Chapter- 1: Narratology and Fiction

The study of narrative is called Narratology. Before I touch upon the subject of narratology, it would be prudent on my part to define the term, narrative. In general terms, narrative means any thing that tells a story- it can be a literary book, picture, ballet, newspaper or movie. “Newspaper, reports, history books, novels, films, comic strips, pantomime, dance, gossip, psychoanalytic sessions are only some of the narratives which permeate our lives” (Rimmon-Kenan 1). Stories are told not only in literature but also in other practices – personal as well as cultural. We tell stories while reporting an incident or while making confessions; we tell stories while sharing our own biographical details or while singing the folk-tales; stories are told while telling lies even. It means narrative is everywhere, in all kinds of activities. All pervasive narrative can be verbal or non-verbal; it can be true or untrue; it can be realistic or unrealistic; it can be fictional or non-fictional, it can be literary or non-literary.

In the present treatise, I shall work on the fictional narrative which Rimmon-Kenan calls as ‘narrative fiction’. In this term, the word ‘fiction’ is of great importance to us. “‘Fiction’ comes from the Latin fingere (original meaning: ‘to make by shaping’) – to invent, to think up, to make up (cf. Italian fingere, French feindre, English feign, German fingieren)” (Lothe 4). In the above definition, fiction has been called a ‘made up’ story, but a narratologist would look at the other half of the definition also i.e. ‘by shaping.’ This means fictional narratives are not merely ‘made up’ stories they are ‘shaped’ as well. Thus, studying the form of narrative- the arrangement of events in time and space becomes important and a subject worthy of study.

Since the study of narrative has become institutionalised, different theorists have attempted to theorize narrative in different ways. Gerald Prince defines narrative as “the recounting (as product and process, object and act, structure 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” (Prince 58). According to this definition, narrative, being the process of recounting the events, intrinsically involves two subjects- speaker or teller and the listener. It can be told to a single person or a group of persons; or it can be told by a
single person or a group of persons. Thus, narrative can either be ‘by’ an individual or a group; or it can be ‘for’ an individual or a group. Narrative can “exist for one person at a time”… it can also be “for a community” (Branigan 2). WHATSOEVERthe case may be, narrative is a set of event or events told by a narrator or narrators to a narratee or more narratees. Theorists have often debated over what constitutes the narrative. Whether it is a set of events that constitutes a narrative or a single event is potent enough to constitute a narrative. Different theorists have expressed their individual and varied opinions on this matter. Gerard Genette, for example, needs only one event to constitute a narrative. Gerald Prince requires three events connected with one another through: chronology, causality and closure.

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan believes that there should be at least two events to make a narrative. He opines narrative is “a succession of events in order to suggest that narratives usually consist of more than one” (Rimmon-Kenan 3). Michael J. Toolan also believes that events or change of events is the key and fundamental of narrative. Michael J. Toolan quotes Tzvetan Todorov to illustrate his views on the importance of “transformation” or “change of events”.

The simple relation of successive facts does not constitute 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 7).

In a narrative, according to him, the important factor is change of state which entails presence of more than one event. In his minimalist manner, he defines narrative as “a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events” (Toolan 7). In this definition the phrase “non-randomly connected events” implies that narrative is not an amorphous amalgam of events but an organized set of events.

The term Narratology was used by Tzvetan Todorov in 1969 “to designate a systematic study of Narrative firmly anchored in the tradition of the Russian and Czech formalism of the early twentieth century and French structuralism and
semiotics of the sixties” (O’Neil 13). Though the term can be used in a broad sense for all “theoretical” persuasions” of narrative theory, “it refers specifically to the theories of narrative structure” (Prince 4). Gerald Prince defines it as “the study of form and functioning of narrative” (Prince 4). He further adds 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). This theoretical neglect of the narrative as a form of literature is aptly compensated by the profuse study done in narrative, especially since the emergence of structuralism on the scene. “The current boom in narrative theories (and in books about narrative theory) has by now reached something close to epidemic proportions” (O’Neil 12). Quite a good number of theories pertaining to narrative have recently mushroomed. Among others there are Russian Formalist theory of Narrative; Bakhtian or dialogical theory; Chicago School, Hermeneutic and Phenomenological theories to name a few.

As stated earlier, the story of narratology itself goes back to Aristotle. In his Poetics, Aristotle has stated that ‘character’ and ‘action’ are the major constituent elements of a tragedy and has also stated that ‘character’ is revealed through ‘action’. He also identifies three key elements in a tragedy (using Aristotle’s Greek words)-

1. hamartia
2. anagnorisis
3. peripeteia

Though Aristotle spoke largely on drama, but all these elements can be found in any narrative form irrespective of its mode of communication.¹

In identifying his three key moments, Aristotle did what all narratologists do, which is to look at a number of different stories (Greek stage tragedies in his case) asking what elements they have in common ... the presence of these three is easy to discern beneath many narratives, acting as the generative force of their moral impact (Barry 224-226).

¹ Peter Barry in his book Beginning Theory has applied Aristotelian concept to a comic strip and has shown that all the three elements can be found there.
It is in finding the common elements or constant “deep structure” in many narratives that Vladimir Propp, a Russian Formalist comes into picture. Working on Russian folk tales, he discovered recurrent structures and situation in every folk tale and published his book entitled *The Morphology of Folk Tales* in 1928. As the title indicates, he worked on the form of the folk tales and concluded that the Russian folk tales consist of elements picked from the repertoire of thirty-one ‘functions.’ He also affirms that each tale may or may not have all the thirty-one functions. A tale may have less than thirty-one functions but they would be chosen from the same thirty-one functions and would always appear in the same sequence. Propp, in his analysis, states that actions done in various stories aim to perform the similar “function.” It is important to mention here that an actual character may play more than one characters role in a narrative and at the same time more than one actual characters in a narrative may also play one character role.

Since the tide of formalist study in Russia had already subsided by 1928, Propp’s book disappeared. It was re-discovered by Claude Levi-Strauss who used Propp's idea to conduct his analysis of myths. Claude Levi-Strauss opines that “the structure which underlies every myth is that of a four-term homology, correlating one pair of opposed mythemes with another” (Rimmon-Kenan 11). As with Propp, the function constitutes the basic unit for Bremond as well.

![Figure 1.1](source: Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (22)).

Every three functions combine to form a sequence in which they punctuate three logical stages: possibility (or potentiality), process, and outcome. Rather than automatically leading to the next function,
as in Propp, each function opens two alternatives, two directions the story can take (Rimmon-Kenan 22).

Since, according to Bremond’s vision, story always opens two alternatives it may end with defeat of Hero. Victory, in this scheme, is not always sure.

Roland Barthes, the French semiologist, narratologist, critic and essayist, in his essay “An Introduction to Structural Analysis of Narratives” begins his argument by justifying the deductive method to inductive method of narrative analysis. Deductive method is “obliged first to devise a hypothetical model of description (what American linguist call a ‘theory’) and then gradually to work down from this model towards different narrative species...” (Barthes 81). For Barthes, beyond linguistics of a sentence lay linguistics of discourse whose object is the language of narrative. Narrative is the object of the structuralist science of narratology and literature is the privileged vehicle of narrative. He proposes three different levels at which the analysis of a narrative can be done:

i) functions (the sense in which this word is used by Propp and Bremond),
ii) the level of ‘actions’ (the sense this word carries in Greimas when he talks of characters as actants) and
iii) the level of ‘narration’ (which is roughly the level of ‘discourse’ in Todorov). Barthes further divides ‘functions’ into two categories - a) functions proper and b) indices. The earlier are to be understood in the sense Propp’s functions are “but treated here in a much more detailed way than is the case in their work” (Barthes 92). Functions are those units of narrative analysis which have immediate correlating unit.

There are indices which only give some psychological information about the character or about the environment. Barthes here makes a point that there are some narratives, like folk-tales, which are largely dominated by functions and some narratives, such as psychological novels, are largely indices dominated. He further divides functions proper into two sub-categories i) cardinal functions or nuclei and ii) catalysers. To Barthes cardinal functions refer to that action which opens an alternative that is of direct consequence for the subsequent development of the story, in short it inaugurates or concludes an uncertainty. If, in a fragment of narrative, the telephone rings, it is...
equally possible to answer or not answer, two acts which will unfailingly carry the narrative along different paths (Barthes 94).

Between two cardinals can be found a cluster of "subsidiary notations" which may or may not modify the cardinals. Barthes calls such trivial incidents or descriptions 'catalysers.' "These catalysers are sill functional, insofar as they enter into correlation with a nucleus, ... Catalysers are only consecutive units, cardinal functions are both consecutive and consequential" (Barthes 94). But Barthes doesn’t mean to say that catalysers are not important. He believes if cardinals cannot be deleted without altering the story, catalysers are vital for the discourse of the narrative. Similarly he classifies indices into two categories- indices proper and informants. Indices proper refer to the character of a narrative agent, a feeling, an atmosphere (for example suspicion) or a philosophy, and informants, serving to identify, to locate in time and space.

One of the most prominent theorists since Roland Barthes has been Gerard Genette, whose work focuses not only on the story itself but also on ‘how it is told.’ There are other theorists who also study narrative as an interplay between ‘what’ is told and ‘how’ the story is told. A naive reader, who is uninitiated into the subtleties of literature and theory of narrative would, perhaps, content himself with the comprehension of the plot; but the concerns of a trained narratologist would be to understand ‘how’ the story has been told. Though the modern narratology is based on the distinction between ‘what’ is told (story) and ‘how’ it is told (discourse), its ancestry is traced as back as far Aristotle when he gave the terms of ‘logos’ and ‘mythos’ for story and plot or arrangement or discourse respectively. Among the modern theorists, Seymour Chatman has used two-level model to study the relation between 'what is told' and 'how it is told'. He calls them Story and Discourse respectively. He opines that Story and Discourse constitute the ingredients of narrative. Story elements constitute ‘what’ is told and Discourse constitutes ‘how’ the story is told. Narrative is all but a matter of ‘what’ (content) and ‘how’ (expression). “This two-level model of story and discourse draws its more immediate authority from the usage of such Russian Formalists of the 1920s as Victor Shklovsky and Boris Eichenbaum (O’Neil 20). Victor Shklovsky, in his model, has given the terms of ‘fabula’ and ‘sjuzhet’. Gerald Prince also sits in the
company of those who believe in two-level model. What ‘story’ is to Chatman is ‘narrated’ to Prince and Chatman’s ‘discourse’ is ‘narrating’ to Prince.

But there are other theorists as well who disagree with this two-level model of story and discourse and have given a three-level model. Gerard Genette, Mieke Bal, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan and Michel J. Toolan, to name a few. Genette has given a model of ‘story’, ‘narrative’ and ‘narrating’. To quote Genette, “analysis of narrative discourse will thus be for me, essentially, a study of relationship between narrative and story, between narrative and narrating, and (to the extent that they are inscribed in the narrative discourse) between story and narrating” (Genette 29).

His understanding of the narrative includes events that are told (narrative) or narrated and the activity (narrating) that “gives birth” (Genette 29) to it. “Story and narrating thus exist for me only by means of the intermediary of the narrative” (Genette 29). Mieke Bal uses the term ‘story’ in a different way. It corresponds to Genette’s ‘narrative’ and Bal’s ‘fabula’ and ‘text’ correspond to Genette’s ‘story’ and ‘narrating’ respectively, whereas Toolan’s and Rimmon-Kenan’s ‘story’, ‘text’ and ‘narration’ correspond to Genette’s ‘story’, ‘narrative’ and ‘narrating’ and Bal’s ‘fabula’, ‘story’ and ‘text’. Here is given a comparative and comprehensive chart of different theorists and their respective terms and terminology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>logos, mythos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shklovsky (1921/1965)</td>
<td>fabula, sjuzhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todorov (1966)</td>
<td>histoire, discours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genette (1972)</td>
<td>histoire, recit, narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal (1977)</td>
<td>histoire, recit, texte narratif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatman (1978)</td>
<td>story, discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genette (1980)</td>
<td>story, narrative, narrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince (1982)</td>
<td>narrated, narrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimmon-Kenan (1983)</td>
<td>story, text, narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal (1985)</td>
<td>fabula, story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohan/Shires (1988)</td>
<td>story, narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolan (1988)</td>
<td>story, text, narration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 SOURCE: O'Neil, Patrick. *Fictions of Discourse: reading Narrative Theory* (21).
The use of different terms for almost similar concepts seems to be quite intricate and confusing. For example, to Mieke Bal Story includes topics like ‘sequential arrangement’, ‘frequency’, ‘rhythm’, ‘focalisation’; and Text includes issues like ‘narration’ and ‘levels of narrations’ and other issues pertaining to narration. Though Genette also proposes three level model, he places all of these concepts under the titles of ‘order’, ‘duration’, ‘frequency’, ‘mood’ and ‘voice’- each studying one or the other aspect of the narrative.

In this scheme of things Story corresponds to the actual or real story that is supposed to have happened and is told in the narrative in a certain way. Presenting the story in a certain way is called Text and the act of narrating the story is called Narration. Mieke Bal uses the term Fabula for Rimmon Kenan’s and Michael J. Toolan’s Story; Story for Text and Text for Narration. It is important to mention here that when Bal uses the term Text for the narration part, she is talking about narrative texts only “in which an agent relates (tells) a story in a particular medium such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof” (Bal 5).

In the present treatise, I shall be using these terms little differently. What a reader encounters is a Text, which is a construct of signs- the signs can be verbal (language), pictorial, visual, auditory, physical movements and bodily gestures or any other that communicate something. I would like to make it clear here that when I use physical movements and gestures as signs, I am thinking of drama and dance especially Indian classical dances that, like ballet, also tell a story and drama is, indisputably, a form that tells a story. Text can be found in a novel, short story, poetry, drama, dance, movie, painting. Thanks to Semiotics, now fashion, advertisements, dresses can also be studied as different forms of texts. Thus, any thing that is composed of signs and can be studied is a Text. But every text is not a narrative text since every text doesn't tell us a story. In the present work, I shall be studying how narrative texts in a novel and in a movie are constructed and what tools can be applied to study them. Though there are so many tools that can be used to study both a novel and a film, yet film being a different and independent form of expression has its own conventions of communication. I shall talk about this aspect of my work in the next chapter. In the present chapter, I shall be concentrating on
the study of narrative in a novel. But the tools of analysis can be applied to other forms of narrative as well.

In a narrative text, events are arranged in a certain way which is different from the way in which events happen in our real life. I would call this particular and certain way of arrangement of events as Story and the manner of narrating them Narration which also includes different levels of narration, points of view from which they are narrated and other issues pertaining to the narration. It is only after having understood the narrative that a reader ciphers or makes out the real story for himself or herself. I would call this 'real story' Fabula. Fabula, the real story, in most of the cases, is supposed to have happened before the act of narration, but meets the reader at the end (Yet there are some narratives which are narrated in present that give the illusion that 'real story' is happening as the narrative progresses; but there is also a gap of time in conceiving the story and its narration). No doubt in a classical linear narrative, the chronological arrangement of story generally corresponds with the fabula but not in every kind of narrative. The whole relation between different levels of narrative analysis can be shown diagramatically like this-

```
TEXT ------- NARRATIVE TEXT
   |         |
   | STORY   |
   |         |
   | NARRATION    FABULA |
   |         |
   | DISCOURSE |
```

*Figure 1.2 SOURCE: self*

During the process of cognition a reader not only understands the Fabula but also understands different characters, their problems, their psychological conflicts, their attempts to come out of it. Besides a reader may also find some narratorial comments which may not have any thing to do with the story being narrated but play a very important role in constructing the 'discourse'. Since characters, manner of their characterisation, their place in the society, their relation with one another along with other signs are important part to understand the ‘discourse’ of the text, I would study them, along with Narration, under the title of Fabula. Thus, in this scheme, Discourse consists of Narration and Fabula.
In the present treatise, I shall also study narrative (fiction and film) at the levels of Story and Discourse and in the same order. The study of Discourse includes the study of Narration and Fabula, the same model can be spread into three-level model of Story, Narration and Fabula.

**STORY**

This aspect of the narrative analysis deals with spatial and temporal arrangement of events in a narrative. It is implied that events in a narrative are not arranged the way they are supposed to have happened in the fabula. Events in a narrative are packed, arranged and presented in a particular way. This is one of the different ways of constructing different narratives from the same fabula. Gerard Genette, while studying the arrangement of the events, studies the sequential order, duration and frequency. Whereas, Mieke Bal, while studying Story, besides looking at sequential ordering and frequency, also looks at rhythm, relation between Place and Space and Focalization. I would study Focalization as part of Narration.

“To study the temporal order of a narrative is to compare the order in which events or temporal sections are arranged in the narrative discourse with the order of succession these same events or temporal segment have in the story” (Genette 35). As stated earlier Story aspect of the narrative analysis deals with the temporal and spatial arrangement of events in a narrative. Since narrative is a construct, its construction makes it different from reality which ultimately justifies the study of narrative. Spatial and temporal arrangement of events is so closely related to each other that one cannot be studied in isolation from the other.

Time is a very important factor in human experience because everything that happens takes some time to happen and we also arrange our personal experiences in some temporal relation with each other. Whether it is happening of an event or events or recounting of events or their cognition, time is a very crucial factor in all the activities. Sometimes, the way different events are placed in temporal relation to each other is different from the way events are linked in Fabula. Thus, Fabula-time and Story-time become two different entities. Saying “time in a narrative fiction can be defined as the relations of chronology” (Rimmon 44) between Fabula and Story implies certain complexities. In real life, we all “tend to think of time” as a unidirectional and irreversible flow. Such a conception was given metaphoric shape by
Heraclitus early in Western history: “you cannot step twice into the same river, for other waters and yet other waters go ever flowing on” (Rimmon 44). Such a linear chronological arrangement of sequences is no more than a literary convention. But “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 beside” (Bal 82). Such differences between the arrangement in the Story and the chronology of Fabula are called chronological deviations or “anachronies.”

Pinpointing and measuring these narrative anachronies (as I will call the various types of discourse between the two orderings of story and narrative) implicitly assume the existence of a kind of zero degree that would be a condition of perfect temporal correspondence between narrative and story. This point of reference is more hypothetical than real. Folklore narrative habitually conforms, at least in its major articulations, to chronological order, but our (western) literary tradition, in contrast, was inaugurated by a characteristic effect of anachrony (Genette 36).

Two basic types of anachronies are ‘flash-back’ or ‘retroversion’ and ‘flash-forward’ or ‘anticipation’ as Mieke Bal calls them. Gerard Genette uses the terms ‘Analepsis’ and ‘Prolepsis’ for them respectively. Mieke Bal, who studies sequential ordering of narrative texts at three levels- i) Directions; ii) Distance and iii) Range, places anachronies under the sub-category of ‘direction.’ Her use of the word ‘direction’ overtly states her perception about two anachronies vis-à-vis story “seen from the moment in the fabula which is being presented in the anachronies either in the past or in the future. For the first category the term retroversion can be used; for the second, anticipation is a suitable term. Michael J. Toolan puts the whole argument in a very simple way. To quote:

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

Every anachrony, as it disrupts the linearity of a narrative, occupies a special position in relation to the narrative in which it occurs. “Every anachrony constitutes, with respect to the narrative into which it is grafted, a narrative that is temporally second” (Genette 48). Genette calls this grafted or embedded narratives as second narrative and the narrative into which it is embedded is called as the first narrative. If there is a narrative which is embedded in the second narrative, it is called as the third narrative. In a hypothetical situation, if this process goes on, we can have unlimited number of narratives. Similarly, there can be more than one second narrative as any narrative embedded in the first narrative would be called the second narrative. The relation between different narratives can be shown diagrammatically as under:

![Diagram](image.png)

*Figure 1.3 SOURCE: self*

In the above figure N1 indicates first narrative into which various narratives are embedded. N2 A and N2 B indicate two narratives embedded in the first narratives. Hence, they are two second narratives and a box N3 within N2 A indicates another narrative embedded in the second narrative which is a diagrammatic presentation of third narrative.

Genette divides analepsis and prolepsis into various kinds. First of all he divides analepsis into three categories external, internal and mixed on the basis of story told in the analepsis in relation to story-line of the first narrative. As their names indicate external analepsis is an anachrony that tells us about that part of Fabula which remains external to the first narrative. External analepsis gives us information about an event or events that have happened before the beginning of the
first narrative. “This means the narration jumps back to a point in the story before the main narrative starts” (Lothe 54). Internal analepsis gives us information about an event that happened after the starting point of first narrative but was not narrated where they should have been narrated. Internal analepsis compensate the delay in narration of an event or events that has occurred because of an ellipsis. Mixed analepsis is a bit confusing. It is called mixed because it carries the elements of both external and internal analepsis. Mixed analepsis begins from a point that is external to first narrative but ends later than beginning of first narrative. Jakob Lothe shows external, internal and mixed analepsis diagrammatically like this:

![Diagram of analepsis](image)

**Figure 1.4** SOURCE: Lothe, Jakob. *Narrative in Fiction and Film: an introduction* (55).

Genette vindicates these anachronies by saying that they 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) function for purposes of narrative analysis in totally different ways, at least on one point that seems to me 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’ (Genette, 49-50).

He further makes two distinctions namely homodiegetic and heterodiegetic analepsis. He defines heterodiegetic analepsis as an “analepsis dealing with a story line (and thus with a diegetic content) different from the content (or contents) of the first narrative” (Genette 50). Speaking on the function of the heterodiegetic
analepsis Genette says “such analepsis deal, 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” (Genette 50).

The second type of anachrony is ‘prolepsis’ or flash-forward which Mieke Bal calls “anticipation.” Prolepsis is an intervention of anachrony which tells about an event or events that will happen in future of time of fabula from the point of intervention.

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” ² (Genette 67).

It is an “evocation of story-event at a point before earlier events have been narrated. This form of narrative information can be extremely compressed; it may be so dense that we can hardly say that it is ‘narrated’ (Lothe 56). Likewise analepsis, prolepsis can also 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 chronological relation to the endpoint of the basic narrative” (Toolan 54). Leaving homodiegetic prolepsis, as the ensuing principle doesn’t apply on them, Genette further divides heterodiegetic prolepsis into two categories- completing prolepsis and repeating prolepsis. The former “fill 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). Like analepsis, prolepsis also have ‘extent’ and ‘reach.’ Repeating prolepsis occur quite less frequently in literature. They “refer in advance to an event that will be told in full in its place” (Genette 73). Proleptic statements are generally made by an omniscient narrator who, in a small phrase, tells us about an event that will happen later in the narrative. Such statements play a major role in what Barthes calls “weaving” of a

narrative. Through such canonical formulae like “one will see later” or “we shall find” an expectation in the mind of the reader is created. The expectation created thus may be fulfilled soon or later. Genette here makes an appeal not to confuse them with “advance mentions” which are simple markers like advance notices but without any anticipation. Genette also talks about another gap called paralipsis which is not created by bringing a temporal gap in a narrative; rather by concealing some information or “by omission of one of the constituent elements of narrative” (Genette 52).

In relation to anachronies, Genette has given two concepts of ‘Reach’ and ‘Extent’ which Mieke Bal calls ‘Distance’ and ‘Span’ respectively. These two concepts pertain to the temporal distance that is covered whenever an anachrony occurs in a narrative. Genette explains these concepts as, “an anachrony can reach into the past or the future, either more or less far from the “present” moment (that is, from the moment in the story when the narrative was interrupted to make room for the anachrony): this temporal distance we will name the anachrony’s reach” (Genette 48). Taking from Genette’s phrase “the temporal distance,” Mieke Bal uses the term Distance for Genette’s ‘Reach’ by which she means “an event presented in anachrony is separated by an interval, large or small, from the ‘present’; that is, from the moment in the development of the fabula with which the narrative is concerned at the time the anachrony interrupts it” (Bal 89). The anachrony itself covers a duration which Genette calls ‘Extent’ and Bal calls it ‘Span’. Hypothetically, in a narrative, an analepsis tells an event of six months that occurred ten years ago; we can say that the ‘reach’ of this analepsis is ten years and ‘extent’ is six months.

Since events are temporally arranged in a narrative, first thing that strikes a mind in relation to time is rhythm. Rhythm either in music, dance or any other performance is associated with sense of time. Any performance that happens quickly in time is said to have fast rhythm and so is also understood the slow rhythm. Rhythm of any narrative text is determined by duration of time granted to different events. If in a narrative all the events are given equal time duration, it will be called a narrative with constant rhythm or “steadiness in pace” (Genette 87). If different events are given different time duration, it will either slowdown the narrative or accelerate it. Thus, the rhythm of a narrative is defined as a relation between
duration of the fabula or story-time and discourse-time of the text. This is what makes this topic a bit tricky as it is very difficult to have any scientific yardstick or scale to measure discourse-time. Contemplating on the problem of discourse-time Mieke Bal states:

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).

Two different persons will take different time to read the same novel. If the readers happen to be linguistically and culturally different also, the difference of time taken in reading the novel is going to be alarmingly different. A film or a dramatic performance may have a concept of discourse-time, but it is near to impossible to have such a concept like discourse-time for reading a novel. It is possible to find the speed at which events are presented in a narrative. Speed can be measured in terms of number of sentences, paragraphs or passages given to an event in a novel. “This is the solution Muller and his followers have chosen” (Bal 100). This is where Genette’s “steadiness in speed” becomes important. To quote Genette:

as by speed we mean the spatial relationship between a temporal and a 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 slowdowns, where the relationship duration-of-story/length-of-time would always remain steady (Genette 87-88).

As Genette himself has said the isochronous narrative is just a hypothetical situation. Such narratives cannot be found in reality or “cannot exist except as a laboratory experiment” (Genette 88), what becomes important to us, in determining
its rhythm, is the relation between the temporal length of an event and the temporal/spatial length given to it in a narrative. It is nearly impossible to have a narrative with unvarying speed or constant speed.

'Constant speed' means that the ratio between how long the story lasts and how long the text is 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 (Loathe 57).

Micheal J. Toolan believes that Genette's definition is too theoretical or mechanical to be applied to any narrative text. To quote-

Genette's ratio is very often far more mechanical than actual texts are. For example, suppose there were a chapter for every year of character's life, but those chapters were of rather different lengths: is this constancy of pace or variation of pace? and how should we reformulate this ratio to oral narratives? ... for example, just how long, in story time, is Eveline's reverie? It could be anything from a few minutes to several hours: it takes place between early and late evening (when the mail-boat goes). Since we can't be sure about the pace of reverie presentation, neither can we be sure as to whether the later scene at the quayside is a presentational acceleration or deceleration (Toolan 56).

This criticism by Toolan makes the subject of time and rhythm in a narrative further debatable and worthy of discussion and exploration. In a classical linear narrative or Victorian novel, narrative covers years of a character's life, but in the novels like *Ulysses* which is about one day sojourn of a character in the city, the duration of one day has been extended into a full narrative, the concept of rhythm becomes very important factor for analysis. On analysing any Victorian or classical linear narrative, which are said to be written in the mode of realism, we may find the time is never treated in the manner that can be called idealist or perfect realism. In every classical linear realist narrative certain anomalies with time can be found which determine its speed and rhythm, which may decrease or increase. On the basis of various possibilities, Genette has given a model of four types of speeds namely
summary, descriptive pause, ellipsis, and scene. Jakob Loathe and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan also agree with the model in which the relation between story-time (fabula-time) and narrative-time (story-time) is studied at four levels. Jakob Lothe shows the relation between two planes of story-time and narrative-time as-

![Diagram showing the relation between story-time and narrative-time.](source)

Figure 1.5 SOURCE: Lothe, Jakob. Narrative in Fiction and Film: an introduction (60).

Mieke Bal, on the contrary, finds the relation between two planes at five different levels and like Genette also proposes a mathematical formulae between them. She uses the terms fabula-time and story-time for story-time and narrative-time used by Lothe.

- **ellipsis**: $TF = n$, $TS = 0$  
  thus $TF > \infty TS$
- **summary**: $TF > TS$
- **scene**: $TF < \approx TS$
- **slow-down**: $TF < TS$
- **pause**: $TF = 0$, $TS = n$  
  thus $TF < \infty TS$

Here $>$ means longer than  
$<$ means shorter than  
$\infty$ means infinite  
$\approx$ means is $\pm$ equal


In the relation between fabula-time and story-time, ellipsis is the case of maximum speed and descriptive pause is the case of minimum speed; “theoretically, between these two poles there is an infinity of possible paces, but in practice these are conventionally reduced to summary and scene” (Rimmon-Kenan 53). To determine the order in which these different aspects can be studied, I shall begin with the maximum speed, ellipsis and gradually come down to slowest pace, descriptive pause.
1. Ellipsis: Ellipsis means when certain fabula-time is given no story-time. In such a case, narrative jumps over to another time sequence without narrating events that might have happened in the intermediary time duration. That particular fabula-time is not given any space in the narrative. Thus, ellipsis is when TF (fabula-time) is n (any number) and TS (story-time) is 0. Mieke Bal speaking on the need of an ellipsis in a narrative says,

That which has been omitted- the contents of the ellipsis- need not be unimportant; on the contrary, the event about which nothing is said may have been so painful that it is being elided for precisely the reason. Or the event is so difficult to put into words that it is preferable to maintain complete silence about it. Another possibility, which I have already mentioned, is the situation in which, though the event has taken place, the actor wants to deny that fact. By keeping silent about it, he attempts to undo it. Thus the ellipsis is used for magical purposes, as an exorcism. This is one reading of the ellipsis central in Robbe-Grillet's *Le voyeur* (Bal 103).

Another reason for observing ellipsis in a narrative may be that the narrator wants to give only limited information to its audience or some part of the information, which has been denied to the audience or readers now, would be revealed later. There can be any compulsions, like artistic, thematic, political and cultural, for concealing some information or delaying their narration. Bal opines 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 deduced on the basis of certain information that something has been omitted” (Bal 103).

Genette has classified ellipsis into three categories:

a) **Explicit ellipsis**- is that in which text itself tells how much fabula-time it jumps over.

They arise either from an indication (definite or not) of the lapse of time they elide, which assimilates them to very quick summaries of the “some years passed” type (in this case indication constitutes the
ellipsis as textual section, which is then not totally equal to zero): or else from elision pure and simple (zero degree of the elliptical text) plus, when the narrative starts up again, an indication of the time elapsed, like the “two years later” quoted just above (Genette 106).

b) **Implicit ellipsis**—as the name indicates no explicit indication of the jump in fabula-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 mostly a product of reader's inference. The reader finds for himself how much temporal period has been jumped over in the ellipsis; but they do constitute an integral part of any kind of narrative whether classical linear or modern where inner time is given precedence over clock time. Even a classical linear realistic narrative cannot correspond to each moment spent by its characters. It always makes a choice which information is to be delivered and which is not. Sometimes, observing implicit ellipsis can be thematically important. At the same time, we cannot generalise that every implicit ellipsis has an important role to play in the interpretation of the text. This can be judged in the proper context of the narrative only;

c) **hypothetical ellipsis**, is the “most implicit form of ellipsis” which is also very difficult to localise, “even some times to impossible to place in any spot at all, and revealed after the event by an analepsis” (Genette 109).

2. **Summary**: In summary, various events of fabula are narrated but in shorter duration of story-time. Thus, TF > TS. Genette defines summary in a very simple way 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” (Genette 95-96). In summary, narrative pace is accelerated through “a textual ‘condensation’ or ‘compression’ of a given story-period into a relatively short statement of its main features” (Rimmon-Kenan 53).

3. **Scene**: To define in mathematical terms, a scene would be TF = TS i.e. fabula-time is or nearly equal to story-time. The purest form of scene is said to be dialogue form as its duration is supposed to be maximum corresponding with

---

3 See Jakob Loathe p 59.
duration of the real discourse or discourse in the fabula. “Consisting exclusively of
dialogue and a few ‘stage directions,’ the passage looks more like a scene from a
play than like a segment of a narrative” (Rimmon-Kenan 54). Some theorists have
opined that scene is not constituted by dialogue form only but “a detailed description
of an event should also be considered scenic” (Rimmon-Kenan 54).

Keeping this view in mind, what characterizes a scene is not only the
presence of dialogues in the narrative discourse, as we find in the case of
Hemingway’s stories, but also a temporal relationship between the information of
fabula and time devoted to that event in story. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan puts it like
a relation between “quantity of narrative information and the relative effacement of
the narrator” (Rimmon-Kenan 54). Scenic description implies varied narrative pace
which invites further investigation 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 detail, less important or background ones in summary précis”
(Toolan 58). Mieke Bal4 cites an example from Madame Bovary to demonstrate how
the portrayal of similar scene is used to indicate “the daily routine that has once
again re-established in Emma’s life” (Bal 105). But such a use of narrative pace
cannot be generalised as, in some cases, it can be used to attain the effect of shock or
irony as in some cases a reader may be expecting an event to be described in detail
where as the narrative doesn’t give any such description. The intent behind this
digression can be justified in the given context only.

4 Slow down: It is a tempo which stands close to descriptive pause. In
scene, we find one to one correspondence between fabula-time and story-time and in
summary, we find larger fabula-time is given a very small story-time; slow-down is
a pace in which story-time is lengthened so as to give details of an event which in
itself may not take much time to happen. The purpose of slow down is to make
reader aware of the importance of the happening event. Since this pace is
successfully adopted and frequently used in cinema, it shall be discussed in the next
chapter.

4 See Mieke Bal p104
5. **Pause:** Descriptive pause is the minimum pace that a narrative can acquire. It happens when story-time is n and fabula-time is 0, thus $TF = 0$ and $TS = n$. It is also defined as “some segment of the text corresponds to zero story duration” (Rimmon-Kenan 53). Descriptive pauses are often found in a novel where text gives detailed description about setting, surrounding of character’s appearance which often brings suspension in 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. When it is again continued later on, no time has passed” (Bal 108). The length of a descriptive pause may vary from a paragraph to a page; from a page to entire chapter. Descriptive pauses are introduced not only to bring digression in the narrative, they also serve a very important role in constructing discourse; they reveal author’s attitude towards the surroundings in which his characters are moving.

The two aspects of time treated above, order and rhythm, are often distorted by a third aspect, which has, in the development of literary theory, as yet received little attention. Genette labels this aspect *frequency*. By this he means the numerical relationship between the events in the fabula and those in the story (Bal 111).

Frequency is an essential part of narrative analysis though it has been much ignored by theoreticians. Genette defines it as “the relation of frequency (or, more simple, of repetition) between the narrative and the diegesis” (Genette 113). In a narrative (story), sometimes an event may be told more than once or sometimes more than one events (fabula) can be told in one utterance. Under the category of frequency, one studies such a relation of events between fabula and story.

A system of relationships is established between these capacities for ‘repetition’ on the part of both the narrated events (of the story) and the narrative statements (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, once what happened n times (Genette 114).

Gerard Genette describes them one by one. Though different theoreticians and thinkers have given different models to study frequency in a narrative, their perspectives would be shared and shown how they differ from Genette’s later.

Narrating once what happened once: This is the most common situation found in most of the narratives in which an event that happened once is told once only. This is the form in which “singularity of narrative statement corresponds with singularity of the narrated event” (Genette 114). Genette calls it “singulative narrative”- a neologism derived from the adjective singular. He gives a mathematical formula of 1N/1S.

Narrating n times what happened n times: This can be shown as nN/nS, which means in a narrative, at the story level, we find an event is reported n times which has happened n times there in the fabula. “From the point of view we are interested in here, that is, relation of frequency between narrative and story, this anaphoric type is still in fact singulative and thus reduces to the previous type” (Genette 115). Theorists like Jakob Lothe, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan study this aspect under the category of singulative only.

Narrating n times what happened once: The mathematical representation for this category is nN/1S. An event which happened once in the fabula is told many times in the narrative. Since in such narratives single event is repeated many times, Genette calls it repeating narratives. Other theorists call it repetitive narration.

Narrating once time what happened n times: Its mathematical representation would be 1N/nS. Thus, an event that happened once in fabula is reported many times in the narrative. Genette calls this narrative, in which “single narrative utterance takes upon itself several occurrences together,” iterative narrative. By doing so the author saves himself and his narrative from being condemned as a narrative with redundancy. Genette further classifies iterations into two categories- 1) external or generalizing iteration: presences of an iterative passage in an otherwise “singulative scenes” which gives us some information that “extends well beyond the temporal field of scene it is inserted into” (Genette 118) and thus “opens a window onto external period” (Genette 118); 2) Internal or synthesizing iteration: gives us
information about the event that doesn’t go beyond the temporal scene into which it is inserted. “The iterative syllepsis extends not over a wider period of time but over the period of time of the scene itself” (Genette 119). An iterative narrative can have determination, specification and extension. Determination is the “span of time in which an event or set of events is said to recur; specification is the rhythm of recurrence of events and Extension is the duration of the recurring of event or set of events. Gerald Prince in Dictionary of Narratology gives an example to elucidate the concept. To quote- “During a period of eight weeks, I ran once a week for an hour” (Prince 47). In the above example, the period of eight weeks is its ‘determination’; ran once a week is its ‘specification’ and ‘an hour’ is its extension. Genette by giving tools for such a detailed analysis makes the analysis of rhythm easier and more sophisticated and scientific. In classical narrative, rhythm is generally set by summaries and scene, but he quotes certain works, not English, wherein the rhythm is set not by scenes and summaries but another synthetic form of iteration. In some cases, iterations can be subordinated to the singulative scene they are inserted into and sometimes, singulative scenes can be subordinated to the iterations. All these hypothetical positions, when applied, determine the rhythm of a narrative.

As stated earlier, different theoreticians adopt different models to study frequency in a narrative. Theoreticians like Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Michel J. Toolan and Jakob Lothe study frequency at three levels namely singulative, iterative and repetitive. Lakob Lothe has also suggested one graphical illustration for the same.

![Figure 1.6](source: Lothe, Jakob. Narrative in Fiction and Film. (61)).

Mieke Bal studies this relationship at five levels namely singular, plurisingular, varisingular, repetitive and iterative. A mathematical formula for them can be shown like this-

1F / 1S: singular: one event, one presentation
nF / nS: plurisingular: various events, various presentations
nF / mS: varisingular: various events, various presentations, unequal in number

IF / nS: repetitive: one event, various presentations

nF / 1S: iterative: various events, one presentation.

**DISCOURSE:**

The second part of the narrative analysis deals with what Chatman calls “expression plane or discourse” i.e. how stories are told, who tells them and to whom they are told. The word narration implies not only the act of narrating, but also the presence of one or more narrator(s) and one or more narratee(s). In every narrative we find one or more than one narrators who tell the story; though the degree of narrator's presence may vary from narrative to narrative. If narrator tells us the story, the second obvious question that comes to our mind is from whose point of view the story is being told. Is it from narrator's own point of view or narrator is merely acting as a mouth piece to somebody else's point of view? All such issues are being taken up in this part of narrative analysis.

Genette believes most of the theoretical works on the issue of point of view in fiction “suffer from a regrettable confusion” between what he calls *mood* and *voice*, “a confusion between the question *who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective?* And the very different question *who is the narrator?* — Or, more simply, the question *who sees?* And the question *who speaks*”? (Genette 186). Genette shows how the study done in the field by different theorists such as Brooks and Warren; Stanzel; Friedman; Booth treat “two but different questions as if they were interchangeable” (Rimmon-Kenan 72). By making a distinction between who sees and who speaks Genette opens the debate of focalization in the narrative.

Genette believes, “It is certainly legitimate to envisage a typology of ‘narrative situations’ that would take into account the data of both mood and voice; what is not legitimate is to present such a classification under the single category of ‘point of view’” (Genette 183). Genette decides to use a more abstract term *focalization* “which corresponds, to Brooks and Warren’s expression, “focus of narration” (Genette 189). Prince defines focalization as “the perspective in terms of which the narrated situations and events are presented” (Prince 31). Mieke Bal
believes whenever events are presented, they are presented from a certain perception which itself depends upon so many factors. Even while striving for objectivity during the presentation of the events, events are perceived from a certain position; thus objectivity becomes “pointless”.

In a story, elements of the fabula are presented in a certain way. We are confronted with a vision of the fabula. What is this vision like and where does it come from? These are the questions that will be discussed in what follows. I shall refer to the relations between the elements presented and the vision through which they are presented with the term focalization (Bal 142).

Before I take up the topic of focalization, it is necessary to make an observation here. It is understandable that it is not necessary that the person who is ‘seeing’ in the narrative must also ‘speak’; though the same person may do both the functions yet they can be performed by two or more than two different persons. “Thus, speaking and seeing, narration and focalization, may, but need not, be attributed to the same agent” (Bal 143).

Depending upon the position of the focalizer and its relation with the focalized objects, broadly three types of focalizations has been classified — Zero Focalization; External Focalization and Internal Focalization. Narratives with zero focalization are also called “nonfocalized” (Genette 189). Gerald Prince describes Zero Focalization as a type of focalization whereby “the narrated is presented in terms of a non-locatable, indeterminate perceptual or conceptual position” (Prince 103). It is associated with omniscient narrators.

External focalization is when focalizing position is outside fabula and cannot be associated with any character. Mieke Bal uses abbreviation of EF for “external and non-characterbound focalization” (Bal 148). “External focalization is felt to be close to the narrating agent” (Rimmon-Kenan 74) and the agent is also called narrator-focalizer. In such cases, the distinction between narrator and focalizer tend to dissolve. In external focalization only “visible phenomena” (Toolan 71), what characters do and say are narrated. External focalization can be found in first person narration, “either when the temporal and psychological distance between narrator
and character is minimal (as in Camus's *L' Etranger*, 1957) or when the perception through which the story is rendered is that of the narrating self rather than that of experiencing self” (Rimmon-Kenan 74).

As the name indicates, the locus of internal focalization is inside the narrated events or, in better terms, “inside the setting of the events” (Toolan 69). As it is always associated with one or more than one characters, Mieke Bal represents it as CF standing for character-focalization. Genette divides internal focalization into three sub-categories, a) *fixed*: in which there is only one focalizer in the narrative;

b) *variable*: in this kind of internal focalization we find agency of focalization changes from one character to another. The locus of focalization may come back to the first focalizer, it may pass on to the other character;

c) *multiple*: a narrative is said to have multiple internal focalization when the same event is focalized and narrated by various characters.

After Genette, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Toolan, Mieke Bal and Stanzel have used the terms external focalization and internal focalization in more comprehensive and simple ways. Genette’s understanding of zero focalization and internal focalization refers to the position of the focalizer and his distinction between external focalization and internal focalization refers to the position of focalized in the narrative. Later theorists use external focalization for the situation in which the focalizing agency cannot be found in the fabula or cannot be associated with any character; and internal focalization is used if the focalizing agency can be associated with any character in the narrative or narrated events. In this scheme of ideas, external focalization implies stands outside the fabula but can have various degrees of perception of the focalized objects.

In the present thesis, the terms will be used as understood by Rimmon-Kenan and Mieke Bal i.e. External Focalization and Internal Focalization shall refer to the position of focalizer in relation to the narrative.

If focalization deals with the first part, the second part is about who speaks which also implies to whom it is spoken. This part of narrative analysis deals with the issues like who is the narrator and who is the narratee. It is a very crucial and much debated question who is the teller of the story- whether it is the real writer or
there is someone else in the story whose presence can or cannot be felt. Seymour Chatman has suggested one model of narrative communication:

As clear from the above diagram, Chatman places real author and his counterpart real reader outside the box which is indicative of the activity of narrative communication. Real author or historical author is the “man or woman who writes a narrative text” (Lothe 17). The word historical author or real author does not refer to a specific historical person but to the writer of the text. The distinction between author and narrator is primary to narrative analysis. Narrator is the agent who narrates the story in a narrative text. Though it is a different affair that his presence may or may not be felt or seen in the text; but the author is one who has created a story, its narrator and hence, a text through language. “The author stands in principle outside the literary universe he or she creates by means of language” (Lothe 18).

After real author the concept of implied author becomes very important because implied author, unlike the real author, does not exist in flesh and bone and cannot be confused with the narrator of the work. Implied author is, 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, with all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn (Chatman 148).

Though the implied author is silent and “voice less,” yet it has capabilities to “instruct us” which makes its position, in relation to the real author, very important in the narrative analysis as it plays a very important role in constructing the discourse of the text. “Its relation to the real author is admitted to be of great
psychological complexity, and has barely analysed, 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” (Rimmon-Kenan 87). He further adds that it is not necessary that both, the real author and the implied author, should be identical.

Like implied author, implied reader is also a construct. Just as the real author differs from the narrator, the implied reader differs from the narratee. A work may or may not have an overt narrator or narratee but certainly has an implied author and implied reader. The concept of implied reader takes us into the “broader areas between narrative theory and theories of aesthetic response … For Iser the literary work arises through the interplay, the interaction, between text and reader” (Lothe 19). Unlike implied author, the implied reader cannot be called passive as it plays a role in the construction of meaning as Maclean thinks that the implied reader, entering interaction, is like a standpoint that provides the real reader with his meaning of the text. Since implied author plays an active role in narrative communication, in a narrative text, which is created by a writer, “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).

But the study of narrative is such a complex phenomena that it cannot be simplified in one or two diagrams. Genette studies narration part (voice in his own terms) at three levels—time of the narrating; narrative levels and person. Time of the narrating looks into temporal relation between narration and fabula. No doubt Space is as important as Time is but in verbal fiction a story can be told without mentioning the space where it is taking place. This aspect of the narrative analysis will be discussed in the next chapter. Space becomes very important in films and cannot be ignored as in a movie characters are shown moving in a particular space. In verbal fiction “stories are generally told in a present, past or future tense” (Genette 215). Most of the time events are told after “they happen (‘ulterior narration’) to mention a few texts where this most frequent form of narration is used” (Rimmon-Kenan 89). Genette calls this “subsequent narrating” in which “the use of past tense is enough to make a narrative subsequent, although without
indicating the temporal interval which separates the moment of the narrating from the moment of the story” (Genette 220).

The second type which Genette calls “prior narrating” has been least used is ‘anterior narration’ in which “narration precedes events” (Rimmon-Kenan 90). Such narratives are generally written in future tense and are prophetic in nature. They are “predictive in relation to the immediate narrating instance” (Genette 220). “Instead, this type of narration tends to appear in narratives within narratives in the form of prophecies, curses or dreams of fictional characters” (Rimmon-Kenan 90).

The third type of narration is simultaneous narration which 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 tandem, it becomes fourth type, namely “intercalated” (Rimmon-Kenan 90) what Genette defines as “interpolated.” It has a very complex structure as events are “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). In such cases narrative grows along with the growth of fabula and one is entangled into the other. We pull one element out, the other gets affected. But in the case of simultaneous narration, events are reported when they are happening where narration and fabula does not mix up. Narration, though simultaneous, implies that events are being focalized and narrated by an agency. In the case of simultaneous narration, the temporal distance between fabula and narration is as less as zero. The following quote from Genette’s Narrative Discourse would make the distinction clear:

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”) (Genette 217-18).
What Genette discusses under the title of levels of narrations takes us back to sequential order of events in a narrative. As discussed earlier as well, sometimes there is another narrative within the main narrative which may give a narrative its analepsis or, hence first and second narratives. Such narrations which take place within the main narrative give a narrative different levels of narration. Genette has given two terms *extradiegetic* and *intradiegetic* in this relation. Extradiegetic level narration is “the narrating instance of a first narrative” (Genette 229) and “the narrating instance of second narrative” is called intradiegetic level narration.

Intradiegetic level narration is done by one or other character in the narrative and the Extradiegetic narrator is not present in the narrative. The most comprehensive example of extradiegetic and intradiegetic level narration is Chaucer’s *The Canterbury’s Tales* in which it is through the extradiegetic level narration that we are introduced to different pilgrims and the tales told by them are told at intradiegetic level. Since the tales told by different pilgrims constitute second level narrations, they are also called “hypodiegetic level (i.e. a level ‘below’ another level of diegesis)...Thus the diegetic level is narrated by an extradiegetic narrator, the hypodiegetic level by a diegetic (intradiegetic) one” (Rimmon-Kenan 92).

Hypodiegetic narratives are not introduced in the main narrative just for the sake of adding complexity to the form of narrative; they have several functions to perform. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan entitles them as *Actional function; Explicative function* and *Thematic function*. Actional function is performed when the embedded narrative carries forward the action of the first narrative “by sheer fact of being narrated, regardless (or almost regardless) of their content” (Rimmon-Kenan 92). The most striking example of this function is *A Thousand and One Night* in which Scheherezade’s life depends upon on the embedded narratives she narrates. Mieke Bal discusses this function under the category in which the embedded narrative makes us forget the main narrative.

When the hypodiegetic or embedded narrative “offers an explanation of the diegetic level” (Rimmon-Kenan 92) or the main narrative, it performs explicative function. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan gives example of Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom!* in which “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 (Rimmon-Kenan 92). According to Bal, if the embedded narrative does not change the main narrative but only explains, its function is to explain only; but if it changes the main narrative, it is said to perform two functions i.e. it explains and determines as well.

Narrators belonging to different levels of narration give a typology of narrator which further highlights other issues pertaining to narrators. Narrators belonging to the extradiegetic level are called extradiegetic narrators and narrators belonging to intradiegetic level are called intradiegetic narrators. Shlomith calls the narrators of third level as hypodiegetic narrators and fourth level as hypohypodiegetic narrators. Both extradiegetic narrator and intradiegetic narrator can be present or absent in the fabula they narrate. If the narrator is present in the fabula he narrates, the narrator would be called homodiegetic, if not, heterodiegetic.

Like extradiegetic narrator, intradiegetic narrators can also be homodiegetic and heterodiegetic. In the case of *The Canterbury Tales* pardoner appears in the fabula, thus, it is an instance of intradiegetic and homodiegetic narrator. These hypothetical positions give us four types of “narrator's status” (Genette 248) 1) extradiegetic heterodiegetic; 2) extradiegetic homodiegetic; 3) intradiegetic heterodiegetic and 4) intradiegetic homodiegetic.

Genette attributes different “functions” (Genette 255) to narrator. First, the most obvious function that can be attributed to a narrator is the “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 metalinguistic (metanarrative, in this case) to market articulations, connections, interrelationship” (Genette 255). Genette calls it “directing function.” It serves in a narrative discourse the function of what we call stage direction in drama. The third function, “narrating function,” includes the participation of characters or protagonists as narratee and narrator. “The function that concerns the narrator’s orientation towards the narratee— his care in establishing or maintaining with the narratee a contact” (Genette 255). According to Genette this function is equal to Jakobson’s “phatic” and his “conative” functions which are about verifying the contact and acting on the receiver respectively. The next function, Genette opines, is very near to Jakobson’s
“emotive” function. “This is the one accounting for the part narrator as such takes in the story he tells” (Genette 256). Through this participation narrator establishes a relationship and through this relationship narrator may indicate feelings and emotions “which one or other episode awakens in him” (Genette 256). Since this function may “take simple form of attestation” as narrator indicates the source of information or feeling, this function is called the “function of attestation;” fifth and the last function is “ideological function.” As the name indicates some time narrators may take an overt ideological position or “story can also take the more didactic form of an authorized commentary on the action” (Genette 256). When it does so, it has performed the ideological function. Genette also warns that these functions should not be understood in a very rigid manner as “none of the categories is completely unadulterated and free of complicity with others” (Genette 257). What function a narrator plays also depends upon his “distance” from the narrated text and his “perspective.” Different functions played by the narrator go a long way in determining the characterisation in the narrative and also the ‘discourse.’

Structuralism does not have much to speak on characters. The most fundamental debate associated with them is pertaining to the nature of their existence. The question is if narrative moves further as a result of action done by character, are they the real doers or they are just ‘paper beings’ who have their existence within the world of fiction created by the author. Since days of Aristotle characters have been placed next to action. Aristotle defines tragedy “as mimesis not of person but of action.” Centuries later, in modern narrative theory, French structuralist, inspired by Propp, A. J. Greimas “links central concept of actant (i.e. fundamental role or a fundamental function) not only to characters but also to things (e.g magic ring)” (Lothe 77). Thus, there is an attempt to grant lower position to character as human characters have been placed on the same platform with non-animate objects. Dwelling on the abstractions of characters and types of characters E.M. Forster has given a simple typology of characters by classifying characters into two types- round and flat.

Even in the modern narrative theory, events have been given the driver’s seat while carrying out narrative analysis. Nevertheless, Aristotelian terms like reversal and recognition are closely related with characters and Roland Barthes also tries
give due importance to characters in his essay S/Z published in 1970. In the context of narratology, character seems to have become highly important if there is a character-narrator. In such cases, it would be difficult to give character a fixed place in the scheme of analysis, but as narrator, a character-narrator clearly belongs to Narration. However, Mieke Bal places characters under the Story and actors under Fabula.

But in narratology, besides understanding the nature of character’s existence, what interests a narratologist more is how the characterisation has been done. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan and Jacob Lothe both seem to agree on the issue. Both of them agree that the primary ways of characterisation are two- direct definition and indirect presentation. In direct presentation, characterisation is done by means of “adjectives or abstract nouns” (Lothe 80) which can be found only in a narrative with “most authoritative voice” (Rimmon-Kenan 60). Such overt technique of characterisation hardly leaves any thing for reader to decipher; but in case of narrative with unreliable narrator, it can be an interesting phenomenon to trust the narrator for the characterisation. In case of indirect presentation, characterisation is done through action, speeches, external appearance (this plays an important role in film narratives as characters are visualised in actors), environment and analogy. These are different character-indicators through which various traits of characters can be indicated.

In a narrative, different elements are so closely intertwined that one can never be studied in isolation. By introducing a character-narrator in a narrative that begins with third person narration, not only the status of character can be changed; it also changes the temporal arrangement of events and at the same time, also changes the overall structure of the narrative which, eventually, changes the discourse. Thus, to study a narrative is to study all parts of narrative in relation with each other.
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