



ISSN: 2319-6505

Available Online at <http://journalijcar.org>

International Journal of Current Advanced Research  
Vol 5, Issue 8, pp 1146-1153, August 2016

**International Journal  
of Current Advanced  
Research**

ISSN: 2319 - 6475

RESEARCH ARTICLE

**NARRATIVE THEORY: A SHIFT TOWARDS READER'S RESPONSE**

**Javad Momeni<sup>1</sup> and Bahareh Jalali Farahani<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Language and Literature, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of English Language and Literature, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article History:**

Received 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2016

Received in revised form 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2016

Accepted 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2016

Published online 24<sup>th</sup> August, 2016

**Key words:**

Narrative, Structuralism, Formalism, Space, Time, Implied Author, Rhetoric, Ideology

**ABSTRACT**

Narratology has developed from its early outset as a mere scientific study of texts to the modern version with its wide-ranging reading of narratives in the realm of literature and in daily life. The excessive attention of formalist narratologists's to the hidden governing system of a work was intensified by the theory's new dependence on Structuralism and its pursuing the underlying semiotic system of works as the determiner of the meaning. Yet, the rebirth of narrative theory is indebted to postclassical narratologists who recognized the fact that this is reading which shapes the text. Moreover, the inception of ideological analysis was sparked by Booth's concept of "implied author" which assesses both the audience's responses and the implied ideologies of the texts. Thus, Narrative theory involved an ideological approach by conceding that there is a design behind texts that affects readers in a particular way, and that can be found through the words, techniques, and the intertextuality of the work by getting help in this process from readers' responses. Such rhetorically-oriented approach allows readers' ideological mindsets to form their readings and leads to the openness of reader-response criticism for the new wave of Narrative theory.

© Copy Right, Research Alert, 2016, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

**INTRODUCTION**

As has been discussed by the prominent critic, David Herman (2007), in his seminal contribution to narratology, *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative Theory*, during the past several decades this scientific study of narrative has absorbed an ever-increasing attention of diverse research realms in literary theory to its multifaceted nature. To put it in a nutshell, narratology is the systematic study of any given narrative for the purpose of finding the basic structure of it, and, as further illustrated by postclassical narratologists, its way of affecting readers. In his 1969 *Grammaire du Decameron*, Todorov coined and used the word narratologie (narratology), using the suffix 'logy' in order to indicate the 'science of narrative' alongside other words denoting systematic study of diverse branches of science like psychology or biology (Herman, 2005). Bearing in mind the era in which this theory was fledging, it comes as no surprise that Saussurean traces are detectable in the early attempts of narratologists for analyzing literary texts. Under such a theoretical framework, the principle premise of narrative theory is to illustrate the way people interpret each story through clinging to an underlying, rather implicit model of narrative (Herman, 2005).

Gerard Genette (1980), the first who established the fundamental steps of narratological scrutiny of literary texts in the groundbreaking *Narrative Discourse* started his instructions by defining 'narrative' itself, since he found the term ambiguous for a scientific, systematic analysis of a work. Among the three possible meanings of this word, the first and the most common one refers to "narrative statement,

oral or written discourse that undertakes to tell of an event or series of events." The second meaning, current among theoreticians of narrative content, is "Succession of events, real or fictitious, that are the subject of this discourse and to their several relations of linking, opposition, repetition." The third and the oldest one refers to the process of "someone recounting something: the act of narrating itself" (25-26). The one that Genette focused his studies on is the most pervasive meaning, narrative discourse. To further illustrate the point, we use the terminology of the narratologist Abbot who refers to narrative as the "combination of story and discourse" while considering story as "an event or series of events" and discourse as "events represented". Therefore, narrative can be regarded as "textual actualization of story" and story as "narrative in a virtual form" (Ryan, 2005b).

Noteworthy is the fact that works on this theory being published before 1987, used the term 'narratology' in their titles, and were devoted to abstract linguistic and grammatical aspects of novels. In contrast, works published after that date are conspicuous for omitting the 'logy' from narrative, using instead Narrativity or narrative theory in their titles, indicating a less scientific, less abstract and more ideologically and politically engaged approaches to text analysis. They claim that narrative should not be restricted to literature, rather it should be searched for everywhere, and dealt with as a mode of thinking and being (Currie, 2005). This change of method (and name) is comprehensible when recognizing the fact that despite the recent outset of narratology- approximately around 1970s- it has undergone a salient evolution from its early formalist-based framework, up to the Structuralist analysis of works, all the way to its modern shift of approach to the

question of rhetoric in literary texts. A brief survey of the historical development of narrative theory is provided below in order to illuminate the challenges which forced classical narratology to adopt a less scientific and more interpreting method of analyzing works.

### **Historical Development of Narratology**

As will be demonstrated thoroughly in the following, narratology in its early stage was entangled with Russian formalism and, in the later, more mature phase was developed by the help of structuralists such as Barthes and Genette. It was only in the late 80s that with the help of scholars like Booth, narrative theory started to detach itself from the scientific, theoretical scrutiny to a more flexible, context- and reader-based study of literary works.

### **Formalism and Early Narratology**

It was Welleck and Warren's *Theory of Literature*, shaping the Anglo-American formalism that provided later narratologists with the backbone of their assumptions for their theories. The fundamental thesis that stories and novels are but specific subtypes of narrative discourse, or other narratological notions like the distinction between fabula and *sjuzhet*, and detailed discussion of point of view, all appeared first in this work. Welleck and Warren, being influenced by the chain of Russian formalists such as Victor Shkolovsky and Vladimir Propp, who in their own right borrowed a lot from German theorists focusing on the question of narrativity, introduced obligatory and optional components of story (Herman, 2005) that were the foci of formalists like Tomashevsky who deemed them 'bound' and 'free' motifs (Herman, 2007). In the next phase, it was the morphological outlook of Russian formalism that helped German narrative theory to mature (Herman, 2007). The strong emphasis formalists put on the form can be considered as the root of interest early narratologists, wholly occupied with what Rimmon-Kenan describes as "the system governing all fictional narratives", developed toward this Russian theory (Wake, 2006). It is from this common interest that the very first form of Narrativity, still struggling with theoretical notions, emerged. However, Saussurean linguistics and structuralist focus on grammar of language should be considered as the ultimate father of the new born narratology.

### **Structuralism and Narratology**

In general, the grounding assumption of structural narratologists, including Genette, Barthes, Greimas and Todorov was in parallel with the basic notion of structuralism that distinguishes between *la Langue* (the system of language) and *la Parole* (individual utterances produced by people), favoring *langue* over *parole*. Thus, discrete stories were considered by this group as the *paroles* that all shared an underlying semiotic system. Consequently, what attracted the attention of these narratologists were not particular narratives, rather the 'transtextual semiotic principles' (Herman, 2005). This grammatical, systematic viewpoint of literary texts was for quite long the dominant method of analyzing works, its major principles being first discussed in detail by Genette in *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* published in 1972. He founded a systematic theory of narratology upon scrutinizing Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* (also translated as *Remembrance of Things Past*). What Genette and his fellow narratologists looked for in individual narratives was

"the common, more or less implicit model of narrative" that, according to them, enabled people to comprehend and interpret diverse types of stories. Therefore, building on grammatical premises, narratologists analyzed texts based on a hierarchical level, considering them as complex structures. For Barthes, for instance, the very first level is 'function', the second is 'action' and the third is 'narration'. The outcome of such theory is an in-depth analysis of 'how' narratively organized signs mean rather than 'what' they mean (Herman, 2005).

The connection between this structuralist narratology and formalism is not limited to their common interest in the governing system of narratives; narratologists also drew on the tradition of Russian formalists studying all genres-folklores, panoramic novels, detective novels, etc. - to explore variety of textual formats, media, dance and visual arts, calling for a cross-disciplinary approach to narrative study (Herman, 2007). In the very beginning pages of his 1975 article, "An Introduction to Structuralist Analysis of Narrative", Roland Barthes (1975) discussed the existence of a systematic narrative structure in diverse realms of human life, including fables, myths, dramas, tragedies and comedies, movies, paintings, and even local news, gestures and conversations (237). Nonetheless, we should keep in mind that the paramount object of narratological scrutiny, for its classical theorists, was novel.

Long years of analyzing texts structurally proved both awarding and restricting for narratologists. On the positive side, structuralism provided them with terms and categories that were most useful in kindling new questions in text analysis. The negative point, however, was the constraining nature of linguistic approaches which were under question because of the deficiencies they showed in the realm of linguistics. It was post-Saussurean linguists like Wittgenstein and Austin who started considering the vitality of language context in interpreting socially situated phenomenon (Herman, 2005). As it can be expected, this shift of attention left a remarkable influence on post-classical narratologists in the years to come.

### **Postclassical Narratology**

Narratology that came on the scene with the grandiose claim of scientific study of narratives started to lose its position in literary theory after years of objections from new historicists and challenges imposed on it by poststructuralists. Thus, for many the death of narratology was proclaimed (Currie, 2005). This death was due to the fact that in its classical phase, narratology was considered as both an applied science and the theory of texts, but its theoretical aspect did not lead to any significant reading, and its application simply ended in this challenge 'so what?' (Fludernik, 2005a). Overcoming this shortcomings, the rebirth of narrative theory and its current paramount place in literary analysis is indebted to postclassical narratologists who recognized the fact that reading, no matter how much objectively and scientifically done, shapes the text. As Currie continues in *Postmodern Narrative Theory*, structure turned to "something that was projected onto the work by a reading rather than a property of a narrative discovered by the reading" (2-3). It was from here on that narratology took a new path in analyzing artifices, and new perspectives were added to the structuralist approaches of it. Thus, classical narratology, rooted in the traditions of

Russian formalist theories, was expanded by the principles of structuralism, and was refined and renovated throughout 1980s by scholars like Mieke Ball, Chatman and Prince. Postclassical narratologists like Phelan (2007), Fludernik (2005a) and Herman (2007) have tried to embrace a larger scope of text analysis by supplementing classical methods with considering gender theory or philosophical ethics.

Considered by Mark Currie (2005) as 'deconstruction' of narratology, the resurrection of this literary theory was a sort of destruction of its scientific, reductive reading, giving space to surveying historical aspects of texts, leading ultimately to politically-oriented criticism. Becoming more entangled with the social, political and historical context of narratives, interpretation of works gained new value in narrative theory and postcolonial, feminist and political readings of texts became part of narrative scrutiny. Another axis being added to narratological reading is genre theory that insists on the conventions that govern an individual's interaction with a text. It is believed that genre processing is partly unconscious, yet some factors like textual features, readers' inclinations and the context can lead to the conscious attention of readers' to conventions of a particular genre. Stronger attention toward ideological, economic and political elements, which influence the reader's interpretation, is the result of taking genre implications into consideration (Kearns, 2005). What is negated by poststructuralist narratologists is the stability of the text; foregrounding, instead, the influence of the reader's interaction with the work in his analysis (Fludernik, 2005a).

One contributing factor to the birth of a new era in narrative theory was the problematic analysis of postmodern novels that contradicted the models set by Genette and Stanzel who confined their readings to realistic novels of 18<sup>th</sup> up to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Considering the fact that early narratology focused mostly on plot, and then on the discourse and narration in the course of work analysis, dealing with postmodern texts that challenged traditional norms of plot, characterization and sequence was much demanding for classical narratologists. Nonetheless, studies by scholars like Wolf helped it to surpass the mere description of literary techniques like defamiliarization and reach the profound analysis of metafiction, its strategies and its constitution of an aesthetic illusion (Fludernik, 2005a).

Among the other principle sources of change in narratological reading, one can refer to Wayne C. Booth's revolutionary *The Rhetoric of Fiction* and *The Rhetoric of Irony* that left great impact on postclassical narratologists. His concept of 'implied author', first introduced in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* was indeed the inception of much scholarly debates and opened a new realm in the narratological analysis. The next pivotal influence was the shift of attention of linguistics from generative grammar and structuralism to the matter of semantics and context orientation. In Germany, conversational narrative became a key realm of study and left a tremendous influence on later postclassical narratologist such as Herman (2007) and Fludernik (2005a).

Feminism was certainly one of the main literary theories that developed affiliation to narrative theory. Feminists like Lanser argued that classical Narratology demonstrated absolute indifference toward the issue of gender; and invited in-depth scrutiny of genderization of narrator figure in the texts. The pragmatic analysis of this group of thinkers makes use of the readers' speculations and the interpretive strategies

they utilize through the reading process (Fludernik, 2005a). However, there are other feminists who have dedicated some studies to the gender-based points of the texts that had remained hidden so far from the eyes of narratologists.

1980s and 90s witnessed a vast ideological orientation in narratological discussions, drawing on modern theories such as New Historicism, Postcolonialism and Cultural Studies. There had already been some inquiries about colonial codes in literary texts, and Marxist readings of novels, borrowing from Marx's and Althusser's ideas, were already prevalent in scholarly studying of works, when narratologists started considering these notions in their analyses. This approach is usually termed as 'symptomatic reading' of works by postclassical narrative theorists (Fludernik, 2005a).

Regarded by some scholars as a threat to the precision and theoretical basis of narratology, the recent expansion of this literary theory to nonliterary domains like medical, legal and psychological discourses has attracted enormous debates. There are prominent defenders of this widened scope of inquiry like Rimmon-Kenan (2005) who believes that narratology should cope with these new perspectives. Indeed one can trace narratives being utilized in psychological meetings by patients, or court testimonies, and therefore it seems quite natural to find the foot print of modern narratology in these nonnarratological contexts.

The last phase of development in narrative theory is the cognitive turn being increasingly scrutinized alongside the current social and media studies, gaining a lot of popularity these days. Its first point of analysis is the study of "human perception of actions and events from cognitive perspective", while the second phase analyzes the "narrative structures and how these obey fundamental cognitive parameters or frames." This has led to two branches of methodology; one focusing on conversations and narratives in oral form, the second dealing with constructivist presumptions about reader-text relationship (Fludernik, 2005a).

All this historical discussion so far testifies, most eminently, to the dynamic, flexible nature of narrative theory and the long path it has passed in analyzing a text, no matter literary or nonliterary, not only theoretically, but also rhetorically. It is worth noting that this broad literary theory is now regarded responsible for scrutinizing narrative in general; this means, probably surprising for some, the narrative represented even in games as well as legal or historiographical contexts. This explains the pervasiveness of interest in narratology and its present productivity. Of course this cannot be regarded as the ultimate point in the course of development for narratology because as Fludernik(2005a)discusses in his "Histories of Narrative Theory (II): From Structuralism to the Present," there still exists a long way ahead of this theory toward reaching its ultimate scientific image it dreamed about from the very beginning of its inception.

#### ***A Definition of Narrative***

Many believe they already know the meaning of narrative, most probably because they hear this word a lot these days, and here lies the problem. Nowadays, narrative is used as the synonym for seemingly irrelevant words such as explanation, theory, and ideology. Brooks regards this overuse of narrative as an evidence for the recognition of the fact that "narrative is one of the principal ways we organize our experience of the

world” (qtd. in Ryan, 2007). In fact, narrative can be found “in the ways we construct the notions of history, politics, race, religion, identity and time” (Wake, 2006). Whether due to what Ryan dubs as ‘postmodern lack of faith in the possibility of reaching the truth or knowledge of things’, or because of a simplistic approach to the concept, the literal meaning of narrative is blurred.

The constituent parts of all narratives are the material signs, the discourse, and the story, and they all play a certain social role. Roughly speaking, we can attribute the three to respectively, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (Ryan, 2007). In *The Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* we find the most famous definition of the term, already mentioned in previous sections, as “the combination of story and discourse” (Ryan, 2005b). Yet, here, we refer to the definitions of narrative in fiction that appears in *Narrative Fiction* as “(1) a communication process in which narrative as message is transmitted by addresser to addressee, and (2) the verbal nature of the medium used to transmit the message” (Rimmon-Kenan, 2005).

### ***Fabula- Sjuzhet***

Of major aspects of the fiction (specially the novel) scrutinized in the course of the narratological analysis are the story and plot of the work. The importance of the latter was to the point that the primary task of early narratologists was decoding the plot of each narrative (Fludernik, 2005b). However, it should be kept in mind that, considering their formalist and structuralist background, to narratologists story was something more than the equivalent of plot, meaning that a story is different from its rendering. This analytical distinction turned into the grounding notion of narratology, and it is from this difference between story and the way it is communicated that narrative scholars consider plot and narration together as narrative discourse (Abbott, 2007).

To trace this analytical split, a reference to the sources of influence on narratology is necessary. It was in the heyday of Saussurean introduction of ‘signified’ and ‘signifier’ that Russian formalism, in the 1920s, first made a distinction between fabula (story) and sjuzhet (its rendering); terms that Todorov called “historie” and “discours” (Abbott, 2007). Probably one of the prime contributions of formalism to narrative theory should be searched for in this very break between story and how it is arranged. According to *The Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, fabula is “the chronological sequence of situations and events that can be reconstructed on the basis of cues provided in the narrative text” (Ryan, 2005a); while sjuzhet is regarded as “the way in which narrative text presents (or notifies readers to construct) a chronological sequence of situations and events”; the term has been also defined by Chatman as “the discourse level of narrative” (Ryan, 2005c). The groundbreaking outcome of such distinction was the suggestion that all narratives can be reduced to thirty one functions that underlie all types of literary texts, constructing the impression readers get from works. This concept was developed by Vladimir Propp who focused on about a hundred Russian fairytales and folktales (Pavel, 2007). The revised version of Propp’s model, introduced by Kafalenos, minimizes and renames the thirty one actions into five stages of equilibrium, disruption, efforts by characters (or actants) at alleviating that disruption, the success or failure of those efforts, and finally the

establishment of a new equilibrium (Herman, 2005). In other words, there is always a goal for the hero of the story to reach, and in the way toward fulfilling this wish he encounters unpredicted situations, accumulating, finally, to the achievement of the goal or failure at reaching it.

Narrative theorists further developed these two separated concepts and brought about a new realm in studying of the two. To them, ‘story’ (fabula) denotes the events in the raw format, abstracted from their constitution in the text and rearranged in a chronological form (Rimmon-Kenan, 2005). On the other side of the continuum, to narratologists ‘plot’ (sjuzhet), which has a wide range of designations, from Aristotle’s definition as “fashioned story, shaped with the beginning, middle and end, to Forster’s calling it “events constructed by cause,” means the departure from chronological order of events, and instead rearranging, expanding, and repeating those events, boosting what would otherwise be simply story (Abbott, 2007). As the aforementioned discussion testifies to, what absorbed the attention and scrutiny of narratologists was certainly fabula- the underlying system of meaning construction- and not the sjuzhet. This interest in story is very much akin to linguists’ notion of deep and surface structure (Rimmon-Kenan, 2005), and illustrates why structuralism had such a great influence on narratology.

This focused attention to the deep structure, story, or fabula of narratives was challenged by some later narrative theorists. For a hypothetical discussion such a dualistic approach proves useful, but paying closer attention, it becomes obvious that this notion is also problematic. According to the classical narratology, readers have no direct access to story, and can reach it only through the plot; this challenges the well-established dualism between the two. Furthermore, as Barbara Smith argues, such a distinction is ‘naïve Platonism’, neglecting the fact that “for any particular narrative there are potentially multiple stories.” Thus, there is an inevitable connection between story and plot (Wake, 2006). As Rimmon-Kenan (2005) discusses, all narratives are “style, language, and medium-dependent, and therefore, one cannot separate story from its plot or they will lose what the narrative really is. Todorov, insightfully, stated long ago that “meaning does not exist before being articulated and perceived...; there do not exist two utterances of identical meaning if their articulation has followed a different course” (qtd. in Rimmon-Kenan, 2005).

### ***Spatiotemporality***

The importance of space and time in narratology lies in this simple fact that all narratives unfold through time- past, present and future-, and are constituted of people who inhabit locations, are influenced, and in return influence their surroundings, providing readers with the chance of imagining and constructing complex worlds in their minds. Consequently, part of our interpretation depends on these two factors (Bridgeman, 2007).

### ***Space***

The very first point about the meticulous scrutiny that narratology dedicates to the discussion of space in fiction is that a discernable number of genres are space-oriented; a wide range of genres have space in the center of their meaning construction, including fantasy, prison, historical, Gothic and

slave novel, science-fiction, Utopia and Dystopia (Buchholz and Jahn, 2005). Basically, space is the environment in which characters live and move, and is characterized by four elements; first, the boundaries that separate coordinate, subordinate and superordinate spaces, second, its containing objects, third, the living standards it provides, and fourth, the temporal dimensions that it is bound to (Buchholz and Jahn, 2005). There is an entanglement between space and focalization in narrative theory; as discussed by Fludernik (2005b), the space of a text can provide the reader with a 'camera position' that can coincide with the protagonist's point of vision. The reader can have panoramic-bird's view- or worm's view, they can move along with or without the protagonist (Bridgeman, 2007).

Different approaches toward the study of space can be divided into three groups. The most influential one comes from phenomenological theories, indicating that there is always a subject who experiences, is affected by and affects a particular space bodily, the one who feels the space by existential living conditions, atmosphere and mood. The next one is a literary-historical perspective whose main concern is perspectival and aperspectival representations of space. The structuralist-semiotic approach deals with judgmental values such as good/ bad or familiar/strange that readers attribute to spatial oppositions like near/far or high/low. The metaphoric and emotive potential of this entanglement between space and values has led to the consideration of semantic charging of space. The key point to consider here is that besides helping readers to visualize the content, space relations and the way characters inhabit them are important from social and psychological aspects (Bridgeman, 2007).

### **Time**

If we consider stories as the sequence of events, the importance of time to narrative theory becomes evident. Scholars consider two temporalities for narratives; the time of the story which means the basic sequence of events easy to be abstracted from any narrative, and the time of discourse that refers to the linguistic presentation of the events. In oral form, the two become "the time of what is told" and "that of telling", while in written format in which we have no access to the time of writing, the consideration of temporality is confined to that of reading (Bridgeman, 2007). Rimmon-Kenan (2005) further develops this notion in her *Narrative Fiction*, "the peculiarity of verbal narrative is that in it time is constitutive both of the means of representation (language), and of the object represented (the incidents of the story). Thus time in narrative fiction can be defined as "the relations of chronology between story and text". There are three main aspects that temporality and narrative intersect; first, "the general, philosophical perspective of temporality and its significance for the story and discourse level," second, "the relationship between story and discourse level," and third, "the grammatical and morphological devices (tense markers) and their significance for the discourse and story level" (Fludernik, 2005b).

Genette systematized the study of time in narratives by suggesting three factors with which temporality and what it means to story and discourse levels create specific effects. These three factors are 'order' - the order of events, 'duration' - how long events and scenes last, and 'frequency' - how often an event happens (Bridgeman, 2007). The importance of such

abstract terms lies in the fact that they leave a particular influence on readers; in fact, this link between story and discourse time creates the senses of suspense, curiosity and surprise in readers (Bridgeman, 2007).

In the 1990s, the 'new wave' of narratology stimulated a reaction to this pure formalist analysis of texts which underestimated the communicative (historical, or ideological) context of them; what they instead proposed was that all narratives are "the products of complex cultural transaction" (Grishakova, 2006). As Grishakova, a postclassical narratologist discusses in her *The models of Space, Time and Vision in Nabokov's Fiction*, a literary text is a "sophisticated and complex form of modeling". It is clear that sociocultural construction of time and space is in close relation to perception and experiences of each individual (14). Ricoeur's *Time and Narrative* also testifies to the shift of concern from objective, scientific study of time towards a psychological and contextual- oriented scrutiny of temporality (Fludernik, 2005b).

### **Implied Author**

The concept of 'implied author', ubiquitously discussed, and prevalently endorsed and opposed by critics, has left a tremendous influence on narrative theory from the very beginning of its inception by Wayne C. Booth (1963) in his *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, up to the present time. What is so unique in this seminal book is Booth's turn to particular narrative techniques that had fallen out of favor with most of the Twentieth century critics and writers who specifically objected to the notion of authorial commentary. He does not posit that such commentary should be regarded as valid always, but he believes that there is a purpose for all works-affecting the audience - and, therefore, those authorial remarks should be judged based on their relation to the texts' overall purpose of influencing the audience (Phelan, 2007). Written first in 1961 and then edited in 1983, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* is the product of an era (under the influence of New Critics) in which literature was deemed as a solitary piece of art, not been bonded to anything- not to its author, nor to its age or context-, and was considered as apart from any specific goal in its communication with the reader; the age that had recently embraced the proclamation of 'author's death'. Booth, then, being motivated by four reasons as he himself explains, writes about ethics, rhetoric, and author's implied version that communicates purposeful messages. His first reason was the distress he felt about "the widespread pursuit of the so-called objectivity in fiction" resulting in the abandonment of all 'telling' in favor of pure 'showing' in the stories", saving, in this way, the poetic quality of works, leaving all the judgment and interpretation to the reader who is left without any clue from the author. Second, he was annoyed by "students' misreadings" that were the outcome of his pupils' addiction to limiting themselves to text only, not being able to distinguish between implied author and 'flesh-and-blood-person', or between reliable and unreliable narrators. Third, he was stimulated by the fact that "critics ignored the value of rhetorical and ethical effects- the bonding between authors and readers". This was his most controversial assertion that was attacked severely by critics who believed that texts "should not mean, but be", and followed this aesthetic claim by Oscar Wilde that "there is no such thing as moral or immoral book. Books are well written or badly written. That's all." Booth asserted that many critics after the

1950s confessed that great works of fiction teach readers ethically, unless the audience misread. The fourth reason, and the most recent one that he came to later in his career was the connection between author's implied version, and our daily and hourly "construction and destruction of role playing"; the fact that all of us have some versions of ours that exist in different contexts of our lives (Booth, 2005). He proposed that it is inaccurate to say that since works are artificial, there are no moral distinctions in them, while great authors invite our critical joining, consciously or unconsciously, by the creation of the implied author (Booth, 2005).

In his *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Booth (1963) defines implied author as the creation of writers' in the process of composing, which is not "ideal, impersonal man in general", rather a version of the writers themselves in each work, different from the implied authors of their other works. The point is that no matter how hard an author tries to be impersonal, readers inevitably build a picture of a writer who is not indifferent toward values. He then defends implied author by referring to Henry James, among the first writers who encouraged objective writing and disappearance of authors from their works, that, nevertheless, clung to a "center of consciousness" that enabled readers to see and feel things through it as a dramatic way of fulfilling the rhetorical task (Booth, 1963). There have been other scholars suggesting diverse terms for Booth's implied author in narrative theory, before and after his proposition. Style, as well as tone, for instance, could both loosely refer to this concept, but as Booth declares each of them only concentrates on the matter of word and verbal aspects of novels, neglecting the author's art of designing characters, actions, episodes and scenes. Technique, in the sense that Mark Schorer applies it to all choices of the author, is the only equivalent Booth showed his consensus with.

Booth is very careful not to entrap in the fallacy of merging implied author with the real person who composed the work, considering the former as just the sum of the choices of the latter. He argues that such a concept saves critics from discussing void qualities like sincerity and seriousness in authors, because it is no longer the opinions, characteristics and lives of the writer that matter, but the values, beliefs and sincerity of the implied author occupy the center of critics' attention (Booth, 1963). The bold statement of this Chicago school scholar is that indifference is impossible and even the neutral comments authors make, reveal some sort of commitment (Booth, 1963). One should keep in mind that rhetoric cannot be confined to direct statements of authors, rather, the whole art of a writer, the way they manage their works, all signal the rhetorical purpose of them.

One remaining point about the implied author is the scrutiny of 'unreliable narrator' it brings about. As Phelan (2007) argues, the importance of rhetoric attracted the attention of the audience to the relationship between author, narrator, and reader. In illustrating this relation, Booth makes it clear that narrator is never one and the same with the author; it is only the 'I' of the work and not that of its creator's (Booth, 1963). The implied author's communication with the reader can be direct, through a reliable narrator, or indirect, through an unreliable one. The roles narrators play are reporting, interpreting and evaluating; by misreporting or reporting less than enough, under- or misinterpreting, and under- or disregarding they can become unreliable (Herman and Bart, 2007).

To sum up, in order for a work to be intelligible, it should contain enough 'telling' to make readers aware of its value system that creates the meaning, and persuade them to accept those, at least temporarily. "Any work with its rhetoric must fill the gap made by the suspension of my disbelief" (Booth, 1963). This part was entangled with the question of rhetoric that is going to be discussed, together with ideology, in detail below.

### ***Rhetoric and Ideology***

What ties rhetoric, ideology and even ethics to each other in narratology is that all the three are postclassical notions of narrative theory, enriching it with interpreting perspectives. A text is regarded as a purposeful communicating device, and not a mere representation of events, in rhetorical approach to narratives. Nünning (2005), one of the new wave narrative theorists who is interested in the question of rhetoric, reminds us that "meaning arises from the recursive relations among authorial agency, textual phenomena, and reader response, and that not only readers but also authors draw on conceptual and cultural schema". We can come to this conclusion that there is a design behind the texts which affects their readers in a particular way, and that can be reached through the words, techniques, forms and structures, and the intertextuality of the work by getting help in this process from readers' responses (Phelan, 2007). What rhetorical approach focuses on is the relation between teller, audience and the event that takes place in the story. The approach acknowledges that the narrated interaction of characters with each other has an ethical aspect, and so does the telling and receiving of these accounts. The emotional reaction that audiences demonstrate is directed to three different components of literary works; mimetic, thematic and synthetic components. The audiences' interest in characters as possible people and literary world as real one is classified in the frame of mimetic response. The way readers consider characters as representatives of social classes, and evaluate the ideological, ethical, cultural and philosophical aspects of the work is part of their thematic response. The third, synthetic response includes the addressee's regarding narrative as a made object. Readers' judgments can also be of three types; interpretive, ethical and aesthetic judgments. The first focuses on the nature of actions, the second considers the telling and the told- the actions and motives of the characters, also the implicit value of the narrator besides implied author, and the third is about artistic quality of the narrative; all of them can affect each other (Phelan, 2007). In this way the implied author's addressees get involved in the process of finding the hidden ideology of the text.

The analysis of novel, the child of 19<sup>th</sup> century bourgeoisie, marked the first attempts of reading for ideology that was scrutinized by Marxist critics. There are multiple ideological interpretations possible for readers of a text that have been classified under the three domains of psychological, sociological and discursive inquiries. In narratology, these approaches include text-oriented-structuralist- attempts, rhetorical readings and contextualizations like feminism and postcolonialism (Herman and Bart, 2013). Though narratologists' concern with ideology is mostly attributed to postclassical ones, it was also regarded by classical theorists like Barthes, deeming it as part of the 'cultural codes', and Genette, looking for it in the "body of maxims and prejudices that make up both the world-view and the system of values". The beginning of ideological studies in modern narrative

theory was kindled by Booth's concept of implied author that evaluates both the audiences' responses and the implied ideology of the texts (Herman and Bart, 2013). What this new wave of narratologists admits is the fact that readers, always, make narrative judgments in the course of their readings. Therefore, in our narratological analyses of fictions, our prime consideration is the ideology that the implied authors of the work convey to the audience.

## CONCLUSION

One of the most palpable literary theories of the twentieth century, Narratology has evolved from its early outset as a mere scientific study of texts to the modern version with its comprehensive reading of narratives in the realm of literature and in everyday life. The excessive attention of formalist narratologists to the latent governing system of a work was exacerbated by the theory's new reliance on Structuralism and its hunting for the underlying semiotic system of works as the determiner of the meaning. Yet, such reductionist readings ended up in the irritating challenge that no significant reading comes out of this scientific approach. The rebirth of narrative theory is indebted to postclassical narratologists who recognized the fact that reading, no matter how much objectively and scientifically done, shapes the text. Becoming more entangled with the social, political and historical context of narratives, interpretation of works gained new value in narrative theory and postcolonial, feminist and political readings of texts became part of narrative scrutiny. The inception of such ideological analysis was kindled by Booth's concept of implied author that evaluates both the audiences' responses and the implied ideology of the texts. Booth asserted that authors invite our critical joining, consciously or unconsciously, by the creation of the implied author; the creation of any writer's in the process of composing, different from the implied authors of his other works. No matter how hard an author tries to be impersonal, readers inevitably build a picture of a writer who is not indifferent toward values. Thus, Narrative theory embraced an ideological approach by admitting that there is a design behind texts that affect readers in a particular way, and that can be reached through the words, techniques, and the intertextuality of the work by getting help in this process from readers' responses. Such rhetorically-oriented approach that permits readers' ideological mindsets, Marxist, Feminist, Postcolonial, and so forth, to shape their readings brings about the openness of reader-response criticism for the new wave of Narrative theory.

## References

- Abbott, H. P. 2007. "Story, Plot, and Narration." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 39-51. Web.
- Barthes, R., and Duisit, L. 1975. "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." *New Literary History* 6.2 (1975): 237-72. Web. 07 Aug. 2015.
- Booth, W.C. 1963. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago, Web.
- Booth, W.C. 2005. "Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?" *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Malden: Blackwell, 75-88. Web.
- Bridgeman, T. 2007. "Time and Space." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 52-65. Web.
- Buchholz, S. and Jahn, M. 2005. "Space in Narratology." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 711-716. Web.
- Currie, M. 2005. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. London: Macmillan, 1998. Web.
- Fludernik, M. 2005a. "Histories of Narrative Theory (II): From Structuralism to the Present." *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Malden: Blackwell, 36-59. Web.
- Fludernik, M. 2005b. "Time in Narrative." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 780-785. Web.
- Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E Levin. New York: Cornell UP, Web.
- Grishakova, M. 2006. *The Models of Space, Time and Vision in V. Nabokov's Fiction: Narrative Strategies and Cultural Frames*. Tartu: Tartu UP, Web.
- Herman, D. 2005. "Histories of Narrative Theory (I): A Genealogy of Early Developments." *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Malden: Blackwell, 19-35. Web.
- Herman, D. 2007. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Introduction. Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 3-22. Web.
- Herman, L. and Bart, V. 2007. "Ideology." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 217-30. Print.
- Herman, L. and Bart, V. 2013. "Ideology and Narrative Fiction." *Handbook of Narratology*: n. pag. Web.
- Kearns, M. 2005. "Genre Theory in Narrative Studies." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 296-301. Web.
- Nünning, A. F. 2005. "Reconceptualizing Unreliable Narration: Synthesizing Cognitive and Rhetorical Approaches." *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Malden: Blackwell, 89-107. Web.
- Pavel, T. G. 2007. "Literary Narrative." *Narrative Theory*. Ed. Mieke Bal. Vol. 1 *Major Issues in Narrative Theory*. New York: Rutledge, 25-41. Web.
- Phelan, J. 2007. "Rhetoric/ethics." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 203-16. Web.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. 2005. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983. Web.
- Ryan, M. 2005a. "Fabula." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 239. Web.
- Ryan, M. 2005b. "Narrative." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 469-74. Web.
- Ryan, M. 2005c. "Sjuzhet." *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn

- and Marie-Laure Ryan. New York: Rutledge, 2005. 693. Web.
- Ryan, M. 2007. "Toward a Definition of Narrative."The Cambridge Companion to Narrative.Ed. David Herman. New York: Cambridge UP, 22-38. Web.
- Wake, P.2006. "Narrative and Narratology."The Rutledge Companion to Critical Theory.Ed. Paul Wake and Simon Malpas. New York: Rutledge, 14-27. Web.

\*\*\*\*\*