Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

A theory of narrative, as a theory of literature, is "poetics" in its sense as transmitted to us by tradition. In another sense it relates to "Milton's poetics" or "Ezhuthachan's poetics:" then it should apply to "the choice made by the author among all the literary possibilities" (on the order of the composition, style, and so on). In still another restricted sense also, "poetics" may be applied to the dissertation attempted here. As both Milton and Ezhuthachan belong to two different traditions, their works refer to the normative codes constructed by an ancestral literary line of poets, Homer, Virgil and others on one side, and Valmiki, the author of Ramayana, and the anonymous author of Adhyatma Ramayana on the other. Following a set of practical rules whose use is obligatory, here, poetics will be called upon to elaborate a theory of narrative that will bring to light not only what all narratives have in common but what permits them to remain different. The present dissertation is an attempt to provide a scientific groundwork for poetics. The object of science is not the particular fact, but the laws that allow us to account for it. So the attempts proposed in this context do not claim to give correct interpretations of the works of the past. It proposes only the elaboration of instruments permitting the analysis of these works. "Poetics is thus a theoretical discipline nourished and fertilized by empirical research but not constituted by it." Poetics in this treatise supplies instruments for the description of the literary texts examined here. It tries to distinguish levels of
meaning to identify the units that constitute them. It describes
the relationships in which the units participate. With the
assistance of these primary categories, stable configurations are
discovered. This leads to the study of genres which exposes some
of the laws of succession of literary history. In the process it
leads to the discovery of the narrative technique each author
employs in the works under study. *Paradise Lost* and *Adhyatma
Ramayanam* offer scope for deep and wide study. The Fall of Man
had often been the subject of narrative since the composition
of *Genesis* in the Old Testament. *Paradise Lost* had been
churned out of all these narratives and the creative imagination
of Milton. Consequently many editions and studies of *Paradise
Lost* have come out throwing more and more new light on this Fall
story. Regarding the study of the poem and its genre a knowledge
of the origin and development of epic since Homer to Milton is
inevitable. Milton turns to the Bible for theme and the Classical
epic for its treatment. The Sanskrit *Ramayana* of Valmiki has been
published more than once. It has been translated into Latin,
Italian, French and English. Today its regional renderings,
Tulsi’s *Ramarita manas*, Kamban’s *Ramayana*, and the like are
more popular among people. The Malayalam presentation of the same
great national epic has never, till now, been translated in any
form into any language whatsoever. Yet it is no unworthy rival of
its more fortunate predecessor. There is no comparison between
the polished phraseology of Classical Sanskrit and the rough
colloquial idiom of Ezhuthachan’s vernacular. As the antiquity of
Valmiki’s poem further invests it with an adventitious interest
for the student of history, he should show keenness in the study
of Indian religious renaissance and Hindu reformation as
reflected in the retellings of Epics and Puranas like Adhyatma
Ramayanam. But Adhyatma Ramayanam has not yet found many good
editors and scholars. Nor has its full English translation yet
been printed and published. So the attempt in the ensuing pages
is hard and it can be hardly expected to offer an exhaustive
treatise on the subject. Attention will be focussed mainly on the
externalization of the contents of these epics, their
significance as retellings of classics, the techniques of their
renderings compared with their predecessors, and the comparative
study of techniques in narration of these two epics in two
different languages, in two different continents, but by two
contemporary poets of Renaissance.

(1)

Ford Madox Ford defines technique thus: "You must have your
eyes for ever on your Readers. That alone constitutes
2 Technique." What he has in mind is self-evident. "Technique"
has at times been expanded to cover all discernible signs of the
3 author's artistry. Mark Schorer's "Technique" covers almost
the entire range of choices made by the author. The technique
comprises many things. It is the means by which the writer's
experience, which is the subject-matter, compels him to attend
to it. Technique is the means of discovering, exploring,
developing his subject, of conveying its meaning, and of finally
evaluating it. "Technique in fiction is, of course, all those
obvious plans of it which are usually taken to be the whole of
it, and many others." But here the evaluation appertains to
narrative technique, for that the concept of narrative should be made clear.

(ii)

Storytelling is a universal phenomenon. It is a permanent feature of culture. Men of all times and climes love to tell and hear stories. Poetics in a broad sense is a reasoned account of the structure of the narrative, the elements of storytelling, their combination and articulation. Though Aristotle gave a good start for narratological research in his *Poetics*, there was none to receive the baton to resume the relay. After a long pause, 5 Vladimir Propp and his compatriots in Russia led a movement of literary studies called "Formalism" which flourished between 1915 and 1930. It had connections with the Prague School of Structural Linguistics in its approach and reacted against the historicism of the time. It discovered literary discourse in literary discourse itself. Propp’s work, *The Morphology of the Folktale* (1928), was published in English in 1959. In the analysis and study of one hundred Russian folktales Propp resembles Aristotle: the action is the soul of the narrative, and the affabulation secondary. But his method is just the opposite of that of Aristotle. To Aristotle, it was up to the poet to build a structure with functional agents. Propp started with existing tales on the assumption that they all had their structure independent of the writer. He called the structural unit of a tale a "function" and defined it as follows:

"A function is an action of a personage defined from the point of view of its significance in the unfolding of the action of the tale considered as a whole." 6

Concluding his studies, Propp established 31 functions forming a
single sequence which may be regarded as the ideal structure of the Russian folktale. His analysis was found wanting due to a total absence of "pivot functions." A pivot function would open the possibility of two alternative functions which exclude each other. His structure was purely linear. That was its second drawback.

Later narratologists tried to improve upon Propp’s concept in two ways. Functions were replaced by "pivot function" for units of narration. Instead of individual function, elementary sequences naturally interwoven became units of narration.

Propp, thus, contributed a new concept to narratology though the term "narratology" was introduced later by Todorov. Alan Dundes in *The Morphology of the American Indian Folktale* (Helsinki: Academic Scientiarum, 1964) extended the application of Propp’s method to analyse the corpus of a tale. Dundes has pointed out the similarities between the problems of narratives and those of descriptive linguistics. The major representatives of the Paris School of Semiotics, Algirdas J. Greimas, Tzvetan Todorov, Julia Kristeva, and Umberto Eco have analysed texts much more complex than folktales. Greimas’s structural semantics and its application to narratology is a continuation and development of the glossematics as suggested by Louis Hjelmslev in his *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, "1969). It accepts Claude Levi Strauss’s anthropology as explained in *Structural Anthropology* (New York : Doubleday Anchor Books, 1968) and in "The Structural Study of Myth" (*Journal of American Folklore*), pp 428-44. Alan Dundes has introduced post-Bloomfieldian principles into narratology.
Todorov has connected various structuralist theories to this study. Julia Kristeva has integrated certain concepts of generative model. Zelling Harris's discourse analysis has extended its influence on research of text structures. Barthes has constructed a complex network of notions, the role of catalysts, indices and of informants. Seymour Chatman has devised a method for the description of psychological literature.

To know what is wrong with the study of a narrative, one has to trace back to Propp's basic assumption of function. Function is not, anyway, an isolated segment of the story. It is the seed of the further development on its level or on a superior level. So a function is dynamic. But all the functions are not. Some accelerate the pace of the story, some slow it down. But structurally everything is functional. Thus function is the smallest unit of a narrative. Functions are classified into two: (1) distributional or horizontal and (2) integrative or vertical. Considering distinction in narrative functions, they are divided into two groups: functions proper and indicators. The indicators are integrative and their correlation is on a higher level. They do not lead to a subsequent and complementary "doing". But they refer to some other aspects of the narrative, outside or above the level of doing. They are concerned with the doers and the atmosphere of the story. Using the functions and indicators Propp classifies the narrations into two, works predominantly functional like folktale and oral epic, and works predominantly indicators like the psychological novel and the "mahakavya". There are intermediary forms also.
While Propp had failed to distinguish between temporal sequence and logical sequence, Barthes discerns two types of functions: the cardinal functions (pivot functions) and the catalysts. The cardinal functions have a logical correlation. They either open, or maintain, or close an alternative, with a possible bifurcation in the course of the narration. Claude Bremond schematically represents the working of the elementary sequence of pivot functions as follows:

```
\begin{align*}
\text{success} \\
\text{virtuality} &< \text{actualization} \\
\text{nonactualization} &< \text{failure}
\end{align*}
```

Filling the narrative vacuum between pivot functions, subsidiary notations belonging to the level of doing swarm around the pivot functions, without affecting their logical correlation. They are catalysts. They either accelerate or delay the narrative movement.

Todorov’s distinction between story and discourse will help us to understand the distinction between pivot functioning and catalysts. Every narrative evokes a certain reality, a sequel of incidents with concrete personages. This forms the story. It can be told in diverse ways. But once it is told it, implies a narrator who tells the story to a listener or a reader. Here, it is not so much the story as such that matters, but the way in which it is told. This is the discourse. Here there is a coming back rather close to Aristotle’s distinction between mythos and lexis. Pivot functions belong to the story, while the catalysts belong to the discourse.

Gerald Prince has devised a method to evolve a grammar of the story. He considers events as basic units. Every story, to
him, shall contain a minimal story. The ordering of events in time is one of the most fundamental characteristics of any story. The causal relationship between certain content units is just as essential a feature of stories as the chronological one. The inversion of an event is another feature of the story. But all these various approaches have not yet yielded any comprehensive narrative theory. Here an attempt is made to get a theoretical strategy from the researches already made in the field of narratology for the objective of this work.

To develop a strategy for the analysis in hand a definition of narrative is necessary. "Narrative" has its ambiguity. It is due to this that narratological problems generally crop up. Gerard Genette attributes three meanings to the term narrative. (i) The narrative means the narrative statement. It is the oral or written discourse that undertakes to tell of an event or series of events. (ii) The narrative refers to the succession of events, real or fictitious, that are the subject of discourse and to their several relations of linking, opposition, repetition and the like. This meaning is less widespread. But it is the current one today among analysts and theoreticians of narrative content. Analysis of narrative then means the study of the totality of actions and situations taken in themselves, without regard to the medium, linguistic or other. (iii) The third meaning of the narrative has narrative reference more to an event, not, however, the event that is recounted, but the event that consists of someone recounting something, the act of narrating taken in itself.
The study of narrative technique has to basically deal with narrative as narrative statement, narrative in its first meaning, which is really the narrative text. This is covered by the analysis and observations in Chapter II. The study should also consider the relations of two kinds. The relation between a discourse and the events that it recounts is important. This is narrative in its second meaning. Chapter IV deals with this. The study is also about the relations between the discourse and the act that produces it, actually or fictively, narrative in its third meaning. The third chapter gives accent on this meaning. Narrative is the signifier or statement, discourse or narrative self. Narrating is producing narrative action. In other words, Genette’s analysis of narrative discourse is essentially a study of relationship between narrative and story, between narrative and narrating, and between story and narrating. Though other approaches are also heeded to in this study, Genette’s definition functions as the key. This is a major starting point of this study of Milton and Ezhuthachan.

(iii)

Here, the area of exploration is comparative literature. To be more accurate, it is “comparative study of literature.” Quite naturally the study should use comparison as its main instrument. To be more appropriate, it must fulfil also the conditions in another definition: “Comparative Literature” is “the study of national literature in relation to each other.” Romans, in the past, had measured their poetry against that of the Greeks. Literatures from various cultures and in various languages had been “compared” ever since. After sometime Latin
gained and later lost its position as a "universal" language. Growing nationalism divided Europe more and more. This demanded a situation when comparative literature studies assumed new functions: It had to restore a lost unity and universality. It had also to enrich narrow narrative traditions by beneficial contacts with others. The comparatists looked beyond the western world to our Indian classics at first, with the German Romantics, to Arab, Persian and even Chinese literature, with Goethe. In our own time they looked to other far Eastern as well as to African literary and oral traditions. Comparisons across linguistic frontiers were used to shape, by contrast, a sense of native traditions. These helped to alter, by example, the course of a particular national literature. These managed to construct, with an unrestricted width of reference, a general theory of literature.

The comparative study of *Paradise Lost* and *Adhyatma Ramayanam* owns certain special features. It does not confine the study to writings in the same language, it amounts to choosing points of comparison in other languages. Moreover, the works under study belong to entirely different languages, one a member of the Indo-European and the other Dravidian, though greatly influenced by the Indo-European branch Sanskrit. The works here belong to two different cultures: Christian and Hindu.

(iv)

A terminology is to be developed for handling this subject. Genette's proposed analysis-triad involves story, narrative and narrating. The events constitute the story. Their verbal representation is narrative. The third one is an act of telling
or writing. Genette calls them "histoire", "recit", and "narrating" (1972, pp 71-6). Rimmon-Kenan calls them "story", "text" and narration. Formalists call story and narrative, "fabula" and "sujet" (Tomashevsky 1965, p 66). Todorov uses "histoire" and "discourse" (1966, p 126). Chatman's "story" and "discourse" refer to the same. Barthes advances these concepts in "functions", "actions" and narration (1966, p 6). Bal employs "histoire", "recit", "texte narratif" (1977 pp 4-8). Perry considers story and narration as metonymies of the text (1979, p. 43). The formalists made a distinction between fabula and sujet. Fabula is a set of actions that we can imagine taking place in the real world (the raw materials for the story). Sujet is the actual "telling" of the story, involving a selection of possible narrative structures: point of view, order, voice, etc. The fabula of course does not really exist, since it can only be extrapolated from the sujet. Barthes, Genette, and Todorov have all expanded and elaborated upon this basic distinction. "Story" designates the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events. "Text" is a spoken or written discourse which undertakes their telling. The text is what we read. The events in a text need not necessarily appear in chronological order. In the text the characteristics of the participants are dispersed. All the items of the narrative content are filtered through some prism or perspective ("focalizer"). The text is a discourse, either spoken or written. It implies someone who speaks or writes it. "Narration" the third aspect is the act or process of
production. Genette calls it "narrating". The agent of narrating is the narrator. Here the words chosen on merit are fabula for the first aspect, sujet for the second and narrator for the third. All these are interdependent. Never can they enjoy independence. All the three are complementary to one another. To represent a narrative with these aspects a triangle may be conceived. The triangle hereafter in this treatise is the narrative triangle.

The narrative triangle (1) given here represents Genette's concepts. The narrative triangle (2) represents the present concept mooted. The triangle (3) represents the present concept confirmed with the new terminology.

(i) Narrating. (ii) Narrator (iii) Narrator

histoire recit story text fabula sujet

To get a theory of narrative, another attempt is made with a revised definition of a narrative. The process of transference of a story into a text by a narrator is called narration. All the three factors in the definition are inevitable in the transference. A narrative is defined as the whole formed out of three components: narrator, fabula and sujet. The process of transference is given here. When a narrator continues to act upon a story, the story undergoes a transformation and it assumes a new dimension and grows into perceivable proportions. That into which a fabula is grown is
called the sujet. That which grows is fabula. The agent who
effects the transformation is narrator. In other words the
fabula is potential story, sujet the kinetic story and the
process of transformation of the potential to the kinetic is
carried out by the narrator. If the agent is withdrawn no
kinetic story (text) will be formed. In the absence of a
potential story also, no product is obtained. All these three
are complementary.

For a comprehensive understanding of a narrative, a
triangular representation is helpful.

The triangular representation of the narrative

In figure 1

\[ \begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{represents narrating/narrator} \\
F & \quad \text{represents fabula/story} \\
S & \quad \text{represents sujet/text} \\
T & \quad \text{the middle point of FS}
\end{align*} \]

The triangle NFS represents the narrative.

Then NF is the story at the disposal of the narrator
NS is the text as formed by the narrative out of the story
FS is the actual transformation of a story into a text
effected by the narrator.

A narrative is neither NF, nor NS, nor FS; but it is the holistic product of the triangle in which NF, FS
and NS are the sides. This is the hypothesis, with which we
start.

The total product of the triangle NFS = The total narrative
\[ \frac{1}{2} FS \times NT \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{s \left( s-a \right) \left( s-b \right) \left( s-c \right)} \] where \( s = \left( a+b+c \right)/2 \)
In an equilateral triangle

\[ \frac{1}{2} FS = \frac{1}{2} NF = \frac{1}{2} NS \]

An ideal narrative is represented by an equilateral triangle.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{N(Narrator)} \\
\text{F(Fabula)} \\
\text{S(Sujet)} \\
\end{array} \]

The inferences made out of the triangular concept of a narrative are the following:

- **Equilateral triangle**
  - NFS

1. Symmetrical NF = FS = NS

2. Interdependent sides and angles

3. Any change in position of one angle will tilt the balance and deny the triangle its equilateral state.

4. The sides of the triangle lose their individuality to become a whole.

An ideal narrative

- Symmetrical in the combination of the three sides [fabula-narrator, narrator-sujet and fabula-sujet] of the narrative

- Fabula, sujet, narrator all the three are interdependent

- Any change in the position of one of the three factors will deny the narrative the ideal state.

The narrator-fabula, the narrator-sujet and the fabula-sujet will lose their independent state to
exist together as the narrative.

(5) the totality of the triangle is determined by the area. is determined by the whole, as externalized as the narrative.

(6) the area is determined by a fourth factor, the altitude which is traceable. the narrative in toto is determined by the narrative technique traceable.

(7) an analysis of only one side is always incomplete as every sujet, or narrator is incomplete. Every one is in relation to the other two. thought of in relation to the other two.

In Fig. 2

\[ \text{NFS is an equilateral triangle. Therefore, as a narrative it is perfect/ symmetrical.} \]

In Fig. 3 (imaginary condition) \text{N} is brought down to \text{N1}. Then \text{the triangle will become FN1S. The results are: NF is cut short to N1S, FS remains the same, NS is changed. The symmetrical shape of the triangle is lost. It becomes a} \]
disproportionate triangle with unequal sides and unequal angles. A narrative with such a representation may have less of the fabula part in it and more of the sujet.

In Figure 4 NFS is not an equilateral triangle. As a narrative it is not symmetrical. The reverse process as in the triangle in Fig. 3 happens here. Result is a disproportionate triangle and a disproportionate narrative.

The minimal unit of a narrative is a smaller narrative. A narrative consists of 'n' number of narratives. Every small unit shall fulfil the minimum requirement of a narrative. Every narrative is different from the other. If it is not so and if there are more narratives of the same dimensions, then there will be irrelevant repetitions in the Narrative. This does not mean that a verbal repetition of a narrative inside a large narrative will be always irrelevant. The repetition may be inevitable, but it must contain a suggestive, metaphorical meaning different from the meaning of the first one. All these may be represented trigonometrically.
But the 'n' number of narratives together forming a longer narrative shall have all the perfection of a narrative. Whatever be the number of smaller triangles, when all of them join together to form a large triangle, all of them shall be arranged so well in the larger one that there shall be no gap or loose and.

Theory of Retelling

Retelling is done on cultural, religious, or any other such levels. Then the narrator changes, the fabula changes and the sujet also changes. But these changes are made in correspondence with one another and the retelling is also acceptable as a narrative. This shows that here too the triangle is symmetrical and equilateral. Imagine a retelling does not give any sujet that can contain the fabula, then the triangle representation suffers variation.

In Fig. (10) NFS is an equilateral triangle.

Fig. (11) N1 F1 S1 is also an equilateral triangle.

But there is change in the sides of the triangle.
Fig. (12) The triangle N2F2S2 will not be an equilateral triangle. It has lost its symmetry. The story part here is more. The narrative technique (altitude) represented by NT is shortened. Anyhow, the retelling may have an equilateral triangle representation only if the balance is maintained in among all the three factors of the narrative.

A perfect retelling should exactly look like the telling. If the triangle NFS is retold and the triangle N1F1S1 is the same as the first then their sides and angles undergo absolutely no change. If so, what is it that demands a retelling at all?

Theory of Translation

In the case of translation an earlier work is involved; that is an earlier triangle is involved. The triangle NFS is a narrative in language L1 and it is translated into language L2. Consider an ideal condition that the translation in the new language looks like the original work. This means that the triangle N1F1S1 in a new language has maintained the symmetry of NFS. Here the sides will not be equal. The very transfer
from one language to another has affected the FS and NS sides. These changes may have made corresponding changes in FN also. So the resultant triangle is equilateral and symmetrical.

Here it is the language factors that tend to tilt the balance of the first work. But that tendency of tilting the balance has been corrected by the second narrator to give the original balance by tilting further the imbalance back to the first one. In the process all the three factors may have undergone changes.

The story of the Fall of Man is part of "Genesis" in the Old Testament. This narrative is attributed to Moses. Moses is an omniscient narrator who is supposed to know all about man. A rational mind can attribute the fabula formation to the myths available to Moses. The triangular representation of the Mosaic narrative in the Old Testament is simple as given here.

Fig. 15

NFS is Mosaic narration of the Genesis story of Adam and Eve.

Paradise Lost provides another narrative on the same story in N1F1S1.
When a specific work like the story of Rama, Ramayana, is analysed following the trigonometrical hypothesis, certain difficult problems crop up. The first available version of Ramayana is Valmiki's Ramayana. This does not mean that it is Valmiki who created the story. Even before Valmiki's time the story had been prevalent in the form of myths. Perhaps, that is the reason why Valmiki attributes the genesis of the story to Narada, the omniscient. The omniscient should have known all the myths too. So the fabula part is said to have been accepted from Narada for fabulation. But this narration of Valmiki's meeting Narada and the synoptic narration of the fabula forms part of the total narration, and this also forms part of the fabulation process, leading to the telling of Rama's story. All this makes the trigonometrical approach interesting and useful.

Valmiki's Ramayana - narrative in triangles

NFS is Narada's narration of Ramayana. N1F1S1 is Valmiki's fabulation of the synoptic narration of NFS. Both NFS and N1 F1 S1 come under N2 F2 S2 as all these fabulations are product of Valmiki's (the Narrator's) imagination. All the three are equilateral triangles. Only in measurements they differ. So there are three levels of narration: (1) Author's narration (2)
Narada’s narration and (3) Valmiki’s narration. In a closer analysis it is understood that the author is Valmiki. Narada’s narration is Valmiki’s narration through Narada and Valmiki’s narration is Valmiki’s (the author’s) narration through Valmiki, the sage.

The *Adhyatma Ramayana* gives another narrative on Ramayana. The diagram is a complex one.

The triangle diagram gives the following details:

NFS = the synoptic narrative of Ramayana given by Siva to Parvati

N1F1S1 = the detailed account of Ramayana by Siva to Parvati

N2F2S2 = the rhapsodist’s narration

N3F3S3 = the author’s narration of the whole work

All the narrations are rendered by the author. But he employs a technique of using the services of various agencies to narrate the story on his behalf.
Ezhuthachan uses a complex multitier narration. The author Ezhuthachan starts his narration with an invocation of the bird (narrator). The bird narrates the story (N2F2S2). It narrates only what has already been narrated by Siva to Parvati (N1F1S1 and NFS). N1F1S1 is the expanded version of the synoptic account of Ramayana given by Siva in NFS. All the four are equilateral triangles. They differ in dimensions only. There are four levels of narration.

For an analysis of the narrative, till now the following methods were used. The story part was examined structurally in Fropp’s way or by Barthe’s method or with Prince’s grammar. But all these analyses linger round the story factor only. The story alone makes no narrative. These methods of analyses are therefore ineffective. They fail since the choice of the narrative unit is wrong. The structural analysis of the text is another possibility. The quantitative analysis of the text will cross over to linguistics. The qualitative analysis of the text relies on the value system of the time of production of text and also of the time of analysis. Then the third approach is to analyse the narrative process employed by the narrator. All these three approaches have not been together used in the analysis. But such a strategy can be proposed if the narrative-triangle equation is acceptable. The units of the larger triangle will be smaller triangles. Therefore calling
trigonometry, the help of reason will solve many problems of narratology.

(v)

The analyses of narratives in the past were mainly based on just two important factors as the narratological studies had not developed well enough: one centering around the narrator, and the other around sujet. The narrator's role has been examined as the performer of narration and sujet as the product of the performance. Now keeping abreast of the developments in narratological research, an attempt is being made to bring the relations between the narrator and the sujet under careful scrutiny. For this, a preliminary knowledge of some of the terms in narratology like narrative, discourse, narrative-discourse and externalization of a story is necessary. This will help to focus the attention on the shifts of levels of analysis in narration.

The phrase "narrative discourse" is in itself a paradox. Both components of the phrase individually mean almost the same, but on a closer examination, they are, of course, distinct. Emile Benveniste encompasses some of the distinctions in the discourse attributed by the poet or storyteller to one of the characters. Certain grammatical forms like the pronoun "I", the pronominal "indicators" like certain demonstrative pronouns, the adverbial indicators like "here", "now", "tomorrow," "today" etc. find themselves limited discourse. Here the focus is only on the meaning of the narrative discourse as applicable to an epic.
In an epic both the narrative and the discourse are used alternately. The storyteller or poet does the narration. The characters of the story participating in dialogues steal away with them the faculty of the onward story movement. In Adhyatma Ramayana it is the poet who executes the whole narration. But the poet presents it in the form of a discourse between the poet and a bird. The bird performs the narration as a discourse between Lord Siva and Parvati. Throughout, one finds a mixture of narrative and discourse in the Benvenistean definition. In a way, the narrative of Adhyatma Ramayana is full of discourses. In Paradise Lost the whole narration is done by the poet himself. But here too, the modes of discourse are fairly used in the exposition of the story: in the debate at Pandemonium (PL II) in Uriel's conversation with Gabriel (PL V) in Raphael's talk with Adam and Eve (PL V & VI), in the temptation scene (PL IX) and in many other scenes. Narrative in the strictest sense is noted for its use of the third person and of such forms as the preterite and pluperfect. This view leads to the objectivity of narrative and subjectivity of discourse. In discourse the "I" maintains the discourse and the presence of "I" makes it subjective. In a narrative, on the other hand, the objectivity is detected by the absence of reference to the narrator. In it "Truly there is no longer a 'narrator' ....The events are chronologically recorded as they appear on the horizon of the story. Here no one speaks. The events seem to tell themselves."

The externalisation of the same story in different languages, by different authors is possible. All these
externalisations will be different from one another. Externalisation of a story is the joint venture of a narrator-trinity: the fabula, the sujet and the narrator. Its product is the text. It is through the text that the fabula, the sujet and the narrator are detected.

Fluctuation levels of a literary narrative discourse at the speech level and their representation in an analysis may form a hypothetical supposition. To approach a literary narrative discourse with such a conception, "mimesis" and "diegesis" should be redefined. This demands a study of these concepts with an historical perspective.

In classical narratology, two traditions, contradictory to each other, are noted: lexis (manner of speaking) and logos (that which is text). Logos is further classified into mimesis and diegesis.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mimesis</th>
<th>lexis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>diegesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Plato means by diegesis or simple narrative all that the poet relates "in speaking in his own name, without trying to make us believe that it is another who speaks...." It is true that "The poet himself is the speaker and does not even attempt to suggest to us that any one but himself is speaking." This is diegesis. In Book I of *Paradise Lost* Milton specifically announces who the narrator of the poem is: "I thence/Invoke thy aid to my adventurous song," (PL I 12-13) and what the nature of the poem will be: "it (the song) pursues/Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme" (PL I 15-16). These are self-explanatory.
Milton prefers to speak throughout the poem in his own name. He does not feel like introducing a narrator. But as the poem proceeds it makes much use of dialogues, admixed with his narration. Perhaps he deems them part of his narrative. It may be presumed that through the lips of the participants of dialogues it is Milton himself who speaks. In Book I, Milton narrates the state of the fallen angels:

O how unlike the place from whence they fell! There the companions of his fall, o'erwhelmed With floods and whirlwinds of tempestuous fire, He soon discerns, and wetering by his side One next himself in power, and next in crime, Long after known in Palestine, and named Beelzebub.

(PL I 75-81)

In contrast to these lines by Milton the focus of our attention shifts after three lines when Satan starts speaking to his fellow friend:

If thou beest he; but O how fallen! how changed From him, who in the happy realms of light Clothed with transcendent brightness didst outshine Myriads though bright:

(PL I 84-87)

Here, it is difficult to guess whether Satan himself makes this utterance or Milton speaks through Satan. But it reminds us of Plato speaking about a similar situation in Iliad when in Book I Homer tells of Chryses: "He came to the Achaen's great boats to buy back his daughter, bringing a tremendous ransom and bearing the bands of Apollo the archer on the golden staff in his hand. He entreated all the Achaeans, but especially Atreus' sons, two fine military leaders." In contrast, Chryses, immediately after this Homeric(authorial) narration, starts to speak: "Descendents of Atreus,.... But for me, may you also give me back my daughter! And for that, accept this ransom,
out of respect to the son of Zeus, to Apollo the archer." Of course, the author can narrate the words of Chryses in a purely narrative form. That is another possibility. In Adhyatma Ramayana(Sanskrit) it is the author who starts the poem with a hymn to Siva: "Apremyatrayatite nirmelugyanamurtaye/ Manogiram Viduraya Dakshnamurtaye namah" (AR Bala Kanda 1).

Salutation to Dakshina Murti(Siva) who is measureless, who is beyond the three Maya(nescience) Jiva (embodied self) and Ishvara (God with attributes) who is the nature of pure intelligence, who is above thought and speech.26

Then the author entrusts the narration with Suta."Suta uvacha: "Kadachinna rado yogi paranugraha vanchaya/Paryadan sakalan lokan satyalokamupagamat" (AR Bala Kanda). Suta said: "Once upon a time the Yogi Narada desirous of doing good to the world went in the course of his rambles in three worlds to the Satya loka."

Except in a couple of lines it is Suta, the rhapsodist-narrator who recites. This practice is in continuation of the Purana narrative tradition.

In Adhyatma Ramayanam the situation is different even from the Indian epic tradition. The poet leaves the entire act of narration to a divine bird. This is a unique concept. The bird recounts a conversation between Lord Siva and Parvati. The poet offers a decastich hymn praising the hero of the poem, invokes the bird-narrator, requests her to narrate the story of Rama and listens to the narration.

Sri Rama namam pati vanna painkilipenne/Sri Rama charitan ni chollidu matiyate.(ARM Bala Kanda 11-12)
Coming to my place, singing Rama’s hymns/ You, little parrot pretty, tell me Rama’s tale.

The bird starts narrating the discourse between Parvati and Siva. Siva narrates Ramayana. Here there are problems in fixing the narrator. The poet is the narrator supreme. The bird is the narrator. Siva is also the narrator. It is a three-tier narration of which discussions will be continued later in Chapter III.

Again coming back to Plato for the classical conception of mimesis and diegesis, one can find Plato’s theoretical division opposing the two pure modes of narration and imitation within poetic diction. His theoretical stand elicits and establishes a practical classification of genres. They include the two distinct modes: narrative represented by dithyramb and mimetic represented by the theatre. Then there is a mixed mode or alternating mode, that of the epic.

Aristotle’s stance is different. It consigns all poetry to imitation. It distinguishes only imitative modes: the direct discourse (Plato’s imitation) and the narrative which Aristotle calls diegesis (Plato’s diegesis). "In addition, Aristotle seems not only fully to identify the dramatic genre with the imitative mode (as does Plato) but also fully to identify the epic genre with the purely narrative mode, without taking into consideration the mixed character of the epic mode." This is because Aristotle defines the imitative mode by the scenic conditions of the dramatic representation. This can justify itself equally because the epic remains essentially narrative no matter what the actual portion of dialogue or direct discourse
be and even if the portion surpasses that of the narrative. The dialogues in a narrative are necessarily together with the narrative parts forming the content or thread of the epic's discourse. Aristotle acknowledges Homer's superiority over the epic poets because the authorial intervention is the least in the Iliad. Homer puts already defined characters on stage thus conforming to the poet's role to imitate as much as possible. Aristotle, therefore, seems implicitly to realize the imitative character of the Homeric dialogues and thus the mixed character of epic diction which is narrative in its depth and dramatic in its largest extension. The difference between these clarifications of Plato and Aristotle is only a simple variation in terms. Both of them agree on the essential opposition between the dramatic and the narrative. The dramatic is more fully imitative than the narrative.

Gerard Genette observes: "Direct imitation as it functions on stage consists of gestures and acts of speech...." Gestures representing actions bring the direct imitation out of the linguistic plane. Thus direct imitation comes out of the specific activity of the poet. To the extent that it consists of acts of speech and of discourse, delivered by characters, the literary work is not representational. The work reproduces a real or fictitious discourse. This observation did not evoke any concern in both Plato and Aristotle. Some verses in Paradise Lost (I 75-31) give us a verbal representation of Satan's acts. But Satan's speech given thereafter (I 83-87) is different. These verses do not re-present the discourse of Satan. If they concern a discourse that was really uttered, the verses would
repeat it literally. If they concern a fictitious discourse, they constitute it literally. In both cases the work of representation is non-existent. The lines of Milton are completely identical with Satan's discourse.

From all the observations made above, the following findings may be arrived at. (1) Poetic imitation is the verbal representation of a non-verbal reality. (2) In some cases it can be the verbal representation of a verbal reality. (3) Both these types of representations are alternatingly used in an epic as it is a mixed narrative: it consists of the representation of a non-verbal matter which the narrative must represent as well as it can, and a verbal matter which presents itself and which the narrative need simply quote. (4) "One type of imitation is in direct relation while the other calls for the intervention of a more complex system of mediation."

As far as "representation is concerned, the only mode that literature knows is narrative, the verbal equivalent of non-verbal events and of verbal events." Genette agrees to the use of direct quotation in the representation of verbal events. He thinks that "narrative will efface itself before the direct quotation," where all representational function has been abolished. He draws a parallel to that situation: "a judicial orator interrupts his discourse to allow the tribunal itself to examine an exhibit." Literary representation as meant by the "mimesis" of the classical notions is the narrative. It is only the narrative. To deem it the narrative and the discourse taken together is wrong. Genette then states "mimesis is diegesis."
and considers that a perfect imitation is no longer an imitation.
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