors” (Bal 5). Toolan observes that story appears to stress on the ‘pre-artistic elements’ (Narrative 10), i.e. the basic events and character pattern in the narrative. ‘Discourse’ is the ‘artistic’ working out of the basic story pattern which is distinctive in its style or manner. ‘Discourse’ is the individualized or personalized working out of a story within a specific genre, which is marked by its individualistic style and point of view or voice. It is important to see that the study of narrative has now been complicated by giving a third level. The third level is in fact a division of the second level – discourse. Genette (1980), Bal (1985) and Rimmon-Kenan (1983) have given a third level. If level one consists of ‘story / fabula’, then level two– ‘discourse’
according to them consists of two levels which can be termed as the levels of ‘text’ and ‘narration’.

The level of ‘text’ is related to choices of sequencing of events, the time and space to be imparted in the text to present them. It also includes the details and their ordering of the text, the perspective / viewpoint to be chosen as also the focalizing lens through which the things are viewed and observed. The third level is the level of ‘narration’, the relation of narrator and narrative. There may be a first person account or a third person account. There may be a narrative which unfolds as a result of the interactions of characters or it includes the strategies of speech and thought presentation. So instead of two levels:

Story – Discourse

We now have three levels:

Story – Text – Narration (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983)

Fabula – Text – Story (Bal 1985)

The present study will be based on mainly Rimmon-Kenan’s Story-Text-Narration division to analyze the novels in the study which is briefly discussed below.

**Story:** According to Rimmon-Kenan the ‘story’ is the same as it was in the earlier division. It consists of the events in their chronological order along with the characters (participants) and setting. The ‘text’ signifies a spoken or written discourse which is listened to or read. It is different from ‘story’ in that the events in the ‘text’ may not be in a straightforward chronological order. The events are viewed and observed through some ‘focalizer’ or ‘prism’. The reality that the ‘text’ is spoken or written implies the presence of a speaker or writer who narrates.

‘Text’ in narrative analysis is related to the spatial and temporal arrangements of events. It is generally believed that the events in a ‘text’ are narrated according to the sequence or chronology they might have occurred in the story. But in a text, events are
arranged and exhibited in a particular order. This provides the different ways through which the same story may construct different narratives. Gerard Genette relates this method to study the order, duration and frequency of the events. “To study the temporal order of narrative is to compare the order in which events or temporal sections are arranged in the narrative discourse with the order of succession of these same events or temporal segment have in the story” (Genette 35). Mieke Bal too observes rhythms, relation between place and space and focalization.

As narrative is created and is a construct, its constitution makes it different from reality which in fact justifies the study of narrative. Spatial and temporal arrangement of events cannot be studied in isolation from one another as they are very closely related to each other. Successive narratologists have tried many times to extract the grammar of narratives from discourse. As mentioned earlier, this is done by breaking up the text into smaller units. Thus one of the units in which ‘narration’ depends is—‘story’. Almost every narratologist agrees with Propp’s idea of a ‘story’, which exists in abstraction and it has been claimed that an ‘immanent’ story can be abstracted from the text at least for the sake of description, Bremond asserts:

The subject of a tale may serve as an argument for a Ballet that of a novel may be carried over to the stage or to the screen; a movie may be told to those who have not seen it. It is words one reads, it is images one sees, it is gestures one deciphers, but through them it is a story one follows; and it may be the same story. (04)

Discourse: The next part of the narrative analysis, according to Chatman is “expression plane or discourse”. It deals with the questions like: How stories are told? Who tells them? To whom they are told? Rimmon-Kenan has given two levels of discourse—‘text’ level and ‘narration’ level. The level of ‘text’ is complicated by the fact that it encompasses many factors, which are crucial to the development of the text. Further
Rimmon-Kenan gives two principles of combination along which events are combined. One of them is the time related principle—‘and then’ and the other is the causality principle, i.e. ‘that’s why’ or ‘therefore’. E.M. Forster (1927) has given a distinction between story and plot on the basis of these two principles (even though both are narration of events)—a story is defined as events arranged in time sequence where as in a plot the causality factor became prominent. Prince (1973) has given three principles of formation and arrangement: 1) temporal succession 2) causality (3) inversion. The principle of inversion implies a change in the state of affairs due to some action.

Rimmon-Kenan (2002) is different from Prince in this. She argues that the temporal succession is enough to label a group of events as a story. Rimmon-Kenan’s contention is that, were such a threefold scale applied to a group of events to make them qualify as a story, many stories (which are perceived as stories) would perforce or by necessity have to be excluded from the category, because all three scales may not necessarily apply to all stories. Some stories may not lend themselves to the analysis of causal connections and in others, though some change may be observed in the state of affairs, yet a clear inversion (happy / unhappy, lost / found) may not take place.

Rimmon-Kenan’s argument therefore recognizes only one essential requirement in a story which is temporal sequence, the other two may or may not be present. In the context of these differences among narratologists and the way they perceive a story, one thing still stands out as common to them all – the time sequence. All agree that one of the essential and indispensable indications of a story is the chronological element which takes care of the ‘and then . . .’ factor.

**Text:** At the level of text, the narrator takes decisions about mainly the following things: How are the events going to be sequenced? How is time going to be presented? How is the text going to be seen? Through which medium does it come? Who is the narrator? Who is the focalizer? To add more, there are questions related to characters as how they
are going to be presented and in what detail; what settings are going to be used for the narrative to give it actualization by providing spatial indications and relating them to the temporal elements in the text.

**Narration:** The third level (a division of discourse) is ‘narration’. It is associated with speech representation. This level is the level at which the relations between the narrator and the narrative are explored along with speech representation which may be pure dialogue or may take the form of free indirect discourse, free indirect speech or free indirect thought.

**Time:** The second factor, important in textual study, is the concept of time. Time has an important place in human life. Time is an integral factor in all happenings and activities whether there are the happenings of an event or events or remembering of events or their cognition. Individual and personal experiences are also arranged in some temporal relation with each other. In fact, the way the events are positioned in temporal relation to each other in text, is different from the actual way events appear in story. This makes text-time and story-time altogether different entities. It implies certain complexities to say that “time in a narrative fiction can be defined as the relations of chronology” between story and text (Rimmon-Kenan 44). Generally everybody “tends to think of time as uni-directional and irreversible flow” (Rimmon-Kenan 44)—a forward movement, which does not allow a reversal—a going back in time. This flow of time is made measurable by ‘imposing repetitive patterns’ on it whether natural (day / night, year) or mechanical as measured by clocks (Rimmon-Kenan 44) and such a conception of time was given metaphoric shape by Heraclitus: “You cannot step into same river for other waters and yet another water go over flowing on” (Rimmon-Kenan 44).

Thus the time dimension is related to the arrangement of events within a certain time frame. Time is paradoxically repetition within ‘irreversible change’. “Thus time in narrative fiction can be defined as the relations of chronology between story and text” (Rimmon-Kenan 44). ‘Story-time’ as observed earlier, is the linear chronological
arrangement of events. ‘Text-time’ is actually thought to be spatial as it is the arrangement of language on a surface. It may be so, yet it is possible to use ‘text-time’ as an important construct to study narrative. ‘Text-time’ may be linear, but it may not correspond on a one to one basis to ‘story-time’. It can, and often does, deviate from it, creating different effects. Gerard Genette’s (1980) discussion of time in story and text is considered as the most elaborated, exhaustive and influential work. He presents three main aspects of temporal movement in a text or story—order, duration and frequency. Order is related to the presentation of the sequence of events as presented in the text and their relation to the chronological order of events in the story. Duration is related to the relations between the time taken up by events when they occurred and the sum of total text taken for their presentation. Frequency is related to how often any event takes place in a story and how often it is narrated.

The differences in order of events in the text from the order in which events actually occur in the story are referred to as ‘anachronies’ by Genette. Anachrony may be understood as the narration of an event at a point in the text which does not match with the story-time. It may have occurred before or after that point in the story sequence. Toolan’s example of anachrony within a sentence is cited here:

The king died of grief because the queen had died. (Narrative 50)

In the sentence, the reason—‘the queen had died’ comes later though she died before the king. The reason given in the subordinate clause becomes an anachrony because it happened at an earlier time. Bal asserts:

. . . playing with sequential ordering is not just a literary convention, it is also a means of drawing attention to certain things to emphasize, to bring about aesthetic or psychological effects, to show various interpretations of an event, to indicate the subtle difference between expectation and realization, and much else besides. (82)
These discrepancies between the presentation of events in the text and chronology of story are known as chronological distortions or anachronies. This is a simple example of anachrony which operates in a more complex way in the text. It can be categorized as flashbacks or flash forward. Genette terms them as ‘analepsis’ and ‘prolepses’. A movement back in time is called an ‘analepsis’, for it relates an event which happened ‘earlier’, but chronologically is presented or narrated at a later stage in the text. Toolan calls it a ‘delayed disclosure’. A prolepsis in this sense would be a ‘premature disclosure’. It means that something which happens later on (chronologically) is brought forward in time. Bal uses the terms ‘retroversions’ and ‘anticipations’ for the two types of anachronies. An analepsis can be ‘homodiegetic’ or ‘heterodiegetic’ depending on whom the information relates to. It is homodiegetic when there is information about the same character or event and it is heterodiegetic when the information it gives, is about some different character or event in the story. Bal calls these anachronies, as mentioned before—flash forward or anticipation. Michael J. Toolan presents the whole argument in the following manner:

An analepsis is an achronological movement back in time, so that a chronologically earlier incident is related later in the text, a prolepsis is an achronological movement forward in time, so that a future event is related textually ‘before its time’, before the presentation of chronologically intermediate event. (Narrative 50)

As an anachrony interrupts the chronology in a narrative and its linearity, it takes a significant place in the narrative. “Every anachrony constitutes ‘with respect to the narrative into which it is grafted’, a narrative that is temporally second” (Gennette 48). Gennette calls this engrafted or embedded narrative as second narrative. The first narrative is the narrative into which the second narrative is embedded. The third narrative
is embedded in that of the second narrative. In a hypothetical situation, there will be limitless numbers of narratives if this procedure goes on. There can be more than one second narrative in the same manner. Analepsis and prolepsis are of different types according to Genette. Analepsis are divided into the following three categories: external, internal and mixed.

This division is on the basis of story told in analepsis in relation to story-line of first narrative. The part of story or the past which preceded the commencement of the first narrative is external analepsis. “This means the narrative jumps back to a point in the story before the main narrative starts” (Lothe 54). The event or events that occurred after the starting point of the first narrative, but could not be narrated when they were due are related to internal analepsis. Internal analepsis compensates the delay in narrative of an event or events that have occurred because of ellipsis. Mixed analepsis almost creates confusion. It is named so because it has the features of both external and internal analepsis. It starts from a point that is external to first narrative, but later at some point either joins it or goes beyond the beginning of first narrative. Jakob Lothe has given the diagrammatical presentation of the external, internal and mixed analepsis:

Figure: 1.2, Source: Lothe, Jakob, Narrative in Fiction and Film an Introduction. (55)
The anachronies, Genette observes, are:

. . . not as useless as it might seem at first sight. In effect external analepsis and internal analepsis (or the internal part of mixed analepsis) functions for the purpose of narrative analysis in totally different ways, at least on one point that seems to be essential. External analepsis, by the very fact that they are external, never at any point risk interfering with the first narrative for their only function is to fill out the first narrative by enlightening the reader on one or another ‘antecedent’. (49-50)

Analepsis are further divided into two more categories by Genette: homodiegetic and heterodiegetic analepsis. Analepsis that “provides past information either about the character, event, or story line mentioned at that point in the text “is called homodiegetic (Rimmon-Kenan 49). Heterodiegetic analepsis is an “analepsis dealing with character (and thus with diegetic content) different from the content (or contents) of the first narrative” (Genette 50). About the function of heterodiegetic analepsis, Gentte says that these “analepsis deals, classically, with a character recently introduced whose ‘antecedents’ the narrator wants to shed light on . . . or they deal with a character who has been out of sight for some time and whose recent past we must catch up with” ( 50).

‘Prolepsis’ or flash forward to which Bal calls ‘anticipations’. It is the next type of anachrony. It tells about an event or events that will happen into the future of the narrative (fabula or story) from the point of intervening in the narrative. Genette says:

Anticipation or temporal prolepsis is clearly much less frequent than the inverse figure, at least in the Western narrative tradition—although each of the three great epics, the Iliad the Odyssey and the Aenied, begins with a sort of anticipatory summary that to a certain extent justifies the formula Todorov applied to Homeric narrative: “Plot of Predestination”. (67)

Just like analepsis, Toolan says, prolepsis may be “homodiegetic and heterodiegetic, depending on whether they entail a switch of focus to a different character, event or storyline; and internal, external or mixed, depending on their
chorological relation to the end point of the basic narrative” (Narrative 54). Genette further divides heterodiegetic prolepsis into two categories: “completing prolepsis and repeating prolepsis” while the former “fills in later gaps resulting from ellipsis in the narrative” (Prince 77) and the latter recounts “ahead of time events that will be counted later” (Prince 77). An omniscient narrator mostly gives the proleptic statements though not very frequent. He gives information about future event happenings in the narrative in very small phrases. Such information plays an important role in the narrative. Barthes calls it “weaving” of narrative. An expectation or supposition is framed in reader’s mind through such constructions like “we shall find” or “one will see later”. The expectation that is created may be fulfilled sooner or later. Another type of gap is called paralepsis, which according Genette, is not created by bringing a temporal gap, but by hiding some information or “by omission of one of the constituent elements of narrative” (52).

Genette has given two concepts in relation to anachrony, ‘Reach’ and ‘Extent’. These are termed as ‘Distance’ and ‘Span’ respectively by Bal. These two concepts are related to the temporal distance that is covered whenever an anachrony occurs in a narrative. Genette says that “an anachrony can reach into the past or the future, either more or less far from the ‘present’ movement (that is, from the moment in the story when the narrative was interrupted to make room from anachrony); this temporal distance, we will name the anachrony’s reach” (48). The anachrony itself covers a duration which Genette calls ‘Extent’ and Bal calls ‘Span’. For example, if an analepsis narrates an event of two months that happened ten years ago, the ‘reach’ of this analepsis will be ten years and the ‘extent’ will be of two months in the narrative.

In most of the narratives, traces of prolepsis are found more easily rather than full-fledged shift in temporal orientation as compared to analepsis which is generally used by writers to fill gaps in stories which may intentionally have been left by the
author and may not have been recognized as such till the analepsis appears. Order helps to establish relations between different parts of the text.

Rhythm is foremost aspect in relation to time and duration. In music, dance or any other performance it is linked with time aspect. The event or performance that happens fast or slow in time has fast rhythm and slow rhythm accordingly. Rhythm of a narrative text is determined by duration of time given to different events. If there is constant rhythm in the narratives, it is called “steadiness in pace” (Genette 87). If different events are given different time duration, it will either decelerate or accelerate the narrative. The rhythm of a narrative thus corresponds to relation between duration of the story or text time and it is very difficult to have any scientific yardstick or scale to measure text or discourse time. Mieke Bal comments here:

Is it the time taken up by the writing of the narrative, as has been proposed? Not only is it impossible to discover what period of time was involved in writing, but also this time is of little importance for the effect of the text on the reader. Should we take as a standard of measurement the time it takes to read the narrative? This varies. (Bal 100)

The readers with different linguistic and cultural background will take different time period in reading the same text. Different persons will have different time to read the same text. A performance in a movie or a drama may have a concept of same discourse time, but it is almost impossible to have such a notion like discourse time or text time for reading a novel. Genette says that it is possible to find the speed at which events are presented in a narrative and number of sentences, paragraphs or passages assigned to an event. Thus the speed can be measured in the novel in the manner as Genette says:

... as by speed we mean the spatial relationship between a temporal and spatial dimensions (so many meters per second, so many seconds per meter): the speed of a narrative will be defined by the relationship between a duration (that of the story, measured in seconds, minutes,
hours, days, months and years) and a length (that of the text, measured in lines and pages). The isochronous narrative, our hypothetical reference zero, would thus be here a narrative with unchanging speed, without accelerations or slow down, where the relationship duration of story / length of time would always remain steady. (Genette 87-88)

Genette observes that the isochronous narrative with constant speed is just a suppositious situation. We cannot find such narratives in reality or they “cannot exist except as a laboratory experiment (Genette 88). In fact, what determines the rhythm in the text, is the relation between the temporal length of an event in an actual story and the temporal / spatial length given to it in a narrative or text. To have a narrative with stable pace is just inconceivable. Lothe observes:

‘Constant speed’ means that the ratio between how long the story lasts and how long the text remains stable and unchanged, for example in the case of a novel which consistently uses one page to present each year in a character’s life. On the basis of this norm the ‘speed’ may increase or decrease. (Lothe 57)

After observing different possibilities in details, Genette finally fixes four types of speeds in a narrative: scene, descriptive pause, ellipsis and summary. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan and Jakob Lothe also agree with this four levels model that deals with story-time (fabula-time) and narrative time and the relation between the two which Lothe presents diagrammatically in the following manner:

Figure: 1.3 Source: Lothe Jakob, Narrative in Fiction and Film: an Introduction (60).
The terms ellipsis and descriptive pause are used for maximum speed and minimum speed respectively in a narrative. Rimmon-Kanan states that “theoretically, between these two poles there is infinity of possible paces” (Rimmon-Kanan 53). Ellipsis is the maximum pace in the narrative when certain story time is imparted no text time. Here the narrative leaps into another sequence of time, representing another chronological sequence without narrating those events that might have happened in the intermediate time period. That particular story time is skipped and not given any space in the narrative. According to Bal ellipsis occurs when TF (fabula time) is n, that is any number and TS (story time) is 0, i.e. zero.

Another reason to observe ellipsis may be that the narrator wishes to give only restricted facts and knowledge to the reader or some part of the information which has been denied to the reader now, but would be unveiled later. The compulsions may be artistic, thematic, political and cultural for hiding some important information or delaying narrating it. But, Bal says that ellipsis “cannot be perceived” as in ellipsis, nothing of the fabula time is mentioned in the story. If nothing has been mentioned, how we can say what has not been mentioned, which should have been. “All we can do sometimes is, logically deduce on the basis of certain information that something has been omitted” (Bal 103). Genette has categorized ellipsis into three categories: explicit ellipsis, implicit ellipsis and hypothetical ellipsis.

Explicit ellipsis is one in which text itself indicates how much story time it skipped in overall. Implicit ellipsis indicates that no clear indication of the jump or story time is shown in the text. Their very “presence is not announced in the text and which the reader can infer only from some chronological lacuna or gap in narrative continuity” (Genette 108). Implicit ellipsis is generally an outcome and result of reader’s observation and inference who himself examines and understands how much time period has been skipped in the ellipsis. But these ellipses form an important part of any kind of narrative
whether classical linear or modern, where inner narrative time is given priority over clock time. Even a classical linear realistic narrative cannot follow each movement spent by its character. It has do decide which information is to be delivered and which is not. Hypothetical ellipsis is the most implicit form of ellipsis “which is also very difficult to localize” even sometimes too impossible to locate any spot at all and “revealed after the event by analepsis” (Genette 109).

In summary some events of story are narrated in smaller duration of text time. Thus according to Bal it is defined as TF>TS. Genette defines summary as “the narration of a few paragraphs or a few pages of several days, months or years of existence, without details of actions or speech” (95-96). The narrative pace is accelerated in summary through a textual “condensation” or “compression” of a given story period into relatively short statement of its main features (Rimmon-Kenan 53).

Bal defines scene in mathematical form as TF=TS, i.e. story time is equal or almost equal to text time. The present form of scene is said to be a dialogue form as its duration is supposed to be the maximum in correspondence with duration of the real discourse or discourse in the fabula. “Consisting exclusively of dialogue and a few ‘stage direction’ the passage looks more like a scene from a play than like a segment of a narrative” (Rimmon-Kenan 54). Other narratologists observe that scene is not constructed by just dialogue form, but “a detailed description of an event should also be considered scenic” (Rimmon-Kenan 54).

It means that it is not only the presence of dialogues in the narrative discourse that describes a scene, but temporal relationship between the information of fabula and time devoted to that event in story is also characterized as a scene. Rimmon-Kenan defines it to be a relation between “quantity of narrating information and the relative effacement of the narrator” (54). Scenic description entails different narrative pace which invite further
examination as it may be thematically important and an “indication of the marginality
(on the one hand) and centrality or importance (on the other) of what is being presented.
More important events and conversations are usually given in scenic details, less
important or background ones in summary précis” (Toolan, 58).

Slow down is a pace closest to descriptive pause. In scene, we find one to one
 correspondence between story time and text time. In summary larger story time is
 attributed to a very small text time. Slow down is a tempo in which text time is
 lengthened to define an event in details which in actual may not take much time to
 happen. The motive behind all this is to make audience aware of some important
 happening or particular event.

Descriptive pause is the minimum speed that a narrative can have. According to
 Bal it happens when story time is ‘n’ and fabula time is ‘0’, i.e. TF=0 and TS=n. It
 happens when some “segment of the text correspond to zero story duration” (Rimmon-
 Kenan 54). Descriptive pauses are used in a narrative when detailed description is given
 in text about setting, surrounding, and background of character and his appearance which
 often bring suspension and deviation in the flow of the narrative. “The term includes all
 narrative sections in which no movement of the fabula time is implied. A great deal of
 attention is paid to one element and in the meantime, the fabula remains stationary” (Bal
 108). The duration of a descriptive pause may vary from a paragraph to a page and from
 a page to complete chapter. In the text, descriptive pauses are incorporated not only to
 have deviation in the narrative rather they have a significant role in forming discourse.
 They illumine author’s response and views on the environment and surroundings in
 which the characters in the narrative exist.

Another integral part of narrative study is frequency. Genette defines it as “the
 relation of frequency (or more simple, of repetition) between the narrative and the
diegesis” (Genette 113). In a narrative sometimes an event is told more than once and sometimes more than one event can be told just in one utterance. Genette says:

A system of relationship is established between these capacities for ‘repetition’ on the part of both the narrated events (of the story) and the narrative statement (of the text) a system of relationships that can a priori reduce to four virtual types, simply from the multiplication of the two possibilities given on both sides: the event repeated or not, the statement repeated or not. Schematically, we can say that a narrative, whatever it is, may tell once what happened once, n times what happened n times, n times what happened once and once what happened n times.

(Genette 114)

Gerard Genette describes them as follows:

1) *Narrating once what happened once:* It is the most common situation found in most of the narratives when an event that happened once is told only once. This is the form in which, according to Genette, “singularity of the narrated statement corresponds to singularity of the narrated event” (114). Genette calls it “singular narrative” and gives its mathematical formula 1N / 1S.

2) *Narrating n times what happens n times:* It means that in a narrative at the story level, an event is reported n times which has happened n times in the fabula. It is shown as nN / nS. Genette says, “From the point of view we are interested in here that is relations of frequency between narrative and story, this anaphoric type is still in fact singulative and thus reduces to the previous type” (115). Lothe and Rimmon-Kenan define this aspect under the category of ‘singulative’.

3) *Narrating n times what happened once:* It is related to the event which happens once in the fabula and is told many times in the narrative. Genette calls it
repeating narratives and its mathematical representation is shown as $nN \div 1S$. Other theorists call it ‘repetitive’ narration.

4) **Narrating once time what happened n time:** It means that an event that happened many times in fabula is reported once in the narrative. Genette calls it iterative narrative. Its mathematical representation is $IN/nS$. Rimmon-Kenan, Toolan and Lothe analyze frequency at three levels: singulative, iterative and repetitive. Jakob Lothe has also given graphical illustration for the same as follows:
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Diagram: 1.4 Source: Lothe Jakob, *Narrative in Fiction and Film: An Introduction* (61).

**Focalization:** Focalization is the third factor which relates to narration of story rather than its arrangement. The term narration means not only the act of narrating, but also the presence of one or more narrator(s) and one or more narrate(s) in a narrative. There may be one or more than one narrator that tells / tell the story in a narrative, though the degree of narrator’s presence may vary from narrative to narrative. If the narrator narrates the story, it becomes important to understand from whose point of view the story is told. It may be from narrator’s point of view or he may be merely acting as a mouth piece to somebody else’s point of view. These issues have been discussed in this part of narrative analysis. It is quite clear that in the narrative, it is not necessary that the person who is ‘seeing’ must also ‘speak’ “Thus speaking and seeing, narration and focalization may but need not be attributed to the same agent” (Bal 143).
The story is usually filtered through one or more angles of vision; hence its relation is mainly to narration. Genette has used the term ‘focalization’ in preference to the Anglo-American term ‘point of view’. Many other words used are prism, perspective, angle of vision and orientation. The preference and importance for the word ‘focalization’ by Genette and Rimmon-Kenan is given by a need to avoid the optical-photographic connotation that ‘point of view’ carries with it. This does not mean that focalization is completely free of this connotation, but what Genette means here is, the angle from which things are seen in a broad sense (not the narrow visual sense). It covers the ‘cognitive, emotive, and ideological perspectives’ in addition to the spatio – temporal one. Toolan has used the term ‘orientation’. Focalization / orientation is different from ‘point of view’ in that it avoids the confusion between two different aspects of narrative practice. These two separable aspects are related to narration and perspective which may be summarized as:

1. Who sees? (A person)
2. Who speaks? (A narrative agent)

When both are dealt as one or as interchangeable then the confusion arises. No doubt, it is possible that the person, who sees also speaks or alternatively speaking, the one who speaks is also the person who sees. But it is also possible that the person or narrative agent is telling what another has seen or sees. So, it becomes necessary to draw a distinction between the two, at least on a theoretical level as stated by Rimmon-Kenan. This can be best illustrated by giving the example of Pip in Charles Dicken’s *Great Expectations*. Here the perception / focalization is of Pip, the child, where as the narrator is Pip, the adult. The adult Pip, who is the narrative agent, recalls the events of his past and his perception of them as a child. Rimmon-Kenan sums up the implications of this distinction by formulating these points:

1. In principle, focalization and narration are distinct activities.
2. In so-called ‘third person center of consciousness’ (Henry James’ *The Ambassadors*, Joyce’s *Portrait*), the center of consciousness (or reflector) is the focalizer, while the user of the third person markers is the narrator.

3. Focalization and narration are also separate in first person retrospective narratives.

4. As far as focalization is concerned, there is no difference between third person center of consciousness and first person retrospective narration. In both, the focalizer is a character within the represented world. The only difference between the two is the identity of the narrator.

5. However, focalization and narration may sometimes be combined. (75)

Thus Focalization has a subject, i.e. the focalizer; ‘the one dominant consciousness’. There can also be more than one focalizer to create a multiple or simultaneous view. Because, if there is a focalizer, it necessarily implies that there will be something that is focalized (an object).

According to the position of the focalizer and its relations with the focalized objects, focalization is of mainly three types:

- Zero Focalization
- External Focalization
- Internal Focalization

Narratives with zero focalization are also called “non-focalized” according to Genette (189). Gerald Prince defines zero focalization as one in which “the narrator is presented in terms of a non-locatable, indeterminate perceptual position” (103), i.e. the position related to omniscient narrators. In external focalization, focalizing position is outside story and cannot be related with any character. Mieke Bal uses abbreviation EF for “external and non character bound focalization” (148). “External focalization is felt
to be close to the narrating agent” (Rimmon-Kenan 74) and the agent is also called narrator focalizer. Here the difference between narrator and focalizer almost fades away. External focalization narrates only the “visible phenomenon” what characters do and say (Toolan 71). It can be found in first person narration, “either when the temporal and psychological distance between narrator and character is minimal (as in Camus’ L’Etranger, 1957) or when the perception through which the story is rendered is that of narrating self rather than that of experiencing self” (Rimmon-Kenan 74). About internal focalization Toolan says that its place or locus is inside the narrated events or “inside the setting of the events” (Toolan, Narrative 69). As it is always related with one or more than one characters, Mieke Bal represents it through CF, i.e. character focalization. Genette(Narrative) has given three sub-categories of internal focalization:

1) Fixed
2) Variable
3) Multiple

Fixed focalization is associated with only one focalizer in the narrative. Variable focalization shifts from one character to another. In the narrative, the locus of focalization either comes back to the first focalizer or it may shift to the other characters. Multiple focalization means when the same event is focalized and narrated by various characters.

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Bal and Toolan define external focalization and internal focalization in more clear and simplified manner. According to Genette, zero focalization and internal focalization are related to the position of the focalizer, while the difference between external focalization and internal focalization is related to the position of the focalized. But later narratologists define external focalization in a narrative when focalizing agent is not present in the story or cannot be related to the character while internal focalization is used if the focalizing agent may be related to any
character in the narrative. Consequently, external focalization refers to someone who is not in the story, but can have different degrees of perception of the focalized objects. Thus external focalization is related to the situation when the focalization is from an orientation outside the story and it is not associated with any character in the text. Here the narrator and the character are not psychologically distanced. In fact they are close. Internal focalization occurs inside the represented events or even inside the setting of the events. This is mostly related to a character focalizer.

Just as there can be two types of focalizers, there are two types of focalized, marked by the same distinction of being viewed from outside or within. When the focalized is viewed from outside, just the visible, outer manifestation of a person or a thing is reported. When something is internally focalized, there is such penetration of the character as if it can report on its thoughts and feelings from within. The focalizer seems to be in the mind of the focalized actually reporting the condition of the person’s mind. Mieke Bal, who is mainly associated with the concept of focalization says:

The subject of focalization, the focalizer, is the point from which the elements are viewed. That point can lie with a character, i.e. an element of fabula or outside it. If the focalizer coincides with the character, that character will have a technical advantage over other characters. The reader watches with the character’s eyes and will, in principle be inclined to accept the vision presented by the character. (104)

The advantage that the character focalizer enjoys is that it is able to coordinate the reader’s view with its own. Rimmon-Kenan gives a detailed description of the types of focalization which Bal does not. Rimmon-Kenan (1983) has given different ‘facets of focalization, the major ones being perceptual, psychological and ideological. Toolan (1988) says that there can be many variations in ‘the power or breath of the focalizing.’ If one is thinking in relation to the perceptual facet and there is an external focalizer then
that focalizer can give a panoramic perspective to the reader. It can give holistic descriptions of characters, scenes and settings not only individually, but also of separate and simultaneous events or scenes. But when the focalizer is within the setting (a character), it can only give a limited perspective. Even along the time dimension an external focalizer can cover different time periods while an internal focalizer is limited to retrospection.

In addition to making distinctions between these spatio-temporal orientations, Rimmon-Kenan distinguishes the psychological facet into two types, consisting of the cognitive and emotive components. Cognition comprises knowledge, belief memory, etc. and an external focalizer from his omniscient perspective, has greater insight into the characters (the focalized) as compared to an internal focalizer who can have only limited knowledge. An internal focalizer is more involved with the events as compared to the external that can be more neutral or detached. By virtue of this, the internal focalizer may be more subjective and offer a coloured view. The focalized’s mind and emotions are open to an external or internal treatment. Rimmon-Kenan writes:

> When the focalized is seen from within especially by an external focalizer, indications such as ‘he thought’, ‘he felt’, ‘it seemed to him’, ‘he knew’, ‘he recognized’ often appear in the text. But when the inner states of the focalized are left to be implied by external behaviour, modal expressions—suggesting the speculative status of such implication—often occur: ‘apparently’, ‘evidently’, ‘as if’, ‘it seemed’, etc. . . .

Uspensky calls these—‘words of estrangement’ (1973:83). (82)

The third facet of focalization is the ideological facet along which variation occurs. When any kind of evaluation is made of the major categories of classification of life in general like man/woman; husband/wife; child/adult; literate/illiterate;
modern/traditional, etc., there is an inevitable ideological angle to the view. The ideological facet consists of the way the world is conceptualized. This world view may be of the external narrator focalizer in which case it becomes the dominant norm (ideology) against which all others are measured. There may also be a juxtaposition of ideological orientations without anyone gaining dominance thus leading itself to a polyphonic effect.

The terminology used in the present study will follow Mieke Bal and Rimmon-Kenan’s observation on focalization, that is the external focalization and internal focalization will be related to the position of focalizer in the narrative.

It is clear that if focalization is related with ‘who sees.’ The other part is about ‘who speaks’ this is again integral to the issue ‘to whom it is spoken’. It deals with the questions like: Who is the narrator? Who is the narratee? The important things to know are—who tells the story or who is the teller of the narrative. If it is the writer or it may be someone else in the story, whose presence we may or may not feel. Seymour Chatman gives one model of narrative communication which is also used by Kenan.

Narrative Text

Diagram: 1.5 Source: Chatman, Seymour, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (151).

Now it is clear that Chatman positions real author and real reader outside the box. Time is indicative of the activity and crucial factor of narrative communication. The words *real author* or *historical authors* do not refer to a particular historical person but to the writer of the text. To understand the difference between author and narrator is an
important element of narrative analysis. The agent who narrates the story in a narrative text is the narrator whose presence may or may not be felt in the narrative; but the author is that entity who has evolved the whole story, its narrator and hence a text through language. Lothe says, “The author stands in principle outside the literary universe he or she has created by means of language” (18).

It also becomes very important to understand the concept of implied author. He is not like the real author. He does not exist or live in flesh and bone and also should not be identified or confused with the narrator in the narrative. Chatman describes implied author as:

...reconstructed by the reader from the narrative. He is not the narrator, but rather the principle that invented the narrator, along with everything else in the narrative. Unlike the narrator, the implied author can tell us nothing. He, or better, it has no voice, no direct means of communicating. It instructs us silently, through the design of the whole, within all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn. (148)

There is no doubt that the implied author remains silent and is “voiceless,” but it has the ability and power to “instruct us” (the audience) silently. This builds its position, in relation to real author, very important. It has significant role in constituting the discourse of the narrative. Kenan asserts: “Its relations to the real author is admitted to be of great psychological complexity and has barely analyzed except to suggest that implied authors are often far superior in intelligence and moral standards to the actual men and women who are real authors” (87).

Further, Kenan says that it is not compulsory that the implied author should be identical with the real author. As far as implied reader is concerned it is also a construct like an implied author. The way the real author is different from the narrator, the implied
reader also differs from the narratee. The narrative may or may not have an overt narrator or narratee, but surely has an implied author and implied reader. Lothe observes that the conception of implied reader is related to the “broader areas between narrative theory and theories of aesthetic respond . . .”

The implied reader plays an important role in forming the meaning in the narrative. The implied reader should not be called passive like the implied author. Thus “the author has, according to Iser, a certain control of the way in which we read, but this form of control is indirect and based on shared conventions which have matured over time – a repertoire of social, historical and cultural norms regulating the manner in which fictional prose works and communicates” (Lothe 19).

Further Genette defines narration part at three levels:

1. Time of the narrating
2. Narrating level
3. Person

Time of the narrating is concerned with temporal relation between narration and story. In verbal fiction, “. . . stories are generally told in present, past or future tense” (Genette 215). “Most of the time events are told after they happen (‘ulterior narration’), as in Fielding’s *Tom Jones* (1749), Dickens’s *Great Expectations* (1860 / 61) and Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), to mention a few texts where this most frequent form of narration is used” (Rimmon-Kenan 89).

Genette calls the second type “prior narrating” as “Much less frequent, for obvious reasons is a narration which precedes the events (‘anterior narration’)” (Rimmon-Kenan 90). Such narratives are usually written in future tense and are predictive in nature. “Instead, this type of narration tends to appear in narratives with in narratives in the form of prophecies, curses or dreams of fictional characters” (Rimmon-
Kenan 90). These are “predictive in relation to the immediate narrating instance” (Genette 220).

“Simultaneous narration”, the third type of narration is “in principle the simplest . . . and narrating eliminates any sort of interference or temporal game” (Genette 218). “When telling and acting are not simultaneous, but follow each other in alteration narration is of fourth type namely ‘intercalated’” (Rimmon-Kenan 91). Genette defines it as “interpolated”. This type of narration has an intricate and complicated structure. Here the events are as Genette says:

. . . reported between the moments of action . . . story and narrating get entangled in such a way that the latter has an effect on the former. This is what happens particularly in an epistolary novel with several correspondents, where we know, the letter is at the same time both a medium of the narrative and an element in the plot. (Genette 217)

Here the narrative develops along with the development of the fabula. One story is intertwined and intermingled into the other. If we remove or pull out one element, the other gets disturbed. In the simultaneous narration, events are reported when they are happening. Here narration and fabula don’t get entangled and mingle with each other. Narration may be simultaneous, but events are being focalized and narrated by some agency. In simultaneous narration, the temporal distance between fabula and narration is almost zero. Here is Genette’s quote from Narrative Discourse to differentiate the terms more clearly:

The extreme closeness of story to narrating produces here, most often, a very subtle effect of friction (if I may call it that) between the slight temporal displacement of the narrative of events (Here is what happened
to me today) and the complete simultaneousness in the report of thoughts
and feelings (“Here is what I think about it this evening”). (217-18)

**Narrating levels:** As it is discussed earlier, sometimes there are other narratives within
the main narrative. The narratives that are positioned within the main narrative attribute
the main narrative various levels of narration. “Narrating instance of a first narrative”
( Genette 229) is ‘extradiegetic level’ of narration and “the narrating instance of second
narrative” is called ‘intradiegetic level’ of narration. The narration in “Chaucer’s *The
Canterbury Tales*” (Rimmon-Kenan 92) is the simplest example of extradiegetic and
intradiegetic level in which there is extradiegetic narration where the reader is introduced
to different pilgrims, but the pilgrims’ tales are told at intradiegetic levels. The different
pilgrims’ tale that constitutes the second level of narration are also termed as
‘hypodiegetic level’ that means a level below the level of diegesis in the narrative “. . .
thus the diegetic level is narrated by an extradiegetic narrator” (Rimmon-Kenan 92).
Rimmon-Kenan holds: “Hypodiegetic narratives may have various functions in relation
to the narrative with in which they are embedded. These functions are sometimes
presented separately, sometimes in combination” He defines these functions as follows:

1. **Actional Function**

2. **Explicable Function**

3. **Thematic Functions.**

According to Rimmon-Kenan, actional function refers to the function when the
narrative on intradiegetic level carries forward the action of the first narrative “by sheer
fact of being narrated, regardless (or almost regardless) of their content” (92). Rimmon-
Kenan has given the most classical example of this function, i.e. *A Thousand and one
Night*. Here Scheherezade’s life depends upon the embedded narratives she narrates.

Explicable function according Rimmon-Kenan refers to the function when the
embedded narrative “offers an explanation of the diegetic level, answering such question
as ‘What were the events leading to the present situation?’” (92). Rimmon-Kenan presents the example of Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom*. Here “Thomas Sutpen’s narration of his childhood to General Compson, especially of the insulting confrontation with the Negro servant (a hypo-hypodiegetic level), explains how Sutpen lost his innocence and came to be the self-reliant, a-moral person he is” (92). Under thematic function Rimmon-Kenan observes that “the relations established between hypodiegetic and the diegetic levels are those of analogies, i.e. similarities and contrast. . . . an identity which verges on identity, making the hypodiegetic level a mirror and reduplication of diegetic . . . .” (93).

Narrators related to various levels of narration determine the typology of narrator. Narrators related to the extradiegetic level are termed as extradiegetic narrators and those related to intradiegetic level as intradiegetic narrators. Rimmon-Kenan defines the narrators of third level as “hypodiegetic” narrators and of fourth level as “hypo-hypodiegetic” narrators (95). Extradiegetic narrator and intradiegetic narrators can be present or absent in the story they narrate. If they are present in the fabula they narrate, they are called “homodiegetic”, if not then “heterodiegetic” (Genette 255-6).

“Like extradiegetic narrator, intradiegetic narrators can also be either homodiegetic or heterodiegetic” (Rimmon-Kenan 97). Pardoner in *The Canterbury Tales* narrates and also participates as character, he is therefore “inradiegetic and homodiegetic narrator” (Rimmon-Kenan 97). These hypothetical positions present four kinds of narrator’s status (Genette 248).

a. Extradiegetic heterodiegetic
b. Extradiegetic homodiegetic
c. Intradiegetic hetrodiegetic
d. Intradiegetic homodiegetic.
Genette imparts five “functions” (255) to narrator:

1. Narrative function
2. Directing function
3. Narrating function
4. Emotive function
5. Ideological function

Narrator’s first and most important function is “narrative function, which no narrator can turn away from without at the same time losing his status as narrator” (Genette 255); the second “function is to some extent meta-linguistic (meta-narrative, in this case) to mark articulations, connections, interrelation ship” (Genette 255). It is called by Genette “directing function” in a narrative which is just like the function that is also known as stage direction in drama. The next function is “narrating function” which is related to the role of different characters as narrator and narratee. The fourth function is “emotive” function (Genette 256). “This is one accounting for the part narrator as such takes in the story he tells” (Genette 256). The narrator who participates also develops a relationship. By such relationship the narrator may express and shows feelings and emotions "which one or other episode awakens in him” (Genette 256). The last function is “ideological function”. Sometimes when the narrator takes an overt teleological position the “story can also take the more didactic form of an authorized commentary on the action” (Genette 256). It is narrator’s ideological function. Here Genette also alarms that these functions should not be taken very strictly as “none of the categories is completely unadulterated and free of complicity with other” (Genette 257). The kind of function a narrator plays in a particular situation also depends upon his “distance” from the narrated text and his “perspective”. The functions performed by the narrator are of great importance in deciding the ‘characterization’ and ‘discourse’ in the text.

In a narrative it is observed that various aspects are so tightly intermingled that no aspect can be studied on its own—separately or independently. If a character narrator
is introduced in a narration that begins with third person narration, not only the status of
the character gets changed, it also affects the temporal arrangement of events and also
the spatial setting of the narrative further resulting in the change in the overall structure
of the narrative which finally affects the discourse also. Thus the study of a narrative is a
holistic study that means studying all parts of narrative in context with one another and
this is what narratology and a narratologist do.

The thrust of the present discussion on narratology has been based on the
classification of its main aspects—story, text and narration. Based on an analysis done in
this chapter the study will limit itself to the examination and understanding of the
narrative strategies with reference to selected novels of Ghosh with a view to study the
narrative voice including focalization, types of narrator, modes of narration and speech
representation in the third chapter, the treatment of time and space in the fourth chapter
and the study of narratology in relation to history in River of Smoke in the fifth chapter
and finally the conclusion of the present study.